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ABSTRACT

The present study examines the function of discourse markers in Arabic newspaper opinion articles. In this study, discourse markers are not only connecting-words that contribute to the cohesion of text, but they are also crucial tools for achieving communicative act in the text. These expressions that come from different grammatical classes and mostly occur sentence-initially function across sentence boundaries to connect textual units above the sentence and to guide and influence the text-receivers’ interpretation throughout the text. Because of the crucial communicative role of discourse markers, they are important elements in text production and perception.

The main goal of this study is to identify discourse markers that are used in Arabic newspaper opinion articles and describe their function at two levels of text structure, i.e. the sentence and the paragraph. To this effect, the study analyzes 50 texts that form the data in the study, taking a semantic/pragmatic relation-based approach. The analytical model employed in this study consists of three steps. The first step is segmenting the texts into paragraphs and sentences. The second step is describing the functional relations that connect units of texts at each level. Two descriptive tools are employed: the Rhetorical Structure Theory to describe relations between sentences and
the Text-type Theory to describe the relations that connect paragraphs. The final step in the analytical model is identifying the discourse markers at the units’ boundaries. Halliday’s (2005) thematic structure analysis is an important tool that the study uses to facilitate this identification.

By means of this three-step analytical model discourse markers are identified in the data and the environment in which they occur is described. Based on the description of the discourse markers’ environment as well as the contribution of these items to their environment, the present study suggests functional classifications for discourse markers at the sentence and the paragraph levels. At sentence boundaries, discourse markers are classified as follows: additive, contrastive, explanatory, inferential, sequential, alternative, exceptive, background, subjective, and interactive discourse makers. At paragraph boundaries, discourse markers are found to serve three main functions: continuity, refocus, and change of topic.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This introductory chapter provides an overview of the present study by answering three key questions. What is the present study about? Why is this study important? And how is the study going to proceed? Therefore, the first section in this chapter specifies the scope and goal of the present study, the second section explains and highlights the study’s importance and the third section introduces the data and methodology the study employs. After providing an overview of the study, the last section in this chapter presents an outline of the study’s chapters.

1.2 Scope and Goal of the Study

The present study focuses on discourse markers in Arabic newspaper opinion articles. Discourse markers are words such as bal ‘rather, but rather,’ ‘ammā...fa ‘as for,’ ‘inna ‘certainly, indeed,’ aydān ‘also,’ min yamma ‘thus, therefore,’ kaḍālika ‘likewise, furthermore,’ ‘adif ‘ilā ḍālika ‘anna ‘in addition to, moreover,’ ‘d’taqid-u ‘anna ‘I think that.’ These words that come from different grammatical word classes, as it is obvious from the examples above, usually occur sentence-initially in texts and are grammatically and semantically loosely attached to their host sentences. They function across sentence boundaries to connect textual units above the sentence and to guide the text-receivers’ interpretation throughout the text.
This is, however, by no means an agreed upon description of discourse markers. In fact, despite the extensive body of research that deals with these expressions, researchers still disagree on the basic issue of defining them. Different studies define discourse markers differently according to the way they approach these items, the method of investigation they employ, the type of data they choose for their analysis, and the items they focus on in their studies.

In the present study, text is viewed as a communicative event that is interactively produced and processed, and discourse markers are seen as linguistic clues that text-producers use to guide the text-receivers’ interpretation of their contribution in order to ensure a successful communicative acts. Therefore, the study takes a semantic/pragmatic approach to describe the function of discourse markers not only as important linking elements that contribute to the cohesion of text, but also as crucial tools for communicating the text-producers’ intended meaning, plans, perspectives and attitudes. Siepmann’s (2005) description of these linguistic devices captures the notion of discourse markers in the present study. Discourse markers, he states, are “natural-language strings of varying length and morphosyntactic structure whose primary function is to signal the coherence relations obtaining between a particular unit of discourse and other surrounding units and/or aspects of the communicative situation and thereby to facilitate the listener’s or reader’s processing task” (45).

Another area of disagreement in discourse markers literature concerns the term used to refer to this linguistic group. Some of the terms found in the literature to refer to discourse markers are: discourse connectives, discourse particles, discourse signals,
discourse operators, cue phrases, pragmatic connectives, pragmatic particles, formulaic expressions, etc. (Brinton 1996, 29; Östman 1995, 98). These various terms reflect different perspectives on discourse markers. To further complicate the situation, the three major studies in Arabic linguistic literature that treat the items that are included in the discourse markers group, or some of them, use three different terms to refer to these items. While al-Batal (1985, 1990) calls the subject of his study “connectives,” Kammensjö (2005) refers to them as “discourse connectives;” yet Sarig (1995) uses Schiffrin’s (1987) term “discourse markers.”

Like Sarig’s (1995) study, the present study adopts Schiffrin’s (1987) term, i.e. discourse markers. The term “discourse markers” is chosen in this study to refer to the expressions that are under investigation because it reflects how the study characterizes these items. On the one hand, the word “discourse” makes it clear that the items examined here function at the discourse level, i.e. above sentence boundaries. On the other hand, the word “marker” is more general than the term “connective;” and thus could comprise the different communicative functions that the items described in this study serve. Although, in the present study, the word “connectivity” not only refers to the connectivity between segments of texts but also to the connection established in texts between the writer, the reader, and the text, as will be explained later, in many studies in the literature connecting function is associated only with linking segments of texts. This makes the word “markers” more appropriate to use in this study where discourse markers are signals not only of semantic relations but also of intentions, plans, attitudes, as well as social relations.
The present study has two main goals: identifying the discourse markers used in Arabic newspaper opinion articles, and describing how these items function at two levels of text structure, i.e. the sentence and the paragraph. Identifying and describing the functions of discourse markers in one type of Arabic text is one step for providing a more comprehensive understanding of the role that these items play in the production and perception of Arabic texts in general. There are some questions that the present study wants to investigate. What are the frequent discourse markers used in Arabic newspapers opinion articles? How are these items distributed in relation to the two levels of text structure that are taken into consideration in this study, i.e. sentences and paragraphs? How do these discourse markers contribute to their environment at both text levels? How could they be classified? Are there specific discourse markers that are associated with each level of text? What is the frequency of the use of these items in the data?

1.3 Importance of the Study

An effective text is a text that achieves the text-producer’s communicative goals. Text-producers are not only engaged in presenting the propositional content of their texts as making sense, but they are also concerned with presenting this content in a way that fulfills their communicative intentions. Texts achieve the communicative intentions of their producers when text-receivers are able to recognize these intentions and to perceive the texts accordingly.

Discourse markers are essential tools for achieving the text-producers’ communicative goals. They form a communicative system that text-producers employ in
text to signal to text-receivers, independently of content, what is happening in the text, where the text is going, and what their intentions, plans, attitudes, and viewpoints are. Through discourse markers, text-producers indicate their organizational plan of the text structure, how they perceive the relations between propositions, their attitudes and evaluations of the content of texts, and how the whole communicative situation relates to text-receivers. The information encoded in these linguistic devices guides the text-receivers’ interpretation of texts according to the text-producers’ communicative intentions. This creates a successful communicative situation in which the text achieves the intended communicative goals for which it is produced.

Because of their crucial role in achieving a successful communicative act in text, discourse markers are key elements in text production and perception. Although they are considered semantically and grammatically optional, they are pragmatically obligatory tools for text processing. In order to produce acceptable, natural, and communicatively effective texts, text-producers are required to use discourse markers in a certain way that is expected and accepted by their text-receivers. Misusing these items renders the texts unnatural, affects their acceptability, and increases the chances of communication breakdowns. Therefore, studying the function of discourse markers as elements that ensure the texts’ acceptability, naturalness, and effectiveness is indispensable for studying texts in any language.

However, while studying how these elements function in texts is important for text studies in general, it is more important for studying texts across languages. Different language systems employ discourse markers differently whether with regards to the type
of markers preferred, their frequency, or distribution. Because discourse markers are communicative tools that signal how text-producers organize, develop, and evaluate their ideas in texts, the use of these items is closely tied to the communicative norms that govern text production and perception in the language in which they operate. Therefore, the type, frequency, and distribution of these items that render texts acceptable and natural differ among languages. Accordingly, what is expected and accepted in using discourse markers in a certain language may not be thus in other languages. For example, the highly frequent use of wa, which is a marker of continuity in Arabic, is not only acceptable but rather required for a written Arabic text to sound natural. However, when translating into English, this discourse marker is often omitted since English translation would otherwise sound awkward.

This language-specific use of discourse markers poses a challenge for L2 learners and translators. It has been noticed that the lack of competence in the use of discourse markers is an important factor for the lack of coherence in L2 writing, especially at the advanced levels. For example, Siepmann’s (2005) study indicates that very advanced German-native learners of English experience difficulties using discourse markers in a native-like manner. Other studies also show similar results regarding the use of discourse markers in written English by Chinese, Finnish, Norwegian, and French advanced non-native learners (Lorenz 1999, 56). Moreover, in their study that examines text-building skills in Arabic texts written by American students of Arabic as a foreign language, Shakir and Obeidat (1992) find that most of these texts suffer from the lack or misuse of discourse markers. Lacking the competence in using discourse markers properly, they
conclude, is an important factor in lacking coherence in these texts. The difficulties that foreign students of Arabic usually face in using discourse markers appropriately in their writings, is also confirmed by al-Batal (1990) and Kammensjö (2005) based on their experience in teaching Arabic as a foreign language.

On the other hand, translators also find discourse markers challenging elements for achieving balance between accuracy and naturalness. In the translation process, they always have to deal with the decision of adding, omitting, or modifying discourse markers in order to produce a translated text that is equivalent to the source text but at the same time acceptable and natural in the target language. Even professional translators, Siepmann (2005) points out, may occasionally commit the error of misusing discourse markers (278). In Arabic, discourse markers pose a greater challenge for translators from or into Arabic as Khalil (2000) and Baker (1992) point out. The balance between accuracy and naturalness becomes harder to achieve in Arabic because of the many discourse markers that should be omitted, added, or modified.

Studying the function of discourse markers is, therefore, a key element for achieving text competence across languages. However, studying how these items function in Arabic texts is even more important for achieving text competence because of the highly frequent use of these items in this language. The high frequency of discourse markers in Modern Written Arabic texts has been attested by many studies in the Arabic linguistics field, such as al-Batal (1990), Hatim (1997), Khalil (2000) and Ryding (2005). In Arabic, Ryding (2005) states, “most sentences within a text actually start with a connective word that links each sentence with the previous one.” “Even paragraphs,” she
adds, “are introduced with connectives that connect them to the text as a whole” (407). Therefore, while the appropriate use of discourse markers pose a challenge for L2 learners and translators in general, the high frequency of these items in Modern Written Arabic texts creates a more complicated situation for students of Arabic as a foreign language as well as for translators working with Arabic texts.

Despite the extensive use of discourse markers in Arabic and the essential role they play in the production and perception of Arabic texts, there are only three studies in modern Arabic linguistic literature that are devoted to the study of these items: al-Batal (1985, 1990), Kammensjö (2005), and Sarig (1995). Among the three studies, however, Kammensjö (2005) study, which focuses on discourse markers in Formal Spoken Arabic is the only one that treats these items from a discourse perspective and operates within a theoretical and methodological framework. This means that a systematic treatment of discourse markers as a discourse phenomenon in Modern Written Arabic is almost absent in modern Arabic linguistic studies. In order to fill this gap in Arabic linguistic research, the present study examines discourse markers from a discourse perspective in one style of Modern Written Arabic, i.e. newspaper opinion articles.

1.4 Data and Methodology

The data analyzed in the present study consist of 50 Arabic newspaper opinion articles drawn from the electronic editions of two major international daily Arabic
newspapers: *al-Sharq al-Awsat* (الشرق الأوسط) and *al-Hayat* (الحياة). The articles are published during the period of time between 1 January and 31 March, 2007. The two newspapers are chosen for their high circulation, international distribution, and comprehensive coverage of various issues concerning the entire Arab World. This reflects their importance in the world of media as well as their influential role on language use across the Arab region. Moreover, the fact that the writers of the opinion articles in these two newspapers are experienced columnists who come from different Arab regions means that their writings represent a sample of one style of the Modern Written Arabic, i.e. journalistic Arabic, that is used throughout the Arab world today. The diversity of regions from which the writers come also eliminates the effect of possible regional differences in using discourse markers on the results of the analysis.

Newspaper opinion articles that are investigated in the present study represent one genre of journalistic prose. They are texts in which different professional writers express their views and opinions on current events or issues pertinent to their local community and the world (Maynard 1996, 392; Van Dijk 1998, 21). Since the goal of these texts is to influence readers’ perceptions of facts and events, they usually employ argumentative text-type in their structure, and their style is characterized as being evaluative and involved. The argumentative and evaluative nature of opinion articles require frequent use of discourse markers in order to construct arguments and express the writers’ points of view. Because of the highlighted role of discourse markers in this genre, opinion articles provide important data for investigating the function of these linguistic devices.

---

1 The transliteration of the two newspapers’ names does not follow the transliteration system in this study. They are transliterated the way they are written in the English editions of the newspapers.
Focusing on the function of discourse markers in one text-type only is essential for the consistency of the result of the analysis. It has been attested in discourse markers studies, as will be seen in the literature review, that the choice, use, and frequency of discourse markers differ according to text-type (see Brown and Yule 1986; Khalil 2000; Östman 1995). Conditions for using discourse markers, Östman (1995) states, “need to be related to the characteristic of different discourse types and genres” (103).

The data examined in this study is selected from the written mode of the Arabic language because, as has been mentioned, discourse markers have not yet been investigated thoroughly from a discourse perspective in this form of the language. On the other hand, selecting the data from the Arabic language used in newspapers is motivated by the importance of this language as one style of Modern Written Arabic. Although some scholars ignore the importance of this style of written Arabic, there are many others who regard it not only as an appropriate representative of the Modern Written Arabic language, but also as an important form of the language that plays a crucial role in its development (Abdelfattah 1996; Hamdi 2002; Parkinson 1991; Ryding 2005; Sharaf 2000). The ability of journalistic Arabic “to reflect and embody change while maintaining the major grammatical conventions and standards,” Ryding (2005) points out, makes it “a lively and widely understood form of the written language, and within the style spectrum of Arabic as a whole, a functional written standard for all Arab countries” (9).

Two important things related to the data should be pointed out here. The first concerns the way the study presents the examples given from the data. In this study, examples that are set off the main text are written in Arabic script. Only discourse
markers that these examples illustrate are transliterated alongside their written form in Arabic. This decision not to use transliteration for presenting the Arabic texts stems from a negative experience with English studies that use transliterated Arabic texts. As a native speaker of Arabic, I always find it extremely confusing and difficult to read the Arabic text in the transliterated form. To avoid this laborious task, I usually opt for the English translation to read the text. Based on this experience, I choose to write the Arabic text in my study in Arabic script. Readers of this study who know Arabic, in my opinion, will prefer to read the texts in Arabic script. On the other hand, those who do not know Arabic will only benefit from the transliteration of the items under consideration, i.e. discourse markers. Transliterating the whole texts does not give them any information that is important for the study of discourse markers functions. The second point that is important to mention here concerns the translation of these examples. Most of the translations provided for the Arabic texts in this study are taken from the English electronic editions of *al-Sharq al-Awsat* and *al-Hayat*. However, all these translations are modified, in some cases significantly, by the writer of this study.

The goal of the present study, as has been mentioned, is to identify discourse markers in Arabic newspaper opinion articles and describe their function in text. To this effect, the study takes the text rather than the discourse markers themselves as its point of departure. Focusing on the text in order to examine the function of discourse markers is based on text linguistic approach which views connected discourse as central to understanding language and grammar (see de Beaugrande 1994; Halliday 2004; Hatim 1997; Hoey 2001, 2002).
Therefore, the analytical model employed in the present study starts with describing the texts; then based on that description, it proceeds to describe the function of discourse markers in their natural environment in these texts. This model consists of three steps: segmenting the texts into units, describing the functional relations among these units, and finally identifying the discourse markers at unit boundaries. The analytical model in this study draws on the model that Kammensjö (2005) uses for analyzing discourse markers in her study. It is, however, modified here to better serve the goals and data of this study. The study also draws on different theories in the field of discourse analysis such as cohesion, coherence, text structure and functional relations.

An essential assumption underlying the analysis process in this study is that texts are communicative events that are interactively produced and processed. They are hierarchically structured and their segments are connected by a network of underlying functional relations that reflect the text-producers’ intentions, plans, and goals. Both analytical tools used for describing the functional relations in texts take the intentions and goals of the text-producers into consideration.

The first step in the analytical process is segmenting the texts in the data in order to determine the unit boundaries where discourse markers occur. Two levels of text structure are taken into consideration in this study, i.e. sentences and paragraphs. The study employs a top-down approach for segmenting the texts into these two levels of text structure.

After identifying the sentences and the paragraphs of the texts, two analytical tools are employed to describe the semantic/pragmatic functional relations that connect
segments of texts at each level. The Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) describes functional relations between sentences whereas the functional relations that connect paragraphs are described with Text-type Theory. Both of these relation-based frameworks represent the text structuring relations from the perspective of the text-producer, taking his intended communicative goals as the means for interpreting these relations. Therefore, these descriptive tools provide a semantic/pragmatic description of the environment in which discourse markers occur.

The third step in the analytical process is to identify discourse markers in the data. A thematic structure analysis is employed in order to distinguish discourse markers, which occur sentence and paragraph-initially but are semantically and grammatically detached from their host units, from other elements that occur at the onset of sentences and paragraphs but constitute part of the structure and core meanings of these units.

Identifying discourse markers in the data and describing the textual environment in which they occur provide the means for describing how these items operate in this environment. Therefore, after analyzing the data according to the three-step analytical model, the outcome of this analysis is used to describe the function of discourse markers at both the sentence and paragraph levels of text structure. In order to present a coherent description of the functions served by these items, a functional classification of discourse markers is proposed in Chapter five.
1.5 Chapters of the Study

After providing an overview of the present study in the previous sections, this section presents an outline of the chapters of this study. The study is divided into six chapters: introduction, literature review, research design and methodology, process of the analysis, outcome of the analysis, and conclusion. The First Chapter presents an overview of the study; its scope, goals, importance, and the data and methodology it employs. In the Second Chapter a theoretical framework for the analysis and description of discourse markers in this study is introduced and a review of the studies that are related to discourse markers research in both English and Arabic literature is presented. Chapter Three describes the data examined in the study as well as the method employed in analyzing this data. This is followed in Chapter Four by describing how the plan of investigation that is employed in this study is used for examining the data. In Chapter Five a description of the function of discourse markers at both the sentence and paragraph levels of text structure is presented as an outcome of the analysis process in the previous chapters. Chapter Six concludes the study by summarizing the findings of the study, presenting its limitations and giving suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Interest in discourse markers as a linguistic phenomenon started with the shift in linguistic study from focusing almost exclusively on the sentence as the higher unit of analysis into looking at the text as a whole. In sentence-based linguistics research, some of the expressions that are now included in this group have been studied and classified within the boundaries of the sentence, such as conjunctions; whereas other items, such as well, you know, and now, have been excluded from consideration because they were regarded as “unworthy of close attention” (Schourup 1999, 228). Within discourse perspective, however, increased attention has been drawn to these elements, and research on this linguistic phenomenon expanded rapidly. In this chapter, a review of related literature will be presented in order to place the present study with regard to other related studies. The chapter will be divided into three major sections: A theoretical background of text theories that are employed in examining discourse markers, followed by an overview of the study of discourse markers first in English linguistic literature, then in Arabic linguistic literature. These are the main areas of research directly relevant to this study.
2.2 Theoretical Background

2.2.1 Introduction

In this study, discourse markers are approached from a discourse perspective. Because their operational scope is considered to be “units of discourse such as sentences and paragraphs, rather than intersentential predications,” as Matras (1997, 177) puts it, they are best seen as providing information at the discourse level, and not at the sentence level. Focusing on the text in order to examine the function of discourse markers is based on text linguistic which views connected discourse as central to understanding language and grammar. This enables linguistic analysis to reach beyond the traditional level of sentence to the text as a whole (see de Beaugrande 1994; Brown and Yule 1986; Cumming, Susanna, and Tsuyoshi Ono. 1997; Grimes 1975; Halliday 2004; Hatim 1997; Hoey 2001, 2002; Longacre 1996, 1996; Morgan and Sellner 1980).

In traditional grammar, linguists prefer to remain within the boundaries of the sentence when investigating language phenomena. They argue that everything beyond the sentence is the domain of the rhetoricians or critics. For Longacre (1976) it is “an amazing fact” that “most schools of Linguistics have confined their work to the sentence level and lower” ignoring “units in text of proven relevance to a practical user of language” (257). This limitation, as al-Batal (1985) points out, is also found in Arab traditional grammar. Most grammarians considered “studying the language at levels higher than that of the sentence” as being part of ‘ilm-u al-balāghah ‘rhetoric,’ and thus not within the field of their interest (22).
Modern linguistics, however, emphasizes the grammatical importance of connected discourse. For functional linguists, grammar cannot be understood “just by looking at it from its own level;” rather, it has to be approached “from above” (Halliday 2004, 31). This, Grimes (1975) argues, is “because certain factors are needed for the understanding of elements in sentences that are not available within those sentences themselves but only elsewhere in the discourse” (8). To dissociate grammatical phenomena from the structure of texts is to miss the essence of their use. al-Jurjānī (1984), the distinguished Arab rhetorician and linguist, also realizes the importance of discourse in studying language. “Individual words, which are conventional elements of language,” he states, “have not been created in order that what they represent may itself be discovered (or known), but in order that they may be joined with one another, thus expressing, by their interrelations, valuable information. This is one honorable science and a great foundation principle.”2 (Abu Deeb 1979, 37).

Because the theoretical framework in which this study operates draws on different theories in the field of discourse analysis, these theories are discussed here and their relevance to the study is highlighted.

2.2.2 Cohesion

A crucial assumption underlying this study is that a text is cohesive. Cohesion is defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976) in their seminal work in this area Cohesion in

---

2 “الأشكال المفردة التي هي أوضاع اللغة لم توضع لتعرف معانيها في أنفسها، وكما لأن يضم بعضها إلى بعض فيعرف فيما بينهما من فوائد.”

و هذا علم شريف وأصل عظيم.” (al-Jurjānī 1984, 539)
English as a semantic relation that is realized through the lexicogrammatical system.\(^3\) It “occurs where the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another” (4). Each pair of presupposing/presupposed elements creates a “cohesive tie.”

Halliday and Hasan (1976) focus on cohesion across sentence boundaries. Although cohesive relations “may be found just as well within a sentence as between sentences,” (8) they are less noticed within a sentence where the grammatical structure is the main source of cohesiveness. To Halliday and Hasan (1976), the sentence as the highest unit of grammatical structure is “a significant unit for cohesion,” (8) so cohesion refers to “the set of semantic resources for linking a SENTENCE with what has gone before” (10).

The aim of Halliday and Hasan’s study is to identify the text as a “unified whole” as opposed to a “collection of unrelated sentences” (1). They consider cohesion as nonstructural relations above the sentence part of the textual component of the semantic system. Within the Functional Grammar Theory framework in which Halliday operates, the semantic system is one of three levels that constitute the linguistic system: semantic, lexicogrammatical, phonological\(^4\) (Halliday 1977, 176). There are three major functional components of meaning that interact within the semantic system and are realized

---

\(^3\) Lexicogrammar refers to the choice of words and grammatical structure (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 5).

\(^4\) Within the systemic theory, a text is the product of ongoing selection in a network of systems (Halliday 2004, 23).
throughout the lexicogrammatical level: the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual (Halliday 2004, 309).

While the ideational component is “concerned with the expression of content,” and the interpersonal is concerned with the social and expressive function of language, i.e. the speaker/writer’s attitudes and judgments, the textual component, is the “text-forming” resource of language that creates “texture” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 27). Within the textual component, cohesion plays a special role in the creation of text by expressing continuity between one part of the text and another (Ibid., 299).

Alongside cohesion, the non-structural aspect of “texture,” this process involves two structural relations within the sentence; information structure “Given/New” and thematic structure “Theme/Rheme.” “It is important to stress that continuity is not the whole of texture. The organization of each segment of a discourse in terms of its information structure, thematic patterns and the like is also part of its texture” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 299). The third component of texture is the “macrostructure” of the text “that establishes it as a text of a particular kind: conversation, narrative, lyric … and so on” (Ibid., 324).

Based on their analysis of English texts, Halliday and Hasan (1976) list five types of “cohesive ties:” reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion, and conjunctions. “Each of these categories is represented in the text by particular features … which have in common the property of signaling that the interpretation of the passage in question depends on something else” (13).

---

5 In the literature it is also referred to ideational and interpersonal as “propositional” and pragmatic respectively.
Reference occurs when certain items in the text require reference to something else for their interpretation. These items include pronouns, demonstratives, and comparatives; “for example she, this, earlier as in She’s shy. This is what I meant. You should have come earlier.” The reference may be “anaphoric” pointing to something that has preceded, but it may also point to something that follows “cataphoric.” If the referent is outside the text “exophoric,” the relation is not considered part of cohesion, which is about intratextual ties (Halliday 1977, 188).

Substitution is the replacement of one item in the text by another that has its same grammatical function. Halliday and Hasan (1976) describe this cohesive device as “a sort of counter which is used in place of the repetition of a particular item” (89). There is a set of “place holders” in some languages, including English, that can substitute for clauses, e.g. so as in This fish is cooked beautifully. Thank you for saying so, for verbal groups, e.g. do as in Did Jane know? No, but Mary did, and for nominal groups, e.g. one as in Borrow my copy. The library one is out on loan. Ellipsis, on the other hand, is considered a substitution by zero (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 143). It is possible to leave out parts of a structure and replace them by nothing, Halliday (2004) indicates, only when they can be understood from what has gone before (535).

A special kind of cohesive tie that is achieved through the choice of vocabulary is lexical cohesion. Lexical ties are “independent of structure and may span along passages of intervening discourse” (Ibid., 537). According to Halliday and Hasan (1977), this type of cohesion includes: repetition of lexical items, synonymy or near-synonymy, and
collocations. Collocations are “pairs or sets of items that have a strong tendency in the system to co-occurrence” (191).

Conjunction, which is the focus of this study, is the final type of cohesion. Where cohesion takes the form of conjunction in expressions like: however, so, that is, as a matter of fact, the presupposition involves cohesive relations between one proposition and another whether in the preceding sentence or in a passage longer than a single sentence (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 16). Unlike other cohesive devices, Halliday and Hasan (1976) point out, conjunction is “cohesive not by continuity of form or reference” (308). It does not set off a search backward or forward for its referent, but it does express “certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse” (226).

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), “conjunctive relations” are “based on the assumption that there are in the linguistic system forms of systematic relationships between sentences” (320). These functional relations, where one segment of text elaborates, extends or enhances a previous segment of text, are marked by conjunctions (Halliday 2004, 540). Conjunctions are classified into four basic categories that correspond to the semantic relationships they signal: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal.

Just like Halliday and Hasan (1976), the present study focuses on cohesion between units above the sentence, which is more relevant to discourse structure.

6 Proposition is the semantic representation of a sentence surface structure (Van Dijk 1983, 151). It is a meaning unit that always has a significant communicative function (Callow 1998, 155).
However, while they view the cohesive devices of conjunction as explicit signals of underlying semantic relations, this study regards their function of maintaining semantic cohesion in text as only one aspect of the various semantic/pragmatic functions performed by these items.

2.2.3 Cohesion and Coherence

Another concept always associated with cohesion is coherence. While cohesion is represented by formal linking signals in text, coherence is the underlying relations that hold between the propositions of a text on the one hand, and relations between text and context on the other. Coherence is then “a matter of semantic and pragmatic relations in the text” (Reinhart 1980, 164).

Cohesion, as introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976) raises questions about the relationship between cohesive ties and textual coherence. Brown and Yule (1986) argue that cohesion in the sense of explicit realizations of underlying relations is not necessary to the evaluation of a text as coherent. They state that a normal reader will naturally assume that sequences of sentences constitute a text and will interpret them as such even in the absence of any explicit cues of cohesive relations (196).

To illustrate their point that cohesive ties across sentences cannot guarantee coherence, they quote Enkvist’s (1978, 110) much-cited example:

I bought a Ford. A car in which President Wilson rode down the Champs-Élysées was black. Black English has been widely discussed. The discussion between the presidents ended last week. A week has seven days. Every day I feed my cat. Cats have four legs. The cat is on the mat. Mat has three letters.
This example displays formal cohesive ties between Ford-car, black-Black, my cat-cats, and so forth, but cannot be described as coherent. For Brown and Yule (1983), it is the underlying semantic relations as perceived by the hearer/reader that make a text cohere.

Morgan and Sellner (1980) also take issue with Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) view of cohesion as a means for creating coherence. They argue that coherence of a text is a matter of content which has linguistic consequences. It is the hearer/reader’s assumption that a text is coherent, they indicate, that makes him link a particular pronoun to a previous noun phrase and not a reference cohesive tie. Therefore, for them, cohesion is “the consequence” rather than “the source” of coherence (179) because there is “no evidence for cohesion as a linguistic property, other than as an epiphenomenon of coherence of content” (181).

While Halliday and Hasan (1976) suggest that cohesion is a necessary condition for coherence, they do not claim that cohesive ties are sufficient by themselves to create a coherent text. For a text to be coherent it has to employ different strategies, of which cohesion is one, in ways that are motivated by the register. Register refers to “continuity of meaning in relation to the situation” (23). In their view, Enkvist’s example, though displays beautiful cohesive ties, fails as a text because it does not display consistency of register. They state that a text “is coherent with respect to the context of situation, and therefore consistent in register; and it is coherent with respect to itself, and therefore cohesive. Neither of these two conditions is sufficient without the other” (Ibid).
When discussing the example he cited, Enkvist (1978) himself points out that it cannot be perceived as coherent text. Although it seems to display formal cohesive links, these “links on the textual surface fail to reflect an underlying semantic coherence.” Such instances are “pseudo-coherent” in Enkvist’s terms (110). For a text to be well formed, he concludes, “it must have semantic coherence as well as sufficient signals of surface cohesion to enable the receiver to capture the coherence” (120).

Reinhart (1980) also regards formal cohesive relations as crucial albeit insufficient condition for coherence. A text must meet three conditions in order to be coherent: connectedness, consistency, and relevance. Connectedness “requires that the sentences of the text will be formally connected.” Consistency means that “each sentence will be consistent with the previous sentences.” Relevance is a pragmatic condition that restricts the relations between the sentences of the text and their context. Her concept of coherence involves conditions of formal, semantic, and pragmatic character (164).

Brown and Yule (1986) and Morgan and Sellner (1980) represent a trend in the field of discourse and text analysis to treat coherence as being less dependent on the language of text itself, and thus not being a product of cohesion. In this study, however, formal markers provide well-defined tools for the study of coherence in text. Just like Halliday and Hasan (1976), the present study considers that explicit linguistic realizations of the underlying functional relations are crucial for the identification of a text as a coherent unit. Alongside formal connectedness, coherent text must also display underlying relations between propositions and relevance to the situation. As Hoey (2002) states:
Text is cohesive. Whether this is a by-product of the need to be coherent, as Morgan and Sellner (1980) have argued, or a prerequisite of coherence, as was originally argued in Halliday and Hasan (1976), seems irrelevant. Almost certainly the relationship works both ways. On occasion, writers (and more rarely speakers) consciously produce cohesive devices in order to clarify or emphasize, i.e. to create coherence…On other occasions, a writer's or speaker's coherence is reflected automatically in the language they use, i.e. in cohesion. Either way, that is a feature of text that cannot be denied and one, furthermore, that continues to be the subject of study. (172)

2.2.4 Cohesion and Textuality

What makes a text⁷ “a text” as opposed to a “non-text?” This question is central to the discussion of cohesion and coherence. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976) a text has “texture” and “this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text” (2). Cohesion is one aspect of creating text and a necessary condition for establishing textuality; however, it is not the only one. Texture, Halliday and Hasan (1976) indicate, “involves much more than merely cohesion” (324).

Language has two other “text-forming” resources for creating text: one is the textual structure that is internal to the sentence, and the other is the “macrostructure” of the text. The main component of texture within the sentence is the organization of its parts in terms of the information structure that is based on the distinction between “GIVEN” and “NEW”, and the thematic structure that organizes the message into “THEME” and “RHEME”. The “macrostructure” of a text “that establishes it as a text of particular kind” is the third component of texture (Ibid., 324).

Textuality for Halliday and Hasan (1976) is also realized by “consistency in register.” Alongside texture, they point out, continuity of meaning in relation to the

---

⁷ By text here we mean spoken and written text.
situation “effectively defines a text” (23). Cohesion, on which they place great importance as one aspect of textuality, is then supplemented by register to create a coherent text.

Brown and Yule (1986) have taken a different approach to determine what makes a text “a text.” It is the hearer/reader who decides whether a passage of language qualifies as a text or not. This decision is based on several factors that include: coherence assumption, socio-cultural knowledge, principle of analogy, and the principle of local interpretation. When people encounter a linguistic message they naturally expect it to be coherent and make every effort to interpret it as such since texts normally intend to communicate. It is then the underlying semantic relations not the formal linguistic realizations that create a text in Brown and Yule’s (1986) view. In addition to the assumption of coherence, the hearer/reader base his interpretation on his previous knowledge of the world, his experience of previous texts, and the context provided by the text itself.

de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) argue that the textuality of any text is a function of the interaction of seven standards. These are hypothesized as: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, situationality, intertextuality, and informativity. Cohesion and coherence are considered to be more text-oriented standards. Cohesion is concerned with the surface elements of text and how they are arranged and connected within a sequence. Coherence, on the other hand, deals with the ways whereby “the configuration of concepts and relations which underlie the surface text, are mutually accessible and relevant” (4).
The standards of intentionality and acceptability are psychologically oriented. They refer to the text producer’s and receiver’s attitudes toward what constitutes a cohesive and coherent text. The writer/speaker intends to make a language configuration cohesive and coherent and the reader/hearer should receive it as such to be considered a text.

Situationality and intertextuality are considered to be social. Whereas the former refers to the factors that make a text relevant to a current recoverable situation, the latter concerns the ways in which the text presupposes knowledge of other texts. Intertextuality is a major factor in establishing different text-types as classes of texts with typical patterns of organization (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, 10). The last standard of textuality is informativity, which is concerned with the content of a text and the extent of its predictability.

A well functioning text displays a high degree of all the seven standards. To measure the communicative value of such a text, de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) suggest three principles: efficiency, effectiveness, and appropriateness. The first depends on the ease of the text processing, the second depends on the strong impression it leaves on receivers, and the third refers to “agreement between its setting and the ways in which the standards of textuality are upheld” (11).

There are then several factors interacting in a text to make it a communicative text. In order to achieve its communicative goal, therefore, a text should display all the seven standards proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981).
2.2.5 Text Structure

Every coherent text has some sort of structure. This structure ties the segments of the text together, so that the text as a whole is perceived as one unit. Our interpretation of what a writer/speaker is talking about is inevitably based on how he structures what he is saying. Halliday and Hasan (1976) acknowledge this crucial aspect of text. It is clear, they state, “that there is structure here, at least in certain genres or registers of discourse” (10).

In text linguistics, Reinhart (1980) indicates, a distinction is made between a text’s linear representation and its hierarchical structure (163). Linearity indicates how text segments are ordered in surface structure. However, text is not just strings of sequences of language items that are linearly produced and received. This is because it follows a hierarchy of content, so that “as each new part of the message is transmitted,” Callow (1998) explains, “it is not added on the end of a string, but rather takes its place in a complex interrelated structure” (151). Every writer is faced with the problem of how to organize and present his non-linear message in a comprehensible linear form. So, there is a fundamental asymmetry in texts between the sequential surface form and the conceptual or meaning hierarchy underlying it.

Since text progresses in two ways: the linear progression of sentences, and the progression of the communicated message “which imposes a hierarchical structure on the linear progression of sentences,” as Hinds puts it (1979, 137), it is important to capture both the linear sequence and the underlying non-linear content of texts in any description of text structure, as Graustein and Thiele point out (1987, 22).
While Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) description of cohesive ties indicates a linear development of text, they recognize the hierarchical principle. The existence of cohesive ties, they explain, does not rule out “the possibility of setting up discourse structure, and specifying the structure of some entity such as a paragraph or topic unit” (10). Rather, the discourse structure is “reinforced by the cohesion, which explicitly ties together the related parts, bonding them more closely to each other than to the others that are not so related” (327). Therefore, they consider the macrostructure of a text that defines it as a particular type the third and final component of texture (324). It combines “with intra-sentence structure and inter-sentence cohesion to provide the total text-forming resources of the culture.” A narrative text, for instance, has a pattern of organizational structure to which it has to adhere in order to be identified as such (327).

The macrostructure as “the top-most level in the text structure” (Pace 1982, 23) is distinguished from the lower level of text organization, namely the microstructure (see Van Dijk 1972, 1980, 1983). While microstructure refers to “intra-sentence structure” and “inter-sentence” relations, and has been defined in terms of the “relations between the successive sentences of the discourse,” macrostructure provides an abstract semantic description of the global content, and hence of the global coherence of discourse (Van Dijk 1983, 150). The function of macrostructure is to organize the local microstructure of discourse and form larger chunks that have their proper meaning and function. The meaning of texts cannot be adequately described at the local level of sentences and sentence connections alone but it should also be specified at more global levels. Macrostructure, says Van Dijk (1983), plays central role in the processing of complex
texts (196), and “Without them the complex tasks of discourse processing could not possibly be performed” (195).

It is, therefore, assumed that what is communicated in a text is more than the semantic content of the individual text segments. Part of the meaning of discourse is the relationship between sentences and larger discourse units (Cawsey 1990, 77; Hovy 1990, 19). Coherence relations that hold between successive sentences organize the microstructure and account for the text’s local coherence (Reinhart 1980, 164). However, schema or what is called “the superstructure,” is the organizer of the propositional content or macrostructure of the text (Khalil 2000, 65). “Rhetorical relations,” Gulla (1996) explains, “seem to be most suitable for microstructure of text. When larger structures are to be constructed, macrostructures, the relationship between them appear to be more governed by schematic standards or communicative goals and effects” (81).

The two approaches to analyzing text above the level of sentence, i.e. the use of schemata vs. planning using coherence relations, are crucial to account for discourse coherence at both the local and the global level. Whereas schema capture domain-dependent patterns of discourse well, coherence relations explain the structure of coherence texts using “a closed set of relation” (Ibid., 79). Hovy (1990) suggests that there is a close relationship between the two since text coherence depends on organizing its functional relations in agreement with the goals that its schema is set to achieve. Schemata are “stereotypically appearing collections of relations, or conversely, relations are simply the elemental building blocks of schemas” (31). In this study, both approaches will be used to describe text structure.
2.2.6 Text as a Communicative Event

Text is a communicative event. Its structure is not a static entity but a dynamic one that is interactively produced and processed. de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) define “text” as a communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality (3). If any of these standards is not considered to have been satisfied, the text will not be communicative. Likewise, for Halliday and Hasan (1976) text is a “unit of language in use” (2) which must be studied in terms of its function in communication.

To say that texts are communicative events that involve “writer/reader interaction” (Hoey 2001, 11) entails that they are intentional and inferential. In this sense texts can be seen as a result of a dynamic process in which speakers/writers express meaning and achieve intentions and hearers/readers recognize these intentions. This could be traced back to “a Gricean view of communicative meaning as speaker’s intention and subsequent hearer’s recognition of intention,” Schiffrin points out (2001, 67).

Communication involves intentional behavior; “specially it involves a speaker’s intention to affect the cognitive environment of another individual in some way or other” (Andersen 2001, 30). Underlying this view is the assumption that language serves two major roles: “transactional and interactional.” While the former refers to expressing content, the latter to the expression of social relations and personal views (Brown and Yule 1986, 1). Callow (1998) points out that any proposition regardless of its size “has both content and purpose. We can therefore define any meaning unit in terms of its reference (what it is about), and its purposive significance (its contribution to the fulfilling of the message sender’s purpose)” (149).
The writers/speakers are engaged in more than merely conveying propositional content. They are always doing two things simultaneously: presenting the propositional content as making sense, and at the same time are also presenting the same content as fulfilling their purpose. Each segment of text then encodes pragmatic information that “signals the speaker’s communicative intentions” and contributes to achieving the overall discourse purpose (Fraser 1990, 385; see also Caron 1994, 706; Grosz and Sidner 1986, 178).

The readers/hearers have no access to the writer’s intended meaning in producing a text, so their interpretation of the coherence of text can only rest on “a process of inferences” of what it was that the speakers/writers might have really meant (Brown and Yule 1986, 35). There is a wide range of possible inferences made by readers in interpreting a text, and “never is there any guarantee that the speaker intended meaning is indeed equally represented in the hearer-inferred meaning” (Lenk 1998, 16).

The main criterion for generating effective text is that the text should achieve the communicative objectives of the text-producer. “Intentions play a primary role in explaining discourse structure, defining discourse coherence, and providing a coherent conceptualization of the term discourse itself,” Grosz and Sidner explain (1986, 175). The text-producer is significantly involved in how the text-receiver will perceive the relations between the text segments according to his intentions. In order to successfully communicate his message, s/he seeks to make these intentions clearly recognizable and inferable from the text.
Discourse markers are extremely useful tools for clarifying the writers/speakers communicative intentions. They signal how the text-producers “intend a message to relate to the foregoing or following discourse or to a particular aspect of the communicative situation” (Kroon 1997, 17). Underlying the description of discourse markers in this study, therefore, is the assumption that they perform not only connective but also communicative functions. This means that the writer/speaker employs them to signal to the reader/hearer what he is doing in the text and influence his understanding of what s/he says. The reader/hearer, in turn, uses these linguistic expressions to postulate the writer/speaker’s goals and intentions which can guide his interpretation process.

2.3 Discourse Markers in English Linguistic Literature

2.3.1 Introduction

The field of discourse markers research, as Lenk (1998) describes it, “is far from being homogeneous or unified” (37). Despite the extensive body of research that deals with this group of linguistic expressions, researchers still disagree on the very basic issue of defining it. While it is widely agreed that such expressions play different important roles in the message interpretation, definitions of what a discourse marker is vary among the researchers. This is because they disagree on such fundamental issues as: the semantic and syntactic features of these expressions, the type of meaning they express, and the role they serve in the text.

Because of their disagreement on the features and functions that define this linguistic group, researchers do not always agree on what items they are studying and
how to refer to the object of their interest. Differences in the items included and the terms chosen to refer to them reflect the different perspectives on discourse markers and the various frameworks in which they are investigated.

There is still no generally accepted list of members belonging to this linguistic group in English because researchers do not have the same conception of what counts as one (Brinton 1996, 31; Lenk 1998, 39). Compare for example the discrepancies between the list of discourse markers given by Schiffrin (1987, 2001) and the one given by Lenk (1998). Schiffrin’s list includes “Oh, well, but, and, or, so, because, now, then, I mean, and y’know,” whereas the focus of Lenk’s study of discourse markers are: “anyway, actually, however, incidentally, still, and what else.”

Depending on one’s definition of these expressions, the items included can differ quite widely. So a given item may be classified as a discourse marker in one definition but not in another. Fraser (1990) for example, excludes two of Schiffrin’s (1987) expressions you know and I mean because, for him, they are content words that are not relational while discourse markers should signal discourse relations and have no content meaning. He objects to the way Schiffrin (1987) views discourse markers as being “typically content formatives,” indicating that “any reliance on content meaning is ill-founded” (1990, 393). Another example is Lenk’s study (1998) which focuses entirely on the six expressions that are listed above. Because the focus of her study are discourse markers that signal relations between “discourse segments set further apart”, e.g. paragraphs, she excludes all other items that do not signal global organization of text (30).
Not only do different researchers not agree on the items they consider as members of this linguistic group, but they also differ in the way they refer to them. Some of the different terms that have been used to refer to these expressions are: discourse markers, discourse connectives, discourse particles, discourse signals, discourse operators, cue phrases, pragmatic connectives, pragmatic particles, formulaic expressions, etc. (see Brinton 1996, 29; Östman 1995, 98). Different studies use different terminologies according to the way they characterize the features and functions of these items.

Östman (1995), for example, prefers the term “pragmatic particles” because “it covers the essence and flexibility of this group of elements better than any of the other terms.” He considers the attribute “pragmatic” crucial in defining this group “since it is indeed functional, i.e. pragmatic, aspects which we should associate with these particles” (98). For Grosz and Sidner (1986), the term “cue phrases” is more preferable because “each one of these devices cue the hearer to some change in the discourse structure” (177). Blakemore (2002), however, who characterizes these items as “indicative” words with no “propositional meaning” uses the term “discourse markers” to underline the fact that the role of these expressions “must be analyzed in terms of what they indicate or mark rather than what they describe” (1).

In the following sections, I will discuss the main issues of agreement and disagreement in English discourse markers research, with reference to some of the most prominent studies that examine this linguistic phenomenon.
2.3.2 Similar Features of Discourse Markers

This section will discuss the generally agreed upon features of items considered as members of this linguistic group. Starting from points of agreement helps creating a sense of the nature of the subject of our study. The following section will then look at the most disagreed upon issues regarding these expressions.

Despite the large disagreement in this area of linguistic studies, it is possible, Schourup (1999) argues, “to identify a small set of characteristics most commonly attributed to discourse markers and to items referred to by other closely associated terms.” The most common features that he realizes in these expressions from numerous studies in the discourse markers literature are: “multi-categoriality, connectivity, non-truth conditionality, weak clause association, initiality, and optionality” (230).

It is important to note that discussing these characteristics here is only an attempt to capture some of the features realized by many studies in the literature. Such general features may provide some guidelines in the identification of discourse markers, but they do not by any means suggest an agreed upon definition.

a- Multi-categoriality

It is often said that discourse markers constitute a “heterogeneous set” with respect to the syntactic class of its forms. This is because items that are usually included in this linguistic set are not structurally unified. Rather, they derive from a variety of traditional grammatical word classes that range from single words like: adverbs (e.g. now, then), verbs (e.g. say, look), coordinating and subordinating conjunctions (e.g. and, but,
because), interjections (e.g. oh, gosh); and extend to include entire phrases and clauses, which are “typically viewed as formulaic or fixed,” such as: you know, I mean, for example, in other words, it must be noted that, it should be recognized that, it is fair to guess that, we conclude that, this is because, to sum up (Brinton 1996, 34, 16; See also: Fraser 1990, 388; Hansen 1997, 155; Siepmann 2005, 36, 44; Schiffrin 2001, 57; Schourup 1999, 234).

This feature of discourse markers poses a major difficulty in describing them as a group. The diversity of the grammatical sources from which they are drawn makes it hard to define them structurally. There are “no morphosyntactic or semantic criteria,” Siepmann (2005) says, that allow us to delimit them as a word class in the traditional sense (44). Each one of these expressions, Schiffrin (1987) explains, could bring some features from its original class into the discourse markers class (40). Instead of describing them structurally, it is often assumed that discourse markers “comprise a functionally related group of items drawn from other classes” (Schourup 1999, 236).

On the other hand, the fact that this set of linguistic expressions is comprised of members drawn from various word classes implies that these items often have “formally identical counterparts that are not used as markers, and which do contribute to propositional content, as markers do not” (Hansen 1997, 155). Many expressions that operate as discourse markers, Fraser (1990) states, “function as a different syntactic type on other occasions” (388).

The coexistence of two structurally identical items that function differently in discourse creates a controversial issue in discourse markers literature regarding the
relationship between the meaning of the two entities. Some linguists suggest that these two identical counterparts that are structurally related also “share a common core of semantic features” (Lenk 1998, 47; see also Andersen 2001; Brinton 1996; Lewis 2007; Schiffrin 2001). The interdependency between the two different meanings is explained by the theory of grammaticalization which, they argue, provides a strong legitimate account for this otherwise ambiguous relationship.

This theory suggests that “discourse markers have evolved from non-discourse marker sources through a historical process of grammaticalization which alter their original meaning” (Schourup 1999, 251). In this process, lexical items from different grammatical categories move to sentence-initial position, and, at the same time, develop a functional pragmatic meaning that is derived from the meaning of their original forms (Kammensjö 2005, 43). The function of the adverb unfortunately, for example, is explained as a result of “unidirectional development along a cline from clause adverbial, to sentence adverbial, to pragmatic discourse particle, where the older usage remains at the side of more recent developments” (Kammensjö 2005, 41). This means that, within this theory, the functional meaning that discourse markers display is related to the propositional meaning of their origin and could be traced to it.

Other linguists who address the issue, however, consider the two structurally related expressions as having completely “different functions and different meanings” (Lenk 1998, 47). Among those who deny any relationship between the pragmatic meaning of a discourse marker and the “non-pragmatic meaning of the same item when it is used in non-discourse marker function,” Lenk (1998) indicates, are Fraser (1990) and
Östman (1982, 1995) (47). For them, although discourse markers are structurally related to the forms from which they derive, their meaning, however, is clearly different “from any content meaning of the homophonous forms” (Fraser 1990, 395; Östman 1982, 153).

While there is a great dispute regarding the interdependency between the pragmatic function of discourse markers and the “non-pragmatic meaning” of their origin forms, it is, however, generally agreed that “these two do not overlap in discourse” (Lenk 1998, 51). When an expression functions as a discourse marker it does not express the propositional meaning of its formally identical counterpart. A discourse marker, Fraser (1990) points out, does not serve in both roles at the same time (389).

**b- Connectivity**

A prominent characteristic that most relevant studies attribute to discourse markers is their role in connecting units of text. There is, however, a great dispute about “the nature of the connection discourse markers express” and “the nature and extent of the elements connected,” as Schourup (1999, 242) points out. What discourse markers are assumed to connect, notes Blakemore (2002), “varies according to the view of discourse that is adopted” (5). Connectivity is, thus, conceived differently according to the way discourse is viewed and the framework that is employed.

In coherence-based studies, like Schiffrin’s (2001), Fraser’s (1996), and Lenk’s (1998), discourse markers are seen as connecting textual units by marking the relationships between them. These items, Levinson (1983) explains, indicate how the units that contain them serve as a response to, or a continuation of, a previous unit in
discourse (87). Within the relevance theory, however, whose object of study is the
cognitive process rather than the discourse itself, discourse markers are viewed as
expressing “inferential connections” that constrain the “cognitive processes” underlying
the interpretation of the segment they introduce (Blakemore 2002, 5). For researchers
who work within this framework such as Blakemore (2002) and Brinton (1996),
therefore, these expressions do not connect one segment of text to another. Rather they
connect the “propositional content” expressed by their host sentence “to assumptions that
are expressed by context” (Schourup 1999, 230).

Not only do researchers disagree on the nature of the elements connected, but
they also have different views on the span of this connectivity. The range within which
discourse markers are assumed to connect differs according to the framework employed.
In her study, Lenk (1998) for instance, analyzes discourse markers in terms of their
connectivity at the global level. Thus, for her, they “signal the kind of relation between
discourse segments set further apart” (30). On the other hand, all the markers Schiffrin
(1987) investigates are effective on the local level indicating relations between
immediately adjacent utterances (315). Fraser’s (1996) description of the function of
these expression, however, indicates that they establish both local and global connections
between units of text.

The connectivity characteristic, Fraser (1996) and Blakemore (2002) argue, is
considered criterial for determining the discourse marker status of any element. This
property of signaling relationships or connections between units of discourse is “the
property that distinguishes discourse markers as a group,” Blakemore states (2002, 2).
This entails the exclusion of elements that do not express connectivity from the discourse markers group. According to this view, expressions like *frankly* and *certainly*, for example, whose main function in discourse is to express the author’s attitude are not considered discourse markers because they do not denote a sequential discourse relationship (Fraser 1990, 391).

In the present study, however, expressions that encode a message which expresses the author’s perspective on the content of the basic message are regarded as discourse markers. Although these items, as Andersen (2001) and Brinton (1996) explain, do not convey connectivity in the sense of expressing relations between units of texts, they do establish other kinds of relations which also enhance achieving the text’s communicative goals. These kinds of relations create connectivity between the author and text on the one hand, and between the author and reader on the other hand.

**c- Nontruth-conditionality**

Nontruth-conditionality is also a feature that most researchers attribute to discourse markers. To say that these expressions are nontruth-conditional means that they “do not contribute anything to the propositional content in the context where they appear” (Lenk 1998, 27). Items that are outside the propositional core of the sentence, Halliday (2004) explains, are the ones that “have no status as participant, circumstance, or process” (85). These items which contribute nothing to the propositional content of the sentence, however, function as “instructions” to the addressee on how to process the sentences that contain them within a given context (Hansen 1997, 156).
That discourse markers are nontruth-conditional means for many researchers that these items are part of the pragmatic component of the sentence. When items from different grammatical categories come to operate as markers at the discourse level they acquire a pragmatic meaning that is not part of the propositional structure. Because their “primary task in language is not related to the propositional aspect of sentences, but to the pragmatic functioning of language,” discourse markers are regarded as pragmatic expressions (Östman 1995, 98).

Underlying this view, Blakemore (2002) points out, is the assumption that pragmatics is defined as “meaning minus truth conditions.” However, while discourse markers are “linguistically encoded nontruth conditional” items, she argues, pragmatic information which is not part of the truth conditional content “cannot be obtained through decoding linguistic forms” (12).

For such “linguistically encoded” items to be included in pragmatics, nontruth-conditional meaning should be taken to refer to “two quite different aspects of the interpretation of an utterance.” On the one hand, it can refer to meaning which is inferred from what is said rather than encoded in any particular linguistic expression. On the other hand, it can refer to contributions made by linguistic expressions which do not contribute to the truth-conditions of the utterances that contain them (Ibid., 32). Being applicable to discourse markers, for many researchers, the latter aspect of nontruth-conditionality is considered “sufficient grounds for treating all of these expressions within pragmatics” (Ibid., 33). They are linguistic “devices in language which allow you to look behind language,” as Östman (1995, 100) puts it.
Being nontruth-conditional, however, does not suggest that discourse markers are void of meaning. While the truth-conditionality characteristic of an item indicates that this item is part of the propositional meaning of the sentence, the item’s conceptual meaning, as will be explained later, refers to its semantic value regardless of its contribution to the sentence propositional content. There are expressions, Blakemore (2002) argues, which encode conceptual meaning despite the fact that they do not contribute to the propositional core of the sentence. An example of this is “the so-called apposition marker in other words” which “is both nontruth-conditional and conceptual” (Blakemore 2001, 114).

The nontruth-conditionality attribute of discourse markers is an essential characteristic of the members of this group. This is because it entails excluding from the group of discourse markers items that are part of the propositional content of the sentence but are sometimes included in this group (Hansen 1997, 161). Being nontruth-conditional distinguishes discourse markers, for instance, from “formally identical counterparts that are not used as markers and which do contribute to propositional content” (155). This non-propositional character also distinguishes discourse markers from preposed adverbials like “now and then, when these function as temporal anaphora.” However, any use of these adverbs whether propositional or not, Hansen (1997) realizes, “is included in Redeker’s (1991) notion of discourse operators.” Including such items that are part of the propositional content in the discourse markers group, he objects, “makes it almost impossible to draw a principled distinction between items that can function as DMs and items that cannot” (161).
In the present study, the non-propositional characteristic is an essential feature for identifying discourse markers. Nevertheless, while the non-propositional character of discourse markers indicates that they are not part of the propositional meaning of the sentence, it does not imply that they do not affect this meaning. These linguistic expressions, though not constituents of the propositional structure, do affect the propositional meaning by guiding and constraining its interpretation. The propositional meaning of an utterance, Andersen (2001) argues, is conveyed by “complex semantic and pragmatic processes” which are “not handled solely by the conventional lexical meaning of the words contained in the utterance” (47).

**d- Weak clause association**

This is a feature that is always associated with the non-propositional character of discourse markers. Not only are discourse markers considered outside the propositional content of the sentence, but they are also regarded as being outside its syntactic structure (Brinton 1996, 34; Östman 1995, 99). Both features, nontruth-conditionality and weak clause association, concern the detachment of discourse markers from their host sentences. However, while the former refers to the meaning aspect of the sentences, the latter refers to their structure. Discourse markers, therefore, as Fraser (1990) puts it, are “grammatically peripheral, in the sense that they do not enter into constructions with the sentence content” (391). Yet, some of these items have shown to “impose limits on the structure and content of the following sentence” (1996, 184).
Besides being structurally and propositionally almost separate and distinct from the sentences they introduce, some of these expressions, Schourup (1999) points out, have even their “own internal syntactic structure,” such as on the other hand and you know (232). It is also because of their loose grammatical attachment to the structure of their host sentences, that discourse markers are often set off from the main clause by comma or independent tune unit “regardless of whether they occur within the clause or at its initial” (Ibid., 233).

**e- Initiality**

That discourse markers often occur sentence-initially is considered, as Lenk (1998) puts it, one of their “most noticeable features” (51). For some researchers, such as Fraser (1990, 1996), Redeker (1991), and Schiffrin (2001), this feature is one of the defining characteristics of items belonging to this group. They assume, Hansen (1997) points out, that “markers must necessarily precede their host unit” (159). Discourse markers, Fraser (1990) states, “typically occur only in utterance-initial position” (389). It has been argued, however, that this is not necessarily always the case because some of these expressions occasionally appear sentence medially and finally as well with functions “fundamentally identical to those they serve initially.” We may, for example, have either After all, corgis are an intelligent breed, with “after all” introducing the sentence, or Corgis, after all, are an intelligent breed with “after all” falling within the sentence boundaries (Schourup 1999, 233).
Although initiality is not always considered criterial for determining the status of discourse markers, it is nevertheless generally regarded as a predominant feature of these items (Schourup 1999, 233). Researchers noticed that discourse markers “favor” the initial position in the sentence, and are most likely to occur there. Because these items “prototypically introduce the discourse segments they mark” (Hansen 1997, 159), they have been referred to as “natural Themes” (Halliday 2004, 83). Besides, whenever more than one of these items are present in the sentence, Schourup (1999) indicates, they “frequently cluster at utterance onset;” such as well, but wouldn’t the best idea be to join in (233). This tendency of discourse markers to cluster sentence-initially indicates that it is this position that they favor.

Another indication of this preference is the fact that while this position is the predominant one for many of these expressions, it is, however, for some of them the only position in which they can function as discourse markers. Anyway, for example, “can function as discourse marker only in the initial position;” whereas it is possible for actually, though frequently found initially, to function as discourse marker in other locations in the sentence.

The close relation between discourse markers and sentence-initial position is also realized by the theory of grammaticalization. This theory, as mentioned above, suggests that “linguistic items which come to be used as markers can, seemingly in a majority of cases, be shown to originate in lexical material” (Andersen 2001, 33). Throughout history, items like: adverbials, prepositional phrases, and clauses move to the initial
position of the sentence, and develop into independent discourse markers (Kammensjö 2005, 43).

Underlying this close association between discourse markers and the sentence-initial position is the assumption that this position is significant at both sentential and discoursal levels. The onset of a sentence is considered “a strategically important position” because it is the point “where continuity as well as breaks in continuity can be marked” (Hasselgård 2004, 77). It is also the information contained in this position that carries the flow of discourse by locating and orienting the sentence within its context as well as contributing to the development of the coming discourse.

The significance of the initial position as a text organizer is what makes it the most appropriate place in which discourse markers can fulfill their role in discourse. Being located at this significant point gives them wide scope over the whole sentence or paragraph, thereby allow them to influence and guide hearer/reader interpretation of everything that follows. “If the speaker/writer is making explicit the way the clause relates to the surrounding discourse (textual), or projecting his or her own angle on the value of what the clause is saying (interpersonal),” Halliday (2004) explains, “it is natural to set up such expressions as the point of departure. The message begins with ‘let me tell you how this fits in’ and/or ‘let me tell you what I think about this’” (83).

The tendency of discourse markers to occur initially, then, is related to the scope of their function in discourse. “Because they are used to restrict the contextual interpretation of an utterance,” Schourup (1999) argues, “it makes sense to restrict context early before interpretation can run astray” (233). Discourse markers that appear in
other positions in the sentence, however, do not have this power over the whole segment. This is the reason that the expressions that are found sentence internally or finally display differences in meaning from their counterparts that occur initially. “Different positions,” says Hansen (1997), “are responsible for subtle changes in meaning or function” (156).

Occurring sentence-initially seems to be the common predominant case for discourse markers, whereas appearing sentence medially or finally seems to be motivated by a reason. This seems to suggest that initiality is a distinctive feature of discourse markers from which some markers deviate in particular instances to convey some intended meaning. Further research is needed in this area to explain how meaning is affected by moving these items from their initial position. Meanwhile, in the present study, discourse markers are regarded as sentence-initial items.

1- Optionality

Being optional rather than obligatory is another feature that most relevant studies often attribute to discourse markers. These expressions, Schiffrin (1987) notes, “are never obligatory.” This means, she explains, that “any utterance preceded by a marker may also have occurred without that marker” (64, 2001, 57). Their absence, though it may make the interpretation process more difficult, does not “render a sentence ungrammatical and/or unintelligible” (Brinton 1996, 34).

It has been realized that the addition or deletion of discourse markers does not alter the propositional content nor the “grammatical well-formedness” of the host sentence (Lenk 1998, 38; Müller 2005, 6; Schourup 1999, 231). Because these
expressions, as we have seen, are neither part of the propositional content of the sentence nor tied to the sentence grammatical structure, they are considered to be “syntactically and semantically optional” (Schourup 1999, 231). This optionality, however, should be taken to concern the grammatical and semantic aspect of the sentence only and not its pragmatic impact (Müller 2005, 6).

Underlying the view of discourse markers as being entirely optional items whose absence does not have serious impact on discourse is the assumption that the main role served by these expressions in discourse is signaling semantic relations between units of text. Because discourse markers do not create these semantic relations but rather signal existing ones, it is argued, omitting these expressions does not take away the relationship they signal. The semantic relations, thus, are always available for the addressee whether explicit discourse markers are present or absent.

Taking the communicative aspect of discourse markers into consideration, however, asserts their pragmatically non-optional status. Although the relations signaled by discourse markers are usually still available to the addressee when these expressions are omitted, “eliciting a relation,” it has been argued, “is not the same as recognizing a relation.” The presence of markers, Caron (1987) finds in his study of processing markers, “affects the representation of sentences in memory” and the way they are processed (571). “When a relation is signaled,” Hoey (1983) explains, “a message is being communicated about the way in which the discourse should be interpreted” (178). The text-producer, in this case, is giving more information about the sentence to the text-receiver “than its mere propositional content” (Lenk 1998, 35). He is actually telling him
to interpret this unit of discourse in a particular way, hence influencing the text-producer’s interpretation of his contribution.

The absence of discourse markers, therefore, though “renders the discourse neither ungrammatical nor unintelligible,” has a great impact on its communicative force and the naturalness of its flow. While discourse markers are regarded as syntactically and semantically optional, Brinton (1996) argues, “they are not pragmatically optional or superfluous” (35). A discourse that is missing the presence of these linguistic devices, he adds, “would be judged ‘unnatural,’ ‘awkward,’ ‘disjointed,’ ‘impolite,’ ‘unfriendly,’ or ‘dogmatic’ within the communicative context” (35). This means that the absence of discourse markers may increase the chances of “communicative breakdown,” as Fraser points out (1990, 390).

What supports this view of discourse markers as being obligatory for achieving the communicative goals of discourse is the fact that their use differs from language to language. It has been realized that there is a certain acceptable frequency and distribution of these items in each language. Any overuse or underuse of these expressions renders the text unnatural or non-native like (Müller 2005, 13; Siepmann 2005, 245). This means that the use of these items is governed by certain pragmatic factors and is not by any means optional. Because of the role that these expressions serve in conveying the text-producer’s intentions and achieving his communicative goals, discourse markers are considered in this study obligatory, key elements in discourse.
Summary

To sum up, the above generally agreed upon features of discourse markers suggest that these expressions are not just a random group of expressions, but rather members of a “coherent group,” as Fraser puts it (1990, 384). It has been suggested that the similar characteristics of discourse markers make them qualify as “a grammatically significant class of items, in English and other languages generally” (Zwicky 1985, 302). However, it is more often assumed that items of this group “do not constitute a class in the traditional term” (Hansen 1997, 156). Because they derive from different grammatical categories, Brinton (1996) points out, it is difficult to place discourse markers “within a traditional word class” (34). Instead, they are regarded as a functionally related class that is “independent of syntactic categorization” (Schourup 1999, 234).

2.3.3 Problems in Defining Discourse Markers

Definitions of what discourse markers are and what they do in discourse vary among researchers as we have seen. Not one single definition of this linguistic group, Lenk (1998) notices, remained “undisputed or unaltered by other researchers for their purposes” (37). This large disagreement in defining discourse markers is usually attributed to the nature of these linguistic devices and the way they are approached. Different studies employ different methods of investigation focusing on different items that are drawn from different grammatical classes. Discourse markers, Schourup (1999) points out, “have been investigated within a large number of frameworks reflecting divergent research interests, methods, and goals,” and with this large number of
approaches employed “have come inevitable disputes” regarding their characterization and function (228).

It is generally assumed that discourse markers comprise “a functional-pragmatic” rather than “a formal, morphosyntactic” group (Hansen 1997, 155). Discourse markers have been defined in terms of their function because it is difficult to delimit such items that derive from different word classes in structural terms. Defining discourse markers by their function, however, has also proven to be problematic, Fischer (1998) realizes, because such definition “has to account for very different functions” (113). Previous studies of these expressions, states Lenk (1998), “have shown that they are a group of items with a variety of discourse functions” (49).

Different definitions provided by different studies of discourse markers emphasize different aspects of the several functions that these items serve in discourse. Lenk’s (1998) study of discourse markers, for instance, focuses entirely on the global role that these expressions have in discourse. While Lenk’s (1998) markers “are effective as coherence indicators on a global coherence level” (49), the markers described by Schiffrin (1987, 2001) are all locally oriented. Although Schiffrin (1987) acknowledges the global function of discourse markers, she only investigates and defines markers that indicate how immediately adjacent segments of text are connected with each other (Schourup 1999, 257).

Another definition that highlights a different function of these expressions is the one provided by Östman (1995). For him, the primary function that discourse markers serve “is to implicitly anchor utterances to the communicative restraints of a culture and
society” (100). It is, thus, “the pragmatic function” that is crucial in characterizing this group (98). Blakemore (2002), on the other hand, draws attention to the role discourse markers have in constraining the “cognitive processes underlying successful linguistic communication” (5). She defines them as “expressions that constrain the interpretation of the utterance that contain them by virtue of the inferential connections they express” (1987, 105).

Different studies of discourse markers describe the function of these items differently according to the way that discourse is viewed in each study and how it is approached. The type of discourse that is being investigated, and the way in which the meaning of the items under investigation is perceived also determine the type of function highlighted in the study.

Researchers who approach discourse markers from discourse perspective have different views of discourse. According to the way discourse is viewed, the role of discourse markers that is emphasized in the study differs. There is “more than one view of what discourse is,” Blakemore (2002) points out, “and accordingly more than one view of what it means for an expression to operate at discourse level.”

Schiffrin (2001), for example, views discourse not only as “a unit of language,” but also “as a process of social interaction” (56). She proposes a model of discourse analysis that involves the integration of structural, semantic, pragmatic, cognitive, and social factors (57). In order to make communication successful, discourse markers, she indicates, operate “in cognitive, expressive, social and textual domains” (54). Another view of discourse is the one introduced by Fraser (1996). Underlying Fraser’s (1996)
analysis of discourse markers is the assumption that discourse segments encode two separate types of information: “content information” and “pragmatic information” (167). The latter is expressed by pragmatic markers of which discourse markers are one type. These markers in Fraser’s (1996) view, therefore, are signals of “the different types of non-propositional messages a sentence can convey” (168).

Approaching the analysis of discourse markers from different perspectives also produces different descriptions of the functions served by these items. Discourse markers, Fischer (1998) indicates, “have been analyzed in many different frameworks and from different perspectives with often highly different results” (113). In coherence-based studies, such as Schiffrin’s (2001), Lenk’s (1998), and Halliday’s (2004), for example, discourse markers are described as signals of coherence relations that link textual units (Schourup 1999, 240). However, while Schiffrin’s (2001) analysis focuses on the functions discourse markers have in constructing local coherence between immediately adjacent units in text, Lenk (1998) analyzes these expressions in terms of their coherence role at the global level of text (28). As for Halliday (2004), unlike Schiffrin (2001) whose discourse markers can indicate semantic, pragmatic, and social relations, his markers are cohesive devices which signal relations in the semantic domain only (538).

Blakemore (2001), on the other hand, introduces another approach to the analysis of discourse markers. Working within the relevance theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1986), she (1987) argues that these expressions are employed to signal to the receiver how one discourse segment is relevant to another. Unlike the coherence-based approaches whose concern is discourse and the relations between its segments, in the
relevance theory framework the object of study is not discourse itself, but the “cognitive processes underlying successful linguistic communication” (Blakemore 2002, 5).

Another factor that affects the description of the function served by discourse markers is the type of data chosen for analysis. Definitions of discourse markers that are provided by different studies may differ according to the type of discourse under investigation. This is because these expressions often display different functions when occurring in different discourse types and genres. Some discourse markers that occur in both written and spoken discourse, for instance, may be used in each medium for different reasons (Brinton 1996, 33). This gives rise to different definitions of the functions displayed by these expressions depending on whether the data analyzed is written or spoken. “Conditions for the use of particles,” therefore, “need to be related to the characteristic of different discourse types and genres,” Östman affirms (1995, 103).

On the other hand, the type of meaning which these items are thought to display when they function at the discourse level also affects the way various studies define their function. “Assigning meaning to discourse markers,” Schourup (1999) states, “has proven no less troublesome than determining what a discourse marker is” (242). This controversial issue, along with the related issues of grammaticalization and multifunctionality, will be discussed in the following sections.

a- The Meaning of Discourse Markers

The meaning assigned to discourse markers is considered an essential factor in determining their status as discourse markers. For many researchers, being void of
“meaning” is criterial for including an item in this group. Hansen (1997) points out that discourse markers have no conceptual meaning, “but are basically instructions on how to process their host utterance in a given context” (162). This means that members of this group should display only “pragmatic meaning,” and any item that expresses “conceptual meaning” is, in their view, excluded from the discourse markers group. This is why Fraser (1990) suggests that “discourse markers should be analyzed as having distinct pragmatic meaning” whereas “any reliance on content meaning is ill-founded” (393).

In order to discuss the controversial issue of discourse markers’ meaning, it is essential to explain what types of meaning we are talking about. To have “conceptual meaning” means that the item under consideration has a semantic value. Expressions such as frankly, amazingly, and in other words, for example, are considered conceptual because they encode semantic content. Other terms used in the literature to refer to this type of meaning are: lexical meaning, referential meaning, content meaning, semantic meaning, propositional meaning, representational meaning, and non-pragmatic meaning.

Describing a linguistic item as having “pragmatic meaning,” on the other hand, means that it displays meaning that is defined according to its function rather than its semantic value. The pragmatic meaning for the discourse marker so, for instance, indicates “that the speaker takes the message following to have a consequential relationship to the prior material,” Fraser (1990, 393) states. This type of meaning is also referred to as: expressive meaning, indicative meaning, procedural meaning, non-propositional meaning, non-conceptual, and functional meaning. “The procedural meaning, as contrast to conceptual meaning,” Schourup (1999) explains, “means that the
linguistic expression encodes information about how to interpret the propositional meaning of the sentence” (244).

It has been argued, as we have seen, that the pragmatic meanings associated with discourse markers emerge from the conceptual meanings of their source forms through a process of grammaticalization. Brinton (1996), for example, concludes that “propositional meanings” in all the forms he studied “are the source of pragmatic meanings” (275). Other researchers, however, deny any relationship between the two meanings asserting that “pragmatic meaning” is “separable from any content meaning of the homophonous form” (Fraser 1990, 395).

It is essential to note that “the conceptual/procedural distinction is not coextensive with the truth-conditional/nontruth-conditional distinction,” Blakemore indicates (2001, 114). This distinction between the two oppositions, however, is not clear for many writers, she adds (2002, 12). As mentioned before, when a discourse marker is described as “being conceptually empty,” this may be taken to imply that this discourse marker contributes nothing to the propositional meaning of the sentence (Schourup 1999, 242). This is, however, not the case, because the conceptual meaning of a linguistic item refers to its semantic value regardless of its contribution to the propositional meaning of the sentence whereas the truth-conditional meaning of an expression refers to its semantic value which contributes to the propositional meaning of the sentence. What this means is that there are two kinds of expressions: “those which are nontruth-conditional but conceptual, and those which are both nontruth-conditional and non-conceptual”
(Schourup 1999, 240). For many researchers, the term discourse marker refers only to the forms of the latter kind.

While nontruth-conditionality is a generally agreed upon feature of discourse markers, as has been mentioned previously, the non-conceptual characteristic is cause for great disagreement in determining the discourse marker status of an item. This is because the term “non-conceptual/pragmatic meaning” does not convey the same notion for different researchers. When they say that an item is not conceptual, therefore, they are not always referring to the same attribute.

Fraser (1996) for example, excludes items like: \textit{frankly, amazingly, certainly, indeed, in short, first, next, and to add} from the discourse markers group because they indicate “representational meaning” (179-184). For him, discourse markers are “not content forms” but rather expressions of pragmatic functions (394). Nevertheless, items like \textit{as a result, in other words, that is, anyway, by the same token, for example, on the other hand, to return to my point, and in the meantime} are included in his list of discourse markers (1996, 186-188, 1990, 388). Some of these expressions which Fraser (1996) regards as “non-conceptual” discourse markers are excluded from this group for being “conceptual” by Blakemore (2001) and Lenk (1998). “In contrast with discourse markers like \textit{but and well}” which are nontruth-conditional and non-conceptual, Blakemore (2001) argues, expressions such as \textit{in other words} and \textit{that is} are “both nontruth-conditional and conceptual” (114).

For expressions to be regarded as non-conceptual discourse markers, Lenk (1998) argues, not only should they be lexically empty, but they also have to display “a
difference between their lexical meaning and pragmatic function” (45). What this means is that expressions like *on the other hand* and *to return to my point*, for example, which clearly convey pragmatic “structuring functions” rather than conceptual meanings cannot be regarded as discourse markers because their structuring functions correspond to their lexical meanings. “The structuring functions of discourse markers,” however, “do not correspond to a lexical meaning, but to a pragmatic meaning of these items” (39). For Lenk (1998), this is considered “one distinctive characteristic of discourse markers” (45). Therefore, in her view, Fraser (1996) “takes a very broad approach as to what constitutes a discourse marker” when he includes such items whose pragmatic functions are not different from their conceptual meaning (Lenk 1998, 45).

The effect that “the inherent semantic meaning” of discourse markers has on their pragmatic function is, however, taken into consideration in Schiffrin’s (2001) analysis (Brinton 1996, 58). She argues that many of the expressions she examined show “referential meaning” that influences their “discourse function” by contributing to “expressive meaning” (1987, 63, 314). Her analysis of *y’know*, for instance, “suggests that it has expressive meaning, but this expressive meaning may include some component of referential meaning” (63). Conjunctions are also examples of expressions whose “pragmatic effects” are “closely tied to their meanings: *but* marks speaker-contrast because of its contrastive meaning, *or* marks hearer-option because of its disjunctive meaning” (317).

Fraser (1990) objects to such analysis that relies on content meaning and describes it as being “ill-founded.” For him, discourse markers “should be analyzed as
having distinct pragmatic meaning which captures some aspects of a speaker’s communicative intentions” whereas Schiffrin’s discourse markers, in his view, are “typically content formatives” (393). This disagreement between Fraser (1990) and Schiffrin (2001) as to how they analyze the meaning of these expressions could be illustrated by the case of the discourse marker so. Although they both include so in their discourse markers list, the analytical ground for this inclusion is totally different. While Fraser (1990) considers that the pragmatic function of signaling a “consequential relationship” between segments of texts is the only meaning that so employs in discourse (394), Schiffrin (2001) argues that so maintains its “core meaning as a result conjunction even when it establishes “metaphorical relationships on non-proposition planes of discourse” (58).

The above are only some examples of the great disagreement among researchers on determining the status of discourse markers according to their meaning. The issue, as became clear, is not whether the expressions themselves lack meaning or not, but what type of meaning they are thought to lack and how this meaning is conceived by different researchers. What complicates the issue yet further is the multi-categoriality characteristic of discourse markers. The fact that these items are drawn from various grammatical classes, as was mentioned before, means that they come to this group with different semantic values. This makes it difficult to define their meaning, let alone categorize them according to it.

In this study, whether an expression encodes conceptual meaning or not is irrelevant in determining its status as a discourse marker. What is criterial, however, is
the nontruth-conditionality status of the expression. However, classifying discourse markers as nontruth-conditional indicators does not mean that they “indicate” in the same way. Some discourse markers encode both pragmatic and conceptual meanings while others have only pragmatic meaning. While all discourse markers in the present study display pragmatic/functional meaning since this is what unifies them as a group, some markers may also express conceptual meaning provided that this meaning does not contribute to the propositional core of the sentence. This conceptual meaning, as Schiffrin (1987) suggests, may influence the discourse function of these items by contributing to their pragmatic meaning (63) (see Andersen 2001, 41). This is because it is but a “thin line” that separates conceptual from pragmatic meaning, as Siepmann (2005) puts it, and very often the distinction between the two “becomes blurred” (40).

b- Grammaticalization

Describing the developmental process through which discourse markers go in order to function as members of this group is not within the scope of this study. However, it is important to shed some light on the theory of grammaticalization because of its “crucial role” in accounting for this development (Andersen 2001, 33). The explanation that this theory provides for the developmental process of discourse markers becomes useful in discussing several issues in the discourse markers literature, such as the fact that these expressions come from different word classes, that they often occupy the initial position, that they have different meaning values, and that they are described as multi-functional.
Traditionally, the term “grammaticalization,” as first introduced by Traugott (1982), is used to refer to the “linguistic developmental process whereby linguistic units are recruited into grammar” (Andersen 2001, 33). Grammaticalization is, thus, a theory that explains how “fully grammatical forms (function words, clitics, and inflections)” develop from “independent lexical items.” However, lexical items are not the only concern of this theory; it also affects already grammatical components to make them yet “more grammatical forms” (Brinton 1996, 51).

In this theory, it is suggested that the syntactic-semantic changes which grammaticalized forms undergo occur through “frequent use in certain highly constrained local context” (Traugott 1995, 32). As the process of grammaticalization goes on, the lexical items continue to develop new grammatical functions while at the same time undergo gradual semantic changes. The semantic change that takes place during the process of grammaticalization has been described in terms of ‘bleaching,’ ‘fading,’ ‘weakening,’ or ‘delexicalization’ (Brinton 1996, 54) because it involves “weakening of lexical meaning accompanied by a strengthening of the item’s pragmatic impact” (Andersen 2001, 35).

It is through a historical process similar to grammaticalization, many researchers argue, that items from different grammatical categories come to function as markers at the discourse level (see Andersen 2001; Brinton 1996; Hansen 1997; Lenk 1998; Schifrin 2001; Schourup 1999; Traugott 1995). In this view, grammaticalization provides the means to establish a “formal and functional relationship” between discourse markers and “their contemporary lexical sources” in order to account for the coexistence of the two
structurally identical but functionally different entities (Schifrin 2001, 64). This process, Hansen (1997) states, “allows one to explain how apparently different senses of what is materially the same linguistic item may be related” (162).

In this process, lexical items from all word classes move to initial position where they gradually lose the force of their lexical meaning while acquiring a distinctive pragmatic function. The developmental process through which discourse markers go, Traugott (1995) argues, happens slowly and gradually over time “along a unidirectional cline from referential (propositional) to non-referential meanings” (Andersen 2001, 35).

Moving along this cline, for example, the prepositional phrase after all, Lewis (2007) suggests, evolves from clausal adverbial of time into sentence adverbial of wider scope and finally into a discourse marker of justification with “fully connective sense” (90). The development of “the adversative marker in fact from a prepositional phrase equivalent to ‘inactuality’, and the development of actually, generally, precisely, really, etc. from manner adverbials to sentence adverbials, and in some cases to pragmatic markers” are also examples of such clines (Andersen 2001, 35).

As discourse markers increasingly become functional they “cease over time to carry significant semantic meaning,” Hopper and Traugott point out (1993, 88). The new functional meaning that discourse markers develop, however, is derived from the propositional meaning of their lexical origins. This interdependency between pragmatic meaning and propositional meaning is explained by a process of semantic bleaching. Bleaching of lexical items, Traugott (1982) explains, “happens when they shift from function which is primarily descriptive and referential to one based on the interlocutor’s
intention to articulate a clear, coherent, and expressive text” (245). At late stages of grammaticalization, the lexical meaning of the source forms may become even “entirely opaque” (Brinton 1996, 58).

Not all lexical items, however, show the same degree of semantic change. This is because the degree of bleaching depends on the semantic values of the source form from which a discourse marker is derived. Some of the markers, such as because and so, “are obviously wholly grammatical from the outset,” so they show very subtle semantic change (Celle and Huart 2007, 2). These two conjunctions, Schiffrin (2001) realizes, “partially maintain their core meaning as cause/result conjunctions even when they establish metaphorical relationships on non-propositional planes of discourse” (58). However, for other markers whose source forms display high semantic value like in fact and as a result, “the notion of semantic bleaching is central” (Celle and Huart 2007, 2).

During the long period of time through which the grammaticalization process takes place, “grammaticalized forms may coexist alongside non-grammaticalized ones.” This phenomenon which Traugott (1995) describes as ‘layering’ is the norm rather than the exception. Discourse markers, therefore, may coexist “sometimes for many centuries” with their counterparts that do not function as discourse markers (32). Although the meanings of the two forms, the discourse marker form and the non-discourse marker form, are related, their functions do not overlap in discourse (Lenk 1998, 51). When the expression truthfully, for example, is used with the pragmatic meaning “expressing the speaker’s opinion,” e.g. Truthfully, you should have answered, it has a discourse marker function; whereas it is not a discourse marker when it is used with its propositional
meaning as an adverb, e.g. *You should have answered truthfully*, Fraser explains (1996, 169).

While, for many researchers, the theory of grammaticalization provides an account for the relationship between the pragmatic meaning of discourse markers and the propositional meaning of their formally similar counterparts, for some researchers this relationship does not even exist. The pragmatic meaning and the propositional meaning, Östman (1982) points out, “are clearly separable in nature, with no scalar ties between the two” (153; see also Fraser 1990, 395).

For Lenk (1998), however, this argumentation does not hold because “from a diachronic point of view, pragmatic meaning arises from non-pragmatic meaning” (51). Another indication that discourse markers do have propositional core meaning is the subtle difference in meaning which expressions with similar functions show. The fact that some contexts accept one marker, e.g. *but*, over other markers that have similar functions like *however* and *nevertheless* means that there is a difference among these expressions in their core meaning (Hansen 1997, 158). Even when the discourse marker is said to be semantically empty, “it is usually, nevertheless, held to have an invariant core meaning” (Schourup 1999, 249).

Some researchers also question whether the theory of grammaticalization could describe the developmental process through which discourse markers evolve. They argue that grammaticalization is a theory that explains how items in the language become grammatical whereas what discourse markers go through seems to be the opposite. When they move to the initial position of the sentence, discourse markers become outside the
syntactic structure of the clause, and hence detached grammatically from their host sentence.

However, although grammaticalization was traditionally more concerned with describing “morphosyntactic changes,” later developments of the theory have shifted the focus towards the semantic-pragmatic change “whereby meanings become increasingly based on the speaker’s subjective belief/state/attitude toward the proposition” (Traugott 1995, 31). This is the type of change that discourse markers go through when they become functional words that “express non-propositional, inferential and often highly subjective aspects of communication” (Andersen 2001, 36). The recent development of the theory of grammaticalization, which came to be known as pragmatisation, subjectification, and functionalization, is, therefore, more relevant to the discourse markers case. “One can only assume,” Lenk (1998) rightfully states, “that a process of ‘functionalization’ of the lexical meaning took place, similar to processes of ‘grammaticalization’ as described by Hopper and Traugott (1993), leading to a more effective signaling system in language” (48).

c-Multi-functionality

Another issue of dispute in the discourse markers literature is the multi-functionality feature that is attributed to these items. Some studies argue that discourse markers may serve more than one function at the same time whereas others refuse this idea completely. What it means for discourse markers to serve many functions, however,
is not clear since the type of function that different studies refer to when discussing the feature of multi-functionality is not always the same.

In her study, Schiffrin (1987, 2001) concludes that the discourse markers which she examines are multi-functional because they function in “cognitive, expressive, social and textual domains” (2001, 54). Her analysis shows these expressions to operate on different planes of her five-plane discourse model to “connect utterances on either a single plane or across different planes” (57). This aspect of multi-functionality is also recognized by Andersen (2001), Brinton (1996), and Östman (1995). For them, discourse markers are shown to operate at the textual and interpersonal planes of meaning simultaneously.

Lenk (1998), however, disagrees with this view. For he, discourse markers cannot function on more than one plane of meaning at once. The plurality of functions, she argues, gives rise to misunderstanding posing an interpretive problem for the receiver. It makes him uncertain whether “his interpretation of that discourse marker’s function in that particular instance” is correct or not (43). Siepmann (2005), however, rules out any possibility of ambiguity here because “disambiguation is usually achieved through the contextual embedding of the marker” (45).

In Lenk’s (1998) view, nevertheless, discourse markers are multi-functional in a different sense. According to this view, discourse markers are multi-functional because they can serve as discourse markers in some instances and as non-discourse markers in other instances. For her, it is “one and the same item” that serves the two distinctive functions (50). This item, however, expresses a pragmatic meaning when functioning as a

Other researchers such as Schiffrin (2001), Fraser (1990), and Östman (1995), disagree with such a view of multi-functionality. For Schiffrin (1987), that discourse markers have structurally identical counterparts that function differently does not mean that the two forms are one and the same item. On the contrary, they are different entities that display different syntactic and functional features. “The principles governing use of conjunctions in discourse do not totally parallel those for conjunctions in sentences” (320). Fraser (1990) and Östman (1995) also oppose multi-functionality in this sense asserting that the two items are separate and distinct.

Another sense of the multi-functionality feature of discourse markers is introduced by Halliday (2004) and Caron (1994). They regard discourse markers as being multi-functional because, in their view, any one of these items can signal more than one type of relations in discourse, for example, and can express a temporal, causal, or even adversative relation (Caron 1994, 706). To deal with this problem that may cause ambiguity, Caron (1994) considers discourse markers to have unique semantic core meanings which decide their role first, then the “pragmatic factors come into play in a second round” (706).
This study takes multi-functionality to be characteristic of discourse markers in the sense of Andersen (2001) and Halliday (2004). On the one hand, discourse markers are viewed as operating at the textual and interpersonal planes of meaning simultaneously. However, one of the two functions, i.e. textual and interpersonal, should be predominant. On the other hand, the present study see these items as capable of signaling more than one type of relation according to the context in which they operate.

**Summary**

Despite disagreements over the definition, meaning, function, and terminology of discourse markers, the shared characteristics that these expressions display set them apart as a coherent linguistic group. While these similarities do not give discourse markers a unified grammatical status; they do, however, give them a distinct status that is clearly distinguishable from other linguistic items that are not discourse markers yet are sometimes included in this group.

On the one hand, the distinctive features and functions of discourse markers distinguish them from their structurally identical forms which serve propositional roles within the sentence. For Schourup (1999) and Lenk (1998), however, the two items that share the same form “are one and the same item” functioning differently, sometimes as a discourse marker and sometimes as propositional element (Lenk 1998, 50). Unlike Schourup (1999) and Lenk (1998), this study suggests that discourse markers are completely distinctive items. Although they originate in different grammatical classes and
may inherit some of the semantic meaning of their derived forms, they, nevertheless, come to acquire a distinct function and a distinct status from their source forms.

In her study, Schiffrin (1987) realizes that the characteristics demonstrated by items functioning at the discourse level usually violate the syntactic roles of the forms from which they derive. When coordinate conjunctions, for example, function within sentence boundaries, they “link items which are members of the same word class.” However, when functioning at the discourse level this grammatical constraint is violated (37).

This is because, Halliday (2004) explains, markers operating at the discourse level signal the relationship between two sentences, but they do not “integrate the two sentences into a grammatical construction” (369). Whereas conjunctions “set up a grammatical relationship with another clause,” markers establish a “semantically cohesive” relationship that is not bound to a grammatical structure (83). The cohesive relationship that discourse markers express to signal “interpretive dependencies between propositions,” is, therefore, “qualitatively different” from the type of relation that their counterparts express through the medium of the sentence grammatical structure (Schiffrin 2001, 56). “We shall refer to the conjunctive and,” Halliday and Hasan (1976) maintain, “by the more general term additive, to suggest something rather looser and less structural than is meant by coordinate.” It is then not only the scope of discourse markers that is “modified and extended,” but also their syntactic and semantic status (234).

Discourse markers, in other words, are not simply the same as their source forms with extended function that allows them to operate between sentences, but rather
distinctive items with distinct characteristics. This distinctive status that discourse markers display is what makes Fraser (1996) and Östman (1995) consider them as “clearly separable in nature” from their structurally identical counterparts (Östman 1982, 153). Even Lenk (1998), who claims that the two identical items are “one and the same item,” admits that, for this item to be recognized as functioning at the discourse level, it should clearly display distinctive features (50). The difference between the two functions served by the same item “must be recognizable for the hearer to avoid misunderstanding.” Misunderstanding could be ruled out by taking these distinctive features into consideration when determining the status of the form under consideration (51).

On the other hand, discourse markers are also distinguishable from other linguistic items that are thematized for rhetorical reasons. Unlike discourse markers, these items, though they occur sentence-initially like discourse markers, do contribute to the propositional content of the sentence. Preposed adverbials are an example of such items. When adverbials are fronted, e.g. li-kay nakām-a ‘alā al-‘īdarat-i al-‘ātiyyat-i fa-‘inna ladaynā mi’yār-ayni ‘In order for us to control the self-administration, we have two norms,’ they display a different scopes and functions from adverbials that operate within the sentence. Research has shown that they have a textual function in marking shifts and discontinuities between segments of text (Givón 2001 330; Thompson, Longacre, and Hwang 2007, 295).

---

8 Adverbial clauses and phrases.
Similarities between preposed adverbials and discourse markers in position and function leads sometimes to the inclusion of these items in the discourse markers group. Discourse markers, however, could be distinguished from such thematized items by their non-propositional character. While fronted adverbials provide settings of time, place, or manner to the main clause, discourse markers are not part of the propositional meaning of the sentence.

Despite the distinguishable status of discourse markers as a coherent linguistic group whose members exhibit distinctive features and functions, there is “no generally accepted and widely used definition of discourse markers” (Lenk 1998, 37). Sharing common features that facilitate the recognition of discourse markers as a linguistic group does not necessarily lead to a general definition under which all items of this group can be included. “Few of the features listed,” Müller (2005) points out, “are defining criteria.” Rather, she continues, “these features are descriptive of the group of linguistic items the respective author has in mind” (4).

This is because a general definition of discourse markers, as Östman (1995) indicates, “needs two aspects to it: a structural one, and a functional one” (99). Trying to delimit such a non-homogeneous group whose members have different roles in either structural or functional terms, however, has proven to be problematic. Given the fact that numerous items from different word classes are used in all kinds of discourse types to serve different functions on various discourse levels beyond the propositional content, Lenk (1998) states, “it is questionable whether a common definition is possible.” Rather, “it seems that every study of discourse markers must come up with its own definition,”
depending on which items are being investigated in which type of discourse and within which framework (49).

2.4. Discourse Markers in Arabic Literature

2.4.1 Traditional Treatment

As a discourse phenomenon, the linguistic elements that are investigated in this study were not treated in Arabic traditional grammar. While these expressions function at the discourse level, the domain of traditional Arabic grammar studies did not exceed the sentence limits. Just as traditional linguists in English, traditional Arabic grammarians confined their work to the sentence level and lower when investigating different language phenomena (Kammensjö 2005, 23; Hatim 1997, 77).

While the study of discourse markers was not within the range of Arab grammarians’ interest, particles, however, which are the source forms of many markers, were treated extensively in their works. They provided comprehensive descriptions of these linguistic devices categorizing them as a grammatical class whose members operate within the sentence boundaries. The treatment of particles in traditional Arabic grammar, Gully (1995) points out, demonstrates “a sophisticated approach to the study of language” at the time when Western dictionaries did not contain detailed information on these “so-called empty forms” (121).

In Arabic grammar, particles are referred to with the term *ḥurūf* (sg. *ḥarf*) which was extended later to *ḥurūf-u al-ma‘ānī* ‘particles of meaning’ in order to distinguish this class of words from consonants to which the term *ḥurūf* also applies. To refer to
consonants, on the other hand, they extended the term *ḥurūf* into *ḥurūf-u al-mabānī* ‘elements of the alphabet.’ These particles were defined as “words that only make sense when joined with others” (King 1992, 260). This means that Arab grammarians considered these items to be “function words,” rather than conceptual elements and this is why they also referred to them by the term *ʻadawāt* (sg. *ʻadāḥ*) which means ‘instrument’, ‘tool’ (Carter 2004, 75; Van Mol 2003, 190).

In their early studies, traditional Arabic grammarians classified particles according to the grammatical function they perform in relation to adjacent elements in the sentence. The particle *wa* ‘and,’ for instance, is classified as *ḥarf-u ʿaṭf* ‘coordinating conjunction,’ the negative particle *lam* is *ḥarf-u jazm* ‘jussive particle,’ and the particle *kay* ‘in order that’ is *ḥarf-u naṣb* ‘subjunctive particle.’ This is because the grammar theory of *al-ʻāmil* ‘operator’ in which they were working shaped their treatment of these elements. The main focus of this theory is the formal structure of the sentence and the grammatical relations combining its constituents. Accounting for these grammatical dependencies is central in their work because it determines *al-ʻrāb* ‘the case and mood inflection’ of each of the sentence constituents (‘Amāyrah 1984, 85). According to this view, particles are divided into *ḥurūf-un ʻāmilah* ‘operative particles’ which have grammatical effects on the following elements in the sentence and *ḥurūf-un hāmilah* ‘inoperative particles’ which serve linking functions only without having any grammatical effect (Ryding 2005, 409).

Focusing on the grammatical function of particles is considered a shortcoming in the traditional grammar treatment of these items (al-Batal 1985, 21; Kammensjö 2005,
23). However, this treatment reflects the grammarians’ view of these items as functional linguistic devices that acquire meaning from context, which is an advanced view of these words that modern linguistics supports. Besides, it should be noted that this preoccupation with syntactic function was also accompanied by a serious interest in the semantic impact of these words on their surroundings. “A complete definition of a harf,” Carter (2004) points out, “would include its ‘meaning’, i.e. the place in which it is used, e.g. hal ‘?’ is for asking questions istifhām; là ‘no’ for negating nafy; ya ‘O’ for calling nidā; wa ‘and’ for conjoining ‘af’; etc.” (75). The significance that grammarians attributed to the semantic aspect of particles is also realized in their discussion of ta‘alluq ‘relevance,’ “where a correct understanding of the meaning of the particle was a prerequisite for a proper interpretation of the sentence in which it appears” (Gully 1995, 122). This semantic role of particles was further emphasized in later studies such as Ibn Hišām’s (1964) who dedicated his work Muğnī al-labīb to the analysis of the “syntactico-semantic role” of these items (Gully 1995, 118).

While grammarians confined their work to the sentence boundaries, rhetoricians, extended their investigation to discourse as a whole. al-Jurjānī (1984), as mentioned before, indicates that the study of language should focus on the relationships joining elements of text rather than on the individual elements themselves. This approach to studying language, he stresses, “is one honorable science and a great foundation principle” (Abu Deeb 1979, 37). Some topics discussed in ‘ilm-u al-balāghah ‘rhetoric’ relates to discourse studies, such as tikrār ‘repetition’ and al-faṣl-u wa-l-waṣl ‘disjunction’ and ‘conjunction.’ The treatment of al-faṣl-u wa-l-waṣl ‘disjunction’ and
‘conjunction’ in traditional Arabic rhetoric, although it could be related to the connecting/disconnecting function ascribed to discourse markers, was limited to the use of the particle *wa* ‘and.’ It, however, indicates that “the skill of knowing when sentences should be connected and when they should not was regarded by the rhetoricians as the ultimate degree of eloquence” (al-Batal 1985, 24; al-Jurjānī 1984, 222).

That *wa* ‘and’ was the only particle that attracted the attention of rhetoricians to the role it performs at the discourse level raises a question about the existence of other particles in old written Arabic that are used at the discourse level. It is argued that many of the discourse markers used in written Arabic today did not exist in old writing but developed lately in the language. In old written Arabic, Kammensjö (2005) points out, “there are very few conjunctions, mostly *wa*, serving many purposes, and almost no preposed adverbials” (44). This lack of connecting words, Cantarino (1975) maintains, “has been compensated for, especially in the modern language, by the development of expressions of adverbial character” (3:3). Holes (1995, 216) and Kammensjö (2005) ascribe this increase of the use of intersentential markers to the influence of foreign textual models (44).

### 2.4.2 Modern Treatment

Most modern grammatical studies in Arabic, whether conducted by Arab or Western linguists, work within the same framework set by traditional grammarians. Their treatment of particles continues to be syntactically-oriented and restricted to the sentence limits. The treatment of discourse markers as linguistic items functioning at the discourse
level, therefore, is almost absent in modern linguistic studies of Arabic. Although some scattered studies touched on this topic, nevertheless, only three works are devoted to the study of these important linguistic devices describing them within a certain theoretical framework.

Reference to some expressions that serve as discourse markers could be found in Blau’s (1977) study about “adverbial construction” in Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic. In this study, the author investigates the special status of “sentence adverbials” which occur sentence-initially referring to “the whole sentence rather than to a part of it.” These adverbials, he argues, acquire this special status by their “separation from the rest of the sentence by conjunctions and/or presentatives” (5). Some examples of these adverbials that Blau (1977) lists from Arabic are wa-min hunā ‘thus, therefore,’ al-‘in-a fa ‘now,’ rāğma hāḏī fa ‘despite that,’ and fi-l-wāqi‘-i fa ‘as a matter of fact.’

Many of the adverbials he mentions display features similar to those realized in discourse markers. However, Blau (1977) is not interested in the discourse function of these items but rather in their “predilection for serving as psychological subjects” (11) to which the rest of the sentence is “added in the form of a subordinate clause” (6). Furthermore, Blau (1977) does not distinguish between adverbials that are not part of the propositional content of the sentence, hence serving as discourse markers, such as the examples mentioned above, and adverbs that serve as scene-setters denoting the time, place, or circumstance for the whole sentence such as: tūl-a al-tufīlāt-i wa ‘whole childhood,’ fi mīl-i sinn-i-k-a wa ‘being of this age,’ and wa- mudd-u ayyāl-in wa ‘and for generations.’ The latter are not discourse markers but rather the topic of the sentence
which places it in a specific “spatial, temporal, or individual framework which limits the applicability of the main predication to a certain restricted domain” (Kinberg 2001, 45). The main contribution of Blau’s (1977) work to the study of discourse markers in Arabic, however, is the long list of markers he provides based on his examination of a large corpus of Arabic prose. His list, however, indicates that the use of these expressions is common not only in journalistic and expository discourse, as Kinberg (2001, 52) and Ryding (2005, 419) say, but also in “some modern literature” where it is “frequently encountered,” as Holes (1995, 216) indicates.

Johnstone (1990) also refers to discourse markers in her study of orality in Modern Standard Arabic. What attracted her attention, however, is not the significance of these expressions as a linguistic phenomenon but their role in highlighting the poetic character of the “expository prose in Modern Standard Arabic” (215). She claims that MSA discourse displays three features of discourse style, namely parataxis, formulaicity, and repetition. These features, she argues, give MSA discourse “its apparent oralness” because they are usually characteristics of oral discourse (225). She takes the frequent use of discourse markers, such as min-mā huwa jadir-un bi-l-dikr-i wa-l-mulāḥazat-i 'anna ‘among that which is worthy of mentioning and noting’ in MSA discourse as a support of the formulaicity and parataxis of the Arabic prose.

On the one hand, discourse markers, in her view, are just formulas that are common in MSA prose, whose presence in discourse supports her assumption of the

---

9 Parataxis is defined as the relatively low use of subordination, formulaicity defines discourse that extensively employs formulas, which are phrases or clauses that recur in texts by many different authors in the language, and repetition is repeating the same structure whether at the semantic, morphological or syntactic level (Johnstone, 1990).
orality of the Arabic discourse (233). Analyzing these expressions as being discourse markers that are detached from the sentence structure rather than being the “subject of an equational sentence,” on the other hand, shows that many sentences that seem to be subordinated in Arabic are actually coordinated. This provides her with evidence of the paratactic nature of the Arabic prose and hence supports “the oralness of MSA discourse” (226). Johnstone’s (1990) analysis of the discourse marker that she identifies in her study, therefore, does not center on its textual role as an important discourse organizer but focuses on the effect of its presence on the grammatical structure of the sentence it introduces. Nevertheless, her analysis draws the attention of researchers to the status of such expressions in the sentence.

Other researchers refer to discourse markers in a general way during their investigation of other linguistic topics. However, they underline the significance of these linguistic expressions as a discourse phenomenon. In his study about grounding\textsuperscript{10} in English and Arabic news texts, Khalil (2000) for example, discusses eight linguistic expressions that resemble discourse markers in their characteristics. His treatment of these items, however, concentrates only on the function they serve as markers of the grounding value of the segment they introduce (129). This study, Khalil (2000) points out, provides evidence “that certain linguistic markers that occur in sentence-initial position perform important grounding-signaling functions and manifest text-level distinctions in the foreground-background structure of news texts” (3).

\textsuperscript{10} Grounding is a textual structure in which propositions are hierarchically organized. They are assigned different values (Foreground, Midground, or Background) according to their semantic importance and relevance to the context (Khalil 2000, 2).
Not all the markers that Khalil (2000) treats as grounding markers, however, could be considered discourse markers. Just as Blau (1977), Khalil (2000) does not differentiate between markers that do not form part of the propositional core of the sentence, such as \( \text{min al-ma'rīf-i 'anna} \) ‘it is known that,’ and \( \text{min-mā yudkar-u 'anna} \) ‘among things to be mentioned is,’ and those expressions which form part of the propositional content of the sentence such as \( \text{fī Johannesburg} \) ‘in Johannesburg.’ Such preposed adverbials and prepositional phrases are not discourse markers but rather serve a “prefacing function” that “expresses the setting of the contents of the textual unit at the beginning of which they appear” (111).

In her reference book of Modern Standard Arabic grammar, whose focus is the grammar of the sentence, Ryding (2005) also touches on the topic of discourse markers by designating a chapter for “connectives and conjunctions.” In this chapter, she introduces connectives as “words or phrases that connect one part of discourse with another” (407). Her connectives, like al Batal’s (1990), function “at different discourse levels” to signal relationships between phrases, clauses, sentences and paragraphs (408). After highlighting the crucial role of connectives in Arabic, Ryding (2005) lists some of the expressions that are included in this group such as \( \text{wa ‘and,} \) \( \text{fa ‘since, for, so, thus,} \) \( \text{bal ‘rather, but rather’ and ‘id ‘since, for’ indicating the type of relation they signal. Most of the connectives she lists, however, do not relate to our study because they function within the sentence limits. And even the ones that she mentions as introducing sentences, such as \( \text{wa-min al-mutawaqqa‘-i ‘an ‘it is expected that,} \) she describes as stylistic “starting formula” providing no reference to their function.
One more work that deals with discourse markers in a general way and is worth mentioning here is al-Warraki and Hassanein’s (2002) text-book about *connectors in Modern Standard Arabic*. In this book, the authors present a comprehensive list of linking elements that are used in Modern Written Arabic grouping them according to their semantic function. Despite the fact that this text-book is not based on specific theoretical assumptions nor does it employ a specific framework and, despite the fact that many of the items listed in this book cannot be regarded as discourse markers, its method of grouping the “connectors” according to their function, however, render it a very useful reference for teaching Arabic writing.

As we have seen, discourse markers have attracted the attention of many researchers, yet none of them focused on these items as the object of his study. What most of them produce, therefore, are intuitive descriptions that have no theoretical or methodological framework. There are, however, three studies that focus on examining discourse markers as a distinctive linguistic group that functions at the discourse level. In what follows these studies, al-Batal’s (1985, 1990), Kammensjö’s (2005) and Sarig’s (1995) studies, will be discussed in order to evaluate their contribution to the study of discourse markers.

**a-al Batal’s Cohesive Connectives**

In his study, al Batal (1985, 1990) examines the function of linguistic items, which he calls “connectives,” in a modern expository Arabic text. He defines connectives as “any element in the text which--regardless of whether or not it belongs to the form-
class of conjunctions—indicates a linking or transitional relationship between phrases, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs” (1985, 2). The items he investigates, therefore, can be of any form and may operate at different discourse levels to link any segments of text.

In order to examine these items, al Batal (1985) draws on Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) definition of cohesion in text, using this concept “as a general framework” for his analysis. Within this framework, “connectives” are regarded as cohesive devices which “provide an explicit surface realization (cohesion) of underlying semantic relations (coherence)” (16). The analysis presented in his study “is based on the occurrences of connectives in one modern Arabic expository text” (4).

al-Batal’s (1985, 1990) interest in Arabic “connectives” as important devices that require great attention and his awareness of the importance of approaching them from a discourse perspective makes his work pioneering in this area of research. His treatment of these elements and his deep insights about their contribution to “textual cohesion in Arabic writing” “has been crucial,” as Ryding (2005) points out, “to our understanding of their nature and importance” (407). However, just as any leading study in its research area, al-Batal’s (1985, 1990) investigation of “connectives” has its limitations.

One major weakness of his study is actually a result of the way he applies Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) concept of cohesion in the study. For Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is a textual strategy that operates primarily above the sentence to give text its wholeness as a text. Although “the cohesive system of conjunctions” does operate within sentences as well as beyond sentences, its real cohesive contribution, however, is
made when it is “used to indicate logico-semantic relations that extend beyond the grammatical domain of a single clause complex” (Halliday 2004).

“There is a difference in principle,” Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue, “between structural relations, which hold within a sentence, and cohesive relations, which hold within or between sentences” (244). While the former is signaled by intrasentential conjunctions which express this linking relationship through the medium of grammatical structure, the latter is indicated by “cohesive conjunctions” which signal the relations between sentences without integrating “the two sentences into a grammatical construction” (Halliday 2004, 369). Not only are cohesive conjunctions “looser and less structural” than intrasentential conjunctions, Halliday and Hasan (1976) point out, but their scope is also “modified and extended” (234). For them, therefore, the occurrence of cohesive conjunctions outside the sentence structure alters their syntactic and semantic role and distinguishes them from conjunctions operating within the sentence.

While Halliday and Hasan (1976) differentiate between the cohesive system of conjunctions and intrasentential conjunctions, treating only the former as cohesive devises in their study, al Batal (1985, 1990) analyzes “connectives” at all levels of text as being part of the cohesive system. This, however, contradicts his attempt to approach “connectives” from a discourse perspective. Working within the sentence boundaries is a violation of the purpose for which cohesive strategies were proposed. Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) cohesive system is meant to break away from the sentence limits to emphasize the strategies employed above these limits to hold the text together as a unit. Cohesion, as al Batal (1985, 1990) employs it in his study of “connectives,” however, is
no longer a discourse strategy but rather a step back to the traditional sentence-bound
treatment of these items of which he criticizes traditional grammarians.

al-Batal (1985, 1990), therefore, ended up describing only 28 occurrences of
“connectives” operating above the sentence level out of 231 occurrences of all
“connectives” serving in the single text he analyzes. Other than \textit{wa} ‘and,’ and \textit{fa} ‘since,
for, so, thus,’ the only discourse connectives in his study that could be included in the
discourse markers’ group are: \textit{kadālika} ‘likewise, furthermore,’ \textit{nazīd-u alā dālika} ‘we add
to this,’ \textit{gayra} ‘anna’ ‘however, but’ \textit{min ūamma} ‘thus, therefore,’ \textit{īmma} ‘then,’ and
\textit{ammā fa} ‘as for.’ While \textit{wa} and \textit{fa} occur several times in the text, there is only one
occurrence of each of the rest.

However, his treatment of the intrasentential conjunctions that takes a semantic
approach to the description of these items could be considered a contribution to the study
of conjunctions. Nevertheless, while his description of some conjunctions reveals new
meanings of these items developed in modern uses, the description of others does not go
further than what was provided by traditional grammarians. Furthermore, his treatment
of conjunctions that are bound to sentence structure require that he includes a discussion
of their grammatical role in his description. “Some of the connectives,” al-Batal (1985)
states, “will be syntactically described as ‘coordinating conjunctions’ while others will be
described as ‘subordinating conjunctions.’ The terms ‘coordinating’ and subordinating’
conjunctions can be thought of in the traditional sense” (3).

The data that al-Batal (1985, 1990) uses for his investigation as well as the way
by which he analyzes these data are also two serious weak points in his study. On the one
hand, that al-Batal (1985, 1990) bases his whole study and conclusions on the
investigation of a single text of around 50 sentences is an obvious weakness in his work.
The absence of an analytical method that leads the analysis process, on the other hand, is
another flaw in the study. Approaching text from a discourse perspective requires the
researcher to have a certain method for analyzing the data under investigation. In his
study, however, al-Batal (1985) “did not follow any specific procedure” for analyzing the
text under consideration “but rather tried to let the text lead the way” (5).

Moreover, the analysis process needs a specific criterion for the identification of
the segments of text that will be taken into consideration. However, al-Batal’s (1990)
study, though examining “connectives” at sentence and paragraph boundaries, provides
no clear definition of either of these segments of text. The sentence boundary in his study
is determined by “the punctuation mark period” (241) whereas there is no reference to the
way he identifies paragraph boundaries. Although many studies that examined the use of
punctuation marks in Arabic concludes that these marks are “unreliable resources for
defining the sentence as a unit in written Arabic” (see Khafaji 2001, 7; Ghazala 2004,
230), al-Batal (1990) claims that “the use of punctuation has become quite common and
consistent” (266).

A final point to examine in al-Batal’s (1985) study concerns the “generalizations”
he draws regarding the “overall significance” of “connectives” “to the notion of
textuality” (2). He argues that “there seems to be a minimum of these formal markers
required” in Arabic for a text to maintain its “coherence and acceptability” (252). This is
a very important observation concerning text-level “connectives” that this study supports.
It is however, based totally on al-Batal’s (1990) “native-speaker intuition on the well-formedness of expository Modern Standard Arabic texts” rather than on the results of his study (252). Neither his semantic approach that emphasizes the role of “connectives” as surface signals of “underlying semantic relations,” nor the limited number of text-level “connectives” he examines, or the limited data he analyzes could lead him to this conclusion. A conclusion that emphasizes the crucial role of connectives in achieving text coherence and appropriateness could only be attained within an approach that takes the pragmatic aspect of “connectives’ into consideration. In general, the overall impression of al-Batal’s work (1985, 1990), as Kammensjö (2005) states, is that it “has not managed to reach beyond the traditional techniques of description” (49).

**b- Discourse Markers in Sarig’s Article**

In her article, *discourse markers in contemporary Arabic*, Sarig (1995) examines the function of some “initial position functionals,” such as *wa*, *fa*, *wa-qad*, *fa-qad*, *la-qad*, *wa-la-qad*, and *fa-la-qad*, in “Contemporary Written Arabic.” Because of the frequent recurrence of these items at positions where they “clearly” have no coordinating function, such as “at the opening of a chapter, the beginning of a new paragraph, or at the head of a new main sentence,” most of them have been considered redundant (7). Her investigation of examples taken from the press, however, shows that while these “initial position functionals” are semantically void and syntactically inactive, they do play an important role in marking “the text rhetorical structure” (8). They either mark
continuation, clarification, confirmation, accentuation, or shift in discourse at the global level of the text organization.

Sarig’s (1995) article draws heavily on Schiffrin’s (1987) seminal work on discourse markers in contemporary spoken English. Not only does she use Schiffrin’s (1987) term, discourse markers, to refer to the items she investigates, but she also adopts her view of their “deictic function” in discourse. However, Sarig (1995) takes issue with Schiffrin’s (1987) view of discourse markers as being non-obligatory and dispensable in text. She argues that her examination of these items confirms that they are not by any means redundant, but rather fulfill an important “rhetorical function” contributing thereby to the coherence of Arabic discourse (21).

Despite the informative analysis which she provides in her study, Sarig (1995), however, like al-Batal, does not base her analysis on any theoretical assumptions or analytical methods. Her (1995) article, however, as Kammensjö (2005) points out, “is a promising start of a new course of study within Arabic linguistics” (50). The significance of Sarig’s work could be attributed to the discourse perspective which the author takes to approach the items she examines regarding them as being unique discourse functionals.

c- Kammensjö’s Study of Discourse Connectives

The third study found in Modern Arabic linguistic literature which focuses on discourse markers as a linguistic phenomenon is Kammensjö’s (2005) research on these items. Her study of “discourse connectives” in “Arabic lecturing monologue” is the most recent one among the three works devoted to this phenomenon in the Arabic literature,
and by all means, presents the most systematic and extensive treatment. In her study, Kammensjö (2005) examines the distribution and functions of “utterance-initial” items, which she terms “discourse connectives” because of their role in marking “connections among units of discourse” (31).

The data analyzed in the study consist of around 2,900 utterance segments of oral discourse. The utterances are drawn from a transcribed corpus, which she names “Arabic lecturing monologue (ALM),” taken from about 10 hours of audio-recorded university lectures given during the years 1995-2000. The lectures were held in four Arabic universities, situated in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Sudan. The (ALM) data, Kammensjö (2005) points out, “may be designated as Formal Spoken Arabic (FSA), which in turn could be regarded as a sub-category of Educated Spoken Arabic\(^{11}\) (ESA)” (67).

Kammensjö (2005) approaches discourse connectives from a discourse perspective taking a coherence-based approach to the analysis of her data. Examining the functional relations that connect the segments of text is, in her view, the means to determine how these expressions function at the discourse level. Therefore, she proposes an analytical model of description that consists of three steps: segmenting the text into units, examining the functional relations that tie these segments together, and then identifying the discourse connectives in the text. This process helps to examine discourse

\(^{11}\) This constitutes one level in Badawi’s (1973) categorization of the linguistic situation of Arabic. In his well-known book, *Levels of Contemporary Arabic in Egypt*, Badawi (1973) describes the linguistic situation in Egypt as a continuum, with five major divisions: illiterate spoken Arabic, semiliterate spoken Arabic, educated spoken Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic, and Classical Arabic. Although Badawi’s study deals with language variation in Egypt, he suggests that “it can also apply elsewhere in the Arab world” (Kammensjö 2005,60).
connectives within their natural environment in order to determine the functions they serve in this context.

The “utterance” is considered the basic unit of analysis in Kammensjö’s (2005) study, hence “no boundaries below the utterance have been considered.” For the segmentation of the data into utterances, both semantic and prosodic criteria were taken into consideration (6). This segmentation process is based on the “flow model,” as developed by Chafé (1994). Continuation in the flow of speech indicates uninterrupted sequences of utterances, but whenever there is a shift in discourse, this flow is broken. The relationships that the study account for are only the ones “between segments in uninterrupted sequence.” Thus, “where there is break or a shift, no functional label has been assigned” (6).

The functional relations employed in Kammensjö’s (2005) study are based on Halliday’s (2004) model of “expansion.” This model assumes that there are three modes whereby speakers expand their topic into an uninterrupted sequences of utterances; which are: elaboration, extension, and enhancement (119). Halliday’s (2004) definition of the “thematic structure,” moreover, is taken as a base for identifying connectives in the data. Kammensjö (2005) also draws on Halliday’s (2004) classification of pre-topical theme constituents in grouping her discourse connectives into five categories: continuatives, e.g. ya’ni ‘that is,’ conjunctions, e.g. wa ‘and,’ fa ‘since, for, so, thus,’ conjunctive adjuncts, e.g. bi-l-tāli ‘thus, therefore,’ interpersonal adjuncts, e.g. ṭab’an ‘of course,’ and
connective clauses, e.g. wa-'anā last-u bi-hāja li-'an ʿudākkir-a-kum ʿinna\textsuperscript{12} ‘I don’t need to remind you that.

Kammensjö’s (2005) study, as it is clear from her theoretical framework, data, and methodology, represents a new approach to the study of discourse markers in Arabic linguistic literature. However, one limitation in the study is that it accounts for the function of discourse markers only at the local level. Kammensjö’s (2005) investigation, as she indicates, is based on the “linear aspect” of text. An investigation that takes the global level of text into consideration, however, would have given a broader view of the function of discourse connectives in structuring the text because global and local levels of text complement each other in building the text structure. Classifying the discourse connectives according to Halliday’s (2004) categorization of pre-topical theme constituents is also a weak point in Kammensjö’s (2005) study. While she says that it is function rather than form that is important in describing discourse connectives, Kammensjö (2005), however, depends mostly on form in her classification.

Another limitation in Kammensjö’s study is her inclusion of preposed adverbials or prepositional phrases that are part of the propositional content of the utterance in the discourse connective group. “Preposed adjuncts of time and location,” she (2005) says, are in various degrees “part of the experiential realm” (131). Therefore, Kammensjö (2005) considers “conjunctive adjuncts” such as maʿa ṭīl-i al-waqt ‘in the course of time’ a discourse connective. She claims that Halliday’s (2004) definition of conjunction adjuncts allows this inclusion, while in fact Halliday (2004) states that preposed adjuncts

\textsuperscript{12} It should be noted that this clause is in the Formal Spoken Arabic and not MSA. In MSA, it becomes as follows: wa-ʾanā last-u bi-hāja in li-ʾan ʿudākkir-a-kum ʿinna-ḥu.
that function as connectives “do not fall within the propositional core of the sentence” (125).

A final limitation in the study is pointed out by Kammensjö (2005) herself in her conclusion. Halliday’s (2004) taxonomy of functional relations that is applied in the analysis of the study, she admits, “does not provide patterns as distinct as one would have hoped to” (199).

In general, however, Kammensjö’s (2005) study achieves its goal of developing “an alternative approach to the study of conjunctions, conjunctive adverbs, phrases and clauses in modern Arabic” (17). Her treatment of discourse connectives, in my view, laid the foundations and paved the way for future studies such as the present study. The present study, as will be discussed later, draws on the methodology Kammensjö’s (2005) study employed.

2.5 Summary

My aim here has been to provide a review of the studies that are related to discourse markers research in both English and Arabic literature, as well as to introduce a theoretical framework for the analysis and description of these expressions in this study. The semantic/pragmatic approach undertaken in the present study is based on several theories in the field of text analysis, sociolinguistics, and artificial intelligence.

The study approaches discourse markers from a discourse perspective taking the text as its point of departure for examining the role performed by these linguistic devices
at the discourse level. In this descriptive functional text-base approach, it is assumed that discourse markers not only have an important linking functions that contribute to the cohesion and coherence of text, but they also play a crucial role in communicating the text-producer’s intended meaning, perspective, and attitudes. This is an approach which views text as a communicative cohesive structure rather than a static one, and discourse markers as essential communicative tools that writers use to guide the reader’s interpretation of their contribution in order to ensure a successful communicative act.

An essential assumption underlying this study is that text has a structure that could be analyzed in terms of a taxonomy of coherence relations and schematic categories. It is hierarchically structured and its segments are connected by underlying functional relations. That text is hierarchically organized means that it can be chunked into units of various sizes. Each unit in text stands in a compositional relation, following from the author’s global plan of the build-up of the text. “These coherence relations provide an underlying network of relational base, and this underlying network is then molded by the schema relations into a pattern of purposive development” (Callow 1998, 188). This hybrid approach of coherence relations and schematic theory allows for capturing the network of relations that ties different levels of text together as a unit whole (Gulla 1996, 81).

While focusing on the structure of text provides a context in which the function of discourse markers can be analyzed and described, taking the similar features of discourse markers that are realized in the literature into consideration in this study provides a means to distinguish these items as a distinctive linguistic group. Siepmann’s (2005) description
of these linguistic devices as “natural-language strings of varying length and morphosyntactic structure whose primary function is to signal the coherence relations obtaining between a particular unit of discourse and other surrounding units and/or aspects of the communicative situation and thereby to facilitate the listener’s or reader’s processing task” presents a general view of these items that corresponds to the sense they have in the present study (45).
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

After providing an overview of discourse markers research in both English and Arabic literature in the previous chapter, as well as laying down theoretical foundations for the analysis process, in this chapter, the plan and the object of study will be introduced. The present chapter consists of two sections. While the data used in this study will be discussed in the first section, the second section will be devoted to the method employed in analyzing the chosen data.

3.2 Data

3.2.1 Introduction

The goal of the present study is to examine the function of discourse markers at the sentence and the paragraph levels in a particular type of Arabic text, namely newspaper opinion articles. In order to investigate this linguistic phenomenon, the study starts by analyzing the chosen data, first to identify the discourse markers used in this type of text, and then to describe the role performed by these items in their textual context. This section, therefore, focuses on describing the type of data used in this study. In what follows, a general description of the chosen data will be introduced, then a discussion of the three aspects that determine the nature of these data will be presented, and finally the section will end with a discussion of the significance of the data under investigation.

---

13 The reason for choosing this particular type of text will be explained later in the chapter.
3.2.2 General Description of Data

The corpus of approximately 30,000 words that is examined in the present study consists of 50 Arabic newspaper opinion articles, which are also known as comment columns and opinion columns. The language of these texts is Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), the modern written language used throughout the Arab world today, as al-Batal and Badawi point out (al-Batal 1985, 4; Badawi, Carter, and Gully 2004). The articles were drawn from the electronic editions of two major international daily newspapers: al-
Sharq al-Awsat الشرق الأوسط and al-Hayat الحياة during a time period of three months, from 1 January to 31 March, 2007.

Focusing on these two newspapers as the source of data for the present study is based on their importance in the media world. al-Sharq al-Awsat الشرق الأوسط and al-
Hayat الحياة are usually described as two of the leading daily pan-Arab international newspapers.14 This is because of their high circulations,15 their well-known experienced Arab journalists, as well as their comprehensive coverage of various issues concerning the entire Arab World.

On the one hand, both newspapers are printed and distributed simultaneously in Europe, the Middle East, and the USA, which means that they have an extensive market in and outside the Arab World. On the other hand, although the nationality and political leanings of the Saudi al-Sharq al-Awsat الشرق الأوسط and the Lebanese16 al-Hayat الحياة

---

14 Evaluation of newspapers are usually provided by media corporations like Allied Media Corp., for example. In her book, Media Arabic, Ashtiany (1993) also uses material from these two newspapers referring to them as being important international newspapers.
15 The circulation of both newspapers is estimated around 300,000.
16 This does not mean that all the journalists in the two newspapers are from the home country of the newspaper in which they work. What it means, however, is that newspapers usually have certain views
may be reflected in their news coverage and viewpoint, just as it is the case for any other newspaper, nevertheless they are regarded as leading pan-Arab international papers that focus on regional issues concerning the whole Arab World. Moreover, the two newspapers are distinguished by their professional, experienced, and well-known columnists who come from different Arab regions. Although there may be minor differences in their styles, these professional Arab writers, in my view, could present a writing sample that represents the modern written language used throughout the Arab world today.

Of the 50 texts that were chosen to be the subject of analysis in this study, 25 were taken from *al-Sharq al-Awsat* الشرق الأوسط while the other 25 come from *al-Hayat* الحياة. All these texts were taken from the *al-ra’y* ‘opinion’ section in the online editions of the two newspapers. They all start with references indicating their source, the name of the writer, the date of publication and the number of the printed issue. The articles are written by different writers and are of varying length, ranging from a 350-word text to a 1350-word text. The topics discussed in these articles are mainly political and social issues that are important to the Arab readers because of the effects these issues have on their lives. The texts express the writers’ views regarding these essential issues that were central at the time in which the articles were written.

All the texts examined in this study are written by professional Arab writers geared toward native readers. The 28 writers are considered to be influential writers with extensive professional experience. They are either leading journalists with prominent regarding national and political issues which they require their journalists to follow whatever their nationality is.
positions in *al-Sharq al-Awsat* or *al-Hayat* newspaper, or regular columnists who have been writing in different newspapers. Only four of the 28 writers are female writers. This is because, in the two newspapers, most opinion articles are written by male writers. The writers are from various Arab regions; 10 are from the Gulf, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, 13 are from the Levant, Lebanese, Syrian, Jordanian and Palestinian, 3 Iraqis, and 2 from North Africa, one Moroccan and the other is Mauritanian.

The texts analyzed in this study were not chosen randomly. Rather, two factors were taken into consideration in selecting each text. First, the data represent writing samples of different writers, and these samples are of reasonably equal length. Second, the texts do not exceed 1500 words because long texts usually pose difficulties in following the argumentation points. Because of these restrictions the number of writers whose articles are included in the data was limited to those whose articles are of relatively acceptable length. Another consequence of these restrictions is the different numbers of articles included in the data for each writer. The writing-sample for some writers is represented by one article in the data, while for others it is represented by two or three articles. This is done to achieve a balance between the amount contributed by each writer since their articles are of varying length.

After introducing the data used in this study in general terms, describing the specific features of this data follows. There are three aspects that define the texts that form the corpus analyzed in this study: they are conveyed through the written medium,

---

17 This means that only writers whose articles do not exceed 1500 words are taken into consideration when choosing the data for this study.
they are taken from the press, and they are all of a particular type of media genre, opinion articles. These three aspects will be taken into consideration because of their importance in determining its specific nature.

3.2.3 Written Language

The language of the texts that are investigated in this study is the written mode\textsuperscript{18} of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). (MSA) includes both the written and spoken forms of Arabic that is used in the Arab world today. Although there is no agreed-upon definition of what exactly constitutes MSA, many linguists suggest a general notion of what could be meant by this term. Ryding (2005), for example, describes MSA as “the written norm for all Arab countries as well as the major medium of communication for public speaking and broadcasting” (7). While it is used, Parkinson (1991) adds, “in newspapers, magazines, textbooks, academic books, novels, short stories and other ‘serious’ writing,” it is also used orally “in some university contexts, in political and other ‘read’ speeches, and in delivery of the news on radio and television” (32).

Generally speaking, however, the written mode of a language usually displays different features from the spoken mode. “One parameter that accounts for text differences,” Khalil (2000) argues, “is the medium” because of the different constraints spoken and written languages impose on text production. Being produced in real time, spoken language is usually less complex structurally and semantically than written

\textsuperscript{18} Mode, McCarthy (1993) states, “is concerned with how it (the message) is composed stylistically, that is with reference to sociolinguistically grounded norms of archetypical speech and archetypical writing” (171).
language, and it may also contain syntactically incomplete sentences, and ellipses (Brown and Yule 1986, 15; Chafé 1992; Kammensjö 2005, 68). The written medium, on the other hand, is characterized by its deliberate organized text structure, extended and well-formed grammatical constructions, as well as the high density of semantic content. This is because writing is usually produced in a relaxation of time, even though it is sometimes limited, that allows writers to plan, choose their words, articulate their ideas and look back at what they have written to reorganize it or even change it.

The difference between the spoken and written medium of language is more complicated in the case of the Arabic language. Each major region of the Arab world, e.g. the Levant, the Gulf, and Egypt, has its own “spoken vernacular” which coexists with the (MSA). “The divergence among the several vernacular forms of Arabic, and between the vernaculars as a whole and the standard written form,” Ryding (2005) indicates, “make the linguistic situation of the Arab world a complex one” (5). However, the differences that have been mentioned above between the spoken and written forms of a language could be best demonstrated in Arabic when comparing the two language variations that Badawi (1973) locates at levels two and three in his continuum. In his description of the linguistic situation in the Arab world, Badawi (1973) locates (MSA) at level two, and Educated Spoken Arabic at level three, of his five-level continuum. Because he identifies (MSA) as mostly used for written purposes rather than spoken, he considers

---

19 Badawi’s (1973) continuum is actually based on the language variations in Egypt, but he suggests that it can also apply anywhere in the Arab world.

20 It should be noted, however, that many scholars do not agree with Badawi’s (1973) continuum. Mitchell (1986), for example, does not see Educated Spoken Arabic as a distinctive variety. For him, Bassiouney (2009) indicates, “ESA is not a separate variety but is ‘created’ and ‘maintained’ by the interaction between the written language and the vernacular” (16). Bassiouney (2009), on the other hand, argues that the idea of ESA is not clearly examined and described. (17)
that levels two and three are “essentially ‘in complementary distribution’ with each other, that is, they function in separate spheres, with some overlap” (Ryding 2005, 9).

The differences between these two forms of the Arabic language have important consequences for the analysis process. For example, this study, in which the language of the data is the written (MSA) form, has to set different criteria for data segmentation than the one employed in Kammensjö’s study (2005) for segmenting the data of Educated Spoken Arabic. In her study, Kammensjö (2005) defines the utterance, her basic unit of analysis, on semantic and prosodic grounds. Using syntactic criteria as the basis for utterance segmentation was not an option since her spoken data “overflows with syntactically incomplete sentences, ellipses, and what we would call anacolutha in traditional grammar, i.e. when a sentence starts with one type of syntactic structure and ends in another” (85). In this study, however, the syntactic criteria provide a very useful tool for segmenting sentences because sentences in this mode of language are usually grammatically well-formed constructions.

The choice between a written and spoken medium, however, not only determines text organization and sentence structure and complexity, but also has an impact on the linguistic expressions used in these two mediums. It has been claimed, for example, that discourse markers are “predominantly a feature of oral rather than of written discourse” (Brinton 1996, 33). “No principal grounds exist,” however, “on which to deny discourse markers status to similar items that are largely found in written discourse,” Schourup (1999) argues. Because most of the early studies on discourse markers focused on spoken discourse, it looked as if these linguistic expressions “occur primarily in speech” (234).
Later studies, however, show that discourse markers occur in both spoken and written language (Siepmann 2005, 38). Brinton’s (1996) study of old, middle, and early modern English, for instance, demonstrates how discourse markers have always had a major role in written texts. These expressions, Schiffrin (2001) points out, “have been examined in a variety of genres and interactive context” of spoken and written discourse (54).

There is, however, a difference between the types of discourse markers that are used in speech and those employed in writing, and even when the same marker is associated with both mediums it usually displays different characteristics. The “forms used in writing (e.g., notwithstanding),” Brinton (1996) notes, “may differ from those in speech (e.g., okay), and the reason for using them may differ” as well (33). The differences between written and oral discourse markers, nevertheless, is not strict, but rather “tied only to the relative formality/informality of the discourse marker” (Schourup 1999, 234). The English markers of course, in fact, and in any case, for example, are common in both spoken and written language (Siepmann 2005, 39).

In the Arabic linguistics literature, although the study of discourse markers as a linguistic phenomenon is very limited, as mentioned earlier, the existence of these expressions has been noticed in both written and spoken texts. Just like discourse markers in English, which display differences between the oral and the written forms with some overlap between the two, discourse markers in Arabic also display many differences between the forms employed in the two mediums of the language, i.e. written (MSA) and Educated Spoken Arabic, with some similar markers used in both. For instance, some of the markers identified in Kammensjö’s (2005) study do not exist in the written language,
e.g. bas ‘but,’ ba’dēn ‘also,’ and halla ‘now,’ others, however, are similar to those identified in the written data of this study, e.g. lākin ‘however, but,’ tumma ‘then,’ magalan ‘for instance,’ and ʾillā ʾanna ‘however, but.’

3.2.4 Journalistic Language

The written form of (MSA), Ryding (2005) points out, “covers an extensive range of discourse styles and genres ranging from complex and conservative to innovative and experimental” (8). Modern Written Arabic journalistic style, which is investigated in this study, is one prominent style among these various styles of MSA.

Journalism, says Abdelfattah (1996), “is said to have a language of its own,” that is characterized by distinctive “functional, lexical and structural features” (129). The Arabic language used in newspapers is not different from other journalistic languages in this respect. It is considered a distinctive type of the Modern Written Arabic language because of its distinct function and features.

The most important factor that has a large impact on shaping the Arabic journalistic style is its social function. “Despite the advent of several new media of communication,” Khalil (2000) points out, “the press, radio and television remain the most widely established means of mass communication” (22). This form of Modern Written Arabic, therefore, is a national and international medium of communication for millions of people across and outside the Arab world. It provides political, social, and cultural information that touch people’s lives, expresses different views and ideas,
reflects on different events and topics, and generates comments and debates among people.

Because of its central role as a major medium of communication in society, journalistic Arabic reaches a wide and diverse audience of educated and less educated people. “Next to the novel”, Kennedy (1998) notes, the “newspaper article is probably the single most widely read written genre” (49). According to a study conducted by the Centre of Applied Social Research in Egypt, Sharaf (2000) says, the percentage of the readership of newspapers reaches 65% among people with basic education, and 95% among highly educated people (247).

The social function that journalistic Arabic performs is what determines its distinctive characteristics. As a regularly and widely used form of the written language, that treats all types of topics, and reaches to people of different levels of education, journalistic Arabic developed a style that is simple, practical, and open to change. This style of Modern Written Arabic, Sharaf (2000) says, uses a clear, simple but expressive language that goes straight to the point avoiding sophisticated and elegant expressions that the literary language usually employs. This, he adds, reveals the flexibility, depth and capability of the Arabic language to express all types of topics and ideas and to be used in various contexts (195). Abdelfattah (1996), on the other hand, indicates the crucial role that this style of Arabic plays “in adopting new structural and stylistic features” in order to cope with the demands of the new era (130). It is, Gully (1993) states, “so readily open to change that it assimilates new types of expression and grammatical constructions with varying degrees of ease” (20).
Using simple structures and adopting new expressions and concepts, however, does not mean that the journalistic Arabic style does not adhere to the Arabic language structural conventions. Most newspapers are careful to comply with the grammatical norms, and, for this reason, they usually “hire correctors who are specially trained in Arabic grammar” (Parkinson, 1991, 32). Besides, although there are indeed some documented changes in the syntactic structures of this style of written Arabic, nevertheless, these changes are in general a “series of ‘acceptable’ simplifications” in the grammatical structures,” as Bateson (2003) puts it. It is also important to point out that many of the syntactic changes that are realized in journalistic Arabic, as Gully (1993) indicates, “have also taken place in modern literary Arabic,” although the process, in the literary style, is not so rapid as it is in the journalistic style (56).

On the other hand, while the syntactic changes in the Arabic journalistic style cannot be ignored, most of the changes noticed in this style of the written language, however, are in the areas of semantics and style. After examining the morphological and syntactic features of the language used in different forms of written Arabic, including huge data base from Arabic newspaper and magazine articles, Ryding (2005) concludes that the major changes that took place in the journalistic style of written Arabic “are stylistic and lexical rather than grammatical” (9). It is mainly “the categories of semantic extension and collocations which appear to be in a constant state of expansion” Gully (1993) points out. These changes are described by Bateson (2003) as a “vast shift in the lexicon due to the need for technical terminologies” as well as a “number of stylistic changes due to translations from European languages and extensive bilingualism” (84). It
is, however, important to note here that none of the mentioned changes that occurred in journalistic Arabic, being syntactic, semantic or stylistic are actually “absent from other genres,” but “taken together, Holes (1995) argues, “they constitute a definite ‘media style’” (257).

The distinctive function and features of the written Arabic used in newspapers, therefore, distinguish it from other forms of written Arabic such as literary prose writing (see Gully 1993; Holes 1995, 257; Khalil 2000, 22). While literary written Arabic is characterized by the complexity of its syntax and style which makes it sometimes very close to Classical Arabic\(^{21}\) style, journalistic Arabic, as we have seen, could be described as the innovative, “modern, simple, grammatically correct Arabic” (Parkinson 1991, 32). Pointing to the differences between the two, Ryding (2005) says, “within (MSA), syntax and style range from complex and erudite forms” in the literary and learned usage of the language “to more streamlined expression” in the journalistic style (4).

Because of these characteristics that it exhibits, journalistic Arabic has been viewed by many people, mainly scholars and academics, as an inferior style compared to the Arabic literary usage.\(^{22}\) In their view, the journalistic style is “a source of linguistic corruption and impurity,” and hence unworthy of academic research and investigation (Abdelfattah 1996, 131).

\(^{21}\) Classical Arabic (CA) is “the Arabic of the medieval heritage of Arabic and Islamic literature and religion” (Parkinson 1991, 33). Many linguists make a distinction between this classical form of the Arabic language and the modern form of literary Arabic (MSA). This is, however, “by no means a clear universally accepted delineation” (Ryding 2005, 4). The existence of a modern form of Arabic that is distinguishable from the classical form has been questioned and denied by some Arab linguists (Persson 2002, 5).

\(^{22}\) Parkinson (1991) refers to this view held by many academics, quoting what a dean at al-Azhar University said about Arabic language newspaper. The dean states that “There is no fushā in the newspapers;” what is there, however, is mainly colloquial, or a form highly influenced by colloquial (33).
Underlying this view, Parkinson (1991) explains, is the assumption that “medieval and modern varieties” of Arabic should be viewed as one and the same form (60). For them, this form, which is represented by the “language of the classical period” as well as the modern literary usages that are close to it, is the only form that represents the Arabic language and deserves the term *al-Fuṣḥā*\(^{23}\) i.e. the most eloquent language (34). This view, Parkinson (1991) notes, “ignores the actual modern ‘standards’ of usage that are normally adhered to by professional writers and users of the form” (60).

The view that ignores the importance of journalistic Arabic as a prominent style of Modern Written Arabic, however, is fortunately not shared by all scholars and academics. On the contrary, many others regard the Arabic journalistic style not only as an appropriate representative of the Modern Written Arabic language, but also as an important form of the language that plays a crucial role in its development (see Abdelfattah 1996; Hamdi 2002; Parkinson 1991; Ryding 2005; Sharaf 2000). Hamza (1961) and Abdulaziz (1978), for example, refer to the contribution of the Arabic journalistic style in simplifying and rejuvenating the language, thereby making it more practical and flexible. Newspaper language, therefore, says Abdelfattah (1996), should be viewed “as a valuable source of linguistic data on the current changes taking place in (MSA)” (135).

As two distinct forms of Modern Written Arabic, literary Arabic style and journalistic Arabic style, each has a different role and hence represents the Modern

---

\(^{23}\) In an informative study in which he searches for what represents the term *fuṣḥā* for Egyptian native Arabic speakers, Parkinson (1991) concludes that people do not agree on either the term *fuṣḥā* or on what constitutes what is referred to by this term (33).
Written Arabic in a different way. Acknowledging that the journalistic Arabic style is a distinct form of Modern Written Arabic that has its own function and features is, thus, a key factor in realizing the importance of this style in representing the modern written language. “It is just this ability to reflect and embody change while maintaining the major grammatical conventions and standards,” Ryding (2005) points out, “that make journalistic Arabic in particular, a lively and widely understood form of the written language, and within the style spectrum of Arabic as a whole, a functional written standard for all Arab countries” (9).

3.2.5 Opinion Articles

That the data examined in this study consist of newspaper opinion articles is also a factor that has an impact on determining the nature of this data. In a newspaper, one comes across different genres, such as news stories, advertising, interviews, sports news, book reviews, opinion articles, and editorials. Each of these different genres of journalistic prose has its distinct characteristics. Because the newspaper opinion article is one genre of journalistic prose that has rarely been investigated or described, the purpose here is to give a general description of its specific characteristics based on the data collected for this study. While, in general, it displays the features of journalistic language mentioned above, this journalistic genre also demonstrates its own specific features that are realized in its linguistic choices, style and structure.

Newspaper opinion articles are texts of different length that usually appear in a fixed place in the newspaper. They are written by various well-known professional
writers who either hold a position at the newspaper or write for several newspapers on a regular basis. Within the community with which they share the same social and cultural background, these writers express their views or opinions on current events or issues pertinent to their local community and the world (Maynard 1996, 392; Van Dijk 1998, 21). However, while these articles reflect the point of view of their writers, it is important to point out that they are also influenced by and in line with the ideologies and political leanings of the newspaper in which they appear.

When writers explain and interpret facts according to their views in opinion articles, they are actually trying to influence the readers’ perception of these facts. The communicative purpose of this newspaper genre, therefore, is to influence readers’ beliefs and attitudes on issues of central importance at the time of writing the articles. This goal that opinion articles seek to fulfill is what shapes their language, style and structure.

Because of the persuasive intent of opinion articles, the style of this journalistic genre may be characterized as being evaluative and involved. This means that it employs linguistic choices that reflect the writer’s personal attitude towards the content of the message as well as establish interactional relations between him and the reader. These “stylistic features,” Khalil (2000) points out, are usually identified on both “the lexical level” and “the level of syntactic organization” (22).

In opinion articles, writers may use lexical items “that generally or contextually express values or norms” (Van Dijk 1998, 31). Evaluative words like qaḏiyat-un kafrat-

---

24 Van Dijk (1998) defines opinions as “evaluative beliefs” as opposed to factual beliefs. Any belief “that involves a judgment about somebody or something,” he explains, “is evaluative” (29).
un wa-mutafaqimah\textsuperscript{25} ‘a critical issue that is on a steady escalation,’ al-man\textsuperscript{n}ijat-a wa-
\textsuperscript{26}‘al\textsuperscript{d}d\textsuperscript{o}-a-ha al-mal\textsuperscript{m}mah\textsuperscript{26} ‘the region with all its chaotic events,’ say\textsuperscript{\textprime}-an qab\textsuperscript{\textprime}-an
\textsuperscript{27} ‘something terrible took place,’ f\textsuperscript{\textprime} kit\textsuperscript{\textprime}b-in am\textsuperscript{r}ikiyy-in f\textsuperscript{\textprime}d\textsuperscript{\textprime}lit\textsuperscript{28} ‘in an infamous
American book’ are employed as a linguistic strategy for conveying the writer’s opinion. Each of these lexical words, Van Dijk (1998) notes, “may feature implied opinion” (32).

Opinions may also be expressed through syntactic structures. “It is not merely the
concepts involved in the proposition but also the propositional structure itself that may
express opinion,” Van Dijk indicates (1998, 32). In a language that displays
pragmatically motivated word-order alternation like Arabic, this could be done by
manipulating the sentence word-order. Preposing the subject in a verbal sentence to
sentence-initial position, for example, indicates evaluativeness and adds emphasis, as will
be discussed later. Prepositional phrases may also be placed in sentence-initial position
to “give emphasis to the proposition expressed in the following main clause” (Khalil
2000, 23). It has been realized that these two evaluative syntactic structures are frequently
used in the data of this study to emphasize or highlight certain points.

Opinion articles may also make use of other linguistic strategies in order to
influence readers. The stylistic strategies that are employed in this journalistic genre are
similar to those Khalil (2000) identified in the editorials he examined. These include, for
instance, concessive sentences, evaluative sentences, rhetorical questions, explanatory

\textsuperscript{25} Text 2, P5, S26.
\textsuperscript{26} Text 6, P 3, S 10.
\textsuperscript{27} Text 8, P 2, S 8.
\textsuperscript{28} Text 8, P 3, S 15
sentences, repetition, and emphatic markers. Here are some examples of these linguistic structures usually used in opinion articles:

(1) Concessive sentence:

[1a] لا ريب في أن الخط الفاصل بين الكوميديا و الواقع رفيع. [1b] إلا أن الترقيه و الفكاهة قد يكونان إحدى الفوائد التي يمكن أن تُضاف إلى إنشاء صلة إيجابية بين الجماعات المختلفة. 29

[1a] No doubt, the line between comedy and reality is thin [1b]; however, entertainment and humor can act as channels to establish a positive connection between various groups.

(2) Evaluative sentence:

و أعراض هذه الأزمة تبدو مغيرة تماماً عما قبلها. 30

The manifestations of this crisis seems to be completely different from the ones that preceded it.

(3) Rhetorical questions:

[3a] من الذي أدار اتجاهات البوصلة و غيرها؟ [3b] من الذي خلط الأوراق و غيره ترتيبها؟ [3c] من الذي خلط الدين بالسياسة و وضع الأعداء في خانة الأصدقاء و بدل الفوائد؟ 31


(4) Explanatory sentence:

في السياسة هناك مقوله شهيرة " احتو أصدقاءك، لكن احتو أعدائك أكثر." [4b] يعني أنه بمقدار ما تجعل أصدقاءك متربين إليك، فاجعل أعدائك قريبين منك أكثر لتحتهاط منهم. 32

[4a] In politics, there is a famous proverb: keep your friends close but your enemies closer. [4b] This means that while you should keep good relations with your friends, you should, however, keep better relations with your enemies in order to guard yourself against them.

---

29 Text 3, P 6, S 19,20.
30 Text 7, P 3, S 9.
31 Text 6, P 7, S 26-28.
32 Text 12, P 2, S 5, 6.
(5) Repetition:

The Iranian discourse is archaic and repetitive. It uses the same discourse used by former, numerous regimes witnessed by mankind which ended in tragedy.

(6) (7) Emphatic markers:

In times of crises, indeed (inna-hā) she is the first to be victimized.

Certainly Nazism was annihilated after humanity paid the price of over 80 million who fell in the battlefield.

The above examples show different stylistic strategies that writers employ in opinion articles in order to persuade and influence their readers. In example (1), the writer first introduces a proposition that the reader agrees with in sentence [1a]. Then in sentence [1b], he presents the idea that he adopts which contrast with but does not eliminate the truth of the first one. This strategy has the effect of presenting the second proposition as the more valid one in contrast with the first proposition. Evaluating, explaining, and repeating his ideas, as in examples (2), (4), and (5) respectively, are also effective strategies to connect with the reader and guide his interpretation. Moreover, the
rhetorical questions and the emphatic discourse markers used in examples (3, (6), and (7) respectively, are effective means to persuade the reader and influence his perception.

On the other hand, just as the persuasive intent of opinion articles is reflected in their style and linguistic choice, it also has an impact on determining the organizational structure and developmental patterns of these texts. An organizational plan is expected in newspaper opinion articles because they are written by professional writers who have practiced writing for a long time. For these writers to persuade their readers with their opinions, they should argue for them employing the argumentative text-type.although, in opinion articles, writers not only argue and evaluate facts but also recount and explain them, these texts are still considered to be argumentative. While it is normal for real texts to display features of more than one text type, as will be explained when we talk about text types, they should, however, have one predominant communicative purpose, which is identified as persuasion in opinion articles.

Arguments, el-Shiyab (1990) points out, “are shaped by the culture and social conventions of a particular community” (148). This is why different languages use different strategies to present their arguments. Like any other argumentative text, opinion articles are persuasive messages that are the product of a specific cultural environment. Thus, they employ linguistic and structural strategies that are associated with this type of text in their specific culture and language, which is in the present study the Modern Written Arabic language.

36 Argumentative text-type will be explained later in this chapter.
37 For further discussion on how languages use different argumentative strategies see Hatim (1997, 164); Hoey (2001, 10); Kaplan (1966, 2); al-Odadi (1996, 4); Maynard (1996, 391); el-Shiyab (1990, 148).
3.2.6 Choice of Data

In a study that is corpus-based, the researcher is faced with two preliminary important questions: which data to use and how much of this data is enough for his study. As for the type of data used in this study, it is clear by now that they are selected from the newspaper opinion article genre. What needs to be explained, however, are the reasons for choosing this particular type of data. After dealing with the first question, we will then turn to discuss the second one that concerns the representativeness of the data.

This study analyzes data from the written mode of the Arabic language because, as we have seen, discourse markers have not yet been investigated thoroughly from a discourse perspective in this form of the language. While Kammensjö’s (2005) study is an important contribution to discourse markers research in Formal Spoken Arabic, in Modern Written Arabic, however, the treatment of discourse markers as a discourse phenomenon is very limited.

Focusing on the written form of Modern Arabic, on the other hand, is also determined by my interest in teaching Arabic writing. It is, however, not an easy task to teach Arabic writing since no agreed upon conventions nor do models exist to guide the production of written Arabic texts (Kammensjö 2005, 19; al-Odadi 1996, 7). “The lack of specific prescribed composition instructions in Arabic,” however, al-Odadi (1996) argues, “does not mean that there is no model which Arabic writers, at least subconsciously, follow” (7). What is required, therefore, for establishing models for different written Arabic styles is a comprehensive study of the Arabic texts’
Examining the organizational structure of written Arabic texts in this study is also relevant to choosing the data from the newspaper opinion article genre. Opinion articles, as mentioned above, are argumentative in nature. Because different cultures argue differently, the rhetorical structure of the argumentative text type usually differs across cultures. “Sociocultural factors,” Callow (1998) points out, “affect the form of the text and the communicative strategies employed in the text” (171).

Examining the structure of this type of text, that is culture-bound, in Modern Written Arabic allows one to perceive how arguments are developed in the Arabic argumentative text. This may explains misunderstandings that occur in cross-cultural communication. Besides, the argumentative text type makes use of discourse markers in constructing arguments, conveying the writers’ intentions and attitudes, and establishing relations with readers. Studying this type of text, therefore, illustrates the role these linguistic elements play in achieving the overall argumentative thrust of the text. What makes opinion articles appropriate samples for examining Arabic argumentative texts, however, is the fact that they reflect the writings of many professional Arab writers which means that they represent some of the best Arabic argumentative writing models used in modern time.

Selecting the data that are investigated in this study from the Arabic language used in newspapers, on the other hand, is also based on legitimate reasons. The journalistic style of Modern Written Arabic is, as mentioned before, a simple, widely-
used, and practical style that ventures to adopt new expressions and structures in order to be able to express the concepts of modern life. “It is these characteristics of newspaper language, its vitality and practicality” Ryding (2005) argues, “that make it a prime example of modern written Arabic usage,” and thus “the focus of linguists’ attention for a number of years” (8). Understanding how journalistic language works, Bell (1998) points out, “is important to understanding the functioning of language in society” (65).

Not only is journalistic Arabic able to “serve as a model of contemporary written usage,” but it is also a dominant style that has noticeable influence on other styles of the Arabic language. Because of its “mass audience” and “daily production cycle,” the press is “one of the main language-forming institutions in society, along with education and government,” Bell (1991, 7) argues. In Arabic, the influence of the journalistic style on Modern Arabic language as a whole has been noticed by many linguists (see Abdelfattah 1996; Abdulaziz 1986; Gully 1993; Hamdi 2002; Holes 1995; Sharaf 2000; Van Mol 2003).

Journalism, says Abdulaziz (1986), plays an “important role in the spread and standardization of language” (15). The constant exposure to this style of Modern Arabic language, Holes (1995) maintains, “seems to be having far-reaching effects on the vocabulary, grammar, and phraseology of the Arabic used by educated Arabs in many other contexts, written or spoken” (255). Most of the changes that take place in journalistic Arabic, Gully adds (1993, 56), eventually find their way to literary Arabic. This is because of the constant interaction between the two styles of the Arabic language. Newspapers and journals, Abdulaziz (1986) explains, used to be the sites for “most of the
modern philosophical, historical, and literary discussions.” Besides, among the Arab intellectuals “who did a great deal to develop MSA were those who ran journals and newspapers in Cairo, Beirut, and Baghdad” (16).

Just as it is an important part of the communicative lives of educated and semi-educated native speakers of Arabic, journalistic Arabic is also widely used by nonnative speaker students of the Arabic language as well as translators. The ability to read and understand the language of newspapers is actually one main goal for many students of Arabic. Moreover, shedding some light on the characteristics of this style of the Arabic language could enhance the ability of translators to comprehend cross cultural differences and hence produce more efficient translations. As a medium of functional language that reflects the modern usage of written Arabic, journalistic Arabic, therefore, should receive greater attention and be the object of linguistic research.

After explaining the reasons behind the choice of data, the answer to the second question concerning the number of texts analyzed in this study will be presented. In this study, a corpus of 50 texts is analyzed in order to identify discourse markers and to describe their functions. The data examined in this study is limited to one type of text, the newspaper opinion article, and one medium of the Arabic language, Modern Written Arabic, to ensure the homogeneity of the corpus. Because some discourse markers are “typical properties of particular text type” (Khalil 2000, 147), and because the markers used in writing usually differ from those used in speech (Brinton 1996, 33), focusing on one genre and one medium of the Arabic language leads to more accurate description of the role performed by discourse markers.
When deciding the size of the material to be analyzed, Bell (1991) points out that two things should be taken into consideration: “limiting the amount of data to be gathered to manageable proportions while ensuring it remains representative” (10). What governs the representativeness of the data when investigating a particular language feature, he adds, is “how often the feature occurs” (29). To be representative, the corpus of this study, therefore, should contain a sufficiently large number of tokens of the discourse markers under investigation. A corpus consisting of 50 opinion articles is expected to yield a large number of discourse markers, most of which occur several times displaying a consistent pattern in their use. The recurrence of these items along with the consistency of their use are two factors that could ensure the accuracy and reliability of the study’s results.

On the other hand, a corpus of 50 texts with an average length of 900 words for each has proven to be hardly manageable for traditional manual analysis. Although computer-based analysis could have allowed the use of larger data, it is, however, not possible here. Using computers to analyze the data requires the existence of an inventory of the linguistic items under investigation, i.e. discourse markers. There is, however, no such inventory of discourse markers in written Arabic, and this is why identifying the discourse markers in the data under analysis is one goal for this study. The choice of the two studies that examined the structural organization of Arabic editorials, al-Odadi’s (1996), and el-Shiyab’s (1990) to confine their data to 12 editorials in the former and 21 editorials in the latter may give an example of the amount of data that is usually considered manageable.
3.3 Methodology

3.3.1 Introduction

After introducing the data that is investigated in this study, the plan of its investigation will be discussed here. As mentioned before, the goal of this study is to examine the function of Arabic discourse markers at the text level, above the sentence, in a particular type of discourse, newspaper opinion articles. To this end, it takes the text, not the isolated discourse markers, as its point of departure to identify the markers first, and then describe them in terms of their function in their natural environment.

Since it takes a discourse perspective, this study employs a methodology that borrows its tools of description from different linguistic theories in the field of discourse analysis. It draws primarily on Kammensjö’s (2005) analytical model for analyzing discourse markers in “Arabic Lecturing Monologue (ALM)” and modifies it to serve its specific goals and data better. Her model, on the one hand, provides a means to identify discourse markers in the data, while, on the other hand, presents an analytical tool for describing the function of these markers.

This section, describes the methodology undertaken for analyzing the data. It is organized following the three-step procedure of Kammensjö’s model. The first step deals with the segmentation process. This is followed by the second step in which the functional relations that bring these segments together are introduced. In the third step, the means for identifying discourse markers in the data is presented.
Underlying this analysis process are the following assumptions, which have been discussed in the theoretical preliminaries: 38

1- Text is linearly displayed but hierarchically structured.
2- A text can be chunked into units of different levels.
3- The sentence is the basic unit for analyzing the text; thus no segments smaller than the sentence are taken into consideration.
4- Text is a communicative interaction between writers/speakers and readers/listeners.
5- Units of text are connected by functional relations, whether at the high or low levels.
6- Discourse markers acquire connective and communicative functions in context; thus they cannot be described in isolation.

3.3.2 Text Segmentation

a- Introduction

A fundamental assumption of many text analysts is that every coherent text has a structure that holds its parts together so that the text as a whole is perceived as one unit. Although linearly displayed, “the communicative units that make up the discourse do not follow one another in an uninterrupted monolithic sequence, but are usually ordered in a hierarchical manner” (Kroon 1997, 19). By virtue of occurring where it does linearly, each segment serves a certain function with respect to the adjacent segments on the one

38 These assumptions are based on the linguistic theories discussed in Chapter 2.
hand and to the overall discourse on the other hand; accordingly “at any given point in mid-message some of those hierarchical units will still be under construction” (Callow 1998, 151).

This hierarchical organization of text that derives its theoretical validity from numerous studies in text structure (see: de Beaugrande 1994; de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981; Dooley and Levinsohn 2001; Grosz and Sidner 1986; Gulla 1996; Hatim 1997; Hinds 1979; Hoey 1983, 2001; Sinclaire and Coulthard 1975; Van Dijk 1983; Winter 1982) underlies the segmentation process.

Segmenting text into units that are involved in its structure is an important notion in analyzing it. In order to examine a text, Allerton (1969) points out, “it has been found essential to split up utterances into units which have a certain degree of self-sufficiency and independence” (27). In the following sections, the segmentation process undertaken in this study will be described. Then the text segments will be discussed, first in general terms, introducing the units of analysis in this study, then in particular terms, examining the paragraph and the sentence as independent units of analysis.

b- The Segmentation Process

An important factor in creating meaning in text is its organizational structure. Text, as Jonassen (1982) states “depends upon organization to make it meaningful,” so “while content is the basic ingredient of discourse,” text structure “is equally important” (8). Since the structural plan of text is the organizer of its global meaning, as mentioned before, it is, therefore, considered an essential device “in the process of text production
and perception” (Khalil 2000, 65). Writers cannot arrange all the details of their message in advance. Instead, Callow (1998) argues, they have “the whole message roughly outlined” in their minds from the start, and “in light of this already established purposive structure” they present the details of the message (150).

Likewise, the plan of composition is essential in interpreting the text as well. We all look for “significant patterning in the message we receive” (Callow 1998, 157). Research in reading comprehension emphasizes the effect of text organizational structure in facilitating the comprehension and recall of the message, and regards it as “the most significant contributor to comprehension” (Jonassen 1982, 9; see also Adams and Collins 1979; Brown and Yule 1986; Callow 1998; Meyer 1992; Pace 1982; Samuel 1987; Townsend, Carrithers, and Bever 1987; Van Dijk 1983). Interpreting what a text producer is talking about, Brown and Yule (1986) maintain, “is inevitably based on how he structures what he is saying” (94).

Knowledge of text schematic structure, acquired through repeated encounters with different text types, not only facilitates comprehension but also enhances readers’ expectations concerning the new forthcoming information in text. Even when text is still in progress, its compositional plan triggers in the readers “certain expectations as to how the message is going to develop,” and it is in terms of these expectations that they “absorb each new element in the unfolding message” (Callow 1998, 151). Skilled reading involves activating a schema, an organizational structure, and looking for information in the text “that can fill empty slots in the activated schema” (Townsend, Carrithers, and Bever 1987, 223).
This cognitive strategy of producing and perceiving text in terms of its schematic structure is reflected in the top-down analytical process of the data in this study. Current linguistic and translation studies argue in favor of this approach for analyzing texts considering it the “more valid one theoretically” (Baker 1992, 6; see also Callow 1998; Snell-Hornby 1995; Brown and Yule 1986, Hatim 1997; Hatim and Mason 1990; Jonassen and Kirchner 1982). It is suggested that textual analysis should proceed from top-down because texts are not just chains of separate sentences, but rather “complex, multi-dimensional” structures consisting of more than the mere sum of their parts (Snell-Hornby 1995, 69). “As each new part of the message is transmitted.” Callow (1998) points out, “it is not added on the end of the string, but rather takes its place in a complex interrelated structure” (151). Consider for example the following string of sentences:

(8)

---

realized that this is not the intended meaning of this sequence of segments. The writer mentions America’s concerns regarding the growing strength of Chain’s military force in order to support his view of China as the future leader of the modern world. Because of its growing power, it has been feared and monitored by America, the current leader of the world.

It is, therefore, the organizational plan of the message, as Callow (1998) argues, that provides “a framework for the message” within which the significance of each part becomes clear (157). An “essential part of analyzing the text” then, as asserted by Hatim and Mason (1990), is perceiving its plan of composition (176). “It is the predictive power of top-down processing,” Brown and Yule (1986) point out, “that enables the human reader to see the text as a coherent unit” (235).

Although the top-down analytical strategy is adopted, bottom-up processing should also be taken into consideration. Text processing involves the occurrence of these two activities at the same time because there is a constant interaction between its local and global levels and “the clues with which the text provides us for the message interpretation are found at all levels simultaneously” (Callow 1998, 170; see also Adams and Collins 1979, 5; Baker 1992, 6; Brown and Yule 1986, 235; Hatim 1997, 6). While the lower semantic and syntactic choices are determined by the overall plan of the text, the global structure is also realized through the lower level signals. For example, argumentative texts employ evaluative words and syntactic structures, but at the same time discourse markers could be indicators of the text type utilized. Therefore, while “the data that are needed to instantiate or fill out the schemata become available through
bottom-up processing,” it is the top-down processing that “facilitates their assimilation” and creates expectations about what is likely to come next in the text (Adams and Collins 1979, 5); and through this interaction between the two processes the flow of information is considerably constrained.

Nevertheless, what is employed in this study is essentially a top-down approach. In accordance with the top-down procedure, the analytical process will seek to establish the structural pattern of the text first, its schematic categories such as introduction, thesis, substantiation etc., and only when the structural organization of the message has been established will it move on to consider lower-level units.

Titles, that are “powerful thematisation” devices which “indicate to the reader how the author intends his argument to be chunked” (Brown and Yule 1986, 7), provide an interpretive point of departure around which what follows in the text is structured (Paltridge 1994, 293; Snell-Hornby 1995, 69). For example, the title qimmat-u al-Riyāḍ .... al-najāḥ al-mumkin 40 ‘Riyadh Summit ... Potential Success’ indicates that the writer will argue in favor of the Riyadh Summit. In light of the compositional structure, aided by titles the text is segmented into meaningful paragraphs, and eventually, as Longacre (1992) explains “macrosegmentation must lead into microsegmentation” (110).

**c- Levels of Analysis**

For the purpose of dividing the data into units of analysis, the present study adopts Hatim and Mason’s (1990) hierarchical model in which “three structural entities:
elements, sequences, and text” (166) are identified. While the higher unit in their model represents the text as a whole, “the smallest lexico-grammatical unit” is the element “which can fulfill some rhetorical purpose, significantly contributing to the overall rhetorical purpose of the text.” Between the two levels is the sequence which normally consists of one or more elements, and “serves a higher-order rhetorical function than that of the individual element” (173).

Similarly, text is viewed here as the uppermost level of the whole, which is realized by sequences, named paragraphs, of mutually relevant elements, named sentences, and serving an overall rhetorical purpose. However, whereas in Hatim and Mason’s model (1990), the element is not equated with any particular grammatical unit, and hence could be realized by a clause. This significantly communicative component applies only to the sentence in the present study. Certain rhetorical relations, as Grimes (1975) and Longacre (1976) argue, “cannot be expressed within the compass of a clause, but instead require a sentence to say” (Grimes 1975, 108).

Within this model of organization, a text progresses towards a communicative goal. It is composed of a series of sentences, where each sentence performs a rhetorical function, and together they form a higher level unit in text organization, the paragraph. A paragraph, that serves a higher rhetorical purpose, in turn, enters into discourse relations with other paragraphs to fulfill the ultimate rhetorical function of the whole text.
**d- The Paragraph as a Unit of Text Structure**

The notion of paragraph as a second level of text organization that is below the text and above the sentence has been attested and discussed by many linguists in the field of discourse analysis (see Brown and Yule 1986; Callow 1998; Chafé 1979; Givón 1983; Grimes 1975; Halliday 2004; Hatim 1997; Hinds 1979; Longacre 1976; Unger 1996; Van Dijk 1980, 1982). It is “beyond doubt,” Hoey (1983) confirms, that there is a level of division above the sentence that “crudely corresponds to the paragraph” (11). Callow (1998) argues that this unit of text structure “constitutes a conceptual unity in terms both of its content and of its function in the total message” (209) (see also Hatim and Mason 1990, 176; Hoey 1983, 14; Unger 1996, 421; Van Dijk 1982, 180). The paragraph is defined as a stretch of text composed of coherent sequences of sentences that “can be reduced to a single theme proposition” (Kammensjö 2005, 110) and serves “a single rhetorical purpose” (Hatim and Mason 1990, 166).

Brown and Yule (1986) refer to the paragraph as a textual unit in which the writer “continues talking about the same thing” (96). It can be treated as a unit of some kind because of its inner coherence that is dominated by a single thought (see Daneš and František 1995, 30; Givón 1987, 179; Hinds 1979, 136; Longacre 1979, 116; Van Dijk 1982, 177). This “thematic unity,” that could be displayed in “topic/participants continuity, temporal continuity, spatial continuity, and action or theme continuity,” as listed by Givón (1987, 179) differs according to text type (Longacre 1979, 116). For example, while the unifying factor in an argumentative text is the topic, it is the time, that identifies narrative texts, Wilkendorf explains (1994, 16).
Besides its local coherence, the paragraph should also be “globally coherent,” that is, to serve a specific function in the discourse as a whole (Van Dijk 1982, 180). Not only does it exhibit “internal unity,” Unger (1996) indicates, but it also serves a specific function, as a unit, that contributes to the text overall rhetorical purpose (421). Daneš and František (1995) explain that it is this “communicative function” that the author employs in order to “articulate the content of the message in a purposive way” (29).

Accordingly, this textual unit is relevant to discourse organization and processing. In surface structure, text analysts argue, the patterns of text organization are observed in a higher level than the sentence “which usually correspond with paragraphs” (Van Dijk 1982, 192; see Hatim and Mason 1990, 175; Hoey 1983, 15; Khalil 2000, 65). Paragraphs, as “textual manifestations of schematic categories,” are units of text development, as will be further explained later (Van Dijk 1982, 191; see also Chafé 1979, 161; Hinds 1979, 136; Longacre 1976, 276). As a stage in building up the text, the paragraph is considered a “typical unit of argumentation” in argumentative discourse, “of explanation and exposition in expository discourse, and of episode in narrative discourse” (Ibid.) (see also: Callow 1998, 211; Hatim and Mason 1990, 174; Wilkendorf 1994, 16).

**e- The Sentence as a Unit of Text Structure**

Linguists have argued for the special status of the sentence as the basic unit of text. In his study, Chafé’s (1979) data confirms this fact showing the sentence “to be one of the most obvious, most strongly signaled of linguistic units” (162). He points out that this in fact has been the case throughout the linguistic tradition, “the sentence has, in fact,
seemed so important to so many that it has been the basic unit of grammatical study from ancient times to the present” (1994, 140).

Allerton (1969) also asserts the significance of the sentence as a unit referring to it as “the unit which is most useful to the purpose of grammatical analysis” (29). For Halliday and Hasan (1976), its being “the highest unit of grammatical structure,” makes it the “pivotal entity” for analyzing and describing the way in which cohesion is expressed in the text (8).

In modern English, the sentence has been defined as a constituent structure “beginning with a capital letter and ending with a full stop” (Halliday 2004, 6). Lyons (1977) points out that while this definition, which draws heavily on the conventionalized writing system, works for the written language (29), the identification of a spoken sentence, “is rather more complex” (624) and requires different criteria. “In spontaneous speech,” Chafé (1979) states, sentence boundaries “are not always clearcut” (162).

Linguists further distinguish between “text sentences” and “system sentences.” Whereas the term “text sentence” refers to the sentence as “language behavior” that is “context-dependent,” the “system sentence” is “an abstract, theoretical entity in the linguist’s model of the language-system” that is isolated from its communicative context (Lyons 1977, 29). Although these two approaches to sentence differ substantially, they are not incompatible, unless they are taken in an extreme form. Brown and Yule (1986) explain that “when a discourse analyst works with sentences in context “text sentences”,

---

41 This does not rule out the existence of other discourse structures such as “a paragraph or topic unit,” but implies that “the type of relation into which sentences enter with each other differs from that which holds among the part or sub-parts of a sentence” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 10)
he does not consider his data in isolation from the descriptions and insights provided by sentence-grammarians” (20). This study, therefore, takes both aspects of sentence, i.e. sentence that is context-dependent and sentence a structure, into consideration.

Summary

Underlying the analysis process in the present study is the assumption that texts are hierarchically structured. Three levels of the hierarchical structure are taken into consideration: the text as a whole, the paragraph, and the sentence. To identify these levels of text organization, a top-down approach is employed. Only when paragraphs are identified and the organizational structure of the text is established, sentences, the basic-level units, are discussed. This is because although “the clues with which the text provides us for the message interpretation are found at all levels simultaneously,” Callow (1998) notes, it is the overall rhetorical purpose of the text that determines its lower-level decisions (170).

3.3.3 Functional Relations

a- Introduction

While the first step of the analytical model in this study was concerned with the segmentation process, the second step involves the functional relations. After introducing the two structural levels, paragraphs and sentences, that form the text structure as a whole in the previous section, in this section, the functional relations that connect the text as a coherent whole will be discussed and the two analytical tools, i.e. Text-type Theory and
Rhetorical Structure Theory, utilized for identifying these relations will be introduced. Since functional relations are realized at different levels of text, the global relations of text structure along with the analytical tool for their identification will be introduced first, then the study will go on to discuss the text’s local relations and present the means for identifying them.

b- The Text: A Structure of Relations

Some approaches to text analysis view text as a structure that could be analyzed in terms of the relations connecting its segments. A major part of the structure of text, in these approaches, are the relations that tie its units together. It is these relations, says Beekman (1970), that “give unity and structure to a discourse” (7). Therefore, a message consists not simply of units, but of “units-in relation” (Callow and Callow 1992, 8).

These relations, that have been given various names in the literature, i.e. coherence relations, rhetorical relations, functional relations, and compositional relations, are the focus of the relation-based approaches to text analysis. Because their significance in text organization is widely recognized, analysts consider them a useful framework for describing text structure (see Beekman 1970; Callow 1998; Cawsey 1990; Grimes 1975; Hobbs 1979; Hoey 1994; Jordan 2001; Longacre 1992; Mann and Thompson 1988; Meyer 1985; Pike 1992; Reinhart 1980; Van Dijk 1982; Winter 1977 ).

Underlying this view of text as a structure of relations is the assumption that texts are communicative units that serve an overall rhetorical purpose. As Hatim and Mason (1990) explain, “a text progresses towards a goal, and will be deemed complete at the
point where the rhetorical goal is considered to have been achieved” (178). This communicative goal determines how sequences of sentences are organized in order to create a coherent text. The same segments, Hovy (1990) realizes, “can be organized differently to achieve different communicative effect.” (19).

The writer organizes his text in a certain way to achieve his goals. Each segment in a coherent text, whether a sentence or a paragraph, therefore, serves a certain function following from the writer’s global plan. “Attributing functions to various discourse parts” Longacre (1992) points out, “enables us to view it as a functioning whole” (112). It is this rhetorical function which a given segment performs, such as explanation, specification, or elaboration, that defines the kind of relation it has with respect to other segments, and contributes to the realization of the overall communicative goal of the text. “We look at coherence relations as realizations of intentions,” Sanders and Spoo ren affirm (1999, 246).

Conveying the functions intended by the text producer, relations become a text organizing device that determines its structure. This is why they are considered to be an essential factor, among others like: cohesion, thematic structure, and information structure, in maintaining the text overall coherence. As Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson (1992) note “Unity and coherence arise from imputed function. A text is perceived as having unity and coherence because all of its parts are seen as contributing to a single purpose of the writer” (43).
Relations between clauses and sentences, Van Dijk (1983) argues, maintain the text’s local coherence by organizing its microstructure. The macrostructure of text, realized by high level units, on the other hand, is organized by global functional relations that account for the text’s global coherence. It is proposed, therefore, that different procedures should be employed to analyze relations at each level of text. Whereas schematic structure theories describes “conventional textual structures in terms of patterns which specify the overall structure of text,” relations holding between low-level segments could be explained by coherence relation theories (Hovy 1990, 3). “The two approaches to analyzing text above the level of sentence,” notes Gulla (1996), “are crucial to account for discourse coherence at both the local and the global level” (79).

In this study, the text structure is described within the framework of two theories that account for local and global coherence. While Text-type Theory provides the means to describe paragraph global functions, the functions served by sentences are described in terms of Rhetorical Structure Theory; this is illustrated in figure 3.1.

**Figure 3.1. Relations in Text**

![Diagram showing relations between paragraphs and sentences](image)

P1 [ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ ]
S1   S2   S3   S4   S5

Global Relations (Text-type Theory)

P2 [ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ ]

P3 [ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ ]

Local Relations (Rhetorical Structure Theory)

42 The macrostructure and microstructure of texts are explained in the first Chapter.

43 In figure 3.1. (P) stands for paragraph and (S) for sentence.
However, it is important to note that this distinction between the two levels of relations is only theoretical in order to facilitate the analysis process. When we treat relations at high and low levels separately, “we must not be misled into thinking that relations are therefore inherently independent and isolable. They are not” (Callow 1998, 250). On the contrary, there is a constant interaction between the two levels since they both work towards the same goal. While global relations provide a framework by which local relations are organized into a pattern of purposive development, local relations are the “elemental building blocks” of global relations (Hovy 1990, 31).

c- The Global Relations in Text

1- The Schematic Structure

The schematic structure of a text is its organizational plan. As mentioned previously, in order to achieve their communicative goals, texts employ compositional plans on which they depend to convey their meaning as much as they depend on their content. Plans, Meyer (1985) explains, “are a central component of the process of communicating and understanding. A writer must evolve some general plan of what s/he intends to communicate, and a reader must be able to follow that plan” (64). This “overall purposive framework,” says Callow (1998), is the schema of the message (157).

This organizational plan which provides an overall form of the text guides the formation of its global meaning, the macrostructure, by organizing the local relations of the text, the microstructure, in a certain way that serves the text producer’s goal. It is important to note, however, that the schema, although “is a global organizer of the
propositional content or macrostructure of the text” (Van Dijk 1980, 108), is not itself the global content of the text. Rather “it is a mold for forming one” (1983, 55). For example, the global content of a story is not a narrative schema but the semantic content that is organized by the categorical structure of this schema.

Schematic structures consist of cognitive categories, such as introduction, setting, background, argument, support, etc., that define the functional relations between paragraphs in a text. As a developmental unit of text structure, a paragraph has a specific communicative function in the text as a whole. This function provides a point around which the paragraph is structured and specifies its relation to other paragraphs in the text. Each paragraph making up the message, says Callow (1998), “has something to contribute to its purposive patterning-- it helps the message forward in some way” (153). It is these communicative functions performed by paragraphs that the schematic categories identify. The paragraph’s rhetorical purpose, Hoey (1983) points out, “correspond to the pattern of organization of discourse” (15).

2- Schematic Structure and Text-type

Since schemata organize the global meaning, they are crucial in the process of text comprehension and perception, as mentioned before. The primary function of a schema is to allow making predictions about new information on the basis of existing schemata. “Schemata can be seen as the organized background knowledge which leads us to expect or predict aspects in our interpretation of discourse” (Brown and Yule 1986, 248).
The reader usually brings an implicit knowledge of schematic structure to the process of interpreting texts. The process of understanding a text, Rumelhart (1980) says, “is the process of finding a configuration of schemata that offers an adequate account of the passage in question” (47). Recognizing the text’s organizational plan, therefore, is an essential part of understanding it. It is this plan, as discussed before, that suggests to the reader “how the message is going to develop,” and thereby guides his interpretation of each segment that is added to the unfolding message (Callow 1998, 151).

Research on reading comprehension indicates that “the different organizational plans and strategies brought to the text by the reader interact with attributes of text to affect the reader’s understanding of the text” (Meyer 1992, 79). If the reader does not have the appropriate schema, he or she cannot understand the concept being communicated. While “content is a basic ingredient of discourse, written or oral, the organizational structure is equally important,” Jonassen indicates (1982, 8). Both structure and content play an important role in understanding and analyzing connected discourse.

The schemata that readers utilize for the interpretation of texts are based on their previous experiences of similar texts. Text, says Brown and Yule (1986), “is interpreted in the light of past experience of similar discourse” (233). Repeated generalization across experience, consequently, creates regularities in schematic categories. Hoey (2001) describes this circular process very well when he says:

The writer knows that readers will expect certain thing on the basis of previous texts of the same kind that they have read and so takes the trouble to conform to those expectations; the act of conforming to those expectations confirms readers in the
rightness of their original expectation and makes it still more likely that they will expect the same thing the next time they encounter a text of this type. (43)

To become fixed, however, these schematic categories have to be “socioculturally accepted, learned, used, commented upon, etc. by most adult language users of a speech community” (Van Dijk 1980, 109). Once the patterns of text organization are conventionalized in a given culture they give rise to text typology. Eventually, the organizational patterns that were responsible for the establishment of text types become governed by these culturally-conventionalized text-types. Text types, then, are text frames that determine the schematic categories to which texts usually adhere in order to be realized as belonging to a specific text type. As a result, it becomes possible to recognize a text as being “a token of a generalized type” and expect that it has the typical patterns of that particular type (Brown and Yule 1986, 63). So when writers compose their texts, they draw upon models that have become normal within their culture; and when readers process these texts, they do the same.

3- Text Typology

As mentioned above, text types are classes of texts with socio-culturally fixed schematic categories that highlight the main rhetorical structure of the text. Classification of texts provides an overall framework which text users can utilize in order to determine the relevance of high-level segments of text to each other and to the overall purpose of the text. Hatim (1997) points out that “text-type focus almost causally determines text structure” and lays down the relations whereby texts develop in order to achieve their
goals (55). Linguists who ignore the importance of text typology, Longacre (1996) asserts, “can only come to grief” (7).

Text typology stands for the means to identify a text as a token of a type by suggesting specific characteristics to major types. It has been suggested by many linguists that despite the cultural differences between conventionalized types of text organization, there exist some similar features in each type that allow developing general taxonomies of texts. Some analysts classify texts according to their field, such as journalistic, scientific, and religious text types, while others categorize them in terms of their plan of organization, such as problem-solution, causation, and comparison. Yet others base their classification on the rhetorical purpose of the text, such as description, instructional, and argumentation.44 Hatim’s (1997) typology, which is adopted in this study, falls in the third category that associates particular text structures with particular functions.

Despite the importance of text typology for the process of analyzing texts, as acknowledged by many analysts, it has been claimed that there are no typical pure types. Any real text normally displays features of more than one type, and it is more likely to find that there is a combination of several text types within each text. This is because writers resort to all kinds of texts so as to deliver their points effectively. In an argumentative text, for instance, as we have seen in opinion articles, one would find a mixture of the descriptive, narrative, and argumentative functions. This poses challenges to analysts, say de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), “the major difficulty in this new

---

44 For further information on different text typologies see de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981); Hatim (1997); Hatim and Mason (1990); Hoey (2001); Longacre (1992); Meyer (1985); Werlich (1983); and Winter (1977, 1994).
domain,“ they explain, “is that many actualized instances do not manifest complete of exact characteristics of an ideal type” (183).

However, this ‘fuzziness’ which is a natural feature of texts, Hatim (1997) argues, “is a well regulated phenomenon.” To account for this ‘hybrid nature’ of texts, one should be able to identify the dominant features in the text. Research shows that only one predominant rhetorical purpose can be served at one and the same time in a given text (42). Text should ultimately be made to address a single predominant communicative goal. For example, in order to achieve persuasion in a given text, a variety of rhetorical purposes may be employed: one can persuade by narrating an event, giving an example, describing a situation, etc. Yet, the predominant focus stays the same, namely to persuade.

4- Hatim’s Text-typology

In his text typology, Hatim (1997) recognizes three major forms for identifying the global structure of texts; expository texts, argumentative texts, and instructional texts. Within the expository text-type, three sub-types are identified: ‘conceptual’ dealing with the analysis or synthesis of concepts, ‘narrative’ focusing on actions and events, while ‘descriptive texts’ describe and explain objects and situations. Another basic type is the argumentative text whose focus is “the evaluation of relations between concepts” in order to persuade the text receiver to the author’s point of view (38). Two variant forms of argumentation are distinguished in this model: through-argumentation and counter-argumentation. The instructional text is the third type in Hatim’s (1997) typology. It
focuses on “the formation of future behavior” either by regulating the way people act or think through instruction without option as in contracts and treaties, or by persuading them with instruction with option as in advertising (38).

Despite the fact that the instruction with option sub-type displays similar functions to that of the argumentative text-type, it has been noticed that the patterns of logical thinking in the latter are more apparent than they are in the former. The three major types and subtypes proposed and discussed by Hatim (1997) may be represented as in figure 3.2.

**Figure 3.2. Basic Text-types (Adopted from Hatim 1997)**

```
Expository text-type
  Conceptual    Narration    Description

Argumentative text-type
  Through argument    Counter argument

Instructional text-type
  Without option    With option
```

The structure of each of these established types follows a familiar pattern of organization and involves a particular set of relations holding among its various
segments. Besides the conventionalized structure, Hatim (1997) adds, the text should also
display certain features in order to be recognized as belonging to a specific type. He
realizes, for instance, that highly marked word order and heavy use of modality and
cohesive devices of emphasis are common features of argumentative texts.

The structural patterns of organization identified by Hatim’s (1997) argumentative
text-type are employed in this study to highlight the overall rhetorical structure of the
texts and define the relations connecting their high-level segments. Argumentative texts,
as mentioned above, relate to a specific goal, namely to persuade. Given that the
newspaper opinion articles, which are analyzed in this study, have the tendency to
persuade and are dominated by evaluativeness, they are considered to represent
argumentative text-type.

d- The Local Relations in Text

1- Classifying Relations at Local level

As mentioned previously, many studies of text analysis view coherent text as a
structure of relations. These relations between sentences and larger discourse units are
part of the meaning communicated in text and provide a useful analytical tool for
describing text structure. “Sequences of text could be explained by coherence relations
between discourse segments,” says Cawsey (1990, 76). While relations between global
units, i.e. schematic categories, account for the macrostructure of text, as discussed
above, local coherence relations seem to be most suitable for analyzing microstructure of
text, and thus describe connections between its basic units (Gulla 1996, 81).
To facilitate the analysis process, relation-based approaches to text analysis suggest that there is a finite set of local coherence relations between propositions that would be sufficient to enable the analysis of every coherent text. As expressed by Longacre (1992) “No one who works for long and in detail with text analysis can avoid positing a set of relations to explain how the segments of the text relate to each other” (114). However, the number and labeling of coherence relations proposed by different studies naturally varies depending on differences in approach and discourse type. “The number of relation types and the nature of these types may differ from one domain to the other,” Gulla (1996) explains, “but within a limited and well-structured domain it has still proved satisfactory to consider a closed set of relations” (79).

Although different studies identify different specific relations, “the underlying similarities among these lists are more significant than the disagreements” (Longacre 1992, 114). It is “a striking fact,” Kammensjö (2005) expresses, that many relation names are shared by different approaches (113). Among the different classifications that have been proposed are those found in: Beekman (1970) and colleagues within the Summer Institute of Linguistics; de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981); Callow (1998); Grimes (1975); Hobbs (1985); Hoey (1983); Longacre (1976, 1996); Van Dijk (1977, 1983); Mann and Thompson (1987); and Winter (1977).

Some researchers attempt to distinguish between two types of functional relations: semantic and pragmatic. The semantic-pragmatic opposition that is proposed by some studies is similar to other oppositions introduced in other studies, namely the external-internal, the referential-purposive, the ideational-interpersonal, the informative-
presentational, and the propositional-procedural (see Callow 1998; Fraser 1990; Halliday and Hasan 1976; Martin 1983; Sanders, Spooren, and Noordman 1992; Van Dijk 1977). Halliday and Hasan (1976) point out that there are two sets of “conjunctive relations,” “those which exist as relations between external phenomena,” and those which exist between “the communication situation” (240). The contrast here is between: They gave him food and clothing. And they looked after him till he was better (external relation), and They gave me fish to eat. And I don’t like fish (internal relation) (321).

However, many analysts acknowledge that the line between the two types is difficult to draw (see Anderson 2001; Fraser 1990; Halliday and Hasan 1976; Moor and Pllack 1992; Sanders, Spooren, and Noordman 1992; Siepmann 2005). It is more “a convenient abstraction than a truly separate and valid classification,” Loveday (1983, 172) asserts. This is because each segment of text encodes both semantic and pragmatic information simultaneously. On the one hand, Fraser (1990) explains, “each sentence encodes content meaning…often referred to as the propositional content.” On the other hand, “each sentence also encodes pragmatic information: signals the speaker’s communicative intentions” (385). So every coherence relation has a dual function, and whenever a relation is identified between two sentences, there are in fact “two levels at which the relations can hold, the intentional and the informational level” (Sanders and Spooren 1999, 237).

In this study each relation is viewed as having both informational and intentional function. However, for some relations, informing is regarded as their main function, so they have more semantic value, while others have more pragmatic value because they are
primarily designed for expressing intentions and attitudes. This is taken as a useful means for describing the degree of the communicative function expressed by each sentence.

2- Describing Relations: Rhetorical Structure Theory

In this study, the Rhetorical Structure Theory, henceforth: RST, is employed to describe the functions served by the basic units of text structure, the sentences. It is a text-analytic model developed by Mann and Thompson (1987, 1988) to describe how parts of text structure combine to create coherent communicative text. RST, they state, “is a linguistically useful method for describing natural texts, characterizing their structure primarily in terms of relations that hold between parts of the text” (1988, 243). This theory, the authors acknowledge, extends a tradition of research on the relational basis of text structure. It has been influenced by many previous studies such as: Beekman (1970); Grimes (1975); Hobbs (1979); Halliday and Hasan (1976); Hoey (1983); Longacre (1976); Meyer (1985); Van Dijk (1977, 1983); and Winter (1977).

In the course of developing their theory, Mann and Thompson (1987) analyzed hundreds of written texts, varying in length from one paragraph to several pages, including different text types and genres, such as: administrative memos, personal letters, letters to the editor, advertisements, scientific articles and abstracts, newspaper articles and editorials, travel brochures, etc. They proposed a set of approximately 24 relations to represent the relations holding between segments of English texts. However, they do not suggest that this is a closed set. On the contrary, to serve a given data better, the number of relations is subject to change, and more specialized relations could be added. This is a
distinguishing feature of RST because it gives absolute priority to the data as having its own structure and culture. “We see the relations as an open set,” Mann and Thompson (1988) emphasize, that is “susceptible to extension and modification for the purposes of particular genres and cultural styles” (250). In table 3.1. below is a list of these relations.

Table 3.1. The Relations in RST (Adopted from Mann and Thompson (1988) with Modifications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antithesis</th>
<th>Volitional Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>Non-Volitional Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstance</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutionhood</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enablement</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Restatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volitional Cause</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Volitional Cause (reason)</td>
<td>Joint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structural relations in this theory could hold between units of any size, from clauses to groups of paragraphs, provided that the unit has an “independent functional integrity” (Mann and Thompson 1988, 248). However, it is a particularly useful framework for describing local structural relations. RST, Gulla (1996) argues, seems to be a most suitable descriptive framework for micro-structures of texts. “When larger structures are to be constructed,” he adds, “the relationships between them appear to be more governed by schematic standards of communicative goals and effects” (80). There is harmony, however, between the relational structure described in this theory and the
other structures of text with which it interacts, such as the holistic, syntactic, and thematic structure. Although there are no sharp boundaries, either in principle or in practice between these different kinds of text structures, Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson (1992) point out, RST “does not attempt to incorporate accounts of either genre or syntax” (41).

An important element that sets RST apart from many other approaches to discourse description is its recognition of the writer’s intended effect in each relation. Each relation in RST is defined according to the effect it produces on the reader as presumably intended by the writer. Underlying this functional view of text structuring relations is the assumption that text is a united whole consisting of functionally significant parts, where each part contributes to the overall purpose of the writer. This theory, Mann and Thompson (1988) state, “is a functional theory of text structure” (244) that focuses on the “functions that make texts effective and comprehensible tools for human communication” (Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson 1992, 43). The emphasis that RST places on the communicative role of text structure is consistent with the assumption underlying the present study, and hence is an important reason for the adaptation of this theory.

There are also several other reasons for adapting RST as the analytical tool in this study. One of these reasons is the extensive use of this theory as a descriptive framework for investigating linguistic issues in a wide range of text types. For example, it has been used to analyze news broadcasts in Noel (1986) and to lay the basis for studies in contrastive rhetoric such as al-Odadi (1996) and Siepmann (2005). This recurring use of
RST validates its assumptions and thus leads many analysts to consider it as “a well established theory for text analysis” (Gulla 1996, 80).

Another important factor for utilizing RST in this study is its open set of text structuring relations which allows adding or modifying relations according to the need of the specific data under analysis. A text in a specific culture, therefore, can be analyzed in terms of a “set of highly recurrent relations, the knowledge of which is shared in this culture” (Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson 1992, 46). Moreover, that RST “allows working with text either from the top-down or from the bottom-up or both” (51) makes it suitable as an analytical tool for this study which takes a top-down approach for analyzing the texts.

One last reason for adopting RST in this study is the open possibilities that it permits for classifying the relations. This framework does not pose a strict classification on its text structuring relations; rather, it leaves it open for various possible groupings depending on the way the analyst approaches the data. Classifying the relations into: ideational and presentational relations, for example, is one possible classification that it suggests. This grouping is based on the effect a relation is intended to have on the reader. While ideational relations “are those whose intended effect is that the reader recognizes the relation in question,” the intended effect of the presentational relations is “to increase some inclination in the reader, such as desire to act or the degree of positive regard for, believe in, or acceptance of the nucleus” (Mann and Thompson 1988, 257).

Such classification seems to draw a clearcut line between the semantic and pragmatic functions of relations. However, the authors do assert that each relation in fact
performs a semantic-pragmatic function at the same time; yet one of these functions is usually predominant. Thus, ideational relations, such as elaboration, circumstances, and summary, could be seen as predominantly informing whereas presentational relations, such as justification, interpretation, and evaluation, are predominantly establishing social relations (Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson 1992, 45). This is consistent with the view held by this study regarding the simultaneous semantic-pragmatic function of each segment with one of them predominating the other.

Summary

In the previous section, the study examined how units of text structure relate to each other in order to create a coherent text. The two methods employed to describe the relations that hold between high-level and low-level segments respectively are: Text-type theory and Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST). Both of these relation-based frameworks represent the text structuring relations from the perspective of the text-producer, taking his intended communicative goals as the means for interpreting these relations. After introducing the analytical tools employed in this study for describing local and global relations, the following section will present the analytical tool employed for identifying discourse markers in the data.
3.3.4 Identifying Discourse Markers

a- Introduction

Identifying discourse markers in the data is the final step in the analysis process which precedes the description of their function. As we have seen, researchers have identified some common features of discourse markers that could set them apart as a coherent linguistic group. These features, as listed by Schourup (1999), include: “multicategoriality,” “connectivity,” “nontruth-conditionality,” “weak clause association,” “initiality,” and “optionality” (230). Although these features give discourse markers a distinguishable status as a group, they, nevertheless, do not imply an agreed upon definition on which the identification of these linguistic elements can be based.

While the initial position of the units of texts where discourse markers usually occur is identified by segmentation, determining which elements in the initial slot have discourse marker status needs a clear definition of the members of this group. Since there is no agreed upon definition to guide the identification of these linguistic elements, a clear criterion for guiding this process and ensuring that it is neither intuitive nor arbitrary, therefore, is needed.

Following Kammensjö (2005), this study employs Halliday’s notion of thematic slot as a means for identifying discourse markers. This tool that is used to identify these linguistic items, however, is based on one prominent characteristic of discourse markers, namely their nontruth conditionality. As nontruth-conditional items, discourse markers are not regarded as part of the propositional meaning of the sentence. While the non-propositional character of discourse markers is considered criterial for determining their
status, it is, however, not clear how to decide what is part of the propositional meaning of the sentence and what is outside this meaning. Here is where the thematic theory becomes useful for identifying discourse markers. Because the thematic structure determines the constituents of the propositional core of the sentence, it could identify the items that are outside this propositional core. In what follows, the thematic structure of texts’ units as identified by Halliday (2004) will be discussed, and its relevance to the identification of discourse markers will then be highlighted. However, this section will not present examples that illustrate the way discourse markers are identified in the data because this will be dealt with extensively in the next chapter.

**b- Thematic Structure**

Operating within the Functional Grammar Theory (FGT) framework, in which language is represented as network of systems, where each system is a set of alternative meaningful choices, Halliday (2004) distinguishes between three different functions in the clause: Theme, Subject and Actor. For him, each of these three functions is part of a different functional structure. Underlying this distinction is the assumption that there are three functional components that contribute to meaning in the semantic system: the textual, the interpersonal and the ideational. The textual component includes the “text forming” resources of language, whereas the interpersonal component is concerned with

---

45 Text, in FGT, is thought of as “the product of ongoing selection in a very large network of systems.” Analyzing text, therefore, “shows the functional organization of its structure and the meaningful choices that have been made” (Halliday 2004, 23).

46 Following Halliday (2004), all functions will be written with an initial capital (60).

47 As has been mentioned in the theoretical background, the semantic system is one of three levels that constitute the linguistic system in FGT: the semantic, the lexicogrammatical, and the phonological (Halliday 1977, 176).
the social and expressive function of language, yet the focus of the ideational component is the expression of content (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 27). While each of these components creates its own structure, the three interact to account for all the semantically relevant choices in the language.

Within the clause structure, Halliday (2004) explains, each of the three components contributes to the meaning in a different way, making up “a separate strand in the overall meaning of the clause.” The three distinct lines of meaning created in the clause by the three components are respectively: the clause as a message, the clause as exchange, and the clause as representation (2004, 58). The Theme, he maintains, is a function in the structure of the clause as a message whereas the Subject functions in the structure of the clause as exchange; The Actor, on the other hand, forms part of the structure of the clause as representation.

In a sentence like: *The duke gave my aunt this teapot*, for instance, the roles of Theme, Subject and Actor are all realized in one element *the duke*. This element, thus, can be analyzed in three different ways depending on the line of meaning under focus. The three functions, however, may be separated as in *this teapot my aunt was given by the duke* where *this teapot* is the Theme, *my aunt* is the Subject and *the duke* is the Actor. While there are also other possible combinations of the three roles in the clause, the typical, unmarked form in an English declarative clause “is the one in which Theme, Subject, and Actor are conflated into a single element” (Halliday 2004, 58).

“By separating the functions of Theme, Subject, and Actor,” Halliday (2004) points out, “we have been able to show that the clause is a composite entity” in which
“three distinct structures, each expressing one kind of semantic organization, are mapped on to one another to produce a single wording” (60, 64). But while each of these structures creates a distinctive meaning, it is the configuration as a whole that realizes the meaning of the clause. This “threefold pattern of meaning,” Halliday (2004) states, is not only characteristic of the clause but runs throughout the whole language (60).

Theme, that functions in the structure of the clause as a message, however, is part of the thematic structure which is one of two structures operating within the textual component to give the clause its characteristic as a message. Halliday (2004) introduces two kinds of textual recourses that manage the flow of text as a message: the intrasentential which involves the thematic structure and the information structure, and the intersentential which is realized through cohesion and rhetorical relations. “Below the sentence boundaries,” he states, “there are two structural systems at work to maintain the discourse flow: the thematic structure and the information structure” (2004, 88).

In the thematic structure, the clause is divided into two functions: Theme and Rheme. The Theme is the element “which serves as the point of departure” of the clause, and the Rheme is the part of the clause in which the Theme is developed (Halliday 2004, 64). In many languages in which English is one, Theme is realized by the initial position in the clause.⁴⁸ Although Halliday (2004) defines thematic structure primarily for the clause, he makes it clear that this Theme-Rheme distinction is relevant to sentence as

---

⁴⁸ Halliday’s notion of Theme is not equivalent to the term Topic that is used by some linguists. Topic may only resemble Halliday’s concept of the “topical Theme” which is only one kind of the Themes that Halliday introduces as will be discussed.
well. There is thematic structure, he says, “in all major clause types: simple, compound, or complex (98).

The thematic structure, for some analysts corresponds to the concept of the information structure. For Halliday, however, although the two structures are “closely interconnected,” they denote two completely different features of discourse organization. In contrast to thematic structure, which is realized in the structure of the clause or clause complex, information structure is not a system of the clause itself, but rather of “a separate grammatical unit, the information unit, which is a parallel unit of the clause” (Halliday 2004, 88).

The information unit, Halliday (2004) explains, is created by the tension between the information which the text producer believes is already known to the receiver or predictable and the information which he believes to be new or unpredictable. These two types of information are defined by the two functions that form the information structure: Given and New, respectively. Being independent from the sequence of elements in the clause, the information structure, therefore, may begin and end anywhere in the clause. However, the Theme and Given typically coincide in the unmarked English declarative clause. This may be the reason behind viewing the two terminologies as referring to the same concept by some linguists.

Thematic organization as defined by Halliday (2004) is considered a significant sentential as well as discoursal phenomenon. What the text producer chooses as his point of departure of the message influences the interpretation of what follows. Theme,
therefore, presents the message from the text producer’s perspective providing a particular context within which the rest of the clause can be interpreted.

The significance of the thematic choice, however, goes further beyond the sentence boundaries. In addition to its function as message orienter at the local level, Theme also “locates and orients the clause within its context” at the discoursal level (Halliday 2004, 64). The choice and ordering of Themes in a given textual sequence plays a fundamental part in the way text develops. This thematic organization forms patterns which the text producer employs to govern the flow of discourse in a way that serves his ultimate rhetorical purpose. While thematic organization could be realized in all major types of clauses, Halliday (2004) maintains, the main contribution to the development of text “comes from the thematic structure of independent clauses” (99).

c- Theme as a Slot

The starting point of the clause or sentence which functions as Theme, Halliday (2004) realizes, is not just one element at the beginning of the clause or sentence but rather a whole slot that may hold more than one element. Defining Theme as “the point of departure” of the clause or sentence, therefore, is not sufficient to identify it. This definition determines only where Theme begins; however, because Theme is a slot that may include more than one constituent, the point where it ends needs also to be determined.

To draw the line between Theme and Rheme and determine where the former ends and the latter begins, Halliday (2004) proposes this simple guiding principle: the
Theme contains one and only one element that has some representational function in the clause. As mentioned before, clause as representation, which is created by the ideational component of meaning, is concerned with the expression of content. Clause elements that are involved in expressing the propositional content of the clause are the ones that have representational or experiential function. They include: “the process itself (the predicator), the participants in the process, and any circumstantial factors, such as time, manner, and cause” (79). This means that the thematic slot starts from the first constituent in the clause and extends over to include “the first element that has an experiential function-- that is either participant, circumstance, or process. Everything after that constitutes the Rheme” (85).

Halliday (2004) refers to the textual function which the first constituent in the representational structure of the clause has as the “topical Theme” (79). By introducing the concept of “topical Theme”, he distinguishes between two possible thematic forms: simple Theme and multiple Theme. Simple Theme means that the topical Theme alone carries the whole thematic force because it is the only constituent in the thematic slot. The Theme that Halliday (2004) treats as simple may consist of one structural element that is represented by just one unit, such as: one noun, adverb, or prepositional phrase; but it may also consist of two or more nouns, adverbs or phrases “forming a single

---

49 Propositional content of the clause or sentence, as mentioned before, is its core meaning or semantic representation.
50 Halliday uses the terms representational and experiential function interchangeably to refer to the role which specific elements play in the propositional core of the clause or sentence.
51 This is because the three structures of meaning: clause as a message, as exchange, and as representation interact within the clause.
structural element.” For example, two nouns joined by and, such as Tom and Sandy, “constitutes a single element within the clause” (68).

In certain structures even a whole clause could form a single constituent of a clause or a sentence. Halliday (2004) mentions two such structures in which the entire clause is contained in the topical Theme: the thematic equative structure, and the predicated Theme structure. In the first structure, all the elements of the clause are organized into two constituents: Theme and Rheme that are linked by a form of ‘the verb to be’ to express the meaning of exclusiveness. An example of this is: What the duke gave my aunt [Theme] was that teapot [Rheme]. The second structure, on the other hand, consists of equational head clause as Theme and a dependent, relative clause as Rheme, such as: it was the duke [Theme] who gave that teapot to my aunt [Rheme]. This structure, says Halliday (2004), “is often used by writers to signal that this is the reading that is intended” (96).

In a multiple Theme, however, there are other elements in the clause preceding the topical Theme and hence sharing some of the thematic force of the slot. These elements, Halliday (2004) explains, are either textual or interpersonal in function, “playing no part in the experiential meaning of the clause” (79). Table 3.2. below shows the range of constituents that may be included in a multiple Theme according to Halliday (2004):
**Table 3.2.** Constituents that May Occur in a Theme (Adopted from Halliday 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual Theme</th>
<th>Interpersonal Theme</th>
<th>Experiential/Topical Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuative</td>
<td>Modal adjunct</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>Object/complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctive Adjunct</td>
<td>Finite (auxiliary)</td>
<td>Conjunctive adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predicator (lexical verb)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d- Topical Theme**

Topical Theme, as mentioned above, is the first element in the clause or sentence which contributes to its propositional meaning. Until one of these elements appears, Halliday (2004) states, the clause or sentence “lacks an anchorage in the realm of experience; and this is what completes the thematic grounding of the message” (85). The main clause constituents that have function in this experiential realm are: subject, predicator (lexical verb), object, complement, conjunctive adjunct.

Choosing any of these elements as the starting point of a clause or a sentence is meaningful. Text producers select the topical Theme that conveys their meaning and helps positioning the clause or sentence in the unfolding text in a certain way that best serves their organizational plan. Examples in table 3.3. illustrate how meaning varies according to the element that is chosen as the topical Theme of the clause or sentence.

**Table 3.3.** Topical Theme Variations (Adopted from Halliday 2004)

| The duke                | has given my aunt that teapot |
| My aunt                | has been given that teapot by the duke |
| That teapot            | the duke has given to my aunt |
| **Topical Theme**      | **Rheme**                     |
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Some choices, however, are more meaningful than others because they are marked. In English declarative sentences, where the typical word order is subject-verb-object, the least significant, unmarked choice is the one in which the topical Theme is realized by the subject. Choosing other elements than the subject as the topical Theme in a declarative sentence, however, is more meaningful and thus considered to be the marked case.\textsuperscript{52}

\textbf{e- Natural Theme}

In multiple Theme, elements that precede the topical Theme and share the thematic force with it do not contribute to the propositional content of the clause or sentence. While not forming part of the propositional meaning, these pre-topical elements, however, have either textual or interpersonal function that introduces this meaning.

Halliday (2004) classifies the non-topical constituents that may precede the topical Theme in English into: Textual Themes and interpersonal Themes. He summarizes them as shown in table 3.4.

\textsuperscript{52} The Topical Theme in imperative sentences is the imperative form of the verb, and in interrogative sentences is the interrogative word. However, in interrogative yes/no sentence, the finite operator, which is the interrogative word, forms with the subject one element in the experiential structure of the sentence, therefore the topical Theme extends to include the following subject as well (Halliday 2004, 72-77). This why neither interrogative nouns, such as kəyfa ‘how,’ and mā‘ādu ‘what,’ nor interrogative particles, such as \textit{hal} ‘question particle,’ are included in the group of discourse markers in this study. Both are regarded topical Themes.
Table 3.4. Textual and Interpersonal Themes as Defined by Halliday (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual</th>
<th>Continuative: a small set of words which signal a move in the discourse, for example: yes, well, now, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conjunctions</strong>: a word or group that either links (paratactic) or binds (hypotactic) the clause in which it occurs structurally to another clause. Semantically, it sets up a coherence relationship between clauses. For example: and, or, but, yet, when, while, before, after, unless, since, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conjunctive adjunct</strong>: these are adverbial groups or prepositional phrases which relate the clause to the preceding text. They cover roughly the same semantic space as conjunctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td><strong>Modal or comment adjunct</strong>: these express the speaker/writer’s judgment on or attitude to the content of the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Vocative</strong>: any item being used to address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Finite verbal operator</strong> (in yes/no interrogative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the items in table 3.4., Halliday (2004) explains, are “natural Themes” because they favor the thematic position in the clause or sentence. For certain textual elements, namely continuatives and conjunctions, sentence-initial is the obligatory position; thus they are “inherently thematic.” The rest of these elements, whether textual or interpersonal, that occur in the pre-topical Theme position are “characteristically thematic.” Although they are frequently thematized, they may also occur in other positions in the sentence.

Whether the text producer is orienting the clause or sentence within the discourse, or expressing his own attitude towards the content “it is natural to set up such expressions as the point of departure” (Halliday 2004, 83). However, since these pre-topical items are
“thematic by default,” their presence, though it uses some of the energy of the thematic slot, it does not exhaust it all. The “thematic energy” is not fulfilled until the topical Theme takes its place, and “this is what completes the thematic grounding of the message,” Halliday indicates (2004, 85).

It is essential to point out here that interpersonal discourse markers may sometimes be realized by a whole clause that resides in the pre-topical slot. This is a central notion for identifying interpersonal discourse markers in the present study. The sentence: *I don’t believe that pudding ever will be cooked* is an example of the structure, where the entire main clause forms part of the Theme functioning as an interpersonal modal, while the dependent clause is divided between the Theme and Rheme.

In multiple Theme, the most frequent order of its constituents is textual-interpersonal-experiential. Usually, only one or two “natural Themes” occur in any one clause or sentence. However, to illustrate the typical order of such elements in thematic position, Halliday (2004) constructs an example that contains all of the six types of these non-topical elements. The table 3.5. below shows this example:

Table 3.5. Maximally Extended Theme (Adopted from Halliday 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well</th>
<th>but</th>
<th>then</th>
<th>surely</th>
<th>Jean</th>
<th>wouldn’t</th>
<th>the best idea</th>
<th>be to join in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuative</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>Voc</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td>Topical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1- Discourse Markers as Themes

To identify discourse markers, Halliday’s (2004) model of thematic structure is introduced in this study. Although discourse markers and thematic structure are two distinct phenomena, their interaction is strong. Both discourse markers and thematic function are associated with initial position of the clause or the sentence, and both of them are also important to the process of organizing text. While the Theme orients the message, discourse markers establish relations within the message and with the receiver. Because of the overlap between the two in position and function, Halliday’s (2004) notion of thematic slot is a useful tool for identifying discourse markers.

According to Halliday’s (2004) model, Theme, the point of departure of the clause or sentence as a message, should be seen as a slot that starts from the first element in the clause or sentence up to and including the topical Theme. Topical Theme is defined as the first element in the sentence or clause “that has an experiential function-- that is either participant, circumstance, or process” (85). Elements preceding topical Theme in the thematic slot are either inherently or characteristically thematic and lie outside the propositional meaning of the clause or sentence. These similarities that pre-topical elements bear with discourse markers make Halliday’s description of them a useful device for identifying these linguistic elements in the data under analysis.

This study adopts Halliday’s (2004) notion of thematic slot as a means to determine what items in the sentence-initial position could qualify as discourse markers. Constituents preceding topical Theme in the thematic-slot, therefore, are identified as discourse markers. What is taken into consideration, however, is the thematic structure of
the independent clause only. This is because while there is thematic structure in all major clause types, it is primarily the thematic structure of independent clauses that contributes to the development of texts and maintains the flow of discourse (Halliday 2004, 99). It is important to note that while Halliday’s (2004) model is employed to identify discourse markers, the order that he suggests for multiple non-topical Theme constituents, textual then interpersonal, is not forced on the Arabic data. Instead, the data itself is given the lead to show how these markers are ordered in Arabic.

Summary

In this study, sentence-initial position is the obligatory place for discourse markers. This position, however, as we have seen, may hold items that are either discourse markers or non-markers. Moreover, because discourse markers as a category is open and may include items from different grammatical categories, i.e. particles, nouns, verbs, phrases, adverbials, clauses, it is, therefore, not clear how to determine whether an item in this position is a marker or not.

Nontruth conditionality, however, is considered a central characteristic for distinguishing discourse markers from other items. While discourse markers do not constitute part of the propositional core of the sentence, other initial items, such as preposed adverbials for example are part of the structure and meaning of the sentence. However, to determine what is part of the propositional meaning and what is not has proved to be problematic. Hansen (1997) points out “the distinction between what does and does not belong to the propositional level is actually problematic” (156). Halliday’s
model of thematic structure provides a tool that eliminates this problem. Because it identifies the propositional core of the sentence, this analytical model determines what is inside and what is outside this domain. This leads to the identification of discourse markers which occur outside the sentence’s propositional meaning.
CHAPTER 4

PROCESS OF THE ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

After introducing the data investigated in this study as well as the methodology adopted for their investigation in the previous chapter, in this chapter, the process of investigating the data by means of this plan of investigation will be presented. According to the analytical model adopted in the present study, this process, as been seen, consists of three steps: segmenting the data into units, identifying the functional relations among these units, and finally the identification of discourse markers at units’ boundaries.

This chapter, therefore, will first deal with the segmentation of the data, then goes on to discuss the identification of functional relations that bring these segments together, and ends with a discussion of Halliday’s Thematic structure theory as a possible tool for identifying discourse markers in the Arabic data. It is important to note, however, that describing the segmentation of the data into units and the identification of the relations holding these units as being two independent processes is only theoretical. When applying the analytical model to real texts, however, the two processes actually occur at the same time. This is because a unit’s boundary cannot be identified unless the unit’s function has been realized and vice versa.
4.2 Segmenting the Data into Units of Analysis

4.2.1 Introduction

The analysis starts with the assumption that texts are hierarchically organized and hence can be chunked into units of different levels. In this study, the text, which represents the uppermost level in the hierarchy of text structure, is divided into two hierarchical levels: the paragraph and the sentence. In order to identify these two levels of text structure, the present study employs a top-down analytical process which starts with the identification of the text paragraphs, and then goes on to identify the basic units of text structure, i.e. the sentences. In this section, the strategies followed for the identification of paragraphs will first be discussed, and then the criteria set for determining sentence boundaries will be introduced.

4.2.2 Identifying Paragraph Boundaries

According to the top-down approach adopted in this study, the paragraph, which is the unit below the text and above the sentence, is the first level of the hierarchical structure of text, after the text as a whole, that should be identified in the analysis process. Since paragraphs are the “textual manifestations” of the text schematic categories (Van Dijk 1982, 191), as mentioned earlier, identifying paragraphs in a text corresponds to establishing the text organizational plan. This confirms what was referred to above that segmenting the text and identifying the relations holding its segments are actually two processes that occur simultaneously.
The previous chapter argued for the status of the paragraph as a unit of text structure that displays a conceptual unity in both its content and its function. This conceptual unity of the paragraph is the means on which the study draws for determining paragraph boundaries. Whenever two sequences of texts are perceived to have two different topics, and perform two different functions, there is a boundary. There are, however, as we will explain shortly, formal signals such as: particles, preposed adverbials and prepositional phrases, and word order alternation that could provide a strong supporting guide for the segmentation process.

In what follows, the means employed in this study for determining paragraph boundaries will be discussed. However, what should be born in mind, as Daneš and František (1995) point out, is that “a text offers several variant possibilities of an acceptable segmentation into paragraphs” (30). “There cannot be right and wrong places to break but only more appropriate or less so, depending on rhetorical need of the writer” as Hoey (1985, 105) puts it.

**a- Orthographic and Structural Paragraph**

When referring to the paragraph as a textual unit, many discourse analysts distinguish between structural and orthographic paragraphs (Callow 1998, 210; Daneš and František 1995, 29; Hatim 1997, 58; Hinds 1977, 83; Hoey 1983, 11; Kammensjö 2005, 109; Longacre 1979, 116). The unit marked off graphically by spacing and indentation in writing, they argue, does not necessarily correspond to the paragraph as a unit of text structure. “Those who use the term paragraph to describe a unit in the
structural analysis of written text,” Brown and Yule (1986) point out, “specify that they are not describing the orthographic paragraph” (95).

According to Hatim (1997), the orthographic paragraph “may be motivated by mechanical aspects of the writing process, such as eye appeal or printing conventions, for little or no regard for the meanings being exchanged through texts” (58) (see also Hinds 1977, 83; Longacre 1979, 115). This may result, as Longacre (1979) puts it “in indentation at the middle of a structural paragraph or putting together several paragraphs as an indentation unit” (115). Spacing and indentation signaling the beginning of new paragraphs in printed text are, therefore, usually ignored in the segmentation process because they are “not wholly reliable guides to the underlying cognitive configurations” (Callow 1998, 210; see also Hatim 1997, 58; Hoey 1983, 11; Longacre 1992, 113). The following example demonstrates this point:

(1)

[1a] A recent survey of the religious situation in France published by ‘Le Monde des Religions’ Magazine, revealed that Catholicism appears to have declined in the state that has long been hailed the daughter of the Church. [1b] According to the published figures, those who consider themselves to be Catholics constitute no more than 51 percent of the population, compared to 67 percent in the 70s. Among these, only 8 percent regularly attend Sunday services, that is less than 3 million French.

53 Text 4, P 1, S 1, 2.
In the above example, sentences [1a] and [1b] form one structural paragraph. This is because sentence [1b] provides an evidence to support the claim in sentence [1a]. The two sentences, therefore, convey one idea, i.e. a claim and the facts supporting it, and perform one function, i.e. introducing the text and thereby providing a context within which the text is to be understood. However, in the printed text, each of these two sentences is displayed as an independent orthographic paragraph.\(^{54}\)

In this study, although the paragraph is taken to designate a structural rather than an orthographic unit, the orthographic signals of paragraph breaks are not completely ignored. Even though not always the case, “there is often a reasonable degree of correspondence between the (orthographic) paragraph and the topic of the text” which makes them useful, though not reliable, indicators of the author’s intended breaking points (Hatim and Mason 1990, 178; see also Brown and Yule 1986, 7; Hinds 1977, 83). “If the text displays other signals of the writer’s intention to set this stretch of discourse of as one paragraph,” Brown and Yule (1986) explain, “then this confirms that the writer is marking a topic-shift at this point” (99). Analyzing texts, after all, is a descriptive rather than a prescriptive process.

**b- Continuity and Discontinuity**

The paragraph as a unit of text structure that “exhibits both referential and functional unity” can be identified and distinguished from the adjacent units by means of this unity. Each paragraph, Callow (1998) explains, “can be distinguished from its
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\(^{54}\) Longacre (1976) points out that sometimes a paragraph may consist of one sentence if this sentence conveys a complete thought and serves a global structural function, which is not the case here (281).
neighbors in the same message by having its own distinctive referential content (what is it about) and its own distinctive significance (its function in the larger unit of which it is a part)” (210).

Many analysts draw essentially on content to determine textual boundaries. Boundaries among paragraphs, they explain, could be identified by the breaks in their semantic continuity (see Bakker 1993; Chafé 1979; Daneš and František 1995; Grimes 1975; Paltridge 1994; Givón 1983). Within the structural paragraph, Givón (1983) argues, “it is most common for one topic to be the continuity marker” (8). Change of topic, however, constitutes “a thematic break” in this continuity (Khalil 2000, 134). Whenever this continuity is broken up, Kammensjö (2005) points out, “there is a boundary” (111). Therefore, as long as the text producer continues talking about the same thing, “he remains within a single segment of the text;” however, “when he changes the subject he passes from one segment to the next” (Grimes 1975, 103). Consider, for instance, the following example:

(2)
The city of Dubai represents an Arab dream. It is a success story that needs to be told in detail continually. It is no longer a secret that Dubai and its success were built upon strategic foundations, a strong will, and an effective leadership. This wonderful atmosphere has been a great opportunity that attracts investments, tourism, and recreation. Multitudes of giant international companies, therefore, came to this flourishing city, as well as thousands of ambitious people seeking wealth and a comfortable lifestyle and wanting to build a bright future for themselves. To enable this, specialized cities within Dubai were established in the fields of finance, internet, media and so on. The required specialization of added value is the key to a great economical surge.

However, recently, something terrible took place that change this beautiful picture. Something really unacceptable. The announcement was made that the headquarters of the American company, Halliburton, would move from Houston, Texas in the USA to Dubai in the UAE. This decision comes after the company suffered at the hands of Congress because of the strong accusations of tax evasion made against it and for receiving "special" and "unusual" treatment and acquiring a number of deals in Iraq through direct commissioning without going through the usual competition. Many people attribute the reasons behind the company’s special relations with gigantic projects with the US army and large oil companies to the influence of the controversial American Vice President Dick Cheney who was the Chairman of Halliburton before running in the US elections with President Bush in 2000.

It is clear in this example that there is a topic shift at sentence 2h. Notice the continuity in topic in sentences 2a to 2g. These 7 sentences describe Dubai as a model of success for the Arab world, pointing out the reasons behind this achievement and...
admiring its outcomes. However, in sentence [2h] the author changes the topic from admiring Dubai’s successful steps towards developing the country to criticizing one unacceptable step, in his opinion, that recently took place in this marvelous city, namely the hosting of the American company, Halliburton. The point at which there is “perceptible change of topic between adjacent portions of discourse,” Hatim (1997) points out, is a breaking point (61-62). Therefore, the topic-shift in the above example is an indication of paragraph boundary. Boundary-marking, hence, “is often indissolubly bound up with topic-marking” as Bakker (1993, 276) puts it.

Once discontinuity in “participants, time, place, circumstances, and global event or action” is identified, “one may assume that there is a beginning of a new episode” (Van Dijk 1982, 181). However, just as the unifying factor on which a text is structured differs according to its type, as mentioned before, description of topic-shift is also text-type specific. According to Brown and Yule (1986), in narrative text, “the writer must provide some indications of change of time or place,” while he “can range over different times and places within a single paragraph in an argumentative text, but must mark out changes in the direction of his argument” (100). Since the texts in our data are argumentative, paragraph breaks in the data are marked by topic shift rather than change in time or place, as it is clear in example (2).

Discontinuity in discourse is also realized by discontinuity of function. Just as breaking internal continuity in content is viewed as an indication of paragraph boundary, so does achieving the specific role a paragraph is intended to serve in the discourse as a whole. According to Hatim and Mason (1990), writers “avoid stopping before they have
made their point.” A paragraph, thus, is “as long as it needs to be in order to achieve its function;” and only when its rhetorical purpose has been fulfilled that it comes to its end (76). The paragraph boundary realized by the break in topic continuity at sentence [2h] in example (2), for instance, is also indicated by the fulfillment of the paragraph’s function. While sentences [2a] to [2g] serve as a background information that provide a context for the argumentation in the text, sentences [2h] to [2i] state the point of the argument, serving as the thesis which the author wants to argue for.

These structural paragraphs, therefore, correspond to the “patterns of organization of discourse” (Hoey 1983,15); and to identify a paragraph within the overall progression of the text, Hatim and Mason (1990) suggest, one can “follow patterns of text organization” (175). This is illustrated by example (3):

(3)

These structural paragraphs, therefore, correspond to the “patterns of organization of discourse” (Hoey 1983,15); and to identify a paragraph within the overall progression of the text, Hatim and Mason (1990) suggest, one can “follow patterns of text organization” (175). This is illustrated by example (3):
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This company was subject to criticisms of misuse. This is because it was awarded projects in Iraq alone that are worth over 20 billion US dollars, most of which are without tenders. In a controversial American book entitled ‘The Halliburton Agenda’, the author discussed a number of controversial issues concerning the methods of running the company and its implication in scandals and bribes. This, according to the author, is more the style of criminal organizations rather than the way of a respectable international company. The conduct of Halliburton led one American country musician to record an album naming it ‘Halliburton Boardroom Massacre.’ This album consists of songs named after the company's violations, members of the board of directors, and their American politician accomplices. Even bumper stickers appearing on cars took part in the anti-Halliburton theme. One of these stickers reading “Support organized crime: vote Halliburton” has become popular.

Halliburton is the ugly face of the American world of business just as the group of neo-conservatives represents the ugly face of the world of politics. Halliburton is an old company, established in 1919. It focuses primarily on the oil trade. Therefore, it expanded to spread to over 70 countries around the world. But in recent years it transformed into a raging monster. And its management approach has become devoid of any morals.

On its way to form a respectable organizational alternative, and a futuristic approach that Arabs can be proud of, Dubai is making a huge mistake if it believes that by hosting Halliburton's headquarters, it will add anything “reputable” to its astounding journey.

The three paragraphs in example (3) form the rest of the text whose first two paragraphs were presented in example (2). The whole text, thus, consists of five paragraphs. Marking paragraph boundaries in this text can follow the pattern of text organization, as Hatim and Mason (1990) suggest, because these organizational patterns
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59 Text 8, P 5, S 27.
correspond to the functions performed by these paragraphs. As we have seen in example (2), while [P1] is an introduction of the topic of the text, [P2] presents the thesis that the author is arguing against. In [P3] above, however, the author supports his opposition of Dubai’s decision of hosting the American company, Halliburton, by criticizing the company’s performance and presenting evidence of its misbehavior. The negative evaluation of the company in [P4] then leads to the conclusion in [P5] where the author restates his opinion that hosting this company in Dubai is a huge mistake.

Consequently, while it is the continuity of content and consistency of function that set a paragraph apart as a unit in text, it is the discontinuity of content and fulfillment of rhetorical purpose that determine paragraph boundaries and guide the segmentation process. According to Paltridge (1994), the search of structural divisions in text is “a search for cognitive boundaries” in terms of content and significance (288). Segmentation, states Levinsohn (1994) “results from local discontinuities of the same parameters listed for continuity” (4).

**c- Flow Theory and Discontinuity**

Associating paragraph boundaries with discontinuities in discourse has been accounted for by the Flow theory. In this theory, in which Chafé (1979) views the flow of text as “the reflection of the cognitive processes that underlie verbalization” (Kammensjö 2005, 111), paragraph boundaries in written texts are considered to be clear indications of “time-consuming mental processing” (162).
According to Chafé (1979), marked breaks in discourse continuity seem “to produce the need for time-consuming mental processing” (178). As text producer moves from thought to thought, there are at certain points significant changes “in space, time, character configuration, event structure, or, even world” (179). Such changes contribute to processing difficulties, which in turn appear in speech as hesitations and in writing as paragraph divisions (Ibid.).

Although focusing on the flow of discourse as sequences of ideas that are converted, one after another, into language, the flow model does not contradict with the hierarchical model on which this study is based. On the contrary, “the vertical hierarchical organization of thought and language” as presented in the hierarchical model, Chafé (1979) states, “is supplemented and enriched through more attention to the horizontal linear aspect” of discourse in the flow model (166).

d- Linguistic Signals and Discontinuity

Besides the conceptual properties, there are also linguistic signals that mark paragraph boundaries in texts. Many linguists indicate that, in “both written and spoken discourse,” the structuring of text into larger chunks than sentences may be signaled by formal linguistic devices (Brown and Yule 1986, 94, 97; see also Brinton 1996; Bakker 1993; Cumming and Ono 1997; Fraser 1996; Grosz and Sidner 1986; Hoey 1994; Lenk 1998; Pace 1982). Longacre (1979) finds that many of the languages that he investigated have formal linguistic markers “that indicate either the beginning or the end of a paragraph” (117).
As units of text structure, paragraphs, hence, not only have cognitive but also linguistic properties “as has been confirmed in descriptive analysis” (Van Dijk 1982, 181; see also Brown and Yule 1986, 95; Longacre 1979, 116; Martin 1983, 56; Wilkendorf 1994, 20). Some of the signals that may be expected at a beginning of a paragraph are: preposed adverbial clauses and prepositional phrases, back references to previous sentences, deictics, and discourse markers. (see Longacre 1979, 117; Callow 1998, 214; Cumming and Ono 1997, 122; Khalil 2000, 110; Levinsohn 1994, 7). Such initial signals, Givón (1987) indicates, mark what is referred to as “thematic discontinuity and the opening of a new thematic paragraph” (182). For instance, “The most general function of initial adverbial clauses,” Cumming and Ono (1997) add, “is that of creating and reflecting discourse structure by signaling shifts in time, place or orientation” (123).

These linguistic signals that mark points of discontinuities in text by indicating changes of topic are considered helping devices that can guide the segmentation process. In order to convey his message as structured in his mind, a message sender “frequently places signposts marking message progression at appropriate points, especially at the beginning of new schema units” (Callow 1998, 163). “Formal markers of topic-shift,” therefore, Hatim (1997) points out, “have been used as a structural basis for dividing up stretches of discourse” (58).

In Modern Written Arabic, an “increasingly extensive usage” of fronted adverbial constructions, whether clauses or phrases, has been attested (Beeston 2006; Blue 1977; Holes 1995; Kammensjö 2005; Kinberg 2001). Whereas the use of this structure was restricted in Old Written Arabic to conditional and temporal clauses only, Modern
Written Arabic displays more flexibility in clause order permitting “adverbial clauses of cause, purpose, concession, comparison, etc.” also in the initial positions (Kinberg 2001, 52). As in other languages, the occurrence of adverbial clauses or propositional phrases at initial position in Arabic, Khalil (2000) states, “realizes a context separation with what preceded, that is to signal a boundary point and a discontinuity” (110). The discontinuity function of the fronted adverbial constructions is evident in example (4):

(4)

[P1] A while ago, an Iraqi diplomat received important representatives of the Houthi movement, which included leadership figures in armed militias. [4b] Many of them affirmed that they had received extensive and advanced training in camps affiliated with the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC), along with members of the Badr Brigade. [4c] This is the terrorist group responsible for murdering scores of innocent people, and is known for its complete subordination to the Iranian intelligence.

[P2] While all are preoccupied with the developments of the Iranian crescent and the ensuing repercussions, the situation in Yemen is developing in a dangerous manner that cannot be overlooked or ignored. [4e] People are too busy watching what Iran is doing in the northern part of the region that they neglect the insidious creeping through their backdoor in the south – which comes as a disturbing shock.

60 Text 7, P 7, S 23-25.
61 Text 7, P 8, S 26, 27.
In example (4), the adverbial phrase of manner, *ma'a in-šūgāl* ‘with the preoccupation’ that introduces sentence [4d] realizes a shift in the flow of the argument in the text. This fronted adverbial phrase, therefore, marks a boundary point between [P1] in which the author presents examples to support his argument that the current insurgency in Yemen’s Saada province is supported by foreign forces and [P2] that summarizes the argument in order to conclude the text. The same thing could be realized in example (3) that was discussed earlier. The adverbial phrase *fī ṭariq-i-hā* ‘on its way’ at the initial position of sentence (3o) signals a boundary point between [P4] and [P5]. This is because it marks a shift in the argument structure from evaluating the American company, Halliburton, in [P4], to concluding the text by summarizing the author’s argument as a whole. These fronted adverbials that introduce new paragraphs, thus, denote “discontinuity and a shift to a new context” (Khaliil 2000, 109).

Because of their strong association with discontinuity in texts, fronted adverbials, as well as other linguistic signals of discontinuity such as back references to previous sentences and deictics, are taken to be strong indicators of paragraph boundaries in the present study. However, discourse markers are not used in our analysis to signal discontinuity in text. Although these linguistic devices are “among the primary indicators of discourse segment boundaries,” as Grosz and Sidner indicate (1986, 177), they are not among the linguistic signals employed in this study to indicate paragraph boundaries because no inventory of such markers exists in Arabic yet.
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62 See also Brinton (1996, 6); Hoey (1994, 44); and Lenk (1998, 38).
To determine the points of discontinuities in text, our analysis, therefore, is guided by some linguistic signals, such as fronted adverbial clauses and phrases. It is important to note, however, that although linguistic signals, are considered “wide discourse phenomenon” (Bakker 1993, 776); texts do not always “provide such explicit guidelines to help the analyst select chunks of discourse for study,” as Brown and Yule (1986, 69) put it. The surest guide to unit boundaries, therefore, Callow (1998) emphasizes, “is always referential and purposive cohesion within the proposed units, and contrast with adjacent units.” Yet, strong supporting evidence can be provided by boundary-marking devices (214).

**e- Word Order and Discontinuity**

A further indication of discontinuity in discourse is word order. In languages that display word-order variation, the change is usually pragmatically motivated (see Hopper 1985, 124; Givón 1988, 249, 275; Myhill 1985, 197; Payne 1995, 455). When a language exhibits word-order alternate, Khalil (2000) points out, “it is necessary to look at the discourse function of word-order variants. The question to be asked is about the communicative function of one rather than another” (157).

It has been recorded in predominantly verb-initial languages like Biblical Hebrew, Chamorro, Spanish, Tzotzil, Chorti, Tagalog, Ute and Yagua, that word-order may signal continuity or discontinuity in text (see Cooreman 1992, 243; Downing 1995, 10; Givón 1983, 19; Hopper 1985, 140; Khalil 2000, 158; Longacre 1995, 353; Payne 1995, 454, 461). The post-verbal position of the subject correlates with event-sequences or
succession of actions, thus, Givón (1983) states, this position “codes ‘neutral,’ unmarked and continuous topic” (34). On the contrary, the SV order “constitutes a very strong discontinuity strategy” because it correlates in most cases with the initiation of a new discourse sub-unit denoting “a marked theme shift” (Khalil 2000, 159; see also Downing 1995, 10; Givón 1983, 33; Longacre 1995, 352; Payne 1995, 461; Hopper 1985, 140). Placing the subject before the verb, Givón (1988) notes, is “twice as frequent in the thematically discontinuous paragraph initial position” than it is in “the thematically continuous paragraph medial position” (257).

Unlike English, which grammatically requires the subject to be in pre-verbal position, as Givón indicates (1983, 29), Arabic is a flexible word-order language. The basic word-order in Modern Written Arabic is considered to be VSO, but SVO, VOS, and OVS are also possible patterns that are encountered under certain conditions (see Khalil 2000, 135; Parkinson 1981, 25; Suleiman 1989, 216). Because words follow meanings in the speaker’s mind, as al-Jurjānī (1984, 40) says, these shifts in word order are meaning sensitive and not arbitrary. Arabic grammar, Suleiman (1989) points out, recognizes this “close relationship between syntax and semantics” and maintains “that all changes in the internal structures of Arabic sentences are motivated by a desire to express a certain meaning other than the one conveyed through the basic order” (215).

The functional differences which Modern Written Arabic displays between VS and SV word-order, however, although pragmatically motivated, are “relatively fixed” (Holes 1995, 208; see also Bateson 2003, 45; Khalil 2000, 157). While VS order is considered to be stylistically the neutral, unmarked structure, SV is the marked, emphatic
and non-neutral one (see Khalil 2000, 135, 160; Parkinson 1981, 25, 29; Pashova 2003, 23, 26; Persson 2002, 45; Ryding 2005, 65, 66; Suleiman 1989, 222; Thalji 1986, 111). The most obvious function for preposing the subject, Suleiman (1989) states, “is emphasis, in which more weight and importance accrue to the preposed sentence element” (222) (see also Pashova 2003, 26). Other pragmatic functions associated with this structure are: specification and particularity, showing importance, increasing the readers sense of involvement, and refuting a claim (Suleiman 1989, 215, 223; Watson 1999, 169).

Similar to other languages with pragmatically-controlled flexible word-order, word order shift between VS and SV in Modern Written Arabic also codes continuity or discontinuity (Khalil 2000, 159). The unmarked verb-initial sentence in Arabic “is essentially non-evaluative,” while the marked subject-initial sentence “is essentially evaluative, promoting a transition-rheme communicative thrust” (Hatim 1989, 143). Pashova (2003), who investigated the functions of the VS/SV alternation in a corpus of modern Arabic texts, calls attention to the strong relationship between the occurrence of the SV word-order in sentence-initial position and discontinuity in Arabic text. The subject, he notes, precedes the verb “at a major thematic boundary” (25). Whereas “the main discourse factor connected with VS order is chronological sequentiality,” he adds (14), SV order “may be attributed to topic change” (33). To illustrate this discontinuity force of the SV word-order, consider the two examples below:
[P1] [5a] At a time when complicated regional issues are inching towards resolution, Qatar is once again back to searching for a role that it can play. [5b] However, since this time the crisis is greater and all the major players have started maneuvering, Doha is left with nothing but explicit slander to resort to, reminding us of the worst forms of insults and condemnations that took place during the 1960s in the Middle East.

[P2] [5c] The maneuvering done by the Major Player, i.e. Saudi Arabia, has led the Qatars to losing their reason. [5d] Therefore, we see and hear their blatant attack on Riyadh and against all those seeking to stabilize the region. [5e] The problem with the Qatari leadership is that it lacks credibility and political weight. [5f] The first to attest to this are the parties that seem to be in good terms with Doha.

Reactions to episodes that deal with sensitive social issues have exceeded the lines of normal debate that may oppose the content and approach. These are actually matters that are worthy of serious discussion. However, what happened was the brandishing of the fatwa sword against a television program that supposedly has other mechanisms to control its performance.

This reflects a substantial defect in the relation between the media in general, and the laws and media function within the framework of these laws. For Islamists and nationalists to take on the task of censorship upon themselves is the physical embodiment of this defect. If not firmly and decisively addressed, this matter could lead to the establishment of a control mechanism similar to the one relied upon by the Taliban.

In sentences [5c] and [6d], the SV word-order indicates a major boundary in the text marking the end of one point and initiating a new point in the text structure. In example (5), this boundary marks the end of the introduction of the text and the beginning of the thesis that the author wants to argue for. However, the boundary in example (6) divides the thesis from the author’s evaluation of this thesis. Note that placing the subject at sentence initial position, not only realizes a topic shift, but also highlights the main point of the new segment. Highlighting this point signals the relevance of the initiated topic to the development of the text as a whole and thereby maintains coherence across paragraph boundaries (Downing 1995, 10; Holes 1995, 209; Levinsohn 1994, 7; Wilkendorf 1994, 25).

The correlation between subject preposing and discontinuity of topic renders this word order typical of evaluative, argumentative texts, like the ones investigated in this study. While in both types of text, argumentative and narrative “the VS order can be said to
to be the basic, pragmatically unmarked order” 67 (Pashova 2003, 37), argumentative writing. Holes (1995) points out, “tends to contain a high proportion of sentences with SV order whereas there is a strong tendency in narratives, and newspaper reporting, for VS” (205). This is because, on the one hand, it adds emphasis to these evaluative texts, and on the other hand, it is employed, as we have seen in our examples, to terminate one point and highlight the beginning of another in an argument (Hatim 1989, 139).

Since “SV syntax is one important feature of Arabic argumentative discourse,” as Hatim (1997, 163) states, and since it is in this type of texts that this word-order “is more extensively used to mark a change of topic and/or theme,” as Pashova (2003, 37) puts it, this study, therefore, takes the SV order as a strong indication of paragraph boundaries.

4.2.3 Identifying Sentence Boundaries

Functioning within the top-down approach, the present study moves from identifying the paragraphs in text, to examining the lower level of text structure, i.e. the sentence. The sentence, as has been argued, has a special status as the basic unit of text structure. Not only are sentences “one of the most obvious, most strongly signaled of linguistic units,” as Chafe (1979, 162) puts it, but they are also “the highest unit of grammatical structure.” This makes the sentence, Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue, a “pivotal entity” for text analysis (8).

In order to identify the sentence as a unit of text structure in the Arabic data, this study needs to set criteria for determining sentence boundaries. Unlike the paragraph
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67 This is because, Pashova (2003) maintains, VS order “is used also under conditions that favor SV order, whereas the opposite does not hold” (37).
whose means of identification could be applied across languages, the means for identifying sentences, however, is more language specific. This is because determining paragraph boundaries, though guided by some linguistic signals, is mainly based on conceptual and functional grounds. While it is true that languages organize their schematic categories, which correspond to the functions performed by the paragraphs such as: introduction, setting, argument, etc., differently, the categories themselves, however, are similar across languages. Sentence boundaries, on the other hand, are usually determined differently among languages since these limits are tied to the sentences’ grammatical structure which is governed by grammatical roles that vary among languages.

In what follows, the study first discusses the status of the sentence in modern Arabic linguistics, then tries to shed some light on its treatment in the Arabic traditional grammar. This will pave the way for establishing criteria for identifying sentence boundaries in the data.

**a- The Sentence in Modern Arabic Linguistics**

Important as it is, the sentence still eludes a structural definition in modern Arabic studies. This situation forced some analysts to confine themselves to the unit of the clause when describing their data. el-Shiyab (1990), for example, argues that selecting the sentence as the basic unit of analysis “does cause problems in Arabic” (149). In order to avoid “any kind of confusion,” he adopts the clause as the “minimal unit for the analysis” in his studies (1995, 241).
This difficulty in defining the sentence is usually ascribed to the unreliability of the punctuation marks in written Arabic. In Arabic, punctuation is considered an innovation under the influence of European languages and was not introduced to the language until the first decade of the 19th century. This European punctuation system is not a reliable source for defining the Arabic sentence because, until now, it is not fully standardized in Arabic (Abdulaziz 1986, 18; Ditters 1991, 213; Meiseles 1979, 289; Stetkevych 2006, 96; Van Mol 2003, 142).

Whereas English employs punctuation systematically in writing, Ghazala (2004) argues, Arabic writers use it “poorly and haphazardly, by way of decoration,” or sometimes disregard it completely (230). To examine the usage of punctuation in Modern Standard Arabic, Khafaji (2001) compared the prescriptive rules of punctuation in Arabic textbooks to actual use in a modern text and the intuition of Arabic teachers. He concluded that there is a “wide range of discrepancy among native writers of Arabic” in the way they employ punctuation marks in text (16). Although writers of modern literary and journalistic Arabic make use of the punctuation system, Meiseles (1979) explains, they use it in “such a random way that makes it impossible to claim for any systematic norm” (289).

This “highly variable and idiosyncratic” usage of full stops and commas in Arabic writing, Holes (1995) argues, “does not in fact matter” because Arabic has its own “native system of textual chunking which relies on coordinating and subordinating conjunctions which perform the dual role of signaling formally the beginnings and endings of sentence groups, and indicating the nature of the logical and functional
relationships between them” (204). However, While he disagrees with Stetkevych’s (2006) claim that this system no longer functions as a punctuation device in narrative text, he admits that this is true in the expository text which may be going through “a stage of transition” from the older system of “sentence coordination by conjunctive particle,” to a new system which relies mainly on “linking phrases” (223). Sa’adeddin (1987) also maintains that the “Arabic morphologised punctuation system” was disregarded in favor of the Western punctuation system, this he states: “entails the superimposition of drastic changes on Arabic texts causing them a loss in their experiential validity” (183).

This inconsistency in employing the punctuation system, however, is not the only difficulty facing modern Arabic linguists in their attempts to describe the sentence as a unit of text structure. They claim that the Arabic sentence is also hard to define because of its length. el-Shiyab (1990), for instance, indicates that it is “very hard to draw the line between what a sentence or a clause is” in an Arabic text. This, he argues, is because “the sentence in Arabic is very long” and “contains among its constituents many adverbial clauses” (149).

b- Traditional Treatment of the Sentence

While modern Arabic linguists, as we have seen, avoid dealing with the sentence as a unit of text structure, traditional Arabic grammarians, however, gave serious attention to this concept. The sentence is regarded as a central concept in the traditional Arabic grammatical theory because it is the ultimate structure in which this theory operates. Trying to delimit it and specify its boundaries occupied many Arab
grammarians in order to establish it as a unit within which they can work. When examining their definition of the sentence, however, one encounters two grammatical terms, *kalām* and *jumlah*, whose implication is often confused. Although the history of the two syntactical terms is beyond the scope of this study, it is important, however, to investigate how traditional Arabic grammarians defined the notion of “sentence” as it is perceived in modern linguistics, regardless of the different technical terms they used.

The term *jumlah*, as defined by Ibn Hišām (1964), Ibn Jinnī (1983), and al-Zamaḵšarī (n.d.), “implies a structure with predicative relation between its constituents: subject placed in front *mubtada*‘, with *kabar* that is predicated of it, or verb predicated or attributed to its agent” (Goldenberg 1988, 57). They do not associate this predicative construction, i.e. the *jumlah*, with ‘*iṣfah* ‘being informative.’ The *jumlah*, they also indicate, may occur in the position of *mufrad* ‘a single word’ and is considered syntactically equivalent to it (54). Moreover, the term *jumlah* is commonly used to refer to dependent clauses like *jumlat al-šarī‘ protasis,* *jumlat al-jawāb* ‘apodosis,* jumlat al-*qasam* ‘oath’ or *jumlat al-ṣilah* ‘relative clause,’ which do not stand the test of ‘*iṣfah* ‘being informative.’

On the other hand, *kalām* is “a unit of speech which is independent, informative *mufid* and capable of standing alone.” Ibn Jinnī (1983) states that “any unit of speech independent by itself from which one picks the fruit of its meaning, that is *kalām*” (Goldenberg 1988, 56). *kalām* and *jumlah*, according to the grammarians’ definitions, therefore, are two different concepts. This is the conclusion drawn by Ibn Hišām (1964)

---

68 Ibn Hišām (1964) states that al *jumlah* “*تَحْلَّ مَحْلُ الْمَفْرَد* ‘occurs in the position of a single word’ (2:382).
69 *فَكَلَّ لَفْظِ اسْتَقْلَالٍ بِنَفْسِهِ وَجَنِبَتْ مِنْهُ لَمَّا مَنَعَهُ فِيهِ كَلَامٌ* (Ibn Jinnī 1983, 1:17)
after examining the two concepts. He says: “Thereby you realize that they \([\text{kålám} \text{ and } \text{jumlah}]\) are not synonyms as many people think”\(^70\) (2:374).

The confusion between \(\text{kålám}\) and \(\text{jumlah}\), however, “could arise from contexts where a kernel sentence forming a complete grammatical structure, standing alone, and making sense, is said to be \(\text{kålám}\) and also \(\text{jumlah}\)” (58). A kernel sentence, such as ‘\(\text{anā } \text{ṭabībāh} \) ‘I am a doctor,’ is, on the one hand, a predicative construction, and hence represents a \(\text{jumlah}\). On the other hand, unlike a usual \(\text{jumlah}\) which has predication but is not informative, the kernel sentence is informative and capable of standing alone; therefore it also represents \(\text{kålám}\). So, when ‘\(\text{Ibn Jinnī}\) (1983) concludes his above definition of \(\text{kålám}\) saying: “It \([\text{kålám}]\) is what the grammarians call \(\text{al-jumalah}\)”\(^71\) (1:17), his words, taken out of context, may imply that the two terms, i.e. \(\text{kålám}\) and \(\text{jumlah}\), are synonymous. However, what he is actually referring to is one of these cases where the two, \(\text{kålám}\) and \(\text{jumlah}\), are comparable because “the \(\text{jumlah}\) [in this case] is complete and independent.”

There are then two conditions for a structure to be considered \(\text{kålám}\) in the Arabic traditional grammar: to be syntactically independent and semantically informative or communicative (‘\(\text{Abd al-Laṭīf}\) 1996, 24; ‘\(\text{Amāyrah}\) 1984, 78). The Arabic conception of \(\text{kålám}\) as a grammatical term, for many grammarians, Goldenberg (1988) points out, “approaches what is commonly regarded-- in linguistic literature- as a sentence” (58).

\(^70\) “\(\text{و بهذا} \text{ يظهر لك أنهما ليسا بمتتابعين كما يوهمه كثير من الناس}\)” (\(\text{Ibn Hīām}\) 1964, 2:374)

\(^71\) “\(\text{و هو (الكلام) الذي يسميه النحويون الجملة}\)” (\(\text{Ibn Jinnī}\) 1983, 1:17)
The term *jumlah*, on the other hand, whose main condition is said to be no other than predication, is very similar to what is considered a clause in modern linguistics.\(^7\)

**c- The Arabic Sentence: A Basic Unit of Analysis**

Despite the difficulties ascribed to defining the sentence in Modern Written Arabic, the present study takes the sentence to be its basic unit of analysis for two reasons. First, the goal of this study is to examine the function of a group of linguistic items that operate at the discourse level and are attested to mostly occupy the sentence initial position. Therefore, determining the onset of the sentences in the data where discourse markers occur is essential for the study to reach its goal.

The second reason for adopting the sentence here concerns the need to give more attention to this important unit of text structure in modern Arabic linguistic studies. Throughout the linguistic tradition in general, the sentence, Chafé (1994) points out, has been considered very important “that it has been the basic unit of grammatical study from ancient times to the present” (140). It is also because of the importance of the sentence that traditional Arabic grammarians made serious efforts for defining it. However, despite its attested significance in the linguistic studies, the sentence has been avoided by

---

\(^7\) Traditional Arabic Grammarians distinguishes between two types of clause on the basis of the nature of the clause-initial word.\(^7\) Accordingly, “clauses introduced with verbs are called verbal clauses (*jumlahh fi liyyah*), whereas clauses with the subject in sentence-initial position are called nominal clauses (*jumlah ismiyyah*), regardless of whether or not the clause as such contains a verbal predicate” (Persson 2002, 28). Some modern Arab linguists, however, have argued against this theoretical distinction of sentence (‘Amayrah 1984, 81). In the teaching of Arabic as a foreign language, “a different distinction is often used for classifying Arabic sentences. This distinction is based on whether or not the sentence contains a verb. The term “equational sentence” is used to refer to verbless predication. The term “verbal sentence” refers to predications that contain a verb” (Ryding 2005, 65).
many modern Arabic linguists in their studies claiming that it is a problematic unit in Arabic. They ascribe the difficulty in defining the Arabic sentence, as we have seen, to the “unusual” length of this unit in written Arabic as well as the unreliability of its punctuation system.

However, the fact that many Arab writers choose to make their sentences long is not a reason to discard a useful concept as the sentence. In English, for example, although the sentence “may be fully as long as the paragraph,” as Longacre (1976, 281) indicates, this, however, does not pose any obstacle for distinguishing its boundaries. Chafé and Danielewicz (1987) show that in English academic writing “a relatively normal distribution of sentence lengths centered around a mean of 24 words” (105). Longacre (1992) considers this an option to the writer that enables him to convey a message through his style. “When propositions that could have been presented seriatim as separate sentences are combined into sentences which display internal coordination or subordination,” he argue, “the text producer’s discourse strategy is at work here” (114).

On the other hand, the fact that the European punctuation system cannot be relied on for identifying sentence boundaries in Arabic, does not mean that Arabic lacks other means to do so. The uncertainty usually associated with attempts to determine the limits of this unit in Arabic could be disputed by Lyons’ assertion (1977) that sentence segmentation in any language is “far from being a matter of arbitrary decision” (624). Native speakers of any language, he maintains, are normally able to recognize the sentences in any written text in their language. What they need, however, is to pay attention to the signals provided by the grammatical system in their particular language.
In my view, defining the sentence as a unit of text structure is viewed as being problematic in modern Arabic linguistic studies, because no clear criterion for such definition has been set in modern Arabic studies yet. In order to identify the sentence boundaries that are necessary for the segmentation process, therefore, this study needs to set a clear criterion on which an operational definition of the Arabic sentence can be based. A useful point to start from is the definition provided by traditional Arabic grammar for kalām, which “approaches what is commonly regarded-- in linguistic literature-- as a sentence” as pointed out by Goldenberg (1988, 58), as well as the modern linguistic view of the sentence.

The sentence boundaries in the present study, therefore, are determined on syntactic and semantic grounds. Drawing on both traditional Arabic grammarians’ and modern linguists’ views of the sentence, two criteria are taken into consideration for defining the sentence: its structural independency and its capability of communicating a complete thought. In traditional Arabic grammar, as discussed earlier, kalām, which corresponds to the sentence, is any independent structure that is capable of standing alone and communicating a complete meaning (see ‘Abd al-Laṭīf 1996, 24; ‘Amāryrah 1984, 78).

Modern linguists, on the other hand, realize the importance of taking both the syntactic and semantic criteria into consideration when defining the sentence. Halliday (2004) states that “two basic systems determine how one clause is related to another” to form a sentence: “the degree of interdependency, or taxis” and “the logico-semantic relations” (373). Chafé (1979) also considers “syntactic closure” as one manifestation of
sentencehood, while the other is “expressing a complete thought” (162, 163). A modern Arab linguist, Humaydah (1997), moreover, suggests a definition of the sentence that takes both its structure and meaning into consideration. A sentence, he states, “is a chain of elements that are tied together in accordance to the grammatical structure rules, to convey a complete intended meaning” (131).

Accordingly, in the present study, the sentence is an “independent structure” (Allerton 1969, 29) which communicates “a complete thought” (Chafé 1979, 162) that “can fulfill some rhetorical purpose, significantly contributing to the overall rhetorical purpose of the text” (Hatim and Mason 1990, 173). Example (7) demonstrates what a sentence is in this study:

(7)

[7a] Democracy today has become the system of choice for ‘most’ of the world – both eastern and western countries alike – so that one may say we live in the age of democracy. [7b] As many would believe, Democracy is no longer one of the choices, as was the case until very recently, but has rather become inevitable if the state and society seek to join a world that has transformed into a single entity with shared values and consistent visions.

In the above example, the word sequence in [7b] represents a sentence because it is structurally independent, it communicates a complete thought, and it serves a specific rhetorical function. Structurally, this is a conditional sentence that consists of two clauses.

---

[7a] Democracy today has become the system of choice for ‘most’ of the world – both eastern and western countries alike – so that one may say we live in the age of democracy. [7b] As many would believe, Democracy is no longer one of the choices, as was the case until very recently, but has rather become inevitable if the state and society seek to join a world that has transformed into a single entity with shared values and consistent visions.

---
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connected with the particle ḍāda ‘if.’ Each of these two clauses consists of a main predicative structure in addition to other optional constituents that are connected to it by dependency relations as will be further explained shortly. This conditional sentence, on the other hand, expresses two dependent ideas that convey one complete thought since the validity of one of these ideas depends on the validity of the other. Besides its independency and informativity, sentence [7b] also serves a rhetorical function. It actually clarifies and explains what was meant by the proposition mentioned in sentence [7a].

**d- The Syntactic Criterion**

Since this study is operating on the discourse level, it employs the term “sentence” in the “text sentence,” i.e. in context, and not the “system sentence,” out of context, sense. However, while discourse analyst works within the concept of “text sentence,” Brown and Yule (1986) argue, he usually takes the insights provided by “sentence-grammarians” into consideration (20). The system, as Halliday (2004) explains “is the potential that lies behind the text” (33). Unlike spoken language, where the “text sentence” and “system sentence” do not correspond because of “syntactically incomplete sentences, ellipses and what we would call anacolutha in traditional grammar, i.e. when a sentence starts with one type of syntactic structure and ends in another” (Kammensjö 2005, 85), in written language, the correspondence between the two is rather close (Lyons 1977, 624). This indicates that the grammatical criterion is an essential base for segmenting the text into its basic units.
When defined in terms of its internal structure, the sentence is said to be “structurally independent.” What is meant by “the structural independence” of a unit, Allerton (1969) explains, considering the nature of the high-level units within which it operates, is “its freedom of occurrence relative to its neighbors” (30). The term independence,” then he argues, should be interpreted as meaning “not only ‘not dependent on another element’ but also ‘not depended on by another element’, or ‘not involved in a chain of dependence’” (32). So defining the sentence as “a minimum structurally independent sequence,” implies that “the sentence candidate must be omissible leaving behind no non-sentences” (42).

This dependence relation that binds the sentence together as a unit is an essential concept in Arabic grammar. Owens (1984) argues that, in Arabic grammar, the notion of dependency is used “to account for the overall coherency of the parts of a sentence” (25). Arabic, Ryding (2005) points out, “can be seen as a language that has a network of dependency relations in every phrase, clause or sentence” (57). According to the dependency relation that “determines how one clause is related to another in a sentence” (Halliday 2004, 373), sentences in written Arabic are classified into three types: simple, compound, and complex. Recognizing the component parts of the sentences facilitates determining their boundaries on syntactic grounds.

Grammatically speaking, the simple one clause sentence is the minimum form of the sentence as a unit. In Arabic, this sentence could be “verbless,” consisting of subject and predicate, i.e. \( \text{al-ṭariq-u ṭawil-un} \) ‘the road is long,’ or “verbal,” consisting of a verb and its subject and sometimes a direct object, i.e. \( \text{yahlmil-u al-safir-u risālat-an} \) ‘The
ambassador is carrying a letter’ (Ryding 2005, 58-65). The compound sentences, on the other hand, consist of more than one predication in which the coordination relationship between the clauses “may or may not be expressed by a conjunction.” While these coordinated clauses form independent predicative structures, they, however, “indicate the development of one idea” (Cantarino 1975, 3:2). Here is an example of a compound sentence:

(8)

[8a] Although the three examples seem to be in contradiction of one another, they, however, constitute a pattern where they explain one another. They form a sequence that falls within the same context, i.e.

[8b] the collapse of the standard and institutional foundation of historical religions, [8c] and the formation of the religious absolute in accordance with new societal and behavioral models.

In example (8) the two coordinated clauses, [8b] and [8c], are connected with the conjunction wa ‘and.’ Although structurally, they consist of two independent predications, semantically, however, they build up one idea which provides an explanation for a previous proposition in [8a].

The complex sentence, which is the third type of the Arabic sentence, on the other hand, consists of a main clause and one or more dependent clauses. These dependent clauses are syntactically dominated by the main clause, and hence not able to function alone as complete sentences. They are conjoined to the main clause by “a variety of
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particles or function-specific phrases” (Holes 1995, 215). In terms of the function they perform within the complex sentence, dependent clauses can be divided into four types: nominal, relative (or adjectival), adverbial, and conditional.

A nominal clause may function as sentential subject or complement of the main clause predicate. If it is a statement, it is usually introduced by one of the complementizers 'an, 'anna, or 'inna, whereas the particles 'in, 'idda and law introduce reported questions. While relative, or adjectival, clauses function as modifiers of nouns in the main clause, and are placed directly after the noun they refer to, adverbial clauses act as circumstantial elements of the predicate of the main clause or the entire propositions. They usually mark peripheral relations such as: cause, purpose, time, manner, result, reason, concession (Holes 2005, 232-237). Conditional sentences, on the other hand, consist of two clauses, in which the validity of one depends on the validity of the other. The following four examples illustrate the four types of independent clauses in the complex sentence:

(9) Dependent nominal clause:

[9a] Yemenis assert [9b] that these inclinations are fostered by some outside power which facilitates its growth through moral and financial support.

(10) Dependent relative clause:
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[10a] It is the discourse of ideology [10b] that believes its mission is to triumph over the enemy, defeat the arrogant America and create a system for the powerless.

(11) Dependent adverbial clause (reason):

[11a] والمعارضة الديمقراطية تطالب بإلغاء الحكومة تعاسا لأنها لا تملك اللصواب لإقلاعه.

[11a] The democratic resistance is illegitimately demanding the abolition of the government [11b] since it does not have the legal quorum to do so.

(12) Dependent adverbial clause (time):


[12a] Since the Fatah-Hamas Mecca agreement, [12b] the Saudis have returned to the spotlight for analysis and comment.

(13) Dependent conditional clause:


[13a] Had the Arabs agreed to honestly and jointly use whatever cards they have in their hands in Iraq, [13b] perhaps they would have succeeded in achieving what others, including the United States, have failed to achieve.

The sentence in example (9) consists of a main clause [9a] and an independent clause [9b]. This independent clause that is introduced by the complementizer ‘anna functions here as a complement for the main clause. In the complex sentence presented in

---
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example (10), however, the predicate of the main clause [10a] is modified by the relative clause [10b] which comes directly after it. Examples (11) and (12), on the other hand, illustrate the independent adverbial clause that function as the circumstance of complex sentence. While the adverbial clause in [11b] acts as a reason for the proposition expressed in the main clause [11a], the preposed adverbial clause [12a] indicates the time of the proposition presented in the main clause [12b]. The last example, example (13), demonstrates a complex sentence that consists of two clauses connected with the conditional particle law ‘if.’ In this sentence, the validity of the conditional clause [13b] depends on the validity of the main clause [13a].

While grammarians were able to specify the minimum, obligatory constituents of a sentence, the subject and its predicate and the verb and its agent, they could not determine its maximum limits. However, affirms 'Abd al-Latif (1996), “they indicated the entities that depend on the main predicate of the sentence and usually occupy peripheral slots” (48). A sentence can be expanded or lengthened through the addition of optional grammatical elements, known in Arabic traditional grammar as faḍlah ‘extras,’ which modify the idea stated by the basic components of the sentence. Accordingly, the two main constituents in the predicative relation in addition to any other optional constituent that is connected to them such as: direct object maf‘ūl bihi, reason maf‘ūl li-‘ajlihi, accompaniment maf‘ūl ma‘ahu, cognate accusative maf‘ūl muṭlaq, circumstantial complements zarf and hāl, and modifiers tawābi‘, are all within the boundaries of the sentence.
e- The Semantic Criterion

Besides the structural interdependency within the sentence, Halliday (2004) points out, “the logico-semantic relations” that bind its constituents form the second system that determines sentence boundaries (373). In Arabic grammatical tradition, the communicative value of the sentence is considered an essential aspect of its sentencehood. When defining the sentence, kalām, Ibn Hišām (1964) stipulates that it should be mufīd communicative by intention (Goldenberg 1988, 60). “mufīd,” he states “being that which denotes a meaning after which it is proper to be silent” 80 (374, 490).

For a unit to be considered a sentence, Chafé (1979) argues, it is not enough to demonstrate structural independency. Besides the “Syntactic closure,” it should also express a complete thought (162). A sentence boundary can only be drawn when “a focus has been successfully verbalized” (169). This focus, he explains, is a “basic unit of memory that represents the amount of information to which a person can devote his central attention at any one time,” and “which appear in language as sentences, syntactically closed” (180).

The semantic and syntactic aspects of the sentence are actually complementary. The grammatical structure of the sentence which is its main source of cohesiveness is the means to achieve its communicative purpose. When we say that a sentence communicates a complete meaning, this means, as ‘Amāyrah (1984) points out, that each of its constituent carries part of this meaning (79). The sentence as a whole, for al-Jurjānī (1984), conveys one intended meaning, which is the outcome of the interaction of the

---

80 “الكلام هو الفعل المنفي بالقصد. "ما دل على معنى يحسن السكت عليه"” (Ibn Hišām 1964, 2: 374, 490)
meanings and structure of its constituents (316). The following example demonstrates this inevitable dependency between the grammatical structure of the sentence and its capability to express a complete thought:

(14)

But on the other hand, it provides the US administration with a compromise between its internal need to demonstrate a larger measure of response to the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, which called for an international conference on Iraq and for a direct dialogue with Tehran and Damascus, and its external desire not to demonstrate any flexibility toward parties that might interpret this flexibility as a weakness on its part which is then applied to other pending issues.

In example (14), the writer states one of the ways in which Baghdad’s international conference could be significant for the US administration. This conference, the sentence explains, provides the administration with a chance to achieve two objectives: to show more consideration to the Iraqi’s study group recommendations, and rule out any possibility to be perceived as becoming more tolerant regarding other issues.

In order to convey this meaning, the sentence provides a specific explanation of each of these objectives. It first modifies tawṣiyyāt ‘recommendations’ of the Iraq study group, to which the US wants to be more considerate, using the relative clause, allatī da‘at ‘ilā… ‘which called for…,’ and then elaborating this clause with the prepositional phrase wa-‘ilā hiwār-in mubāšir-in… ‘and for a direct dialogue….’ The sentence, moreover, goes

\[\text{81 Text 21, P 1, S 4.}\]
on to describe the parties ‘aṭrāf, which the US does not want to show any flexibility, modifying it with the indefinite adjectival clause qad tufassir-u tilk-a al-murānāt-a ḍa‘f-an ‘which might interpret this flexibility as a weakness,’ and then continues to explain this ḍa‘f-an ‘weakness’ with another adjectival clause yansāḥib-u bi-dawr-i-hi ʾilā malaffāt-in ʾāliqat-in ʿuqrā ‘which is then applied to other pending issues.’

Although semantic analysis “is naturally more of a subjective affair, since relationships of content exist only in the minds of language users” as Kammensjö (2005) puts it, it is however, an essential means to identify sentence boundaries. A sentence then, is an independent unit whose components are bonded syntactically and semantically in order to perform a communicative meaning that contributes to the overall rhetorical purpose of the text.

Since the syntactic form and semantic content interplay to define the sentence as a unit of text, the present study takes both the structure and the meaning into consideration for segmenting the data into its basic units, sentences. However, although the sentence is viewed as being syntactically and semantically independent, it is important to bear in mind that “dependence, both functional and syntactic, is not an absolute discrete property but rather a matter of degree.” There is no sentence in connected, coherent discourse that is “100% independent of its local ‘linear’ or even global ‘hierarchical’ context. This is after all, the very definition of coherence” (Givón 2001, 327).
4.2.4 Summary

To sum up, in the segmentation process, the paragraph is identified mainly according to discontinuity in content and function. A paragraph boundary occurs when there is a break in the continuity of topic, and a certain point in the argument has been fulfilled. Graphic layout, linguistic signals and word order are considered to be helping devices that confirm the perceptible division. To identify divisions among sentences, on the other hand, a syntactic-semantic criterion is employed. A sentence boundary is drawn when a grammatically-independent structure communicates a complete thought. Both structure and meaning define the sentence as a unit of text and determine its boundaries. Consequently, all boundaries in texts are marked either (P) or (S). (P) stands for paragraph breaks, while (S) stands for boundaries between sentences, the basic units of analysis.

4.3 Identifying Functional Relations Among Units of Text

4.3.1 Introduction

Besides the assumption that texts are hierarchically organized, viewing the text as a structure of relations is also another assumption underlying the analysis process in the present study. It is assumed, as discussed before, that what is communicated in a text is more than the semantic content of the individual text segments. This is because the relationship between sentences and larger discourse units forms an essential part of this communicated meaning (Cawsey 1990, 77; Hovy 1990, 19). Identifying these relations, therefore, is the second step in the analytical model employed for analyzing the data in
this study. While the previous section discussed the means employed for segmenting the text into paragraphs and sentences, this section will describe the global and local functional relations in text by means of the two analytical tools that were introduced in the previous chapter, i.e. the Text-type Theory and the Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST).

However, it is important to stress again that the segmentation process, which is the first step in the analytical model, does not take place independently from the process of identifying the relations among segments in text. Rather, the two processes occur simultaneously. This is because identifying paragraph boundaries, as we have seen, is mainly based on the realization of the functions performed by these paragraphs as unified units of text structure. Since the schematic categories that form the organizational plan of text correspond to these functions that paragraphs serve in text, determining paragraph boundaries is actually a process that involves realizing the organizational plan of the text at the same time. The same could be said about the identification of sentences in text. Sentences’ boundaries are determined by means of their structure and meaning. Once the meaning that the author wants to convey in the sentence is realized, the intention behind expressing this meaning at this point in the text should also become clear.

In what follows, according to the top-down approach adopted in this study, the section starts by discussing how Hatim’s text-type model, modified by el-Shiyab’s model of editorials’ structure, works as an analytical tool for establishing the text global organizational plan. After describing the text’s global relations, the study turns to
examine how RST is employed to describe the functional relations holding the text’s sentences at the local level.

4.3.2 Identifying Relations at the Global Level

a- The Present Study and Hatim’s Model

Hatim’s (1997) model of argumentative text-type, that is employed to identify the patterns of text organization fits the data of this study in two ways. The first relates to the theoretical background on which his typology is based. In Hatim’s (1997) typology, texts are classified according to their predominant rhetorical purpose. He argues that the purpose of expository text is to explain, inform, or sometimes entertain, and the purpose of argumentative text is to persuade to the writer’s viewpoint, whereas the purpose of instructional text is to regulate how people act or think. The communicative purpose is involved here and the text producer’s intention is the determining factor in distinguishing between text-types. This is consistent with the assumptions underlying the present study.

Basing his description of organizational patterns involved in the argumentative type on his extensive investigation of both Arabic and English argumentative texts is another reason for employing Hatim’s (1997) model in this study. In his typology, he proposes two different forms of text organization for argumentative texts, the counter-argumentation and the through-argumentation, capturing the differences between structural patterns favored in the two languages.

The general structure of argumentative text consists of a thesis and supporting arguments. However, there are variations in the structural patterns of the two subtypes.
Whereas the structural format for counter-argumentation displays the opponent’s claim followed by a counter-claim, a substantiation supporting the counter-claim, and finally a conclusion. In through-argumentation the thesis is cited to be argued through with no explicit reference to adversary. This is followed by substantiation and then conclusion. The patterns of the argumentative two subtypes could be represented in figure 4.1. and 4.2.

**Figure 4.1.** Counter-argumentation (Adopted from Hatim 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTER-ARGUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— Thesis cited to be opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Substantiation of counter-claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.2.** Through-argumentation (Adopted from Hatim 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THROUGH-ARGUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— Thesis to be supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Substantiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two argumentative forms, Hatim (1997) explains, are not equally available for all language users to choose from; rather, the preference for one or the other is culture-specific. Although using through-argumentation to argue for an idea is familiar to many languages, using this same strategy to argue against an idea is culturally bound to
modern written Arabic. When arguing against an opponent’s view, English shows a noticeable tendency towards counter-argumentation, whereas most present-day Arab writers use through argumentation to argue against and for a position. This trend prevails in current rhetorical practice, Hatim (1989) argues, despite the fact that old rhetoricians, such as Qudāmah bin Ja'far, “discuss and recommend counter-argumentation as an effective persuasive device in the rhetoric of Arabic” (28). Counter-argumentation in modern Arabic, however, is exclusively found in the writings of “Western-educated Arabs and those well-versed in classical Arabic rhetoric” (1997, 160).

The mode of arguing by explicitly including the opponent’s view, which is common in languages such as English, is thus uncommon for most modern Arab readers. This is due to the fact that the Arab reader expects to find the text producer’s thesis cited first and not the opponent’s. On the other hand, using through-argumentation to argue against an idea is considered problematic for English readers who expect a counter-argument structure in such a situation.

This tendency to adopt a more direct argumentative style in modern Arabic writing, Hatim (1997) notes, could be explained by cultural factors, such as freedom of speech and social norms. By ignoring the opponent’s claim, the text producer is actually complying with the social and political rules in his culture which disapprove of any sort of confrontation with opponents (el-Shiyab 1990, 330).

Although all text-types are culture-bound, argumentative texts in particular are more sensitive to cultural differences (Longacre 1996; Van Dijk 1989). These differences are acknowledged by many studies in contrastive rhetoric (see for example Hinds 1983;
Johnstone 1983, 1990; Kaplan 1966; Maynard 1996; Sapir 1956; el-Shiyab 1990). The means languages use to present their argumentative texts are different, they argue, because argumentation is shaped by the culture and social conventions of a particular community. According to Kaplan (1966) and Johnstone (1983, 1990), the native speaker of a particular language employs a structural pattern, a rhetoric and a sequence of thought which are different from those of other languages, and this creates problems for communication across cultures. The culture of the message sender, says Callow (1998), “pervades the message from beginning to end because his mind is rooted in his own culture, in all its thought patterns and values” (171).

Just as Hatim focuses on describing the organizational structure of argumentative texts that is preferred by most modern Arab writers, al-Odadi (1996) and el-Shiyab (1990) also describe the relations realized in modern Arabic writing texts, but at the microstructural level. Relations employed by Arabic argumentative texts are found to be causal relations just as those used in English argumentative texts. However, despite the similarities between the two, al-Odadi (1996) points out, evaluative and interpretive relations are predominant in the Arabic texts while elaboration is the leading relation in the English texts. Mann and Thomson (1992) refer to this when they state that “different set of relations are displayed in text according to cultures” (46). Thus, cultural differences are apparent not only in the structural organization of texts, but also in their micro-level relations. Whorf (1956) suggests that languages organize their ideas differently “depending upon what relationship they hold to be important” (233).
b- Text-type and Genre

Just as text-types are global frameworks with socio-culturally fixed patterns of organization, genres, are also “conventionalized forms” of texts that are associated with typical organizational patterns. However, unlike text-types, genres usually serve specific communicative purposes that are involved in “particular social occasions” (Hatim 1997, 31). These communicative purposes are identified and mutually understood by the members of a language community in a specific culture. Any disregard for the “generic conventions,” therefore, “leads to opting out of the genre and is noticed by members of the community as odd” (Bhatia 2004, 23). Editorials, scientific articles, political speeches, sales promotion letters, news reports, book reviews, abstracts, etc. are few examples of genres that have been identified in different cultures. Every language community, says Bhatia (2004), “has its own typical sets of genres, which are used by most of its members to achieve a social goal” (54).

Genres and text-types, thus, are not the same. As communicative forms of language that relate to social practices and have specific communicative purposes to serve, genres utilize different text types to achieve their goals. While some genres are usually associated with a typical text-type, like editorials that utilize argumentation as their text format and news reports that use narrative text type focus, there are yet other genres like novels that can be written in the form of narrative text-type as well as argumentative or exploratory text-type. The differences between text-types and genres, Östman (1999) states, “clearly need to be taken into account in any linguistic analysis” (78).
Newspaper opinion articles, as discussed before, represent a media genre that usually employs argumentative text-type. When the writer lays his opinion, in an opinion article, this should always be supported by reasons and justifications and therefore exhibits argumentative structure. However, while they employ argumentative text-type strategy, opinion articles also display specific generic features. Just as a specific text-type governs the schematic structure of a text and identifies it with certain characteristics, so does a social situation in a specific culture.

As a genre, newspaper opinion articles, has rarely been investigated. No specific definition or description of the structure or features of this media genre, as we mentioned previously, is found. However, based on the analysis of opinion articles in the present study, it has been realized that many of the features they display resemble the ones usually attributed to editorials. Although editorials are usually written by one writer, i.e. the chief editor, opinion articles are written by different writers, the similarities between the two, nevertheless, are overwhelming in their purpose, language and structure.

Both writers of editorials and opinion articles are expected to express their opinions and views on current issues and argue for them. The style of the two, moreover, is generally characterized as being evaluative with a persuasive intent because they aim at influencing the readers’ attitudes and beliefs. These similarities in goal, content, and organizational structure, are also reflected in the syntactic structures and linguistic choices that they both employ. Opinion articles, Khalil (2000) notes, are similar to editorials “in their persuasive intent” (23). el-Shiyab (1990), on the other hand, defines editorials as “statements of opinion” (68).
While text-type models usually describe the most common organizational structures associated with each type in general; specific genres that utilize these text strategies, however, may display slightly different schemas depending on their specific purpose. For this reason, Hatim’s (1997) argumentative text structure that is employed in this study to identify the text’s global relations is modified according to el-Shiyab’s (1990) model of Arabic editorials structure. The lack of material that has been produced on the structure of opinion articles, as well as the striking similarities that this genre displays with editorials justify this decision.

In his study, el-Shiyab (1990) investigates the structure of Arabic editorials in order to identify the structural constituents of this genre, and then compares it to the structure of English editorials. Based on his analysis, he argues that Arabic editorials, as a genre that utilizes argumentative text-type, have “specific characteristics that distinguish their structure” (251). He presents the main categories that he identifies in the structure of this genre in four stages: Background information that serves as an introduction, thesis and its evaluation, substantiation to support the thesis, and conclusion. These main categories of Arabic editorial’s structure are presented in figure 4.3.

**Figure 4.3.** el-Shiyab’s (1990) Model of the Generic Structure of Arabic Editorials

| — Background information |
| — Thesis/evaluation |
| — Substantiation |
| — Conclusion |
It is clear that these four stages of el-Shiyab’s (1990) model of the Arabic editorial’s organizational structure fit well with Hatim’s (1997) general model of argumentative text. Therefore, they are employed as an analytical tool to describe the patterns of text organization of the opinion articles examined in this study.

According to el-Shiyab’s (1990) model, the first schematic category in the text structure is the background information. The text producer, he explains, usually provides this information in the first stage in order to orient himself and the reader to what he is going to talk about. This introductory stage is an essential part of the message, as Callow (1998) argues, because it “sets the message in the larger social context and relates both the message itself and the message sender to the addressee” (164). In this study, most of the opinion articles examined start with this structural category of text organization. It has been noticed, however, that the introductory information not only provides the needed context for understanding the message but also serves to attract the readers’ attention to the topic. Here are three examples, (15), (16), and (17), to illustrate how opinion articles in the data are introduced:

(15)

More often than not, rightfully deserving causes are converted into folkloric festivities. Last week marked the International Women’s Day

82 Text 2, P 1, S 1-5.
celebrations. Under this raised slogan, women were flooded with information and facts about their rights and the realities that the figures and day-to-day occurrences reveal are still regressive and have yet to witness any radical improvement. Women still fall victim to discrimination and violence throughout the world. We should not overlook the fact that women in crises-laden areas in the Arab world have become victims of conflicts and sometimes were even used as direct targets in these disputes.

The city of Dubai represents an Arab dream. It is a success story that needs to be told in detail continually. It is no longer a secret that Dubai and its success were built upon strategic foundations, a strong will, and an effective leadership. This wonderful atmosphere has been a great opportunity that attracts investments, tourism, and recreation. Multitudes of giant international companies, therefore, came to this flourishing city, as well as thousands of ambitious people seeking wealth and a comfortable lifestyle and wanting to build a bright future for themselves. To enable this, specialized cities within Dubai were established in the fields of finance, internet, media, and so on. The required specialization of added value is the key to a great economical surge.

Instead of adopting a reassuring tone to set the world and his neighbors at ease, Iranian President Ahmadinejad persisted in using the same

---
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inflammatory language when he gave his speech marking the 28th anniversary of Iran's Islamic Revolution.

After setting the stage for the topic that will be discussed, the text producer then presents his thesis as the second stage of the text structure, and at the same time, in most cases, evaluating the topic positively or negatively. It is possible, however, el-Shiyab (1990) points out, that the thesis may be presented implicitly within references to background information. This is followed in the third stage of the analytical model by a substantiation of the claim presented in the thesis. These two stages, the second and the third, form the main body of the text structure in el-Shiyab’s (1990) model. In the opinion articles analyzed in this study, however, it has been noticed that the text producers not only express their stand when presenting the thesis, but they also try to stress the point of the argument after providing their evidence. In some cases, they may devote a whole paragraph to stress the significance of their point in light of this evidence. The following example illustrates these stages of text structure:

(18)

85 Examples (2) and (3) in this chapter also illustrates the organizational patterns of opinion articles’ structure.

86 Text 9, P 2, S 2-4.
The Iranian discourse is archaic and repetitive; it is derived from former languages of numerous regimes witnessed by mankind that ended in tragedy. It is the discourse of ideology that believes its mission is to triumph over the enemy, defeat the arrogant America and create a system for the powerless. It is a corrupted and modified language of the many ideological languages in the history of mankind for which mankind has paid dearly.

German Nazism tested the ideology of the German race versus all other races. It believed in the superiority of one race over all others. The same is true of fascism. International Islamic extremism also put forth the two-camp idea, the eternal battle between faith and disbelief, and the necessity that Islam defeats all other religions, vanquishing them until God inherits the earth and everyone on it. Thus came the 9/11 tragedy, and innocent Muslims from Sanaa to Riyadh and Baghdad were killed. Zionism proposed the idea of God’s chosen people versus all the other peoples of the world. Saddam Hussein promoted the racist ideology of Arabism over the so-called ‘Persian Magi’. Then he proceeded to foster the notions of God’s soldiers against Satan’s legions and the battle of good that will triumph over evil.

Every human being has the right to think in the manner that best suits him. However, no one has the right to control society and the state and forcefully impose his opinion on people in the name of religion, race or doctrinal belief under the assumption that mankind is engaged in a permanent war of religions, beliefs and races. The world is a network of interrelated interests. Thus, the management of nations cannot take place in isolation from understanding the world and the conviction that a particular ideology can abolish all others and impose its terms by force.

---
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The three paragraphs in example (18) constitute the body of an opinion article. The introductory paragraph that provides background information for this text is found in example (17). After providing a context for his text, as illustrated in example (17), the author starts making his point and arguing for it. In the first paragraph here, he presents his thesis stating that the discourse used by Iran in communicating with the world is unacceptable and will only lead to disaster. In order to support his negative evaluation of the Iranians’ discourse, in [P2], the author provides examples of other regimes in history that used the same type of discourse and failed. Then, in the third paragraph, he evaluates the validity of his point again, but now in view of the evidence that he has already presented, stressing that a discourse, that is based on an ideology that wants to impose its terms on others, like the one used by the regimes he mentioned, cannot work in a world of interrelated interests.

The final stage in el-Shiyab’s (1990) model, is the conclusion. In this stage, the text producer concludes his text either by summarizing the main points of his argument, or drawing some inferences and implication, or he may also give the reader advice or recommendation. The main function of this stage of text organization is to offer a last thought making it clear that the text is heading to its end. Here is an example to show how the text in example (18) is concluded by drawing some inferences and giving some recommendations:

(19)
It is important to note here that most of the texts in the data of this study use the through-argumentation strategy to argue whether for or against an idea. This argumentation form could be noticed in example (18). While the use of this form of argumentation seems to dominate in the data, there are, however, few texts that employ the counter-argumentation strategy. This confirms Hatim’s (1997) findings regarding the use of these two forms of argumentation in Modern Written Arabic. Example (20) demonstrates a text using the counter-argumentation strategy. Notice how the author displays the opponent’s claim in sentences [20a] and [20b] followed by a counter-claim in [20c], and then a substantiation supporting the counter-claim in [P2]:

[P4] Nazism was annihilated after humanity paid the price of over 80 million who fell in the battlefields; Zionism has built its state on the ruins of the homes of others and at the expense of their displacement; and Saddam ended up in his famous hole. Revolutionary Iran will confront its historical dilemma if it does not transform into Iran the state. This is a matter that requires a sound understanding of oneself and of others, an understanding of the regional and international balances of power, a great deal of modesty and dismissing the belief that the world’s complicated problems can be solved using ideological wars. Iran is in more need of bread than it is of nuclear arsenals. It needs the trust of its neighbors and the region at large over pleasing others. The language that might have been appropriate prior to the 28 years of the revolution is not necessarily suitable for this age, which is in a state of continuous flux no matter how much we resist or refuse to recognize that.
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(20)

[20a] Among the famous mainstream opinions about Saudi foreign policy that can also be found in Saudi official newspapers, as well as in articles and studies published by the Saudi press, is that the Saudi foreign policy has always been characterized by constancy and invariability, and it has maintained its attitude since the establishment of the Saudi State by King Abdul Aziz until today. [20b] This opinion is primarily aimed at praising Saudi foreign policy and underlying the political stability that Saudi has been living in since its foundation. [20c] However, it actually deprives this State and its foreign policy of an important right, namely, improvement.

Any observer of Saudi foreign policy easily realizes that it has witnessed a quantum leap in its strategy over the past years. The peak was reached under the reign of King Abdullah bin Abdel Aziz. Saudi foreign policy has shifted from the attitude of 'waiting and devising' to 'taking the initiative and changing'. As a result of this substantial change, the others' attitude toward this policy has also changed. Before, the question that used to be asked whenever a regional crisis emerged was: 'What do we need from Riyadh?'. As though Saudi was a mere financier to resolve crises. But today, the question has become: 'What does Saudi want?' The earlier refusal to take the initiative and make changes was
not due to the absence of the elements of that role, but that foreign policy in the past required this limited kind of role.

4.3.3 Identifying Relations at Local Level

RST and the Data

In order to describe the functional relations that hold sentences in text together, the present study employs RST. In the previous chapter, this theory was introduced and the reasons behind adopting it in this study were highlighted. This section, however, goes further to explain how this analytical tool functions, first in general, then in relation to the data of this study.

In RST, there are two major types of text structuring relations: nucleus-satellite and multi-nucleus. Whereas the former implies hierarchical relation, the latter represents the simple joining together of independent sentences. Mann and Thompson (1987) observes that most adjacent segments have a more central part, the nucleus, which is considered to be more prominent to the writer’s purpose than the other part, the satellite. In most cases, this relation is simple consisting only of one nucleus and one satellite, but there may also be cases where several satellites are related to one single nucleus. On the other hand, to describe the relations combining adjacent units of the same importance, three multi-nucleus relations, in which all the parts are marked as nuclei, are identified: “sequence”, “contrast” and “joint”. Figure 4.4. illustrates how these relations work:
RST, as mentioned before, considers the writer’s intentions as central in the process of describing the functions served by the sentences in text. The set of relations proposed by this theory, therefore, are described according to the effect they produce on the reader as presumably intended by the writer. Taking the writer’s intended communicative goals as their point of departure for interpreting these relations, Mann and Thompson (1988) provides detailed description of each relation in terms of: (1) constraints on the nucleus, denoted by N, (2) constraints on the satellite, denoted by S, (3) constraints on the combination of nucleus and satellite, (4) the effect. For example, the ‘evidence’ relation is defined as follows (Mann and Thompson 1988):

Relation name: EVIDENCE
Constraints on N (the claim): The reader possibly does not already believe the claim.
Constraints on S (the evidence): The reader either already believes the satellite or will find it credible.
Constraints on the combination of N and S: As the reader understands the evidence, the reader’s belief in the claim will increase.
The effect: The reader believes the claim.
Locus of the effect: N

There are, however, no constraints on the order of the nucleus or satellite in the development of the text. The relation could go in either direction according to the ordering of ideas by the author. But for some relations like: antithesis, concession, background, circumstance, and conditional the tendency is $S \rightarrow N$, whereas the tendency is $N \leftarrow S$ for relations such as: elaboration, enablement, evidence, purpose, justify, and restatement.

Table 4.1. describes the majority of nucleus-satellite relations that are introduced in the RST in order to show how they are identified. This table will be followed by examples from the data of this study to illustrate the way they function in natural text.

Table 4.1. Nucleus-satellite Relations (Adopted from Siepmann (2005) with Modifications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation name</th>
<th>Nucleus</th>
<th>Satellite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antithesis</td>
<td>Ideas favored by the author</td>
<td>Ideas disfavored by the author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>Situation affirmed by author</td>
<td>Situation which is apparently inconsistent but also affirmed by author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstance</td>
<td>Text expressing the events or ideas occurring in the interpretive contexts</td>
<td>An interpretive context of situation or time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation name</td>
<td>Nucleus</td>
<td>Satellite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutionhood</td>
<td>A situation or method supporting full or partial satisfaction of the need</td>
<td>A question, request, problem, or other expressed need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>Basic information</td>
<td>Additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Text whose understanding is being facilitated</td>
<td>Text for facilitating understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enablement</td>
<td>An action</td>
<td>Information intended to aid the reader in performing an action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>An action</td>
<td>Information intended to increase the reader’s desire to perform the action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>A claim</td>
<td>Information intended to increase the reader’s belief in the claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Information supporting the writer’s right to express the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volitional Cause</td>
<td>A situation</td>
<td>Another situation which causes the first one, by someone’s deliberate action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Volitional Cause (reason)</td>
<td>A situation</td>
<td>Another situation which causes the first one, but not by anyone’s deliberate action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volitional Result</td>
<td>A situation</td>
<td>Another situation which is caused by that one, by someone’s deliberate action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Volitional Result</td>
<td>A situation</td>
<td>Another situation which is caused by that one, but not by anyone’s deliberate action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation name</td>
<td>Nucleus</td>
<td>Satellite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>An intended situation</td>
<td>The intent behind the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Action or situation whose occurrence results from the occurrence of the conditioning situation</td>
<td>Conditioning situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise</td>
<td>Action or situation whose occurrence results from the lack of occurrence of the conditioning situation</td>
<td>Conditioning situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>A situation</td>
<td>An interpretation of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>A situation</td>
<td>An evaluative comment about the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restatement</td>
<td>A situation</td>
<td>A re-expression of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>A short summary of the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>A successive text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast (In this relation, both segments are considered nuclei)</td>
<td>Situation which is compared with another situation that is (a) identical with another situation in at least some respects, (b) similar to, or different from, another situation in a few respects</td>
<td>Situation which is compared with another situation that is (a) identical with another situation in at least some respects, (b) similar to, or different from, another situation in a few respects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint (In this relation, all segments are considered nuclei)</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>No relation is claimed to hold between the multi-nuclei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are examples of the relations identified between sentences in the opinion articles analyzed in this study. The nucleus is denoted by N while the satellite is referred to by S.

(21) Antithesis

[S] The greater problem lies behind the driving force that led these Islamists and loyal nationalists against Hala Sarhan. A fact that can, or rather should, be discussed.

[N] What motivated those groups is the fierce resistance against Arab media attempts to deal with actual problems, which include prostitution and violence against women, in addition to a multitude of thorny issues that afflict Egyptian and Arab societies in general. However most of the time we deny their existence under the claim that our societies are free of such ‘plagues’.

(22) Concession

[S] Every human being has the right to think in the manner that best suits him.

[N] But no one has the right to control society and the state and forcefully impose his opinion on people in the name of religion, race or doctrinal belief under the assumption that mankind is engaged in a permanent war of religions, beliefs and races.
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(23) Solutionhood

[S] كل ذلك يشرح السلوك القطري غير المستقيم. وإن كان هو سلك حكام الدوحة منذ الإطاحة

[N] بالأب، تجاه الرياض.

[N] ومن الطبيعي أن الرد الأفضل والأمثل على هذا السلوك القطري هو مواصلة العمل السياسي

[N] الذي تقوم به الرياض. 

[S] All this accounts for Qatar's evasive behavior, which has been its usual behavior towards Riyadh since the ousting of its former Emir.

[N] Of course, the best and ideal response to this behavior is for Riyadh to continue its political work.

(24) Elaboration

[N] إلي بيرناني، مؤلف ومفكر إسرائيلي معروف، وسافر سابق في باريس، كتب مؤخرا كتابا

[S] بعنوان "الديانات القاتلة"، أثار ضجة هائلة وصدى فيه فشل كاملا "الأصولية الثورية

[S] الإسلامية" التي اعتبرها التهديد الأكبر الذي تعاني منه الإنسانية اليوم.

[S] ويتعلق بيرناني في كتابه من أطروة رئيسية في الدراسات الأنثروبولوجية، مفادها أن

[S] الديانات القاتلة تعزز بتصوراتها الاقتصرية العواشي الناتجة عن فهمها الأحادي الوثوقي

[S] للحقيقة وتمسكها بنص مرجعي تحصر دائرة الحقيقة فيه.

[N] Eli Barnavi, a well-known Israeli thinker and historian and former ambassador to Paris, recently published a book entitled “Murderous Religions” which was met with a lot of controversy. In his book, he dedicated an entire chapter to the notion of ‘revolutionary Islamic fundamentalism’, which he considers to be the biggest threat currently facing humanity.

[S] Barnavi launches his book from a common anthropological notion which states that Revealed Religions are characterized by aggressive and exclusionary visions, which are resultant of an understanding that is marked by certitude, a unilateral perception of truth and the adherence to a referential text in which that truth is embodied.

(25) Background

[N] نقلت وكالة الصحافة الفرنسية قبل أيام عن النائب الإسلامي في مصر نبيه الوحش مطالبه

[S] بتطبيق "حيد الحرابة" على الإعلامية المصرية حائزة سرحان بعد اتهامها لها "بافتركة" خلقة من

[S] برنامجها التلفزيوني والتي تناولت فيها ملف الدعارة.

[S] وحيد الحرابة الذي طالب السيد الوحش بتطبيقه يقضي بقطع اليد والقدم من خلاف والصلب.

94 Text 13, P 7, S 27-29.

95 Text 5, P 1.2, S 1.2.
[N] A few days ago, Agence France-Presse (AFP) quoted Egyptian Islamist Nabih al Wahsh demanding the imposition of the ‘hirabah’ penalty on Egyptian media figure, Hala Sarhan, whom he accused of fabricating an episode of her television talk show that dealt with prostitution.

[S] The penalty that Mr. al Wahsh demanded to be applied was cross amputation, i.e. severing the right hand and the left foot, followed by crucifixion.

(26) Enablement

[N] إيران الثورة تواجه مأزقها التاريخي إذا لم تتحول إلى إيران الدولة [N] وهو أمر يتطلب فيما جديدا للذات والآخر، و فيما لموازين القوى الإقليمية والدولية وكثيراً من التواضع والتخلي عن اتفاقيات الآنا والاعتقاد بأن حل مشكلات الدنيا المعقدة يمكن أن يتم بحرب أيديولوجيات 97.

[N] Revolutionary Iran will confront its historical dilemma if it does not transform into Iran the state.

[S] This is a matter that requires a sound understanding of oneself and of others, an understanding of the regional and international balances of power, a great deal of modesty and dismissing the belief that the world’s complicated problems can be solved using ideological wars.

(27) Evidence

في آخر استفتاء حول الوضع الديني في فرنسا نشرته مجلة عالم الديانات، تبين أن الكاثوليكية تكاد تكون قد انحرفت في الدولة التي طالما تمته بنت الكنيسة. [N] فحسب الأرقام المنشرة لا يتجاوز نسبة من يعتقدون أنهم كاثوليك 51 في المائة من السكان مقابل 67 في مطلع السبعينات من بينهم 8 في المائة فقط يประกอบون على الصلاة في الكنيسة يوم الأحد أي أقل من ثلاثة ملايين فرنسي 98.

[N] A recent survey of the religious situation in France published by ‘Le Monde des Religions’ magazine, revealed that Catholicism appears to have declined in the state that has long been called the ‘Daughter of the Church.’
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According to the published figures, those who are considered Catholics constitute no more than 51 percent of the population, compared with what stood at 67 percent in the 1970s. Only a miniscule 8 percent regularly attend Sunday services, that is less than 3 million French.

(28) Justify

إن ملاحة القادة الحقيقيين في أزمة التطهير الطائفي والسياسي المستمرة في العراق هي [N] الحل الحقيقي الذي يختصر الوقت والدم. مثل هؤلاء القادة من سنة وشيعة الذين يقللون المدنيين هم جبناء وليخاطروا بأنفسهم في أي [S] مواجهات مع القوات الحكومية أو الأميركية. سيضرون بمسرعهم وليخاطروا بأنفسهم ومصالحهم الشخصيةكونهم يسعون من أجل بناء مجد ونفوذ يتأي ثمن كان.99

[N] The pursuit of the true leaders in the ongoing crisis of political and sectarian genocide in Iraq is indeed the only real solution that can save time and blood.

[S] Such leaders, Sunni or Shia, who murder innocent civilians are cowards and will not put themselves at the risk of any confrontation with the government or US forces. They will sacrifice their troops but not hazard their own lives or personal interests, because their goal is to build glory and influence at any cost.

(29) Reason

كان الله في عون المواطن المسلم البسيط [N] فهو ضحية لقاتلى دينية متعارضة بل ومتناضفة.100

[S] God have mercy on the simple Muslim citizen.

[S] He is the victim of conflicting and often contradictory religious fatwas ‘Islamic decrees.’

(30) Non-Volitional result

تحرك الكبار، وهذا أقصى السعر، أفاد القتربين صوابهم [N] ولذلك نرى ونسمع الهجوم الصارخ على الرياض، وكل من يسعى لاستقرار المنطقة.101
The maneuvering done by the Major Player, i.e. Saudi Arabia, has led the Qatars to losing their reason.

Therefore, we see and hear their blatant attack on Riyadh and against all those seeking to stabilize the region.

Purpose

Women’s issues have become the title of a cause that is used to elicit sensationalism.

Most of our media outlets are biased and tend to tell people what they want to hear when it comes to issues that are the considered taboos.

Otherwise

Institutionalization is the translation of these values into reality which enables individuals to practice their rights and freedoms.

Otherwise, they are just empty words that mean nothing being said but not practiced.

Interpretation

Internationally, the conference looks like another way for saying that the United States is apologizing for excluding international participation in the Iraqi issue without actually apologizing.

---

102 Text 2, P 3, S 13, 14.
103 Text 23, P 12, S 61, 62.
104 Text 21, P 4, S 14, 15.
[S] Producing the conference as an Iraqi “initiative” will prevent the diplomatic interpretations that would result from its looking as being an American “initiative.”

(34) Evaluation

الآرقام تتحدث عن ارتفاع هائل في حجم العنف الممارس على النساء سواء من داخل محيط العائلة أو خارجها. العنف يصل في أحيان إلى القتل في ظل اعتراف السلطة الفلسطينية بعجزها في معالجة الأمر. إنها قضية خطيرة ومتفاقمة. لكنها لم تشغل حيزاً فعلياً في تناولات الصحافة والإعلام. 105

[N] Figures reveal a massive rise in violence against women whether within or outside their families. It is a violence that sometimes can lead to death; something the Palestinian Authority has admitted its failure to remedy as a situation.

[S] Although it is a critical issue that is on steady escalation, still, it has failed to occupy the relevant space in media and press coverage.

(35) Restatement

وألا الله في عون المواطنين المسلم البسيط. فهو ضحية للفتاوى دينية متعارضة بل ومتناقضة.

وكلها تدعى وصاية نبيلة. 106

[S] God have mercy on the simple Muslim citizen. He is the victim of conflicting and often contradictory religious fatwas 'Islamic decrees.'

[N] All of which claim to be related to Laila.

[S] All of which claim to be genuine and based on the Quran and the Prophet’s Sunnah.

(36) Sequence

المعارضة الديمقراطية تطالب بالعفو للحكومة تعسفأ، لأنها لا تملك التنصيب القانوني لإسقاطها. 107

105 Text 2, P 5, S 24-27.
106 Text 10, P 1, S 1- 4.
107 This is a name of a beautiful woman, from pre-Islamic times, which is used figuratively to represent something very precious that everyone wants to be associated with.
The writer adds that Washington should not make Riyadh its gateway to Tehran, until he says that the Saudis are playing with fire and this will cause the US to get burnt.

Such comments are contrary to the *Washington Post* editorial that talked about the Saudi role following the Mecca Declaration, saying that Riyadh is doing what Washington should have done.

Poor contemporary Muslim; how is he to raise his family in the storm of *fatwa* contradictions?

How can he manage his money when some significant Islamic authorities allow dealing with commercial banks while others prohibit that because they see these banks as usurious.

How can he spend his free time.

How can he travel.

---

108 Text 20, P 3, S 9, 10.
109 Text 12, P 1, S 3 . 4.
Using RST to describe the functional relations at the local level in this study shows the predominance of some relations, i.e. interpretation, concession, evaluation, reason, evidence, and elaboration, over other relations in the data. This is, actually, consistent with the findings of al-Odadi (1996) and el-Shiyab (1990). In their studies, as we have seen, they found that causal, evaluative, and interpretive relations are highly recurring relations in Modern Written Arabic argumentative texts that they examined.

On the other hand, some of the relations proposed by RST are rarely encountered in the data of this study, while others are not used at all. Relations like motivation, condition, volitional cause, and circumstance, for example, are not found in the data, whereas the use of relations such as joint, purpose, restatement, and summary has proven to be very limited. Other relations, however, though identified in the data of this study, are not listed in Mann and Thompson’s (1988) set of relations. These relations that are not identified by the RST, but are needed in this study to describe the functions performed by some sentences in the data are, therefore, added to the analytical tool. The following examples illustrate these additional relations:

(39) Affirmation

[N] و هو أمر يمكن نقاشه.
[S] بل تجب مناقشته.111

[N] This is a fact that could be discussed.
[S] Or rather, should be discussed.

---

111 Text 1, P 6, S 17, 18.
(40) Emphatic elaboration

[Text 24, P 2, S 3, 4.]

[42] Disjunction

[Text 3, P 5, S 17, 18.]

(41) Comment

[Text 6, P 1, S 3, 4.]

(42) Disjunction

[Text 24, P 3, S 3, 4.]

[87x73]231
[87x121]114
[87x132]113
[87x143]112
[97x149]Text 24, P 2, S 3, 4.
[114x174](42) Disjunction
[120x5]afii62760/afii62761 /afii62825  /afii62810/afii62817/afii62760/afii62778/afii62821/afii62817
[120x524]/ ا
[120x524]afii62841/afii62785/afii62817
[120x483]/ق
[120x483]afii62830/afii62818/afii62802
[120x483]/ا
[120x483]afii62760/afii62809/afii62765
[120x483]afii62824/afii62768
[120x483]/ ا
[120x165]/ر
[120x165]/ ا
[120x165]afii62782/afii62784/afii62756/afii62761 /afii62782/afii62820/afii62836
[120x165]/ب
[120x165]/،
[120x165]/afii62828/afii62823/afii62760/afii62808
[120x165]afii62780/afii62812/afii62761 /afii62828/afii62823
[120x165]/ا
[120x165]/وام

[Text 24, P 2, S 3, 4.]

[N] Attending a seminar on European-Israeli relations, in Berlin over the weekend, I was surprised that almost all Israeli participants pinned so much hope on what they called “The Saudi Peace Plan.”

[S] Even Likudniks, who had always maintained that, as far as Israel was concerned, nothing good would ever come out of Saudi Arabia, praised the Mecca agreement between Hamas and Fatah and expressed support for the “Peace Plan” promoted by Riyadh.

[N] Some optimists have not hesitated to consider this comical approach to the clash between Islam and the West as a gateway to dialogue between immigrant minorities and the West.

[S] Unless conflict and violence are considered to be one mode of communication.

[N] If that is not the case, how does one explain that the enemy for the Palestinian now is the other Palestinian, who holds a different political opinion?

112 Text 24, P 2, S 3, 4.
113 Text 3, P 5, S 17, 18.
114 Text 6, P 1, S 3, 4.
[S] How can one explain the fact that Lebanon's Prime Minister, Fouad Siniora has become the number one enemy for the Islamic resistance, represented by Hezbollah and its followers?

What has been realized in the data of this study regarding RST confirms the assumptions underlying this theory. Mann and Thompson (1988), as mentioned earlier, assume that relations in texts differ according to the text-type and the culture in which the text operates. The high recurrence of a set of relations in a certain text, they assert, is a clear indication of the influence of its type and culture. It is, therefore, the text type and culture that determine the kind of relations displayed in the text. This is why they leave their set of relations open for change and modification so that it could better serve the data under analysis no matter what the culture or language is.

One more thing realized when describing the local relations in text is the existence of some kind of hierarchical organization within the paragraph itself. It has been noticed that more than one sentence in the paragraph may form a unified sequence that relates, as a whole, in a particular way to the proposition in the previous sentence. This is what Mann and Thompson (1988) refer to as several satellites relating to one single nucleus creating a hierarchical structure within the paragraph. Here is an example to demonstrate this point:

(43)

Text 7, P 2, S 3-6.

115 Text 7, P 2, S 3-6.
[43a] The current rebellion in Yemen, which is called ‘Al Houthi’s sedition’ by Yemenis, is by no means a new movement. [43b] Badr al Din al Houthi led the rebellion in 2004 which lasted 90 days, killing over 400 victims. [43c] In 2005, the rebellion erupted again and lasted a period of two weeks in which over 280 lives were claimed as a result of the clashes. [43d] This was followed by a ceasefire which resulted in the Yemeni president pardoning the rebels.

In example (43), sentences [43b] to [43d] present successive events that are connected by the “sequence” relation. The three sentences, however, form a unified sequence that serves as evidence to support the writer’s claim in sentence [43a]. This is because they provide information that is “intended to increase the reader’s belief in the claim.”

4.3.4 Summary

This section explain how the functional relations at the global and local levels of text structure are identified by means of the two analytical tools used in this study, i.e. Text-type Theory and RST. On the one hand, it shows how the organizational patterns of Hatim’s (1997) argumentative text-type, modified by el-Shiyab’s (1990) more detailed model of Arabic editorials’ text structure, are employed to describe text’s global relations. On the other hand, it demonstrates how RST provides a framework for describing the local relations between text’s low-level segments. To illustrate the way both theories work within the model provided in this study, examples of the analysis process under which the data go were presented.
4.3.5 Difficulty of this Approach

Applying the analytical framework adopted in the study, as described above, has not been a simple task.

At this stage of the analysis, the present study identifies the relations between the segments of text mainly by means of the text’s organizational structure. This is why it employs two analytical models to describe the relations that hold between the global level and local level segments. Hatim’s (1997) argumentative text’s organizational structure is used to describe global relations whereas local relations are described by the Rhetorical Structure Theory. Because the study seeks to describe these relations in order to examine the environment in which discourse markers occur, it does not take discourse markers as indicators of this environment. This means that the relations between segments are taken as indicators of discourse markers’ functions and not the opposite.

It should be pointed out, however, that this analytical strategy does not contradict the fundamental assumption underlying this study, i.e. that discourse markers are crucial devices for signaling the underlying coherence relations. Identifying relations between segments of texts in this study by means of the text organizational structure only, without utilizing discourse markers, does not mean that discourse markers are dispensable elements in signaling these relations. This is because, although discourse markers are crucial devices for signaling the relations between segments, these expressions are not the only means for recognizing these relations. Rather, the macro and micro structure of texts, as has been mentioned previously, are also important components that contribute to the text’s global and local coherence.
On the other hand, focusing theoretically on the organizational structure of text as the grounds for interpreting how segments relate to each other and to the text as a whole does not mean that the effect of the presence of discourse markers on this interpretation is avoidable in application. The presence of discourse markers in any text segment will always influence the segment’s function because they are part of it and contribute to its meaning in various degrees. This, however, does not affect the validity of the analysis since the analysis goal is to describe the discourse markers’ environment, and the discourse markers presence in any segment is actually part of this environment. So the study describes the functions of the segments as a whole with the discourse markers being part of them. As Hoey (1983) puts it “just as the conjuncts are described chiefly as signals of relations, so also relations are described chiefly as a way of clarifying the nature of conjuncts” (21).

Another thing that one should bear in mind when employing this analytical framework is that “a perfect taxonomy of relationships is not devisable, because at its best, a taxonomy can only cover some of the most conspicuous functional components pertaining to the data” (Kammensjö 2005, 185). And just as there is no one perfect model of text relations, there is also no one definitive way of analyzing relations in text. On the one hand, determining how one unit relates to another is not always precise. It is possible, for example, that one sentence presents a reason to clarify the proposition in a previous sentence. This reason, however, may also be viewed as a way to justify the previous proposition. The following example illustrates this point:
[N] God have mercy on the simple Muslim citizen.
[S] He is the victim of conflicting and often contradictory religious *fatwas*
‘Islamic decrees.’

On the other hand, the analyst’s description of the textual units and their function
depsends essentially on his interpretation of the text being examined. Mann and
Thompson (1988) refer to this inevitable subjectivity of text analysis and emphasize that
a human analyst can not escape it when making judgments about the functions of text
parts. “Such judgments are necessarily subjective,” they state, “since they are made only
by human beings who communicate, on the basis of what they know about their culture,
their society, and their language” (1992, 52).

4.4 The Identification of Discourse Markers

4.4.1 Introduction

Identifying discourse markers at units’ boundaries is the final step in analyzing
the data in this study. Halliday’s (2004) model of thematic structure was introduced in the
previous chapter as a means to determine what items in the sentence-initial position could
qualify as discourse markers. However, since Halliday’s description of the initial
thematic slot is based on English data, it is important, therefore, before applying this tool

---

Text 10, P 1, S1, 2.
to the Arabic data, to examine the consistency of this notion, the initial thematic slot, with the Arabic language. This is what the following section focuses on.

4.4.2 Arabic and Halliday’s Thematic Structure

According to Halliday (2004), in all languages, the clause displays the character of a message. Thematic structure is the form of organization that manages the flow of discourse as a message by orienting the clause and locating it within its context. Different languages, however, realize this structure in different ways, Halliday (2004) argues. While Theme is indicated by means of specific particles in some languages, like the particle –wa in Japanese that thematises what comes after it, in other languages, like English, this function is realized by the first position in the clause.

Halliday’s description of the thematic structure of the clause, as mentioned previously, is based on his observation of message structure in English. Applying his model of thematic analysis to the Arabic data in this study, therefore, needs to be justified in order to avoid what Kammensjö (2005) describes as “obvious risk of anglicizing” the Arabic message structure (101). What needs to be examined here is the possibility of Arabic being among the languages that signal the thematic status of an item by placing it in the initial position. If this is the case, and Arabic seems to use a similar strategy like English for realizing the thematic structure, then Halliday’s model of thematic analysis could be applied to the Arabic data.

Signalling thematic status by association with initial position in some languages like English is based on the assumption that initial position is significant. Theme is a
sentential and discoursal phenomenon that governs the interpretation of the clause locally and the progression of the text globally. Associating this key function with the first position in the clause is a clear indication of the special significance that this position carries in these languages. A language like Arabic which regards the beginning of the sentence as a strategically important position for realizing the different meanings that word-order variations convey, therefore, a good reason for locating the Theme in this slot.

Thematic status, on the other hand, is not associated with grammatical status. That the most common type of topical Theme in English is realized by the grammatical subject does not confine this function to the subject. According to Halliday (2004), any element of the experiential structure, whether it is process, participant, or circumstance, regardless of its grammatical status can be chosen to function as topical Theme. Just like subjects, therefore, verbs are possible elements in this position. This, Halliday (2004) points out, is realized in the Theme of imperative clauses in English. While “the imperative is the only type of clause in which the predicator is regularly found as Theme,” he maintains, “this is not impossible in other moods” (77). This means that realizing the Theme as the initial position in a language like Arabic that has VS as its basic word-order does not pose any problems to Halliday’s (2004) model of thematic structure.

While the grammatical status of an item does not affect its capability to function as a starting point for the clause as a message, it, indicates the state of the topical Theme as marked or unmarked. The markedness value given to the Theme in a certain language depends on the word-order system which governs how this language organizes its
constituents grammatically. In a language like English, where the basic word order is subject-verb-object the Theme is marked whenever the element chosen for the initial position is something other than the subject. When the subject, however, is chosen as the Theme, it is considered an unmarked case. On the contrary, the subject in the initial position indicates a marked case in Arabic which has verb-subject-object as its basic unmarked word-order, whereas the thematic verb signals a neutral, unmarked case.

The idea of signaling the item in the initial position as marked or unmarked in Halliday’s model of thematic structure, actually fits languages with word-order variation better than languages with fixed word-order. The model permits text-producer to choose the topical Theme that best conveys his/her meaning, and based on the element chosen, as mentioned before, the function of Theme becomes marked or unmarked. This variation in meaning that is based on alternating between elements in the sentence-initial position is consistent with the way that word-order system in Arabic works. The fact that Arabic pragmatically alternates between word-order in the initial position in order to achieve different meanings, such as continuity, importance, and specification, is completely consistent with the notion of markedness and unmarkedness in the thematic model introduced by Halliday (2004).

Since Arabic seems to realize thematic status by initial position in the clause or sentence, it is, therefore, obvious that Halliday’s model of thematic analysis can be applied to the Arabic data. It is noteworthy here, however, to mention that Arabic sometimes signals its topical Theme in the initial position by means of two particles framing the Theme. Although Arabic sometimes uses a particle such as ‘ammā ‘as for’ to
signal the topical Theme, this is an optional rather than obligatory choice. It is similar to
the English use of explicit particles such as as for, with regard to in order to announce the
Theme. This, Halliday (2004) points out, “has the effect of focusing the Theme,” and this
is why Kammensjö (2005) refers to it as “topicalized Theme” (155). In Arabic, however,
a topicalized Theme requires the presence of a particle, such as fa, that marks the
boundary between the Theme and Rheme. This special case of Theme in Arabic in which
the topicalized Theme is framed between two particles deviates from Halliday’s
description of the thematic slot where all the markers precede the topical Theme.\footnote{The framing structure that Arabic utilizes to emphasize the Theme will be further explained in Chapter five.}
CHAPTER 5

OUTCOME OF THE ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, the process undertaken for analyzing the data as well as the analytical tools employed for this reason were discussed. This is followed in this chapter by presenting the outcome of this analysis. It is the goal of the present study, as mentioned earlier, to identify the discourse markers in the data and describe their function. Thus, while the prior chapter provides the means for reaching this goal, the present chapter introduces the identified markers and examines their function in their natural environment by associating them with the functional relations realized in the environment where they were identified. In order to present a coherent description of the functions served by these markers, a functional classification of these items is suggested.

In this chapter, an overview of the discourse markers identified in this study will be presented, then a description of their function will be provided. The chapter will end with general remarks concerning discourse markers in the data.

5.2 Overview of Discourse Markers in this Study

This overview of discourse markers identified in this study's data provides a general idea of these items as a group before describing specific functions of members of this group. Since the study starts with the assumption that discourse markers share common features that set them apart as a distinctive group, as has been realized by many studies in discourse markers literature, the general description of discourse markers
identified in this study is presented in relation to these features. This section, therefore, describes discourse markers in the data with regard to their five main characteristics: multi-categoriality, nontruth-conditionality, weak clause association, connectivity, and initiality.

5.2.1 Multi-categoriality

Discourse markers identified in this study’s data are not structurally unified. Rather, they constitute a structurally “heterogeneous set” whose members are derived from different grammatical categories, as Brinton (1996, 34) puts it. This is, as mentioned before, a common feature of discourse markers that has been attested by many studies in discourse markers literature. Although the grammatical forms from which discourse markers derive are not within the scope of the present study, referring to these forms is important for understanding the nature of the discourse markers group.

The analysis shows that the discourse markers group in this study includes the following word classes: coordinating conjunctions, e.g. wa ‘and,’ fa ‘then, since,’ ‘aw ‘or,’ ‘am ‘or,’ ṭumma ‘then,’ and bal ‘rather, but rather,’ particles, e.g. wa-‘illā ‘otherwise, or else,’ ‘ay ‘anna ‘that is,’ ‘amma…fa ‘as for,’ ‘inna ‘certainly, indeed,’ lākin(na)\textsuperscript{118} ‘however, but,’ ḥattā ‘in order to,’ adverbs, e.g. ḥākādā ‘in such a way,’ ‘aydan ‘also,’ maḍalān ‘for instance,’ ḥayṭu ‘where,’ adverbial phrases, e.g. min ṭamma ‘after that,’ bi-l-tālī ‘consequently, therefore’, kamā ‘just as,’ wa min hunā ‘from here,’ and clauses, e.g.

\textsuperscript{118} Many researchers argue that lākin(na) ‘but’ is not included in the coordinating set of particles in Arabic. This is because this particle, i.e. lākin(na), is frequently preceded by the coordinating conjunction wa ‘and,’ while, as Beeston (1973/1974) puts it, “no two coordinating particles can be used in immediate juxtaposition” (167). (see also Holes 1995, 217).
la-qad 'atbat-a al-wāqi‘-u 'anna ‘reality has proven that,’ wa-lā yafūt-u-nā ‘we should not miss,’ 'ataqid-u 'anna and ‘I think that.’ That discourse markers are drawn from these different grammatical word classes implies that each member of the discourse markers group has a structurally identical counterpart that serves an intersentential role. The members of the discourse markers’ group, however, are not the same as their structurally identical source forms. Discourse markers, as discourse markers studies confirm, mostly appear sentence initially, become detached from their host sentence both structurally and semantically, and are governed by the pragmatic force of the text rather than the grammatical structure of the sentence. These new features that these linguistic items acquire give them a distinctive status as a linguistic group and make them distinguishable from their original sources.

It has been realized from the analysis process in the present study that the difference between discourse markers and their structurally identical counterparts is often noticeable. The discourse marker wa-lākin ‘however, but’ for instance, could be distinguished from its intersentential original form although the two seem to perform a similar function. The following examples demonstrate this point:

(1)

The International Women’s Day has become an occasion for revealing real and painful facts, (wa-lākin) but in a hasty and brief manner during symposiums, meetings, and seminars.

119 Text 2, P 2, S 6.
[2a] At a time when complicated regional issues are inching towards resolution, Qatar is once again back to searching for a role that it can play.[2b] (wa-lākin) However, since this time the crisis is greater and all the major players have started maneuvering, Doha is left with nothing but explicit slander to resort to, reminding us of the worst forms of insults and condemnations that took place during the 1960s in the Middle East.

In example (1), the particle wa-lākin ‘but’ introduces a prepositional phrase that describes the manner in which the tragic facts about women are presented on Women’s Day. While the sentence starts with a statement indicating that these tragic facts are usually discussed on this day, the author, however, goes on, using the adversative particle, to confirm that the nature of this discussion is far from being a real one because of its fast and superficial manner. The discourse marker wa-lākin ‘however, but’ that introduces sentence [2b], on the other hand, although conveys also an adversative relation signaling a contrast between the meaning in sentence [2b] and the meaning conveyed by sentence [2a], it, however, displays different characteristics from its intersentential counterpart. The position of the discourse marker wa-lākin ‘however, but’ at the sentence onset, as well as its structural and semantic detachment from its host sentence gives it a distinctive status.

120 Text 13, P 1, S 1.2.
The distinction between discourse markers and their original forms becomes yet more obvious when the two items display different functional meanings. Consider, for instance, the functional meaning of hattā in the following two examples:

(3)  
الأيدين أن لبنان، فلسطين، العراق، وقعت في النزاع الذي يزيد تفتيت الهوية العربية، وجعلها في صالح الثورة الراديكالية الإيرانية في المنطقة، لتكون إيران المستفيد الأول من هذا الصراع النتائج في أنحاء الوطن العربي، حتى (hattā) تمنع أمريكا والمجتمع الدولي من توجيه ضربة عسكرية لها لتراجع عن مشروعها النووي.121

Indeed, Lebanon, Palestine, and Iraq have been entrapped by Iran, which is striving to fragment the Arab identity and make it serve the Iranian radical revolution in the region. Iran is the primary beneficiary of this fierce conflict in the Arab World (hattā) in order to prevent the US and the international community from striking it to give up its nuclear project.

(4)  
وفي مشاركتي بندوة حول العلاقات الأوروبية الإسرائيلية عقدت في برلين في نهاية الأسبوع، ابهرتني أن كل المشاركين الإسرائيليين تقريبًا كانوا يعلقون أملًا على ما سوّمه خطة السلام السعودية (hattā) وتحت (wa-hattā) أعضاء الليكود، الذين كانوا يؤكدون الدوم على أنه يفترض ما تعلق الأمر بإسرائيل، فإنه ما من شيء جيد يمكن أن يأتي من المملكة العربية السعودية، لأنها على اتفاق مكة بين حماس وفتح وعبروا عن دعمهم لخطبة السلام التي رشحتها الرياض.122

[4a] Attending a seminar on European-Israeli relations, in Berlin over the weekend, I was surprised that almost all Israeli participants pinned so much hope on what they called “The Saudi Peace Plan.” [4b] Even Likudniks, who had always maintained that, as far as Israel was concerned, nothing good would ever come out of Saudi Arabia, praised the Mecca agreement between Hamas and Fatah and expressed support for the “Peace Plan” promoted by Riyadh.

The particle hattā ‘in order to’ that introduces the adverbial dependent clause in example (3) indicates that this clause provides a purpose for the main clause. However,

121 Text 46, P 7, S 22.  
122 Text 24, P 2, S 3, 4.
"hattā ‘even’ that appears at the onset of sentence [4b] in example (4), is a discourse marker that does not belong structurally to the sentence it introduces. Its function is to signal an emphatic additive relation between its host sentence [4b] and the preceding one [4a].

It is clear from the above examples, therefore, that discourse markers are different and distinguishable from their original forms. However, it should be noted here that what seems to be a similar function performed by the two different items, as examples (1) and (2) display, is actually not the same. This is because it is performed by two different items that have different features. On the one hand, performing this function while occurring sentence-initially, as discourse markers do, gives the function of the discourse marker a different scope. On the other hand, being outside the grammatical structure and semantic core of the sentence means that the discourse marker is functioning through the writer’s intentions rather than the grammatical structure. This makes the nature of the relation signaled by the discourse marker substantially different from the one signaled by its intersentential form. The relationship that discourse markers express to signal “interpretive dependencies between propositions,” Schiffrin (2001) affirms, is “qualitatively different” from the type of relation that their counterparts express through the medium of the sentence grammatical structure (56).

Although differentiating discourse markers from their intersentential source forms when identifying discourse markers in the data has proven to be non problematic in general, nevertheless, some instances where drawing the line between the two was not easy. This is evident when trying to differentiate the discourse markers kagālika
’likewise, furthermore’ and *hākadaَ* ‘thus, and so’ from their adverbal counterparts.

Consider the following examples:

(5)

[5a] لقد جربت النازية الألمانية آيدولوجية العرق الألماني في مواجهة الأعراق الأخرى. [5b] ولذلك، هال (wa-kadālikā)

[5a] German Nazism tested the ideology of the German race versus all other races. [5b] It believed in the superiority of one race over all others. [5c] (wa-kadālikā) The same way is fascism.

(6)


[6a] Egypt is also timidly manifesting a desire to possess nuclear technology. This wish was renewed after Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak's visit to Russia, where he signed a memorandum of understanding to extend and deepen bilateral cooperation between the two countries in the field of peaceful nuclear energy. This is particularly relevant especially since Israel has refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) for years. [6b] (kadālikā) Likewise, the Algerian nuclear record is not something concealed from public opinion. [6c] Since it is an old and renewable file.

(7)

[7a] من بلير إلى بوش إلى أثار وبروسكوي، مرورًا بباقي الحلفاء، الجميع ينظر إلى الشرق الأوسط بمناظر إسرائيل المقل، مثلما بدأ في صورة وزير دفاعها إيمير بيرتس عندما كان يراقب المناورات الضخمة في الجولان. [7b] الجولان لا يرى شيئًا [7c] يكفي أن ينظر إلى داخله ليستههم التاريخ الاستعماري، خدمة للإمبراطورية الصناعية وأيديولوجيتها. [7d]

[7a] From Blair to Bush to other traces and Bruskov, passing through all the allies, everyone looks to the East, the Middle East with Israeli optics, just as Emir Peretz began to look when he observed the huge maneuvers in the Golan. [7b] The Golan is not seen [7c] is enough if you look inside to not see the colonial history, service for the imperial economy and ideology.
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[7a] Blair, Bush, Aznar and Berlusconi, as well as the rest of the allies, are looking at the Middle East through Israeli capped binoculars, just like the Israeli Defense Minister, Amir Peretz, who was inspecting his troops' maneuvers in the Golan with his binoculars' lens caps firmly in place, as his published pictures show.[7b] No one can see anything. [7c] It is enough to look within oneself in order to be inspired by the colonial history, which is to the advantage of the emerging Empire and its ideology.[6d] (hākādā) This is how the war on Iraq started.

The above examples illustrate the difference between kādālika ‘likewise, furthermore’ and hākādā ‘thus, and so’ as discourse markers that are detached from the sentence structure and their adverbial source forms kādālika ‘the same way, like that,’ and hākādā ‘in such a way, this is how’ which are part of the proposition they introduce. In examples (5) and (7), the two preposed adverbials kādālika ‘the same way, like that,’ and hākādā ‘in such a way, this is how’ could easily be mistaken for the discourse

---
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markers that structurally resemble them. This is because these demonstratives of ‘vague reference,’ as Holes (1995, 155) calls them, while serving as adverbs of manner, they also refer back to the whole preceding proposition at the same time. In Halliday’s (2004) cohesion theory, such items are referred to as “anaphoric references.” This type of reference, Halliday (2004) indicates, points ‘backwards’ “to a referent that has already been introduced and is thus part of the text’s system of meanings” (552). Occurring sentence initially, however, makes these adverbials look similar to their discourse markers counterparts.

In such a case, the thematic structure analysis becomes very crucial for differentiating these adverbials from their structurally similar forms that function as discourse markers. In the thematic structure theory, as has been explained before, constituents preceding the topical Theme in the thematic-slot are identified as discourse markers because they are outside the propositional meaning of the sentence. Therefore, the thematic structure analysis that shows the thematic status of the items under consideration indicates whether these items are adverbials that form part of the propositional core of the sentence or discourse markers that are outside this propositional meaning.

In examples (5) and (7), the two preposed adverbials kəɗaliŋa ‘the same way, like that,’ and hōkəɗa ‘in such a way, this is how’ form part of the propositional core of the sentences they introduce. This is because the two adverbials represent the topical Themes of sentences [5c] and [7d] respectively. While in sentence [5c], kəɗaliŋa is the topical
Theme of an equational sentence, *hākadā*, in sentence [7d] is a topical Theme that is a preposed adverbial indicating the manner in which the war started.

However, unlike the the preposed adverbials *kadālika* ‘the same way, like that,’ and *hākadā* ‘in such a way, this is how’ that represent the topical Themes of sentences [5c] and [7d] respectively, the discourse markers *kadālika* ‘likewise, furthermore’ and *hākadā* ‘thus, and so’ constitute the pre-topical Theme position in examples (6) and (8) respectively. This is because the two discourse markers *kadālika* ‘likewise, furthermore’ and *hākadā* ‘thus, and so’ in examples (6) and (8) do not belong structurally or semantically to the sentence they introduce. According to the thematic structure analysis, the thematic slot in sentence [6b] starts from *kadālika* and extends to include the phrase *al-malaff-u al-nawawīyy-u al-jaza‘īriyy-u* ‘the Algerian nuclear record.’ This phrase represents the topical Theme in the thematic slot because it is the first element in the sentence that has experiential function, i.e. the participant. However, *kadālika* that precedes the topical Theme occupies the pre-topical Theme position, and hence is identified as a discourse marker that is outside the propositional meaning of the sentence. Likewise, *wa-hākadā* that introduces sentence [8c] is also a discourse marker because it precedes the topical Theme *zahar-a* ‘appeared’ in the thematic slot of this sentence.

The thematic structure analysis, on the one hand, shows that the two adverbials *kadālika* ‘the same way, like that,’ and *hākadā* ‘in such a way, this is how’ that introduce sentences [5c] and [7d] respectively form part of the propositional meaning of the sentences they introduce. On the other hand, this analysis indicates that the discourse markers *kadālika* ‘likewise, furthermore’ and *hākadā* ‘thus, and so’ constitute the pre-
topical Theme position in examples (6) and (8) respectively. Therefore, this analysis is a very useful means to distinguish discourse markers from their original counterparts.

5.2.2 Nontruth-conditionality and Loose Clause Association

In the present study, only sentence-initial items that are nontruth-conditional and loosely attached to the sentence’s structure are regarded as discourse markers. Because nontruth-conditionality and loose clause associations are considered criterial features of discourse markers by most researchers in discourse markers literature, these two characteristics play a central role in identifying the discourse marker status of the members of this group. To say that discourse markers are nontruth conditional and structurally detached means, as mentioned previously, that these items are outside the propositional content as well as the syntactic structure of their host sentences.

Accordingly, items that occur sentence initially but constitute part of the sentence’s propositional content and grammatical structure are excluded from the discourse markers’ group in this study. Particles that introduce preposed adverbial clauses, such as baynamā ‘while,’ ‘indamā ‘when,’ mahmā ‘no matter how/what,’ ḫayīyū ‘anna ‘since,’ likay ‘in order to,’ ma’a ‘anna ‘despite the fact that, although’ bimā ‘anna ‘since,’ rağma (‘anna) ‘despite the fact, nevertheless,’ are, therefore, not considered discourse markers. Because they link the dependent clauses that they introduce to the
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main clauses, these particles constitute part of the complex sentences’ structure and meaning. Here are some examples that illustrate the use of such particles:

(9) 

بينما لا يقطع الحديث عن التمدد التوغل الإیراني تحت عباءة المقاومة أو الدين وضرورة الضعفاء في المنطقة العربية بصورة واضحة، صارت تعرف منطقة المركز الرئيسى لهذا الحراك بالهلال الشیعی، والذي يمتد من العراق حتى فلسطین.\(^{128}\)

(*baynamā*) *While* talk of Iranian expansion and penetration in the Arab region, under the cause of resistance, religion, and supporting the weak, continues, the central area for these activities has come to be known as the Shiaa crescent, extending from Iraq to Palestine.

(10) 

وعندما أرادت إسرائيل التحدث عن المبادرة العربية، مبادرة الملك عبد الله بن عبد العزيز، أول ما تجاهلتم قطر.\(^{129}\)

(*’indamā*) *When* Israel wanted to discuss King Abdullah's peace initiative, Qatar was the first to be ignored.

(11) 

مهمة (mahmā) أصر البيت الأبيض على نفي إعداده خططا لغزو إيران أو ضربها، لن يصدق خامنئي وهو يسمع بعض الحلفاء الأوروبيين ليوش يجهرون عننًا بعد 4 سنوات على غزو العراق، بسقوطهم في فخ號کودة الأمريكية الكبرى حول أسلحة الدمار الشامل لدى صدام حسين.\(^{130}\)

(*mahmā*) *No matter* how the White House insists on denying that it is preparing for an invasion of Iran or an assault on it, Khamenei will not believe this while he listens to some of Bush's European allies declaring publicly, after 4 years of the invasion of Iraqi, about how they fell into the pit of America's grand lie about Saddam Hussein's supposed WMDs.

(12)
And since the biggest player---in this case the United States---would not introduce a clear initiative then the others would not have many incentives for leaving their trenches.  

For these initiatives to mature and turn into real action plans, they must be regionally and internationally embraced as real plans for solutions that end a futile argument about legitimacy and quotas in favor of a constructive argument about the means of building the Iraqi civilian state that acts as a bridge which fills regional chasms.

Despite the fact that the growing criticism of the Iranian president's policies have led to what could be seen as a parliamentarian division in Iran, a change of leadership has been ruled out due to the concerns of repeating the Sadr scenario in Iraq.

And whenever a Lebanese does not take part in the collapse of his economy, he does not deserve the title of a citizen.  

The words between brackets are added to clarify the meaning. They are not in the original text.
(bimā ‘anna) Since it is not conceivable for a Lebanese to contribute to the collapse of his national economy, efforts must be exerted to preserve some confidence in Lebanon.

(ragma) Despite US Defense Secretary Robert Gates’ objection to Putin’s statements, it is unlikely that they will bother any of the neoconservative officials of the Bush administration, who do not hide their wish to enforce an international policy that suits their narrow vision of the fate of this world, and they do not mind, if such policy is met with success, dominating the future of those peoples who disobey them.

When the adverbial clauses are preposed to the initial position of their complex sentences, as in examples (9) to (16), the particles that introduce them may be confused with discourse markers. However, the obvious role that these particles serve in linking the dependent adverbial clauses that they introduce to the main clauses of the complex sentences indicates that these items are not discourse markers but rather part of the structure and meaning of their host sentences. The same could be said about particles that introduce conditional clauses in complex sentences, such as ʿīdā and law both meaning ‘if.’ Because these particles are structurally and semantically tied to the sentences that they introduce, they are not included in the discourse markers’ group of this study either.
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The difference between these particles that introduce dependent clauses and the discourse markers could be further illustrated by comparing the function of kamā in the two following examples:

\[(17)\]

Secular vision, considering that it is an institutional expression of the rational view and the free management of the sociopolitical affair, is part of the enlightenment's system of values; [17b] hence it is institutionally inextricable from it. [17c] (kamā) As Marcel Gauchet illustrates in his pioneering works on secularism, the political-religious question in Europe passed through three stages.

Even within a single religious group there exist contradictory stands depending on the time and place. [18b] Back in the 1940s, the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in Egypt issued a fatwa that prohibited women from uncovering their faces or working in mixed gender governmental departments. [18c] (kamā) Furthermore, the MB denied women judiciary and prosecution practices. [18d] Their involvement in politics was also considered to be blatantly inconsistent with Islam.

It is clear that kamā is performing two different roles in the above examples. In example (17), kamā ‘as, like’ is a particle that links the preposed adverbial clause of
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manner that it introduces to the main clause of the complex sentence [17c]. This particle, therefore, is part of the complex sentence’s structure and meaning. *kamā* ‘likewise, furthermore’ in example (18), however, is structurally and semantically outside the propositional meaning of the sentence. Its function here is to indicate that the sentence [18c] that it introduces elaborates on the proposition in sentence [18b].

Moreover, just as the particles that introduce adverbial clauses are excluded from the group of discourse markers in this study because they form part of the meaning and structure of their sentences, so are the fronted adverbial expressions and phrases. When thematized, such adverbials, become similar to discourse markers because of their textual function in marking shifts between segments of text (Givón 2001, 330; Thompson, Longacre, and Hwang 2007, 295). However, unlike discourse markers, fronted adverbials contribute to the propositional meaning of the sentences that they introduce by setting them in a certain time, place, or manner. Consider the following examples:

(19)

In politics, there is a famous proverb: keep your friends close but your enemies closer.

(20)

In the United States today (fī al-wilāyāt-i al-muttaḥidat-i al-yawm) a new humor is developing.  "أهلاً كوميدياً محضور الشر" 139
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Today, in the United States, attention has been directed towards a new American comedy series entitled “The Axis of Evil Comedy Tour Special.”

The two preposed adverbial phrases fī al-siyāsah ‘in politics’ and fī al-wilāyāt-i al-muttahidat-i al-yawm ‘Today, in the United States’ that appear at the head of the sentences in examples (19) and (20) respectively are not discourse markers. This is because each of these adverbial phrases provides settings for its proposition by locating it in a certain context of time, place or manner (see Holes 1995, 208; Levinsohn 1994, 111). Therefore, unlike discourse markers, these items, do contribute to the propositional content of their sentences. This is also the case in examples (5) and (7)¹⁴⁰ where the thematic analysis indicates that the preposed adverbials kādālika ‘the same way, like that,’ and hākādā ‘in such a way, this is how’ are part of the propositional meaning of the sentences that they introduce and hence are not discourse markers.

On the other hand, not only do nontruth-conditionality and loose clause association characteristics of discourse markers justify the exclusion of some items that may be confused with discourse markers from the discourse markers’ group, but these two criterial features also explain why some items that do not seem to belong to this group are considered discourse markers. Sentence initial items such as wa-l-haqīqat-u ‘anna ‘the truth is,’ lā šakka ‘anna ‘there is no doubt that, undoubtedly’ wa-min al-wādīh-i ‘anna ‘it is evident that,’ that seem to be in a dependency relation with the rest of their sentences are included in the discourse markers group in this study because they are proven to be outside their sentences’ propositional content and structure. Such clauses

¹⁴⁰ Look page 246.
and phrases, Johnstone (1990) points out, are “not part of the propositional core of the sentence at all but a separate element which serves an exclusively connecting function” (221). The following examples illustrate this point:

(21)

Undoubtedly, there is no doubt that the line between comedy and reality is thin. However, entertainment and humor can act as a channel to establish a positive connection between various groups.

(22)

Interestingly, the one-state solution was originally popular in Israel. At a time when the demographic factor worked in favor of Israel, sustained by the hope of persuading millions of Soviet Jews to come and settle in the" promised land", the partisans of Greater Israel advocated a direct annexation of the West Bank and Gaza.

According to the syntactic analysis, the two expressions, lā rayb-a fī 'anna ‘undoubtedly, there is no doubt that’ and al-'amr-u al-muṭūr-u li-l-īḥtimām-i huwa 'anna ‘interestingly,’ that appear at the head of the sentences in examples (21) and (22) respectively form part of these sentences’ meaning and structure. Syntactically, these
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expressions represent the main clauses of the sentences that they introduce, and hence are considered part of the dependency relation that forms the structure of their complex sentences.

However, the Thematic structure analysis, which provides a means for determining what is inside or outside the propositional core of the sentence, shows that these initial clauses are not the Themes of the sentences that they introduce. Rather, they occupy the pre-topical Theme position which is the place where discourse markers usually occur. The Theme in example (21), according to this analysis, is al-kāṭṭa al-fāsīl- a bayna al-kūmīdīyā wa-l-wāqī‘-i ‘the line between comedy and reality,’ and ḥall-a al- dawlat-i al-wālīdāt-i ‘the one-state solution’ in example (22). In such cases, Halliday (2004), explains, as mentioned previously, the entire main clause forms part of the Theme while the dependent clause is divided between the Theme and the Rheme. Because the two expressions lā rayb-a fī ’anna ‘undoubtedly, there is no doubt that’ and al-‘amr-u al- muqīr-u li-l-īltimām-i ʿuwa ʿanna ‘Interestingly,’ that introduce the sentences in examples (21) and (22) respectively occur in the pre-topical Theme slot, they are outside the propositional core of the sentence and hence they are considered discourse markers.

Nevertheless, there are some occurrences of similar phrases and clauses that, although appear at the onset of their host sentences, are not counted as discourse markers. This is because, in these cases, the thematic analysis indicates that these expressions do constitute part of the sentences’ structure. This is evident in the following examples:
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It would be absurd for Saudi Arabia to isolate itself or to rely upon others to manage its security and interests, and solve the conflicts that are taking place in the region while it stands by and watches.

It is true that the Cold War is over. And it is unlikely to see its return soon.

Although the two phrases, *wa-min al-‘abat-i ‘an* ‘it would be absurd to’ and *wa-min al-ṣa‘b-i ‘an* ‘and it is unlikely to,’ that introduce the sentences in examples (23) and (24) respectively seem to be very similar to the expressions mentioned in examples (21) and (22), they are not discourse markers. While the clauses that introduce examples (21) and (22) occupy the pre-topical Theme position in their sentences, the phrases in examples (23) and (24) represent the Themes of the sentences that they introduce, and thus constitute part of the core meaning of these sentences. According to this semantic analysis, such phrases, although they seem to function as discourse markers, are actually not discourse markers.

One more important point that should be mentioned here, is that while all the markers identified in this study are outside the propositional content as well as the syntactic structure of their host sentences, some of them, however, though semantically
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and structurally detached, “impose limits on the structure” of the sentence they introduce (Fraser 1996, 184). Some discourse markers like ‘inna ‘certainly, indeed’ and lākin(na) ‘but,’ for example, must be followed by a noun or pronoun, while others like fa-qad ‘since, for’ requires that the following item be a perfect verb.

5.2.3 Connectivity

Based on the two different roles that they serve in text, the discourse markers identified in the data of this study can be divided into two broad categories: textual discourse markers and interpersonal discourse markers. While connecting units of text by marking relationships between them is the main role served by textual markers, the main function that interpersonal markers perform is to express the author’s attitude and to achieve intimacy between him and the reader. Whereas fa ‘since, for, so, thus’ ‘aw ‘or,’ bal ‘rather, but rather,’ ’ay ‘anna ‘that is, līgā ‘hence, therefore,’ and min 탈라 ‘hence, therefore’ are examples of the members found in the textual markers category, la-qad ’al-bat-a al-wāqt-u ‘anna ‘reality has proven that,’ wa-lā yafūt-u-nā ‘we should not miss,’ ’a’taqid-u ‘anna ‘I think that,’ and lā rayb-a fī ‘anna ‘there is no doubt that, undoubtedly,’ represent the type of markers included in the interpersonal markers category.

The difference in the role performed by these two types of discourse markers has been recognized by many studies in the discourse markers’ literature, such as: Andersen’s (2001), Brinton’s (1996), Fraser’s (1996), Halliday’s (2004), Hasselgård’s (2004) and Östman’s (1995). “I came to the conclusion that discourse markers, what I call in this study pragmatic markers,” Brinton (1996) states, “can be defined, despite the variety of
forms included and the multitude of functions proposed, by two main functions, which fall into the categories that Halliday has termed ‘textual’ and ‘interpersonal’”(2).

However, for some researchers, like Blakemore (2002) and Fraser (1996), as mentioned before, only expressions that serve textual roles are regarded as discourse markers. Interpersonal expressions, however, are excluded from the discourse markers group because, Fraser (1996) argues, they do not mark a sequential discourse relationship whereas connectivity is a criterial characteristic for determining the discourse marker status of any element (391). Moreover, for Blakemore (2002) and Fraser (1996) who view discourse markers as being void of meaning, interpersonal expressions that encode conceptual meaning cannot be included in this group.

In this study, however, just as in Brinton’s (1996) study, the discourse markers group consists of both the textual and the interpersonal markers identified in the data. Interpersonal markers are considered part of this group because, in my view, they display all the features ascribed to discourse markers in the literature. On the one hand, although these items express conceptual meaning, the meaning they express, however, does not form part of the propositional content of their host sentences. This is evident in examples (21) and (22) above where the two expressions, lā rayb-a fī ‘anna ‘there is no doubt that, undoubtedly’ and al-ʿamr-u al-muṣf-r-u li-l-ʿiytimām-i ḫuwa ‘anna ‘interestingly,’ that occur at the head of their sentences are structurally and semantically detached from these sentences. Since the conceptual meaning that these interpersonal markers express is outside the sentences’ propositional core and structure, this meaning, does not affect the discourse marker status of these items. Besides, not only do these expressions reside
outside the sentences’ meaning and structure, just as textual markers do, but they also cluster with these textual markers at the onset of the sentences they introduce.

On the other hand, although connecting text units is not the function usually associated with interpersonal expressions, these expressions display another type of connectivity in text. While textual markers connect segments of text by marking the relationships between them, interpersonal markers establish relations that create connectivity between the participants in the communicative act, i.e. the writer, the reader and the text. Therefore, it is because of the discourse markers’ characteristics that the interpersonal expressions display that these expressions are regarded as part of the discourse markers’ group. However, since the type of connectivity created in text by these expressions is different from the one signaled by the textual markers, the members of the discourse markers group is divided, according to this difference in function, into two categories: the textual markers and the interpersonal markers.

It should be noted, however, that this difference between the textual and the interpersonal markers is not decisive. This is because the members of each category actually perform, as Brinton (1996) points out, a “two-fold” function in the textual and interpersonal domains simultaneously (39). The distinction between the two categories, however, is based on the predominant function that the members of each category serve. Therefore, although the main function of textual markers is to connect segments of text, these markers are at the same time important in signaling the author’s intentions and plans. All discourse markers, Andersen (2001) argues, express a degree of subjectivity
since their function is to convey the author’s intentions on how the message progresses (60).

On the other hand, interpersonal discourse markers that are predominantly associated with interactive and evaluative functions may also indicate relations between segments of texts. While the interpersonal marker it is clear that, for example, Siepmann (2005) argues, is an emphatic marker because it implies “certainty and emphasizes the force of the proposition;” it also signals that the proposition it introduces is inferred from the previous one (86). The following examples from the data of this study also illustrate this point:

(25)

[25a] Let us proceed with the rejection of the prevalent image in Arabic literature of the contradiction between secularism and religion in view of the fact that secularism emerged as an antithesis to the Church and an alternative to religion. [25b] (wa-min al-wāḏīk-i 'anna) It is evident that such a conception comes as a result of generalizing the French experience to the various other European contexts that differed in their experiences and which cannot be boiled down to this individual feature that was the outcome of the nature of the French Enlightenment experience. During this time, the situation in France had an anti-religion character, whereas the German enlightenment experience assumed one of religious reform, while the English enlightenment took on what was a reconciliation between political reform and religion.

146 Text 4, P 3, S 7, 8.
[26a] Meanwhile, American spying sources uncovered that China succeeded weeks before in testing an anti-satellite weapon. [26b] (wa-la šakk-a fi ‘anna) There is no doubt that, this unprecedented superiority made the US milieus panic.

The main role of the two interpersonal markers, wa-min al-wādhi-i ‘anna ‘it is evident that’ and wa-la šakk-a fi ‘anna ‘there is no doubt that, undoubtedly’ that introduce sentences [25b] and [26b] respectively is to express the authors’ attitude towards his message. It could be realized, however, that these two expressions may also indicate, though implicitly, how their propositions are related to the previous ones. Therefore, while the former seems to signal that the proposition following it is a justification for the previous proposition, there is an indication in the latter that the following proposition is an evaluation of the preceding situation.

In this study, however, only the predominant function of the discourse markers are taken into consideration. Once a discourse marker is classified according to its predominant function in text, as a textual or an interpersonal marker, no reference will be made to its other marginal role. While this is true for discourse markers that function at the local level of text, however, at the text’s global level, as will be discussed later, sometimes it becomes hard to draw the line between the textual and interpersonal functions of these expressions.
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5.2.4 Initiality

All discourse markers identified in the present study are sentence-initial items. The tendency of discourse markers to appear at the onset of their host sentences, as many discourse markers’ studies indicate, is one of the “most noticeable features” that the members of this group display (Lenk 1998, 51; see also Fraser 1996; Hansen 1997; Redeker 1991). Although some of these expressions, it has been argued, may occasionally appear in other positions in the sentence with functions similar to those they serve initially, it is the initial position of the sentence that these items favor; and therefore, it is the place where they are most likely found. Because discourse markers “are used to restrict the contextual interpretation of an utterance,” as Schourup (1999, 233) puts it, the sentence onset, which is a significant point for the organization of text structure, is the most appropriate place in which these expressions can fulfill their role.

The data in this study show that discourse markers not only favor the sentence initial position, but they also have a strong tendency to cluster at this place. Of 1276 text units introduced by discourse markers, 274 units start with multiple markers. While most of these multiple markers consist of a combination of two elements, like fa-maṭalan ‘since for instance’ and wa-kadālika ‘and furthermore,’ some of them include a cluster of three discourse markers, such as wa-‘alayhi ḍaʿtaqīd-u anna ‘and accordingly I think that.’ Clustering at the onset of the sentence is a characteristic of discourse markers that has been recognized by many studies in discourse markers literature. Whenever more than one of these items is present in the sentence, Schourup (1999) points out, they “frequently cluster at utterance onset” (233); and when they do, Hansen (1997) adds,
“there are at least some restrictions on their order of occurrence” (157). In English, Halliday’s (2004) study indicates, the most frequent order of the items that occupy the thematic slot, which is, as discussed before, the initial position of the sentence that is shared by the discourse markers and the topical Theme, is: textual-interpersonal-experiential.

This same order of the Thematic slot constituents that Halliday’s (2004) English data display is also realized in the Arabic data of this study. In this study, the data show that the Thematic slot typically starts with textual markers followed by interpersonal markers. This slot is then closed by the topical Theme, which is the first element in the sentence that has experiential function. Consider the following examples:

(27)

\[ \text{"لكن من الواضح أن"} (lākin min al-wāḏiḥ-i 'anna) \text{ سقف التوقعات كان عالياً من دول المنطقة وليبيا.} \]

(\textit{lākin min al-wāḏiḥ-i 'anna}) However, it is evident that the expectations of the regional states and Lebanon were high.

(28)

\[ \text{"لذا تبدو} (lidū tabdū) \text{ المكابرة الإيرانية الظاهرة، عبر التأكيد على مواصلة برنامج التخصص والتشديد على القدرات العسكرية، غير قادرة على احتواء بحث طهران عن مخرج سوء في العراق أو لبنان أو فلسطين، لعله يوقف الضغوط عليها أو يخففها إلى حين يستطيع التقاط الأنفاسها مجدداً.} \]

(\textit{lidū tabdū}) Therefore, it seems that the apparent Iranian defiance, reflected in its decision to resume uranium enrichment activities and exult its military capabilities cannot conceal Iran's search for a way out in Iraq,

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{148} Text 12, P 6, S 27.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{149} Text 28, P 4, S 8.}
Lebanon, or Palestine, hoping that this would eliminate or ease the pressures on it and give it an opportunity to catch its breath.

(29)

و عليه اعتقاد أن (wa-'alayhi 'a'taqid-u 'anna) Therefore, I think that the Saudis are not playing with fire.

As the above examples demonstrate, the constituents of the Thematic slot follow the textual-interpersonal-experiential order. In examples (27) and (28), the topical Themes saqf-a al-tawaqqūt-i ‘the expectations’ and al-mukābarat-u al-'irānīyyat-u al-zāhiriyat-u ‘the apparent Iranian defiance’ are preceded by the two-element multiple markers lākin min al-wādiḥ-i 'anna ‘however, it is evident that’ and liḏā tabdū ‘therefore it seems that’ respectively. Both of these two multiple markers start with textual markers lākin ‘however, but’ and liḏā ‘thus, therefore’ followed by interpersonal markers min al-wādiḥ-i 'anna ‘it is evident that’ and tabdū ‘it seems that.’ The Thematic slot constituents in example (29) also show a similar order. In this example, the three-element multiple marker wa-‘alayhi 'a'taqid-u 'anna ‘and therefore I think that,’ which consists of two textual markers wa ‘and’ and 'alayhi ‘thus, therefore in addition to an interpersonal one 'a'taqid-u 'anna ‘I think that,’ is followed by the first experiential element in the sentence, i.e. al-su’ūdiyy-ūnā ‘the Saudis.’

Members of the textual markers group that cluster at the onset of the sentence, on the other hand, are, also restricted by a typical order. According to the data examined in

150 Text 12, P 4, S 15.
this study, this order is based on the structural form of these elements. The textual markers, therefore, are combine in the following order: coordinating conjunctions, e.g. wa ‘and,’ fa ‘then,’ and bal ‘rather, but rather,’ particles, e.g. ‘ay ‘that is, in other words,’ ‘inna ‘certainly, indeed,’ lākin(na) ‘however, but,’ and bāttā ‘even,’ adverbials, e.g. hākadh ‘thus, and so,’ aylān ‘also,’ and maṣalan ‘for instance.’ Here are some examples that illustrate the order in which textual markers cluster:

(30)

\[fa-
\text{maṣalan} (~f-	ext{-matālān})\]

\(\text{fa-matālān}\) An example is women in Palestinian society, both in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

(31)

\[lākin(na) min jihat-in’ulgrā\]

(lākinna min jihat-in’ulgrā) But on the other hand, it provides the US administration with a compromise between its internal need to demonstrate a larger measure of response to the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, which called for an international conference on Iraq and for a direct dialogue with Tehran and Damascus, and its external desire not to demonstrate any flexibility toward parties that might interpret this flexibility as a weakness on its part which is then applied to other pending issues.

\[\text{Text 2, P 6, S 23.}\]

\[\text{Text 21, P 1, S 4.}\]
(32)

Even Likudniks, who had always maintained that, as far as Israel was concerned, nothing good would ever come out of Saudi Arabia, praised the Mecca agreement between Hamas and Fatah and expressed support for the “Peace Plan” promoted by Riyadh.

When more than one textual marker are combined together, as the above examples show, it is the form of the marker that determines its position in the cluster. Therefore, markers that are derived from coordinating conjunctions, such as wa ‘and’ and fa ‘since, for’ in examples (30) and (32), are placed first. These are followed by markers whose original forms are particles, like hattā ‘even’ in example (32). Then, as it is evident from examples (30) and (31) markers with adverbial origins, i.e. maṭalan ‘for instance and min jihat-in'ugrā ‘on the other hand,’ are positioned at the end of the textual markers cluster.

It has been noticed, however, that the textual-interpersonal-experiential order that the constitutions of the Thematic slot in Arabic normally follow may be altered in certain situations. This happens when the topical Theme, i.e. the experiential element in the thematic slot, is framed between two discourse markers. This linguistic phenomenon associated with the cluster of markers in Arabic, therefore, is actually a deviation, as mentioned previously, from Halliday’s (2004) description of the thematic slot where all

\[153 \text{Text 24, P 2, S 3, 4.} \]
the markers precede the topical Theme. The following examples illustrate this framing phenomenon:

(33) 

أما البشر فهم (ammā...fa)  

(ammā...fa) As for human beings, they can merely make individual efforts and judgments.

(34) 

لكن طهران في الوقت نفسه (lākinna ... fī al-waqt-i nafs-i-hi)  

(lākinna ... fī al-waqt-i nafs-i-hi) However, Tehran has at the same time established relations with the parties involved in the region's hot crises, namely Iraq, Palestine, and Lebanon.

(35) 

وفي الحالة العراقية علينا الاعتراف أن (wa... ‘alay-nā al-‘ītirāf-u ‘anna)  

(wa... ‘alay-nā al-‘ītirāf-u ‘anna) As for the Iraqi issue, we must admit that most Arab capitals have adopted one of two "strange" positions.

(36) 

وهي بالتأكيد (wa ...bi-l-ta’kīd-i)  

(Ala’ī: Text 17, P 9, S 46.  

Ala’ī: Text 26, P 1, S 4.  

Ala’ī: Text 11, P 4, S 8.  

Ala’ī: Text 17, P 10, S 44.
This will undoubtedly cause the eruption of conflicts that are more serious than any of the others that the world had ever witnessed.

The above examples show that the topical Theme may be framed between either two textual markers or a textual and an interpersonal marker. In examples (33) and (34), the topical Themes, i.e. al-baṣar-u ‘human beings’ and ẓahrān-a ‘Tehran,’ are placed between ‘ammā...fa ‘as for’ and lākinna...fī al-waqt-i nafs-i-hi ‘however...at the same time’ respectively. The topical Themes, i.e. fī al-ḥālat-i al-‘irāqiyyat-i ‘the Iraqi issue’ and hiya ‘it,’ in examples (35) and (36), however, are positioned between wa...‘alay-nā al-‘īṭirāf-u ‘anna) ‘and...we must admit that’ and wa...bi-l-ta’kād-i ‘and...undoubtedly’ respectively. This means that this linguistic phenomenon only changes the position of the experiential element whereas the textual-interpersonal order of the discourse markers remains the same.

It is clear from examples (33) to (36) that setting the topical Theme apart from the rest of the sentence by means of two markers framing it is a linguistic technique that is used to highlight the framed element and to put it in focus. Because of the role that the markers preceding the framed topical Themes serve in focusing these experiential elements, Kammensjö (2005) refers to such markers as “topicalizers” (156). The closing markers, on the other hand, which are placed directly after the topical Themes, and closing thereby the thematic slot, are considered “demarcation devices” because they mark the boundary between the Theme and the Rheme (Kammensjö 2005, 156; see also Kinberg 2001, 44; Ryding 2005, 68). The data in this study show that the most frequent markers used as topicalizers in the framing structure are: wa ‘and,’ fa ‘since, for’ and
‘ammā ‘as for,’ whereas the most frequent markers that function in this structure as closers for the thematic slot are the two textual markers: fa and ʿaydan ‘also.’

It has been realized, however, that the experiential topical Themes are not the only elements that may be framed by discourse markers at the onset of the sentence. Rather, a textual or an interpersonal discourse marker may also be framed by positioning it between two textual markers. In this case, the framing phenomenon has the effect of separating the pre-topical items, i.e. the discourse markers, from the structure of the sentence they introduce (Blue 1977, 5). This phenomenon could be noticed in the following examples:

(37)

(38)

(37)  

(38)  

158 Text 6, P 6, S 25.  

159 Text 29, P 6, S 29.  
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Morillon assured the people of the town of Srebrenica that there is nothing left to fear.

(39) (wa-najid-u fi al-waqt-i ḏāt-i-hi) Yet at the same time, we find the Muslim Brotherhood voting against women’s rights in the Kuwaiti parliament.

(40) (wa-lisū‘ī al-ḥaẓẓ-i fa-‘īnna) It is also unfortunate that sit-ins, demonstrations, and political uncertainty are directly contributing to the economic collapse; either in the form of warding off Arab tourists in the holiday season, or through paralyzing the economic activities in the country’s commercial center, where most of these economic activities take place.

In examples (37) and (38), each of the two textual markers ‘alayhi ‘thus, therefore’ and ma‘a ḏālika ‘despite that’ is framed between the two textual markers wa and fa. On the other hand, the two interpersonal markers najid-u ‘we find’ and lisū‘i al-ḥaẓẓ-i fa-‘īnna ‘it is unfortunate’ in examples (39) and (40) are positioned between wa... fi al-waqt-i ḏāt-i-hi ‘and yet at the same time’ and wa... fa-‘īnna ‘and...that’ respectively. In the data, however, we found three occurrences of discourse markers cluster, such as al-marjuww-u ‘idan ‘an ‘what is hoped for therefore,’ which, although similar to the framed structures, are missing the topicalizer marker. This results, as can be seen, in a discourse

---

160 Text 10, P 3, S 20.
161 Text 31, P 5, S 11.
markers cluster in which the interpersonal precedes the textual. This order, however, is not found in any other clustered markers.

One more thing that should be pointed out regarding the discourse markers cluster is the fact that this procedure is only structural. While markers are combined structurally at the initial position of the sentence, the different markers within this combination seem to function independently. Multiple markers, Hasselgård (2004) points out, “can potentially mark several discourse relations at the same time” (65). The only exception found in the data is when the *fa* closes the framed structure. In this case, *fa* does not signal any intersentential relation but rather functions merely as a boundary marker that separates either the Thematic slot or the discourse markers from the rest of the sentence.

5.3 Functional Classifications

While the previous section provides a general overview of the group of discourse markers that are identified in the present study, this section presents a description of the functions served by the members of this group. To this effect, a functional classification of the frequent discourse markers identified in newspaper opinion articles is suggested.

Therefore, after associating discourse markers with the functional relations that are realized in the environment in which they occur, items that are found to perform similar functions are grouped under one functional category. Discourse markers that are found to perform more than one function, however, are categorized according to their predominant function. Members of each functional category are then described in terms of their frequency, the relations that they signal, and the information in their environment.
that is relevant to their function. Because these categories are based on the functions served by discourse markers at the text level, neither the structural forms of these markers nor their grammatical description given in grammar references are discussed here. This kind of information is provided only if it is essential for explaining the textual role of these discourse markers.

However, when classifying discourse markers according to their function in text, it is important that the distribution of these items in relation to the different text levels be taken into consideration. This is because the scope of discourse markers functions is determined by this distribution. The following section, therefore, describes discourse markers that are identified at each of the two levels of text structure, i.e. the sentence and the paragraph, independently. Because of its special status, however, the discourse marker *wa* ‘and,’ is excepted from this distinction, and hence is treated at the beginning of the section as being a local-global discourse marker. After describing the function of *wa,* the section goes on to describe the functions of the discourse markers that occur at the local level of text structure, and then to examine the functions served by discourse markers at the text’s global level.

Two things should be borne in mind, however, regarding the functions and classifications suggested for discourse markers in the present study. The first thing concerns the inevitable subjectivity of this process. Like any study based on discourse analysis, this study cannot escape a degree of subjectivity. Although the functional description presented and the classification proposed in this study result from an analytical process that is based on a well established theoretical background, they are
inevitably influenced by the analyst’s semantic-pragmatic interpretation of the texts. The idea that such judgments “can be done totally objectively, i.e. without the interference of personal interpretation,” Kammensjö (2005) points out, “is a deception” (107). This is because the analyst’s culture, language, personal world-view, and experience are always present in this process influencing his cognitive interpretation of the analyzed material.

The other thing that needs to be taken into consideration is the fact that genre, text-type, and individual style of the authors are factors that may affect the choice and frequency of discourse markers in any text (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001, 12). If they are not controlled, these factors, may pose problems for the findings of the analysis of any study of discourse markers. In the present study, however, all the texts examined are chosen from one specific genre, i.e. newspaper opinion articles, and from one specific type, i.e. argumentative text-type, in order to eliminate the impact of these two factors on the accuracy of the findings of the study. The discourse markers identified and described in this study, therefore, are the discourse markers that are usually used in this particular genre, i.e. newspaper opinion article, and this particular text-type, i.e. argumentative text-type.

On the other hand, the study also tries to eliminate the impact of the writers’ individual styles on the outcome of the analysis by examining articles that are written by 28 different writers. Examining different styles makes it possible to differentiate between the norm and the individual usage of these items. Therefore, discourse markers that occur
less than three times in the data\textsuperscript{162} are not included in the group of discourse markers in this study. As a reference for future research, however, they are listed in the final section of this chapter.

5.3.1 The Discourse Marker of Continuity: \textit{wa}

The analysis of the data shows that \textit{wa} ‘and’ is a discourse marker with a special status. On the one hand, \textit{wa} is indisputably of the highest frequency of all discourse markers in the data. About 45\% of all the texts boundaries and 57\% of the boundaries that start with discourse markers are introduced by \textit{wa}. Out of its 727 occurrences, \textit{wa} occurs 530 times alone and 197 times combined with other discourse markers. On the other hand, unlike other discourse markers in the data, \textit{wa} frequently appears at both sentence and paragraph boundaries. Six hundred forty eight sentences and 79 paragraphs in the data are introduced with this discourse marker. Although other discourse markers, such as \textit{fa} ‘since, for, so, thus,’ \textit{inna} ‘certainly, indeed,’ and \textit{‘ammā...fa} ‘as for,’ are also found to introduce both sentence and paragraph in the data, these markers, however, usually display a preference to occur either locally or globally as will be discussed later. This is why \textit{wa} is the only discourse marker that is regarded as a local-global discourse marker.

Moreover, not only does \textit{wa} frequently occur at the onset of sentences and paragraphs, but its occurrences are also associated with various functional relations at

\textsuperscript{162} Discourse markers that appear less than three times in the data are mostly the expressions preferred by one author. In some cases, however, the two occurrences of a discourse marker in the data are used by two different authors. What is interesting in these cases is that the two authors that use the same low frequent discourse marker write in the same newspaper.
both levels. Here are some examples that illustrate some of the relations associated with
wa at the sentence level:

(41)

[41a] First, however, it must be mentioned that the claim that Jewish and
Christian fundamentalism have been tamed within democratic systems is
a false allegation.[41b] (wa) Violent events that have erupted and shaken
the world in recent years contain enough evidence to negate the
aforementioned premise.

(42)

[42a] As the main source of the authority of the state
is the ethical codes of the religion, where the Christian and Jewish
leaders are independent from the state.[42b] (wa) Neither the Islamic value system nor Islamic
legislation call for a religious state.

(43)

[43a] A few days ago, Agence France-Presse (AFP) quoted Egyptian
Islamist Nabih al Wahsh demanding the imposition of the ‘hirabah’
penalty on Egyptian media figure, Hala Sarhan, whom he accused of
fabricating an episode of her television talk show that dealt with

---

163 Text 5, P 6, S 14, 15.
164 Text 5, P 9, S 26, 27.
165 Text 1, P1, S 1, 2.
prostitution. [43b] (wa) The penalty that Mr. al Wahsh demanded to be applied was cross amputation, i.e. severing the right hand and the left foot, followed by crucifixion.

[44a] Revolutionary Iran will confront its historical dilemma if it does not transform into Iran the state. [44b] (wa) This is a matter that requires a sound understanding of oneself and of others, an understanding of the regional and international balances of power, a great deal of modesty and dismissing the belief that the world’s complicated problems can be solved using ideological wars.

[45a] As for The current rebellion that has broken out in Yemen’s Saada province, it is led by Abd al Malik al Houthi, [45b] the son of Badr al Din al Houthi who led the second revolt.[45c] (wa) However, the manifestations of this crisis seem to be very different from the ones that preceded it.

As the above examples show, wa may introduce sentences that perform different functions in text. In sentences [41b], [42b], [43b], [44b], [45b], and [45c], wa, correlates with the functional relations evidence, reason, background, enablement, background, and antithesis respectively. These relations, however, are only some of the functional relations that are found to correlate with sentence-initial wa in the data. The great number

---

166 Text 9, P5, S 21, 22.
167 Text 7, P 3, S 7- 9.
of functions performed by sentences introduced by this discourse marker indicates that it is not actually the wa that is signaling these relations between segments. Rather, it is the meaning of the two propositions, as Cantarino (1975) points out, that “reveals” the actual nature of the connection (3:39). What wa is doing here, however, is signaling the continuity of the flow of ideas in the texts “without implying any closer, more logical relationships” (11).

On the other hand, the analysis shows that the discourse marker wa also introduces paragraphs serving different roles at the global level of texts. Consider, for instance, the two following examples:

(46)

[P1] Media outlets have only served to reinforce this celebratory trend through their neglect of the signs pointing towards the deteriorated circumstances that confront women. In times of crises, indeed, women are the first to be victimized. They are the recipients of both direct and indirect consequences of these crises. Women are raped when a group seeks to avenge itself on another. It is they who are subjected to violence in our patriarchal social system. The figures confirm these facts on every level on a global scale.

168 Tex 2, P 5, 6, S 16-27.
However, so as to avoid overgeneralizations let us focus on a particular case. An example is women in Palestinian society, both in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Figures reveal a massive rise in violence against women whether within or outside their families. It is violence that sometimes can lead to death; something the Palestinian Authority has admitted its failure to remedy as a situation. Although it is certainly a critical issue that is on a steady escalation, still, it has failed to occupy relevant space in media and press coverage.

Today in the United States, attention has been directed towards a new American comedy series entitled "The Axis of Evil Comedy Tour Special." As apparent from the title, the series satirizes the so-called fight against terror or the axis of evil, as defined by the Bush administration in the post-9/11 era. A group of actors of Muslim background had set up a team of comedians, naming themselves "the axis of evil," and held shows in NY, attracting an American audience of non-Middle Eastern descent. According to Dean Abdallah, a comedian of Arab descent, the American audience wants to hear jokes about the news. This tendency to mock the news seems to be a way to vent anger that has been maximized by false or exaggerated news aired and

169 Text 3, P 4, 5, S 8- 17.
exploited by several American channels, which has contributed significantly to Arabphobia and Islamophobia.

[P2] (wa) American interest and the West in general in this type of comedy stems from the ability of these kinds of shows to reduce tension between the two cultures where clash has taken a violent turn. Some optimists have not hesitated to consider this comical approach to the clash between Islam and the West a gateway to dialogue between immigrant minorities and the West, unless conflict and violence are considered one mode of communication.

In the above examples, (46) and (47), wa appears at the onset of two paragraphs that have two different roles in the text organizational structure. While [P2] in example (46) functions as a substantiation that supports the author’s argument, [P2] in example (47), is an evaluation of the support laid in the paragraph preceding it. The occurrence of wa at the onset of these two paragraphs, however, though it correlates with two different textual functions, is an indication of one thing, i.e. the continuation of an ongoing idea.

In example (46), the support presented in [P2] does not introduce a totally new idea that is different from the one presented in [P1], but rather refocuses the reader’s attention to one aspect of the same idea. Likewise, because [P2] in example (47) operates as an evaluation of the idea presented in [P1], the break between the two paragraphs is not complete. In both examples, therefore, wa is the device that makes the continuity of the same idea possible despite the existence of a paragraph boundary. wa appears between two chunks of texts, Cantarino (1975) points out, when the division “is not intended as a complete break” in the ongoing idea (19).

The correlation between wa and the different types of local and global functional relations, therefore, does not indicate that this discourse marker has the widest variety of
functions. Rather, it suggests that *wa* functions as a discourse marker that indicates continuity of ideas and hence maintains the flow of the text. At the sentence, paragraph and discourse levels, al-Batal (1990) points out, *wa* indicates “that the argument or discussion is still ongoing with no major breaks” (246). Since this textual function that *wa* performs in Arabic is not usually found in other languages, when translating into other languages such as English, this continuity marker is often omitted, Khalil (2000, 142) adds.

An indication of the continuity function of *wa* at the text level is the tendency this discourse marker shows to cluster with some discourse markers more than others. It has been noticed in the data of this study that, although *wa* may combine with all types of discourse markers, it, however, prefers inferential/resultative discourse markers, i.e. that denote result such as *min ḥamma* ‘thus, therefore,’ over explanatory discourse markers, such as *ʿay anna* ‘that is’ or contrastive discourse markers, such as *gayra anna* ‘however, but.’ This tendency is actually consistent with the role of *wa* as a marker of continuity in text. In the inferential process, where one idea emerges from another, there is a move in the flow of text, and thus the environment calls for *wa*. However, explanatory discourse markers, which expand a preceding idea, indicate that there is a stop at that particular point of text that they are expanding. Contrastive discourse markers, on the other hand, mark a return to a previous point in the text in order to interpret the coming point. These two environments, therefore, are not favored by the continuity marker *wa*.

Another indication that *wa* functions mainly as a continuity marker at the discourse level is the fact that this discourse marker rarely introduces paragraphs that
serve as conclusions. The data analysis shows that only two of the 79 paragraph-initial occurrences of *wa* introduce concluding paragraphs. As the final stage in the texts’ organizational structure, the conclusion is usually clearly marked off from the rest of the text in order to highlight the last thoughts of the author. The role of *wa* is to smooth transition between stages of text structure. Thus, the conclusion is not a point of the text where it commonly occurs.

While signaling continuity in text is the dominant function of the discourse marker *wa*, this marker may also serve a more specific function as an additive discourse marker. Signaling continuity in text is a more general function than indicating that one segment is adding new information to a previous segment. This is because continuity is concerned with the flow or break of ideas in the text regardless of the type of relationships between text segments. Although continuity is sensitive to these relations, e.g. a resultative relation indicates continuity more than the interpretation relation, it is, however not tied to any specific relation. The additive function, on the other hand, as will be seen, usually correlates with the elaboration relation which indicates that one segment of text is adding new information to a preceding segment. The data analysis shows that out of the 727 occurrences of *wa* that are associated with all possible sorts of functional relations, 36% of them correlate specifically with the elaboration relation. It is worth mentioning here that Kammensjö’s study (2005) also finds that 37% of the uses of *wa* in her data “are purely additive” (185).

It has been noticed, however, that *wa* usually performs an additive function when the sentences it connects form a unified whole that serves to support or describe a
previous idea. These sentences that are loosely connected by *wa*, i.e. with no particular logical or hierarchical organization, relate either to a previous proposition in the same paragraph or to a previous paragraph in the text. Here are two examples to illustrate this additive function of *wa*:

(48)

[48a] Media outlets have only served to reinforce this celebratory trend through their neglect of the signs pointing towards the deteriorated circumstances that confront women. [48b] In times of crises, indeed, women are the first to be victimized. [48c] They are the recipients of both direct and indirect consequences of these crises. [48d] Women are raped when a group seeks to avenge itself on another. [48e] It is they who are subjected to violence in our patriarchal social system. [48f] The figures confirm these facts on every level on a global scale.

(49)

[49a] German Nazism tested the ideology of the German race versus all other races. [49b] It believed in the superiority of one race over all others. [49c] The same is true of fascism. [49d] International Islamic extremism also put forth the two-camp idea, the eternal battle between
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171 Text 9, P 3, S 5–12.
faith and disbelief, and the necessity that Islam defeats all other
religions, vanquishing them until God inherits the earth and everyone on
it. [49e] Thus came the 9/11 tragedy. [49f] Innocent Muslims from
Sanaa to Riyadh and Baghdad were killed. [49g] Zionism proposed the
idea of God’s chosen people versus all the other peoples of the world.
[49h] Saddam Hussein promoted the racist ideology of Arabism over the
so-called ‘Persian Magi.’

In example (48), sentences [48b] to [48f] form a unified whole that provides
evidence to support the claim in sentence [48a]. *wa* serves here to signal that each of
these propositions elaborates on the previous one in order to create a complete supporting
idea. Sentences [49a] to [49h] in example (49), however, form a paragraph that functions
as a whole to support the author’s claim in the previous paragraph. In order to support his
claim, i.e. that the Iranians’ discourse will fail, the author provides several examples of
failed regimes in history that used the same type of discourse. These examples are
connected by the additive *wa* because each of them represents a piece of information that
is added to form the evidence as a whole. *wa*, therefore, as Holes (1995) puts it, “acts as a
neutral link” between pieces of new information (220).

5.3.2 Discourse Markers at the Local Level

The analysis of the data in this study shows that about 85% of sentence
boundaries are introduced by discourse markers. In this section, discourse markers that
appear at the local level of texts are classified and their functions are described. As
mentioned earlier, there are two different types of discourse markers, i.e. textual and
interpersonal discourse markers. These two general categories of discourse markers
signal two different types of relations in text. Therefore, in this section, the study suggests
different functional classifications for the members of each of these distinct categories at the local level of text.

**a- Textual Discourse Markers at the Local Level**

Textual discourse markers, as has been discussed earlier, predominantly signal functional relations between segments of text structure. Since this section focuses on local textual discourse markers, it is concerned only with functional relations that are identified between sentences. Based on the type of relations that they signal between sentences, local textual discourse markers in the data of this study are classified as follows: additive discourse markers, contrastive discourse markers, explanatory discourse markers, inferential discourse markers, sequential discourse markers, alternative discourse markers, exceptive discourse markers, and background discourse markers.\(^{172}\)

**1- Additive Discourse Markers**

Discourse markers that are included in this category are those that correlate with elaboration functional relation. This relation indicates that one sentence adds new information to the previous sentence. It should be pointed out, however, that *wa* is not listed under this category because discourse markers in this study, as mentioned before, are categorized according to their dominant function. Although *wa* serves as an additive marker, its dominant function is to signal continuity in text. The following table shows

\(^{172}\) Most of these classifications are adopted from the names of the relations that are commonly used in text linguistics literature.
the additive markers found in the data, their meaning(s), their frequency and the type of relationship(s) they encode:

Table 5.1. Additive Discourse Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أيضاً</td>
<td>ʿaydan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كما/ كما أنَّ</td>
<td>kamā/kamā ʿanna</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إضافة إلى/ أضاف إلى ذلك أنَّ (آن)</td>
<td>ʿidāfatan ʿilā/ ʿadīf ʿilā ẓālika ʿanna/yudīf-u ʿilā ẓālika (ʿanna)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فضلاً عن أنَّ</td>
<td>faʾllanʿan ʿanna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حتى</td>
<td>ḥattā</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emphatic elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كذلك</td>
<td>kadālika</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 5.1. shows, among the predominantly additive discourse markers found in the data, ʿaydan ‘also’ is the most frequent one. This discourse marker never occurs alone in the data, and only in three of its 18 occurrences does it not form part of a framing structure. In the 15 framing structures of which ʿaydan is part, however, it functions as a closer, i.e. the marker that closes the thematic slot. The topicalizers of these structures are either wa ‘and,’ 11 times, e.g. see example (50), lākin(na) ‘however, but,’ 3 times, e.g.
lākinna al-sahih-a 'aydan \textsuperscript{173} ‘but what is true also,’ and bal ‘rather, but rather,’ one time, e.g. bal yaqta 'aydan\textsuperscript{174} ‘but rather it requires also.’ Here is an example where 'aydan is used twice clustering with wa, one time precede directly by the wa while in the second time framing a verbal clause with the wa.

\[(50)\]

[50a] \textit{(wa-‘aydan)} Also at that time, there were frequent anti-Shia fatwas issued by the chief religious leaders in “Istanbul” and other cities depending on how hot or cold the confrontation was between the Sultan and Shah. [50b] \textit{(wa...‘aydan)} Al Wardi also mentions that during a truce, a fatwa was issued in Istanbul using friendly language about the Shia.

Another additive discourse marker in the data is kamā ‘likewise, furthermore.’ Because eight of the 16 occurrences of kamā are accompanied with ‘anna, kamā ‘anna is considered a variant of this discourse marker. ‘anna is a complementizer, Holes (1995) points out, that is equivalent in its function to ‘that’ in English (226). Placing ‘anna, after the discourse marker kamā makes it possible for this marker to precede a noun or a pronoun, as in example (51). Otherwise, kamā can only introduce a verb phrase.\textsuperscript{176}

Notice the additive function of kamā ‘anna in example (51) where it signals that sentence [51b] is adding new information or details to sentence [51a].

\textsuperscript{173} Text 41, P 3, 16.
\textsuperscript{174} Text 6, P 4, S 16.
\textsuperscript{175} Text 25, P 9, S 50, 51.
\textsuperscript{176} “The expression kamā, Ryding (2005) indicates, “is normally followed directly by a verb” (374).
These two discourse markers not only appear at the onset of sentences, but they also introduce paragraphs. Each of them occurs twice at the global level. While the latter has only one form in the data, the former has two other variants: faḍlan ‘an ‘anna (kamā ‘anna). Furthermore, Muslim minorities in China, who are suffering from political, economic, and legal abuses, also need support in their issues.

‘idāfatan ‘ilā ‘in addition (to), moreover,’ and faḍlan ‘an ‘anna ‘besides,’ are also additive discourse markers that are associated with the elaboration functional relation in the data. These two discourse markers not only appear at the onset of sentences, but they also introduce paragraphs. Each of them occurs twice at the global level. While the latter has only one form in the data, the former has two other variants: ‘adif ‘ilā dālika ‘anna and yuḍa‘-u ‘ilā dālika (‘anna). However, of the three variants of this discourse marker, ‘idāfatan ‘ilā, which occurs four times, is the most frequent one. Here are two examples illustrating the additive function of the two discourse markers, i.e. ‘idāfatan ‘ilā and faḍlan ‘an ‘anna.

[51a] China, where Islam arrived 14 centuries ago, and where there are more than 30,000 mosques for 30 million Chinese Muslims, considers that it is beneficial for it to establish relations with extremely economically and religiously powerful Arab and Islamic countries. [51b] (kamā ‘anna) Furthermore, Muslim minorities in China, who are suffering from political, economic, and legal abuses, also need support in their issues.
In addition, during his Eid al-Adha speech, Yemeni President Ali Abdullah Saleh has expressed the same desire by sending signs of support to the decision of the GCC summit that calls for the setting up a joint Gulf program in the field of peaceful nuclear energy.

[53a] However, there is no doubt that the current Saudi policy began to sense the danger of what was happening to its internal security. [53b] Hence, Saudi changed its strategy and tools. [53c] (faḍlan ‘an ‘anna) Besides, it also relinquished a great deal of its nature that is inclined to waiting and using the factor of time to find solutions to problems.

Elaboration relation has also been found to correlate with two other discourse markers in the data, i.e. kaḏālika ‘likewise, furthermore,’ and bāṭā ‘even.’ While none of the occurrences of kamā ‘likewise, furthermore,’ ‘idāfatan ‘ilā ‘in addition (to), moreover,’ and faḍlan ‘an ‘anna ‘besides’ is accompanied with wa ‘and’, the data show that kaḏālika and bāṭā do cluster with wa in some of their occurrences.

What distinguishes bāṭā, however, from the other additive discourse markers in the data is the emphasis it places on the information added by the proposition it introduces. This marker may have developed this emphatic effect from the basic form from which it derives. The intersentential original form of bāṭā, Cantarino (1975) indicates, has empathic meaning that is “used to amplify the validity of the verbal action in the main clause: “to the point of . . .,” “to such an extent that . . .” (3: 93). It should be

179 Text 37, P 4, S 23-25.
noted that all the six occurrences of *hattā*, the five times sentence-initial and one time paragraph-initial, are followed by nouns. While example (54) illustrates the emphatic additive function of this discourse marker, the function of *kadālika* as an additive discourse marker could be seen in example (7) above.

(54)

[54a] The conduct of Halliburton led one American country musician to record an album naming it 'Halliburton Boardroom Massacre.'[54b] This album consists of songs named after the company's violations, members of the board of directors, and their American politician accomplices.[54c] (*hattā*): Even bumper stickers appearing on cars took part in the anti-Halliburton theme.

2- **Contrastive Discourse Markers**

This functional category comprises of five subcategories of discourse markers: contrastive/concessive discourse markers, contrastive/argumentative discourse markers, contrastive/affirmative discourse markers, contrastive/additive discourse markers, and contrastive/comparative discourse markers. Under these subcategories fall discourse markers that are associated with the following functional relations: 181 concession, otherwise, affirmation, contrast, and comparison. Although these discourse markers

---

180 Text 8, P 3, S 17-19.

181 For the list of relations introduced by Mann and Thompson (1988) see chapter three.
signal different types of functional relations, all the relations they signal have one similar feature: that they establish some kind of contrast between the two propositions that they connect. However, because the contrastive meaning that these relations establish is expressed in different ways, it produces different effects. The following Table lists contrastive discourse markers that are found in the data along with the relations that they signal.

**Table 5.2. Contrastive Discourse Markers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لكنُ / لكنٌ</td>
<td>lākin/ lākinna</td>
<td>However, but</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إلا أنْ</td>
<td>'illā 'anna</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غير أنْ</td>
<td>gayra ‘anna</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بيد أنْ</td>
<td>bayda ‘anna</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و إلا ف</td>
<td>wa-‘illā fa</td>
<td>Otherwise, or else</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| بل / لا بل  
بل إنْ | ballā ball bal 'inna   | Rather, but rather | 16                  | Affirmation         |
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Table 5.2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ف...أ</td>
<td>'ammā...fa</td>
<td>As for</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afii62828/afii62765/ ذا /afii62767/afii62811/afii62829/afii62817</td>
<td>/afii62828/afii62785/afii62809/afii62823 /afii62767/afii62811/afii62829/afii62817</td>
<td>Meanwhile, at the same time</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concessive discourse markers form one subcategory of the contrastive discourse markers functional category. Discourse markers that are included in this class, i.e. lākin/lākinna, ʾillā ʾanna, ḡayra ʾanna and bayda ʾanna all meaning 'however, but,' correlate with the concession functional relation. This relation means that a proposition contrasts with a previous proposition in some way without terminating the truth of this previous proposition. In this relation, the writer first introduces a proposition upon which there is agreement between him and his opponent. Then, in the second proposition he presents the idea that he adopts which contrasts with but does not eliminate the truth of the first one. This strategy has the effect of emphasizing the second proposition since it presents this proposition as being the more valid one in contrast with the first proposition. Consider for instance the following example:
(55)

Every human being has the right to think in the manner that best suits him. But no one has the right to control society and the state and forcefully impose his opinion on people in the name of religion, race or doctrinal belief under the assumption that mankind is engaged in a permanent war of religions, beliefs, and races.

In example (55), the writer admits the truth of the proposition presented in sentence [55a], but then introduces proposition [55b], which contrasts with the previous one, as having more validity. The concession relation between the two sentences is signaled here by the discourse marker lākin. This type of discourse markers, as Spemann (2005) puts it, alerts “readers to a reversal in perspective or result despite an adverse or promising condition which was mentioned or implied in the previous discourse” (89). Concessive discourse markers, the data show, are always preceded by declarative statements like the one presented in sentence [55a]. This is because the first propositions in the concession relation usually express agreement. These declarative statements, however, it has been noticed, range from expressing probability to making strong assertions. yabdu ‘anna ‘it seems that,’ sabih-un ‘anna ‘it is true that,’ la-qad (tajowaz-at) ‘certainly (it exceeded)’ la rayb-a fi ‘anna ‘there is no doubt that’ undoubtedly’ are examples of such statements.

182 Text 9, P 4, S 14, 15.
Among the four concessive discourse markers found in the data, lākin/lākinna is the most frequent one. lākin/lākinna appears at the onset of 64 sentences and six paragraphs. Out of the 70 occurrences of this discourse marker in the data, lākin occurs 25 times while lākinna occurs 45 times. The use of either of the two variants of this discourse marker is determined by the structure of the following sentence. This structure, however, seems to be based merely on stylistic reasons. The data show that lākin can be followed by verbs, preposed adverbial clauses, and nouns, whereas lākinna can only precede nouns and pronouns.

While none of the three concessive discourse markers, ʿillā ʿanna, gayra ʿanna and bayda ʿanna occur with wa in the data (see table 5.2. above), 30 occurrences of lākin/lākinna are preceded by wa. The use of wa with lākin/lākinna, as Kammensjö (2005) suggests, seems to be a matter of style. lākin/lākinna is also the only concessive discourse marker that clusters with discourse markers other than the wa; ʿaydal ʿalso,’ fi al-waqt-i nafṣ-i-hi ‘meanwhile,’ laʿalla ‘perhaps’ are some of the discourse markers that lākin/lākinna is found to precede.

The contrastive/argumentative discourse marker wa-ʿillā fa ‘otherwise, or else’ that is associated with the otherwise functional relation also has the effect of emphasizing a proposition by means of contrasting it with another proposition. However, while concessive discourse markers signal contrast that increases the validity of the second proposition, the contrast signaled by the contrastive/argumentative discourse marker wa-ʿillā fa places the emphasis on the first proposition. When two sentences are connected by wa-ʿillā fa, the content of the first is emphasized by presenting the negative consequences
of the contrastive or adversative situation in the second sentence. It is because of this contrastive and argumentative nature of the function served by *wa-ʾillā fa* that this discourse marker is called contrastive/argumentative marker. The structure of the discourse marker, *wa-ʾillā fa*, it should be noted, consists of the three words: *wa*, ʾ*illā*, and *fa*, because this is how it appears in all its occurrences in the data. Here are two examples to illustrate the function of this discourse marker:

(56)

[56a] Democracy is no longer, it is believed, one of the choices as was the case until very recently, but has rather become something of an inevitability if the state and society seek to join a world that has transformed into a single entity with shared values and consistent visions. [56b] (*wa-ʾillā fa*) Otherwise there would be isolation.

(57)

[57a] In most cases, it is the political factor that is behind the clashes and conflicts of religious character. [57b] (*wa-ʾillā fa*) Otherwise, how else could one explain the convergence between the “Sunni” Hamas movement and the “Khomeini” regime of Iran.
It is clear that the argumentative/contrastive discourse marker wa-‘illā fa in the two above examples, i.e. (56) and (57), serves to validate the propositions preceding it. In example (56), the negative consequence of not adopting democracy is presented in sentence [56b] in order to confirm the validity of proposition [56a] that stresses the importance of democracy. On the other hand, in example (57), the validity of the proposition introduced in [57a] is argued for by presenting the invalidity of the contrastive situation in sentence [57b]. If political interests were not a central factor behind the actions taken by religious groups then the “convergence between the “Sunni” Hamas movement and the “Khomeini” regime of Iran” would be inexplicable. It is, therefore, the invalidity of the contrastive/adversative situation presented in the second sentence that confirms the validity of the content introduced in the first sentence.

Another discourse marker that is included in the contrastive discourse marker category is bal ‘rather, but rather.’ Although this discourse marker correlates with affirmation functional relation, it is listed under the subcategory contrastive/affirmative discourse marker because of the contrastive/adversative effect it creates between the two propositions it connects. However, it is not the relation between the two propositions connected by bal that conveys this contrastive/adversative meaning, rather it is an effect of bal itself. Unlike the concession and otherwise functional relations which indicate that one proposition contrasts with another, in the affirmation relation with which bal is associated, the second proposition is an assertion of the first. bal connects these two propositions that are in agreement creating pseudo-contrast between them by means of its contrastive effect. When the reader sees bal, he expects a contrastive or adversative
proposition to follow, but instead he finds a stronger assertion. This strategy draws the reader’s attention to the importance of the content of these two propositions. The function of this discourse marker is illustrated in the following example.

(58)

[58a] The fame that Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and Fateh had as being the central bodies for the Palestinian national struggle has declined. [58b] (lā bal) Today, in radical circles, both Islamic and non-Islamic, Palestinian or non-Palestinian, they are being described in a way that was only used to describe 'traitors' and 'agents.'

In the above example, notice that there is no contrast between the meanings conveyed by the two propositions [58a] and [58b] that are connected by lā bal. Rather, the meaning of sentence [58b] confirms what is stated in sentence [58a]. The contrast denoted by lā bal, however, draws attention to the fact that the writer wants to put more emphasis on what has been said in the first proposition. Holes (1995) describes the function of bal very accurately when he says that it is “simultaneously affirmatory and adversative.” This discourse marker, he explains, “affirms the truth of the proposition in Sen1 but at the same time introduces another in Sen2 which gives a more accurate, appropriate, or detailed description of the same state of affairs” (224).

It should be noted, however, that although the meaning of example (58) does not require using any discourse marker equivalent to bal when it is translated, ‘rather, but

\textsuperscript{185} Text 35, P 1, S 2, 3.
rather’ are usually the English contextual equivalent of this discourse marker. Another thing that should be pointed out here is that the form là bal, that is used in this example, is a variant of the discourse marker bal. bal ‘inna, moreover, as table 5.2. shows, is also another variant of this marker. While là that precedes bal adds more emphasis to the contrastive meaning of this discourse marker, ‘inna that follows bal makes it possible for this discourse marker to precede nouns or pronouns.

‘ammā...fa in table 5.2. is also a discourse marker that has a contrastive function. It occurs 13 times sentence-initially and 14 times at the paragraph onset. At the sentence level, this contrastive/additive discourse marker connects two propositions that introduce two different aspects of one idea. In order for two sentences to be connected by ‘ammā...fa, the content of the two sentences must be related to each other. While it is the difference between the two aspects of the idea that creates the contrastive effect in this structure, their being part of one entity, however, is what conveys the additive meaning. Here is an example to illustrate this contrastive/additive function of the discourse marker ‘ammā...fa.

(59)

[59a] As a result of this substantial change, the others’ attitude toward this policy has also changed. [59b] Before, the question that used to be asked whenever a regional crisis emerged was: ‘What do we need from Riyadh?’ [59c] As though Saudi was a mere financier to resolve

---
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crises.[59d] (‘ammā…fa) As for today, the question has become: 'What does Saudia want?

It is clear that the two propositions connected by ‘ammā…fa in example (59), i.e. [59b] and [59d], present two phases in one process, i.e. the change that took place in the Saudi foreign policy. This idea that a change has indeed occurred, however, is expressed by two propositions; sentence [59b] describes the situation before the change whereas sentence [59d] focuses on the situation after the change happened. The contrast between the two propositions makes the meaning more prominent, but the fact that they add to each other is what presents the two propositions as one complete idea.

It is important to note, moreover, that the emphatic function ‘ammā…fa serving within the sentence as a topicalizer relates to its contrastive/additive textual function. As has been discussed earlier, ‘ammā…fa is one of the most frequent discourse markers that are used to front and highlight the topical Theme. It is, in fact, the emphatic effect of highlighting the topical Theme by framing it between the topicalizer ‘ammā and its closer fa, that creates the contrast between the two propositions connected by the discourse marker ‘ammā…fa.

The last discourse marker in the contrastive functional category in table 5.2. is fī al-waqt-i nafs-i-hi ‘meanwhile, at the same time.” Although this discourse marker may suggest a temporal relation of simultaneity between the two propositions it connects, this temporal meaning, however, is overridden by the comparative meaning of this discourse marker. Consider, for instance, the function of fī al-waqt-i dāt-i-hi, which is a variant of this discourse marker, in the following example.
[60a] Even within a single religious group there exist contradictory stands depending on the time and place. [60b] Back in the 1940s, the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in Egypt issued a fatwa that prohibited women from uncovering their faces or working in mixed gender governmental departments. [60c] Furthermore, the MB denied women judiciary and prosecution practices. [60d] Their involvement in politics was also considered to be blatantly inconsistent with Islam. [60e] The MB, however, backed down on its stand. [60f] Since that time, women’s names started to appear on the party’s lists in Egypt, Yemen, and elsewhere. [60g] (wa- fī al-waqt-i dāt-i-hi) Yet at the same time, we find the Muslim Brotherhood voting against women’s rights in the Kuwaiti parliament.

Despite the temporal simultaneity that may be sensed between the two propositions [60f] and [60g] that are connected by the discourse marker wa- fī al-waqt-i dāt-i-hi in the above example, it is not the temporal relation, however, that is in focus here. Rather, what is in focus is the comparative effect that this relation produces. The role of the discourse marker wa- fī al-waqt-i dāt-i-hi here is not to locate the two sentences in a certain time context but to set a certain comparative point where the adversative relation between the two sentences becomes clear. There is, therefore, a comparative meaning emerging from the temporal meaning of this discourse marker rendering the first insignificant.
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3- **Explanatory Discourse Markers**

Discourse markers that fall under this functional category indicate that the proposition they introduce provides an explanation for the proposition preceding it. Based on the range of the functional relations that these discourse markers signal, however, some of them, i.e. *fa* and *fa-qad* ‘since, for,’ serve a general explanatory role while others, i.e. *'id* ‘since, for,’ *kusīṣan 'anna* ‘especially that,’ *'ay ‘that is,’ *mā ya'nī 'anna* ‘this means that,’ *fa-ma’alan* ‘for instance,’ have more specific explanatory functions. Table 5.3. shows the explanatory discourse markers that are identified in the data as well as the functional relations with which they are associated.

**Table 5.3.** Explanatory Discourse Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>fa</em></td>
<td>Since, for, so, thus</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Reason, Evidence, interpretation, result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fa-qad</em> + perfect verb</td>
<td>Since, for</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Reason, evidence, interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>'id/'id 'anna</em></td>
<td>Since, for</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kusīṣan 'anna</em></td>
<td>Especially that</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أي/ أي أنّ</td>
<td>‘ayf’ay ‘anna</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بمعنى أنّ ذلك يعني أنّ</td>
<td>bima’nā ‘annal dālika ya’ni ‘annal mā ya’ni ‘anna</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فمثلاً</td>
<td>fa-maṭalan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With its 150 occurrences, as Table 5.3 demonstrates, *fa* ‘since, for, so, thus’ is the second most frequent discourse marker in the data. Moreover, it should be noted that this discourse marker also appears 15 times at the initial position of paragraphs. This discourse marker is regarded as having a general explanatory role because of the various explanatory functional relations that it signals. The analysis shows that *fa* introduces propositions that serve to explain previous propositions by means of providing a rationale or reason, presenting an example or evidence, or just by giving an explanation that is based on the writer’s interpretation of the situation. The following examples illustrate these diverse explanatory functions of *fa*.
[61a] God have mercy on the simple Muslim citizen. [61b] (fa) He is the victim of conflicting and often contradictory religious fatwas ‘Islamic decrees.’

[62a] Even within a single religious group there exist contradictory stands depending on the time and place. [62b] (fa) Back in the 1940s, the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) in Egypt issued a *fatwa* that prohibited women from uncovering their faces or working in mixed gender governmental departments. [62c] Furthermore, the MB denied women judiciary and prosecution practices. [62d] Their involvement in politics was also considered to be blatantly inconsistent with Islam. [60e] The MB, however, backed down on its stand. [62f] Since that time, women’s names started to appear on the party’s lists in Egypt, Yemen, and elsewhere.

[63a] We all saw Qatar’s absence from the Paris III conference. [63b] The same applies to Baghdad. [63c] They are the source of dissension in all that relates to Iraq from the start of the war to the ousting of Saddam from its soil.

---
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In examples (61), (62), and (63), *fa* introduces propositions that provide explanation for previous propositions. This explanatory role, however, is performed by means of presenting a reason in sentence [61b], an example/evidence in sentence [62b], and an explanation provided by the writer in sentence [63c]. When translating into English, as it is clear in these three examples, there seems to be no need for an explicit equivalent discourse marker to perform the function served by *fa* in Arabic. It should be pointed out that many modern Arabic linguists, e.g. Cantarino (1975, 24); Holes (1995, 220); Khalil (2000, 190); Sarig (1995, 11); and Van Mol (2003, 200), have noticed this explanatory role that *fa* plays at the discourse level.

Similarly, *fa-qad* ‘since, for,’ that precedes the simple past verb-form, is also a general explanatory discourse marker. This discourse marker, the analysis shows, is actually in “complementary distribution” with *fa* (Sarig 1995, 11). Just like *fa*, it appears at the onset of sentences that provide reason, evidence or interpretation for previous sentences. However, while *fa-qad* introduces sentences opening with perfect verbs, *fa* appears at any other environment with the exception of the onset of sentences starting with imperfect verbs. This means that neither of these two explanatory discourse markers precedes verbs in the imperfect form. Because it functions as a distinct discourse marker, *fa-qad* is regarded here as a compound word.\(^{191}\) Consider the function of this discourse marker in the following example.

---

\(^{191}\) It should be noted, Khalil (2000) points out, that the use of the particle *fa-qad* was not referred to in traditional Arabic grammar (191). However, “linguistic literature which discusses contemporary written Arabic,” Sarig (1995) states, “regards the functionals *wa-qad, fa-qad, and la-qad,* as compounds consisting of the conjunctions *wa, fa,* or the intensifying particle *la* with the particle *qad,* which denotes aspect and mode in the verbal system of written Arabic” (8).
The Chinese man is no longer ignorant of what is going on in the world, as was the case in the past. China, whose population exceeds 1.25 billion, which is one-fifth of the world’s population, opened many cultural doors that were closed in the past; to the extent that some studies point out that the number of internet users in China may exceed that in the US.

In example (64), sentence [64b] provides a reason or rationale to explain sentence [64a]. Notice that sentence [64b] that is introduced by the explanatory discourse marker fa-qad starts with a verb in the simple past, i.e. qāma-t bi-fath-i ‘opened.’ What further confirms that the explanatory markers fa and fa-qad are in complementary distribution, is the fact that fa seems to lose its explanatory meaning when it precedes a verb. When followed by a verb, whether in the perfect or imperfect form, fa acquires a resultative meaning that resembles the English ‘so, thus.’ The data show that the discourse marker fa-prefixing a verb, denotes that the proposition it introduces is a result from the previous proposition. fourteen of this discourse marker’s 150 sentence-initial occurrences are followed by verbs and thus signal a resultative relation. The following example demonstrates the function of fa as a discourse marker that signals result.

---
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International Islamic extremism also put forth the two-camp idea, the eternal battle between faith and disbelief, and the necessity that Islam defeats all other religions, vanquishing them until God inherits the earth and everyone on it. [65b] (fa) Thus came the 9/11 tragedy.

Notice that fa in example (65) is followed by the verb kān-a-t ‘was, came, happened.’ It is clear that fa in this example indicates that the proposition it introduces, i.e. [65b], is a result from the previous proposition, i.e. [65a]. The logical sequence expressed by this discourse marker, therefore, as Van Mol (2003) says, may progress in two directions, from a cause to its effect or from a situation back to its cause (200). It should be noted, however, that fa may also function as a closer for the Thematic slot in a framing structure, as has been discussed before. In this case, however, this device is considered either a constituent of another discourse marker, e.g. 'ammā...fa, wa-illā fa, or merely a demarcation device that separates the Thematic slot or the discourse markers from the rest of the sentence.

Other than fa and fa-qad, all the discourse markers that are included in the explanatory functional category in table 5.3. denote specific explicative functional relations. The two discourse markers 'īd/īd 'anna ‘since, for,’ and kusūsan 'anna ‘especially that,’ are found to signal a reason or rationale relation that explain or justify a previous
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193 Text 9, P 3, S 8, 9.
proposition. Examples (66) and (67) illustrate this logical/explanatory function of these discourse markers.

(66)

[66a] The less radical ones, however, are prepared to allow Israeli Jews to remain in what would be a Greater Palestine. [66b] (‘id) For the demographic factors and a massive return of Palestinian refugees especially from Jordan and Lebanon, they would soon be in a minority.

(67)

[67a] Interference in the donors’ choices is not easy. [67b] (kusiṣan’anna) Especially that organizing this process has taken on a political dimension after the September 11 attacks.

In example (66), ‘id precedes sentence [66b] which states the reason or motives for the previous sentence [66a]. Similarly, kusiṣan’anna that appears at the onset of sentence [67b] provides a rationale or justification for the preceding proposition [67a]. It is important to note, however, that kusiṣan’anna is regarded here as a discourse marker rather than an adverbial particle linking two clauses because, in my view, all the 13 occurrences of this word introduce propositions that show independence in their meaning and structure.

---
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'ay 'anna ‘that is, i.e., in other words,’ and bima 'anna dälka ya'ni 'anna mā ya'ni 'anna ‘this means that,’ are also discourse markers that serve specific explanatory functions (see table 5.3). While 'id 'anna and kusshan 'anna signal a causal relation, the two explanatory discourse markers 'ay and mā ya'ni 'anna and their variants denote an interpretation functional relation. The propositions that they introduce, the analysis shows, serve to clarify what is stated in the previous propositions. The following examples illustrate this explicative function of these discourse markers.

(68)

[68a] This declaration has particular importance because it was made at the margin of the last African Union (AU) summit, which included the Sahrawian Republic among its members. [68b] (mā ya'ni 'anna) This means that he [the UN Secretary General] distanced himself from the AU's way of handling the issue and paved a new way for a peaceful settlement linked to international legitimacy.

(69)

[69a] And it is noticeable that, in these conferences, Iran is accused of spreading the Shiite doctrine among Sunnis. [69b] (ay 'anna) In other words, the Iranian intervention is much more than a mere interest in the doctrinal aspect of Shiite Arabs that has now become a threat to others.

196 Text 44, P 2, S 5, 6.
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The last discourse marker in this category as presented in table 5.3. is *fa-ma'alan* ‘for instance.’ This explanatory discourse marker introduces sentences that present examples to support the proposition preceding them. Because all four occurrences of this discourse marker in the data are preceded by *fa*, *fa* is regarded as a constituent of this discourse marker form. Here is an example that shows the explanatory role of this discourse marker.

(70)

[70a] However, so as to avoid overgeneralizations let us focus on a particular case. [70b] (*fa-ma'alan*) An example is women in Palestinian society, both in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

4- Inferential Discourse Markers

Discourse markers that are included in this category introduce propositions that come as results or conclusions from previous propositions. These discourse markers, therefore, correlate either with result or conclusion functional relations. Because both of these relations indicate that the truth of the second proposition follows from the truth of the first, discourse markers that signal these relations are called inferential discourse markers. Inferential discourse markers that are found in the data of this study are listed in table 5.4. below.
### Table 5.4. Inferential Discourse Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لذلك ‌لذلک</td>
<td>\textit{li\d{a}l\d{a}}</td>
<td>Thus, therefore</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لذا</td>
<td>\textit{lid\d{a}}</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لهذا</td>
<td>\textit{lih\d{a}d\d{a}}</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من ثم</td>
<td>\textit{min \d{a}amma}</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من هنا</td>
<td>\textit{min hun\d{a}}</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عليه</td>
<td>\textit{\d{a}layhi}</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالتالي</td>
<td>\textit{bi-l-t\d{a}l\d{a}}</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا</td>
<td>\textit{h\d{a}kad\d{a}}</td>
<td>Thus, and so</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إذا</td>
<td>\textit{\d{i}dan}</td>
<td>Thus, therefore, so</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the occurrences of the discourse markers: \textit{li\d{a}l\d{a}}, \textit{lid\d{a}}, \textit{lih\d{a}d\d{a}}, \textit{min \d{a}amma}, \textit{min hun\d{a}}, \textit{\d{a}layhi}, \textit{bi-l-t\d{a}l\d{a}}, and \textit{h\d{a}kad\d{a}} in the data, as table 5.4. shows, are associated with the result functional relation. These inferential/resultative discourse markers signal that the sentences they introduce are logical results or consequences of previous sentences. On the other hand, the three occurrences of \textit{\d{i}dan}, which is the ninth discourse marker in this category, denote that the following proposition presents a conclusion to what has been
said previously. To distinguish this discourse marker from the other members in the inferential group, it is referred to as an inferential/concluding discourse marker.

It should be pointed out, moreover, that fa ‘so, thus’ may also indicate a resultative relation when it precedes a verb, as mentioned earlier. However, because the inferential function is not its predominant role in text, fa is not included in this functional category. Examples (71), (72), and (73) illustrate the resultative function of some inferential discourse markers. Example (74), on the other hand, shows how ‘īdān functions to conclude the two points that are discussed in the three sentences preceding the sentence it introduces.

(71)

(72)

[71a] The maneuvering done by the Major Player, i.e. Saudi Arabia, has led the Qataris to losing their reason. [71b] Therefore, we see and hear their blatant attack on Riyadh and against all those seeking to stabilize the region.

[72a] Many military analysts and politicians believe that Bush will fail in his latest desperate attempt to achieve acceptable stability in Iraq that will prepare for the withdrawal of American military forces. [72b] Therefore, America, which lacks credibility in the Middle
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East, will be incapable of, or not sincere in, achieving a peaceful solution for the Arab-Israeli conflict any time soon.

(73)

[73a] Arabs are a part of this world, or they must acknowledge that they are part of it and of its interactions. [73b] (wa-bi-l-tālī fa) Therefore, they have to be part of these interactions.

(74)

[74a] Moreover, their frustrations are contradictory. [74b] First, their opposite and mutually hostile natures are unprecedented in the history of alliances. [74c] Second, Hezbollah's frustration is due to Resolution 1559 and the Syrian withdrawal which led to Michel Aoun's return to Lebanon while one of the causes of Aoun's well-known frustration was the creation of the "four-party electoral coalition" that put Hezbollah together with the "Amal" Movement, the "Future" Movement and the Socialist Progressive Party. [74d] (iḍan) Therefore, the smell of absolute opportunism dominates this bilateral relation.

Because the function of iḍan differs from the other discourse markers in the inferential group, this discourse marker, unlike other members in this group, does not combine with wa, i.e. the discourse marker of continuity. The data show that all the inferential discourse markers except iḍan may cluster with wa. This is actually consistent
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with the function that 'idn serves as a marker of conclusion relation. A concluding proposition or paragraph indicates that a final point in a discussion has been reached. The onset of this proposition or paragraph, therefore, is not a position that the continuity discourse marker wa, favors.

5- Other Functional Categories of Discourse Markers

Sequential, alternative, exceptive, and background discourse markers are four additional categories that describe the functions served by some of the discourse markers identified in this study. Each of these functional categories, however, includes only one member. Table 5.5. lists the discourse markers that fall under these groups.

**Table 5.5 Sequential, Alternative, Exceptional, and Background Discourse Markers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ثم jumma</td>
<td>Then</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أو 'aw</td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Disjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إلا إذا 'illā 'idā</td>
<td>Except if, unless</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وقذ الفعل الماضي wa-qad+perfect verb</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first discourse marker in table 5.5. is the sequential discourse marker *tumma* ‘then.’ This discourse marker signals a temporal sequence relation in its eight sentence-initial occurrences in the data. In these cases, *tumma* indicates that the action in the sentence it introduces takes place after the action in the previous sentence has been completed. The following example illustrates this function of *tumma*.

(74)

[74a] Saddam Hussein promoted the racist ideology of Arabism over the so-called ‘Persian Magi’. [74b] (*tumma*) Then he proceeded to foster the notions of God’s soldiers against Satan’s legions and the battle of good that will triumph over evil.

Sentence-initial *tumma*, as example (74) shows, signals a temporal sequence. It denotes that the action in sentence [74b] comes later in time than the action in sentence [74a]. When this discourse marker occurs at the global level of text, however, it seems to lose its temporal aspect. The one occurrence of *tumma* at the onset of a paragraph in the data denotes a logical rather than temporal sequence.204

’aw ‘or,’ which is the second discourse marker in table 5.5., correlates with disjunction functional relations in the nine times occurring in the data. This discourse marker introduces a proposition that presents an alternative to the preceding proposition. The alternative proposition, however, does not exclude the previous proposition but
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rather adds another possibility or option to it. The data show that the sentences introduced by 'aw may be affirmative or interrogative. Here are two examples where this alternative discourse marker precedes interrogative and affirmative sentences.

(75)

[75a] [75b] 
[75a] [75b] 

[75a] If that is not the case, how does one explain that the enemy for the Palestinian now is the other Palestinian, who holds a different political opinion? [75b] (aw) Or how can one explain the fact that Lebanon's Prime Minister, Fouad Siniora has become the number one enemy for the Islamic resistance, represented by Hezbollah and its followers?

(76)

[76a] [76b] 
[76a] [76b] 

[76a] Moreover, there are some Arab countries which do not openly show any interest and yet wish to own such a program. [76b] (aw) Or other countries which have openly abandoned their nuclear ambitions for fear of losing their sovereignty, such as Libya.

The third discourse marker in table 5.5. is the exceptive discourse marker 'illa 'idā 'except if, unless.' In the three occurrences of this discourse marker, it introduces sentences that comment on the content of the previous sentences. In this structure, the writer confirms the content of the first sentence by presenting an unacceptable contrastive situation in the second sentence. This contrastive situation is presented in the form of a comment that is introduced by 'illa 'idā. The exceptive meaning of 'illa 'idā adds
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prominence to this comment conveying the writer’s strong disapproval of it. The rhetorical exceptive function of *'illā 'iddā* is illustrated in the following example.

(77)

[77a] Some optimists have not hesitated to consider this comical approach to the clash between Islam and the West a gateway to dialogue between immigrant minorities and the West, [77b] (*'illā 'iddā*) unless conflict and violence are considered one mode of communication.

The last discourse marker in table 5.5 is the background discourse marker *wa-qad* ‘and.’ Just as *fa-qad*, *wa-qad*, that is followed by the verb in the simple past form, is regarded as a compound discourse marker because of the distinctive function it serves at the discourse level. The data show that this discourse marker introduces propositions that provide background information for preceding propositions. Whenever this discourse marker occurs at the onset of a sentence, it seems that the flow of the text stops at that particular point to provide information against which the previous proposition should be interpreted. Consider the following examples:

(78)

[78a] صحيح أن التطرق لقضايا العنف بحق المرأة ليس بالأمر الجديد في الإعلام العربي. [78b] وقدم بعض المحاولات في كسر جدار الصمت حول العنف العائلي والتمييز بحق المرأة. [78c] لكن تناول هذهقضايا لم يصلح النفاذ إلى ما وراء الخطابات المتشنزة وفوضى العنانز.208
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It's true that dealing with matters relating to violence against women is not a novel issue in the Arab media. Some attempts have contributed to cracking the wall of silence that surrounds violence, domestic abuse, and discrimination against women. However, dealing with these issues does not go beyond overzealous discourse and chaotic instincts.

However, the author argues that radical Christian fundamentalism no longer poses a problem because it was vanquished during Europe's reform and enlightenment ages. Since its inception, Christianity has contained the seeds of secularity with its dual view of authority, the spiritual and the temporal which led at the end to the exclusion of religion from the public domain. This rendered it neutral and powerless.

In examples (78) and (79), *wa-qad* locates the propositions that it introduces at a time prior to the propositions preceding it. In other words, the flow of the text seems to move backward rather than forward. The background information encoded in the proposition introduced by *wa-qad* is expected to increase the understanding of the previous proposition. *wa-qad*, therefore, signals that propositions [78a] and [79a] should be interpreted in light of the background information provided in propositions [78b] and [79b] respectively. In English, however, Hatim (1997) points out, propositions functioning as background information do not need to be signaled by an explicit discourse marker (71).
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b. Interpersonal Discourse Markers at the Local Level

This section that focuses on discourse markers at the local level of text started with describing the functions served by textual discourse markers. Now, it moves to describe the functions performed by the other type of local discourse markers, namely the interpersonal discourse markers. Unlike textual discourse markers, interpersonal discourse markers, as has been mentioned previously, are members of the discourse markers group whose contribution to text structure is very limited. While marking the relations between segments of texts is the predominant function of textual markers, the main function of interpersonal markers is to establish relations between the participants in the communicative situation, i.e. the writer, the reader, and the text. Because of the difference in the nature of the relations marked by these two types of discourse markers, these relations cannot be described with the same analytical tool.

While the descriptive tool employed for describing the relations signaled by textual discourse markers is the Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST), it is the conceptual meaning of the interpersonal discourse markers that guides the description of the relations created by these expressions. RST, which describes how segments of texts relate to each other, provides a useful tool for examining the relations between segments that textual discourse markers mark. However, although this analytical tool describes the environment in which interpersonal discourse markers occur, it does not explain how these expressions affect their environment. The RST’s description of the relations identified between sentences in the data of this study, for example, shows that interpersonal discourse markers are mostly associated with two types of functional
relations: interpretation and evaluation. This description, although provides information about the environment in which interpersonal discourse markers usually appear, does not capture their contribution to this environment. This is because marking relations between segments of texts is not the main function of interpersonal discourse markers. The main function of these expressions that should be described, however, is the type of relations that they establish between the author and the text on the one hand, and between the author and the reader on the other hand.

In order to describe the type of relations established by interpersonal discourse markers, it is not the relations between segments of text that should be examined but rather the conceptual meaning of these expressions. Interpersonal discourse markers, as mentioned previously, have conceptual meaning, which specifies the message that they convey, and pragmatic function, which indicates that this message functions as a comment on the basic message. It is, however, the conceptual meaning of interpersonal discourse markers that guides the analysis of the pragmatic function of these expressions. This is because examining the message expressed by interpersonal discourse markers is what explains the effect that these expressions have on the basic message. Consider the following example.

(80)

وفي الوقت ذاته، كشفت مصادر تجسية أمريكية أن الصين نجحت في أسابيع، في إجراء تجربة لسلاح يهدف إلى إبطال عمل أفراد أصطناعية [80] ولا شك في أن [80a] MAIL (wa-ššūr) مثل هذا النموذج غير المسبوق قد أثار ذرعاً في الأساطير الأمريكية [210] *sakk-a fi’ anna*)

\[\text{Text 30, P 6, S 25,26.}\]
Meanwhile, American spying sources uncovered that China succeeded weeks before in testing an anti-satellite weapon. (wa- lā šakk-a fi 'anna) There is no doubt that this unprecedented superiority made the US milieus panic.

Notice that the main function served by the interpersonal discourse marker wa-lā šakk-a fi 'anna ‘there is no doubt that, undoubtedly’ in example (80) is to establish a relation between the writer and the content of sentence [80b]. This expression encodes an entire message that signals the writer’s attitude towards the proposition that this marker introduces. To determine the pragmatic function that this discourse marker performs by commenting on the basic message, therefore, it is the conceptual meaning of the interpersonal discourse marker wa-lā šakk-a fi 'anna that should be examined. The conceptual meaning of this expression, i.e. that the writer has no doubt, is actually what indicates that wa- lā šakk-a fi 'anna signals the writer’s certainty of the truth of the proposition in [80b].

Based on their conceptual meanings, interpersonal discourse markers that are identified in the data of this study have been found to perform two main functions: subjective function and interactive function. Subjective discourse markers, as Brinton (1996) points out, are writer-oriented because they express the writer’s attitudes and evaluations of the message. On the other hand, interactive discourse markers, whose function is to establish intimacy between the writer and the reader, he adds, are reader-oriented.
1. **Subjective Discourse Markers**

Under this functional category fall interpersonal discourse markers that signal to the reader that the propositions that follow are to be taken from the writer’s perspective. These are discourse markers that create relation between the writer and the communicated proposition by expressing to the reader how the writer perceives this proposition. They either convey the writer’s evaluation or attitude towards the content of the sentence or just present the sentence from his point of view. Consider the interpersonal discourse markers listed in tables 5.6. and 5.7. below.

**Table 5.6. Discourse Markers that Express Certainty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا شك في أن / الذي لا شك فيه هو أن lā šakk-a fi 'anna/al-lāḏī lā šakk-a fihi huwa 'anna</td>
<td>There is no doubt that, undoubtedly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالأكد أن / بالتأكيد / من المؤكد أن al-'akīd-u 'anna/bi-l-tā'kid-i/min al-mu'akkad-i 'anna</td>
<td>Surely, definitely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحقيقة أن / حقيقة al-ḥaqīqat-u 'anna/ ḥaqīqat-an</td>
<td>The truth is, truly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من المرجح أن / الأمرجح أن min al-murajjah-i 'an/ al-‘arjajh-u 'anna</td>
<td>It is more likely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الحقيق هو أنّ</td>
<td>al-ṣabīh-u huwa 'annā</td>
<td>The truth is, the reality is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من الواضح أنّ واضح أنّ</td>
<td>min al-wādīḥ-i 'annā/wādīḥ-un 'annā</td>
<td>It is evident that, it is clear that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لقد أثبت الواقع أنّ في الواقع/في واقع الأمر</td>
<td>la-qad 'aṭbat-a al-wāqī'-u 'annā/fī al-wāqī'-i/fī wāqī'-i al-ʿamr-ı</td>
<td>Reality has proven that, in fact, as a matter of fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إنّ</td>
<td>'innā</td>
<td>Certainly, indeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لقد</td>
<td>la-qad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غني عن القول أنّ</td>
<td>ġanīyy-unʾan al-qawl-i 'annā</td>
<td>It goes without saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صار معروفا أنّ</td>
<td>sār-a maʿrūf-an 'annā</td>
<td>It became known that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من الطبيعي أنّ</td>
<td>min al-ṭabīḥiyy-i 'annā</td>
<td>Naturally, obviously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interpersonal discourse markers in tables 5.6. and 5.7. serve to evaluate the content of the sentences introducing them. Through these expressions the writer signals to the reader how he perceives the upcoming message. Using the discourse markers that express certainty, i.e. expressions in table 5.6., has the effect of emphasizing the content of the communicated proposition. However, discourse markers in table 5.7. that express probability are used to suggest or recommend the idea in the upcoming proposition.

### Table 5.6. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لم يعد سراً أن ليس سراً</td>
<td>lam ya'ud sirr-an 'anna/laysa sirr-an 'anna</td>
<td>It is no longer a secret, it is obvious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.7. Discourse Markers that Express Probability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لعل</td>
<td>la'allā</td>
<td>Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ربما</td>
<td>rubbamā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من المحتمل أن</td>
<td>min al-muhtamal-i 'an</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قد+ (فعل مضارع)</td>
<td>qad+ imperfect verb</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpersonal discourse markers in tables 5.6. and 5.7. serve to evaluate the content of the sentences introducing them. Through these expressions the writer signals to the reader how he perceives the upcoming message. Using the discourse markers that express certainty, i.e. expressions in table 5.6., has the effect of emphasizing the content of the communicated proposition. However, discourse markers in table 5.7. that express probability are used to suggest or recommend the idea in the upcoming proposition.
It should be pointed out that the discourse markers in table 5.6. that writers use to validate propositions are actually of two types. The first type includes the nine first expressions listed in this table. These are discourse markers that express the writer’s certainty in a straightforward manner. However, this certainty is expressed implicitly by the last four expressions in table 5.6., i.e. ġaniyy-un ‘an al-qawl-i ‘anna, ṣār-a ma’rūf-an ‘anna, min al-ṭabīyy-i ‘anna, lam ya’ud sirr-an ‘anna/laysa sirr-an ‘anna. Instead of confirming the content of the sentence explicitly, the writer introduces this content as an obvious fact that is generally accepted. Introducing the proposition as a self-evident fact that does not need to be argued for expresses the writer’s confidence of the validity of this proposition.

Another set of discourse markers that are used to evaluate the message are listed in table 5.8. Just as the discourse markers in tables 5.6. and 5.7., the discourse markers in table 5.8 express the writer’s attitude or evaluation of the following proposition. What is different about these expressions, however, is that they convey the writer’s attitude in a more involved manner. In these evaluative personal comments, the writer encodes his opinion in a personal form using expressive words that indicate his emotional attitude towards the topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min al-sadājat-i nisyūn-u ḥaqīqat-a ‘anna</td>
<td>It would be naïve to forget the fact that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8. Discourse Markers that Encode Evaluative Personal Comments
The last type of the subjective discourse markers that are found in the data of this study are expressions that present the communicated proposition from the writer’s angle. These discourse markers do not evaluate or judge the content of the proposition but rather simply introduce it as a point of view. They signal to the reader that what is upcoming is the writer’s view of the topic in hand. These expressions are listed in table 5.9, below.
Table 5.9. Discourse Markers that Introduce the Writer’s Point of View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أعتقد أنّ</td>
<td>'a'taqid-u 'anna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يظهر أنّ</td>
<td>yazhar-u 'anna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يبدو/ يبدو أنّ</td>
<td>yabdū/yabdū 'anna</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يلاحظ أنّ/ الملاحظة</td>
<td>yulūghaz-u 'anna/al-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mulūghaz-u 'anna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Interactive Discourse Markers

The other function that interpersonal discourse markers serve in the data of this study is to establish relations between the writer and the reader within the context of the text. So, not only does the writer use subjective expressions that show his involvement in the communicative situation, but he also makes the reader part of this situation by using interactive discourse markers. Discourse markers that fall under this functional category are employed by the writer to involve the reader in the communicative act in three different ways: by appealing to the reader, by attracting his attention, or by interactively guiding the reader's interpretation of the text. These three different types of interactive discourse markers are listed in tables 5.10., 5.11., and 5.12. below.
Table 5.10. Discourse Markers that Appeal to the Reader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا يفوتنا</td>
<td>lā yafūt-u-nā</td>
<td>We should not miss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كيف لنا أن ننسى/لا ننسى</td>
<td>kāyfa lanā 'an nansā lā nansā</td>
<td>How could we forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كلنا رأينا كيف/رأينا كيف أنْ نحن نرى كيف أنْ</td>
<td>kull-u-nā ra‘aynā kayfal ra‘aynā kāyfa‘annalnalnā narā kāyfa‘anna</td>
<td>We all saw how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتدنا على أنْ</td>
<td>i’tad-nā ‘alā ‘anna</td>
<td>We have become accustomed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دعونا</td>
<td>da‘ū-nā</td>
<td>Let us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لنا هنا إلا نستغرب أنْ</td>
<td>lanā hunā ‘allā nastaghrib-a ‘anna</td>
<td>We should not be surprised that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias min al-mudhik-i al-mubkī ‘an</td>
<td>Is it not pathetically ironic that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هل من العدل ومساواة أنْ</td>
<td>hal min al-‘adl-i wa-l-musāwāt-i ‘an</td>
<td>Is it justice and equality that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.11. Discourse Markers that Attract the Attention of the Reader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>﴿اذلاء ﴾ ﴿فانا ﴾ `anna</td>
<td>Most importantly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿ها هو ﴾ ﴿ه ﴾ ﴿ها نحن ﴾</td>
<td><code>ha huwal </code>ha hiya/ `ha nahu</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿المفارة القائمة ﴾ ﴿هنا ﴾</td>
<td><code>al-mufaraqat-</code>u <code>al-qimmat-</code>u <code>hun </code>hiya `anna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿الأكثر غراية ﴾ ﴿أن ﴾</td>
<td><code>al-akpr-</code>u <code>garbat-</code>an `an</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿تري ﴾</td>
<td>tur`a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12. Discourse Markers that Guide the Interpretation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>﴿على المرء ﴾ ﴿أن ﴾ ﴿يأخذ ﴾ في الحساب ﴾ ﴿أن ﴾</td>
<td><code>al-</code>almar<code>i </code>an ya<code>a</code>ud-<code>a fi al-</code>husb<code>in-</code>i `an</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>﴿هذا دليل واضح علي ﴾ ﴿أن ﴾</td>
<td>h<code>ud</code>a dalil-un wadi<code>ah-un</code>al<code>a </code>anna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/afii62764/afii62796/afii62760/afii62785/afii62761 /afii62819/afii62815/afii62761 /afii62763/afii62762/afii62785/afii62817</td>
<td><em>السَبْبُ بِكُلِّ بَسَاطَةٍ هوَ أَنَّ</em> al-sabab-u bikull-i basālat-in huwa 'anna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afii62829/afii62816/afii62817</td>
<td><em>يُؤْثِرُ ذَلِكَ إِلَى أَنْ</em> yu'aṣṣir-u dālika 'ilā 'anna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afii62782/afii62787/afii62755/afii62831</td>
<td><em>بَعْدُ مِنْ هَذَا</em> 'ab'ad-u min hāḍā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emphatic/elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afii62781</td>
<td><em>فَوقُ هَذَا</em> fawqa hāḍā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afii62776/afii62832/afii62775/afii62790</td>
<td><em>النِتْجَةُ أَنْ</em> al-natījat-u 'anna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afii62833/afii62806/afii62762/afii62824/afii62831 / /afii62884/afii62754/afii62761  / /afii62884/afii62782/afii62781/ُ/afii62831 /afii62760/afii62821/afii62820</td>
<td><em>صَحِيحُ أَنْ</em> saḥīḥ-un 'anna</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afii62825/afii62802</td>
<td><em>يَنْبِيغُ الْتَذْكِيرُ هَذَا</em> yanbaği al-tadzkir-u hunā bi-'anna/ min-mā yuḏkaru 'anna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/afii62829</td>
<td><em>بِمَناسبةِ الحَدِيثِ عن... فَا</em> bi-munāsabat-i al-hadīth-i ‘an ... fa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice how the discourse markers in table 5.10. try to reach to the reader and involve him in the communicative situation. The writer talks about “we” in expressions such as lā yafūt-u-nā ‘we should not miss,’ ʾtad-nū alā ʾanna ‘we have become accustomed to’ to signal to the reader that they both, the reader and he, relate to the message in the same way and share the same views about it. Another way of relating the message to the reader is by using rhetorical questions and emotionally-loaded words that appeal to him, e.g. kayfa lanā ʾan nansā ‘how could we forget,’ ʾalaysa min al-mudhājik-i al-mubkī ʾan ‘is it not pathetically ironic that.’

While interactive discourse markers that appeal to the reader focus on establishing intimacy and shared attitudes with him about the text, the two other types of interactive discourse markers, that are listed in tables 5.11. and 5.12., are more concerned with managing the way the reader interprets the text. On the one hand, table 5.11. shows interactive discourse markers that serve to alert the reader or draw his attention to an important point in the coming proposition. The discourse markers in table 5.12., on the other hand, give the reader a hint of how to interpret the following proposition in relation to what has gone before. These two types of interactive discourse markers are referred to as discourse markers of notification.

Discourse markers of notification, therefore, serve an interactive functions that resemble functions served by textual discourse markers. Like textual discourse markers, discourse markers of notification guide the reader’s interpretation of the text. However, unlike textual markers, these interactive markers have a strong interpersonal effect in addition to their textual role. The writer’s voice in these interactive expressions is very
clear. This gives emphasis to the presence of the writer and highlights his role in managing the flow of text. The similar yet different way in which these two types of discourse markers function shows how the communicative force of discourse markers could be manipulated in many ways to serve the writer’s communicative goals.

A final thing that should be pointed out regarding the interpersonal discourse markers in general relates to the interpersonal nature of this type of discourse markers. It has been noticed that the interpersonal character of interpersonal discourse markers has an effect on the form and function of these expressions. On the one hand, there is great variability in the forms of the members of the interpersonal discourse markers group, as tables 5.6. to 5.12. show. While the individual style of the writer, as has been mentioned before, plays an important role in determining the type of discourse markers that he uses in text, the impact of the writer’s individual style becomes more obvious in the choice of interpersonal discourse markers. Because these expressions convey the writer’s attitudes and establish interactive relations between him and his reader, the writer’s style has strong influence on the form of this type of discourse markers. However, despite the variable forms of these expressions, they are all found to serve two specific functions in text: subjective and interactive functions. Therefore, although the variable forms of interpersonal discourse markers necessitate including expressions that occur even one time, unlike textual discourse markers, the similarity in the function served by these items justifies this inclusion.

The subjective and interactive nature of the interpersonal discourse markers not only affect the form of these items, but it also has impact on the way they function. These
expressions create relations that connect the different components of the communicative situation, i.e. the writer, the reader, and the text. The components of the communicative situation interact with each other in a very complicated way. This makes it difficult to draw the line between the functions served by subjective and interactive discourse markers. Subjective discourse markers, such as تَذَكَّرُنا ‘reality has proven that’ and ̀يَّنْنَ اَنْتُنِ يَلُونِ ‘it is truly a tragedy,’ for example, that express the writer’s attitude towards the message are actually performing this role to communicate something to the reader. On the other hand, interactive discourse markers like تَذَكَّرُنا ‘it is not pathetically ironic that’ and يَنْبَغِي تَذَكِّرُنا ‘it is noteworthy here that’ that reach to the reader are also conveying the writer’s view on the message. Therefore, the distinction between the functions served by the two functional categories of interpersonal discourse markers is not as decisive as it is between the functional categories of textual discourse markers. This should be borne in mind because it may result in classifying the members of the interpersonal discourse markers differently in different studies.

5.3.3 Discourse Markers at the Global Level

While discourse markers that appear at the onset of the sentences are the focus of the previous section, this section is concerned with discourse markers that occur paragraph-initially. The analysis shows that about 54% of paragraph boundaries that are identified in the data of this study are introduced with discourse markers. These discourse markers occur at the onset of paragraphs mark boundaries between the different stages of
text structure and provide logical links for bringing these stages together as one unified text. It is, therefore, the text organizational structure and how each stage in this structure relates to the previous stage that should be examined in order to describe the functions served by paragraph-initial discourse markers.

Hatim’s (1997) model of argumentative text-type structure that is modified by el-Shiyab’s (1990) model of Arabic editorials structure, as discussed previously, provides a useful tool for examining the text organizational structure of the opinion articles analyzed in this study. The analysis shows that the main stages of the opinion articles’ organizational structure are: background, thesis, evaluation, substantiation, evaluation, and conclusion. Since paragraph-initial discourse markers signal the relations between these stages of text structure, in this section, the functions of these markers are described in relation to the stages of text structure that they introduce. The functions served by textual and interpersonal discourse markers are described separately here at the text’s global level as they were at the text’s local level. However, because drawing the line between the functions of these two categories of discourse markers, i.e. the textual and interpersonal, sometimes becomes hard at the global level, this issue is discussed at the end of the section.

a- Textual Discourse Markers at the Global Level

Textual discourse markers that occur at the onset of paragraphs in texts signal how the texts move from one stage of the organizational structure to the next stage. The functions of these discourse markers, therefore, are described here by associating them
with stages of text structure they mark. Table 5.13 lists paragraph-initial textual discourse markers that are found in the data of this study along with the structural stages that they signal. As this table shows, most textual discourse markers that are found at paragraph boundaries are similar to those that appear at the sentence initial position. To show the relation between the local and global functions of textual discourse markers, these markers are grouped in table 5.13. according to the functions that they serve at the sentence level.

Table 5.13. Textual Discourse Markers that Occur Paragraph-initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence-initial function</th>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Stage of text structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additive discourse markers</td>
<td>إضافة إلى ذلك كان</td>
<td>In addition to all that, moreover</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Substantiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ُبضاف إلى ذلك أن</td>
<td>Besides</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faḍlan 'an 'anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُحتى</td>
<td>battā</td>
<td>Even</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُثُمَّ</td>
<td>tumma</td>
<td>Moreover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Substantiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.13. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence-initial function</th>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Stage of text structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferential/resultative discourse markers</td>
<td>لذا</td>
<td>ligā</td>
<td>Thus, therefore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>من هنا</td>
<td>min hunā</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>بالتالي</td>
<td>bi-l-talī</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>هكذا</td>
<td>hākādā</td>
<td>Thus, and so</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive/concessive discourse markers</td>
<td>لكن / لكن</td>
<td>lākin/lākinna</td>
<td>However, but</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>غير أن</td>
<td>ġayra 'anna</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive/additive discourse marker</td>
<td>أما ... ف</td>
<td>ammā...fa</td>
<td>As for</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory discourse marker</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>fa</td>
<td>Since, for</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferential/conclusive discourse markers</td>
<td>إذا</td>
<td>idān</td>
<td>Thus, therefore, so</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.13. shows that the three sentence-initial additive discourse markers 'idāfatan 'ilā dālika kull-i-hi/yudāf-u 'ilā dālika ‘in addition to all that, moreover,’ faḍlan ‘an 'anna ‘besides’ and hattā ‘even’ appear five times paragraph-initially. In all the five occurrences of these discourse markers at the global level of text, they introduce paragraphs that function as substantiation. This is the stage of text structure where the writer presents evidence to support the viewpoint that he adopts in the thesis. It has been noticed, however, that the paragraphs that these markers open function as either the second or third substantiation stage in the text’s organizational structure. Occurring at these points of text structure where the writer’s argument continues to develop means that these discourse markers denote the continuation of an ongoing topic. They signal that the substantiation stage that they introduce is an additional step in the development of the writer’s argument. The discourse markers idāfatan 'ilā dālika kull-i-hi/yudāf-u 'ilā dālika
'anna, faḍlan ‘an ‘anna and ḥattā, therefore, function as markers of continuity at the global level of text structure. The following example demonstrates the continuity function of the ḥaddātan ʾilā dālika kull-i-hi when it occurs paragraph-initially.

(81)

Moreover, the Chinese government urged its people to open to the world, which it wants to control. The Chinese man is no longer ignorant of what is going on in the world, as was the case in the past. China, whose population exceeds 1.25 billion, which is one fifth of the world’s population, opened many cultural doors that were closed in the past, to the extent that some studies point out that the number of internet users in China may exceed that in the US. If this increasing rate continues, China may surpass the US in the number of internet users in two years' time according to these studies. This comes at a time when China opens its doors for tourists from all over the world. Last year, more than 120 million tourists visited the Eastern giant which made the revenues reach about $10 billion.

Example (81) is a paragraph that represents a substantiation stage in the text organizational structure. In this paragraph, the writer supports the claim he presents in the thesis that China is rising as an international power. The evidence introduced in this paragraph, however, is the fourth time that the writer provides an evidence in the text to
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support his argument. The discourse marker *iḍāfatān ḫāli ḫalika kull-i-hi* that opens this paragraph, therefore, indicates that what is coming is a continuation of the current argument.

Another sentence-initial discourse marker that denotes continuity when occurring paragraph-initially is *ṭumma* ‘moreover.’ The only time that this discourse marker appears paragraph-initially in the data is when it marks the boundary between two substantiation stages in the text’s organizational structure. Unlike sentence-initial *ṭumma* which denotes a temporal sequence, as mentioned previously, *ṭumma*, that occurs at the onset of the paragraph, signals logical sequence between two points of argumentation. This means that the role of this discourse marker at the global level of text is to signal continuity in the development of an argument.

The four sentence-initial inferential discourse markers *liḍā, min hunā, bi-l-tālī* all meaning ‘thus, therefore’ and *hākadā* ‘thus, and so’ also indicate continuity when they occur paragraph-initially. The analysis shows that each of these discourse markers appears only one time at the onset of a paragraph in the data. In the four times they occur paragraph-initially, however, *liḍā, min hunā, bi-l-tālī* and *hākadā* introduce paragraphs that evaluate evidence presented in previous paragraphs. The function of these discourse markers that occur at the boundary between a point and its evaluation, therefore, is to signal continuity by showing the logical relevance of the following paragraph to the previous one. Consider the logical continuity signaled by paragraph-initial *liḍā* in the following example.
Therefore, it seems that the apparent Iranian defiance, reflected in its decision to resume uranium enrichment activities and exult its military capabilities, cannot conceal Iran's search for a way out in Iraq, Lebanon, or Palestine, hoping that this would eliminate or ease the pressures on it and give it an opportunity to catch its breath. Along this line, Iran has begun clipping the wings of President Ahmadinejad, of whom many Iranian officials began to acknowledge that his impulsiveness has drawn too much attention and accelerated the sanctions imposed on their country, which has not yet reached the nuclear stage that Ahmadinejad implies in his statements. Moreover, Nejad's hard-line attitude undermined Iran's ties with Europe and the Arab world, pushing it back to square one, except for the window of opportunity that Tehran opened with its ongoing dialogue with Riyadh. While growing criticism of the Iranian president's policies have led to what could be seen as a parliamentarian division in Iran, a change of leadership has been ruled out due to the concerns of repeating the Sadr scenario in Iraq. The Iranian regime sees Ahmadinejad as a product, not an enemy, of the revolution. The issue, therefore, is only a matter of calibration and modification.

In example (82), the paragraph introduced by the discourse marker *liyd* (*therefore*) evaluates the substantiations that the writer presents in the previous paragraphs. In this text, the writer states in the thesis that Iran is worried and confused although its actions implies otherwise. Then, in the following paragraphs, he argues for this claim by presenting a
number of reasons that prove Iran's anxiety. The above paragraph, i.e. example (82), then follows to evaluate the validity of the writer’s substantiations in supporting his argument. 

*lidā* that appears at the initial position of this evaluative paragraph, therefore, signals continuity by indicating that the evaluation presented in this paragraph is logically inferred from the evidence presented in the previous paragraphs.

*lākin/lākinna, gayra ‘anna* both meaning ‘however, but’ are also sentence-initial discourse markers that appear paragraph-initially. However, these two sentence-initial discourse markers do not denote continuity when they occur at the onset of a paragraph. At the global level of text structure, *lākin/lākinna* and *gayra ‘anna* either open a paragraph where the thesis is introduced or a paragraph that functions as an evaluation stage in the text organizational structure. The thesis presented in the paragraphs that these discourse markers introduce, however, is not a thesis that is cited to be argued through but rather a thesis that presents the writer’s counter-argument. In the counter-argumentation style, as discussed previously, the writer introduces generally agreed-upon information followed by the writer’s counter-claim. This means that *lākin/lākinna* and *gayra ‘anna* signal that there is a turn from a stage where an agreed-upon claim is presented to a stage where the writer presents his counter-claim. The function of these markers, therefore, is to mark a point where the writer refocuses the reader’s attention from one aspect of the topic which is generally agreed upon to another aspect of the same topic which the writer adopts. On the other hand, when these two discourse markers introduce an evaluation stage, their function is also to refocus the reader’s attention to a new aspect of a topic. This is because in these cases *lākin/lākinna* and *gayra ‘anna* mark a boundary between two
evaluation stages in which the writer evaluates two different aspects of one topic. Here is an example that illustrates the refocusing function of läkin when it introduces a paragraph that presents the writer’s counter-argument.

(83)

The city of Dubai represents an Arab dream. It is a success story that needs to be told in detail continually. It is no longer a secret that Dubai and its success were built upon strategic foundations, a strong will, and an effective leadership. This wonderful atmosphere is a great opportunity that attracts investments, tourism, and recreation. Multitudes of giant international companies, therefore, came to this flourishing city, as well as thousands of ambitious people seeking wealth and a comfortable lifestyle and wanting to build a bright future for themselves. To enable this, specialized cities within Dubai were established in the fields of finance, internet, media, and so on. The required specialization of added value is the key to a great economical surge.
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(wa-lākin) However, recently, something terrible took place that changed that picture. Something really unacceptable. The announcement was made that the headquarters of the American company, Halliburton, would move from Houston, Texas in the USA to Dubai in the UAE. This decision comes after the company suffered at the hands of Congress because of the strong accusations of tax evasion made against it and for receiving "special" and "unusual" treatment and acquiring a number of deals in Iraq through direct commissioning without going through the usual competition. Many people attribute the reasons behind the company’s special relations with gigantic projects with the US army and large oil companies to the influence of the controversial American Vice-President Dick Cheney who was the Chairman of Halliburton before running in the US elections with President Bush in 2000.

In example (83), lākin appears at the boundary between the background and thesis stages of the text organization. In [P1], the writer provides a context for the text by presenting background information about Dubai’s achievements. This information, however, also serve to create a ground for agreement between the writer and his reader. Then, in [P2], the writer presents his counter-argument that he will argue for in the following paragraphs. The discourse marker lākin that introduces the thesis in [P2], therefore, marks a refocus from an agreed-upon aspect of the topic, i.e. that Dubai is a model of success, to a contrastive aspect of the same topic which the writer adopts, i.e. that there is something unpleasant disturbing this success.

ammā...fa ‘as for’ is another sentence-initial discourse marker that marks a refocusing point in the text flow when it occurs at the paragraph onset. Just as lākin/lākinna and gayra ‘anna signal that the writer is redirecting the reader’s attention to another aspect of the same topic that he is discussing; so does ammā...fa. This discourse marker that occurs 14 times paragraph-initially is found to introduce either a substantiation or an evaluation stage of text structure. In both cases, however, ammā...fa
signals that there is a turn to a new aspect of the same topic being discussed. It marks a boundary either between two substantiation stages in which the writer discusses two different aspects of the same evidence, or two evaluation stages where two aspects of the same topic are evaluated. The following example illustrates how ammā...fa refocuses the reader’s attention to another aspect of the topic being evaluated.

(84)

P1 Transits in the early periods. Sometimes? When the time is ripe, the Arab public’s attention shifts to another aspect of the same topic being discussed. It marks a boundary either between two substantiation stages in which the writer discusses two different aspects of the same evidence, or two evaluation stages where two aspects of the same topic are evaluated. The following example illustrates how ammā...fa refocuses the reader’s attention to another aspect of the topic being evaluated.

P2 If it is based upon the former, and upon attempting to create a balance with the Shia activity that is backed by the Iranian infatuation, there will

P3 What if we consider the case in the context of electoral campaigns or new and changing convictions? This question is yet to be answered. However, this region with all its chaotic events will not wait much longer for an answer. The Sunnis and the Arabs need to make a painful but crucial decision vis-à-vis strategic and dangerous “movements” on the Iraqi scene. The decision is between movement based on sectarianism or ethnicity.
be no other choice but to open the door to cooperation with Turkey. This will result in benefiting from its Sunni magnitude and sound relations with Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt as well as its expansion in Central Asian countries, a large part of which are of Turkish ethnicity, yet it shares its borders with Iran. Such “movement” requires overlooking the issue of “Arabism.” It also requires introducing the Kurds into the equation. This will be no easy challenge owing to mistrust between Kurds and Turks.

[P3] (ammā...fa) If the issue remains in perspective of a conflict between Arabs and Persians, then the game must be based on including rational Shia Arabs, specifically Iraqis, who do not follow the Iranian “wave”. There are rising Shia voices in Lebanon and Iraq that demonstrate that there is a widening gap between the Shia of Iran and the rest of the Shia, a factor that should be used positively.

The three paragraphs in example (84) represent the thesis and an evaluation of this thesis. In [P1], the writer introduces his viewpoint stating that a strategic step should be taken in order to end the chaotic situation in the region. This step, however, could be based either on sectarianism or ethnicity. In the following two paragraphs, i.e. [P2] and [P3], the writer then evaluates these two choices. The boundary between [P2] and [P3] is marked by ammā...fa to distinguish between two stages of evaluation in which two aspects of the same topic are evaluated.

The explanatory discourse marker fa ‘since, for’ is also a sentence-initial discourse marker that appears paragraph-initially in the data. This discourse marker, however, does not refocus the reader’s attention to another aspect of the same topic, but rather marks a shift to a new topic. Twelve of the 15 paragraph-initial occurrences of fa introduce substantiation stages of text structure. The three other occurrences mark evaluation and conclusion. Because the 12 substantiation-initial occurrences show
consistency in the function they perform, the other three occurrences are not taken into consideration.

The analysis shows that in the 13 cases where fa appears at the initial position of a substantiation stage of text structure, this substantiation paragraph follows a stage of the text structure where the thesis or its evaluation are presented. This means that fa marks the opening of the argumentation part in the text structure. It indicates that the text is moving from the part in which the writer presents his opinion to a different part in which he starts supporting this opinion. Therefore, paragraph-initial fa marks a point of topic change in the text development. However, it indicates at the same time how the new topic relates to the previous one. It signals that the upcoming stage provides a rationale that supports the claim presented in the previous stage. The following example illustrates the function of fa as an introducer of the part of text where the argumentation is presented.

(85)

[\text{P1}] 

ثلاث قضايا عربية مثيرة ستكون على جدول أعمال القمة، وهي تحريك مسار السلام المعطل بين الفلسطينيين والإسرائيليين، وتخلق حالة من التوافق بين الأطراف الفاعلة في العراق وإخراج لبنان عن أزمته الحائكة. يخطى العرب إذا اعتقدوا أن ليس في يدهم حل لهذه القضايا المثلثية.

[\text{P2}] 

فهناك (fa) قاعدة أساسية تتعلق منها العرب تجاه عملية السلام في الشرق الأوسط وهي المبادرة العربية التي هي قاعدة تمنع الاختلاف والتناين، والذي يحتاجه العرب هو الترويج لهذه المبادرة والقيام بحملة دبلوماسية واسعة على أعلى المستويات. ومنها تشكل وقد من عدد من القادة العرب لزيارة العواصم الكبرى في واشنطن وموسكو ولندن وغيرها من أجل ابتداء زخم دولي لحل القضية على قاعدة المبادرة العربية ودفع الإسرائيليين للاعتراض بهذه المبادرة.

[\text{P1}] The following three burning issues will be on the agenda of the upcoming Arab summit: bringing the interrupted peace process between 

\footnote{Text 11, P 2, S 1.2.} \footnote{Text 11, P 3, S 5-7.}
the Palestinians and Israelis back on course, creating a state of conformity between effective parties in Iraq, and helping Lebanon emerge from the crisis that is gripping it. Arabs would be making a mistake if they assume that there is nothing they can do to solve these issues.

[P2] (fa) The Arab initiative serves as a fundamental base for Arab action toward peace in the Middle East and prevents disagreement or discrepancy. Arabs need to promote this initiative and to launch a broad diplomatic campaign at the highest echelons. This includes the formation of a delegation of Arab leaders to visit major world capitals such as Washington, Moscow, London, Beijing, and others, in an effort to build international momentum toward resolving the Palestinian-Israeli issue based on the Arab initiative, and making the Israelis recognize this initiative.

In example (85), The writer presents his thesis in [P1] and then starts arguing for his point of view in [P2] that follows. This means that fa marks a boundary point in the text structure where the topic changes from stating an opinion to supporting this opinion. fa, however, not only marks a shift to a new topic, but it also provides information on how the new topic relates to the previous one. It indicates that the upcoming paragraph provides the rationale for the opinion stated in the thesis.

'ilan ‘thus, therefore, so’ is another sentence-initial discourse marker that marks a shift to a new topic when it appears paragraph-initially. In the three times that this discourse marker occurs at the paragraph-initial position in the data it introduces paragraphs that function as the conclusion stage in the text structure. Conclusion is an important stage of text structure that indicates reaching the final point in a discussion. This means that ilan signals a point in the text organizational structure where there is a shift from the stages in which the writer develops his arguments and evaluates them to a stage where he places his final thoughts. Table 5.13. shows, moreover, that there are also
two other textual discourse markers that open conclusions in the data of this study. These discourse markers *al-kulāṣat-u 'anna/kulāṣat-u al-qawl-i 'inna al-`amri 'inna* ‘to sum up, in summary’ *bi-kalām-in `ākar-a* ‘in other words’ that introduce conclusions in text also indicate a shift in the text flow although they do not occur sentence-initially. The following example illustrates how *idān* marks that there is a shift towards the end of the text.

(86)

إذاً (idān) Therefore, it is culture, education, institutionalization and law that matters. These are the infrastructure that a successful democratic experience requires. Thus, is this infrastructure available to any Arab society? Has any Arab regime sought to lay down its foundations? This question remains to be answered in another article.

Example (86) is the last paragraph in a text that tries to answer this question: why does the application of democracy fail in the Arab world when it succeeds in other countries? The writer argues that applying democracy fails in the Arab world because these countries only apply the form of democracy without seeking to establish a solid bases for its application. In his opinion, democracy is a political system that needs four basis to flourish: culture, education, institutionalization, and law. The writer goes on to argue for his point by explaining the importance of each of these four elements in implementing democracy. In the concluding paragraph that is presented in example (86),

---

220 Text 23, P 16, S 87-89.
the writer signals that he is reaching the end of his argument. He opens this paragraph with the discourse marker *iḍan* to signal a shift from the part of the text in which he argues for his viewpoint to the final part in which he presents his final thoughts to close the argument.

To sum up, it is clear from the above discussion that the local and global functions served by the discourse markers listed in table 5.13 are similar in their nature but different in their scope. The additive, sequential, and resultative functions that the discourse markers *iḍāfatan ilā dālika kull-i-hi/yudāf-u ilā dālika ‘anna, faḍlan ‘an ‘anna, ḥattā, tumma, lidā, min hunā, bi-l-tāli and hākadā signa,l* when occurring sentence-initially, are consistent with the continuity function that these markers perform at the paragraph level. Although continuity is a general notion that is not tied to specific relations, it shows consistency with some relations, such as elaboration, sequence, and result, more than other relations, such as contrast, conclusion, and reason, as discussed previously.

Moreover, the function that the contrastive discourse markers *lākin/lākinna, ǧayra ‘anna* and *ammā...fa* serve at the sentence-initial position is consistent with the function that they serve when occurring paragraph-initially. These markers that signal contrast between two propositions at the sentence level serve at the global level to mark a boundary between two paragraphs that discuss two aspects of one topic. The contrastive role that these discourse markers serve at the sentence level is consistent with the refocusing role that they perform at the paragraph level because at both levels these discourse markers signal a point of distinction between two related but different aspects of one topic.
The explanatory function served by *fa* and the concluding function served by *idan* at the initial position of the sentence is also consistent with the topic change function performed by these two discourse markers at the onset of the paragraph. *fa* that functions as an explanatory discourse marker when introducing sentences, signals a shift to the argumentation part in the text structure when occurring paragraph-initially. However, when marking the shift to a new topic at the global level, *fa* also signals how the new topic provides a rationale to the previous part of the text. At both the local and global levels of text, therefore, *fa* indicates that the following unit provides a rationale for the previous one. On the other hand, the concluding function that *idan* performs at the onset of the sentence is consistent with its function at the paragraph boundary to set the final thoughts of the writer apart from the rest of the text.

### b- Interpersonal Discourse Markers at the Global Level

The main function of interpersonal discourse markers that occur sentence-initially is to establish relations between the writer, the reader, and the text. This type of discourse markers, as has been discussed, also have a minor textual role that is dominated by its interpersonal function at the sentence level. While the analysis shows that most of the interpersonal discourse markers that appear at paragraph boundaries are similar to the ones that appear sentence-initially, it also indicates that there is some difference in the function performed by these items at the paragraph level. When examining the function of interpersonal discourse markers at the paragraph level, it was found that the minor
textual role that these items display at the sentence level becomes more noticeable when they occur paragraph-initially.

Because of the obvious textual function performed by interpersonal discourse markers at the onset of paragraphs, both the stages of text structure that these discourse markers signal and the conceptual meaning that they convey are taken into consideration in describing the functions of these items. Tables 5.14. and 5.15., therefore, list the paragraph-initial interpersonal discourse markers that are found in the data of this study along with the conceptual meaning they express and the structural stages that they mark.

**Table 5.14. Subjective Discourse Markers that Occur Paragraph-initial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence-initial function</th>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Stage of text structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse markers of certainty</td>
<td>لا شَكْ أَنَّ/لا شَكْ فِي أَنْ/أَنْ/لَا شَكْ فِيهِ أَنَّ lā šakk-a 'anna/lā šakk-a fi 'anna/mā lā šakk-a fihi 'anna</td>
<td>There is no doubt that, undoubtedly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thesis, evaluation, conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>إنْ/inna</td>
<td>Certainly, indeed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>لَقَدْ/la-qad</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الأَكَيدُ أَنْ/al-‘akīd-u 'anna</td>
<td>Surely, definitely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evaluation, conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لَارِبَ بِـَأَنْ/lā rayb-a 'anna</td>
<td>There is no doubt that, undoubtedly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence-initial function</td>
<td>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>No. of occurrences</td>
<td>Stage of text structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Discourse markers of certainty | من الواضح أنه
\( min \text{ al-}wādh-i \)\( '\text{anna-hu} \) | It is evident that, it is clear that | 1 | Conclusion |
| | الواقع أن
\( al-wāqi'-u \)\( '\text{anna} \) | As a matter of fact | 3 | Evaluation |
| | لابد أن
\( lā \text{ budd-a} \)\( '\text{anna} \) | It is certain that | 1 | |
| Discourse markers of probability | ربما
\( rubbamā \) | Perhaps | 3 | Thesis |
| | قد+(فعل)
\( qad+ \) imperfect verb | | 2 | |
| Evaluative personal comments | لأنّي
\( lā \text{ 'adrī} \) | I wonder | 1 | Evaluation |
| | المثير للأسى أن
\( Al-muṭr-u l-\)\( l-'asā \)\( 'anna \) | Sadly | 1 | |
| | لسوء الحظ فإن
\( li-sū'\text{'}i al-\)\( kāzz-i fa-'inna \) | Unfortunately | 1 | |
| | من المستغرب أن
\( min \text{ al-}mustagrab-i \)\( '\text{anna} \) | It is surprising that | 1 | |
Table 5.14. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence-initial function</th>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Stage of text structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writer’s point of view</td>
<td>يبدو/يبدو أنّ yabdi/yabdū ʾanna</td>
<td>It seems that</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15. Interactive Discourse Markers that Occur Paragraph-initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence-initial function</th>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Stage of text structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention-getting discourse markers</td>
<td>المثير في الأمر أن/الأمر المثير للاهتمام هو الأمر المثير الآخر أنّ</td>
<td>al-muṣīr-u fī al-ʾamr-i ʾanna/al-ʾamr-u al-muṣīr-u li-l-ʾiḥtīmām-i huwa ʾanna/ al-ʾamr-u al-muṣīr-u al-ʾākhar-u ʾanna</td>
<td>What is interesting about the matter is that</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>السؤال هو السؤال المطرح</td>
<td>al-suʿāl-u huwa/ al-suʿāl-u al-matrūḥ-u</td>
<td>The question is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ما ييمناً هنا هو</td>
<td>mā yahum-mu-nā hunā huwa</td>
<td>What is interesting here is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.15. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence-initial function</th>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Stage of text structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention-getting discourse markers</td>
<td>المفارقة</td>
<td><em>al-mufaraqat-u</em></td>
<td>Ironically</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>المفارقة</td>
<td><em>al-qā`imat-u</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>المفارقة</td>
<td><em>hāliyy-an hiya</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>المفارقة</td>
<td><em>`anna</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>أكثر أهمية أن</td>
<td><em>al-`akgar-u</em></td>
<td>Most importantly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>أكثر أهمية أن</td>
<td>*<code>ahamiyyat-an</code></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>أكثر أهمية أن</td>
<td><em>`anna</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الغريب في الأمر أن</td>
<td><em>al-`garib-u fi</em></td>
<td>Oddly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الغريب في الأمر أن</td>
<td><em>al-`amr-i</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الغريب في الأمر أن</td>
<td><em>`anna</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الملفات أن</td>
<td><em>al-lūfit-u</em></td>
<td>What is interesting is</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>الملفات أن</td>
<td><em>`anna</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>المشكلة هي أن</td>
<td><em>al-mu`kilat-u</em></td>
<td>The problem is</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>المشكلة هي أن</td>
<td><em>hiya</em></td>
<td>that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ليتُبادر بالإشارة إلى أن</td>
<td><em>li-nubūdir-a</em></td>
<td>Firsly, it must be mentioned</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ليتُبادر بالإشارة إلى أن</td>
<td><em>bi-l-`iṣārat-i</em></td>
<td>that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ليتُبادر بالإشارة إلى أن</td>
<td><em>`ilā</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>صحيح أن</td>
<td><em>ṣaḥīḥ-un</em></td>
<td>It is true that</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourse marker that guides interpretation

|                            | صحيح أن | *ṣaḥīḥ-un* | It is true that            | 3                     |                        |

Discourse markers that appeal to the reader

|                            | علينا | *`alaynā* | We should admit that      | 1                     |                        |
|                            | الاعتراف أن | *al-`iṭirāf-u* |                                |                        |                        |
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It is clear from the above two tables, i.e. 5.14. and 5.15., that the interpersonal discourse markers that appear at paragraph initial positions in the data of this study are similar to those that are identified sentence-initially. Moreover, just as the sentence-initial interpersonal discourse markers are found to convey two different conceptual meanings: subjective and interactive, so are paragraph-initial interpersonal discourse markers.

Table 5.14. shows that subjective interpersonal discourse markers that appear at paragraph initial positions either express the writer’s evaluation of the content of the paragraph or present the topic from his point-of-view. The analysis indicates that discourse markers that express the writer’s certainty of the content of the paragraph, whether they are emphatic expressions or personal comments, occur 42 times in the data. Out of the 42 occurrences of these markers, three open a thesis stage of text structure, 24 an evaluation stage, and 15 a conclusion stage. On the other hand, all five occurrences of discourse markers of probability in the data appear at the onset of a thesis stage of text structure. Discourse markers that present the message from the writer’s viewpoint, however, occur only three times opening an evaluation stage of text structure.

On the other hand, table 5.15. demonstrates that most of the interactive discourse markers that are identified at paragraph-initial positions in the data serve an attention-getting function. The analysis shows that out of the 18 paragraph-initial occurrences of interactive discourse markers in the data, 14 occurrences serve to draw the attention of the reader to an important point in the following paragraph. These attention-getting discourse markers appear four times at the onset of a thesis stage in the text structure while they occur ten times at the initial position of an evaluation stage. The four other
occurrences of interactive discourse markers at the paragraph initial position appear at the onset of an evaluation stage either to appeal to the reader or to guide his interpretation.

According to the above two tables, therefore, the only stages of text structure that interpersonal discourse markers, whether subjective or interactive, are associated with are: thesis, evaluation, and conclusion. This means that interpersonal discourse markers that occur paragraph-initially in the data mostly open prominent stages in the text organizational structure that the writer usually wants to emphasize and highlight.

On the one hand, subjective discourse markers that appear paragraph-initially are found to mark the onset of thesis, evaluation and conclusion stages of text structure signaling a topic change at these points. These discourse markers, therefore, serve to set important text stages off while at the same time signaling the importance of their content. In fact, it seems that it is the emphatic force of the subjective discourse markers that produce the strong textual shift at these major points of text structure. Consider how the subjective discourse markers in the following examples signal topic shifts by means of their emphatic effect.

(87)

[221] Text 19, P 1, S1-4.
[P1] Americans in Baghdad have admitted that their forces will stop pursuing political leaders that are implicated in violence and will track the culprits of militia soldiers directly. This policy is doomed to fail if indeed the aim is to end the violence that has already spilled much blood. Leaders are usually opportunists. Thus, they would not care if half their supporters died while executing their plans, whatever they may be, from eliminating opponents to spreading chaos, or declaring wars.

[P2] (inna) The pursuit of the real leaders in the ongoing crisis of political and sectarian genocide in Iraq is indeed the only real solution that can save time and blood. Such leaders, Sunni or Shia, who murder innocent civilians are cowards and will not put themselves at the risk of any confrontation with the government or US forces. They will sacrifice their troops but not hazard their own lives or personal interests, because their goal is to build glory and influence at any cost.

(88)

[223] Text 47, P 3, S 6-14
Jordan is aspiring to possess nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Especially that King Abdullah II made some hints about such orientation, although he also warned of the perceived repercussions of a nuclear race in the region. This means that the rules of the game in the Middle East have to change, now that so many countries in the region intend to look at developing such programs. In addition, during his Eid al-Adha speech, Yemeni President Ali Abdullah Saleh has expressed the same desire by sending signs of support to the decision of the GCC summit that calls for setting up a joint Gulf program in the field of peaceful nuclear energy. Egypt is also timidly manifesting a desire to possess nuclear technology. This wish was renewed after Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak's visit to Russia, where he signed a memorandum of understanding to extend and deepen bilateral cooperation between the two countries in the field of peaceful nuclear energy. This is particularly relevant especially that Israel has refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) for years. Likewise, the Algerian nuclear record is not something concealed from public opinion, since it is an old and renewable file. Moreover, there are some Arab countries which do not openly show any interest and yet wish to own such a program. Or some countries which have openly abandoned their nuclear ambitions for fear of losing their sovereignty, such as Libya.

There is no doubt that the Arab agenda has changed after it became clear that Iran would not meet the deadline it had been given to halt its nuclear activities. This means that a similar action will be taken by Arab countries since the Jewish State possess this weapon and Iran pursues the same path. Therefore, that more than 20 Arab countries remain without this nuclear technology is something that these countries consider a fatal defect. If the nuclear technology race in the Middle East continues, even for peaceful purposes, it will inevitably revive the memories of the two bombs dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the health and environment crises resulting from the explosion at the Russian reactor of Chernobyl, whose consequences still affect subsequent generations.

224 Text 47, P. 4, S 15-18.
It is clear that there is a topic change in [P2] in both examples (87) and (88). In example (87), the subjective discourse marker ‘inna ‘certainly, indeed’ that opens [P2] marks a boundary point between a background stage that locates the text in its context and a stage of text structure in which the writer presents his thesis. However, the subjective discourse marker lā šakk-a fī ‘anna ‘there is no doubt that, undoubtedly’ that introduces [P2] in example (88), marks a boundary point between a substantiation stage in which the writer presents evidence to argue for his point of view and an evaluation stage in which he stresses the significance of his viewpoint in light of this evidence. In both of these examples, the emphatic force of the subjective discourse markers not only signals an obvious topic change at the boundary point where they occur, but it also emphasizes the importance of the topic that is being initiated.

On the other hand, interactive discourse markers that occur at paragraph boundaries serve to refocus the reader’s attention to a specific point of a current topic. These discourse markers are also found to perform this textual function at the onset of two stages of text structure that are usually highlighted: thesis and evaluation. There is, however, a strong relation between the textual role that the interactive discourse markers serve and their interactive function. The analysis shows, as has been mentioned earlier, that most of the interactive discourse markers that appear paragraph-initially are discourse markers of notification, i.e. attention-getting discourse markers. It seems, therefore, that it is the interactive attention-getting effect of these discourse markers that creates their refocusing textual force. The close relation between the interactive function of discourse markers of notification and the function served by textual discourse markers
was also realized at the local level of text structure, as has been mentioned previously.

The following examples illustrate the attention-getting/refocusing interpersonal/textual role of the paragraph-initial discourse markers of notification.

(89)

[PI] في آخر استفتاء حول الوضع الديني في فرنسا نشرته مجلة عالم الديانات، تبين أن الكاثوليكية نكاد تكون قد انحرفت في الدولة التي طالما تسمى ببنية الكنيسة. فحسب الأرقام المشتركة لا يتجاوز نسبة من يعتبرون أنهم كاثوليك 51 في المائة من السكان مقابل 67 في مطلع السبعينيات من بينهم 8 في المائة فقط يواكبون على الصلاة في الكنيسة يوم الأحد أي أقل من ثلاثة ملايين فرنسي.225

[PF] المثير في الأمر أن (al-μuṭr-u fī al-‘amr-i ʿanna) انهيار الكنيسة الكاثوليكية في فرنسا الذي هو ظاهرة عامة في أوروبا واكتشاف ظاهرة تبدو متعارضتين مع هذا المشهد البازز هو من جهة أزمة النظام العلماني، وانتشار الطوائف الدينية الجديدة الغربية على النسيج الطقوسي التقليدي. وعلي رغم أن هذه المشاهد الثلاثة تبدو متعارضة، إلا أنها في واقع الأمر متلازمة يفسر بعضها بعضا، وتدرج في السياق ذاته. أي انهيار القاعدية المعبرية والمؤسسة للديانات التاريخية وتشكل المطلق الديني، وفق النماذج المجتمعية والسلوكية الجديدة.226

[PI] A recent survey of the religious situation in France published by ‘Le Monde des Religions’ magazine, revealed that Catholicism appears to have declined in the state that has long been hailed the ‘Daughter of the Church.’ According to the published figures, those who consider themselves Catholics constitute no more than 51 percent of the population, compared with what stood at 67 percent in the 1970s. Only a miniscule 8 percent regularly attend Sunday services – that is, less than 3 million French.

[PF] (al-μuṭr-u fī al-‘amr-i ʿanna) What is interesting about the matter is that the decline of the Catholic Church in France – which is also a general European phenomenon – coincided with two phenomena that seem to be contradictory to this striking scene, namely, the crisis of the secular system and the spread of religious sects that are alien to the traditional ritual fabric. Although the three examples seem to contradict one another, they do, in fact, constitute a pattern where they explain one another. And they fall within the same context. That is the collapse of the standard and institutional foundation of historical religions, and the

225 Text 4, P 1, S 1, 2.
226 Text 4, P 2, S 3-6.
formation of the religious absolute in accordance with new societal and behavioral models.

(90)

And from the beginning [P1] since the very beginning, Berry confessed to some Lebanese statesmen that his actions were bound by the Syrian rejection of the tribunal. Given that, his willingness to engage in a dialogue with Haririri may be at the request of Syria, which is seeking to buy time until the Riyadh summit is held, an inter-Lebanese agreement is announced, and the essential issue of the international tribunal is put aside. This is the point behind declaring intentions and setting up committees to study the issue of the international tribunal, while at the same time insisting on retaining the obstructing third in the framework of a national unity government.

[P2] (al-muškilat-u hiya 'anna) The problem is that Syria's diplomacy today is the same diplomacy as before the vote on UN Resolution 1559. As in the recent past, this diplomacy did not listen to French President Jacques Chirac's message, which was delivered by his Diplomatic Advisor Maurice Gourdault-Montagne, about the necessary action to stabilize the region. The Syrian diplomacy is also deaf to the European message conveyed to Damascus by EU foreign policy chief Javier Solana. It does not heed the advice of Saudi Arabia and Egypt, either. Moreover, it has failed to apply the advice of its ally, Iran, about the necessity to accept the international tribunal.
The discourse markers of notification that introduce [P2] in both examples (89) and (90) indicate that the writer wants to redirect the attention of the reader to a specific aspect of the topic being discussed. The discourse marker *al-μufir-u fi al-‘amr-i ‘anna* ‘what is interesting about the matter is that’ that opens [P2] in example (89) serves to refocus the reader’s attention from the general information introduced in the background stage of text structure to a specific point that is related to this information but has more importance because it represents the writer’s thesis. In example (90), however, the discourse marker *wa-l-muškilat-u hiya ‘anna* ‘the problem is that’ marks a point where the writer wants to refocus the reader’s attention from a substantiation stage in which evidence is presented to an evaluation stage where the significance of this evidence is emphasized.

Both subjective/evaluative and interactive/attention-getting discourse markers, therefore, mark important points in text progression. However, these two types of interpersonal discourse markers employ different strategies to signal this importance. Subjective/evaluative discourse markers that occur at the onset of thesis, evaluation, or conclusion stages mark a topic change at the points where they occur. The emphatic force of these discourse markers set off the paragraphs that they introduce, marking them as prominent parts in the text’s organizational structure. On the other hand, interactive/attention-getting discourse markers, that open thesis or evaluation stages only, serve to redirect the reader’s attention to an important point in a current topic. They indicate that the upcoming stage is related to but more important than the previous one. Therefore, unlike the evaluative discourse markers that signal importance by setting the
following paragraph off, attention-getting discourse markers signal that the content of the following paragraph is important in relation to the information provided in the previous paragraph. Both of these strategies that the two different types of interpersonal discourse markers employ, however, signal that there is a move in the text structure toward an important point in the text structure.

**c- The Functions of Global Discourse Markers**

It is clear from the discussion in the above two sections that the textual and interpersonal discourse markers that occur at paragraph boundaries in the data serve three main textual functions: continuity, refocus, and change of topic. While continuity is indicated only by textual discourse markers, refocusing attention, and marking topic change in text could be signaled by both textual and interpersonal discourse markers.

The analysis shows that continuity in the development of an argument could be signaled by additive, sequential, or inferential textual discourse markers. Additive and sequential paragraph-initial discourse markers mostly open paragraphs that function either as the second or third substantiation stage in the text’s organizational structure. Occurring at this point of text structure means that these markers signal continuation in the development of an ongoing argument. Paragraph-initial inferential discourse markers, on the other hand, mark the onset of a paragraph that evaluates the content of a previous paragraph. These markers indicate that the evaluation in the following paragraph is a logical consequence that is inferred from the content of the previous paragraph and hence is a continuation of it. It should be pointed out, moreover, that *wa*, i.e. the local-global
discourse marker of continuity, also serves a continuity function at the global level of text.

Another global function that paragraph-initial discourse markers serve is refocusing the reader’s attention to a point that is relevant to the discussion. However, unlike continuity that is signaled only by textual paragraph-initial discourse markers, refocusing the attention of the reader is a global function that both textual and interpersonal paragraph-initial discourse markers perform. This function is performed by textual contrastive discourse markers as well as interpersonal discourse markers of notification. On the one hand, paragraph-initial contrastive discourse markers appear at a boundary point between two paragraphs that discuss two different aspects of one topic. Therefore, they serve to refocus the reader’s attention from one aspect of a topic to another aspect of the same topic. On the other hand, discourse markers of notification that occur at the onset of paragraphs that serve as thesis or evaluation refocus the reader’s attention to the following point by signaling the importance of this point in relation to the previous one.

The third global function that discourse markers perform at the onset of paragraphs is signaling a topic change. Just as the refocusing function, the topic change function is also performed by textual and interpersonal paragraph-initial discourse markers. On the one hand, textual discourse markers that indicate topic change at the global level of text are of two types: explanatory and conclusive discourse markers. \textit{fa} ‘since, for,’ which is the only explanatory discourse marker that occurs paragraph-initially in the data, often opens the first substantiation paragraph in the text. This means
that this discourse marker marks a point in the text structure where the topic changes from introducing an opinion to supporting this opinion. While fa is the only explanatory discourse marker that appears at paragraph onset in the data, there are, however, three conclusive discourse markers that occur paragraph-initially. idan ‘thus, therefore, so,’ al-kulāṣat-u ‘anna/ţulāṣat-u al-qawl-i ‘inna/ţulāṣat-u al-’amr-i ‘inna ‘to sum up, in summary,’ bi-kalām-in ‘āğar-a ‘in other words’ are conclusive discourse markers that signal a shift to the final stage of the text structure where the writer puts his final thoughts in order to close his argument. On the other hand, evaluative interpersonal discourse markers also signal points of topic change in the text structure. These markers that open thesis, evaluation, or conclusion paragraphs emphasize the importance of the structural stages that they introduce by marking them as points of topic change.

Interpersonal discourse markers, therefore, display a clear textual function at the paragraph level. However, the textual function that these markers perform is not exactly the same as the textual function performed by textual discourse markers. In addition to the textual function that paragraph-initial interpersonal discourse markers serve, these markers still have their original interpersonal effect. This means that although interpersonal discourse markers, just as textual discourse markers, signal a refocus or change of topic at paragraph boundaries, the evaluative or attention-getting meaning of these interpersonal markers produce an additional effect that is not created by the textual discourse markers. In other words, paragraph-initial interpersonal discourse markers play a double role at the text global level. While maintaining their evaluative or attention-
getting effect, these markers use the force of this effect to signal boundaries in the text organizational structure.

The emphatic textual role of paragraph-initial interpersonal discourse markers renders these markers very effective devices for marking major turns in the text organizational structure. Interpersonal discourse markers, the analysis shows, have more tendency to occur paragraph-initially than occurring sentence initially. While 20% of paragraph boundaries in the data are introduced with interpersonal discourse markers, these markers introduce only 8% of sentence boundaries in the data. However, when interpersonal discourse markers appear at the onset of paragraphs, they mainly introduce thesis, evaluation, or conclusion stages, which are major stages of text structure. These discourse markers note a topic change or refocus attention at these points while at the same time highlighting the importance of their content. In fact, the analysis shows that interpersonal discourse markers form 60% of discourse markers that introduce thesis paragraphs, 66% of discourse markers that introduce evaluation paragraphs and 70% of discourse markers that introduce conclusion paragraphs.

It should be pointed out, however, that among the interpersonal discourse markers that occur paragraph initially, \textit{laqad} and \textit{inna} both meaning ‘certainly, indeed’ are found to have the highest frequency as Table 5.14 demonstrates. On the other hand, in addition to the interpersonal discourse markers, the textual discourse marker \textit{ammā... fa} also shows a tendency to occur paragraph-initially. While 4% of paragraph boundaries in the data are introduced with \textit{ammā... fa} ‘as for,’ only 1% of sentence boundaries start with this discourse marker. This, however, does not apply to the discourse marker \textit{fa} ‘since, for,’
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although its paragraph-initial occurrences are more than those of *ammā... fa*, because of the high frequency of *fa* at the sentence-initial position.

5.4 General Remarks on Discourse Markers in this Study

After introducing an overview of discourse markers identified in the data of this study and describing the functions performed by these items at both sentence and paragraph boundaries, this section presents some final remarks regarding the analysis and description of discourse markers in the present study.

The analysis and description of discourse markers in the previous section of this chapter show that each discourse marker in the data consistently correlates with one functional relation, e.g. *lidālika* ‘thus, therefore’ always correlates with a result relation. This means that the descriptive tool which this study employs for describing the functions of discourse markers provides an effective means for distinguishing between the functions of discourse markers that signal different functional relations. For example, *lidālika* ‘thus, therefore’ that correlates with a result relation performs a different function from *‘aydan* ‘also’ that is associated with elaboration relation. However, the analysis also shows that usually more than one discourse marker is associated with the same functional relation. For example, *‘aydan* ‘also,’ *kamā/kamā anna, kadālika* ‘likewise, furthermore’ and *‘idāfatan ilā* ‘in addition, moreover’ are all associated with the elaboration functional relation. This indicates that although the functional relations with which discourse markers correlate could differentiate between discourse markers of different functions, these relations do not differentiating between discourse markers that perform similar
functions. Therefore, all the additive discourse markers, with the exception of hattā ‘even’ whose meaning adds emphatic effect to its function, are found to perform the same additive function because they are all associated with the elaboration relation. Similarly, because all the resultative discourse markers correlate with a result relation, they are all described as having a resultative function. It should be noted, however, that in the case of contrastive discourse markers the different effects of contrastive relation, i.e. concession, otherwise, contrast, and comparison, provide a means for differentiating between the members of this functional category.

Another thing that the analysis and description of discourse markers in the previous section shows is the similarity between discourse markers that occur at the local and global levels of text structure. The analysis also shows that not only are discourse markers that appear paragraph-initially the same as discourse markers that appear sentence initially, but they also perform functions that are consistent with their sentence-initial functions. For example, the continuity function that additive sentence-initial discourse markers serve at paragraph boundaries is consistent with, though more general than, their local additive function. Likewise, in addition to the textual role that interpersonal discourse markers perform at paragraph boundaries, these items preserve their sentence-initial interpersonal effect. However, although the analysis in this study does not provide any evidence of discourse markers functioning exclusively at one level of text rather than the other, it shows that there are some discourse markers that display more tendency to occur locally, e.g. fa ‘since, for’ and lākin/lākinna ‘however, but,’ while
others display more tendency to occur at the text’s global level, e.g. əlaqad, əinna both meaning ‘certainly, indeed’ and ammā... fa ‘as for’.

Furthermore, the analysis and description of discourse markers in this chapter show that most of the discourse markers that appear at the onset of sentences or paragraphs do not serve any other role other than discourse markers when occurring at this position. For example, the only status that lākin/lākinna ‘however, but,’ əaydan ‘also’ and fa-qad ‘since, for, so, thus,’ constitute at the initial position of a sentence or paragraph is the discourse marker status. However, there are some discourse markers, such as kamā, kaddālika both meaning ‘likewise, furthermore,’ battā ‘even’ and hākadhā ‘thus, and so,’ that may display either a discourse marker status or an adverbial status when they occur sentence or paragraph initially. This indicates that these items are still undergoing the process of grammaticalization or pragmatisiation, and thus the discourse marker and the form from which it originates exist simultaneously performing two different functions at the same initial position.

One more thing that the analysis and description of discourse markers in the previous section show concerns the meaning of discourse markers in this study. The analysis shows that some discourse markers identified in the data display only a pragmatic meaning whereas others encode both conceptual and pragmatic meaning. Discourse markers like lākin/lākinna ‘however, but,’ fa ‘since, for, so, thus,’ əinna ‘certainly, indeed,’ əd əanna ‘since, for’ and wa-əllā fa ‘otherwise, or else,’ for example, have only pragmatic meaning that is defined according to the functions that these items perform. However, yudāf-ə ilā dālika (əanna) ‘in addition to, moreover,’ min hunā ‘thus,
therefore,’ bima’nā ‘anna ‘this means that,’ faḍlan ‘an ‘anna ‘besides’ and fī al-waqt-i nafs-i-hi ‘meanwhile, at the same time’ are examples of discourse markers that encode conceptual meaning besides their pragmatic meaning. Similarly, interpersonal discourse markers display both conceptual and pragmatic meaning encoding a message and signaling at the same time that this message that they encode is to be taken as a comment on the main message. The pragmatic meaning of discourse markers that have conceptual and pragmatic meaning, it has been noticed, is closely tied to their conceptual meaning, and is usually influenced by it.

A final point that should be mentioned here concerns the frequency of some discourse markers in the data of this study. The description of discourse markers in this chapter shows that the most frequent discourse markers used in the data, other than the discourse marker of continuity wa, are the concessive/contrastive discourse marker lākin/lākinna ‘however, but’ and the explanatory discourse marker fa ‘since, for.’ On the other hand, the least frequent discourse markers in the data are those listed in table 5.16 below. Due to their low frequency, as mentioned earlier, these discourse markers are not included in the discourse markers’ group in this study. However, these items are listed here as a reference for future research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أخيراً</td>
<td>'aṣgaran</td>
<td>Lastly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16. Discourse Markers that Appear Less than Three Times in the Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أولًا</td>
<td>ʾawwalan</td>
<td>Firstly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ثانية</td>
<td>tāniyan</td>
<td>Secondly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذاك أنْ</td>
<td>dāka ʾanna</td>
<td>That is because</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حيث</td>
<td>ḥayyu</td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بناء على ذلك</td>
<td>binaʾ-an ʿalā dālika</td>
<td>According to that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بذلك</td>
<td>bidālika</td>
<td>Thus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من أجل ذلك</td>
<td>min ʿajl-i dālika</td>
<td>Because of that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لأنه كذلك</td>
<td>liʾanna-hu kadaʾlika</td>
<td>Because of that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من جهة أخرى</td>
<td>min jihat-in ʿukrā</td>
<td>On the other hand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إنما</td>
<td>ʾinnamā</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>على أن</td>
<td>ʿalā ʾanna</td>
<td>But</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.16. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Correlated relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>على رغم ذلك ف</td>
<td>‘alā rağmi dālika fa</td>
<td>Despite that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مع ذلك ف</td>
<td>ma‘a dālika fa</td>
<td>Despite that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هذا</td>
<td>hādā</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يجيء هذا</td>
<td>yaji‘-u hādā</td>
<td>This comes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ناهيك عن أن</td>
<td>nāhika‘an ‘anna</td>
<td>Moreover</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أم</td>
<td>‘am</td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

The main purpose of the present study is to identify discourse markers in Arabic newspaper opinion articles, and examine how these items function at two levels of text structure, namely the sentence and the paragraph. To this end, the study takes the text rather than the discourse markers themselves as its point of departure. It focuses on the structure of texts as a means for identifying discourse markers in the data and describing the environment in which they occur. Therefore, there are two main parts in this study: the first part focuses on analyzing and describing the texts in the data, whereas the second part focuses on describing how discourse markers function in their natural environment in these texts. The description of discourse markers that the second part of the study presents is based on the analysis that the texts undergo in the first part of the study.

In the first part of the study, a three-step analytical model is employed for analyzing the texts. The analysis starts by segmenting the texts into paragraphs and sentences in order to determine the onset of these units where discourse markers usually occur. A top-down approach is employed in the segmentation process since it is the organizational plan of the text that guides the development of ideas in the text. The second step in the analysis after identifying the boundaries of the texts’ units is to describe the semantic/pragmatic relations that connect these units at each of the two levels of text structure, i.e. the sentence and the paragraph. Rhetorical Structure Theory is used to describe how sentences relate to each other, and Text-type Theory is employed to
describe how paragraphs relate to each other. Both of these relation-based frameworks represent the text structuring relations from the perspective of the text-producer, taking his intended communicative goals as the means for interpreting these relations. In the third step of the analysis, discourse markers are identified in the data. Halliday’s (2005) model of thematic structure analysis provides a tool to distinguish discourse markers, which are not part of the propositional and grammatical core of their host sentences, from other initial items that are semantically and structurally part of the sentence.

After identifying discourse markers in the data and describing the environment in which they occur in the first part of the study, the second part proceeds to describe how these items operate at both sentence and paragraph boundaries. This description is based on the textual environment in which discourse markers occur and on their contribution to this environment. In order to provide a coherent description of the role discourse markers play at the text level, a functional classification of these items is suggested at each level of text structure, i.e. the sentence and the paragraph.

This chapter presents final thoughts that conclude the analysis and description in the present study. It summarizes the important findings of the analysis in the study, refers to the study’s limitations, and gives some suggestions for future research. From the concluding points presented in this chapter, it becomes clear that the analysis and description in this study answer the questions that the study wanted to investigate.
6.2 Concluding Remarks

This section highlights the main findings of the analysis undertaken in the present study. It should be emphasized, however, that these findings are the outcome of analyzing a specific type of text in a specific language, i.e. Arabic newspaper opinion articles. Therefore, they should not be generalized, but rather viewed in relation to the text-type and the language which they represent. The choice, frequency and distribution of discourse markers, it has been attested in discourse markers literature, differ according to the language and text-type in which they operate. Representing one type of text in one language renders the findings of this study more accurate, reliable, and useful for comparison in future research.

In order to summarize the findings of the present study, this section focuses on three main points: the description of discourse markers in the data, the function of discourse markers in the data, and the description of the texts in the data. These points are highlighted because they are the center of the analysis, and thus they represent the main contributions of this study.

One important contribution of this study is identifying discourse markers in the data and describing the main characteristics that distinguish them as a group. The analysis of the data indicates that discourse markers come from different grammatical word classes. These word classes include: coordinating conjunctions, e.g. fa ‘then, since,’ aw ‘or’ and bal ‘rather, but rather,’ particles, e.g. ‘ay anna ‘that is,’ amma...fa ‘as for’ and ‘inna ‘certainly, indeed,’ adverbs, e.g. ‘aylan ‘also,’ maatalan ‘for instance’ and haytu ‘where,’ adverbial phrases, e.g. min llamma ‘after that,’ bi-l-tāli ‘consequently, therefore’
and wa min hunā ‘from here,’ and clauses, e.g. la-qad ’atbat-a al-wāqī‘-u ‘anna ‘reality has proven that,’ wa-lā yafūt-u-nā ‘we should not miss’ and ’a’taqīd-u ‘anna ‘I think that.’ However, these items comprise a distinctive group whose members are distinguishable from the different forms from which they are derived. What distinguishes the members of this discourse markers group is their preference to occur at the initial position of the sentence, their loose attachment, whether structurally or semantically, to the sentences they introduce and their association with the pragmatic force of the text rather than the grammatical structure of the sentence.

One of the most noticeable features that distinguishes discourse markers is their preference to occur sentence-initially. Some of these expressions, the analysis indicates, may occasionally appear in other positions in the sentence where they are set apart from the sentence by commas. However, the initial position of the sentence is the place where these items are most likely to be found. In order to set a clear criterion for identifying discourse markers in this study, only discourse markers that occur sentence-initially are taken into consideration. Identifying the items that are included in this group pave the way for future research to examine what motivates the occasional occurrence of these items elsewhere in the sentence.

Occurring at the sentence-initial position, therefore, is one strong indication of the discourse marker status of the members of this group. For example, the only status that lākin/lākinna ‘however, but,’ ’aydān ‘also’ and fa-qad ‘since, for, so, thus,’ constitute at the initial position of a sentence is the discourse marker status. However, there are members of the discourse markers group such as kamā, kadālika both meaning ‘likewise,
furthermore,’ ḥattā ‘even’ and ḥākatā ‘thus, and so,’ whose occurrence at the onset of the sentence is not enough to distinguish them as discourse markers from their original adverbial forms. This is because these items are still undergoing the process of grammaticalization or pragmaticalization, and thus the discourse marker and the form from which it originates exist simultaneously performing two different functions at the initial position.

Moreover, not only do discourse markers favor the sentence initial position, but they also have a strong tendency to cluster at this position. Out of the 1276 text units introduced by discourse markers in the data, 274 units start with multiple markers. In this cluster, textual discourse markers, such as fa ‘since, for, so, thus’ aw ‘or,’ bal ‘rather, but rather,’ ‘ay ‘anna ‘that is,’ typically precede interpersonal discourse markers, such as la-qad ‘āl-bat-a al-wāqi‘u ‘anna ‘reality has proven that,’ wa-lā yafūt-u-nā ‘we should not miss,’ ‘a‘taqid-u ‘anna ‘I think that.’ This cluster is then followed by the topical Theme, which is the first element in the sentence that has experiential function. This textual-interpersonal-experiential order of the constituents of the thematic slot in the Arabic data of this study is similar to the order realized by Halliday (2004) in his English data. However, unlike Halliday’s (2004) English data, the data of this study show that the topical Theme may also be positioned between either two textual discourse markers or a textual discourse marker and an interpersonal discourse marker. Setting the topical Theme apart from the rest of the sentence by means of two markers framing it is a linguistic technique that Arabic employs to highlight the framed element in order to put it in focus. This framing structure, it should be pointed out, may also be used to frame a
discourse marker between two other discourse markers forming a cluster of three discourse markers.

Another characteristic that distinguishes the members of the discourse markers group is their occurrence outside the propositional content as well as the syntactic structure of their host sentences. This feature differentiates discourse markers from items that occur sentence-initially but constitute part of the sentence’s propositional content and grammatical structure. Therefore, particles such as baynamā ‘while,’ ‘indamā ‘when,’ likay ‘in order to,’ ma‘a ‘anna ‘despite the fact that, although’ bimā ‘anna ‘since,’ rağma (‘anna) ‘despite the fact, nevertheless’ and ‘iddā and law both meaning ‘if’ that introduce preposed adverbial clauses or conditional clauses are not included in the discourse markers group. Because these particles link the dependent clauses that they introduce to the main clauses in complex sentences, these particles constitute part of the complex sentences’ structure and meaning. On the other hand, fronted adverbial clauses and phrases are also excluded from the discourse markers group because they form part of the meaning and structure of the sentences they introduce, setting them in certain time, place, or manner. It should be noted, however, that some discourse markers are semantically and grammatically detached from their host sentences, and impose structural restrictions on the linguistic environment in which they occur. For example, ‘inna ‘certainly, indeed’ and lākin(_na) ‘however, but,’ must be followed by a noun or pronoun, while fa-qad ‘since, for’ requires that the following item be a perfect verb.

What also distinguishes discourse markers is the fact that the use of these items is governed by the pragmatic force of the text rather than the grammatical structure of the
sentence. Because these expressions are neither part of the propositional content of the
sentence nor tied to the sentence grammatical structure, they are considered to be
“syntactically and semantically optional” (Schourup 1999, 231). However, discourse
markers are pragmatically obligatory tools for text processing. In order to produce
acceptable, natural, and communicatively effective texts, text-producers are required to
use discourse markers in a certain way that is expected and accepted by their text-
receivers. However, the choice, frequency, and distribution of discourse markers that
render texts acceptable and natural differ among languages. This means that discourse
markers are governed by the pragmatic norms of the language in which they operate.

In the data, discourse markers that are distinguished by their sentence-initial
position, their structural and semantic detachment from their host sentences, and their
association with the pragmatic force of the text fall into two main categories: textual and
interpersonal discourse markers. The members of the two categories operate on the
textual and interpersonal domains simultaneously; however, the distinction between the
two categories is based on the predominant function of their members. On the one hand,
while textual discourse markers, such as bal ‘rather, but rather’ and lidā ‘hence,
therefore,’ predominantly signal relations between segments of texts, they also indicate
how the text-producer perceives these relations, how he structures his text, and how he
intends to develop his ideas. On the other hand, interpersonal discourse markers, such as
wa-lā yafīṭ-u-nā ‘we should not miss’ and lā rayb-a fī ‘anna ‘there is no doubt that,
undoubtedly,’ predominantly signal the text-producers’ attitudes, evaluations, plans, and
social relations with the text-receivers, but they also indicate how the propositions they
introduce relate to the previous ones. In this study, however, only the predominant function of the discourse markers are taken into consideration. It should be noted that most textual discourse markers in this study encode only pragmatic meaning, e.g. lākīn/lākinna ‘however, but,’ fa ‘since, for, so, thus,’ īnna ‘certainly, indeed,’ though there are some with conceptual meaning, e.g. yūdāf-u ‘ālā dālika (’anna) ‘in addition to, moreover,’ min hunā ‘thus, therefore,’ bima’nā ‘anna ‘this means that,’ whereas all interpersonal discourse markers display both conceptual and pragmatic meaning.

Another important contribution of this study is describing the function of discourse markers at two levels of the text structure, i.e. the sentence and the paragraph. The study finds regularities in the use of discourse markers at each of the two textual levels. In order to provide a coherent description of the functions served by these items, functional categories are suggested. Then, the discourse markers that are found to perform similar functions are grouped under one functional category.

At the local level, i.e. sentence boundaries, textual discourse markers are classified according to the type of relations that they signal as follows: additive discourse markers, contrastive discourse markers, explanatory discourse markers, inferential discourse markers, sequential discourse markers, alternative discourse markers, exceptive discourse markers, and background discourse makers. Most of these discourse markers are found to perform one consistent function in all their occurrences in the data. However, wa ‘continuity, and’ serves both continuity and additive functions and fa ‘since, for, so, thus’ performs explanatory and inferential functions. The two multi-functional discourse markers are categorized according to their predominant function, which is the former for
each. The analysis shows that the most frequent local textual discourse markers employed in the data of this study, other than the local-global discourse marker of continuity *wa*, are the concessive/contrastive discourse marker *läkin/läkinna* ‘however, but’ and the explanatory discourse marker *fa* ‘since, for’.

On the other hand, the two main functions served by interpersonal discourse markers at the sentence boundaries are: subjective and interactive functions. Under the subjective category fall two types of the interpersonal discourse markers: discourse markers that convey the text-producer’s evaluation or attitude towards the content of the sentence, and discourse markers that present the sentence from the text-producer’s point of view. The interactive category, on the other hand, includes three types: discourse markers that appeal to the reader, attention-getting discourse markers, and discourse markers that interactively guide the reader’s interpretation. The analysis indicates that the most frequent local interpersonal discourse markers employed in the data of this study are the subjective/evaluative discourse markers. It should be pointed out that the description of the interpersonal discourse markers’ functions at the local level is based on the conceptual meanings of these expressions rather than associating them with functional relations. This is because marking relations between sentences is not the main function of these expressions.

At the global level, i.e. paragraph boundaries, the difference between the functions performed by textual and interpersonal discourse markers becomes vague. Both textual and interpersonal discourse markers that occur at paragraph boundaries in the data serve three main textual functions: continuity, refocus, and change of topic. While continuity is
signaled only by textual discourse markers, refocusing attention and marking topic change in text could be signaled by both textual and interpersonal discourse markers. Interpersonal discourse markers, therefore, display a clear textual function at the paragraph level. However, the textual function that they perform is different from the textual function performed by textual discourse markers because it is reinforced by their interpersonal effect. Paragraph-initial interpersonal discourse markers maintain their interpersonal effect while at the same time employ the force of this effect to signal textual boundaries. This emphatic textual role of paragraph-initial interpersonal discourse markers renders these expressions very effective devices for marking major turns in the text organizational structure. The analysis shows that these items form 60% of the discourse markers that introduce thesis paragraphs, 66% of the discourse markers that introduce evaluation paragraphs and 70% of the discourse markers that introduce conclusion paragraphs.

After describing the functions performed by discourse markers at the local and global levels of texts, the study examines how the items at the two levels relate to each other. The analysis shows that discourse markers that occur at the paragraph initial position are similar to those that appear at the sentence initial position. *hattā* ‘even,’ *fa* ‘since, for, so, thus,’ *līdā* ‘thus, therefore,’ *lākin/lākinna* ‘however, but,’ *‘inna* ‘certainly, indeed,’ and *‘ammā...fa* ‘as for’ are examples of discourse markers that occur at both local and global levels. It should be indicated, however, that other discourse markers that do not occur paragraph-initially in the data, such as *kadālika* ‘likewise, furthermore’ and *‘illā ‘anna* ‘however, but,’ may have the potential to occur at this position since other
members of their functional category do, such as hattā ‘even’ and lākin/lākinna ‘however, but.’ However, further research is needed in this area to verify this assumption.

It has been found also that there is consistency between the global and local functions of discourse markers that occur at both levels. The functions served by these markers at paragraph boundaries are consistent with, though different from, the functions these same items serve at the sentence boundaries. For example, the continuity function that the discourse markers yudaf-ū īlāq ālika ‘anna, faḍlan ‘an ‘anna, hattā, ṭumma, lidā, min hunā, bi-l-tālī and hākadā signal at the paragraph level is consistent with the additive, sequential and resultative functions that these markers serve when occurring sentence-initially. While it is true that continuity is a general notion that is not tied to specific relations; this function, the analysis shows, correlates with the elaboration, sequence, and result relations more than any other relations, such as contrast, conclusion and reason.

Another example is the consistency between the functions that the contrastive discourse markers lākin/lākinna, ġayra ‘anna and ammā…fa serve at the onset of paragraphs and the functions that they serve at the sentence-initial position. These markers signal contrast between two propositions at the sentence level while at the global level they mark the boundary between two paragraphs that discuss two aspects of one topic. The refocusing role that these discourse markers perform at the paragraph level is consistent with the contrastive role that they serve at the sentence level because at both levels these items signal a point of distinction between two related yet different aspects of one topic.

However, although many discourse markers are found to introduce both sentences and paragraphs in the data, wa, the discourse marker of continuity, is the only discourse
marker that is regarded as a local-global discourse marker in this study. On the one hand, *wa* occurs frequently at both sentence and paragraph boundaries whereas other discourse markers that occur at both levels in the data show a tendency to occur at one level more than the other. Taking only *wa* that signals continuity in the data into account, while disregarding additive *wa* ‘and,’ shows that this discourse marker introduces 30% of the sentence boundaries and 25% of the paragraph boundaries in the data. This means that 37% of the sentences that start with discourse markers and 41% of the paragraphs that open with discourse markers are introduced with the continuity *wa*. Other discourse markers that occur at both sentence and paragraph boundaries either show preference to occur sentence-initially, such as *fa* ‘since, for’ and *lākin/lākinna* ‘however, but,’ or show a tendency to occur paragraph-initially, such as *laqad, ‘inna* both meaning ‘certainly, indeed’ and *ammā... fa* ‘as for.’ However, it should be noted that, for some of these discourse markers that occur at both levels, their low frequency in the data makes it hard to determine their tendency, such as *fa’dan ‘an ‘anna* ‘besides,’ *hattā ‘even,’ *lidā, min hunā, bi-l-tāli* all meaning ‘thus, therefore’ and *hâkadā* ‘thus, and so.’ Moreover, some of the discourse markers that do not appear paragraph-initially in the data but occur more than 15 times sentence-initially, such as *‘aydan* ‘also,’ *kamā ‘anna* ‘likewise, furthermore,’ *fa-qad* ‘since, for,’ may be regarded as having local tendency. On the other hand, while the functions served by discourse markers at the paragraph onset are consistent with the functions these markers serve sentence-initially, *wa*, is the only discourse marker that performs the same function, i.e. continuity, at both levels. This
unique discourse marker, therefore, seems to cross the boundaries of text levels taking the text as a whole as its domain.

The third area to which the present study contributes relates to the description of the texts it analyzes. This contribution could be summarized in three points. The first point concerns the segmentation of texts into units and the way the units’ boundaries are determined. Because of the long sentences that written Arabic usually displays and the unreliability of the punctuation marks employed in them, the study proposes a syntactic and semantic criteria for determining sentence boundaries in the data. In this study, both structure and meaning define the sentence as a unit of text and determine its boundaries. Therefore, a sentence boundary is drawn when a grammatically-independent structure communicates a complete thought. This definition of the sentence draws on both traditional Arabic grammarians and modern linguists views of the sentence. It should be pointed out here that the analysis of the data in this study confirms that sentences in written Arabic are considerably long. In some extreme cases, sentences may reach 70-80 words. However, it has been noticed that the length of sentences depends primarily on the individual style of the text-producer.

While the study employs a syntactic-semantic criterion to identify sentences in the data, it draws on the conceptual unity of the paragraph for determining paragraph boundaries. Whenever two sequences of texts are perceived to have two different topics, and perform two different functions, there is a boundary. However, based on the findings of many studies in text linguistics, the present study also takes preposed adverbials and word order alternation into consideration as helping devices for indicating paragraph
boundaries. The analysis in this study confirms the strong relation that preposed adverbials and word order alternation have with paragraph boundaries. Seventy five percent of the paragraphs that are not introduced with discourse markers in the data start either with fronted adverbial clauses or phrases or with preposed subjects.

The second point relates to the structure of the texts that are analyzed in the present study. A by-product of the investigation undertaken in this study is describing the structure of newspaper opinion articles. Providing a description of the structure of the text-type analyzed in this study is one step in establishing models for different written Arabic text-types. As mentioned previously, as a genre, newspaper opinion articles have rarely been investigated, and thus no specific description of the structure of this type of text is found in the literature. In this study, however, in order to identify and describe discourse markers in the data, both the global and local structures of 50 newspaper opinion articles are examined.

At the global level, the analysis shows that the organizational structure of newspaper opinion articles adheres to the following pattern: background, thesis, evaluation, substantiation, evaluation, and conclusion. On the other hand, the analysis of the functional relations at the local level in the texts analyzed in this study shows the predominance of the following relations: interpretation, evidence, concession, evaluation, reason, and elaboration. This is consistent with the findings of al-Odadi’s (1996) and el-Shiyab’s (1990) studies. In their studies, they find that causal, evaluative, and interpretive relations are the highly recurring relations in the Modern Written Arabic argumentative texts they examined. According to Mann and Thompson (1988), relations in texts differ
according to the text-type and the culture in which the texts operate. The high recurrence of a set of relations in a certain text, they assert, is a clear indication of the influence of its type and culture. It should be pointed out here that Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson (1992) consider most of the relations that dominate newspaper opinion articles to be predominantly pragmatic (45).

Lastly, we summarize the way the analyzed texts in this study employ discourse markers. In order to produce natural and communicatively effective texts, different languages and text-types employ discourse markers differently whether with regard to the type marker preferred, or with regard to their frequency or distribution. The analysis of Arabic newspaper opinion articles in this study indicates that discourse markers are highly frequent in these texts. Seventy eight percent of the unit boundaries in the data start with discourse markers. Furthermore, 22% of these units start with more than one discourse marker. Discourse markers, however, are more frequent at the sentence boundaries than they are at paragraph boundaries. While 85% of sentences in the texts are introduced with discourse markers, 54% of paragraphs start with these items. The analysis also shows that the most frequent discourse markers used in Arabic newspaper opinion articles examined in this study are: the continuity discourse marker \textit{wa}, additive discourse markers, explanatory discourse markers, and interpersonal discourse markers. Twenty nine percent of the unit boundaries in the data start with the continuity \textit{wa}, 19% with additive discourse markers, 15% with explanatory discourse markers, and 11% with interpersonal discourse markers. Interpersonal discourse markers, as mentioned
previously, are found more frequently at the global level, where they introduce major stages of the text structure: thesis, evaluative, and conclusion.

The high frequency of discourse markers in Arabic newspaper opinion articles as well as the type of discourse markers used in this type of text, i.e. the continuity, the explanatory, and the interpersonal discourse markers, indicate a high degree of writers involvement in texts. They are always managing the readers’ interpretation, interacting with them, reflecting on the message and expressing their attitudes and viewpoints. It seems that the writers of Arabic newspaper opinion articles depend heavily on discourse markers as a communicative strategy to emphasize their involvement due to the importance of this factor in achieving natural and effective texts in their specific culture. Nevertheless, this rate of use could also be attributed to the evaluative and persuasive nature of the texts under investigation. A degree of involvement and evaluativeness is usually expected and accepted in argumentative text-types like the opinion articles analyzed in this study. In order to find out how the choice and frequency of discourse markers affect the involvement of writers in their texts; the use of discourse markers should be examined in other Arabic text-types; and then their use should be compared with the use of discourse markers in newspaper opinion articles. Moreover, comparing the use of discourse markers used in newspaper opinion articles with similar items that are used in the same text-type in other languages could show the difference in the communicative strategies used in these languages for persuasion.

It is clear from the above discussion that the present study is an important contribution to modern Arabic linguistics studies. Not only does it contribute to the
discourse markers literature in Arabic, but it also adds a deep insight into the field of Arabic discourse analysis.

On the one hand, this study is the first systematic work that investigates discourse markers from a discourse perspective in Modern Written Arabic. As mentioned previously, while Kammensjö’s (2005) study is an important contribution to discourse markers research in Formal Spoken Arabic, in Modern Written Arabic, discourse markers have not yet been investigated thoroughly from a discourse perspective. By identifying these items and describing the main characteristics that distinguish them as a group in one type of Arabic text, i.e. newspaper opinion articles, this study makes the first step in creating an inventory for discourse markers in Modern Written Arabic. Future studies of discourse markers in other text types in Arabic could add to this inventory and refine it. It is also essential to note that this study sheds light on framing which is an important characteristic of Arabic discourse markers that is not found in English. This phenomenon associated with the cluster of discourse markers at the onset of units in Arabic is a linguistic technique that the language uses to highlight the importance of the framed elements.

On the other hand, the detailed description that the present study provides for the way discourse markers function at sentence and paragraph boundaries is an important contribution to the study of text in general, as well as to text studies across languages. As discussed before, discourse markers are key elements in text production and perception. However, the type, frequency, and distribution of these items that render texts acceptable and natural differ among languages. Therefore, the description provided by the present
study of how to use discourse markers and where to use them helps L2 learners of Arabic produce more natural and effective Arabic texts. It also gives them guidelines for better perception of the Arabic texts that they read, and more understanding of the writers’ intentions. Moreover, the description of discourse markers in this study is also useful for translators from and into Arabic. It gives them insight into how these items are used in Arabic, and how they differ from discourse markers in other languages.

Furthermore, the present study is an important contribution to the field of discourse analysis in Arabic. The description it provides for Arabic texts, paragraphs, and sentences is a useful tool for future research that focuses on analyzing Arabic texts. Its comprehensive description of the organizational structure of one type of Arabic text, i.e. newspaper opinion articles, is an essential step in establishing models for different Arabic text-types. Moreover, describing the various textual strategies that Arabic uses for marking paragraph and sentence boundaries gives insight into the way that Arabic texts could be segmented for investigation purposes.

One more contribution of the present work to the study of text in Arabic is shedding light on the way arguments develop in Arabic texts. Because different cultures argue differently, the organizational structure of the argumentative text-type usually varies across cultures. Examining the global and local organizational structure of newspaper opinion articles, which are argumentative in nature, allows one to perceive how arguments are developed in the Arabic argumentative text. This makes it possible to examine how argumentation in Arabic culture differs from argumentation in other
languages. Such comparative studies may explain misunderstandings that occur in cross-cultural communication.

6.3 Limitations

It is clear from the concluding remarks discussed above that the analysis undertaken in the present study fulfills the study’s goals and answers its questions. However, this study still has its limitations. One limitation is its focus on one text-type only, i.e. newspaper opinion articles, for examining the functions of discourse markers in modern written Arabic texts. Although it may be seen as a limitation in the study, the focus on one text-type for examining the functions of discourse markers is essential to ensure the consistency of the analysis’ results. Many studies of discourse markers indicate that the choice, use and frequency of discourse markers differ according to text-type (see Brown and Yule 1986; Khalil 2000; Östman 1995).

Another limitation in the present study relates to the analytical tool that it employs for describing the functional relations between sentences, i.e. RST. This tool, the analysis shows, fails to distinguish between the functions of discourse markers that perform similar roles. More than one discourse marker is found to correlate with the same functional relation. For example, ‘aylan ‘also,’ kamā/kamā ‘anna, kadālika ‘likewise, furthermore’ and ‘idōfatan ‘ilā ‘in addition, moreover’ are all associated with the elaboration functional relation. While the descriptive tool shows that all of these discourse markers serve the additive function because they all correlate with the
elaboration relation, it does not explain why some environments prefer one of these additive discourse markers over another.

A final limitation in this study relates to the inevitable subjectivity of the analytical process it undertakes. Like any other analytical study, this study cannot escape a degree of subjectivity. Although the segmentation, description and classifications presented in this study result from an analytical process that is based on a well-established theoretical background, these processes are inevitably influenced by the analyst’s semantic-pragmatic interpretation of the texts. The idea that such judgments “can be done totally objectively, i.e. without the interference of personal interpretation,” Kammensjö (2005) points out, “is a deception” (107). This is because the analyst’s culture, language, personal world-view and experience are always present in this process influencing his cognitive interpretation of the analyzed material.

6.4 Implications for Future Research

The present study identifies discourse markers in newspaper opinion articles and describes the function of these expressions at two levels of text structure, i.e. the sentence and the paragraph. While this study identifies and describes discourse markers in one type of Arabic text, it paves the way for future research in other Arabic text-types. Future research could examine discourse markers in other Arabic text-types to describe their function, the type preferred by text-type, and their frequency and distribution. Comparing the use of discourse markers in different Arabic texts could provide more comprehensive understanding of the role that these items play in the production and perception of Arabic
texts in general. Moreover, the use of discourse markers in Arabic texts could be compared to the use of items that perform similar functions in other languages. This is important for cross-cultural communication because discourse markers, as mentioned previously, pose a challenge for L2 learners and translators.

Another area that is worth investigating is the way discourse markers emerge and the process by which they develop. Examining a variety of Arabic texts from different time-periods shows when and how discourse markers come to perform this role at the discourse level. This may give more insight into the current function of these items, and may also shed some light on the differences between discourse markers that have similar functions.

In short, despite their importance in text production and perception, discourse markers as a linguistic phenomenon are rarely investigated in modern Arabic linguistic literature. Therefore, the areas of investigation regarding this phenomenon are wide open.
### Table 1. Textual Discourse Markers that Occur Sentence-initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أيضًا</td>
<td>'aydān</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Additive discourse markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كما / كما أنّ</td>
<td>kamā/kamā 'anna</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إضافة إلى / أضاف إلى ذلك أنّ (أنّ)</td>
<td>'idāfatan 'ilā/ 'adīf 'ilā dālīka 'anna/ yudāf-u 'ilā dālīka (anna)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>In addition (to), moreover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فضلا عن أنّ</td>
<td>fuḍlan 'an 'anna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Besides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حتى</td>
<td>hattā</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كذلك</td>
<td>kadālika</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Likewise, furthermore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكنّ / لكنّ</td>
<td>lākin/ lākinna</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Contrastive discourse markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إلاّ أنّ</td>
<td>'illā 'anna</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غير أنّ</td>
<td>ḡayra 'anna</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بيد أنّ</td>
<td>bayda 'anna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa-‘illā fa</td>
<td>Otherwise, or else</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Contrastive discourse markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballā bal bal ‘inna</td>
<td>Rather, but rather</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ammā...fa</td>
<td>As for</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi al-waqt-i nafs-i-hi/</td>
<td>Meanwhile, at the same time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi al-waqt-i dāt-i-hi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa-qad+ perfect verb</td>
<td>Since, for, thus</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Explanatory discourse markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘id/’id ‘anna</td>
<td>Since, for</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ayl/’ay ‘anna</td>
<td>That is, i.e., in other words</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘annal mā ya’ni</td>
<td>This means that</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bima’nā ‘annal dōlika ya’ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘annal mā ya’ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa-maṭalān</td>
<td>For instance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لذلک</td>
<td><em>lidōlika</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inferential discourse markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إذا</td>
<td><em>lidā</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لهذا</td>
<td><em>lihādā</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من ثم</td>
<td><em>min ṭamma</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من هنا</td>
<td><em>min hunā</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عليه</td>
<td>‘<em>alayhi</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالتالي</td>
<td><em>bi-l-tālī</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا</td>
<td><em>hākadā</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إذا</td>
<td>‘<em>idan</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ثم</td>
<td><em>ṭumma</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sequential discourse marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أو</td>
<td>‘<em>aw</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alternative discourse marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إلا إذا</td>
<td>‘<em>illā ʿidā</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exceptional discourse marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وَقِدْ+الفعل الماضي</td>
<td><em>wa-qad</em>+perfect verb</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Background discourse marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Interpersonal Discourse Markers that Occur Sentence-initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا شك في أنّ / الذي لا شك فيه هو أنّ</td>
<td>There is no doubt that, undoubtedly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discourse markers that express certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الأكيد أنّ / بالتأكيد من المؤكد أنّ</td>
<td>Surely, definitely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحقيقة أنّ / حقيقة</td>
<td>The truth is, truly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من المرجح أنّ / الأرجح أنّ</td>
<td>It is more likely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الصحيح هو أنّ</td>
<td>The truth is, the reality is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من الواضح أنّ / واضح أنّ</td>
<td>It is evident that, it is clear that</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لقد أثبت الواقع أنّ / في الواقع / في واقع الأمر</td>
<td>Reality has proven that, in fact, as a matter of fact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>إنّ</td>
<td>’inna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discourse markers that express certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لقد</td>
<td>la-qad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غني عن القول أنّ</td>
<td>qanîyy-an ‘an al-qawl-i ‘anna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It goes without saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صار معروفا أنّ</td>
<td>sâr-a ma’ařîf-an ‘anna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It became known that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من الطبيعي أنّ</td>
<td>min al-’abî’îyy-i ‘anna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Naturally, obviously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لم يعد سرا أنّ/ ليس سرا أنّ</td>
<td>lam ya’ud sirr-an ‘anna/laysa sirr-an ‘anna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is no longer a secret, it is obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لعل</td>
<td>la’alla</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Discourse markers that express probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ربما</td>
<td>rubbamâ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من المحتمل أنّ</td>
<td>min al-mulţâmal-i ‘an</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قدّ+(فعل مضارع)</td>
<td>qad+ imperfect verb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>من السذاجة نسيان حقيقة أن‌(^n)</td>
<td>(\text{min al-sad\textcircled{-}\text{a}jat-i nisy\textcircled{-}\text{an-u \hspace{1em} h\textcircled{-}aq\textcircled{-}\text{at-a \hspace{1em} 'anna}})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discourse markers that encode evaluative personal comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المثير للسخرية أن‌(^n)</td>
<td>(\text{al-mutf\textcircled{-}r-u li-l-sukriyyat-i \hspace{1em} 'anna})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إنها مأساة فعلًا أن‌(^n)</td>
<td>(\text{\textasciitilde inna-h\hspace{1em} ma\textasciitilde\textcircled{-}s\textasciitilde\textcircled{-}t-un fil-an \hspace{1em} 'an})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طبعتا                                               (^n)</td>
<td>(\text{\textasciitilde ab'an})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أخيرا                                               (^n)</td>
<td>(\text{\textasciitilde ak\textcircled{-}iran})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كان/ لكأن‌(^n)                                           (^n)</td>
<td>(\text{ka\textasciitilde anna\textasciitilde la \hspace{1em} ka\textasciitilde anna})</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أعتقد أن‌(^n)                                             (^n)</td>
<td>(\text{\textasciitilde d\textasciitilde taqid-u \hspace{1em} anna})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discourse markers that introduce the writer’s point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يظهر أن‌(^n)                                             (^n)</td>
<td>(\text{yazhar-u \hspace{1em} anna})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>بيدو أنس</td>
<td>يادلي واد دّ 'اننا</td>
<td>It seems that</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بلاحظ أنس / الملاحظ</td>
<td>يلُحاز-و  'اننا/ال-محلُحاز-و  'اننا</td>
<td>It is noticed that</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا يقوتنا</td>
<td>لا يفوتنا</td>
<td>We should not miss</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كيف لنا أنس</td>
<td>كيف لنا أنس</td>
<td>How could we forget</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كلنا رأينا كيف أن</td>
<td>كلنا رأينا كيف أن</td>
<td>We all saw how</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اعتدا علينا أنس</td>
<td>اعتدا علينا أنس</td>
<td>We have become accustomed to</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دعونا</td>
<td>دعونا</td>
<td>Let us</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لنا هنا ألا نستغرب</td>
<td>لنا هنا ألا نستغرب</td>
<td>We should not be surprised that</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2. Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'alaysa min al-muğlík-i al-mubbā 'an</td>
<td>Is it not pathetically ironic that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discourse markers that appeal to the reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hal min al'-‘adl-i wa-l-musāwāt-i 'an</td>
<td>Is it justice and equality that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-‘ahamm-u 'anna</td>
<td>Most importantly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discourse markers that attract the attention of the reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hā huwal hā hiya hā nalyu</td>
<td>Look, behold</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-mufāraqát-u al-qā’imat-u hunā hiya 'anna</td>
<td>Ironically</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'akjar-u ġarābat-an 'an</td>
<td>What is even stranger is that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turā</td>
<td>I wonder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘alā al-mar‘y ‘an yā’gūd-a fi al-husbān-i ‘an</td>
<td>It should be taken into consideration that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discourse markers that guide the interpretation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Functional category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>هذا ندليل واضح على أنّ</td>
<td><em>hādīl-un wādh-un 'alā 'anna</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discourse markers that guide the interpretation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>السبب بكل بساطة هو أنّ</td>
<td><em>al-sabab-u bikull-i basājat-in huwa 'anna</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يُؤيّر ذلك إلى أنّ</td>
<td><em>yu'aṣīr-u dālika 'ilā 'anna</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أبعد من هذا</td>
<td><em>'abīd-u min hādā</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فوق هذا</td>
<td><em>fawqa hādā</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>النتيجة أنّ</td>
<td><em>al-natījat-u 'anna</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صحيح أنّ</td>
<td><em>ṣalīh-un 'anna</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ينبغي التذكير هنا بأنّ</td>
<td><em>yanbaği al-taḍkīr-u hunā bi-'anna/ min-mā yuğkaru 'anna</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بما أنّ يذكر أنّ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بمناسبة الحديث عن...</td>
<td><em>bi-munāsabat-i al-ḥadīt-i 'an ... fa</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Textual Discourse Markers that Occur Paragraph-initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Textual stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>إضافة إلى ذلك كله/يضاف إلى ذلك أنّن</td>
<td>'idāfatan 'ilā dālika kull-i-hi'yūdāf-u 'ilā dālika 'anna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discourse markers of continuity</td>
<td>Evaluation/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فضلاً عن أنّن</td>
<td>faḍlan 'an 'anna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Besides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حتّى</td>
<td>lattā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Even</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ثمّ</td>
<td>ṭumma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moreover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لذا</td>
<td>lādā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thus, therefore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من هنا</td>
<td>min hunā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالتالي</td>
<td>bi-l-tālī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا</td>
<td>hākaḍā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thus, and so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لكنّ / لكنً</td>
<td>lākin/lākinna</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Discourse markers that refocus attention</td>
<td>Thesis/evaluation/Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غير أنّن</td>
<td>ḡayra 'anna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أما...ف</td>
<td>ammā...fa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>As for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Textual stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>fa</td>
<td>Since, for</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Discourse markers that indicate topic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إذا</td>
<td>idan</td>
<td>Thus, therefore, so</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marks conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

الخلاصة
إلا | al-ğulāsat-u | To sum up, in summary | 3 |

ان | al-‘amr-i inna | |

بكلام آخر | bi-kalām-in | In other words | 1 |

Table 4. Interpersonal Discourse Markers that Occur Paragraph-initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Textual stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا شك أن</td>
<td>lā šakk-a</td>
<td>There is no doubt that, undoubtedly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discourse markers that indicate topic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فيه أن</td>
<td>šakk-a fihi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فيه أن</td>
<td>šakk-a fihi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إن</td>
<td>inna</td>
<td>Certainly, indeed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>No. of occurrences</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Textual stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لَقَدُ</td>
<td><em>la-qad</em></td>
<td>Certainly, indeed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Discourse markers that indicate topic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الْأَكْيَدُ أَنّ</td>
<td><em>al’akīd-u ‘anna</em></td>
<td>Surely, definitely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mark evaluation, conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لَارِبِب أَنّ</td>
<td><em>lā rayb-a ‘anna</em></td>
<td>There is no doubt that, undoubtedly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مِنَ الْوَاضِحِ</td>
<td><em>min al-wādīh-i ‘anna-hu</em></td>
<td>It is evident that, it is clear that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marks Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الْوَاقِعُ أَنّ</td>
<td><em>al-wāqi’-u ‘anna</em></td>
<td>As a matter of fact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mark evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لَبَدَ أَنّ</td>
<td><em>lā budd-a ‘anna</em></td>
<td>It is certain that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رَبِّمَا</td>
<td><em>rubbamā</em></td>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mark thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(فعل مضارع)</td>
<td><em>qad+ imperfect verb</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>No. of occurrences</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Textual stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لآدري</td>
<td>$lā 'adrī$</td>
<td>I wonder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discourse markers that indicate topic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المثير للأسئلة في الأمر</td>
<td>$Al-	ext{mu}ğīr-u li-l-'asā 'anāna$</td>
<td>Sadly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>من المستغرب أن</td>
<td>$min al-	ext{musta}ğrāb-i 'anāna$</td>
<td>It is surprising that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يبدو/يبدو أن</td>
<td>$yabdū/yabdū 'anāna$</td>
<td>It seems that</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المثير في الأمر للإبتسامة هو/الأمر المثير الآخر أن</td>
<td>$al-	ext{mu}ğīr-u fi al-	ext{amr}-i 'anāna/ al-	ext{amr}-u al-	ext{mu}ğīr-u li-l-'ihtimām-i huwa 'anāna/ al-	ext{amr}-u al-	ext{mu}ğīr-u al-	ext{'iğār}-u 'anāna$</td>
<td>What is interesting about the matter is that</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Discourse markers that refocus attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>السؤال هو/السؤال المطروح</td>
<td>$al-	ext{su}'āl-u huwa/ al-	ext{su}'āl}-u al-	ext{marāh}-u$</td>
<td>The question is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mark thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker &amp; variable(s)</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>No. of occurrences</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Textual stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ما يهم هنا هو</td>
<td>mā yahumm-u-nā hunā huwa</td>
<td>What is interesting here is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discourse markers that refocus attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المفارقة القائمة حالياً</td>
<td>al-mufāraqat-u al-qā'imat-u ḥaliyy-an hiya 'anna</td>
<td>Ironically</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mark Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الأكثر أهمية أن</td>
<td>al-'akgar-u 'ahamiyyat-an 'anna</td>
<td>Most importantly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الغريب في الأمر أن</td>
<td>al-garīb-u fī al-'amr-i 'anna</td>
<td>Oddly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اللاقت أن</td>
<td>al-lāfit-u 'anna</td>
<td>What is interesting is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المشكلة هي أن</td>
<td>al-muṣkilat-u hiya 'anna</td>
<td>The problem is that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لننادر بالإشارة إلى أن</td>
<td>li-nubādir-a bi-l-īsārat-i 'ilā 'anna</td>
<td>Firsly, it must be mentioned that</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صحيح أن</td>
<td>saḥīḥ-un 'anna</td>
<td>It is true that</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>علينا الاعتراف أن</td>
<td>'alaynā al-ī tīrāf-u 'anna</td>
<td>we should admit that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX-B

ARABIC TEXTS

Text (1)

(من جريدة الشرق الأوسط)

الإحدى 30 محرم 1428 هـ 18 فبراير 2007 العدد 10309

ديانا مقلد

 ......  نقلت وكالة الصحافة الفرنسية قبل أيام عن النائب الإسلامي في مصر نبيل الوحش مطالبة بتطبيق "حذ الحلاقة" على الإعلام المصري هالة سرحان بعد إشهارها لها "كفركة". حذاعة من برنامجها التلفزيوني والتي تناولت فيها ملف الدعارة. حذ الحلاقة الذي طالب السيد الوحش بتطبيقه قضى بقطع اليد والقدم من خلاف الصلب. وعلى ما قال النائب الإسلامي، الذي إشهار برفع قضايا ضد الفنانين الجدد بدون تبرع أخلاقي، فإن إقامة هذا الحذ حجم عبير شري في مواجهة الذين يشترون الفحشاء. من هذا الخبر مرور الكرام في سياق الضجة المثيرة حول الإعلام المذكورة.

وحلقات برنامجها الأخيرة التي عرضت شهادات نقل أنهم يملؤون في الدعارة وما لبث أن ظهرت على محطات أخرى تهم هالة سرحان بأني دعت له مبالغ لقاء تلك الشهادات وهو أمر نفى الإعلام المصري.

لم يكن الϧحود وجده من طالب بإزالة الفساد بحق هالة سرحان فقد نشرت إليه حوامة أخرى من الإعلاميين والقوميين الذين هددوا بالويل والثير.

قد تجاوزت ردة الفعل على حلقات اجتماعيا حساسة حدود الجدل حول المضمون وطريقة المعلجة وهي أمور تستحق النقاش بشكل جدي، لكن ما حدث هو إشهار بسيط الفن في برنامج تلفزيوني يفترض أن يكون له آليات ضبط أخرى لأدائه هذا الأمر يعكس خلل كبيرا في العلاقة بين وسائل الإعلام والميدان عموما وبين القوانين والآليات عمل الإعلام في سياق تلك القوانين.

فإن تصدي شخوص الإعلامي وقومية لخدمة الرقابة على الإعلام هو تحسيس فعلي لهذا الخلل وهو أمر ما لم تتم مجابته ويبقى فهو سؤال لأنها من الضبط والرقابة مشروبة تلك التي أ Aynıتها حركة طلابية.

هذا قضية تتراوح في ثلاث فئات في أن إنها تقاويم مالية لقاء شهادات تلفزيونية غير صحيحة.

من حكم في هذا قضية!

الشريعة العربية لا تزال غير ممكهة لمستويات جديدة من العمل الإعلامي.

المشاطكة الأكبر إن الذي حرك تلك الشخصيات والجماعات الإسلامية في وجه هالة سرحان لم يكن خطأ مهينا وهو أمر يمكن تناوله بل يجب مناقشته. إنما حرك تلك الجماعات هي المقاومة العنيفة للساتي الإعلام العربي لمعظمات نفاذية فحشة الفن التي وفادت ومقاوم شائكة كبيرة تتمثل في المجتمع المصري والمجتمعات العربية عربا لكننا نقدر ما ننطبق جوهرها تحت ذريعة قراء مجهولين من آفات من هذا النوع.

التي أظهرها هم المطلوبون بحاكمة هالة سرحان حملت توابع من "نشر الفحش" و"الإساءة إلى قيم المجتمع المصري وظهوره على غير حقته" أو أن تلك الشخصيات لا تجاهل في طريق معالجة معاملات اجتماعية خطيرة بل هي ترضه وحده تلك المضاعفات أصلا ولا تعتبر أن طرحها يقضي بإزالة القضايا عند طريقه طلاب.

وكان المطلوب أن تيقن أزماننا خارج التدوين العام وبالتالي يؤثرها مشكلة مسئولة عنها بل وفوقا لا يمكن أيضا تحت طائلة "حذ الحلاقة"!
من جريدة الشرق الأوسط

الإحدى 21 صفر 1428 هـ 11 مارس 2007 العدد 10330
يوم المرأة: حتى لا تغرق القضية في فخ الأبدال!
ديانا مقدس

غالباً ما يتم تحويل قضايا مخصصة إلى مادة احتفالية فلكورية.
الأسبوع المنصرم، كان أسبوع الاحتفالات بيوم المرأة العالمي. وتحت هذا الشعار أطروحت النساء بمعلومات وحقائق عن حقوقهن وواقعهن الذي تدل الأرقام والواقع اليوبي التي تعبيرها أنه ما زال متزاماً وأن هناك جذرياً لم يطرأ عليه بعد. فما زالت النساء ضحايا التمييز والعف في مختلف فئات الأرض. ولا يوجدنا كيف باتت المرأة في بعض المناطق المزروعة في الدول العربية ضحية للنزاعات وأحياناً حديثاً مباشرةً فيها.
تحول يوم المرأة العالمي إلى محطة لاحق تحضر المزيد من الحقائق المفجعة ولكن بشكل سري وعابر من خلال تناول اجتماعات وحلقات نقاش. وطبعاً كان للقضية نصيب لا يعبس من اهتمام الصحافة والإعلام على قاعدة الاستنكار العام وليس التوقف جديد عند واقع توليهم مجتمعنا.
امرأة من بين خمس يمارس عنف بحقهن.
لتمثليت حصة لا يسهم من هذا الواقع.

صحيح أن التطور لقضايا العنف بحق المرأة ليس بالأمر الجديد في الإعلام العربي. وقد ساهمت بعض المحاولات في كسر جدار الصمت حول العنف العللي والتميز بحق المرأة. لكن تناول هذه القضايا لم يستطع النافذة إلى ما وراء الخطابات المتقطعة وفوضى الغرام.
باتت قضايا المرأة عنوان يستغل لاقتحال الإثارة.

يميل الإعلام أو سواد الأعظم إلى مسألة جمهور في قضايا هي في صلب غرامه ورقابته.
لا شك أن تغليب الوجه الاحتفالي على يوم المرأة العالمي أقربه من مضامينه وجعل من هذه المناسبة أقرب إلى عيد منها محلته للثأر في أوضاع المرأة والأزمات التي تواجهها سواء في العالم أو في منطقتنا.

الأعلام كرس هذا الاحتفال عبر إمكانية الكثير من المعطيات التي تؤدي إلى تغري أوضاع المرأة. إنها الضحية الأولى في الأزمات لحظة اندلاعها. وهي المثلية لتنميةها المباشرة وغير المباشرة. المرأة تغتصب عندما تزداد جماعة الإنتاج من جامع أخري. والمراة تنفع في مجتمعات الرجال (مجتمعاتنا) والأرقام تتكاثر تدريبياً في أوضاعها على مختلف المستوى في مجتمع الصفاق الأرض. وعندما لا تغرق في بذلك العام، يمكن أن تكون أوضاع الثورة بعيداً. فمثلما نتاني وضع النساء داخل المجتمع الفلسطيني في غزوة وضفة المرأة. فالأقدمون يتحدث عن ارتفاع هائل في جمع العنف الممارس على النساء سواء من داخل محيط العائلة أو خارجها. عنف يصل في أحيان أخرى إلى تلقي انتفاضة في ظل احترام السلطة الفلسطينية ببعضها في معالجة الأمر. إنها قضية حقيقة ومتقاثمة. لكنها لم تشخص حياً فعلياً في تنطوي المصادر والإعلام.

قد يرى سريعاً على هذا الكلام بأن الأدوار هي في تنظيم المواجهة مع إسرائيل. صحيح أن القوانين الإسرائيلية كرست قضايا عنفية بحق الفلسطينيين نساء ورجاء وأطفالاً وهو أمر تتناوله سلوك الإعلام عن ف. كيف أن لنا أن نبني العدل بين النساء الفلسطينيات الحوامل اللواتي اتهمهن على هويات إسرائيلية أو فقنين حقيقين عنها.
لكن الأمل بانجيل مع إسرائيل لا يعني إلغاء ما تردته بل من عنف ولا يبرره. وأن يركز الإعلام على قضية مجتمعاتنا وممارسات الشاذة المرتكبة بحق النساء لن يدفعنا لأن نظل الطريق عن صراعات كبرى أخرى.
هل يمكن للفاكهة أن تحقق ما عززت عنه السياسة؟ قد يبدو السؤال بسيطًا إلى حد ما، خصوصًا حين يتعقق معضلة من نوع رأب الصدع بين العالم الإسلامي والغرب أو اندماج الجاليات العربية والاسلامية في مجتمعات المهرج. إلا أن ما ينتج إلى هذا السؤال هو النجاح المتزايد لمؤسسات الفوزونية الأوروبية وأوروبية تقضي على واقع المسلمين في الغرب ونجاح مثاليين من أصول إسلامية في تناول إشكالية العلاقة بين المجتمع الإسلامي والغربي في قلب ساحر.

على خط موارى، يمكن لـ"الصحافة الأوروبية والأمريكية أن يلاحظ بروز نمط جديد في الكتابة قائم على التحكم من الأيديولوجيا بين المسلمين بالغرب وبسحب هذه العلاقة من فح الخوف والرعب إلى قاعدة تكريم دين الإسلام ولغو التفوق.

فهذا في صحيفة "الغارديان" البريطانية قرأت "بتهجيا لاحالات تعني بقضايا المسلمين ينصح ما بين ضرورة معرفة هذا الآخ الأمل بعثارات تتناغم فك كوميدي الصورة المتصلة للمسلمين العنيف الغير.

وفي الولايات المتحدة اليوم بدأ الاهتمام بـ"السوري" أوروبية فلكياً جديدة. من عنوان "خاص كوميديا مبتكرات"، والمسائل كما يبدو من عنوان يتيح فك كوميديي بخصوص "الدار البيضاء" أو محاكاة الأسابيع أو محاكاة أوروبا. وفق ما حددته إدارة الرئيس جورج بUSH.Build. كان يتراوح شكل لمجموعة من الممثلين من أصول إسلامية أن أسلم فرقة "محور الشر" كوميديي وقامت عروضاً مرشدًا في نيويورك وانتهت في جنوب جمهور أمريكية من غير أصول عربية. وبحسب ما يقول الكاتب "المرأة الإنجليزية "دين عبد النور" فإن الجمهور الأمريكي يرغب في الاستماع إلى الإفصاح عن الأخبار ونشرها. وهذا الحال نحو粝ة المسلمين من الأخبار بيد بموافقة حاجة للتنقيض من خلال ضراعة من مختلف وسائلها. من العديد من القنوات الأمريكية على أنها واستغلتهم، مما ساهم في مضايقة الرهاب من العربي المسلم.

والاهتمام في الولايات المتحدة أو الغرب عموماً بنجاح مثل هذا النوع من الكوميديا ينبع من فترة هذا النوع من البرامج على تغليق التشيير بين أطراف ثقافين أخذ الصدع بينهما منحى عنيفًا. لم يتوان بعض الممثليين عن اعتبار هذا النمط من محاكاة الصدع بين الإسلام والغرب على نحو هزلي بمكانية مدخل فعلي للحوار بين الأيديولوجيات المهجرة. والغرب. إلا أنه كان هناك من بث أن الصراع والعفونه هو شكل من أشكال الحوار. لا ريب أن السينما كونتكيزيون جماهيرية فلكية أو إيجابية في مناجم نجاح قسط. إن التفوق وكفاءات إيجابية في مناجم نجاح قسط. أن اعتماد إنشاء صلة إيجابية بين الجماهير المختلفة. خصوصاً أن جماعين سيمتراجت لائتش الأدبيات إلى الجاليات العربية والمسلحة على نحو غير مسبوق. وربما مثل هذه محاكاة المبسطة للأمور تساهم في تخفيف حجم الرهاب من العربي والسلام الذي باث هاجسا في الولايات المتحدة وأوروبا.
في أخر استفتاء حول الوضع الديني في فرنسا نشرته مجلة عالم الدينات، ثبت أن الكاثوليكية تكاد تكون قد انحسرت في الدولة التي طالما تُسمى بـ "مملكة الديانات". فحسب الأرقام المنشورة لا يتجاوز نسبة من يعتبرون أنهم كاثوليكون 51 في المائة من السكان مقابل 61 في مطلع السبعينات من بينهم 8 في المائة فقط يُطابقون على الصلة في الكنيسة يوم الأحد أي أقل من ثلاثة ملايين فرنسي.

الأنشطة في الأسرة "أن هناك الكنيسة الكاثوليكية في فرنسا الذي هو ظاهرة عامة في أوروبا واكتبه وجهات تنوير معارضة مع هذا الشهداء البارز هما من جهة أزمة النظام العلماني، وأنتشار الفروع الدينية الجديدة في العالم الطوسي التقليدي. وعلى رغم أن هذه المشاهد الثلاثة تبدو معارضة، إلا أنها في الواقع الأمر متلازم يفسر بعضها البعض، وتدرج في السياق ذاته. أن ابتعاد الفاعل الفاعلية والموضوعية للسلاسل التاريخية وتشكل المطلق الدينى وقين النماذج المجتمعية والسلوكية الجديدة.

وينبغي هذا برض الصورة الشاملة في الأدبيات العربية عن تعامل العلمانيان والدين من منظور كون العلمانيات ناشئ

فالروية العلمانية تعتبرها مؤسساً عن النظرية العقلانية والتدبير الحزك للسياج السياسي الاجتماعي تنقسم في

المنطقية القيمة للتنوير. ولا يمكن فصلها مؤسساً عنه، وكمب بين مارسيل غوشي في أعماله الرائدة حول العلمانية،

فإن المسالك الدينية السياسية في أوروبا قد مرت بمرحله ثلاثة. * المرحلة الاتحادية منذ نهاية حرب الدواد - 1598. - إلى نهاية القرن الثامن عشر. وتميز هذه المرحلة باستقلال فهم الوضعية الدائمة التجيدة التي هي الكيان السleri للكلم SCSIoli الذي يتعني ضرورة التحول من الادمان

والانضباط الاجتماعي والطابعية في سبيل السلامة الحقية للدولة التي ليست في تعارض مع الدين. ولن تقوم في

وال..
التاريخية.
من هذا المنظور كان الفيلسوف والقانوني الألماني كارل شميت يقول أن المفاهيم السياسية المدنية ليست سوى مقولات
لاهوتية ملتبسة، وفي مقدمتها مقولية السيادة التي هي مركز الفكر السياسي المدنى. فإن تحوار مفهوم السيادة وتراجع
الدولة القومية تجذب صياغة المسألة الدينية نفسها. ولا يعني الأمر هذا عودة الدين إلى الحكم في الحقل السياسي,
وإنما تحوله في أن واحد إلى رافد مغذ للنزاعات الانكسارية التي تشهد الوحدات القومية حتى في الديمقراطيات العريقة
والإلى رافد دالل ومعروك بعد انحسار الأيديولوجيات التحديثية الكبرى.
ومن هنا يفسح انهيار الكنيسة الرسمية المجال أمام بروز أشكال جديدة من الدين تثبت الحقيقة التي طالما كررها علماء
الابنرولوجيا، وهي إن الصلة بالمطلق هي البعد الوحيد الثابت في نمط الاعتقادات الإنسانية المشترك.
الإلي إبراهيم، مفكر ومؤرخ إسرائيلي معروف، وسفر سابق في باريس، كتب مؤخرا كتابًا بعنوان "الديانات الثقيلة". أثار ضجة واسعة حصة قصصه في كتاب "الأصوليات الليتورجية الإسلامية" التي يعتبرها النقاد الأكبر الذي

تعاني منها الإسلامية اليوم.

ويتطلع الإسرائيليون في كتابهم من أطراف رائجة في الدراسات الليتورجية، فما أن شأنها في الديانة الكلاسيكية تميز بتصوراتها الأدبية الموحية التالية من فهمها الأحادي الوثوقي للحقيقة وتمسكها باستمرار تصور دائر

الواقعية في مقال الديانات الإسلاميَّة التي هي أقرب للفلسفات عيش وسأس حياة، أو الديانات الأرثوذكسيَّة الرومانية

القرنيَّة التي لم تكن سوى آية من آيات الجسم الاجتماعي. لذا، يعد إلى أن الأصوليات الليتورجية المحسية لم تُقِدْ تطور مشكلة لأنها نُجِبَت من صحراء الإصلاح والتنوير في أوروبا. وقد كانت الديانة المحسية منذ نشأتها تحمل دورًا هامًا بالنسبة للناشرين الرئيسيين والمؤثر

ذين أفصَّلُوا في نهاية المطاف إلى إعداد الدين من المجال العمومي. قدم تطبيقاته واضحًا.

كما يرى أن الأصولية الليتورجية اليهودية قد نُجِبَت ناحية لقيام الدولة الصهيونية التي احتضنها ضمن

رزميتها السياسية وهميتها الديمقراطية، فحتى أدناها إلى نزعة معزولة، لا تهدد أحدًا لأنها غير قابلة للتصدير، ما دامت

اليهودية دينًا قوميًا بدون طروح كوني.

الأصوليات الليتورجية الإسلامية تُنظَّم بالنسبة له الإستثناء الواحد في التقليد الكلاسيكي، مسؤوليتهم ضرورة في كل أزمات

العالم وكأنها الأزمة والإرهاب والعنف.

ولكن كأن هناك بعض التأويلات الرائجة لظاهرة الأصولية الليتورجية، المقاربة السوسيواقتصادية

وبالمثل، اقترح التأويلات الرايقة لظاهرة الأصولية الليتورجية، المقاربة السوسيواقتصادية

، إذا نهاند عن أطراف أخرى رائحة في

الأديان الاستشريشية العميقة، ما أن شأنها في كونه الديانة الوحيدة التي لا تقصّص فيها بين الدين

ويساهم في الفكر النّسبي من حيث يسود دائمًا تلقي الإنسان الحرة.

ويشترط أن يكون تبادل النّسبي في مملكة العالم برض مع مفهوم "حوار الحضارات"، التي يضمنها الساهم

والسياسي بين عصراتها. كما قد يكون تبادل النّسبي في أثره التزام و великائه هو في مفهوم التواصل

الحداثة، كما يُطلق عليه ممارسة الحب من جديد للدفاع عن القيم الثقافية والفلسفية في مواجهة "القانية

الأسلامية".

ليس من هنا التعلق السمهب على أطراف إبراهيم التي يبدأ أنها قيد تجاربها واستغلالها في الإعلام العربي (الفرنسي

على الأخص)، وإنما بسبيلا القوة على الجانب المتصل به تنذر ظاهرة التطرف الإسلامي بما يعزب

خصوصية التنموية بين العقيدة والسياسة في الإسلام في مقابل الأصوليات الليتورجية، المسيحية، «المسلمتين».

والفقرة المقدمة هنا هي أن الأدبيات الإسلامية تتحرر الموقف ذاته (الاختلافات الإقليم العضوي بين الدين

والسياسة) وإن من خلقية مغايرة غير عادية باستيعابات النظرية والأطوارية لهذه المقاربة.

ولنُبْنِي بإشارة إلى أن غير الحقيقية الأصوليات الليتورجية، المسيحية، «المسلمتين»، وفع تجيُههما ضمن النظم

الليتورجية. في الأحيان الملكية التي تجلت الْعالِم في السنوات الأخيرة كفاءة على هذه الصحراء. حرب

المسلمين التي تسببت فيها الأصولية الأرثوذكسية الصربية، وجماع الأصوليات الليتورجية في إسرائيل التي ذهب ضحيتها

رئيسية الوضع السياسي.

فما شهدته في الواقع هو توظيف القاموس الأصلي للدين في الاستدلالات التي أُدبِحَت تتخلَّى من

المتزجيجية الخلاقية، مما لا يمكن للإجابة المؤسسية القائمة أن تضمن أيما أن تستند إلى عقلية ومنظورة

طقوسية من المجال العام.

وقد فقطعت الفلسفة اليهودية الأمريكية المعروفة حنة أرنت قبل خمسين سنة إلى هذا الأمر، من بينهم أرنت، يتفادى
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أن صراع العالم الحري ضد الاستبداد الشيوعي قد ولد اتجاهاً متناضماً إلى تأويل هذا الصراع بحسب الاصطلاحات الدينية، مما نجم عنه نمط من عودة الدين للقضاء العقومي. إنه المشهد الذي ننسه يوضوح في خطاب الرئيس الأمريكي الحالي بوش مما لا يحتاج لمزيد من التوضيح.

وأما نتائجه من هذا المصطلح ليس روج حافل النظام الديموقراطي في الغرب أو انحسار العلمانية وإنما مركز النظرية الاستراتيجية إلى الآخر في نفس القاموس الطوري الإقليمي الذي يعتبره رناني جوه المخابئ الدينية الوسطية التي لم يخرج منها الإسلام بعد، وليس من الصحيح، على عكس ما يتصور براوني والأساليب الإسلامية، أن الإسلام هو الدين الوحيد الذي يقترن فيها العلمي بالسياسية ويعتبر فيها الدين مقامات الشرعية السياسية.

فمع تسلحتها بأن كل المجتمعات الوسطية أقرن فيها تاريخاً دينيًّا بالسياسية لأسباب معروفة ليس هذا المجال ذكرها إلا أن الإسلام اختص بكونه وضع الأساليب المرجعة للقوة الإدارة البشرية للكتاب السياسي التي هي الخلفية المدعومة للعملية الدينية.

أما الأساس الأول فهو نزع القادة عن الدولة بصفتها كياناً قوياً دينياً ليس بإمكانه تجسيد الجوهر الأخلاقي للدين (على عكس التقليدين اليهودي والسيسي الكوستريكي). وليس في المنظومة القومية أو التشريعية الإسلامية ما يسمح بالقول بالدولة الدينية. باعتبار أن هذه المنظومة توترها في أحلام الأشخاص (معنى الأثيبي) وليس معايير القيم المدنية بالتصور الديني الذي رفضه القادة والمكلمون الأوللاً (أي القول بأن قيم الفضيلة لا تتوقف إلا في الدين). ويتأسس هذا الموقف على القول الجدي في دينية التوحيد بين مجال الأصولية ومجال الخلق، الذي استنتج منه علماء الأمة الأوللاً أن شؤون السلطة وضعية تعاونية ليست من أصول العقيدات والأساليب الدينية.

فلا إمكان يكون في السؤال الاجتماعي المتعلق بوجود نظرية سياسية في الإسلام (نحن نحاول إعادة أفراد الدين بما فيهم العلماء والسياسية الذين يمتلكون أخلاقيات شاملة)

وأما بالنسبة في منزلة الدولة ككيان يحظى بمث الاستسلام المشترك في المجموعة الدينية، والمزيفة الكبرى للتنطق الإسلامي كما فهو علماء الأمة الأوللاً هو أنه استمرتا كسباً بشرياً لا يمكنه التدور بقداسة الدين ولا كسره. وليس خلاف ذلك سوى تطويق الغلاة أو سوء فهم المناولين.
اتجاهات البولصة في العالم العربي تغيرت! هذا واقع واضح تعيشه شعوب المنطقة بشكل يومي، وتدفع نتائجه. إلا كيف يمكن تفسير أن "العودة"، بالنسبة للفلسطينيين بات هو الفلسطيني "الآخر" نفسه المخالف له في الرأي السياسي؟ أو كيف تحول قيادتهم المدرجة رئيس الوزراء اللبناني إلى العدو رقم واحد بالنسبة لل ценات، الإسلامية في لبنان، وتمثيله في حزب الله ومن معه من التغيير؟ وتحولت السعودية بالنسبة للسعودية للفتراً ومحطتها السياسية محور كل ما هو سلبي، في ذات الوقت الذي تفتح فيه الأعرج وتدعو الابتسامات على النشأة لاستقبال الزعماء الإسرائيلي شيمون بيريز (عواد) مجردة قانا الأولى) في دولة الفجر 2007؟ أو كيف بات الرضا الإقليمي للسعودية إعلان استحالت تشاد والدنغال وفي مراكنة، فأسهم في مليء عرب جميل؟ كيف لو أعاصمة "العرب" دمشق بانته أهل حلقنا؟ عند تحيز في العلاقات أم قناعات جديدة وتفاهم؟ سواء لا تحن وتتفاهم عليه، ولكن المنطقة وأحداثها المهمة والمسارعات لا تناظر الإجابات طويلة السنة والعرب بناء وأخذ حذر أن لا يكمن هذا خطاب في كل الطرق، على أساس ديهمي أو أسس عرقي. إذا كان الحراك على أساس مذهبى ومحادثة إيجاب توزع مع الحراك الشيعي، المدعوم بهمن من قبل إيران، أي تكون هناك من خيارات سوتي فح باب التعاون وبوصة من تركيا وال السعودية، وصلت إلى تقدم جيدة مع الأردان والسعودية. ومصر واستدلالاً القوى في دول آسيا الوسطى ذات الأعرج التركية في غالبيتها، ونالت تقرب حدودها مع إيران نفسها، وهذا النوع من الحراك لا يقتنق إلغاء قضية "العرج"، لوفما يلي، يتضمن أيضاً اعمال الأكراد في المعادة. (وهذا سيكون تحداً كبيراً).

ولا سيما مراعاة لحالة الرغبة، وشعارات الشعبيات بين الأكراد والإيراني. أما إذا بقيت القضية في منظور صراع ما بين العرب والكرد، فقابات يجب أن يكون قائما على ضرورة أحيان عقلية الشعية العربية، والعراقيين منهم تحديداً، والذين لا يعبرون "العدو" الإيراني بالضرورة، وهناك أصول متزودة في لبنان والعراق منهم تشريع إلى جزء ما بين شعبية إيران، وصاص الشعبيات مطلوب استغلالها بشكل إيجابي. كشف حساب الثورة الإيرانية في المنطقة إلى اليوم، مشين. مباشرة في إحداث شعف ومحاولات ارهابية في الكويت والسعودية والنورس، واتجاه القيادة في بناء الدولة، وعلاقتها، احتلال سوري للعراق، احتلال عسكري للاستعراضات، ارهاب وسبيل خيال مؤامرة العصبة. وعلاقة العالم بحث لهم أن يكون لديهم الحدود الدنيا للقلق والشكوك، ومادية الإضاءة والفصل عن هذا النهج المحال واليقين عليه.

ولكن يبقى السؤال الذي يُفرض نفسه مجدداً: من الذي ادار اجتهادات البولصة وما الذي خلف الاراضي، وغير ترتيباً، من الذي خلق الدين السياسياً ووضع الإعداد في خانة الأصدقاء، وبدل المواضيع؟ الإرادة مؤمّة ومحبّة ولكنها مطلقة. العرب احترا مواصلة في يوم من الأيام، وهو اليوم يعد تغيير اجتهاداتهم سياسياً تساهم في تمزيقهم وتشتيتهم.

2007 لا تزال في أنفسها الأولى، وحدها التجارب وتبادلاتهم لم تتمكّن بعد، ولا يملك العراقيون سوء الدعاء بالقول، اللهم أرنا الحق حقاً وازفنا اتباعه وأرنا الاطلاق بالطاعة وازفنا اكتتابه.«
بينما لا يتفق الحديث عن التكويد والتوغل الإيراني تحت عباءة المقاومة في المنطقة العربية بصورة واضحة، صارت تعرف منطقة التحرك الرئيسي لهذا الحراك بالهلال الشمالي، والذي يتدفق من العراق حتى فلسطين. إلا أن هناك منطقة أخرى تشهد حركات غير حديد مدعومة وقوية من المخابرات الإيرانية في المنطقة المعنية وهي اليمن، التي تشهد موجة حادة من المواجهات العنيفة بين مجموعات متكافئة من أتباع المذهب الزيدي ضد الحكومة. وقتل الحوثي كما يطلق عليها اليمنيون، كوصف للتمرد الحاصل، ليست حركة جيدة. إذ قاد بدر الدين الحوشن في أواخر سنتي 2004، وحصد من القتلى ما يزيد على الأربعمائة ضحية. وعندما وصلت التمدد من جديد عام 2005 لفترات تزداد عن الأسبوعين سقط فيها أكثر من 900 قتيلا. ويعدها هذه حزنا، النهضة بعد عام من قيام الرئيس اليمني بحق المنتزرين. أما التمرد الحالي الذي تشهد مدينة صعدة فقيده عبد الملك الحوشي، وهو نجل بدر الدين الحوشن الذي قاد التمرد الثاني. وأعراض هذه الأزمة تبدو معاً ولا تزال تتصاعد. إذ يتحول وجود بضائع التخليج الخارجي، والحديدة المحمولة عن وجود تحركات سرية تزداد أن لها توجها لإنشاء دولة فارسية في المنطقة! وأن الحوشن يلقى دعماً لوجستياً من جهات خارجية.

ويعزون اليمنيون أن هناك من يغذي هذه التوجهات ويحضوها لما فُتى بالمقاومة المدنية المادية، وكل الأساليب تتجه صوب ونشر ونشر يظهر الموت في الشؤون العربية الداخلية، والتأثير على الأوضاع فيها. يضاف إلى ذلك أن أجزاء من العناصر المتشابهة للإرهاب والثورات المجهولة، على توسع فضاء التعلم والتعليم ساعد على دعم التوجهات الإيرانية. وقد أوضحت الصحف اليمنية وجود مقاييس عراقيا في صور يراها في التحالفات اليمنية، وتمت اكتشاف هذه القبضة مرة أخرى لاستغلال بعض الأشخاص من هناك. من يقى أن هناك إعادة بناء للأنظمة والقوانين لإيران في اليمن، وفي مقدمته حركة "الشباب المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن".

الأسهم الفارسية هناك، ومن ضمنها الألغام والتجمعات السياسية التي ظهرت في الساحة مثل: حزب التحرير الإسلامي، حزب الله، حزب الحق، اتحاد القوى الشعبية اليمنية، وأن لم تكن من هذه المجموعات سوى حزب التحرير، اتحاد القوى الشعبية اليمنية، وحلفائه، ولا تزال هذه التوجهات تتجه صوب ونشر ونشر يظهر الموت في الشؤون العربية الداخلية، والتأثير على الأوضاع فيها. يضاف إلى ذلك أن أجزاء من العناصر المتشابهة للإرهاب والثورات المجهولة، على توسع فضاء التعلم والتعليم ساعد على دعم التوجهات الإيرانية. وقد أوضحت الصحف اليمنية وجود مقاييس عراقيا في صور يراها في التحالفات اليمنية، وتمت اكتشاف هذه القبضة مرة أخرى لاستغلال بعض الأشخاص من هناك. من يقى أن هناك إعادة بناء للأنظمة والقوانين لإيران في اليمن، وفي مقدمتهم حركة "الشباب المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن". وليمات من قبل أن تصلم حركة "الشام المؤمن".
تشكل مدينة «دبى» حالة حلم عربي مثيرة، فهي قصة نجاح بناها لأن لإمداد ترويج وتسلل تفاعليا بأنفسها بإسهام وتواصل وإستمرار. لم يعد سرا أن دبي تتشابّها بنيا على أساس ورؤية استراتيجية وارادة صلبة وإدارة نافذة. وكان هذا المناخ الساحر فرصاً جذباً لجلب الاستثمارات وبناء الخيال والسياحة والترفيه، وجاءت إلى هذه المدينة المستقبلية أرطى من الشركات العالمية العلاقات، والاستفادة من الطاقة المؤدية لفرص التواء والعضلة الكربونية وربما في بناء مستقبل عام ومحترم.

وخصمت لأجل ذلك المدن المتخصصة في مجالات البحوث والإنترنت والإعلام وغيرها داخل دبي نفسها، وكان التخصص المطلوب بالمنطقة المضافة للمنطقة الاقتصادية الكبرى. ولكن شيئاً في حين حصل مؤخرًا بغير أي جمل هذا الصورة الرائعة، شيء غير مقبول! فقد أعطى مؤخراً عن نقل شركة «هاليبرتون» الأمريكية من مقرها الرئيسي بمدينة هيوستن بولاية تكساس الأمريكية إلى مدينة دبي بالإمارات العربية المتحدة، وهي جزء من المكانية وعملاتها غير «الأداة» والتخطيط في تهريبها من الصراعات وعمولاتها غير «العادية» و«الخاصة» وحصولها على العديد من الصفقات بالعراق عبر التكليف المباشر من دون المرور بالمناقشة والنقاشات التقليدية.

ويعود الكثير من أسباب تلك العلاقة (الخاصة) للشركة المترابطة الخاصة من الجيولوجيا الأمريكي، وشركات النفط الكبرى، التي تتحدى نائب الرئيس الأمريكي المثير للجدل ديك تشيني، والذي كان رئيساً للشركة قبل أن يترشح مع الرئيس بوش في انتخابات عام 2000. وهذه الشركة تعرضت لانتقادات بسبب الاستغلال فلقد كسبت مشاريع في العراق وحدها بأكثر من عشرة مليارات من الدولارات، معظمها كان من دون منافسة، وفي كتاب أمريكي قاضى بعنوان «أميرة هاليبرتون» تطرق مؤلفه للعديد من الجدلية والاسئلة التي تثار بها الشركة، ودورها في قضاتها وروشائها، وهي كانت يثبت تأثير أقرب للاستراتيجية الأمريكية من منحها إلى شركة نمساوية متعلقة.

وقد أعطى مصري بعدد من الشركات المختلفة من المدن التي تفاقمت فيها مع حساب نفاد النفط وتصعيد اسطوانة موسى بنعو بنو بُلَا حُرَّى. تراتب دياب أما تأسي بحثية «هاليبرتون»، وكان يفتح في إصدارها في المقام الأول عن معادلات الشركه والآراء في مجلس إدائها وعمولته من الساحة الأمريكية. حتى المسائل التي توضّح على سبيل المثال «صوت للحريمة المنظمة، صوت للهاليبرتون».

إذاً هاليبرتون هي الوظيفة الأولى لعالم الأعمال في أمريكا تماماً، كما تشكّل مجموعة المحافظون الجدد ذات الفئة بالنسبة لعالم السياسة. هاليبرتون شركة قدّمت في عام 1919، وكان لها مركزاً في مجال النفط بشكل أساسي، ومن ثم توسعت لتصبح في أكثر من 70 دولة حول العالم، ولكنها في السنوات الأخيرة تحولت لوحظ هزيل ويتكون نهجها الإداري حالياً من الاختلاف.

في طريقها لتشكيل دبل إداري محترم ونهج مستقبلي يدعى بفخوره بالعربية تخطى «دبى» إذاً اعتقدت أنها بتقليد بأن تكون مقدراً للهاليبرتون منصفي أي شيء «محترم» ل ואניومها المبرة.
اللغة الإيرانية هي لغة محظطة، مكرمة، مستنسخة من لغات سابقة لأنظمة عديدة شهدتها البشرية وانتهت نهاية مأساوية. إنها لغة أديولوجيا التي تعتقد أن مهتماتها الإستراتيجية وهمية أمريكا «المغطرسة» وأقامة نظام صناعي جديد. هي لغة محروقة ومعدلة من لغات أديولوجية عديدة شهدتها البشرية ودفعت الإنسانية مند بأبهما بسببها.

لقد جربت النازية الألمانية أديولوجية العرق الألماني في مواجهة الأعراق الأخرى، واكتشفت بقيادة ابن الأعراق الأخرى على بقية خلق الله، وكذلك حال الفاشية، وطرح التطرف الإسلامي الدولي فكرة الفضائح، والمعركة الأزلية بين الكفر والإسلام وضرورة أن يهزم الإسلام بقيادة الإبادرة وسائلها حتى برث الله الأرض ومن عليها، فكانت مسألة 11 سبتمبر، وقتل الأبرياء المسلمين من صماعه إلى الرياض وبغداد، وطرحت الصهيونية فكرة شعب الله المختار ضد بقية شعوب الدنيا، وطرح صدام حسين أديولوجية العرقية العنصرية في مواجهة ما أسماه «الفرس المهجوس» ثم انتقل إلى أطراف جنده في مواجهة جنده النار، وحركة العالم الذي سيتنصر ضد الباطل.

من حق كل إنسان أن يفكر بطرقية تتاسبه. لكن ليس من حق أي إنسان إدارة المجتمع والدولة والvoie بالقوة على الناس باسم الدين أو العرق أو المذهب، والاعتقاد بأن البشرية هي في حرب دامية، هي حرب ديان ومتاعقة وأجناس. فالعالم هو شبة من المصاحب المتداخلة، وإدارة الأمم لا يمكن أن تتم بمغازل عن فهم العالم والاقتباس انه لا يمكن لأديولوجية أن تبلغ الآخرين وتفكر شروطها بالقوة.

لقد انتهت النازية بعد أن دفعت البشرية أكثر من ثمانون مليوناً في ميدان الحرب، وأقامت الصهيونية دولتها على حساب أقامت بيوت الآخرين وشمرتهم، وأنتمي صدام حفترات الشهيرة. إيران الثورة اجتازتها التاريخي إذا لم تتحول إلى إيران الدولة، وهو أمر يطلب فيها جديد للذات ولآخر، فيهما لملازمين القوى الإقليمية والدولية وكثيراً من التواريخ والملكيتين من انتفاضات الأنا والاعتقاد بأن جزء من مشكلات الدنيا المعقدة يمكن أن تتم بحرية أديولوجيات إيران بباحة إلى الخضر أكثر من حاجتها للكرسية النووية. وهي بباحة للغة جيرانها وإقلاهم أكثر من حاجتها للإرضاء الآخرين، ونظام الزمن الذي تغير كثيراً مهماً عادنا ورفضنا الاعتراف بذلك.
كان الله في عون المواتين المسلمين البسيط. فهو ضحية لقاتال دينية معترضة بل ومتناقض. وكالا تدعى وصلاة
ولاية.
وكلما تقول إنها تعتمد على كلام الله وسنة رسولها رغم أنها تصل إلى درجة من التناقض في القضية الواحدة
بشكل مثير للدهشة...

لتأخذ قضية واحدة فقط في الموقف من المرأة ودورها السياسي والاجتماعي وما يجب أو لا يجب عليها فعلا.
لدينا فتاوى بشأن قضايا المرأة من قراءة السيرة وهي فوق تتمد موقفها من قاعدة شرعية هي سيد الثرائع، وإغلاق أي
باب يمكن أن تأتي منه مفيدة كما يعتقد هذا الوقف، وقبل يومين صدر في مصر قرار تعيين أكثر من
ثلاثين إمرأة في سلك القضاء ويعتقد أصحاب هذه الفتاوى أن المرأة كأثر جل يحق لها تولي القضاء بل والولاية العامة
ودمهم في ذلك حجج وبراهين كثيرة. وفي ليبيا صدر قرار قبل أسبوع بمنح المرأة من السفر إلى خارج الحدود دون
وجود محرم شرعي لها، رغم أن رئيس الدولة لا يسفر إلا ومعه عدد كبير من الحراس اللواتي يباورون دون
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يجب أن يستناد العرب على إنجاز القمة العربية في الرياض. فقد أثبت الواقع أن حل مشكلات العرب بأيديهم، وتنازلهم عن دورهم في المبادرة وحل المشكلات بالتفاهم هو الذي يخلق الفراغ السياسي ويسمح للقوى الخارجية بالتدخل.

ثلاث قضايا عربية ملتهبة ستكون على جدول أعمال القمة. وهي تحلق مسار السلام المعطل بين الفلسطينيين والإسرائيليين، وخلق حالة من التوافق بين الطرفان القاطع في العراق وإخراج لبنان من أزمه الخاصة. يخطط العرب إذا اعتقدوا أن ليس في يدهم حل لهذه القضايا الملتهبة، فهناك قاعدة أساسية تتعلق منها العرب تجاه عملية السلام في الشرق الأوسط وهي المبادرة العربية التي هي قاعدة تمنع الاختلاف والتباين. الذي يحتاجه العرب هو الترويج لهذه المبادرة بالقيام بحملة دبلوماسية واسعة على أعلى المستويات ومنها تشكيل وفد من عدد من القادة العرب لزيارة العواصم الكبرى وواشنطن وموسكو ولندن وبيروت وغيرها من أجل إيجاد رحم دولي لحل القضية.

على قاعدة المبادرة العربية ودفع الإسرائيليين لا إعتراف بهذا المبادرة.

وفي الحالة العراقية علينا الاعتراف أن هناك موقفين غربيان مارسهما معظم العواصم العربية. وهما ما وافق التخرج وعدم التحول تجاه الطرف العراقي لخلق حالة من التوافق، وإحال ما يحدث في العراق، أو موقف التدخل السلمي؛ وذلك بدعم الطرف تمارس القتل والعنف. ولو اتفق العرب على استخدام ما فييديهم من أوراق في العراق ويشكل صداق وجماع في لمللو تجوا فيما عجز عنه الآخرون من بين الولايات المتحدة والأمم يطلب الضغط والتفاهم مع إيران لوقف تدخلاتها المستمرة في شأن العراق.

أما في الحالة اللبنانية فقد عواصم العربية أوراق ضغط على الأطراف اللبنانية، وباستطاعة العرب التفاهم مع سوريا لتغيير موقفها من الأزمة، وتحديد الحدود وتبادل السفراء مع لبنان وخلق حالة من التفاؤل. ويمكن أن تتحرك العواصم العربية وستخدم إمكانياتها السياسية والاقتصادية لدفع اللبنانيين إلى مائدة مفاوضات ثانية لحل المشكلات المغصوبة.

لجذبت السعودية في جميع اللهجات العربية بعد الحرب الاهلية في مؤتمر الطائف، ونجح اجتماع مكة بفتح وحماس، فما الذي يعني من أن تعمل العواصم العربية مجتمعة وبرادة للصراعات المدنية، وتتفاهم عن الاعتقاد بأن مشكلاتها تحلل الآخرون، ومحاولة إعادة اللة بзамен ضمMb الأطراف العرب على مواجهة أنفسهم وقضاياهم.
هل السعودية تلعب بالنار؟
طريق المحميد

من فتح وحماس، عاد السعوديون لدارة الأوضاع، فكتسيت التحليل والتحليل، من جديد.
وجاءت زيارة الرئيس الإيراني أحمد نجاد للرياض، وصل الأمر إلى أن كتب معلق أمريكي «في كل منطقة مهمة في الشرق الأوسط بدأ الأمر وكان الرياض تدعي».
ويعتبر الكاتب أنه لا يجب لواشنطن أن تجعل الرياض بوابتها إلى طهران، حتى يقول أن السعوديين يلعبون بالنار.
وأمريكا التي سوف تحتكر. وهذا معناكم لذا كتبته افتتاحية "الواشنطون بوست" عن الدور السعودي بعد اتفاق مكة، وان الرياض تقول ما كان على واشنطن القيام به.

في السياسة هناك مفاسدة شهيرة «اختتام أصدقاء»، يعنى أنه يقدر ما تجعل أصدقاءك مغرمين بك، فجعل أعداءك قريبين بك أكثر لتحتاجهم، وذلك القرار الأساسي لا يقطع الجسور، فهما السعودية هي التي تعيش على خطوط النار في المنطقة، ما يحدث على الأرض، يتعين عليها، حيث دورها الذي، والدولي، والاقتصادي، والعقلية، ومن العقل أن تتغطى السعودية على نفسها، أو أن توكل للخبراء أنهم وصالحهم، وحل

الصراعات التي تدور حولها بينما تأخذ دور المترشح، فلكي الامر، يتطلب حجمه.

سبق أن كتبنا هذا الراوي، مما جهرته به من خلال الأحداث الشخصية لصاحب القرار، عندما كتبنا عن

السعودية تتبع عن دورها المطلوب حيال قضايا المنطقة، ولذا أطلق اليوم عن سياسة الرياض بكل قناعة.
وعلى أن السعودية لا يلعبون بالنار. بل يحاولون تهدئة من أصابهم الزخم من خسائرهم حولها. في منطقة العربية هناك من أوقده شمعة من الذهب، وإن لم يدخل أحد إنفاق فانه يخرج برعاية، أو أن الشمعة ستتساقط في

هل znaleźć أمراً من البرود.

لا يمكن أن يتركون لبنان بوضعته كالسقوط على خيارات البلاد، ويعود لبنان إلى

الحريق الكبير، أي الحرب الأهلية، ولا يمكن أن تترك الرياض لستينات سلعة بيد إيران، أو أن لا تبت النوم على

يعداء لا من طهران، ولا يمكن أن تتقدم المنطقة بين بني مالك، وبين مالك، وبين مالك آخر. لا بد أن تجرب

الألم، فاننا أقول فون الأصعدة.

قد لا يحدث الكثير بعد حSTATEPOLITICS بين الملك عبد الله بن عبد العزيز والرييس الإيراني، وهذا ليس أمرًا مزعجًا

لЉمة. لكن من الواضح أن سفريت التوافقات كان عملاً من دول المنطقة ولبنان. وهذا نذيل واضح على أن هناك

شوارع باللون من سلك إيران في المنطقة، والتحدي الأمريكي إجازة طهران بالانية.

إذا كان واشنطن قد قررت أن لا تتقدم دبلوماسياً، فإلى طرف آخر أن يقم بهذا الدور، والسبب بكل سباق هو أن

السعوديين أحر خف خيالات الدبلوماسية، وليس أولهم.

والأخذية متأخرة على بعدها الدور، هو السعودية، فالملك السعودي رجل صريح، يمني الأشياء بأوامرها،

والرياض لا تتردد حسبًا جدًا في المنطقة، كما أن السعودية لا تقل بدولة نووية على أطراف حقولها، حيث لم توفرهم

إيران من أوراق الثورة، فكيف بالاستعارات النووية؟
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البكير، وهذا أقصد السعودية، أفقد القطريين صوابهم. وكذلك نرى ونسمع الهجوم الصارخ على الرياض، وكل من يسعى لاستقرار المنطقة. ومشكلة حكام قطر أن لمصداقية لهم، ولا قليل سياسياً، وأول من يعرف ذلك من يبيعهم. معهم في شرح عمل.

يحدث القطريون عن العروبة والتحرير والنضال وعلى أرضهم أكبر قاعدة عسكرية أمريكية، ويتحدثون عن التسليح في الأديان وقد تكون الدوحة إلى جزء أو دبلس في تنظيم «القاعدة» أشرفته ل الثأر الأفكار المسمومة.

ومن مراشليهم من هو مسجون بسبب التعاون مع «القاعدة».

يتحدثون عن القضية الفلسطينية وهم أكثر من يهول إلى إسرائيل. وعندما أرادت إسرائيل التحدث عن المبادرة العربية، بمبادرة الملك عبد الله بن عبد العزيز، أول ما تجاها طرف.

وفي الوقت الذي يظهر فيه حكام الدوحة فرصهم على لبنان، نقل القاطك التذكير من أراضيه إلى إسرائيل إبان حرب الثلاثة والثلاثين يوماً. وعندما تحدثت أمير قطر عن النسر الذي طال انتظاره في لبنان، كان وزير خارجيه، حتى وهو في طائرته، ينقل إلى الإسرائيليين أدق التفاصيل بعد المؤتمر الذي عقد في بيروت إبان الحرب الأخيرة، والذي وصل إليه من إسرائيل.

وإذدا ودأ يتحدث القطريون عن الخوف على مستقبل لبنان، كانت سياساتهم في بيوت لا تختلف عن سياسة محطة «أبو عدس» حيث التحلي بالهيب. وكننا رأينا كيف اختفى حكام الدوحة يوم مومتر باريس. والأمر نفسه في بغداد. فهم مصدر الفضائل في كل ما يختصر العراق، منذ انتقال حرب إطاحة صدام من أراضيه.

هذا طرف الذي يبتغ على دور يرقح جسمه السياسي، ومصادماته. اليوم القطريين في حال أفضل بعد اتفاق مكة، والعراقيون ينقاشون المصطلحة الوطنية وبدأت وقتهما.

تناظر إلى الزرقاء، واليابانيون أراوهوا أسطراً من س络ين، وغيرهم ويتوأوا ومجاً لوجه مع السعوديين، فقضايا، كبيرة اهتاج إلى ساسة وليس حجار آراماً، أو دول ميكروونات مثل الدوحة أو كحلافها.

وبالعكس اليابانيون يشكون حلاً قد تكون مثيرة لعديد تحت مظلة السعودية إسرائيلية. وإسرائيل تراجع وتدار، وتتحرك من أجل مراجعة ملف المبادرة العربية، التي طرحتها السعودي، والأميركيين يتحركون مع الرياض من أجل كل تلك الملفات العائلة في المنطقة. وأخيراً نحن نحن مشرف القمة العربية في السعودية.

كل ذلك يشرح السلوكي القطري غير المستقيم. وإن كان هو سلوك حكام الدوحة منذ الإطاحة بالأب، تجاه الرياض.

ومع العلمي أن الرد الأكثر والأمثل على هذا السلوكي القطري هو مواصلة العمل السياسي الذي تقوم به الرياض.

فقط قطرة في محيط ولن تؤثر، فعنده الشدائد قوانين الطبيعة في التي تحكم ويعود الكل إلى حجمه.
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زو ومواء ومان

سعد بن طلق

الإنسان أسير التاريخ، ومن لا يتعلم من الماضي قد يقع في بعض أخطائه وخطاياه، ومن لا يتجاوز الماضي بمرارته.

يطرق مكلاً بعدمها. من لا يبتعد تاريخه.

تأجر في الأمانة هذه الأيام قلعة فرقت قانون يقلب كل من يكتب أو يحمل أو ينطق شعار الصليب المعروف لأنه يبرهن في النازية، التي قادت إلى حرب عالمية مدمرة، ضحيتها ستمني ميلون إنسان عدا الخسائر المادية والنفيسة.

وغيرها.

ال تحديث رأوا في تحرير حمل الصليب المعروف تعديًا على معقلهم، فالفصل في المعروف بالنسبة لهم بعضاً من الصليب.

للسمايين والهلال بالنسبة المسلمين، فهو رمز يعني الحب والشمس وقوة وتفاؤل ومن أكثر من ثلاثة آلاف سنة، بل جاء من اللغة السنسكريتية الهندية القديمة وتعني "عمل الخبر". غير أن النازين حوله هذا الرمز المجهل إلى رمز للكره والحرف والدمار وعجس الفن والتفوق.

العصر العربي.

في التاريخ، نعى الأنسان كأنه دوماً فارساً، ولا يتناول عن تسميته بالعربي ما دامت إيران تريد تصور ثورة وتعمل كرهها لكل ما هو عربي عدا آل البيت. عرسيه ممنوع تسميته بأصيل العرب، فهي خريزون، أي أرض الخرب، صحيح أن البست بمعركة وصولاً، هناك كرستون، وطرفاكستان وتركمانستان، وكل قلب، ما عدا العرب: لا سيئاً أرجوهم له على أرض قهر وله جواها يجمع الله عليه وسلم ودته!!

لم نكن أسرى التاريخ والسياسة كان أمرًا بناء أن نستلم إسرائيل، فليس التأجيل أحد أساليب الله يعوب، ولسامي كلمته عمانية في الانتكاسات والأحداث التاريخية، فإننا نعتذر التفكير في التغيير.

بالإنسانية ومسهمتها كفا وفخا، لذا لا ينتمي نبي الله سلام معاه بنياهاؤا كل النبياء.

يوعف ويعود أيامهم ي يقولو وهم وهم نفر كما تعبد عبده دومًا! لن كون نجيًا، إنه على ما نبطها ناتي!

انضمت رمانة سادحة عبر الإنترنت شرح اسمية "الكريسيان"، وكيف أن اسم صليبي عبر عن رهة "النصرة"، في كل المسلمين الذي يدخل أهل لحضارة وهم وهم، كنت قد قررت أن التسمية فردية، رمانات أخرى تكافح عبر واعي الوجوه تثير مسماً الكريكيت التاماراتي الذي استمر في الزواج مع السلم.

السلام حرقاً، مما يذكر أن الروسات كانت مجمعة في صيحة دانماركية لرسامين. عادة!

في عصر النزاعات الطائفية، عرض السيناريو الشبيه به "الكرسي" أي من نسبوا آل البيت العداء.

المتطرفون من السنة يعوضون الشبيبة "هاؤو" أي من رفضوا مبادئ النبي على الخلافة، بنت أبواهم ما وجدوا جميعاً، وأصبحوا شمعاء، وكذا آل البيت نظم (عليهم السلام) جميعاً، ونحن لا نزال نخوض معركة صحس، والجمل وكربلاء.

في الفيلم!!

التشيخ اختصره الغلاة من أهل السنة في رجل اسمه الله باب سبأ! المتطرفون من الجانبين برون في إيران ملدلا

للشيء، ولد تاريخ مشوه، والخزاز يليد التاريخ، وكسب كفري وطرف طافي.

في مقابلة مع صحفية، القيروانية، ساوا السنين المفكر المصري حسن العلوي ابن أبو مصطفى الزراعي، ويبيان جبر

صواغ زعيم الداخلية السابق في حركة الجفرية، العلوي سي صواغ زعيم الزراعي الشبيبة!! هو أصب الزراعي.

وسيلوث أصولاً تاريخي ومرزق للغة في محلة عراق الفوضوي الطائفية؟

ليس هناك من ينادي بنا نازيم التاريخ، وليس من عاقل يتحاه لروس الإسلامي، ولكن عنايا مثالي في الماضي أكثر مما يوجد في الحاضر، ونحن إلى القدم أكثر من تطوعه للمستقبل القادم. نحن أسيرة الماضي، نماذج هذا الأسر

وصوره ببنا بلا حدود.
تتسع ان

سعد بن طلعة

يقف إذا كره هنوك فادع عليه بالجهل لأنّ «الجاهل علم نفسه».

أسوق هذا المثل وأنا شاهد عيان على العجب العربي الذي ينضج تشيعه برائت قضا ويجب، مقدمين بذلك هدية

للنسطرين من الشيعة من جهة وإيران «لاية الفقيه» من جهة أخرى.

الشريعة تجريد، ونهاية فريق شعب، أي ناصر. بني هشام من آل البيت وفريق شعب بنية أمينة ومن قبلهم من الخلاصة

عذاب على أبي طالب. وقد أخذ هذا الصرع أشكالاً داماء كانت فئة مأساتها في كربلاء، وفي موقعة الطف التي

آسفت عن تخفيف رسول الله الحسن بن علي وأمه. وهكذا بدأ الصراع بين الفرقين استمر كل منهما، من الدين والقرآن والحديث، ما يعزز رأيهم وموقفهم السياسي، ويدعو

قبل: «الدين حلال أوجو». ثم تتبّع كل فريق عن الآخر حرّص كل طرف على تعزيزها تأكيده لموقفه

السياسي، والذي تحول شيا فصين إلى مذهب ديني.

هكذا ابتهاضت بداية الفرقين، الشيعي والسني، صحيح بأن تفاصيل تمثل المكتبات في تراث كلا الفرقين حول هذه

الفرق بينهم، ولكن الجوهري في وحدة في الاختلاف بين الفريقين.

إيران لم تكن شيعية حتى وقت قريب، بل إن دولة مثل تمت تشيّع في العصر الفاطم، ثم تمتّتها سنويا في

العصور اللاحقة، وإذا كان لدي في إيران اليوم طموح وأطماع توسّعية بعلم الملال، فإن التوسّعين كانوا ينسون

تتأليف أبابا أبعاد الشريعة، وكل ما وهو في المظهر لا في الجوهر.

اللغة والطريقة والجاهل يحاول زيد كل ما هو شيعي بابرا، في ذلك جهل وظلم كبير للشيعة، فهناك هي دولة

وسياسية، والشيع المذهب وعبادة وفكر، والغالبية الساحقة من فقهاء الشيعة وقوا ولا يزالون ضد ولاية الفقيه، أي ضد

نسيب المذهب من أجل مصالح دنيوية، ولا يزالون يعرّبون على روحية المرجعية وديينتها وتحديدها، على عكس ما

تمنّيه بون_db لدوره الدولة التي تتحاول أي مجتمع شيعي لا يرتبط بدولته المذهب. أي، المرشد الأعلى للثورة الإسلامية على

الخانس.

وقد تعرض خصمه إيران من القضاء الشبهة إلى الإهانة والإقصاء والإضطهاد، ومنهم صبيح الطيلي - الأمين

العام السابق لجهاز الله، وأيضا منظري حتى محمد حسن فضل الله. وإن كان الآخر يخشى الإقرار بذلك. وقد

تعرض منابع مجتهدي المدرسة الجعفية ومجتهدي مدرسة الزهرا بكركر، ففي الكتب أعرف كتاباً (شيعة)

ترصد للهديك والفيتو من قبل الملايين لإيران أن أبناه وطاهاتهم ومضمونهم الصوفي المافي لأنيهم كتبنا كتابات تدين

حسن نصر الله، وهو جزء من خراب على الشعب الفيّاني، البعض أتّكأ وتوقف عن الكتابة، والبعض الآخر

غير أسلوب قلمه، والشجاعين تمسكاً بمواقيفهم حتى الآن. وربط الإهانات من الشيعة أكفان المذهب ومبادئه

بشعرات دكتورية ضد إما المذهب أنفسهم، وعليّ تبني هذه الشعرات والإكباره.

إن الشعية تباحة إلى من ينفّذ نفسيهم، وباحة إلى الحبكة من الصحابة الذي يعذرهم لث. ويحتاجون إلى الشعور

بالمثل والمثل والمثل، وفي أبطالهم، كي يعيروا مكانة الطاعية ومكاناتهم الإسلامية، وليست هذه الشعر والكتابه لديهم

سوف يفعّل الطريق على الخط الأمان الذي ينوي على جهاد إيران الدولة، ويحلّم إلا فإن من

الطاعية في ظل الإعتقاد والاستجابة الطفانية الذي نتفاقم أن بناء الشعية لابن الشعيرة في

العالم، وهذه الحماية المزروعة لها دوافعها السياسية لا الشيعية.
النص (16)

(من جريدة الشرق الأوسط)
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هون وصورة

سعد بن طن

حديثان شاركت فيها الأسبوع الماضي، كان الأول ندوة في مكتبة عبد العزيز الباطنين للشعر العربي بالكويت.

وتعنونا: "صورة أمام الغرب"، والثاني في حوار مع مجموعة أكاديمية أمريكية تزور الكويت ومنطقة الخليج.

وقالａ المشاركين في التعرف على ما يجابي التَرَكِيِّب عليه في قيم الدراسات العليا في جامعة جورج وستمن.

سماء صورة أمام الغرب هوس سيلفونية في دراسة بدوام الانتباه إلى الأصل، ومد ذلك عقلية صحب.

الحالة الفردية في حالة الجماعة، أي أننا نفكِّر بأننا شخص واحد يجيب أن "بكل ما يجيب الناس!". كما أن مرد الاهتمام بصورة أصلها في الاعتقاد بأننا يمكن أن نظهر بصورة للعالم الخارجي على عكس ما نحن عليه، وهذا هو ناحية، وخداع لل النفس من ناحية أخرى، فلم يعد من المقبول النظر بإمكانية خداع العالم اليوم.

وال تماماً على عالم القضاة الفموي، واللذين الذي يضع العالم أجمع بين ديك، كما أصير من المستحيل حجب.

المعلومة أو تشييُّدْهْا مِنْ نَشِدْهَا حقاً.

ولعل السبب الآخر الذي يدغمنا نحن الهوس "الشكي" أي الهوس بصورة أمام الغرب - والغريب تحديداً، هو "عِدْة الخواجة". فلا أرى الألم - على سبيل المثال - مشغولون بصورتهم كثيراً، ولا أرى أبناءهم يعونند الندوت.

والمحاضرات لتجميل صورتهم، فالكل يدرك أن الصورة تعكس الأصل، وأن الشم "ميا مشيدها الإغرياب". ولا أدري لماذا تهتم صورة أمام الغرب تحديداً، فالعالم ليس كله غرب، فهناك الشروق الذي يعدل أضعاف الغرب عدة وما من بردات إلى ديوان بأنهم في صراع سريدي "قططرأ" مع الغرب "الكولسي".و bildتنا واعتنا وتهديتنا البديعة وسانتنا ومنظورنا، يحموله العرب ما نحن فيه من مصائب ونكبات، ويطلبون معمّم ليل نهار بـ "الجهد"، الإبرزي مع الغرب، لكنه في الوقت نفسه يحاول أن

يُبِّعَوْا أمام هذا الغرب "الفيجي".

شارك في الندوة عرب - غرب، أي العرب يحملون نفسيات الدول العربية، وفي ثانيا كلامهم - تلميحًا وتصريحاً، هجوم على هذا الغرب العالم الذي يدوم صورة العرب والمسلمين، والحقيقة أن هؤلاء عانوا تمازجاً في دولهم، المكلفة إلى هممنا مبكر، وإلى ما قد قل قراءات المجمع العربي والإسلامي في الغرب على إظهار روح التناسم في دولهم العربية، بل إنهم اجتذبوا - طوعاً - من قبل المنظور، بينهم الذين أبدوا صموداً حسناً ودقفاً بين لاجن، ولهما ثلاثة شكلهم معيّن لا يجب للعلم العربي لتشوهه صورة على ميادين العدوة الرابعة المادية، الأولان - والذين إنفاذ النواحي والمواقف الجماعية، والثاني إنشاء الخطوات والمواقف الدينية وقوتته السياسية، التي انتهت من إبطال وكبيرة أوروبا، عام بن أداة ودحولا...
في خلاص غير مباشر نشأ بين وزيرة الخارجية الأمريكية، كونداليزرا رايس، وبين فيكتور إتش مير، أستاذ اللغة الصينية في جامعة بنسلفانيا، حملت كلمة "wei-ji"، خاصة أن رايس أعترف أنها لا تقرأ الصينية، ولكن اعترفت أنها "قبلها". لا توصف الصينية هي "الخطر والرقصة"، وفقاً لما تبنى مير، ولكن "أنا أعرف ليس هو "الخطر والرقصة".

الصينية فيكتور مير قال إن صناعة كلمة قد تتأثر حول هذه الصياغة العارية عن الصحوة الدقيقة حيث أكّد أن: ""الخطر والرقصة"" تعني "أزمة راقية، أفضل مثيل مهم، حين تبدأ الأمر بالاندماج نحو النهائية". وفقاً لمن المعنى الحقيقي للكلمة، "عذرًا بالخطرة،そして من المعنى الذي تمّ نقله للسيدة رايس، معناها "الرقصة"، يشير إلى حد بعيد جداً الرقص بين ما يجري في الشرق الأوسط وما يتمّ إعلان السيدة رايس بأنه يجري، وهو الرقص الذي يجري بين الخطابات التي يجيب عليها كي يكون للسيدة لأجل التصريحة وأعمال أخرى، وفقاً لما يقول السيدة رايس أن هجمات 11 سبتمبر هي "الخطرة والرقصة". 

الحرب القادمة في سياسات تطوير المرأة في الشرق الأوسط، وتمّ إعلان السيدة رايس بأنها تجري، وهو الرقص الذي يجري بين الخطابات التي يجيب عليها كي يكون للسيدة لأجل التصريحة وأعمال أخرى. يُعدّ المهاجرون إلى العالم أخرماً بما استقر، وفقاً لما يقول السيدة رايس، فإن هذه الرقصة تطور لرقصة زمنية حقوقية في الشرق الأوسط، أمر يُعدّ لمناقشة في منظورات سياسة العالم. 

وخلاصًا، دفعت مير إلى أن نشير إلى cümle "عذرًا بالخطرة،そして من المعنية التي تمّ نقلها للسيدة رايس، معناها "الرقصة"، يشير إلى حد بعيد جداً الرقص بين ما يجري في الشرق الأوسط وما يتمّ إعلان السيدة رايس بأنه يجري، وهو الرقص الذي يجري بين الخطابات التي يجيب عليها كي يكون للسيدة لأجل التصريحة وأعمال أخرى. يُعدّ المهاجرون إلى العالم أخرماً بما استقر، وفقاً لما يقول السيدة رايس، فإن هذه الرقصة تطور لرقصة زمنية حقوقية في الشرق الأوسط، أمر يُعدّ لمناقشة في منظورات سياسة العالم. 

واللقاء بينهم ما كان خاصيًا سولانا يعني أنه الواقع في فلسطين ويبين ما وجد على أرض الواقع من مستوطنات إسرائيلية، فقوله: "إنه صدى حين زار المدينة العربية في الضفة الغربية في الضفاف الشرقية من 428
القرن، ضد نمو المستوطنة، وبحاجة (هجرة الفصل العنصري) والذي يتطرق الأرض التي يحكمها الفلسطينيون عزلها ومأزق informational الجغرافي، وهو النضال الذي يخيّل النساء الفلسطينيات تسلّح الإستيطان.» الفرق هو ذاتيته من
الوصية التي أدت إلى حيّز تأسيس حمام كافور، والتي لم تكن تأسس أي فكرة أو مفهوم في الكتاب سوى العنوان، إذ تسأل
الجمعية، وكيف قد فرد أبناء أميركي على تسمية النظام الإسرائيلي بالعنصري غير أنه في الواقع الفعلي للأعمال هناك
العنصريّة القطرية التي تقيم بها النساء الفلسطينيات وإعمال التنظيم العضوي في ضمها، مما تضرر بقيمهم من
أهمية التشكيل على الجسد الأقصى وحتى من أجل الانتزاع الثقافي حيث ما فهمت ما إذا كانت
المدن، والأثاث، والموسانيق، والملايين، والمكملات الثقافية والدينية تدعو أنها يهودية. ومن
لا يمكن تحلق من
العصرية الفلسطينية، لابد ما كنتي الكاتب الإسرائيلي نوريني فلانو أن كاتب الاحتلال المحتل من
أحد ركاب الفلسطينيين من الصغير في المقدرات التي سير بها الإسرائيليون، وقد أوضح أن في
مقالة في الكاتب بأن الأجواء العنصرية الإسرائيلية التي تختلف أحياناً وتطابق أحياناً أخرى مع إجراءات نظام
الأعمال في جنوب أفريقيا.
والخطوة في المقارنة بجنب الواقع والتأثير السياسة عليه، وبين العالم المثالي، الذي يضيع بعض صالح
السياسة الثقافية فيه هي أن تكون العالم إلى صراعات دموية ومزج قادة كثيرة داخل تنفيذ شكل من العنف
والإرهاب لا يعلم أحد كيفية الخروج منه، والمروجون لمصرام_pixelsبه في العالم عالم، عالم عربي يريد درء
الأخطار عنه، وعالم آخر مسمى في صراعات تزايد جدّة نتيجة الاحترام والعبر السلام والعلاقات، ومن
أجل الوصول إلى الأهداف التي تسعى فيها البعض يتم تخصيص القتر معروض جلّة ممتثلة، أو يتم تخصيص عبور أو
أجر أو استغلال الحكم أو تمثيل العالم السياسي بعض الفصول دون توضيح من هذة دولة مملكة من هذه الأشكال حيث
أعمال الفصول هذه أشكال الديا والديا وآلام الثقافة، ومع البيان الفضّال الفضل في الجمل السياقية السياسي على
المرء، والوقت الديا في كتاب أيّرون يسمح لمّي النصوص على الأختر النص الاستاذ على
المعقدة في ذنبا إسرائيل.» ونهاز الذين شعرنا سبيل الإعلام بشروط قارن بسلام إسرائيل.
عند تفاصيل الأصوات النازية قلّت اليهود والعرب والمسلمين والبيزنطيين والروس، ولم تتفقوا على حقائق أن
الاستعمار، غير أنّ النازية أنجزت من ضمن عناصر وثابتة بناءً على اليهودي والأوروبي، أما العرب والمسلمين فإنهم يوم صحابة
العنصريّة والدين الإسلامي في التعبير عن الكوارث التي تترسب في الجملة في التاريخ، وتعتبر
العنصريّة ضد المسلمين والمسلمين في الإسلام بأن تتأثر شمل قادة في أفكارهم في القطب التي في المستقبلي
قد تكون تكور من مراة مقالات «أنا كبار»، بكثير من دعم مشترك، إلا أننا نرى، بل أننا يتعذر
نحن نست أهم!» مفاده أن أيّرات المسلمين أو نباركهم أو إعلانهم أو حضاراتهم وكذلك.substring عام على
العرب أمام المسلمين، وهذا أمر غير مقبول للعبّيل في بعض الأحيان.» هل الاستقرار والأثاثيّة، ماهما الأنسب?
العنصريّة مع قادة مترسمة من جهات من دون المسلمين والمسلمين الذين من الواضح أنه إتّبع ذهنيه المفاخرة بين تجاهلا الثقافة الإسلامية بعد الاستقرار والأثاثيّة، ووقع في هذه
الثقافة الإلهام جزوها وتميزها التي تأسست منذ بداية النفوذ لها على حقوق ومركزا الإنسان بغض النظر عن
الدين والعروق واللغة والجنس، والتي تلت أمام عيون العالم مفتي والمعرفة والمعرفة.

هذه المفاهيم في اليوم الدّنيوي والواقع الفعلي لدى صناع القرار أو القرار تؤدي إلى ما ستحدث اليوم من هجمة
العنصريّة شرسة ومن الحرب والاستيلاء والعنوان، وهي تتألف عبّيلة تتفاوت صراعات أتنا خطرة لذيّة هذه
الواقع المستقبلي في اليوم، ونرمي على التأثير بالنسبة إذا كان ذلك بين الفرق بين الواقع العنصري ويبت تخصص هذا الفهم
القرار الأم، فكل العالم أصبح قراراً حيّزاً بين حالة طاقة تحقيق بين الواقع والمفهوم؟ وهل تصبح هذا الفهم
المختلف جدًا عن الواقع الفعلي ناجم عن صناعة خيبة لأولئك الذين فكر عن العالم أكثر وأكثر في صراعات يمكن
تبنيها بسهولة لو ثمّ حكمت العالم المسلّح بالعراق والحروب؛ وهل هناك حشر أكبر من أن يصر نائب رئيس القوة
الأعظم في العالم بأن العراق يسجّل "تجهيزات هائلة" (الوطنين بوست 25-1-2007) بينما يجمع العالم برمته أنّ
العراق يعيش "كارثة رهيبة" أودت بجوهر وهدف الحياة كما يعرفها كلّ البشر؟ إنّ المؤشرات جميعها تشير إلى أنّ العالم باشر ووجهه إلى النفق المظلم، فهل يمكن الحلم بوقفة جادة وحريدة تغيير المسار، أم أنّ الوقت قد تأخر لأبناء جيلنا كي يشهدوا مثل هذه الوقفة الضرورية اليوم؟
السbit ذو الحجة 1427 هـ 13 يناير 2007 الميلادي
(من جريدة الشرق الأوسط)

العرب: في أي وقت يعيشون اليوم؟
ثريا الشهري

بمراجعة أدبيات العالم العربي للاقتصاد أن العمل الثقافي قد يشكل من نفسه واحة تصدع عن أوطانه وعرُوبه الاختراقات
المضادة، فإنها في الإيجابية حقًا الإدراك بأن حداثة هذا الجانب من حياة الإنسان، وهو أمر لو تذكرت فيه لوجيد أنه شبه
مثير في تاريخنا، خطورة نتيجة الأخلاقية والاقتصادية والأمني، تناولنا للجذور النهائية في مظاهر عصرنا، وتحليلاً و(5,9),(995,989)
تلتزمنا، فنكن فإن النطق المعرفي ابن رشد ابن طفيل ابن عربي ابن حزم وغيرهم؟ أم يكن في
العهد الأخباري من تاريخ الأندلس والإمبراطوريات، وال옷 الآلات السمعية والنظيرات الطغائات، ومن ثم نظر حي الله
الشيوخ الثقافي من أثاث الطبيعة والأعمال ومعهد عبد الله الكواكبي إلى نظم السبا وهمج الحضري
 أمامهم؟ أم يكن في زمن وقوع الوعي العربي في قضية الاحتلال الأوروبي؟ وما حل بعد تاريخ 1967؟ أم
تقررات الهيئة تحكم مراجعة لثائقية تدريجية أعادة التأسيس الشعري العربي وما زالت تكتسب نموذجًا، فإن صرفنا
النظر على ظاهرة البكتاريا والتواريخ التي تعبت اعتباً على فترات دلالة على موضوع واحد بعد أن نكتونا
بكتاريات تضخيم النوايا وماركة إعداد صوت العرب إياها، ورغم قدسيتة في هوي تحت وفاة العرب؟ تلزمر
والف، وفيما أفضى أوفر القرن الرحمن يميز الزمان العربي، رغم هذا وضعنا، ينبغي أن نستطيع إنفتاحاً الثقافي
في إطار النصي الطبيبي كرد فعل شعوراً جزاء الحالة العربية، وإنني كيف أن الميدان «على بعضه» لا يخلو
من بناء ثقافي يبحث الإضاءة.

على أن هناك حقيقة يجب الحديث عنها ومبشرة، فقد تطور نمو الخطاب الثقافي العربي من خلال نخب دون أن
يساهمه تطور متماثل أو مقارب لجوء المجتمعي الأخرى، تأتي مؤثرات هذه الحالة الفكرية قبل دخول حرير الجماهير
المواطنة، وتعليمها في التحصين والاعتماد بالتحرك الملائم لفهم الدين، والذي هو مهيد من وجهة نظرها، أو عبراء
أوضح، الفسور المشروطة الوطني الشريحي في استعداد التوجهات الحرفية أو التأكيل وإنما كفارة اجتماعياً، يدلل
أن أعمال العنف المتلفعة بإلى ما تناول في المناطق النائية والبعيدة عن المدينة، وأي نظام سياسي لا يقدم م
نظرية التشريحي الاجتماعي يسعى إلى هذه التوجه، ففي إيران مثل، وفجاءة مشروط النهوض في حركة
مصمص، عمل نظام摘要 على أثابة عصر آخر، ولكن حتى مع MAP للملاءة الاقتصادية إلى حد ما، إلا أنه
مسبط استعداد الفوضى والبراء، ولابد من فعله ما علية طاقة المجتمع الاجتماعي
والاقتصادي، سواء تلك التي تطلقها أو ساهرها في إخبارها، والتي تكون عند أعلاها، في ضياء أدبي، في الدن
الديني المتقدم، أو على الأقل تناول قيم الثورة، صحيح أن نجاً شابة ومتعممة تعليماً حديثاً، ولعب فيها تولى
قيادة الحركات الدينية في إيران أو غيرها، غير أن الشروط المجتمعية الضاربة إذا تحكنا النصا فالف ضبط
الوجه الرفيع، أو النوي المتعلق عن نفس، والذي غالبًا ما تتجاوزه التعل ي الف طرف الاجتماعي.
فإذا أخذنا في اعتبارنا حظوظ الخبان في بلاد تعزير مثالي الكيماوي، والمثير، ودرس الأنهار.
 وليس السبب في ذلك، إنما الف مؤثر عن هذا الموضوع، ومن تجاوزها، فنحسن في تيسير
الخطاب الثقافي والثقافي، ونحن نستعمل هذا النوع، ومن تجاوزها، فنحسن في تيسير
تلك الأثورية وتطرأها بالفاضل، ولا نستعمل هذه البنية
العربية عازفة عن تحضيراتها، حيث يوجد شراً البحرية وتحويلاً إلى قوى متواصلة معاً، تتعامل على الحكمة
فإنها نفناً، وفي مقياس هذا الخطر الاجتماعي، المثل، شريحة من متقبلين يقبلون بحلفاتهم الحيل،
وكره يوحيون قراءة لهم على الضفة الأخرى، وأنه يكتون لتبقيهم وحُولًا، وكأن
الديمقراطية مستحبة من السماوات، بل تأسيس قاعدة المجتمعية الصريحة، وهذا ما يفسر أيضاً ميل غالب المثل، وغيرهم
من غير الممثلين للمجتمع الشديد إلى خط النباح، والذين انشاؤهم أنهم كانوا في محلة سلامة ضد زمنهم، وهو
واضح، إننا نقتربون بأن وجودهم أصبح مرتعاً يدمرك الدولة وطاعة سياستها، قد تشكل لهم الواقع حكمة اختيار
الجانب الرسمي والهنا، والاهتمام تحقيق إصلاح، ومن الداخل.
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لو استقللنا القرن الحالي مزودين بنيهضة علمية وحرب على الخرافات والتقاليد المعطلة، وتطور للطب وتحسين أحوال الطبقات الشعبية ودرجة قدرها وجعلها، وتبني مصانع بحري إنجازات القرن الماضي، وقوائمنا تحيا أطفالنا ونسائنا وغيرهما، وحتى إنماست أبنائنا وحرياتهم، وبطرق ومواصليات ووضوراً مرور وظائف عامه، أن فعلنا ذلك كله أو شيئاً منه، لما استيقظنا على من يبغي بيننا ويقبل بفئة مختصة تقوم مبادئ الإسلام بترفها، كما تقوم المبادئ التقليدية، ولم أتعلع كثير من الإسلاميين أن نهج الدين من فجر الدعوة حيال من أهل إسلام فلم يقبل القرآن إيمانه، واعتقد بأدلةه، وأشد كفا وندفعه، إلى أن يتم تحوله المجتمع، دينه - ليس للفظي - إلى البيئة الحاضرة ونظمه وآدابها وتكييفها مع قيم الدين وتعاليمه، كخلفية حديثة وحدود الأرثين، ولكنه ليس من باب الصدفة ما جاء عن موشي ديان، وزير الدفاع الإسرائيلي الدموي السابق حين قال: "إذا رأيت العرب ينشطون في طابور لركوب الباص، عندئذ سأشعر بالخطر".

يخطي العرب إذا تصوروا أنهم دخلوا حاما جديدا بما فيهم تغيير الرقم في التقويم السنوي، فبعد خوف أضواء الاحتفالات، علينا أن نذكر أن تخفيف العلمي تأكيم سياسيا لتنafxنا العقل البشري، ويأتي أوضاع عربية - فلسطينية واستبدادية - ما زالت تنتمي إلى القرن الغابرة، وتتحكينا حتى إلى اللحظة، فيهكي مشهد إعدام صدام يلخص حالتنا كلمة أخرى: عالم اليوم يعين طاقاته يعلمه وفكره المنهجي، ومنطقه والنظام بالسلوك الحضاري، وليس بالنزاعات وطرقات الانتقام، ولا بالشخصية «الفقهية» أو المحترجة.
لاحتوا السادة لا العبيد
عبد الرحمن الراشد

اعترف الأميركيون أن عاجلاً أم خفياً، يتعين عليهم تحقيق ملاحظة القيادات السياسية المؤلمة في العتمة، وأنها ستتطلب القادة المباشرين من الرفاق المحليين الهروب. هذه سياسة محكمة عليها بالفعل إن كان الهنيد بالفعل إنهاء العنف الذي أدى الكثير من الدمار. فالعامة عادة تضعفون ولن يعترف لهم فلن يقلصف تابعهم من أجل تنفيذ خيالهم مهما كانت، من تقصف الخصو، أو تدفق القتلى، أو إعلان الحرب. إن ملاحظة القيادات المحلية في أميركا الطفيفة والسياسية المتسرع في العراق هي الحل الحقيقي الذي يحتضن الوقت والدم. مثل هؤلاء القيادات من سنة وشيعة الذين يتقلدون المسؤولين هم جناء ولن يخاطروا بأنفسهم في أي مواجهات مع القوات الحكومية أو الأميركية. سيضحو بعذرهم ولن يخاطروا بأنفسهم ومحاصيلهم الشخصية كونهم يشعرون من أجل بناء مجاني ونمو بديه في مجال كلاً.
وبسخيط أن رأينا في الأزمات الماضية قد استهدفت القيادات الأميركية لأنهم يعترفون للعامة السياسية لقياداتها، ورأينا كيف أن تجوب القيادات الأجنبية قهرة ووساطة عالية المستوى وتعقيدات كبيرة.

العامة أعطت حماية لقادة القيادات الحكومية، كما اعترا فيها، كما رأينا في الخدام القائم.
فقط جانب بيد أن يتقدم بالتصنيفات والتجارب والتجربة، ونحن نرى كيف أن عمليات التهجير القسري للمواطنين من أحيانهم جزء من الخطة لحالة الحرب مروعة تتنوع صراع الالتفاق.
وبعدها الجانب الأميركي في تصريحاته أنه، بناء على طلب الحكومة العراقية، ابتعد عن محاسبة القيادات العليا، لكنه قرر أخيراً أن يوافق القيادات حتى وإن كانت محسوبة على الحكومة. وهذا منطق أعتبر تماماً يوجد في حماية قادة عاصية تغلب في القتال، وقبل ذلك في ترك القيادات تنظيم الناس، فقط لأنها مترتوبة بالنظام السياسي الجديد في العراق.

فلا يوجد على المخططي في المؤسسة السياسية الجديدة أن يكونوا أكثر انضباطاً والتزاما بالقانون من مجاري المعركة المتقدمة المتزامنة التي ترد لإبتكار النظام، ولا خلاف على سريعة ملاحظتها والقضاء عليها. وقد تسبب السكوت على القيادات الرسمية في الوضع الأخير للعناصر، والذي يجهز - كما ذكرت من قبل - إلى مرحلة اقتال وإسهامات في إجراء كل النظام. إن إجادة لا يمكن أن يدفع عن جوانب الإمпиروات من تنظيم القادة والمعركة المعلية وغيرهما، لكن جوانب عبره لا تورث أن يخترق المعركة على الدولة الجديدة في مشاركة الإمبراطورية نفسها.

انطلاقهم في الالتفاق بباب المطلقة للعامة التي يصوت عزيماً قبل أن يفقد رأسه أبو مصيخر الزراقي، والذي حث على الاقتراح والتشريع بالساحة المتنازعة عن الاقتراح في الحرب.
إن لم تتوج القوات العراقية والأميركية راحة بشكل صريح ومحققة بإبرام القيادات المتترفة في الاقتراح الحالي، فلا أمل في إيقاف العنف لأن مصادر العناصر هو من الساحة لا العديد. وجدنا فيه نفوذ سياسي، ورغم مراحلا مالية من أطراف داخلية وخارجية تريد استغلال القيادات الذين فتحت دكاكين في صراع أن ينتهي.
السunday 05 ربيع الأول 1428 هـ 24 مارس 2007 العدد 3034
(من جريدة الشرق الأوسط)
سخريه الديمقراطية في لبنان
عبد الرحمن الراشد

يوجد دول تفاخر بأنها ديموقراطية، وأخرى تقر بأنها ليست كذلك، وأنه لا تحكم إلا على من احتكم إلى الصندوق الانتخابي.

ولبنان ظل دائماً يتنسك بصورته الديمقراطية حتى في أسوا أوقاته وحروبه، لكن لم يعتد أحد المعاني الديمقراطية كما فعل البعض في لبنان اليوم. لقد شوهها وجعلها محل سخرية الجميع. فالرئيس الذي فرض قضاء بالقوة عبر الحكومة الشرعية ويشكل فيها. ورئيس البرلمان، الذي يفترض أن يكون الحامي الأول للديمقراطية، هو من يقوم بدور الشرطي السبيل فيمنع النواب من الاجتماع. والممارسة الديمقراطية تطالب باللغة الحكومة تعصا، لأنها لا تمثل النصاب القانوني لإنفاقها، ثم تستر أولاًها لمحاربة مقر الحكومة بالاحترام إلى القانون.

بذلك ضاع البرلمان اللبناني إلى صف البرلمانات العربية محل السخرية. تقد أراد البعض أن يخسر من اللبنانيين، ومن ديموقراطتهم، فنحى جعلها مملحة عزلانية ولسان حاده يقول، هذه هي ديموقراطية التي تتخلى بها رئيس ليس رئيس، ومعارضة منطقة تمارس التهديد بدلاً من التوصيت، وبرلمان ضد البرلمان، نواب الشعب اللبناني لم يستطعوا أن يضغطوا جملة، لأن رئيس المجلس لا يريد الدعوة إلى الاجتماع ويصر على إيقاف باب المجلس موصلاً. حالة غريبة في تاريخ البدايات في العالم كله، أن يمنع رئيس الحكومة اللبنانيين من الاجتماع، ولا أحد يستطيع فعل شيء ضد، فقد اعتدنا على أن تقوم العسكرية، أو الأجهزة الأمنية، بمنع الحركة الديمقراطية، لا رئيس النواب الذي يفترض أنه حامي العمل الديمقراطية، وتمثل ممثل الشعب لا قاهم.

وأغرب من هذا أنه يخرج أستاذ جامعة، وسياسي متصر، كالدكتور سليم الحص، ليلوح أن الحكومة غير شرعية لأن قطاعاً واسعاً من الشعب لا يعرف بها. هكذا؟ ومنى صارت الحكومات تتغلب فقط لأن أحداً يعتبر أن لا شعبية لها؟ ومؤسف أن يختتم رجل محترم كمحترف حتى السياسية ليلعب دور المرمر الفوضي، يبرر الآن الدعوة لإنفاذ الحكومة بصورة غير قانونية. فالمماضي الخاطئ لن يحق إنفاذ الحكومة، حتى لو قال الحص انها نقصت عن قطاعاً عاماً في رغبتها، كما أن حملة دعوات المدافعين والتنظيم على الوزارة لا تعد لها علاجًا تحت ولا سياسة في جبين المعارض، وكذلك عن رئيس البرلمان زلاءه البرلمانيين من ممارسة حقوق الشعب، لكن يقال إن هناك معركة سياسية بين الأغلبية وال thiểuية، فهذا دينул العمل السياسي، لن يقبل أحد التجربة الديمقراطية ويطوق بعض الاصلاحات في سير الزمان، ومصرح من المجتمع كله، ومن تجربته الديمقراطية. في لبنان 18 طاقة، ولن يوجد من خيار سوى حماية الممارسة الديمقراطية حتى لتكون تفاخر مع نتائجها، لأنها الحامي الوحيد من التنازع في الشارع.
للمؤتمر الدولي الذي عقد في بغداد أمس، أكبر معامز، فوء أول يعكس توجهاً، وليس بالضرورة قناعةً، لدى الولايات المتحدة بأن حل المعضلة العراقية قد لا يتم عبر توسيع الأجزاء مع المحتاجين والمطببين بها، بل عبر حوار هادئ حتى مع أكثر الأطراف يعد عن المعوقات الأوروبية. إنّ هذه جهات أخرى توفر للإدارة الأمريكية مساحة بيئة، مع حساب اتخاذ الأجزاء مع توسعته مجموعة كرسا العراق، التي دعت إليها مؤتمر دولي حول العراق، وهي حوار متواتر مع ضار وحمض، وبين رغبتها الخلاقة في إطار إدارة موجه تجاو الأطراف، قد تقر تلك المرة ضعفاً من جانبها، ينسحب بدوره إلى ملفات علاقة أخرى. ذلك يبدو هذا المؤتمر في المنظور الإقليمي، تناغماً متضمناً مع كلا التوجهين، وذلك فإنّه سيكون أقل من مؤتمر دولي، على الأقل من ناحية المستوى الإقليمي، فيه، وأكثر من مؤتمر الإقليمي.

عراقياً يبدو المؤتمرFontSize:1em; text-indent:0em; text-decoration:underline; جردة للحكومة العراقية كي تهره على أنها تأخذ بزمام المبادرة. فيبدو أنّ كان العراق مجهز "موضوع" على طلبات نقاش الآخرين، يدخل إلى سوريا، بوصفه "ذات فاعلة". وبدلاً من أن يضع لاجداج الأطراف، فهو حاضر في النقاش لهم. الحكومة العراقية رأت بابياء عرض صفقة إجراء المؤتمر، وعلي انتهاز عثر معجم يحكي في المبادرة وتحديها الطريق على محاولات تدوين القضية العراقية، والتي ترى فيها التقاف في العملية الديمقراطية، ولكن يبقى عليها أن تكون ممتنة بحلة الكافية لإدارة هذه المبادرة، واستمراراً من خروج منها برهن أكبر، وما سمحه حصولها موضوع التنبيه.

إقليمياً، يبدو المؤتمر متضامناً مع عدد من الخطوات والتحركات التي شهدتها الساحة مؤخراً بإلتقاء "الهيئة" في مختلف المجالات، لا سيما تلك التي يبرز فيها دبلوماسية سعودية نشطة، عمبت إلى حد كبير إجماعية إيجابية متصلة. تراجع قائم الخوارق الملا وإقلاع ونظر المترابط من مصادر متعددة مبرراً بحرق، وتصميمي على الإطارات. وبما يكون التحالف العربي باتجاه بغداد والأسوأ ضمنSortedList:1em; بيئة الرؤية العربية بداية تحلو ما في التعاطي العربي مع الناش العراقي بعد زمن طويل من تريع الذات، بسب ما يطلق عليه أغلبية، ويعيش كثير من السياسيين والمتقدمين العرب 

"التحلي على الناش العراقي ليكون لفتة سابعة لأيران."

دولياً، يبدو المؤتمر طرقاً أخرى لقول أن أمريكا تعتبر عقلاً قانوناً المباشكة الدولية عن الناش العراقي، من دون أن يعترف فعلاً. فيخارج المؤتمر بوصفه مبادرة عراقية يتم منع معظم القنوات الدبلوماسية التي تستعرض على إظهاره بوصفه مبادرة إقليمية. تشير إلى أنّ تجربة الإدارة الأمريكية جعلت غالبية أبطال الولايات المتحدة، وبمقارنة بعض "المبادرة" على الآخرين، وفضل مظهر من جيزة بوضع "المشروط"، ربما نتيجة لهم قاصر. بما يمكن القوة العلمية المحيطة أن تقوم في ظل إلغاء مفهوم القوة على النسياب السياسي الدولية. وذلك هذه الأسباب، يبدو المؤتمر "فرصة" لوضع الشروط قبل جامعة مبادرة جيدة لمبادرة المنطق، وهي صلابة معطيات أخرى، ولكن هذه المبادرة، بisbury وهو، في هذه الدولة الوجود المبادرة لا يذهب في حبيبة مبادرة واضحة، أن نجد الأطراف حفز أمورهم الأكبار، وهو في هذه الدولة المبادرة لا يذهب في حبيبة مبادرة واضحة، أن نجد الأطراف حفز أمورهم الأكبار.

ولكن المؤتمر يسلف في جميع الأحوال قراراً لتأتيجو الحركات الدبلوماسية الإقليمي، وحيد عدد من العقد النفسية، وبشكل خاص، فهذا القرار الإسلامي الإذبي على طالب واحدة مشروعه الأساسية هو النسوية، وفترة اللافع العراقي - العربي على طالب واحدة مشروعها دعم الحلول البنية للقضايا العراقية. قد ظل العراق منذ 2003 ساحة لصراع
مفهوم بعدها إرادات إقليمية ودولية محلية أنتجت سفكا كارثيا للدماء، بعد أن أصبح التدمير والقتل وسائل تسجيل نقاط سياسية ضد الخصوم، فغا الإنسان العراقي مطحنا في عين اللحظة التي كان يطم قلبه إلى أن يسعده قرامه المطحونا. ففعل الله من المعادلة السياسية وتشييده المترأكم من سنوات طويلة من الحكم الشمولي، ويمكن لهذا المؤتمر أن يسهم في معالجة قضية هذا الإنسان عبر النظر إلى هويته الإنسانية، ببعضة عن أي هوية مكتسبة أو مفروضة أخرى.

وإذا كانت فئة الرياض السعودية الإيرانية قد أدت إلى تفاهمات حقيقية وحاجلت من عواط دعم الثقة، وهى أمور ما زال عليها أن تخبرها على أرض الواقع، فإن المبادرة الإقليمية قد تناسب مع مبادرة عراقية داخلية تسعي حكومة المالكي إلى إخاذها، بложение مشروع حل يصبح معه الجمع راضين على ما حققنا من حدود دنيا في الأقل، ويدعو معه الصراع ضد الجماعات المتطرفة التي تتفق كلها بجنود العراق، إرادة إقليمية مشتركة تضيق الفضاء أمام ما بدأ تساهم ضد جريان الدم العراقي.

حكومة المالكي تعكس قضايا في خطتها الأمنية، التي وان حُفقت بعض الفقد على بعض الساحات، فإنها تواجه صعوبة مع إقرار جماعات العنف على البركة بأن عنكما سيظل حاضرا في الحياة المدنية العراقية، ومع ظهور تجاوزات سياسية داخلية حول أولويات الخطة، وتجاوزات أمريكية - عراقى حول جدية أي من الطرق في ضمان نجاحها. ولذلك تترك هذه الحكومة ضرورة المزاولة بين حماية الدولة وتشريعات السياسة في ظل سلوك لا تسهم أيضًا في تجاوز المواقف المتخصقة والحاد، والعمل تم تقديم إشارات إلى إمكانية الحلحلة فيما يخص قانون احتلال البعد، الذي يمارس البعض من العرب كوسيلة للتعويض السنة، ويدعو مع 책임ية الاحتلال السابق في المؤسسة العسكرية الجديدة، بما يحمل المزيد من الطاقات حول التركيبة العنصرية والطائفية والايتلافية لهذه المؤسسة، وضمانات دستورية لمثالية توزيع الواند والتحديثات دستورية خارجية أخرى، ويساعدا تصلاحيات كما تخص أو تستثنى أحيانا، وتكبب تضحيات هذه المناسبات وتحمل إلى مشاريع عمل حقيقية، لا بد وأن تلقى احتضاننا إقليميا ويستلمها في إطار مشروع حقيقي للحل، ينجه جدلا عقبا حول الشرعية والخصوص، لصالح جدل بناء حول سبيل تشييد الدولة العراقية المدنية، التي تعمل كجسر يربط الفواصل الإقليمية. وهذا هو الدور الأساسي للمؤتمر.
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(من جريدة الشرق الأوسط)

العبه المزدوج

وليد أبو مرشد

لم يشهد الشرق العربي، منذ انتهاء الإمبراطورية العثمانية عام 1919، حالة انتعاش وازن كما شهد اليوم: النسوية الفلسطينية تراوح مكانها بانتظار ثبات السلام الفلسطيني، والحالة العربية تزداد تردداً بانتظار تفاهم عراقي - عراقي لا يبدو قريبًا، والوضع اللبناني يتجه، وإن ببطء، نحو قيام ثنائية سنية - شيعية قد تثبيط ما نفد، وما لم ينفد بعد من اتفاق الطائف، مما يهد طرح العقدة المزمنة في لبنان: عقدة (الهوية) القومية لهذا البلد الثالث بين العرب والشرق.

وكل ذلك يحدث في منطقة يفترض، في ظل موارى القوى الدولية الواحنة، أن تستخدم ضمانة استقرارها من النفوذ الأمريكي نتيجة الأحداث في الشرق الأوسط، الأمر الذي يوجب أن الخلل الراهن في استقرار المنطقة هي انعكاس مباشر لفحص أكبر في النفوذ الأمريكي نفسه.

والواقع أن الحدث عن تعرض النفوذ الأمريكي في الشرق الأوسط إلى "خال" ينوي لم يعد حديثاً افتراضياً بعد التطورات السياسية والأمنية على الساحة العربية، حتى أن رئيس "المجلس الأمريكي للعلاقات الخارجية"، يشيرد هاس، يعتبر أن ما تشهده المنطقة حالياً هو "نهاية العهد الأمريكي". وذهب هاس إلى أن من ذلك يصبحه المرحلة الأمريكية الراحلة في الشرق الأوسط بمرحلة انهيار التفويض الفرنسي والبريطاني في الشرق الأوسط في أعاقات الحرب العالمية الثانية.

ربما استنتاج رئيس "المجلس الأمريكي للعلاقات الخارجية"، يوضع سمات، مصرباً لعد مستبداً للنفوذ الأمريكي في المنطقة - خصوصاً إذا طورت إيران ترسانتها النووية وعادت روسيّاً لعب دور القوة العالمية الثانية في المنطقة.

إلا أن المفرزة اللاقفة في هذه الحالة يصبح العرب في موقف مضطر لأن يدفع ضريبة النفوذ الأمريكي في هذا الزمن. وفي هذه أيضًا، يوم كان النفوذ الأمريكي على أوجه في الشرق الأوسط لم تتغير وانشقت يوماً بضرورة تقديم "مكافأة" تذكر للدول العربية المتصلة، والمصنفة في خانة "الصديقات"، تعوض عليها بعض ما تناهت من صداقتها الممتلكة، رغم أن هذه الدول لم تُحكم في إطار مواقف القمة العربية، في طرح عروض تفق عليها جمعاء تتولى نسبتهم. الأف، أي "السياسة الفلسطينية"... فكان من فنمنه من صداقتها للأمر الذي "جميع"، الأوروبيين، يرتقي بالعديد من الإشادة، إنها又能 "المل本网站"، وما أن أمه، بل وعند أن أصبح النفوذ الأمريكي على عتبة الأول، فقد أحدثت هذه المواقف العربية المعتادة، من جديد، لدفع ضريبة أخرى أيضًا. وإذا لم يعد خلايا أن واسطاء لم تطمح من عملة الإطاحة بظام صدام حسين إلى تشر، الديمقراطية في الشرق الأوسط وقد تطورت إلى تبديل الأزمة، وقد تطورت إلى تبديل الأزمة، مما تطورت إلى تبديل الأزمة، فيما تطورت إلى تبديل الأزمة.

حتى من المزدوج، الثواب الأول من هذا السيناريو تناج عكسية إذ قياسه الاحترافية قد تم وضع مساج حسن في خانة تطبيق النفوذ الإيرانية على حساب النفوذ الأمريكي وحولت خلافة "Iran" الشبيهة في العراق وال릿نا، إلى المستفيد الأول من انفجار ذلك.

من الواضح أن أبعد ما يتزاح من النفوذ الأمريكي جورج بوش داخل الكونغرس الأمريكي يقدر ما يفقد البيت الأبيض قدرته على حسم أزمات الخارج. وفي ظل هذه المعطيات إلى الأمر المثابرة من هود الرئيس يوش مترشحة للسماحة في تلك التكنولوجيا، وعلى أن يحقق التساؤل: إذا كان النفوذ الإسلامي في الشرق الأوسط عوض تغريز، عليه أن يصح السياق. ولقد يصح أن ن.filters على النفوذ، يوش مترشحة للسماحة في تلك التكنولوجيا، وعلى أن يصح السياق. ولقد يصح أن ن.filters على النفوذ، يوش مترشحة للسماحة في تلك التكنولوجيا، وعلى أن يصح السياق. ولقد يصح أن ن.filters على النفوذ، يوش مترشحة للسماحة في تلك التكنولوجيا، وعلى أن يصح السياق. ولقد يصح أن ن.filters على النفوذ، يوش مترشحة للسماحة في تلك التكنولوجيا، وعلى أن يصح السياق. ولقد يصح أن ن.filters على النفوذ، يوش مترشحة للسماحة في تلك التكنولوجيا، وعلى أن يصح السياق.
نوي، أنه لن يكون مستبعداً أن يصبح ما كان يعرف بالهلال العربي الخصيب هلالاً إيرانياً يبدأ في طهران... ويتهدد في الضاحية الجنوبية لبيروت.
صاحب الديمقراطية اليوم هو النظام الذي يتجه إليه ؛ أغلب العالم، شرقًا وغربًا، بحيث يمكن القول أننا اليوم نعيش عصر الديموقراطية. تم تطور الديموقراطية، حسب تقدير الكثيرين، خياراتنا بين خياراتنا، كما كان الأمر حتى الأمور القريبة. قد كتب ما صُبِحَت، كما أرى نوعًا من التحول، إذا كانت الدولة والمجتمع بريدين انتهازي في العالم تصل إلى مكان واحد يُسمى مشتركة، ومناطق متفرقة، وإذا في كل المنهاج والسياسة، ومن ثم الضمور في عدم تطور في حالة خياراتنا.

وبعدا عن كون الديموقراطية هو روح هذا العصر، فإنها أثبتت تاريخياً أنها هي النظام الأكثر فرصة على الحفاظ على السلمن الاجتماعي في المدى الطويل. وذلك حسب التجربة الديموقراطية كما طبقت في أميركا وأوروبا الغربية، خصوصاً إذا كان نمو ضروري على قواعد، أو بنية تحتية قوية. وليس مجرد ممارسات جزئية تأخذ بعض الضعيف، وترك البعض الآخر. أو أن عليهم أن يعلموا أنهم جزء من هذا العالم أو تفاعلاتنا. وبالتالي فلا يمكن لمهم أن يكونوا جزءاً من هذه التفاعلات. إلا إذا كان الضمور هو الخيار، وهو خيار من لا خيار له في نهاية المطاف.

سؤال الديموقراطية هذا دائما ما يثير في ذهن، وأنا أرى العالم، وفي دون الديموقراطية في ديار العرب، ونفعل مجرد واحد لوتاء واحد إلى الآخر، فيما هي ناجحة في معظم ديار الآخرين، سواء كانوا من العرب أو من الشرق، وإن فشلت مرة في غير تقلل مرتين، وإن فقط مرة فإنها تعود للهروب من جديدة، مستفيداً من أخطاء الماضي، ومصممة على نجاح التجارة التي لم ت '::

لماذا يفشل تطبيق الديموقراطية في بلاد العرب فيما هي ناجحة في ديار الآخرين؟

سؤال كبير قد يحتاج إلى أكثر من مقالة عاجلة في محاولة الإجابة عليه، ولكن بعضنا من جواب، أو محاولة جواب، خار عن عدم الجواب.

بدي أن الجواب يمكن أن أن كل «التجارب» الديموقراطية العربية، سواء تلك التي كانت قبل أن يتجه العصر، أو تلك التي صارت بعد ضائع العصر في متأهبة السياسة، مارست الديموقراطية شكلاً، ولكنها لم تحاول أن تكون نهضات بشكل حقيقي وحرة للديموقراطية، بما يكون شعوراً بعشرات كما تشرحه في المجتمع قبل السياسة. وإذا كان هناك نهج، فإنها يتحمل ما قبل الحكم إلى الشعور، والاقتصاد القومي لا يقوم دون بنية تحتية مستدامة، وكذلك في الحياة السياسية عموماً، والأنظمة السياسية خصوصاً، والديموقراطية نظام سياسياً لا يستمر دون بنية تحتية في أساس كل فلاديموقراطية، والديموقراطية الليبية تمثلت، ليست ممارسة سياسية وحيدة، بل أنها سلسلة اجتماعي معين، معرض للطاقة لا تُ"]

الممارسة الديمقراطية دونها. ومع ذلك، الاعتقادات الموقع يجتاز إلى أصولاً وواصلات، وليس كتبية بنية تحتية لا يمكن النمو دونها، فلكل بنية − بنية تحتية التي لا تُลาน، الديمقراطية من دونها ت تكون هذه الشك، أو بنية − بنية تحتية الديموقراطية، من عدة أوضاع، ولكن يمكن تخفيفها في أربعة أوان هي: الثقافة، والتعليم، والعواصم والقانون. في دون مقاتلة ديموقراطية، وأعمال الليبرالي، وتتشكل تعليمهم يؤثر هذا النوع في النبض قبل الطالب، ويتكون من حوار تطبيق بين حوارات المجتمع، وجمعين براعي والتغير، ولها في الحقيقة ثم الأساسي، فإنه لا يمكن الحديث عن الديمقراطية، حتى لو كان هناك ملوكاً، أو كان هناك أحزاب وكانت ذات دورية، وذلك بمعنى أنه لا يمكن أن يكون هناك اقتصاد ناجح دون شريكة من الطريق الجيد، أو سلسلة من الموارد القدرة على الاستعباب.

فالمجتمع، الديموقراطية، والعمل الليبرالي الذي لا يمكن الحديث عن الديمقراطية بدونه، وما الأساسي لأي ممارسة الديموقراطية: ناجحة، ظهر الأساس في أي ديموقراطيا. هذه الثقافة تتكون من قيم تتغير تعلمهمها بيهم الحريات (حرية الحركة في إطار القانون)، والمساواة (في المواطنة، وأمان القانون)، والحرية (وصف الفرد أساس كل
مجتمعين، والتفقدية (توصفها بطبعة الحياة)، والتسارع (لكل حق الإنسان بما يشاء، ولكن لا حق لأحد بفرض إيمانه على الآخرين). ومن هذه القليل الأساسية تتبعد قرية قريبة أخرى كلياً تلعب دور في نفس الملعب في النهايات. ومن هذه القليل الفرعي منها، تنطلق القنادات والمنافسات على أساس، قراءة القول والمعتقد والتمتع، وغيرهما من حريات مدنية. وعلى أساس قيمة المساواة، تقوم فكرة المواطنة التي لا تستند على ملاءة، والتفقدية، وللتأكيد على، أو كراكة الإنسان، والفرص في النهاية هو الإنسان المماس للإنسان، بعيداً عن الفافلاكتات، والتطورات والأدبيات، التي تقضي على الإنسان بالاساس. وعلى أساس قيمة التعددية، تقوم فكرة أن الأفكار هو الإنسان، هذا لا يمنع أن تكون، إلا أنه كان قادراً، من ذلك، على أن يعلج كل الناس أمة واحدة، ومعتقدمها، واحدثها، ومن الحروب واللياقة واحدة، ولكن غيرهم، وعلى أساس قيمة التساوي، تقوم فكرة أن التكلفة للراشد، وأن الحقبة المطلقة لا يعترف إلا الحق، والاشر فيهم مجرد بمجرد، في هذه الدنيا، لكل محتوى ناسبة حتى أو زرع أنها محتوى مطابقة، وهذا الاعداد والمعنويات، والحقيقة، هو أساس كل حضارة خالدة ذات قيمة في التاريخ، وفلا فإنه تكون داعية، ولد وثمن شياء، وفعليات في غيابهم.

التاريخ.

هذه القافية لا يمكن لها أن تتيح، وليس بدون أن يكون هناك نوع من الشفافية قادرة على أسسها، ووفق ميزاتها.

مؤلفات النشأة عديدة متعددة، ولكنها أقلها، أكثرها تأثيراً تتميز الناشئة، الذي يجري على العقل منذ الصغر وحتى الآن، والمعرفة والإعلام، والعديد من، مؤلفات عدة قيمة في النشأة، ولكن ذكر العقل والمعرفة هو الجيد، فلن تكون، أو مlassenات أخرى، تقدم على الاختيار المرجو، والتفقدية في المقابل. بل لا يمكننا أن نشير إليها. ولن يكون في مستوى، وما يجري في مرحلة تطور، وما هنا في جمهورية القبول. ولن يكون في مرة تطور، وما يجري على أهمية التطور، ويعود القبول، ويستند على جمهورية أنها على أساسها.

إذن حتى لو كان هناك نظام ديموكراسي ممارس في الأوالة، وقيم ديموكراسي محسوبه فيها في الدستور، وكانت مساهمة العلماء تلقى قيمة أخرى من نمطاقها، وهذا القول لا تحدد أن يكون مجرد تقصير تجريب لكونه إلى واقع ملموس. ومن هنا تدخل المؤسسة في المشهد، فالمؤسسة olduğu الالتزام إلى واقع ملموس، يسهم الفرد من خلاله ممارسة هذه الحقوق واهل تلك الحريات، ولا إلقاء لا تعنينا، شيئاً، حتى لو قال بها الدستور، وعندها قانونها، والمأساة، وعذوف جزء من البنية التحتية للديمقراطية، لا مؤسسة سياستها قوية ثابتة. لا تعنينا أكثر من وجود محتوى من واع، وفقاً، يدعى فيه الفرد، كحق من حقوقه الديموقراطية عن الأشياء السلوك، ويسهم هذا التعبير إلى واقع ملموس. ومنها قس فضاء النشأة، وأرادة فضاء المجتمع، منذ فترة وماذا كانت في اتفاقية الديموقراطية، مثل، فالمجتمع المدنى هو في النهاية النشأة للتفقدية إضافة، سيكون هناك تقدير، ستكون هناك تعاون، ومعاونة في التحول، ومشاركة في التطور، وكثير من المسلمين في ذلك اليوم، ولهذا، ومعنا، هو ما يمكن أن نعيها أن ضاء المجتمع المدني كان أكبر من فضاء النشأة السياسية، هذا فضاء، أي السياسي، الذي شقن في للحية في أوروبا.

ولكن، كل هذه الأمور، من تقارير وأدبية وما يترقب عنها من قيم أخرى وسلاكيات محددة، لا يمكن أن تمتع في الاستقرار والبائحة دون قانون ينظم الحياة ويضمنن التفاعلات بين وحدات المجتمع. وهو الذي يقدم الفراغ، كسابق، في ضبط العلاقات في الداخل، وفروعه في الداخل، والتفقدية، دون قانون هي المصدر، والوفيات، بضعة وفاة في العين الأدنى. والمأساة ممدوحة عام، للزم القانون، والمجتمع، بعد يجري، فسؤلة، وهو، هذا الأهمية، ولكن، هو معنى لأي شيء.

ويعد المعني، هناك نقطة، فالدبلوماسي ليس صحيحة شكل، وإن تجولت إلى كارثة حين التطبيق بعد ذلك، يقول ليبن، إن الجريمة قيمة إغلاقة، ولذلك يجب توفيرها، وسحق في القانون، ولكن، خلق الحياة حين إنها، من حيث أنه أفرغها من محتواه، ولم يعد هناك من حرية الأحرار الوحيد والأحد. ويجب هنا،اردية مسيرة للذين تجربة السوفيتية التي لا تشكل أي من القوائم المحذوف عنها، أذهى، جزءاً من أفقاتها السياسي أو المجتمع، ولكننا نتحدث هنا عن تجربة مختلفة، وينظر فيها أن تكون مختلفة.
إذا هي الثقافة، وهي التعليم، وهي المأسسة، وهو القانون: هذه هي البنية التحتية لأي تجربة ديمقراطية ناجحة، فهل تنور مثل هذه البنية في أي مجتمع عربي، أو حاول وضع أساسها أي نظام عربي؟ سؤال لعل محاولة إجابته تكون في مقال آخر.
قبل خمس سنوات وعندما كشفت المملكة العربية السعودية عن طاقة من الإقارات لاستثمار عملية السلام الموثقة، كانت رداً على الأفعال الإسرائيلية إما رافضة أو متعاونة تماماً، غير أن المسؤولين الإسرائيليين ينظرون في الوقت الحالي إلى طاقة الإقارات نفسها باعتبارها فرصاً في نهاية نفق عميق.

ومشاكلنا بنتوة حول العلاقات الأوروبية الإسرائيلية، تقترب في نهاية الأسبوع، أخذت من كل المسؤولين الإسرائيليين تقيماً كابنوا على فهمهم "حالة السلام السعودية". وعندما أعضاء الليكود، الذين كانوا يودون الحوار على أنه قد متعلق الأمر بإسرائيل، فإنهم ما كان يهمهم، فهم ما كان يهمهم.

وأثناء اتفاق مكة بين حماس وفتح و hüروا عن دعمهم ل"إدارة السلام" التي رفعتها السياسية، ولا ريب أن الحوار في الموقف الإسرائيلي يعود جزئياً إلى ضغوط بوجه. وترجع ضغوطات الخارجية القوية بإعتبارها تحسناً للعلاقات الحقوقية السعودية للولايات المتحدة، إلى موقف أكثر نزاهة من النزاع الإسرائيلي الفلسطيني. وقد ورد أن الأيام التي كانت فيها إسرائيل، في ظل شارون، تعتمد على الدعم غير المشروط تقريباً من جورج بوش.

والآثار أهمية أن إسرائيل تجد نفسها في واجبة أزمة سياسية عاجلة تأثر بها ت وغيرها من الإقادات، وياتي في العربية في مواجهة الإقادات العربية من توفير قيادة يومية، ناهيك عن معالجة قضية السلام مع الفلسطينيين التي هي قضية حياة أو موت. فقد فازه بيهود أوكرن وتحالفه كندي (إلى الأمم) في الانتخابات الأخيرة في إطار وعد بتنفيذ خطة شارون التي أعلنت على أساسها واصح يشير إلى أن إسرائيل، بbecue باعتبارها المنصورة في الحرب، تتحمل المسؤولية في صياغة نموذج السلام الذي يمكن أن تعفيه في الفلسطينيين.

وإلى جانب أن يكون تقيس سري بالي الألم كان يجب أن يكون سري، أن يكون تقيس سري.

وأحد الخيارات يمكن أن يتم في السياسيات "الانقلاب - التحالف - انتخابات - التحالف" التي أستقبلها الزمن، وهي سياسة إصلاح شامير التي أعضأت إسرائيل، على الرغم من أنها لم تحقق السلام، في موقع قوي خالق حاسم. وتمثل الخيار الآخر في تشغيل الديمقراطية بهود بارك على كل حدث شهير، إيجابي، غير أن كلاً من هذين الخيارين يمكن مشاريعه بشرة: كان الأول ووجود شريك أمريك قوي قادر على مشاركة المقابلة، كما أنه يمكنه أن يكون ذلك مثيراً. من الواضح أن الولايات المتحدة تعرف بعليه الأسلحة الخاصة، ليست في موقع يسهلها على صياغة سياسات ذات مصداقية بشأن أي قضية لفترة لا تقل عن عامين أو ثلاثة.

وكان الشكل الثاني وجود شريك فلسطيني مستعد لقبول وجود إسرائيل كحكمة، وراعي في المشاركة في مفاوضات ميدة لم تفعل الكثير لتحسين أوضاع سكان الضفة الغربية وطئة الخطاب، أو ما.

ومع الوضعية أنه بينما تواصل تحديت قمة محمد عباس استقرار وجود إسرائيل كحكمة معتدلة، فإن حماس، التي ما تزال تتأثر على المشهد الفلسطيني، لا تفعل ذلك.

وبنما يكون اتفاق مكة قد أ фон على موقف حماس تجاه هذه القضية الحاسمة، إلا أن الذي يرغبون في قراءة ما بين الموقف يركبون أن حماس ستتمكن من الجزء المقابل من الخط الفاصل فيما يتطلب مستقبل للسيان. نجد في واقع من جانب هذا الخط الفاصل حركات سياسية وديانية، ولا تدعو للحل القائم على أسس إقامة دولة واحدة.

وأثناء إعلان النزاهة، فإن إسرائيل، كانت تتأثر في ظل إقامة دولة إسرائيل، كانت تتأثر في ظل إقامة دولة واحدة، لن تملأ 20000 كيلومتر مربع الذي يشكل دولة إسرائيل اليوم يجب أن يتم تضمين إلى 5000 كيلومتر مربع من الأرض، وهي مساحة الضفة الغربية وقطاع غزة، بغرض تشكيل دولة واحدة.

المؤيدون الأكثر تطوعاً لحل الدولة الواحدة يصررون على أن غالبية اليهود يجب أن يغادروا المنطقة ويعودوا إلى الأراضي الأصلية لأنابهم أو أسلهم، وهكذا أيضاً من هم أقل تعاطفاً وينبزون في السماح للمسلمين الإسرائيليين. ونهاك أيضاً من هم أقل تعاطفاً وينبزون في السماح للمسلمين الإسرائيليين.
بالبقاء في ما يصبح "فلسطين الكبرى". إذ يفضل المعالج السياسة والعودة الجماعية للاجئين الفلسطينيين من الأردن ولبنان من مصلحة اليهود. 

الأمر المثير للإهتمام هو أن حل الدولة الواحدة كان راجحًا فيإسرائيل أصلاً. ففي الوقت الذي كان فيه الأであること المثير للإهتمام هو أن حل الدولة الواحدة كان راجحًا فيإسرائيل أصلاً. ففي الوقت الذي كان فيه الأ Saúde بالنسبة للنظرية، وقضية غزوة بصرة مباشرة.

ولكن للجغرافية أثر ضرور مستوية 80 في المائة من الإسرائيليين في الوقت الراهن صيغة الدولة الواحدة، في الوقت الذي تنزوي فيه نسبة التأييد لها وسط الفلسطينيين. (تشير آخر نتائج الاستطلاعات إلى أن نسبة 45 في المائة من سكان الضفة الغربية تؤيد صيغة الدولة الواحدة، وهي تقريباً نسبة الناخبين الذين أدوا بأصواتهم لصالح حركة حماس في الانتخابات السابقة).

أيدت الدول العربية جموعًا عام 1967، باستثناء المغرب وتونس، الحلف القائم على إقامة دولة واحدة، ولكن ليبيا هي الوحيدة من بين الدول الأعضاء في جامعة الدول العربية التي ترفض حل إقامة دولتين. كما لم تؤي أي دولة غير مسلمة حل الدولة الواحدة بصورة واضحة. وتحاول إيران في الوقت الراهن أن تنصب نفسها زعيمة لمعسكر الدول المؤيدة لإقامة دولة واحدة، وتأمل في إقناع سوريا بالانضمام إلى المؤيدين لهذا الحل.

خطاً السلم السعودي وجدت أسبابًا لأنها تحسنت التأييد الواسع للحل القائم على أساس إنهاء دولتين، وكانت هذه الخطوة قد صادقت عليها في البداية قمة بيروت العربية قبل حسب سنوات ووجدت تأييدًا من دول عربية ومسلمة بارزة خلال الأسابيع الأخيرة السابقة، ومن المؤكد أن تجري المصادقة عليها في وقت لاحق من الشهر الجاري، ربما بالإجماع.

من جملة المواد العربية المرتفعة في الرياض، ومن المرجح أن تجري المصادقة عليها مرة أخرى بالإجماع في compelled.

تشارك فيها 57 دولة ذات أغلبية مسلمة.

لم يحدث أن كان التأييد الدبلوماسي والشعبي لصيغة الدولتين بهذا المستوى، ولكن فعله من منظور نسبية حقيقية أن المبادرة السعودية، شأنها شأن المبادرات الأخرى، لها قيمة زمنية محددة، إذ أنه من المحتمل أن تكون إذا لم يتعامل معها الطرفان بالجهد الفاعل، فعلي ذلك لأنها كانت مشتركة بشأن كل محطات من مطارات الوقت الذي لم تحدد مطارات وجهتها النهائية.

تكون الفكرة الأساسية في بدء القصة قبل صنع السلام، والتاريخ أثبت أن الدول تصنع السلام وتبني الثقة في نفس الوقت. ترى كيف يمكن أن تكون لديك ثقة في طرف لا يجتمع به سلام؟
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي.
العراق، فمرة يدخل المها العربي إلى بغداد فينكر بالسنة، ومرة يدخل السلطان العثماني فينكر بالشيعة، ويعمر قبر أبي حنيفة، وحذاء التشييع بالنسبة لـ(السندية) إيران، أما كان النظام الحاكم فيها، حتى ولو كان علمانياً تزعم، هو قنات توضعي سياسة قومي خارج الحدود الإيرانية، وبدأت في العراق، ومن هنا كانت أهمية الأوساط الشيعيون الوطنيون التي تكبدت وما زالت تكبد على
التي تهمني الشيعة العربي، والشيعة العربي أو «الصوفي». لمع نظرة حذر على الأرض.
بحددها تعريف الإصلاح في كتاب «الرسالة البغدادية»، فكان شاه بعلوي، وهو رجل علماني، أو هو «أتوانز إيران»، لكنه مع ذلك كان شديد النصرة لحزمة النجف، وبحث في النصيبي المربوط بـ(السياسة)، مع أنه كان يحارب عملاً الدين الشيعية في الداخل، أي أن الأمر برمته يتعمل بمحركي الثور السياسي، حتى ولو بدا لنا ذا
صيغة بيدينة بعيدة.
هذا الأمر لم يكن محصوراً بالصوفيين، فسلاطين بني عثمان حاربو الصوفيين بكل الأوراق المتاحة، وانتقد في
تلك الرحلة من الصراط بين الصوفيين والعبادة الذين انزلت، وكانت حرب منهجية. ولذلك فإن أكثر
الإدبيات الشيوعية المطلقة، والتي «تنتفخ» الشيعة، ومنحته مسوعاته الكبيرة، مثل «ذبون الأثر» للملحدين ذات
الملحدين التي ناهزت الدنيا، ومنحت تلك الحقيقة، وهو أمر لم نحن المحلي، لم عمل لما أطلق كتايبه، خصوصاً أن
كتاب «ذبون الأثر» ليس كتاباً واحداً من كتب المحلي، الأمر الذي يمثل عليه وجوهر جهد (نورلي مؤسس) كما
يلبى إلى ذلك الوردي.
وإضافة إلى ذلك، تطورت قتات شيوخ الإسلام في «الاستانة» وغيرها من الشيعة، تبعاً لسخريته المواجهة أو
بروتها بين الملاك والशاب. وذكره الوفدي أيضًا كيف أنه في إحدى فيارات الهدنة حُرّقت قرب ذلك من الاستانة لينة
الجيش، وتحت مكان الشيعة بلغة ودية، لما خربت الهدنة وتكرر الوضع مجدداً بين الطرفين، استغلت حرب القتال
مجدداً.
لم تحدث عن الماضي البعيد؟! دعونا نشير إلى القريب والناصر، فمشروع التقرب بين السنة والشيعة، ليس له
شيوع الأهر في مصر، وجمعية الإخوان حينها كان الشيوع لا يمثل هوية سياسية، بالنسبة للشيوخ الأهر مثل الشيخ
شنوت، أو يمثل هوية سياسية في الجماعات ذات النهج الديني مثلاً جماعة نوب صوفي، الذي أفلت محاربة شهيرة
بكرية بإيران في الواقعة التي تمت ذات الأوراق.
وحيما تأثرت الثورة الإسماعيلية (الإسلامية الحركة)، نظر لها الإخوان المسلمون بيداً، كما في حديث يوسف،
وفياء الإخوان لطهوان، لكن حينها أصبحت الثورة تبدأ تصدير نفسها، والانفراد الحزب، باردة واستثنائية بين
الخليج والعراق من طرف، وعبور الإخوان من طرف آخر، كما مشروعة التقرب، وتقدم مشروع المواجهة،
وافتراضات الأديان المتباينة التي تهتم الرجل الآخر مستندة إلى ارتفاع المفاهيم الطويل بين السنة والشيعة، ولكن
أيضاً نحن وصلنا إلى الحُمَّا تحت التوجهات التي تظهر رأياً ثورةً، بدأ القتال تصبح دونه، ناهزت الثورة، على
وتحتاق التقرب»، بين الإسلام السياسي، وظل (السيست) هذا حتى انفصلت طائفة العراق، وخلقت
إيران أحمد ناجي نجى عليه الخطة وألقى بعملها هناك، وبعث (الهلال الشيعي) - بالمعنى السياسي للتشييع
- حتى تمت عملها مالياً مجدداً.
نحن الآن في بداية فصل جديد من صواريخ الحكاكية في الإصلاحات الشيعة، وهي حكاية، في كل قسوتنا، كانت مطلقة بيدين
والاعتقادات والأدوات اللامتناهية، حزناً وENTSكة منطق الفخاري، أو سبيلاً، واتعرج في منطق الشيعة أكثر أن هذه الأساليب دامياً تنتج تطبيق
فعلها! فهي المشكك في أنه قد قدر على العرب والمسلمين أن يحفظوا في استعداد واهتمام وثمة وطنية عابرة للطواف
والشرق، أي إذا؟!
وانتهت المشكلة مع إيران، أما بالدين أو بالسياسة أو يعترف الله ما لا يعترف بها答え لإيران...! لكن من ينهي هذه
الحرب الخالدة بين المسلمين أنفسهم، هذه الحرب التي وقوفها الناس والأمم والثور...؟!
كل الاحتمالات التي تتحدث عن ضربة عسكرية لإيران، لمنعها من تطوير برنامجها اليدوي للتقنية، تشير إلى أن التفتيش سيكون أسوأ مما يُتوقع. أي أن المنطقة المتنازلة للطاقة وذات خلال الريكي في السلك الما المحل، ستصبح جموحاً، في ظل توافق ركود إيران بالصحراء الفارغة المديد. وقد يكون هذا الاحتمال في الموضع هو عصر الارتفاع الذي تتأهل عليه إيران، في إدارتها لمثلما النموذج. لكل طهران في الوقت نفسه، شكلت علاقاتها مع أطراف الأرضات المتبقية في المنظمة، من العراق إلى فتحة مروءاً للبنان. وتسعى إلى تعميق علاقاتها القائمة مع الدول العربية في هذه الأرضات. مما يشكل بالنسبة لها نوعاً من النزاع الاستراتيجي، والذي تنميه مصالحها الأقليمية.

وبين انتشارات الخطط المتميزة لأسرائ، الدولة الواحدة في المنطقة التي تحس الحدود اليدوي. وبين الديات التي صدرت عن الرئيس جاك شيرك في شأن محدودية الأثر لسرقة نوي إيراني، يبقى الجانب الآخر من السياسة الإيرانية، المتمل بالعاصمة الإستثنائية والقدرة على تعطيها الاستراتيجية، والألمانية حي إلى الصحراء، في المنطقة. وهذا ما تجاوز طهران تطويره في العراق ولبنان واليمن. أي تحاول أن تضع كل المشكلات في سلسلة واحدة جدي التفاوض عليها. وتركت طهران حكم الفشل الأمريكي في العراق، بعد اختراق عسكري جزئي في لبنان ووقف أي تقدم على جبهة السلام مع إسرائيل. عندما تعلق الإدارة الأمريكية أن إيران قد تصرفها دورة في العراق فقور في الوقت نفسه أن الجمهور الآخر التي فتحتها طهران في المنطقة عبر مضمار النتائج. وظهر أيضاً أنه مصدر غير واضح بين الهجوم الاستراتيجي لإيران في المنطقة وبين سعيها إلى اليدوي. وهذا يمكن الخط في التحال مع هذه المشكلة. إذ أن انسحاب المواجهة من العراق إلى مكان آخر في المنطقة، وصولاً إلى الأراضي الإيرانية، يصبح وارداً مع زيادة الجهد ونقطة العرض، والخسائر الإيرانية.

ونطلق إيران رسائل في كل الإشاطر، وإن بدا أن هذه الرسائل غير مرتقبة أو حتى متضامنة في أنها كلاً تستطع من هاجس ستة الحلول: وضع البرنامج النووي والدور الإقليمي لإيران معاً على طاقة التفاوض. وإن فإن طهران مستعدة لكل الاحتمالات. بما في ذلك المواجهة العسكرية التي تعرف أنها في ذاكرتها ما تزال عشرة رده بحول دون الوصول إليها. تمت اتفاقيات وتعهدات داخل السلسلة الإيرانية. وتمت تفكيك التمتع في المجال المحتمل المستقبلي. فلكل هذه الحالات التي تكسر آمنة العمل السياسي في إيران من إبراز أنها مرّة من تعسير المواجهة مع النظير لنتهاها من تهديد النظام في الداخل، أي أن الرهان على إيجاد اتفاق كبير في النظام، لدفعه إلى التخلي عن برنامجها النووي، والدوري، ليس رهاناً ناجحاً. خصوصاً أن الخروجات الخارجة في وجهه غير مستعد للفوز على دعوات عقلانية من طهران. ولم تتفق للاتصال، معين قرار التفليس إقرار طهران مباداً رقابة الوكالة الدولية للطاقة على مشاركتها. كما أنها لم تتم بموجب مفاوضات الامشات والمفاوضات المفاوضات، وثمرت الاتفاقية الإيرانية في إنهاء الاعتمادات على الحرب على طهران. وترجع حالة الحراك الشاملة إلى استعداد الحوار.

يراجع حالياً على سرعة الهربة الإيرانية في المنطقة، ما يثير الإدارة على فك الحصار السياسي عنها وبدء مرحلة المفاوضات، وإدارة بوش تسعى إلى تضيق الخناق على طهران، من أجل التقليل من المطالب الإيرانية في أي مفاوضات محتملة. وتقدير المنظمة، توترها وحروب وتكتكاً، ثم الوقت الضائع.
الحياة

07/01/23

إيران: حملة علاقات لدى العرب

عبد الله استكر

كما يكون للسادة الإیرانیین، من اجل تصبح صورتها الحالية في المنطقة، ان تنظر ان ممارساتها تلقّى على الشيعة

العرب في اطار التقييد بين وجهات النظر والتحديات، وهذا الفنون ومعالجات استراحات التي تعزّز القوى

الخارجية، وليس في إطار سياسة هجومیة إیرانیة في المنطقة.
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7/02/08

انتحاء إيراني
حسن حيدر

أباح قلقة مرتقبة، ولا كنتا تصميمها تتحفي بعض ذلك. وهي لم تتعلق أثقال الإيرانيين انفسهم قبل الأخرين بأن
في ألمانيا المشغة إلى ما لا نهاية في مواجهة العالم كله تقريباً، باستثناء بعض الثغرات غير الكافية التي توفرها
روسيا والصين وبعض الحلفاء الذين يحتاجون أكثر منها إلى من فك عزائهما، مثل سورية أو كوبا.

أما سبب الفقر المتعقده وأخرى أثار انتهاك عقول الشرير الذين حددوها مجلس الأمن الأفقر المزيد من العقوبات
وتشديد العزلة الدولية على طهران، وهو أمر لا تسخين به الدولة الخيالية التي تخشى أن يعرقل الحصار المالي
مشاريعها الداخلية والإقليمية ويعني بالانحساد على المدى الطويل، خصوصاً إذا أقر بمقابل القرار الذي اتخذه
الإدارة الأميركية، وبدأت في تنفيذه، بتلقيح الدور الإيراني في العراق ومحاربه، ومع تراجع دور حلفاءه الرئيسي
"الحزب الشيوعي" في مواجهة اسرائيل بعد انتشار القوة الدولية في جنوب لبنان، وانطلاقاً إلى مسيرة السياسة اللبنانية
داخلية التي قلعت رصدها المحلي والعربي، وشهدت تحوليه إلى مجرد ميليشيا مذهبة. أما الحلف الأفقي:
الاجتهاد، أي حركة "حماس"، ففاعلية أيضاً في مسيرة نصر فكاكها من دون تغيير في مقايتها وإيديولوجيتها
التين لا تستطيع بسبب منهما سوى الاستمرار في التنازل، لأن ما حقق للسعوديين قبل أن يؤثر الحكم الديمocracy، في حين
يقوده ذلك حتماً إلى اقتناع أهل ويدم الحصار على شعب وعده في برامجها الانتخابية يخفف عذاباته، ولعلها تجد
في لقاء مكة المكرمة تسوية مشتركة تجعلها في أقل تجربة بنابر أنها لا تستطيع قيادة الشعب الفلسطيني بالشعارات
الوطنية وحدها وبعضة صواريخ لا تجري في تعديل ميزان القوى وتبديل إيران محدد ومكمل.

لذا تبدو المكاحرة الإيرانية الظاهرة، عبر التأكد على مواصلة برنامج التخسيس والتشديد على القدرات العسكرية،
غير قادة على إخافة بحث طهران عن مخرج سواع في العراق أو لبنان أو فلسطين، لعل يوقف الضغوط عليها أو
يقوها إلى حين تستطيع التقاطف نفسها مجدداً، وهي بات ذلك في تقليم أطراف الرؤوس احدها الذي يبدأ البكر
من المسؤولين الإيرانيين، يعتقدون بأن مواجهة الثوار الكثيرة أكثر مما يجب وسرعت العقوبات على يلاهم
فهما نهل مصيبة الهوية إلى المرحلة التي توجها بها تصريحاته، وإن تشدد حرب العدال مع
أروبا والعالم العربي وأعادها إلى نقطة الصفر، لولا النافذة التي فتحتها طهران في تشاورها الحالي مع الرياض.

ومع أن الانتقادات الواسعة للسياسات الرئيسيّ اتخذته ما يشبه الأنسحب في الزلزال، لكن تنفيذه غير مطرد، كي لا
تتكور تجربة برلين. فالمخاطر الإيرانی لا يعتبر نجاحاً، وليس على هذا. فإن إعلان إعادة دولته
الضيقة. تعبر طهران إن خروض مواجهة من أي نوع مع الإلياذين والإغريقة لا يكون في مصلحتها، وسبيولاها
إلى العراق للاقتصاد من هذه النوع. وتعرف أيضاً أن الإدارة الأمريكية المحترسة في العراق قد تتأجج إلى خطوات مؤدية
نتغلبية ما يحصل في حال انتظارت إلى إعلان قرار بالLEASE قبل الآن، فإن إيران قد تكون واحدة من
اقدافها إذا لم تكن هدفها الوحيد. وهذا يضعها أمام خيار واضح: استخدام كل إمكانياتها يراعية في الاعتداء
تتعلقها بانتظار تغيير الإدارات والسياسات والمعادلات، حتى لو اضطرت إلى "تلين"، موقف حلفائها.

العاصمة الأميركية بانتظار تغيير الإدارات والسياسات والمعادلات، حتى لو اضطرت إلى "تلين"، موقف حلفائها.
الحياة

محكمة العدل الدولية تفقد صدقيتها.

محقود المبارك

لعل أحد أسباب شؤم المحكمة الدولية، التي أقامتها الأمم المتحدة بجهد الحرب العالمية الأولى، كان يكمن في مسأله المنسوب إلى المحكمة، التي كان يفترض أنها تتمتع، وهي تنال الأذى، لا تتمتع. لعل هذا من أسباب عدم استطاعة المحكمة تحقيق مبادئ العدل. لعل الشعوب العربية، الأمر الذي جعل دول أوروبا تدفع إلى استخدام القوة العسكرية كدليل، والذي ينتج عنه إدانة الحرب العالمية الثانية، ومن ثم مبدأ الأساليب القانونية الدولية يتمثل في صيغة الأمم ولهباتها المتماثلة، بما في ذلك المحكمة الدولية. اليوم وبعد مرور أكثر من ستين عاما على قيام وريثها المحكمة الدولية، يجاج دارته المتأرجحة وتهيجها البسيطة ضد مسلمي البيروني والعربي، وتسعى بعدة دول كهيئة عالمية، حال الفضائح التي تمس المسلمين. فالانتقادات الواضحة في حكم المحكمة غير الموقعة الذي أقره جريمة إبادة، قد ارتكبت. ولكن رفض تحمل مسؤوليتها القانونية الدولية المتتالية عليها، ربما يكون أحد محكمة العدل الدولية في قضية قضائية، واضحة نظرية في عالم سياسة قزمة.

فالיים الذي ارتكبها الشرب ضد المسلمين في الفترة ما بين 1992-1995 وقائمة ما يزيد على 200 ألف مسلم، تشكل من دون جدل ما ينفع في القانون الدولي الإنساني بـ "جريمة إبادة"، وتعتبر أهرامات جرائم ضد الإنسانية، واندلاع السقوط على القانون الدولي.

بيد أن هذا الحكم أثار قلقاً لدى الكثير من المسلمين الذين ما زالوا يتساءلون: من مدى يستمر تعسف الغرب في تصنيف الجرائم بحسب أهوائه ورغباته؟ ومن مدى يبقى المسلمون ضحية الاعتداءات في فلسطين وليبنان ودوما، وازدواج السلوك والهرس والتكسير والتشريد والوفيات، ثم تأتي المنظمة الدولية للأمم المتحدة هذه الاعتداءات يشغبها: السياسية في مجلس الأمن، القانوني في محاكم العدل الدولية، ثم ضحايا الذي قد يرتكب المحكمة الموقعة في مسؤولية جريمة إبادة بشرعية في البوسنة والهرسك؟ تنص صيغة مسؤولية جريمة إبادة على دخول قضية المسلمين؟

لمذا بذلك تطبق القانون الدولي حراً على الدول المعادية الإسلام، بينما يمتلك الدول الصناعية لـ "الخصومة"، هناك؟ هل مستقلة فردية على سبيل المثال بأنها قام يوم بـ "جريمة إبادة" في بلاد المسلمين.

 себ، أم أنها متكافئة بمعايير المحكمة، كجزء من أي أمثلة تزعم المحكمة لمجلس الأمن؟ في قضايا العالي، ومن يصر الغرب على أنه بيتنع عن مبادئ الشعب الأغلبية الذي دمر بلادهم بالكامل وقتل ما يزيد على ميلينيون. هل هو من العدل والمساءلة أن يشكل لجان دولية من قبل أطراف عالمية في القضايا القانونية، التي مارسة جرائم "جريمة إبادة" في العراق، حيث تم وقوع ميلينيون عراقي، أقل أهمية من جرائم وأعمال أنظم التي اتفقت على إرتكابهم جريمة إبادة ضد 148 شخص؟

ثم لم شعائر مسلمة في التي قامت بجريمة إبادة ذلك، ترى آتانيا توصف من قبل "العالم المتحضر" بشيء غير "العربية" و"الإنجليزية" و"الهندية"، بل "البشريات الإسلامية"، هل كانت المحكمة ستترده كثيراً في إدانة تلك العصابات بالغالبية كله؟ إلى مدى يستمر هذا الاستهانة العربية بأرواح المسلمين وحقوق الم갔ين في حق الفضائح، مثلاً في المحكمة التي صادر يوم الاثنين الماضي، هو أعتراف المحكمة بأن "جريمة إبادة" قد وقعت، وأن الرئيس الشرب وغيره من المسؤولين الحكوميين العراقيين، كانوا بعضنا عناصرها وعلى
رغم ذلك، فقد تمت تبرئة صربيا كدولة بزعم أن من قاموا بـ«جرائم الإبادة» انها حملت صفة «عناصر» من الجيش الصربي، وأن الجريمة لم تتم على أرض صربيا، وبذلك فإن صربيا كدولة لا تتولى مسؤولية تلك الجريمة.

والواقع أن تبرئة محكمة العدل الدولية لصربيا من المسؤولية القانونية الدولية المتزامنة على الإدانة بتهمة "جريمة الإبادة" في قضية سربينيتاشا، هو في حقيقته تبرئة قوات الأمم المتحدة. كما أن تبرئة لـأوروبا أيضاً، فقد كانت قوات الأمم المتحدة على مقرية أمان من موقع المذبحة التي قتل فيها 10 آلاف يوغوسلافي مسلم في مدينة سربينيتاشا وحدها.

ومع ذلك فلم تتحرك قوات الأمم المتحدة سكاكا، بل تقهقر وتترك المجال للقوات الصربية لإكمال مهمتها، بعد أن كان مجلس الأمن قد وضع سربينيتاشا تحت الحماية الدولية، وبعد أن كانت قوات الأمم المتحدة قد نزعت سلاح جميع المتهمين لجيش البوسنة والهرسك، وبعد أن طمع الجنرال الفرنسي فيليب موريون أهل مدينة سربينيتاشا بأنه لم يعد ثمة سبب للخوف.

خلاصة الأمر إذا، أن قرار محكمة العدل الدولية يتعلق بـ"تبرئة صربيا من عبء ارتكاب مجزرة إبادة ضد مسلمي البوسنة والهرسك"، قد لا يكون مفاجئاً، وإن جاء مخيباً للأمل، إذا ما علمنا بأن إدانة صربيا وتحملها المسؤولية القانونية الدولية عن جريمة الإبادة تلك، قد تنتهي إلى أن تكون نظام الأمم المتحدة ذاتها - التي تعتبر محكمة العدل الدولية إحدى فيتنامها، وهو الأمر الذي أشار إليه الأمين العام السابق للأمم المتحدة بقوله إن تبرئة سربينيتاشا سيطره يطارد المنظمة الدولية إلى الأبد. ولعله أصبح من المن況 أن للدول المسلمة أن تجمع شئانها وتلمع جراحها وتوقف عن لوم الغرب على كل مصائبها، وأن تبدأ الليلة الأولى لوضع «محكمة عدل إسلامية» تتفق الدول المسلمة على أن تحكم إليها جميعاً. فالدول المسلمة اليوم يوقف عددها 45 دولة، وإذا أضافنا إلى ذلك الدول التي تسكن بها مسألة مؤثرةCSR مجموعها 90 دولة. وهو رغم يعادل قرابة نصف دول العالم، ولو استطاعت هذه الدول مجتمعة أن تحقق اتفاقاً قانونياً دولياً يتعين فيها كتيرة من دول العالم الثالث في أمريكا اللاتينية وأفريقيا وأسيا، لربما استطاعنا أن نبدأ تحقيق قانونية دولية جديدة، بحيث لا يحتاج المهمومون من المسلمين في البوسنة أو غيرهم أن ينتظرنوا نظرة عطف غريبة عليهم. وإلى أن يتحقق ذلك، سيظل رجل الشرع البوśni ينتظر عدالة السماة بعد أن فقد العدالة في الأرض.
يروي أن القائد الفرنسي نابليون بونابرت أحدهما خلال خروج العالم ذات يوم، ثامنًا إلى الصين وقال: "هناك تقع الصين، العلاقتها 함. دعوة تناول، لأنها إذا ما انتظرت صور نزح العالم، ربما يكون اليوم الذي تكتم الأزمنة الفرنسي قد أقرب إلى المعه. إن لم يكن فقه عام. فهم الإنسان الإنجابي اليوم - بعد أن سقطت من سببها الكفيف الطويل - أصبحت تعني تعديل الاقتصاد والأعرابيات والبيئة في العالم في هذه المحاور الثلاثة، ويرجع أن تكون قوة بديلة عن قوة الولايات المتحدة، التي بدأت تتحرر كما تتحجر كرة النجاح من أعلى الجبل، التي بُكر حجمها وترانز سرعة سقوطها أثناء تحريرها.

فكل المؤشرات تدل على أنه أَنا أُنجم نجومي صادق، بغض فسه بكيل ستيني. فمن الناحية الاقتصادية، استطاعت الصين أن تحقق إنجازات ضخمة في العوائد الأخضر خلال تدريجًا يبدي في تقلد الإنجابية. فقد ضاقت الصين جهودها في التركيز على الاستثمارات الأجنبية وأفادت منها كثيرا، إذ يأتي اليوم قرابة 60 في المئة عن عوائد الاستثمارات الصينية عبر استثماراتها الأجنبية. أما من الداخل فقد تركزت الجهود الصينية على المباني في قطاعات الاتصالات والUFFER والأنشطة الكهربائية، ولهذا الجانب فهو الذي حفل الصين من بلد غير منافس إلى علاقتي كبر خلال أقل من عقود، وفي الوقت نفسه عادل الصين من فوانيسها الداخلية لتستغل استثمارات أجنبية، فحققت - نتيجة لذلك - أرقاماً قياسية للنسبة الأخرى. بلغت عوائد الاستثمارات الأجنبية عام 2006، أكثر من 60 مليار دولار. وبناء تحت تدريج التكوين القانوني، ضمن برنامج التدريج للقوانين الداخلية، أقر البرلمان الصيني قبلي أيام قانونين، أهدافه يتعلق بتحقيق ضرائب الدخل المفروضة على الشركات التي يمثلها أجنب، كل هذاداد متتبع وتشجيع تطور التجارة والصناعة الداخلية على كل المستويات، وتشابها مع متطلبات العوائد الاقتصادية الجديدة.

ومنذ انتشارها إلى منظمة التجارة العالمية عام 2001، استطاعت الصين أن تضاعف حجم تجارتها الخارجية ثلاث مرات، وقاد حجم الbang بسهم شهيرة أضعافًا. ولا يزال الbang بسيطًا للставить قبل، في الراتب العالمي، وضعت صادرات الصين التجارية بنسب 74 بالمئة من الطبق الذاتية، وصلت صادرات الصين التجارية إلى 177 مليار دولار، نتيجة زيادة صادرات الصين التجارية، التي زادت عام الماضي بنسب 27 في المئة عن العام الذي قبله. لتصدر إلى قرابة ال州ليون دولار. ليس هذا فحسب، بل إن التوقعات تشير إلى أن الصين - التي تجاوزت اليابان في مجموع صادراتها للعالم 2003، ويتوقع لهما أن تتجاوز الولايات المتحدة صاحبة المركز الثاني عالميا هذا العام - ستستخدم تجارتها كفاية مصرف في العالم. يأتي هذا الbang بسيطتي، بعد أن أحسست حجم التجارة، حتى من أن تتحجر النجاح، إذا تتجاوز الصين المركز الأول في العالم. حين تجربتها في بداية هذا العام تيليون دولار، تتجاوز بذلك اليابان التي بلغ إجمالاً أجنبياً 800 Bachelor دولار بهجة العالم澜澜.

أما في الجانب السياسي، فما زالت الصين - التي تتغذى ثالث أعظم دول العالم في مقدمة العلاقات الثنائية - تزيد في مواقفها المتعلقة بسيط مزيداً على مدار الأعوام الماضية، ومع ذلك، أن يسوع بعدقانون أخرى لدى الخبراء. الأمريكيين، ما نقلن بكون على موازنتها العسكرية لإيقاف ثلاثة أضعاف الأرقام المعلنة. إلا أن نسبة الزيادة العسكرية بالنسبة لهذا العالم - التي وصلت إلى 17.8 في المئة وهو ما يعادل 45 مليار دولار - كفيل بأن يثير قلق واسع.

وقد أثار المحدث باسم البيت الأبيض عن أن "زيادة المزايدة العسكرية تشكل نقطة للدول المجاورة".
للسن، ويتعارض مع سياسة التنمية السلمية»، هذا الشعور جد صدئ في الأوساط اليابانية التي حذرت من أن هيئة
الصين العسكرية قد تتخلى عن اليابان تحت سلطتها.

بدء أن تقارير استعراضية أمريكية أشارت إلى أن الصين - التي تمتلك جيشًا قوامه مليوني ونصف مليون جندي
ولديها 55 غوغاية هجومية - تتفكر حالياً على إنتاج جيل جديد من الأسلحة البحرية، حيث تستطيع الوفود الجديدة
من الجيل الثاني الصواريخ بالستية من طراز «جي إل 2»، التي ي]<ن مأهله إلى تجاوز الأفام كما. وفي الوقت ذاتيه، شكفت
مصادرة شبهة أمريكية أن الصين تجتذب أسلوب، في أجزاء تجربية لسلاح بهدف تطهير أسلوب المفاوضات
المجتمعية، ولا شك في أن هذا مثل هذا التقول غير المستفتي قد أثار دعاوى في الأوساط الأمريكية. قد أثر داعي
الرئيس الأمريكي ديك تشيني قبل قليل، على تقديره تجربة الصين العظيمة قواتها المسلحة. وفي إشارة إلى
تحويف الولايات المتحدة من تفوق صيني، قضى مستقبل، أعرب الرجل الثاني في الإدارة الأمريكية عن أن "تمديد
الصين التقدم الاستخراجي لم يكن عملاً بناءً.

أما في الجانب السياسي، فقد يعد إخفاء الدور الذي تلعبه الصين اليوم كمحرك رئيسي أكثر من المسائل الدولية.
فالمصمو، بصفتها عضواً دائمًا في مجلس الأمن، ولا سابقاً سياسياً مقابلًا عند خصوص الولايات المتحدة، لا تلقائها السياسي
الدولي غير المنقسي. وقد بدأ واضحاً لو أننا أن لا لا خذل بكين في الأزمة الكورية. من يمكن أن يتفق شبات
(قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) كلاً دارك (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر) (قبر)
تتشتت دوراً نشطاً في الأزمة الإيرانية الرائحة التي جرت بعد الصين فيها صاحبة نقضاءة أخرى ما تكون فيها.
جشعها تشترط على الجانب الإيراني. إضافة إلى ذلك، قد قردت حكومة الصين بطبعها في العالم كما كان بالأساس. قد قدمت الحوكمة الصينية
- التي يتجاوز عدد سكانها بيلاجياً وربع مليون سنة، وهو مثل مثلم للدول العربية، - يفتتح كثير من الأبواب الثقافية
التي كانت مغلقة في السابق، تجدر أن بعض الدراجات تشير إلى أن الصين قد تقول قرباً على الولايات المتحدة في
مجال استخدام الإنترنت. إذ لم يرد استخدام الإنترنت في الصين مع نهاية العام الماضي 137 مليون شخص،
زيادة قدرها 23 في السنة العاشرة. وإذا ما استمرت وتيرة الزيادة هذه، فإنه تتوقع الصين أن تتجاوز
الولايات المتحدة في فترة لا تتlict في كاناب ولا. هذه الدراجات جزيء، مما في الوقت الذي يفتح فيه العالم العربي دارعه لاستقبال MCP من كل أنحاء العالم، حيث استقبلت الصين العام
الماسي أكثر من 120 مليون سائح، عاد ذلك بإرادة ساحقة تجمعها بالضرب في 100 مليون دولار.

بعد هذا الكله، يبقى سؤال يبحث عن جواب: لماذا تتأثر الأمم العربية والإسلامية في الاستفادة من هذه المكاسب؟
وما إذا لم تعيش بدعم العلاقة التي ناشئ في المصالح المشتركة عن الحوار الذي لم يلق يوماً مع أي من قضايا الإنسانية
والذين؟ وفي الوقت الذي عزم على توفير عوانية متبادلة شملت رئيس الوزراء الإسرائيلي وغيره، نجد أن التجارب العربية مع العلاقة المستفتيك ليست داعياً لكثير. يبرع في المفاوضات بين علاقة
المصمو، مع以色列 وعلاقتها بالعالم العربي والإسلامي أكثر إغراء أكثر لمتابعة ماص. فالمصمو، التي تحلم بالإنسانية قبل
ارية أقرأ عزن ووجدوا فيها أكثر من 30 أمين مصير - قد ترى فيguards أكثر من المعيق لها كسب
علاقات خارجية مع دول إسلامية وعربية ذات نفوذ اقتصادي وديني غير محدود. كما أن الأفكار المهمة في الصين
الذي تعلينا من هضمها في قضايانا الاجتماعية والاقتصادية والوطنية - ينطلق من ناصر للإفكار والتوجه نحو
العربية والمسلمة من جانب، والصين من جانب آخر يمكن أن تكون (فرز مصلحة). قد تغذي الاقتصاد، ويمكننا أن
ستفيد استراتيجياً وسياسياً واقتصادياً، أما بالنسبة إلى إسرائيل فهي لديها الكثير لتقدمها، وإن كانت تزيد أن تحصل
على أقصى استفادة من هذا العلاقء، وسوف تفعل.

خلاصة القول إن المثل في الوضع الصيني ي سنار في ضرورة أن يعمل العالم على تجاوز أسباب ذلك، استفادة علاق
من فرائشنا الذي أضحى عليه المبارة بعيد، لذا فقد تطرقنا إلى فترة راحة قد تكون في نهاية الجبال العربي، استفادة
الشرق، ويبين هذا ذلك ضاعف وسط الشرق المثير للأمل في حال تغير العالم لم نعود بالآن متي أتي دورنا
نح كنام عربية أو إسلامية، ولكن ما ناسخ هو كيف يمكن أن تستفيد من الصراعات الجديدة، فأصبحنا كالأيام
الذي لا يستطع أن يحلم بعد من تغير السجان، ولعل صيغة الأمة العربية في مجمع تقديم صراع العالم وغريب بعد
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إلى ذاكري طرفة غير سعيدة. إذ تروي الطرفة أن علماء من الشرق والغرب توصلوا إلى اختراع جهاز كمبيوتر عظيم، باستطاعته أن يكتبا بما سيحدث في المستقبل ويجيب عن أي سؤال. وحين تم صنع هذا المنتج العظيم الذي شارك في إنتاجه علماء من الولايات المتحدة وروسيا والصين واليابان، وأثناء احتفالية أقيمت بهذه المناسبة أراد العلماء معرفة مستقبل العالم، فاتفقوا على وضع سؤال حول من ستنكون له الهيئة على الأرض في المستقبل. وللهجة الحاضرين جميعًا كانت الإجابة أن الأمة التي ستستقيم على الأرض في المستقبل هي الأمة العربية! حينها أسرع العلماء بإضافة سؤال آخر عن سبب ذلك، فكانت الإجابة: لأن بقية الأمم ستتوجه إلى الفضاء!
على رغم الأزمة الداخلية في لبنان والاتهامات وسط بيروت التي تكثّل الاتهامات، هناك أمانة جميع اللبنانيين أمّل في

مؤتمر (باريس – 3) الذي يعقد في 25 من الشهر الجاري في باريس.

مع الصعوبات التي يواجهها لبنان والاتهامات السياسية وتداخلات جيوسياسية وإيران عبر حلقاتهم فيها، هناك قرصة ل

تتجلد في التضاؤل الكبير للدعم الدولي للبنان والتصامم مع وساعته، عبر هذا المؤتمر الذي يترأس ويساعى إلى

إنهج التأكد بعدة الرئيس الفرنسي جاك شيراك.

والسؤال المطروح: هل الوضع الداخلي في لبنان سيُغير هذا المؤتمر؟ المَرَجُو ألا يُحقق مثل هذا الاحتمال المسؤوم

لأن (باريس – 3) هو الفرصة الأخيرة لكل لبنان والتجميع اللبنانيين.

هدف المؤتمر مساعدة اللبنانيين على عبر مرحلة ومؤامرة مالية بالعديد من حقول تنميطية، فعام

2007 يُمكن استعدادات دون مهبة على لبنان تبلغ حوالي 3 مليارات دولار، في حين أن 2006 لم يكن عام استعدادات

ديون أساسية. ينبغي التذكير هنا بأن لبنان نظامًا كان زعيمًا في موعد تسديد استعدادات كان حول الحزب

الأهلية. ونظرًا إلى الوضع الحالي ماليًا للبلد حيث يعد المصروف المركزي إلى سداد استعدادات وفوائد الديون، ينبغي

أن يتم النظر إلى التفاصيل المالية في بلد مالي على لبنان في حفر وردع اللبنانيين في حفر

أيضا، ونسج الحشام فإن هذه الاتهامات وتطاولات وتقديرات النظام السياسي تساهم في انهيار الاتصال، إذ كان من

طريق من السياحة العربية في موعد الاستعداد أم من طريق شل الحركة الاقتصادية في موعد تجاريا استقطاب، جزء

مهم من هذه الحركة.

وأما أنه لا يجوز لأي لبناني أن يساهم في انهيار الاقتصاد وطننا، ينبغي العمل على إبقاء بعض الثقة للبنان. والثقة هذه

تعني أن يمكن المصداقية استعدادات دونه وعمر هذه المرحلة الصعبة، ومن أجل ذلك ينبغي أن تضافر

الانتعاشات التي تسمح بالعقد مؤتمر (باريس – 3) في موعده.

و على جميع اللبنانيين أن يحذروا بهذا الموعد وأن يحذروا عن خلافاتهم من أجل انعكاس لأن مصدري اللبس. فهو

المؤتمر الذي سيغطي وكيلين لرجل يكتنف.

والدعم الدولي الذي سيجيده المؤتمر للبنان سيأتي ليس فقط من الغرب بل أيضا من الدول العربية العربية المهيئة للبنان

ومن دول العالم الإسلامي. إذاً يمكن تجميع (باريس – 3) من أن يتم الاستعدادات المالية للدول العربية، سيطر ذلك

لبنان أن يواجه مواضع استعدادات بهدف وثمة لتدريب الانتعاشات. أما إذا منح الاتصالات السياسية، فيمكن ذلك

لبنان في لبنان العربي، ومن صقلهما أن يتيح البلد داخلياً وإن كان ذلك من مصطلحات الدين لا يُستند إلى مصطلحات

الدولي الداخلي اللبناني مسؤولية جميع الأطراف، وأي حلَّ لأي طرف كان مع سوريا وإيران، لا يخدم مصلحته

أن يوافق على إفلاس البلد وأنهياره، لأنه يقاسمه واتهامه ينتمي دور الجميع.

المرجو إذاً أن يتم تفعيل (باريس – 3) وأن (مقاوم) المقاومة اللبنانية معاً خارجية تسعى إلى إيقافه أو يمنع

انقاذه لأن فرصة التyunة الدولية الحالية للبنان لن تُقَدَّم، خصوصاً أن الإدارة الرئاسية شيراك تنتهي في غضون

 أشهر.

المطلوب إذاً أن يتضمن جميع اللبنانيين في مسعى لإيقاف وطنهم من الإفلاس اقتصادياً وسياسيًا.
الحالة 

المحكمة الدولية آتية

رضدة تقي الدين

المحكمة ذات الطابع الدولي لمحاكمة المجرمين الضالعين في اغتيال الرئيس الشهيد رفيق الحريري ورفاقه ضرورية للبنان ومستقبله كتاريخه وحاضره.

فالمحكمة عندما تشكل ضروريا لكل الجرائم التي استهدفت خبرة السياسيين والمثقفين في لبنان.

فإذا استمر لبنان مسحاً للأعمال السياسية والعمليات الإرهابية، لن يستطيع استعادة استقلاله الحقيقي والحياة الديمقراطية القائمة على عدم التدخل الخارجي في شؤونه. واستناداً إلى هذا الخبراء و أجل الوصول إلى هذا السوق.

يحول الجمع التوصيل إلى حل للخلاف حول الناشئة المحكمة.

لكن الأدلة الأثرية في لبنان على مناصب بحرينية لا تتزامن المحكمة ذات الطابع الدولي، خصوصاً أن محكمة ريفاً ابتدأ قادة "الحلف العربي" أن سوريا لا تترضى المحكمة وأنها مصورة على ذلك المحبط في حكومة وحدة وطنية.

الحوار الذي دار بين رئيس تأسيس المستقل"، الدليل سعد الحريري ورئيس مجلس النواب نبيه بري، هو من أجل التوصل في نهاية المطاف إلى تشكيل دائم المحكمة الدولية من قبل البرلمان اللبناني بدلاً من فرضها من الخارج.

وعدة الحوار بين الحريري وبري أمرًا ايجابياً لأنها تتيح تخفيف أحوال التشنج، خصوصاً أن هذا الحوار يغوص في صلب الموضوع الصعب.

لكن الحوار لا يمكن أن يؤدي إلى نتيجة إلا إذا توفرت رغبة حقيقية بالتوصل إلى النتيجة المركزة.

ومع ذلك، يمكن أن تترشح محكمة بحرينية للمحكمة.

وقد يكون استعداد للحوار مع الحريري بطلب من الجانب السوري الذي يريد كسب الوقت للوصول إلى فعالية المحكمة الدولية.

والمشكلة هي أن الدبلوماسية السورية اليوم هي كما كانت قبل التعليم على القرار 1559. وهي، كما في الماضي، القريب، لم تصبح إلى رسالة presidente الفرنسي جاك شير، التي نقلها[Mathias de la Lande] موريس غيرو، من يعنى بالاستقرار في少女 وREMATIONS وعلى ضرورة العمل على استقرار المنطقة.

وهذه الدبلوماسية ستصبح إزاء رسالة الأوروبية التي فعلها منبق السياسة الخارجية خارجياً سولانا في دمشق، و لا تسمح نصائح المملكة العربية السعودية ومصر. كما أنها لا تسمح

نصائح حلقتها إيران حول ضرورة القبول بالمحكمة الدولية.

اليوم، وقبل الفئة العربية. لا تزال سورية على موقف الرفض وستتجدي نفسها أمام المزيد من المصاعب والمزاعم.

لم ترظها المحكمة الدولية إلا لم تترصد المواضيع الدبلوماسية اللبنانية فقد تم فرضها من قبل مجلس الأمن الدولي. ومن الخطأ التقدير أن Россия والصين ستعرضان قراراً حديثاً حول إنشائها لأن معلومات رؤساء الدول العربية تفيد بأن الروس

لن يعارضوا بل ربما يتعاونوا بالتصويت.

وإذا قررت المحكمة الدولية من قبل مجلس الأمن، وهو التوجه المتوقع في حال حل حلفية سورية في لبنان على مواقفهم، فإن الرهان السوري على عدم قدرة الأسرة الدولية على إقرار المحكمة عبر الفصل السابع بشكل خاص ينبغي

تجنبيه.
الحياة - 07/02/13
طقوس بارد في موسكو
الياه جروفش

لم يتم قراءة النص من الصورة. يرجى تقديم نسخة يمكن قراءتها بشكل طبيعي.
انتهت الحرب الباردة فعلاً، ومن الصعب أن نشهد عودتها في وقت قريب. لكن أثار تلك الحرب لا تزال باقية وكذلك استغلال التنافس في المواقف هي الأزمات الدولية، الذي طغي على سياسة الحلفين الكبيرين في ذلك الزمن.
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أحاديث محرجة عن "صفقات!" 

الحياة - 07/01/2007

أحمد حرب

ينقل الإخراج مادة الأقليم عندما يأتي على بد من يفترض أنهم حلفاء أو أصدقاء. في هذا السياق جاءت احديث

اليبين والمثابرين عن عرض "الصفقات" السياسية والأردنية مع الولايات المتحدة، في مقابل تقبل المعاصرين عن

"حزب الله" و"حماس". في وقت غير مناسب بالمرأة الحلزونية "الوطنية"، المبالغة في توصيفها "الاستكباري" لمواجهة الداخلية، التي تثبت تطلقها قياداتها. ف"النهم" التي يوجهها الخصم لنهج التنظيم الناشئين في خط

البرامج العربية، الإقليمي، هو ارتباط المصالح الذي يجعله ديموقراطياً، تواجه داراً بالاستكبار، والتكعون، على

لأعمال علاقة "حزب الله" و"حماس"، و"حماس" باللبنانيين، التي يجري الزعم علاقته "شبيهة"، لا يصل إليها

غير من قريب أو من بعيد، أنها لا تهدف سوى إلى خدمة المصالح الوطنية الداخلية ولا يرقي إليها بالثاني أي-

أصبحها! 

لهذا السبب سوف ينتظر المشاهير كثيراً قبل أن يسمعوا عبارة توضيح، سواء من "حزب الله" أو من "حماس"،

لندن مطلقة صحفية "هارتس"، الإسرائيلية عن لقاءات "الখلافة"، كان بين "الوضوعة العربية" التي قدمت

فيها وقف الدعم العربي للحزب المعاون اللبناني وتنظيم "الديمقراطية"، وسائر التشكيلات الناشئة انطلاقاً من الأردني

السورية، وإذا قبل أن "التاكور" الأوسمي كان، كما أكدت "العاصمة العربية" التي نفت向き مالية وتنظيم، ما-

بالتذكير الذي قدمته إيران، "على أن من وثائق القدر، إلى أدارة الرئاسة بوش في اعتج الجزء

الأميريكي للعراق، والذي لم يتم تفهمه حتى الآن، وقد أكدت هذا العرض الرسالة العربية التي حصل عليها البرامج

العراق (الخليج) الذي تتفاوت فيه دورها السيادية، والمحلية لتلفزيون友谊 "بي بي سي"، وفي الرسالة

الإيرانية عرض بأجزاء مقاومة بين الجانبين، على أن تدعم إيران عملية الأطفال في العراق في ظل الاحتلالي

(أي شعب عديمة القدرة) وتتسع سياسة الشاقة في الموضوع الدور، وتتسع دعمها لم "حزب الله"، و"حماس"،

وفي المنهاج دخل بوش ساحة إدارة بوش العالمية تجاها ويرفع كل نوايا العقوبات عنها، وملاحظة تنظيم

"الخليج"، وأعلان قاددا على الرسالة العربية، وسؤال قاددا للسلطات الإسرائيلية.

ما بينها من حدث العرضين هذا، وصرف النظر عن الشق الذي انتهى، بسبب الوضوعة الإسرائيلية والأميريكي

على الإراج، هو التزامه الذي ترى من خلالها كل من دعم وطهران إلى ارتباطها بالحزب "الله" و"حماس"،

الندور الذي يمثل التنظيم في حسابات البلدين الأقلية، وهي نظرية تسمى "بالخليج"، هي المهمة الداخلية التي ندب

نفسها لها واتت بحولها أن تكون تأكيده من خلالها أن قفانات أتاحت لا يمكن قرارها أي أن حصوله

فتعدها "الخليج"، كوربه في حجم حروب وانسحاب مصالحه الخارجية، وتتهيأ صاعدة لدخل "حزب الله"، عندها، في

مايضاها بالأ وبيانات المتحدة، لا تعاب في وقفة الغطاء السياسي، والمادي عندها في حال توصلها إلى الصفقة

النقدية التي تسيء إلى "فسكر" ربطة بصلة العرض الأوروبي إلى الولايات المتحدة، وهو "استكرار" قد

يطول انتظاره، كما سبق القول.

لقد جاء الإخراج في وقت غير مناسب، وربما كان مهدداً، بينما يواجه "حزب الله" وضعًا داخلياً دقيقًا يشبه الأساسي

التارق من قبل "الخليج"، ملحين بأن حملته الداخلية على حكومة الرئاسة مئوية استمر على العباس لوقفة

سوري، بإرنا من الخط السياسي لهذه الحركة، واستخدام لبنان في المواجهة المتى في الولايات المتحدة. كذلك

يكون وضع اليد الفقيرة، الذي يتم دفاعها بحول الفيدرالية، والعالمية في علاقاتها مع الرئاسة الفلسطينية محمد عباس صورة

أخرى من صور الصراع الأقلية. وفي الحالتين تخضع المنشور الرسمي اللبناني ومتلقى المشروع الوطني بالشكل

تحت ضغط هذه الحسابات الداخلية، التي يغلب ارتباط "حزب الله" و"حماس"، بها حارب صعب الفكاك منه.
الحياة - 07/03

خطف "القضية الفلسطينية"
 حازم صاغية

في مواجهة الاستيكانات في غزة، وهي ما تبّغ لا تتفحّي حتى تتجه إلى أبدية أكبر، يلوح كأن "القضية الفلسطينية"، كما عرفها في العقود الماضية، قد نبتت، يف篥ح مكانها لـ "القضية الفلسطينية" من نوع آخر.

ذاك أن مؤكدة "الحركة الشعبية" و "حركة فتح" في العمل الوطني لتشجيعهما إلى الانصهار وضمهم، لا بل تردد الذي تزعمه في الأساطير الرازيجية، الإسلامية منها وغير الإسلامية، الفلسطينية وغير الفلسطينيّة، نسورة قردا "فتح" و"العمال".

وقد أذكت هذه المارع التي أربعتها المشكل الوطني الفلسطيني منذ أواخر

السنين.

وتصحيح الموقع الرئيسي هذا كان دائماً بدأ عريباً وينتهي فلسطيني، نسوبة لمشيئة الشتات والتوزع الفلسطينيّين ودرجة الانتكا بالقرار العربي ثانياً. وها أتلاقت هذه الظاهرة من مارس الحكم السوفيتي بعد اجتياح 1982 في حرب طرابلس، وعقب مع الحيارات البيروتية، ونور ضوء "الانفتاح" التي أوجعتها صغيرتا معاً من ثمّاقل التي تناقصت "المنطقة الحضرية" على وحدة قرار الثوري.


ولا يعترض إطلاء صناعته أحمد الشهري من قيادة المنظمة وصولاً إلى عارض عرف حاكي. أما في حروب الأردن ولبنان الأهلية التي ساهمت في ذلك، ففي النزاع الثوري الفلسطينيّي قد ساهمت في استثمار البلدان المذكورة، لتشمل الزعيم من مثابه في الشمال، ولا تفرّغت من إنشاء تنظيمات مياوية، بلغة أخرى، لم يكن هٌما الأردنيّين والبنانيين الذين قاتلوا الفلسطينيّين نزاع قضية منهم، سعى نجح ل الدنيا، بل

كان هذه حماية لدبّديهم من نتائج ذلك النزاع. لهذا ما لم يشفع عن التعبير على رغبتها الإصلاحية وأفرط بوحدانيّة

"المنطقة الحضرية" في تجنب شعبها. في النزاع يصح فيه هذا التوضيح، وهو الذي يشرح، هو هُما، منذ حرية 1967، "المنطقة الحضرية" على "المنطقة الحضرية" من خلال الأعمال المحليّة الملحّة.

ومن هنا، فإن نزع احتلال "فتح"، الشرعية الثورية التي أسسها دمشق، بلغ اليوم طوره المقدّم: ففي داخليّ فلسطين،

وبالتفاصل مع قضيّاء دائم، تنقسم "القضية" بوصفها SCP الإسلامي لـ "فتح"، ففيها، بصفتهها وأساليبها، يعتمد على وسيلة.

وما لا يصح في بيان هو حلول الحروب المستمرّي الصيني الم حلول "القوميتين" السوفيتي: الشهير "القوميتين"، ففي المسرح الفلسطيني، ينتظم من "فتح" تدريجياً فوق الهوى، وهو علّه وجوهها، ليسهم إلى رصد "الله"، الليّابي، كما تجذب موضع الصروع جملة وتفصيلاً بحثاً بعد حكمة في التنزّهات الإراديت مع كل من

المواطنات البلدان والدولة العربية، والشيء نفسه يحسّن على البهجة التعدّديّة الدعائيّة على أنواعها، فالتظاهرات

الداخليّة لفلسطين في عوام العالم، مثلًا، صارت تظاهرات إسلاميّة تستعرض فيها رمز الإصلاح الإسلامي وشعارها

"الحالة كأنما حالي الشيشان".

والحال أن خروج الأهلية في الجزء العربي أُنفت أحد ثوابت الصراع السياسيّة على فلسطين، وتي كانت طيلة

مجال إجماع عربي، يتصور النزاع المعرّف في العمق ب전문ية المرأة، لم يعد حالة فلسطينيّة حصرية، فالأهرام الغريب، حسب "الانتربينت" الآخرين، أن خضوع فلسطينيّة يقتلون شهريًا، أكثروا أن تتفوق، في فترة وشيككة، بلغ رقم فلكي ينسج جميع الأرقام القياسية. يبدأ أن النزاع الشامل، وقبله التهمجي اللباني على أيقظة أشياء، يكسر ذاتاً آخر في الصراع الذي أحسنت平均水平ة الإنسانية. فراض أن العالم هذا لا يعود مرتبطًا حصرًا بالعقرائي الآتي من الخارج، بل يعد نشاط ممّا يمكنه يستطبع إن الله أن يبشر فيه العربي.
وما لا شك فيه أن في الوسع إضافة عناصر أخرى كسياسة الاعتصار والموجبة الإسرائيلية حيال السلطة الوطنية، والفساد الذي شاب عمل هذه الأخيرة. لكن سياسات إسرائيلية وفلسطينية مختلفة كان يمكنها أن تحقق سلام أوسلو، أما أن تخفف من هجمة الطامحين بوراثة القضية الفلسطينية، تلك البقية المدار حليبا، مدعومين، دوما، بسواطير الحروب الأهلية، فأمر آخر.
الحياة

07/06

سنة على "التفاهم"
حازم صاغية

ما الذي أنجز بعد عام على توقيع "ورقة التفاهم" بين "حزب الله" وميليشيات عون وتيار؟

لهذا، في هذه الدورة، أن ذات "التفاهم" جاء نتاجاً إيجابائين لا يتجزأ ولا يثين للحياة. فهناك، في الأثناء، لا إعداداً للمعاكستان المتبادل على نحو غير معقود في توازي التفاهمات. وهناك، تأتي، أن إعداد "حزب الله" ناجح عن أقرار 1590 وحواسياً، ومن ثم، واتباعاً، عن عودة ميشال عون إلى لبنان، فما آخرها إمداداً الإبداية الملعب. في هذا التحالف الإنتخابي الرعاي.

الذي وضع "حزب الله" إلى حركة "أمل" وتيار "الكرسي" وحزب التقدمي الاشتراكي.

إذا، راحة الإنتخابية المطلقة راحة هذه العلاقة الثانية. فكانت حياء زواج كاذب كاذب يعده بعض المهاجرين مع فتيات من بلدان معينة يريدون الحصول على جنسية.

على أن حال، وقبيل، بما يقبله الضبوعتو في ما خص "التفاهم"، يبيى أن أكثرهم وجهة وأفكاراً ضدهم. فإذا

suffix هو صحيحة "التحالف الرعاي"، تم رغبة في تميش التيار، والسياسيين تاباً، والإبقاء على معاكستانه:

الصراعية السريعة من دون السياسين، فإن الإنتخابات كانت فرصهم لإعادة تصويت التحالف مع قوى 14 حزب

الآخر. فقد يأتي، خصوصاً بعد تلك الإنتخابات، ضبط التوجو الحزبي الحزبي للنخبة على الليبراليين.

وفق توافاً أخرى تمثلوا تفاوتًا إذا كنا، إذا كنت، بطريقاً لمرحلة ما بعد الاستقلال الثاني، ومنطقامها.

ويه، في الحال، فتحة، معركة سياسيّة كان حيى، بعون أن خوضها ضعف حلقاته في 14 حزب، كما يضج شروط.

تخصيص التحالف، ولم بح عن دون خوضه إذا شاكر الآلاء المضطماً، التي جرت على الرد بأساً، مما عموم، في

في لقاء 8 حزب، المرئي الوحيد بينما هو، في لقاء 14 حزب، واحد من حمصاً ميزة، على الأقل، يمكن لواحدهم أن

يعتبر مراقباً لرستة الجمهورية. هذا يعزز ميزة الأصلية إلى إشكال أي دور لغيره، بما في ذلك النتائج التي تأتي عن

اقتصادات الدوريات الحزبية، تلك، كنها، صار صح الموظفين، في اشتراكية حكومة الاقتصادية، وهو حزب الحكومة التي امتتح جميع الأنوار الإستدلالية على المشاركة فيها.

فهذا، أن حزب الله كتب حزب في هذا "الحزب" تجاري، حيث، أن حزب الله، أساس الناس لقاء النزاعات

السياسية، على الحسم، والإписать على استقرار ما.

وبالرغم في "التفاهم"، مع "حزب الله"، يمكن "إنجاز" أهداف يجوز الشك في مدى ملاءمتها لحساسية الجمهور

الذي ينصح، منظم في مصطلح الأخلاق الاستراتيجية لليابانيين. [فقد حيل دون قيام حكم قادر، فيما أبي]

على نفوذ سيء، متحدد الأوجه ساءه عون في بكاءه عبر التحالف مع رموزه. وتم، كذلك، تشدید الرباط ومشروع

إقليمي، راكيكي، بصفة لبعض علاقات لبنان العربيّة، وجمع علاقات الديموقراطية، وفقاً، وبعد من هذا، خوضت

الحزب التي لم تتمشيا فيها عون ورئي لها، ليوم، وفيها أهتمت الدولة والثوريّة على سياسة الشتات خارج

"حزب الله" و"أمل". [هذا تولى الأحزاب، بضعة من الزخم، إنشاء ما كان يسمى "التحالف الرعاي"، قبل أن

يتراعب عنه] [أنا، لم نستغنى، في تحسين جهاد كان ليست في معركة الاستقلال الثاني، وصبر إلى مزيد من

تغريب سياسيين على حساسيتهم، ومن تزوير مباعيهم في طن ودولا.]

لقد كان ميشال عون القتلة التي قسمت ظهر مشروع الانقلال من حال لبنان إلى حلال.
الحياة
07/01/31

السعودية من الترجم إلى التغيير
داود الشريان

من الأراء السائدة المشهورة عن السياسة الخارجية السعودية، والتي يدها الإنسان حتى في بعض المبادئ، أهمية السياسة السعودية، فضلا عن مقالات ودراسات تنشرها الصحافة السعودية، أن السياسة الخارجية السعودية تسكت على الدوام بصفة التبشير وعدم التراجع، وتبقي محاكاة على نهجها منذ تأسيس الدولة السعودية على يد الملك عبد العزيز وحتى اليوم. هذا الرأي في السياسة الخارجية للمملكة العربية السعودية بهدوء في الأساليب المثلى على هذه السياسة وتأكيد صحة الإستراتيجية السياسي الذي تعيش السعودية منذ تأسيسها. لكنها في الواقع الأمر يظل هذه الدولة وسياساتها الخارجية حقاً مهماً وهو النمو والتطور. فالصراعات للسياسة الخارجية للمملكة بعيد أنها شهدت في السنوات الأخيرة نقلة نوعية في استراتيجيتها وصلت منها في عبد الملك عبده بن عبد العزيز. فقد انتقلت السياسة الخارجية السعودية من أسلوب الانصهار والتراجع إلى المبادرة والتغيير. وتبعاً لهذا التغيير الجوهري تغير تفاعلي الآخرين مع هذه السياسة. ففي السابق كان النسيل الذي يطرح عند كل أزمة إقليمية هو "ماذا تريد من الرياض؟". كأن السعودية مجرد معلم لحل الأمور. أما اليوم فالنسل أصبح "ماذا تريد السعودية؟". وهذا الزهد في النزول إلى ساحة المبادرة والتغيير لم يكن ناجحاً عن غياب عناصر هذا الدور، وإنما لأن الدور المطلوب من السياسة الخارجية في الماضي كان يتطلب هذا النوع والقدر من التحرك.

هذا ليس كل شيء. فالانتقال السياسة الخارجية السعودية من الترجم إلى التغيير لم يكن التغيير الوحيد الذي ترتب على السياسة السعودية الهادئة. فهذه التحول قرضه تحول أشبع واعوضه انسجام وتطور نظرتها السعودية إلى دور السياسة الخارجية. ففي السابق لم يكون الرياض يتعاطى مع سياساتها الخارجية من منظور أمي داخلي، وأقصى ما تصل إليه السياسة الخارجية في مسألة الأمن هو أمر حادث، لكنه اليوم أصبح تحت تأثيره أثناء الداخلي في شكل جلي، بل أن هذا الأمر هو الذي يفرض معظم تحركاتها، وللذى لم تعد السياسة الخارجية محدودة عن متطلبات الداخلي، وهذا التغيير في دور السياسة الخارجية ليس حكراً على السعودية، لكنه في الحالة السعودية واجب ارتدالاً من منطقة الأدنى في ضوء الحركة وانسة المبتغاة. وعلى نطاق الرياض مع الإرادة اللبنانية ساقاً وحالةً بين موقف هذا التغيير. صبحوا حتى تطورت الفرق بين نوعية الإرادة العربية والذهابية به تأثير على طبيعة هذا الموقف. لكن الذي لا شك فيه هو أن السياسة السعودية الراغبة في استهداف خطوة ما يجري على أمها الداخلي. ومن هذا التغيير استمرت جهاداتها وأدواتها. فضلا عن أنها تتأثرت عن شيء كثيرة من طبيعتها المبادرة للانصهار.

واعتاد استخدام أمي الزمن في حلحلة الضباب.

لكن رغم هذا التغيير في السياسة الخارجية السعودية، إلا أن المقدمة التقليدية حول الثبات موجودة في بعض ملامح هذه السياسة رغم الارتباك والانقلاب، ولهذا احترام النتائج هذه الثبات هو قرارة هذه السياسة المبادئ، فالسعودية من الدول القليلة التي تحتفظ حساسات هذه تلك، وهي تحتفظ على هذا الوقاف لقضية المبادئ في علاقاتها مع الدول العربية في شكل عام والولايات المتحدة على نحو خاص، ولذا يمكن أن يكونوا إلى سياسة السعودية الخارجية التي تشهد هذه المرحلة تحركاً أثناً نشطاً، فالرياض لا تتحرك في العراق أو لبنان أو سلطات من خلايا المصالح الحساسة، ولا تدار علاقاتها مع إيران بعضاً واحداً، وتجاوز طهران الآخر مع مبادرات الرياض لحل الأزمة اللبنانية مدعوم وأهم السياسة السعودية
الحياة - 07/02/07

ال ملف الصعب

داود الشريان

البيان الذي أصدرته وزارة الداخلية السعودية يوم السبت الماضي حول القصف على عتلة أشخاص بهمة جمع

تبرعات وتهريج أمول لجاهزية لدعم شؤونها إتجارب العاقبة لم يكون الخطرة الأولى لمعالجة هذا ملف الصعب، فقد

سبق للسلطات السعودية أن قامت بإجراءات تدريبية جمع التبرعات شملت بنوكا وجمعيات خيرية، وآشأت فئة

مركزة لهذا الغرض، وليس سرا أن جمع جمعيات الجمعية الخيرية في البكير وبيام لرافعة مصرفية، سفهولة

الإدعا في هذه الحسابات تقابله إجراءات رقابية مشددة في عمليات الصفص حازت على اعجاب السلطات الدولية

العربية بهذا الملف، مقدما عن السعوديان ممثلة وزارة الداخلية أوقفت تبريع جمع التبرعات النقدي، ورفعت

المصادق التي كانت تنتشر في المحال التجارية والأسواق، وخضعت مواسى هذه التبرعات تم تشريعا مباشر من

قبل الأجهرة الرسمية. لكن رغم كل هذه الإجراءات لم تحال المشكلة موجودة، ناهيك عن أن حاليا جميع التبرعات

انتقلت وتبعان النشاط الشاذ السعودي، كما استمرت الشرطة في تدريب نشرة «الطعة» يوم الاثنين

الماسي. والسول هو ما هي الإسباب التي حالت دون السيطرة الكاملة على هذا الملف على رغم ما تم حتى الآن؟

ولم يبدأ بالإنسانية لل음을 تبرعات نقدي على رغم الجزاءات والتحذيرات.

من ناحية القبول الأشارة إلى أن قضية جمع التبرعات الخيرية في المجتمع السعودي، والمجتمع العربي عموما، تأخذ

فيدة دينيا وفعلا على المعاملين معها حساسية خاصة، فالمسؤول لا يستطيع أن يكون ذا حماسا في هذا الأمر

فبذاك كمن يعرض على قضية حساسة للنساء وحسب عليها. فالتدخل في خيارات البقرة ليس بآي المصلحة.

فيما قد نتخذه هذه العملية أخذ إحداث حادثي عصر من يولو (سيبيربر). وقت الحدث عن جمع

التبرعات وتنظيمها مثل التفاصيل حول المناهج التعليمية والخطاب الإسلامي. فمن أن يكون وفقا وتشريع عدد من

المؤسسات الخيرية بما في ذلك الشركات في إحداث أزمة ثقة لدى الناس في المؤسسات المحلية جمع التبرعات

في مجمع لا يزال نشيط العيون المؤسسة ودورها، الأمر الذي ندعم المثيرين إلى اللجوء إلى الأفارد، إلا

إن أزمة الثقة في المؤسسات لم يأخذها الناس من زاوية الأرخص وتهمة نقش، بل إن هذه الشكوك التي حامت

حتى هذه المؤسسات اصابتا عدداً من النساء لديها في إيران، وكشفت أعينا من عدم الثقة بالفاعلين عليها، فعند

وبدأت لوسألوا عن أساس لا علاقة له بالثرة وبلاذ، ولننا إعدادها إلى <$3> لا يعني

الضرورة أن تكون على الأهداف النقدي ودعم الجماعات الأرخص، بقدر ما هو نلحق عن عدم تنفيذهم في المؤسسات

المعنية بهذا الغرض.

لا شك أن بعض المؤسسات الخيرية بعيان من أزمة ثقة من جانب البقرة، وهنا الأزمة لم تتأثر من تحميل وعلاق

بعض المؤسسات الخيرية، بل لأن هذه المؤسسات لا تعمل بشكل متميزة كما تفعل البنوك والشركاتxDDD. وهذا فإن تنفيذ عمل هذه المؤسسات تحسين صورها مهمة في محاربة

محل أو تشكير الشركاء. والذين إذا تم تشريعا للفعراض مثل موازنة الدفعة، الذين بمضموناتهم في الأفق مع

سياسة الدولة في موافقة الجماعات والإشرافات والشكاوي بالنسبة، ومن دون حسم هذه القضية.

سيتم النظرية هذه القضايا من طريق التحريات في أفغانستان، وجمع جمعية المؤسسات الرسمية،

وتصدر أن هذه الأمور صعب في جوهر تجار العرب وساهمت في زيادة الإتفاق والتفصيل الشعوب

الأغرافي.

التأكيد أن لهذا الملف جديدة ديما تختصره الأسباب، لكنه ساسي بالاستناد، لا تستطيع البقرةแลعاء بها مرجعية فكرية.

وطالما أن هذه المجموعات متخصصة في ظل هذا الخلاف حول ضرر المدنين والمماوعة والرضى، فمما أولا وأخيرا لها مرجعية فكرية.

الخطاب الإسلامي في معظم البلاد العربية يعد أن هذا الخلاف الجوهري لم يتحس بعد، فلا يزال بيننا من بير التبرع
للتمردين والإرهابيين والخارجين على القانون يحتج دينيًا. والخلاصة أن ما نواجهه في قضية تمويل الإرهاب لا يختلف عما نعانيه في مسألة تسويع الإرهاب ذاته، فتمويل الإرهاب هو محصلة لأخطاء وتجاوزات فكرية وعقدية وليس نتيجة تقدير في المراقبة والملاحقة.
قرة تعرّف إدارة الأزمات؟
وليد شغّير

يُطلق استحاقات انتقاد القائمة العربية المرتبة أولاً شهراً آذار (مارس) المقبل في الرياض ديناميكية جدداً، قد تجعل منها إحدى أهم القوي العربية، بعد مسبي سنوات على تراجع هذه المؤسسة التي جمعت اجتماعاتها سنوات بين أواخر التسعينات وأواخر القرن الحاضر. وحتى القوى التي انعقدت في السنوات الأربع الماضية على مناديب الصبر والحماس.
ولو لم يُ_tracking قمة برلين عام 2002 مبادرة السلام العربية التي كان أطلقها ندّام الحرميين الشريفين الملك عبد العزيز حين كان لا زال ولداً، إلى بعض التّحرّك الدبلوماسي، كانت قدرة السنوات الماضية كلها لا لون محرم.

وبالنسبة للدبلوماسيين، ألاوبة العقد الذي ساور لدى بعض النخب العربية الحاكمة بإنفاذ إدارة جورج بوش الذي سيطر عليها المحافظون الحدود، بعد مجالت حجته 11 أيلول (سبتمبر) الإراده على نيويورك وواشنطن، وتم حياده liquation. التي انطلاقت مؤسسة القائمة العربية أم، فإن حجة الانفاذية الأميركية باعتضار ضعيفة إلى الحد الذي لا يبرر أن يبقى العرب هامشين في معايضة قضاياهم.

ثمّة أسباب موضعية تسمى بإحياء مؤسسة القائمة العربية في آثار القمال، بصرف النظر عن نوبة القادة العرب في هذا المجال، ومن ثمّا أشارت الانفاذية الأميركية وقائع على الرهان، فإنّ قوانين لغير مصورة هذه الانفاذية تأكد أيضاً: الفعل الأميركية في العراق الذي لا يمكن للتلفة المستمرة أن تنوعه، ويستند على السياسة الأميركية الإقليمية في إدارة أزمات العالم أن يتّجه في مواقع العجز الإسرائيلي. عن وموجة سياسة إتفاقية الفلسطينيتين بالدولة الإسرائيلية، وفّقد تشير الشخصية الوطنية لهذا ألوان باثان أنّ نواة الإبادة والقتل والطمع والتعويج وهو عجز أثبت عند قدرة الأمة العكبرية على استيعاب هذا الشتّى على رغم ما تعرّض له من خسائر، وأدانة الفعل الإسرائيلي في الغرب لدان الصراط المباشر، وتفاوتاتها داخل المجتمع الإسرائيلي رغم قدّة أضرارها على لبنان وشبيهه.

فظل المسارات القصيرة النظير لدى أبناز في استيعاب المواقف الوطنية والأقليمية للدول المحورية على السياج الإقليمي، خصوصاً إيران...

إنّ القائمة العربية، قوة هامة لإطالة مبادرات عربيّة واعية بعدما أصيبت الأنظمة العربية التي أفعلت القادة العرب عن أي جهد فعال، بالفرصة. ومن دون أتمّ حاضراً حول إمكانية أمكاني في المنطقة. فإن هذه الفرصة تتيح التحرّر من ضغوط الدول العظمى بعد أن قدر أنّ تحميّة جزيرة ما كانت

ومن دون طموحات كبيرة حول مدى انفاذ مؤسسة القائمة على استعداد الإدارة الإقليمية، فإنّ تمدّحANO. القادة العرب السعيا إلى الإمساك برمّة إدارة أزماتهم بدلًا من أن يدرّجة لهم من بادية لزمن أو زمان، عميداً زلّاً تزعمجي عربيّة تسمى إلى حدّ هذه الأزمات.

وإذا كانت القادة الصريحة السعيديّة قررت استضافة القائمة بعد أن كانت فتحت الأمل العربي أن تكون في شرم التمييش على رغم أنها برستها، فإنها استشعرت الحاجة إلى إدارة مختلفة لقاء الأزمات المتراكمة التي تراقب على كيف ساهمت السياسة الأميركية في المنطقة في تأديها، وفي تعقيدها، وصولاً إلى مرحلة باتت تهدّد فيها بحلّ كارثيّة على دول هذه المنطقة.

إنّ مؤامرات ضدّ القائمة في الرياض تفترض أن القادة السعودي سعياً إلى خروجها بقرارت ناجحة تؤسس لمسار جديد في التعاطي مع أزمات المنطقية. يفهد القيادة نجحت في لعب دور ضاغط من أجل وقف الحرب على لبنان الصيف الماضي. وقد جذبت عواطفها الدبلوماسية في الأول من كانون الأول (ديسمبر) السعيدي لألماني السرايا حموها إلى حلّ العقال بالسياق الإسلامي الذي كان يحتل مكانة «حجاز الله» السرايا حموها إلى عدم تكرار مواقفه.

تبتعد تفوق هذا الأفراح، وتقلب في سراح خروج إيران على تجنّب الخلافات - السعيدي المتفاوض في العراق ومرغمين في السعي إلى إطالة وحدة انتظاره إلى لبنان فاجتهد لفتح خطوط قادة التفاوض مع طريفان بدلاً من العصا العظيمة التي ترغم واسعنة في وجهه لأن استعمالها سبهي إلى كارثة في المنطقة، وانتشرت من الإدارة الأميركية.
تسلماً لها بدور سلمي، وأخيراً نجحت في إلحاح استثنائي دام شهراً في اقتراع الاستعداد الأميركي لتحرير عملية السلام (بالاشتراك مع الإلحاح المصري والأردني) في شكل سمح لها بـ "الإネタ" الخلافات الفلسطينية – الفلسطينية لتهنئتها على النحو الذي يحصل في مكة المكرمة.

إن الدبلوماسية "الهجومية" التي اتبعها الرياض، خلافاً لعاداتها باعتماد الدبلوماسية الصامتة، تجعل من القمة المقبلة تحدياً كبيراً لقدرة العرب على "التعريب" إدارة أزماتهم المدنية من رأسها إلى أخمص قدميها، تمهد لرؤية لحلها
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إداعات السياسة الأمريكية

لا تنفق إدارة الرئيس الأمريكي جورج بوش تخلفه تمسيعم العرب المعتدلين، بعد أن تعدهم بتعديل سياساتهم في المنطقة، تعود إلى سياسته الالحاجز الإغبي إلى إسرائيل، فترقبهم هذا العامل من ناحية سياسية مثل ينطوي على التأسيس على شعب المنطقة إلى المربع الأول، هذا إذا كانت لا تزالًا مما ترغب فيه إسرائيل.

وإذا كان أبرز تحليلات هذا الاستنتاج الذي ياتي قاعدة عدم الثقة العربية بدون واسطين وسانتها، هو التنافض الأمريكي بين ترحيب بوس باجتماع مكة وتأييده للإنهاء إلى الاتفاق بين حركتي «فتح» و»حماس» وبين المسارين رئيسة الحكومة北美كية كوندوزا رابس الموقف الإسرائيلي اللافتة التفاوض مع حكومة الوحدة الوطنية التي اتفقت عليها الطرفان، فإن خيامات الأمر تعود ولا تتحى لدى قادة النظام العربي، من عودة واسطن عن التفاوضات، وكانوا فعلاً بالسعي إلى حاول لنفسية الأم، أي القضية الفلسطينية، ومن اعتادها تفاوض الناس في أراض المنطقة الأخرى تقوم على الجهد ونكاسها، أو على المكاسب التي لا تكون منها إلا على الاعتناق إلى القوة المطلقة، التي تسبب في الرجوع وتعظيمها بها.

تستطيع من طريق إسرائيل القضاء على "جيش الله" الصعب الماضي، فضلا عن مراهكتها السرية على إمكان إقامة صرح الديمقراطية في دول المنطقة.

يكيال القول أن بوش نفسه وعد قبل ثلاث سنوات ونفف بأن يكون عام 2007 عام قيام الدولة الفلسطينية المستقلة، وها تبين تجربة منتصف هذا العام في وقت ترقص إدارته، أسوة بالموقف الإسرائيلي، الاعتراف بالحكومة الفلسطينية التي ارتبعت الفلسطينيون باتفاق بينهم على أساس تفويضه خوض المفاوضات بالدولة العربية، وتعود إلى الموقف الشرقي العربي الذي تعقله الجامعة الأوروبية، وهو الموقف الإسرائيلي - الفرنسي المقابل الذي لا يؤدي عملية إلا إلى تكوين الأورشفية السياسية التي تيتيح للاست蜴 وتكب انتفاضة شعب الفلسطينيين المفاوض شبيه الحج، وتذكر مع الرئيس محمود عباس ما حصل مع الرئيسي الراقية عرفات، أي التغيير الصغرى لهذا الظهور، أولاً منح حمل عرفات مكان على قيادته، وثانياً مشرطاً طالما أن حاول قررت أن "تحترم" أزمات الإفلاض الموحدة ان "تلتهب" بها، فوكل قراءة لمعايدة عملية السلام، وعتمد تكسيت التطرف من أن تستفيد من التهديدات في ذلك لتفقيمة السياسة الإسرائيلية، وتفجر في إعلان إسرائيل "الوفاء" مع الاتحادية وتفجر في إعلان إسرائيل "الوفاء" مع الاتحادية وتفجر في إعلان إسرائيل "الوفاء" مع الاتحادية

وللتحضير دون مواصلة الرضى بين ممالكة 일본 التي incapacitated الشكل الذي يجري فيه الربط بينها.

لقد سعت المملكة العربية السعودية ومصر والاردن وروسيا الدبلوماسية التي لها علاقة تعاون مع واشنطن منذ سنوات وأبلغت وضعتها في الأشهر الماضية، صارحًا بعد الهمة التي منتبت بها إسرائيل بدعمها في حربها على لبنان، و"ال]</text>
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عودة إلى التعامل مع الأزمات

مصطفى زين

هل بدأت الولايات المتحدة تراجع عن سطوعها في التحكم مباشرة، وبالقوة العسكرية بمقدرات الشرق الأوسط؟ وهل بدأت رحلة العودة إلى سياسة التعايش مع أزماتها وإدارتها بمشاركة الحلفاء والآخرين؟ أو من الناحية الأخرى، ما هو تغيير الواقع السياسي، وعلاقته في النهاية، مع إسرائيل حتى الآن؟ في قلب الواقع السياسي، وإنتاجها عن الديمقراطية، رفضت ألمانيا مبادرتها للحصول على الحكر. وقد كانت التجربة في فلسطين غير متميزة على ذلك. أما الديمقراطية، فتجاوزت الحركات التي تدعمها واسمها على مشاركة المقاومة في السلطة.

وتصدرت فيها الورزازة اعتراضاً)

المعالك أن هذا التغيير بدأ مع مقارنة الأزمة الداخلية. بعدما كانت إدارة بوش تعارض أي تدخل للفنون في شؤون المنطقة، تعافتنا معها في ميزان القوى الجديد، ثرا في اقتراح القرارات الأخرى الخاصة بالمحكمة الدولية، و"إنهاء العلاقات العديدة"، خلال الحرب الإسرائيلية على لبنان في تموز ( يوليو) الماضي، وهي لا تزال في اتجاه فرض قوانين مع إسرائيل، شرط أن تتصرف على النحو المطلوب.

وإذا كانت تعارض أن تدخل عربي في الصراع مع إسرائيل، ولم تتعالى عليه العربية أي اهتمام، فهنا الأنظمة تعوض عن رعية المملكة العربية السعودية للحوار الفلسطيني - الفلسطيني. أو أنها أقرت، عملياً، بحق حركة "الصباح" بالمشاركة في الحكم.

صحيح أنها، واللجنة الرابعة، وضعت شروط على حق من بمثابة: الإعتراف بالانفتاح والاتفاقيات المبرمة معها، والتي يتفق عليها العقل، وصحيح أيضاً أن الحركة أقرت مثابرة بعض هذه الشروط من خلال تأكيد احترام قرارات الشرعية الدولية والمبادرة العربية، من دون أن تصل إلى حدود الإعتراف بالدولة العربية. لكن الصحيح أيضاً أن

وأشن على الأراضي التي تم فيها الاعتراف بالوكالات، والاتفاقيات المبرمة معها، ونتقدم في منطقته.

رئيس "مجلس العلاقات الخارجية" الأميري، فهدان، يوضح البيت McIntosh بالتعابيش مع الأزمة، مستغرحاً من المؤرخ البردس، حيث قتل: "من يحكم الشرق الأوسط يحكم العالم". ومن حكم مصالح في العالم مثلاً بالاهتمام بالدولية، و"إنهاء الجبهة العربية". ويتبع أن الثورة الإيرانية التي أطاحت بإحدى الاستراتيجيات هي الإقليمية في المنطقة، أدرك أن الإقليم لا يستطيع التدخل بمجرد الاحذاء.

وإذا ما أثبتنا مواقفنا المبكرة بنتائجها معنا في مواجهة الأحاد وكانت سابقة. أما المحافظات الإسرائيلية للبنان عام 1982 فاستطع صعود مقاومة بزعة "حرب الله" تصدت وما زالت

ومخططات وثانية تنتهي إلى أن شرق أوسط سوداء للاستراتيجية. وصين شرق أوسط يحتضن إيران القومية وأخرى تمثيلاً، بل وصول، وواستيعاب بالتخلص عن شرق الديمقراطية، والتعلم عن تجربة العراقية، والتجربة الإسرائيلية في لبنان، ودعم الاستخدام على قوة الشرقية التي أثبتت ضعفنا، وكانت بداية للأزمة في الشرق الأوسط، مثلما كان النوع الثاني من علماء الشرق.

(الكرد بقيادة حزب الله)

موستاتر رولا تأتي بأن الولايات المتحدة بدأ في تطبيق استراتيجيتها. من المبكر تسميتها مرحلة الإفلاس فهي هناك الآن مرحلة محاولة ملخص الإصلاحات، وقد تكون ناجحة على مواجهة ضربات الاستراتيجية، لكن الأمك بهدف الحفاظ على الأزمات، أجرياً، وفجراً، ومن ثم تمهميعهم مهدداً منها التحرك. لاحتواء الانتقادات الكبرى، والتعابيش مع الأزمات وإدارتها
الحياة

نهاية الكابع عودة الوعي
مصفوفة زين

من يلبي إلى بيشة إلى أتبر وبريلوسككون، مرورا بباقي الحفائر، الجميع ينتمي إلى الشرق الأوسط. منظما إسرائيلي المكلف، رغمما بدأ في صرارة، وزوج دفاعها عباس بيرتس عندما كان يتقرب من المقاتلين الضخمة في الجولان. الجميع لا يرى شيئا، يسخرون في أن ي alışverيهم التاريخ الاستعماري، خدمة للإمبراطورية الصربية والمذابح بينها.
هذا بدأ الحرب على العراق. منظور مطلق العنان، الأيديولوجيا أمت الأصابع. لا المقاتلين الدبلوماسيين أو الدبلوماسيين استطاعوا انقاذ الواقع إلى البيت الأبيض. لكن كان لا بد للمعارضة من نهاية. كان لا بد من اقتراح الكابع الكبرى التي دمرت بلدا وكواد شعبا: تفوق الحفائر. عاد كل الى حجمه الطبيعي، فوافق أقوى من كل الأعداء.

العراق اليوم أسوأ ما يلقى ما كان عليه إياه صدام حسين. الحرب الأولية في الوسط، والجنب تطورت إلى مواجهة بالأسلحة الثقيلة. بعثت تلك المساحة من الأحياء المختلفة. هجر البلاد أكثر من مليوني إنسان. نزع عدد مماثل إلى الأمن في الصحراء والجبل. الأملاك التي أدعي بليز ود وبوس محاربته ووجاء نقطة خصبة. فرع من لب لدب. القاعدة تسيطر على معظم الأنهار. العراقيون عادوا إلى القليلة الطافية والمذهبة. يكفي أن يعتقد أحدهم على مسجد أو حسانية أو أن يرتدي جرائد استطع قي تتعلق في نطاق قضاء الهاون.

في الجنوب حيث يبقي بليز المصمم، رفع منه إلى بريطانيا وجزء من قواعد، ما كان «جيش المهدي» و«انتقالي»، warrants والنصوص الذين في ملايين المدافعين مجلس القمة. وقد تطرف في حرب شعبية.
شعبة، فمثلا، بقية الصدر يتخرج من جمعة العلمي الحكيم، يمارسون على الحكام في المنطقة. وحربันتو، تعلوه جماهيره ووجوهه في السلطة لتعزيز مواقعنا. أما التظاهرات فهي كل دقيقة وقريبا، تزعزع

الجمعتين الدينية واللبنانية والاجتماعية.

كل هذا حاصل في العراق، لكن السيد بليز أنجز المهمة، هل أنجزها فعلا؟ الواقع تؤكد غير ذلك. نشير إلى أن

اندماج كان أساس بالمالية، ربما لأسابين تتعلق بصنع الإدارة الأميركية، وفرضت إيران. واستطعت أن تجوبها واسطاعها في الخليج، استعدادا ضد المحتملة أخطار. قد يكون نتائجه مبينا على آداب شبيبة
 بالإمكان الركاب التي سبقت الحرب على العراق.

لا بد أن يكون بليز أخذ هذا المعاني في الاعتبار حين قرر الانسحاب. فأي هو نوع لعراق يضع جيشه في الخط الأمامي للمواجهة؟ ونذوب طهران في القصر، حيث هذا الجيش. لا يعدها فوز في أي منطقة أخرى، وقد يكون هذا
الاعتبار وراء محاربته الجهوية للنظام عن صفراء وال دقائق، قلما، الأولياء يهملون صبر الصراعات، فالمأمورين، يحملون إلى الحرب، سيستمرون في قياس، في اتخاذ قرارات للإدارة العراقية،
ثم ساعدت دعوة ترسيب بكـ - هاملتون الذي تلقته بوس. ومنذ أن اللحاقين الحاصل داخل البيت الأبيض، فوز
الидولوجيا مليئة باللغرطية والمغترقة، معبرة أميركا هي "العقل" ولا يمكن للحدود الذي يواجهنا أن يتغلب عليه يوما.

إذا كانت الإمبراطورية القديمة، مثل بليز، تعزت منها من التاريخ فهو تعمية الجريمة والهمزية بالانسحاب بفضل
الخصائص والتحلي، فإن الإمبراطورية الحديثة مثل بيشة ود وبوس ينتمي، فإن الصراعات وتبنيا تعززها بزيارة من الحرب الاستباقية، معبرة

الهجوم فشل وسيلة للدفاع.

469

07/02/24
الحياة - 07/01/18

الاختلافات والاستقلالات

عباس شريف

كانت مارا رزق قريت في الصحف نبا استقالة رئيس الأركان الإسرائيلي دان حاسو. شاركت بيبي من الارتداد. فال الرجل الذي استقال هو الذي أمر الصيغ الماضي باغتيال لبنان. اعتين المدن والقرى والسبوع والأطفال والجسور والศิล، هو الرجل الذي أخلى لبنان بالحماية والقاب الطرقية والمجازر الجوية بدلا من الجنوب ومرورا ببيروت ووصولًا إلى البقاء. لكن القال الكبير لم يستقل بسبب وحشتة أو أرميه وارتكابات جبهة. استقال لأن أهداف العدوان لم تتحقق. لأن إسرائيل خاضت حربا ولم ترجع منها متصرقة. 

حين أطلقت إسرائيل أسلوب الهجوم ضد لبنان، حدثت أحداثا هدفنا: الأول إعداد الأسرى الذين خططوا هجوم الله "مذياء الخط الأزرق"، والثاني نزع سلاح الحرب.

وكل توقف إطلاق النار كان الحرب لا يزال محاطا بالأسرى وقبردته على إمضاء مدن شمال إسرائيل بعيدا. الصواريخ، وضمانات الهجمات البرية المتاخرة والمعترضة مشاعر الفشل لدى الجيش الذي امتلك داميا القدرة على توجيه الرميات القاسمة.

افتتحت الأصابات في إسرائيل. اهتود الرئاسة لا يشبه هجوم سابق. طارع بينزون لا يشبه الهجوم بارك. ولم يستطع رئيس الأركان المسرف في الروهان على سلاح الجو الذي جاء منه في تفتيض إفطار ووزير الدفاع ورئيس الوزراء إلى الخبرة العسكرية. نالت الحرب من صورة الجيش. نالت أيضا من قدرة إسرائيل على الردع. وفي منطقة حلي بال춰ار لم تكن المؤسسة العسكرية والأمنية في وارد التسامح مع القتل والفتيان. بدأت التحالفات. تردمت كمود الأخلاف كثيرة في إسرائيل. شدد كليرون على الحاسوب وامتلاص البحر. وقبل اسبرين من تراجع لجنة فينغوبار أطل حائط يستقالة، ومن دون أن يحصل صراحة تقبيلهم. قال: "خفف أصداء المعركة. قررت المصرف وفق ما تمليه على مسؤولية هو الأهم.

بعرف فايلر أن كبار الخبراء في إسرائيل يذهبون إلى الحرب ليعودوا منها الاستقرار والسلام. بعدما تراودهم رغبة الجواسيس في المقاومة البارزة. الأكثر معا نبينر يطلع إلى رئيس الوزراء، هناك فلابن وشارون وباراك. هذا الدولة التي تقوم على العدوان والانصارات لا تقبل الخبرة ولا تحب الخمسين. وعرف حاملات أن ممارسة الصلاحيات تحتاج إلى السلطة المعاوية والعتمد ال rendez-vous. ولهذا استقله بعدما طرط السيئة عن قدرته ونظامه أيضا. وهي تبني، بأن مسألة الأخلافات والاستقلالات تستوفع عند حائط.

عرف كل عقرب الوجه العنصري للكيان الإسرائيلي. وعرف ان الديمقراطية الإسرائيلية تطلب مذاب بحقي الفسطينيين. لكن يدري الجهر أن يرقص أعداء للتعزف على أسرار قوته ومكانه. وحباحا يجلد ما يعده أو يثير غيره يورطقة في الغرب. لا حاجة الطوارئ أعلنت ولا تحرك الشعوب والدبابات في الكتل. قبل ذلك ذهب محقون عاديين وسألوا وนาน وشارون عن صحة التهابات بالفس_UNKNOWN أو التهرب من الضربات أو استغلال المصعب.

لم يحصب الإسرائيليون حائليات في لبنان أو غزوة. حاولوا لأن جنود إسرائيليين سقطوا في حرب لم تحقق أهدافها. إن ليت المساحية هذه تمرى إلى تمكن الاحتكار العسكرية من استعادة قدرتها على العدوان وصولتها الرايدة في المنطقة. إنها مسألة فعل أن يعالج الكيان الإسرائيلي اختلافات الاستقلالات واستخلاص العبر توجيه نحن اختلافنا بمزيد من الاختلافات. ولا نحتاج إلى مثال مما تكون.
لا يمكن الحكم على النزاع الصحرائي قائمًا على التفاضل، فالأيام وأي دلائل لمفهوم النسوية السلمية التي يتراوح من فرضية لا غالب ولا مغلوب. ما يثير في هكذا قضية أن الحرب انتهت منذ أزيد من 15 سنة، لكن من دون أن يخفق النزاع وتتوارى إلى انتظار. غير أن ما يدفع إلى اعتقاد الباحثين أن الغير بجانب النزاع تمكّن من استثمارهن على قدر من الأهمية بانتزاع نفسها. في مقدمها أن الأمم الواضحة الأمام المتحدة بأن كي - مون عرض في أول تصريح له عن الموضوع إلى صياغة الحل السياسي ورهن إثر الأحزاب التقدم في المفاوضات المباشرة بين الأطراف المعنية. وقد انتهى التصريح أهمية خاصة كونه صدر على هامش القمة الأخيرة للاتحاد الأفريقي الذي يعد "الجمهورية الصحرائية" بين أعضائه. ما يعني أنه وضع مساحة بينه وبين المسار الذي آل إليه تفاعلي الأفريقة.

ووفق منفذاً جديداً وثر النسوية السلمية في أمريكا الجنوبية.

لا يمكن الحكم على النزاع الصحرائي قائمًا على التفاضل، فالأيام وأي دلائل لمفهوم النسوية السلمية التي يتراوح من فرضية لا غالب ولا مغلوب. ما يثير في هكذا قضية أن الحرب انتهت منذ أزيد من 15 سنة، لكن من دون أن يخفق النزاع وتتوارى إلى انتظار. غير أن ما يدفع إلى اعتقاد الباحثين أن الغير بجانب النزاع تمكّن من استثمارهن على قدر من الأهمية بانتزاع نفسها. في مقدمها أن الأمم الواضحة الأمام المتحدة بأن كي - مون عرض في أول تصريح له عن الموضوع إلى صياغة الحل السياسي ورهن إثر الأحزاب التقدم في المفاوضات المباشرة بين الأطراف المعنية. وقد انتهى التصريح أهمية خاصة كونه صدر على هامش القمة الأخيرة للاتحاد الأفريقي الذي يعد "الجمهورية الصحرائية" بين أعضائه. ما يعني أنه وضع مساحة بينه وبين المسار الذي آل إليه تفاعلي الأفريقة.

ووفق منفذاً جديداً وثر النسوية السلمية في أمريكا الجنوبية.

لا يمكن الحكم على النزاع الصحرائي قائمًا على التفاضل، فالأيام وأي دلائل لمفهوم النسوية السلمية التي يتراوح من فرضية لا غالب ولا مغلوب. ما يثير في هكذا قضية أن الحرب انتهت منذ أزيد من 15 سنة، لكن من دون أن يخفق النزاع وتتوارى إلى انتظار. غير أن ما يدفع إلى اعتقاد الباحثين أن الغير بجانب النزاع تمكّن من استثمارهن على قدر من الأهمية بانتزاع نفسها. في مقدمها أن الأمم الواضحة الأمام المتحدة بأن كي - مون عرض في أول تصريح له عن الموضوع إلى صياغة الحل السياسي ورهن إثر الأحزاب التقدم في المفاوضات المباشرة بين الأطراف المعنية. وقد انتهى التصريح أهمية خاصة كونه صدر على هامش القمة الأخيرة للاتحاد الأفريقي الذي يعد "الجمهورية الصحرائية" بين أعضائه. ما يعني أنه وضع مساحة بينه وبين المسار الذي آل إليه تفاعلي الأفريقة.

ووفق منفذاً جديداً وثر النسوية السلمية في أمريكا الجنوبية.

لا يمكن الحكم على النزاع الصحرائي قائمًا على التفاضل، فالأيام وأي دلائل لمفهوم النسوية السلمية التي يتراوح من فرضية لا غالب ولا مغلوب. ما يثير في هكذا قضية أن الحرب انتهت منذ أزيد من 15 سنة، لكن من دون أن يخفق النزاع وتتوارى إلى انتظار. غير أن ما يدفع إلى اعتقاد الباحثين أن الغير بجانب النزاع تمكّن من استثمارهن على قدر من الأهمية بانتزاع نفسها. في مقدمها أن الأمم الواضحة الأمام المتحدة بأن كي - مون عرض في أول تصريح له عن الموضوع إلى صياغة الحل السياسي ورهن إثر الأحزاب التقدم في المفاوضات المباشرة بين الأطراف المعنية. وقد انتهى التصريح أهمية خاصة كونه صدر على هامش القمة الأخيرة للاتحاد الأفريقي الذي يعد "الجمهورية الصحرائية" بين أعضائه. ما يعني أنه وضع مساحة بينه وبين المسار الذي آل إليه تفاعلي الأفريقة.

ووفق منفذاً جديداً وثر النسوية السلمية في أمريكا الجنوبية.
تمت استيعاب أعباء الضمي على طريق الديمقراطية في صمت، إنه أن الناخبين يدعون إلى صناديق الاقتراع في استحقاقات الرئاسيات من دون حدوث أي فراغ في السلطة أو أزمة في الحكم، وحين تحدث بعض أعمال العنف فإنها لا تخرج عن نطاق حسابات مناصريه هذا المرشح أو ذلك، وهذه ميزها ضعبي للميلاد الأوروبي الذي يعيش في المسلمون والسياسيون استناداً لما في مقابل أنواع الأزمات المستمرة في مجتمعه، والأرجح أن الديمقراطية لا تكمل عبر علاقات الاقتراعات، وإنها أمتشت وتترابط في ظل بين الحالة الواردة وسلسة المناصب السياسية والاقتصادية، ويدعم على مجتمع أن بقاء بعض شرارات الديمقراطية تبدو كأنه تترافق مع التنمية وتكافح الفرص وتأهل الموارد. وأنا أن المصابع الاقتصادية والاجتماعية التي تواجه السجال، فإنه لم يتز من وقت، منذ المؤسسة الشاعر أنغام المراقبة في استخدام هذه المعاني لتعزيز الآثار الديمقراطية كما في تجارب أخرى، ولا بد أن تفت نمطه المنتمي وأيضاً بعد الفوز وحفر في منصات رئاسة وزارات سابقة أدرس سيكا وباقي المرشحين، وفي قواعد اللعبة الديمقراطية قد تنطلق الأذى والطروحات المشروعة ويفتح الإدخال إزالة الاختيار لا مفيده عن.

لم يبل أنتو السجالي قبل ذلك إلى تعديل دستور البلاد ليتمد الدولة الرئاسية التي يرحب أن تكون قانون، ولم يبلأ إلى اختيار متفق على خلقية الصراع الشكلي، كما يتبين من احتدام المناقشة التي قد تحدث مفاوضات، فالصراعات السياسية الإقليمية إزاء المبادئ لا يضاهيها إلا في التزامها، مما كان النتائج، وحين يعز الأفق عن عسر حل الخلافات السياسية ويستعود إلى حل السلام والاحتلال، غر ان التحريزات السكانية التي تجرت في على وعيي امتاد عقد عدة استطعت بالتعاون السلمي للنقطة، تختلف عن باقي التجارب كونها نشأت في بلاء، وطرف الطريق إلى اقتراحات

السلطة من طريق التنافسات العسكرية والاحتلالات العرقية.

حين يتوجه السنغاليون اليوم إلى صناديق الاقتراع تكون الحملات الانتخابية للنوابيات الموريتانية بدأت في بلد الجوار الشمالي نذك، وما جمع التجريبين النفاية لتعودن المهام قلمها في أرسل الإشارات القومية حول التعليم الديمقراطية، فالسنغاليون بخوضون مباريات تعودوا على أن تجري مابينهم بين فرق يعرفون جيداً موطئهم الدائم، ولا تخفف من أي نطق طالما أن القلم ينضم قواعد المناقشة المماثلة إضاءة، فيما يظهر التيموريانون يعبرون على كن يتعويض فرقة الانتقادات السلمية بأخبار، رؤوس جديد نبذة في غير الرجال الذين أطلقوا نظام الرئيس المملوء مارياً ولد الطايد والصفحة وحدها التي جعلت البلدين الاجراء يقصور حول حوض السغال في

هذا فينها إعداد احتفالات توالية الديمقراطية في ضفتيrightarrow ونجم، يتجاوز مطلاك تمارين الديمقراطية في

دكار، ويكشف وتولد حاشة التعديلة الديمقراطية الناشئة في عرب الرؤية الديمقراطية متلازمة على النوايا واختلاف معايير ما تتحلى به من خلال:

أبعد من هواجس ترحب الأوضاع في الدوائر الإقليمية والإقليمية، غيرها من طريق تجريب النظرة الديمقراطية غير المفرطة من الخناق، أن الدول العربية ذات الانتباه الإسلامي لم تكن تتبع بهاء عدم دعم العالم العربي في تكمل الديمقراطية، وكان الأمر وقتذاك في ستينيات الشرق الأوسط يوم تأتي لها أن تأخذ مكانة إعتبارية في منظمة المؤتمر الإسلامي، وكان الأمر وقتذاك في ستينيات وسبعينات القرن الماضي بعثة إقامة حواجز سياسية لتحديد الهوية الإقليمية في القرن، وقامت دول الآن للسغال، وغيبانه بدأ بارزة في جزء التأييد بحاجة الفضاء العربي والعالمي، وأنه هناك تطول تعلم في غضون ذلك على فعالية الحوار العربي، الذي يدريس مباشراً مع خطوة الحوار العربي، وأطار وأطر، وجهة سادت اعتماد لد عمليات الديمقراطية كله على دولاً عربية بدأ تقدم المساءلات والتجارب احتمت أكثر نقل الحلافات إلى

النظام الإقليمي، ما أثر في ممارسة الحوار العربي، الذي أصبح أكثر أنلايات عامة بلا معلق سياساً، وحافظت منظمة المؤتمر الإسلامي على امتداد الديمقراطية، كما أظهر لا انصهار التزامات الدول الإقليمية، من غير أن يكون ذلك نحو معاودة أشكال التضاغل الإقليمي الذي يحصول عليه الغثر.
مما تكن الإجابات حول مسائل الحوار العربي - الإفريقي، فالآفة أن دول الاتحاد الأوروبي رأت في الانتفاضة في القارة الأفريقية، ومنع الترويج والمواد الأولية، وكذا النزاعات والأزمات، ضرورة استراتيجية تتماشى وتحولات بناء الاقتصاديات الاقتصادية وفضاء توريد تصريف المنتجات.

وبدأت الخطوة في التبادل عبر القمة الأوروبية - الأفريقية الأولى التي استضافتها القارة مطلع القرن الحادي والعشرين، وهي في طريقها لأن تصبح نداء للمقاربة الأميركية التي تتخذ من الحرب على الإرهاب مدخلاً لمعاوضة ترتيب العلاقات الأميركية - الأفريقية. ومنذ سابقة الأهداف وتقاطع المصالح فلأيوجد ما يبرر الغياب العربي عن حوار كان سابقاً في طرحه وتحديثه، ليس كونه ي置ق بفلسطين أكثر في البحث بالعهد العربي التي تحقق في القارة الأفريقية فقط، ولكن لأنه يضمن للامتداد العربي نحو أفريقيا ذي الخلفية التاريخية والبعد الحضاري أن يتحول إلى قيمة مضافة سياسياً واقتصادياً.

الآفريقيين في الترديتين المتزايدتين والموروثية إلى العالم العربي انهم يؤمنون تفاقم ديمقراطية جديدة تستجيب لمعظم الاقتراحات الداخلية والخارجية، وبدأت الدول العربية تصرف في نطاق المنظومة الأوروبية - متوسطية تحولات الفترة الشمالية في البحر المتوسط، حين الوقت لآن تتعلق إلى جذورها في الامتداد الأفريقي.

لإدراك أن في النسق الديمقراطي هناك راهن أكيد اسمه احتراز ارادة الشعوب.
الحياة

حتى لا تقول "عرب جرب!
جميل الدبيبي

يقول بعض العرب عن أنفسهم "عرب جرب!"، وقيل إن الأتراك هم من أطلق عليهم هذه الصفة، مثلما قالوا عنهم أيضاً "عرب خليجات". لذلك فضل الأتراك السعي إلى الانضمام إلى الاتحاد الأوروبي هو رواجاً من "جرب" الجامعة العربية. ورغم هذا الطابع المتضخم في أمراض النساء، في يوم من الأيام مصيبة العرب إلى مرض الجرب، الذي ينتقل من جسم إلى جسم، ولا يخفى أنه يخلق المنطقة العربية الموبوءة. الجرب مضطرب استهدف في أحداث بعض البلاد العربية، على رغم سعي أشخاص منهم إلى مكافحة هذا المرض ومحاربته، إلا أنه يهدد باستنفجار في حال استمرار الصراع على الكرنك، والعصرين على السلطة بالمقطور والنازجة، وهو ما ينتصع بيئية الأجسام العربية السليمة أو الصحية. أخذت هذه الحقيقة والحنان، قبل أن تصبح المنطقة العربية كلها "موبوءة".

في العراق اقتاد بين النساء والشبيبة الذين عاشوا السنين الطويلة في سلام ونان، في لبنان صراعات وخلافات ومارك كلامية تجاوزت إلى محاولة حلب بورت، وأكملها عدد من أطراف معارضة للحكومة، وفي فلسطين تخليات وخلافات بين "هсп" و "هاموس". وصلت بعد الوقت إطلاق الرصاص في الشوارع على الأبرياء، وفي مناطق مختلفة من الشرق الأوسط تتصاعد سنة الدخان والليب، وتتجدد مشاهد الموت المدفع في الطائر.

لبنان يعيش حالاً فوضوية يضخها الأمين العام لـ "الجهاز"، السيد حسن نصر الله، ضاحية نصرية "النصب الإلهي" تندفع إلى جانب النساء الإسرائيلين وتسبب ذلك في كارثة إنسانية للبنان. وقد فوّت على بلاده فرصة الاستقرار والبنك، وال بنك، والبنك،
الحياة - 07/02/05
المحرر: ناجد!
جميل العتيبي

هل يسجل التاريخ الشرقي أن الرئيس الإيراني أحمدي نجاد هو المحرر الفعلي على تزايد البرنامج النووي في منطقة الشرق الأوسط؟ هل يمكن تجاوز قيود الآلات العسكرية في المنطقة عبر التحدي العلمي لأمريكا وأوروبا، والإصرار على استمرار ببناء البرنامج النووي الإيراني؟ هل يمكن رفع عبءاً دولياً أو آخرين، أعلان قادة دول مجلس التعاون الخليجي على هامش "قمة جابر" الأخيرة في الرياض، عن شروط قبائلهم في إعداد دراسة مشتركة لبناء برنامج نووي سلمي.

وما تأكيدات الأمن العام لمجلس التعاون الخليجي إبرازاً للفعلية في تصريحات صحافية، عن مضاعفة لقاءات ستتم خلال الأسابيع المقبلة مع سؤالي الوكالة الدولية للطاقة الذرية بشأن البرنامج "النوفوروي الخليجي"، إلا خبر برهان على مدى الدخيلة الخليجي في امتطاية برنامج نووي سلمي، طبقة للمعايير الدولية.

الاردن يدعو إلى امتطاية الطاقة النووية للأعراض السلبية. خصوصاً أن الاحترام الملك عبدالله الثاني لمح إلى هذا الإعداد، على رغم تعزيزه من معدة حوض سهيل في المنطقة، ونهر有序推进 قيود الآلات في منطقة الشرق الأوسط.

بعد تزايد توجهات دول المنطقة نحو إمتطاية امتطاية البرنامج النووي، إضافة إلى رغبة الرئيس اليمني على عبدالله صالح في ذلك عبر ارسل شارات تأيد لقرار القمة الخليجية الداعي لإقامة برنامج خليجي مشترك بين دول المجلس في مجال الطاقة النووية السلمية، خلال خطابه الذي ألقاه بمناسبة 얻ة عبد العظيم. وكان رغبة مصرية "جميلة" في امتطاية التكنولوجيا النووية، تبتعد بعد الزيارة الأخيرة للرئيس المصري حسن مبارك إلى روسيا، وتوقع مذكرة تفاهم لتوسيع وتعزيم التعاون بين الدولتين في مجال الاستخدام السلمي للطاقة النووية، خصوصاً بعد رفض إسرائيل طلبات السنوات الماضية التوقيع على اتفاقية الحد من إمتطاية التكنولوجيا النووية. كذلك ملف النووي الجزائر لا يبعد عن الأضواء فهو ملف قيد متابعة. إضافة إلى دول عربية متميزة وهي راجبة. ودأ أعلنت

النضل الشعبي حول طرف النووي خففاً على سلطتها مثل ليبية.

لا شك في أن الأجهزة العربية وplets تأكد عدم الذلزائم الإيراني بملعمة الحديدة لوقوف النظام النووي. ما يعني

الدورة في عم "نهائي" لما أن الدورة العربية تمثل هذا السلاح، وإيران تمثل على خطاهما. وفاب أكثر من عشرة دول عربية من دون هذه الثقة النووية صعب تُنال في ظروفها "طيب جداً". إذا استمر سياق امتطاية التكنولوجيا النووية في منطقة الشرق الأوسط حتى وإن كان له أذى سلبي، فإنه لا محاولة لمسه "شرايين" ذكية قبليتي "هروب الصم" و"ناغازاكي" ما صادق انفجار من "شيرينبول" الروسي من كوارث صحيحة وبيئية.

أصبحت التكنولوجيا النووية الآن ضخماً دولياً، وسبب لها لعب كثير من البلدان، ومن بين دول منطقة الشرق الأوسط في ظل تساقط التسلل النووي، على رغم الكوارث التي تخلفها تلك التقنية، حتى وإن كانت لأعراض سلبية.

صورة كارثية ترسمها سياق امتطاية التكنولوجيا النووية في الوطن العربي، وهي المنطقة الأكثر خوفاً وافجاراً في العالم، والتي لا تمثل إلا نكلاً من الحروب والصراعات.

الآهر أن تذكر أولاً التكنولوجيا النووية بشكل خطر على البيئة والعوباد والإنسان، وعلى المنطقة بقرتها، مما يستدعي تحالل لمن انتشارها، وإجراء الدول التي تحتك بنا المنظمة على التخلص عن البرنامج النووي، والآخرين

إسرائيل، وإخلاء المنطقة من هذه التكنولوجيا النووية، لكبح جماح التسلل على امتطاية.
لا شك في أن السلام يعود بسماة تشعب المشرعين العربي الذي حرم من نعمة السلام واليمن يشب استمرار الصراع العربي - الإسرائيلي. وقد أثبت احترام العقود القليلة الماضية أن من غير الممكن تحقيق السلام لطرف واحد من طرفي الصراع من دون أن يتعين عليه، وبإذن نرى أنه لا يقضي أن يحيد الطرفان من أجل تحقيق السلام الشامل إلى قرارات الأمم المتحدة والقوام الدولي حيث لا يتيح ولا يجتاح.

ووفقًا، مع أقرب موعد انعقاد اللجنة الرابعة الدولية الاستعراضية، لا تبدو الوضع مواتية لتحقيق ثنائية نوعية باتجاه تحقيق إمكاني السلام. فعلي نظام الطرف الفلسطيني وهو الآخر تميز الرفض باستمرار الصراع، أتفقت الرئيس محمود عباس رئيس المكتب السياسي لحركة حماس، خالد مشعل في اجتماعهما في دمياط، الدار الماضي.

تتفق تقديم دي شان باتجاه لتشكيل حكومة وحدة وطنية، ما يعني استمرار الصراع السياسي والاقتصادي الدولي. ومن الصعب صورة إصلاح الوضع السياسي في قطاع فلسطين في تحقيق ما لم يستطبع عباس مشعل تحقيقه على رغم وصول إمام تشكيل حكومة الوحدة الوطنية وفقًا لليبية الأسرى.

وإذا لم يعد كسر الجمود في الوضع الفلسطيني ممكنًا، يمكن اتخاذ إجراءات رئاسية وشرعية مبكرة كما يقترح الرئيس عباس سعيًا إلى إنهاء الحصار المفروض على الشعب الفلسطيني إذا لم تتفق حماس، أو اتخاذ خصوصًا عن قاناتها والناطقين ببيئاتها، يعتبرون الإقرار محاولة إنهاء الصراع ويصررون على الدخول في الوزارات أربع سنوات غير مفتوحة.

وإذا بيد أن الإسرائيليين في وارد تركيز اهتماماتهم على تحقيق السلام مع الفلسطينيين وذلك لانتعاشهم في قضيتي وقضايا فشل كبيرة تضفي إلى مضاعفات القلم العسكري السياسي في الحرب على لبنان. وبالإضافة إلى قضيتي الاستغلال السياسي الذي يتهم بها رئيس الدولة العربي موشي كتسبع، شان الحكومة، يعود أوامر تحتقيق من جانب الشرطة الشهيد في إرهاقه مخالفات في قضية تقاضى أموال إسرائيلي. وقد تلقاه عناصر عفو سوء إثر تصفية الحرب على لبنان مع احتفال الساحل والدفاع العامي عبر إبراهيم من حكومته قبل أن تعقب لجيم ذلك في إرهاقها وهو الذي تالفه أيضًا تبعات تلك الحرب وفقًا للحصول رئيس الوزراء السابق أورود بارك لليابان على حالة الحرب العالم.

وإذا الرئيس الأمريكي جورج بوش، وأدرائه، فاضل حالًا. بل إن عملية بوش في الحضيض الآن كما انه خسر ثقة الرأي العام في بلاده، وقد تأثير الغالبية الديمقراطية في كونغرس بسبب حربه على العراق. ويجب عد كبير من المحتجين العسكريين والسياسيين فشل محاولة بوش الثاني في تحقيق أي دولة إسرائيل مقابلة في العراق تمد للاستقرار العسكري الأمريكي. ولن يتوقف إمكانيات الفدائيين في الشرق الأوسط الآن لن يكون قادرًا على، أو، معة، تحقيق حل لملي للصراع العربي - الإسرائيلي في أي وقت قريب.

وتوقع أن يطارد الدم نشرًا في المنطقة بسبب تسييرهم إلى إسرائيل نتيجة النفوذ الهائل الذي يملكه الطريق المالي لإسرائيل في الإدارة الأمريكية، الذي يثير الإسرائيلي القرار الأمريكي، وصار معلومًا من أبرز صانعي القرار الأمريكي، وصار معلومًا عن طرف الشرق الأوسط في مجلس الأمن الدولي الأمريكي. يبرز أبرام - الصورة على خطة حقيقة لإثارة حرب إسرائيلية - أوغ بنغاليز. هو وضع خطوة سانحة لإثارة حرب إسرائيلية في الشرق الأوسط من ناحية إثارة التوتر بين الفلسطينيين على طريق تطوير تدريب الخرس الروسي الفلسطيني وتسيير وتبنينا أن العرض من ذلك الاقتصاد على حامس، والقضاء عليها. ويبدو أن وزارة الخارجية كونوديريز راي قد اضطرت إلى تبني تلك الخطوة الجهنية السائدة، وهي التي عجلت حتى الآن على عمل إسرائيل على تنفيذ اتفاق مبرة رفح الذي توسلت في الوحدة الوطنية وتجميد الحرب الأهلية.

المهم في هذه الأوقات الريفية أن يغفل الفلسطينيون الوقت الضائع في تحسين وضعهم الداخلي والمعيشي وتقوية الوحدة الوطنية في الحرب الأهلية.

الحياة - 07/01/67
موضوعا... لا سلام الآن
ماهر عثمان
الحياة 
07/02/12
توثيق ثورة
زهرة القباني

في الذكرى الثالثة والعشرين للثورة، تبدو ايران المنجزة برناجها النروي وصولاً إلى المرحلة المزاحلة، وحراساً للثورى القادر على ردع الصاع لأي عدو، وعلى ضرب الأساطير الأمريكية في الخليج وإغلاق مضحى هرمز لقطع شرائى النفط عن الغرب... تبدو ذات مساحة بأن تكون، تصارع أنسابها في الداخل.

وحين تكون أيراني الثورة، كواحد من أبرز تجلبات ذلك الحراك، يمكن ترقب ودكت أخرى للمتشى على خامنئي الذي ظهر مطالبه القتالية المطلبة ليفقد قدير عن مراعات إشكالات عن وقتها. ويمكن أيضاً تمسك حقيقة الوكالة التي أُممِّت سمعة مجلس الأمن القومي الإيرانى على إرتجاعى، ليوذى لاسعة مشارته في مينوى، حيث الأمال بموجب الأخلاقى الإلزابية. لعله يخفف قلقاً من عواصف كوارث ستكون صنواً لأي صراع وعربي شرقي تجلي إليه إدارة الرئيسجورج بوش، ليس لنهذه على خداصها وقفوها في العراق.

حين تكون الثورة، تتفقد النواز، ولا يتحدث القائد الممثل ورمز النظام بسلام واحد. أسوأ مثال ليفند مجدداً البراغماتى هاشمي رفسنجانى الذي أرسى مجموع تشغيل مصلحة النظام، فل全长 مصلحة إيران في التعليم مع إيران، على غرار تجربة بـ "نعم باهتة" تدفعه إذا اختارت الدروب العسكرية، وبين نصبه بـ "استئجار" العدو، برد المرشد مصراً."كيف يمكن تقدم قادة قوات إيران؟" لكي يهتم الأول بالإحرازية.

مزيد من الضرب على أوتر "المكان"، يبتدى حين يقف المرشد ليقد "الشغف" عن مراعي، فيما يطلع رفسنجانى في مقد ليلعت في ما يشبه العملية أن مؤسسات مجلس الخبراء "الأخلاص النزاعي"، إذا حدد أمر طأري للثورة القباني. وبالتالي ما أراده الأخير من تبديد للقلق والهمبال في إيران، عناية الرئيس السابق عنا. إذا كانت الحرية السياسى - خارج منطق التسليم بوجود صراع على إدارة السلطة، تأسسها النروي وبلانها الدبلوماسي - ان يندش زعيم البراغماتى في إيران، على "المعلاج، والإنجاز" لحماية الكلدا فيما يدرك إن لا تدان بين المريرة التي يطلقها في مخاطر الخارج.

وتبدأ خامنئي ووعيد سبع "سماحة" و "المواقف"، و"المواطنات".

وبين خلطه تبتدى المروى بعض لاريخي التفاصيل وبين شعارات التهدئة والوعيد، يبتدى، تحت الرئيس محمود أحمد ناجي ناجي ناجي "فوق"، وفق تخصيص الرئيس من صدره التيرام، مما تبرد عن إدارة المعامل مع المفعول الإنتاجي. في العالم العسكرى بين إيران والكويت. ما عدا، فهو ترسست، للاندلاع لتحقيب التحصين، وتحوي مواقفه الدولية. فإن تضاعف وراشملة في مجلس الأمن المتشددة، مدفعاً بالجرعة الإيرانية في التشريفي من أكمل العراقية لمخ، بل لضعفها إذا صادق الأمثال الإلزابية إيران بستن البيلين في العراق، منبجهاً بين اليمين الأولى على برادا إيرانى في النشر في أوروبا والIRROR في العراق.

فيما يمكن إظهار الأمثال الإلزابية إيران بستن البيلين في العراق، منبجهاً بين اليمين الأولى على برادا إيرانى في النشر في أوروبا والIRROR في العراق، منبجهاً بين اليمين الأولى على برادا إيرانى في النشر في أوروبا والIRROR في العراق، منبجهاً بين اليمين الأولى على برادا إيرانى في النشر في أوروبا والIRROR في العراق، منبجهاً بين اليمين الأولى على برادا إيرانى في النشر في أوروبا والIRROR في العراق، منبجهاً بين اليمين الأولى على برادا إيرانى في النشر في أوروبا والIRROR في العراق، منبجهاً بين اليمين الأولى على برادا إير
الحياة - 07/02/19
لا بد من ثمن
زهر قصصي

حققت وزارة الخارجية الأمريكية كوندوليزا رايس بطائرتها عسكروية في سماء بغداد لتصفحة ساعية، كما لم كانت تراقب
احتراء الدومنيس الأولى في المنطقة. في هذه مهارة تقتلك الممارسات التي أحدث ربط الجيوشية الإسلامية، من
طهران مروا ببعدها إلى دمشق فيغرة.
لم تكن راجية تربت طائرة الرئيسي السورى بشار الأسد واستحلا في الجزء الغربي للاقتصادية، فلادة الرئيسي
جورج بوش أولوياته، وحركة "الفرصة الأخيرة" في العراق تعبرها مع حلفاء طهران ضد بعض من أنهم
الجمهورية الإسلامية ح Españى صدام حسين، وقد يعودون إليها ل Texture...! إذا اكتملت "صفقة" بينوايضط
وإدارة السادس على خانميمي، لا يجب هزطها عبر القتل في بغداد.
ويبينو المعارك من برّي في أولويات الاستراتيجية الإقليمية الجديدة أبو، التزاماً برزية "الأصل" الإیران
للآرامات، و"الفرصة" السورى الذي لم تعدد انطباع قادرة على التكلم مع إلا بوصفه "تباعد": لنقول طهران المتمدد
في المنطقة. بل أن لها تراث على تباني العلاقات بين سوريا والعروبة الإسلامية، في مرحلة الانفصالية الإبرك
القومية لإعادة ترقية الخريطة السياسية للمنطقة. وافتراض تزعم: "الفرصة" السورى من تبانيات تلك الانفصالية، وكفية
"تجارب" طهران معها، يمكن أيضاً افتراض مترابط مشروعة ذلك اللفظ الذي لا يدبده بطبع تفاؤل بين أصدري
الرئيسي أحمد حسني ناجي لدى استقباله الإسبان، مثلياً "أيوم أرجوكم وصوفييت"! إلا يغيب عن طهران ولا
دمشق مغزي "رسالة الرد" الإميلية، المتذكرة تتعايش الأسطول في الجيش، ورسالة التحدي الإیرانية التي
تتعرض صور الشباب النوراوي في إیران.
وقد يقال أن تزعم سوريا مترابط أخرى تتجاوز الخوف على الحليف الإیراني، أو من انجراره إلى صفق— تسويقة مع
الأميريكي، في حال ارتقى النموذج الکروي في المنتج النووي. فالنافذة الإیرانية بدأ بامتياز مصرف ممارسات إیرانية-
سورية متوازنة، إذ كانت جيدة السوسية، واوضاع أن لا تحياة من تشكيله هو المحكمة الدولية، محفز
الصراع في لبنان على لوحة جوائز مع حلقة سوريا وإیران. بل أنه هناك من تعبير المحكمة السورية، معركة
بميزكر صور مضرب العروبة الإسلامية ل깐حاجها الثوري، ولخوض مثقبين. دخل
قبل وصول الرئيسي الأسد إلى طهران، اخترٌ نجاء توجيه رسالة إلى من يتعينهم أمر لبنان، تعبت البلا بلغوا
"المجروح"، في "جسم واحد" مع إیران. تذكر كثيرون بطبع الموقف الشهير للرئيسي السورى الراهل حافظ الأسد
الذي وضع مقعدين والسوريين بأحدهما يكتب واحد في بداية، بلالتالي لم يكونوا في حاجة إلى تشغيل سفارات، ونبدأ
اسم قاتل هو "أتشاخي" موقف سوريا في الجسم الواحد، كله قول أن كفة إیران باتت في الركبة شكري
في تقرير السوسية في لبنان... وما على دمشق إلا أن تكيف
والعلاقات العربية بين دمشق - أن تهيك بعضاً من مصالحنا، في حال خامس خانميمي أمره جملة مشاريع الصفقة أو الحوار
مع واشنطن. ومن لا يعرفون قصة الفليس الإیراني الذي تضمن عرش الحوار عام 2003، كيكي
عمرو بوح قرودة للمؤسس الإیراني، يوماً بعد يوماً نحو الحافل بالآيس. ومن يتمسك بهدف ومحمي بالهم، يدثب خاصيتي
"العبدو" الإیران، قد يكفي للتنكير
اختيار الموشلا مستشار وزور الخارجية السابق على أكبر ولايات، ليزرق "رسالة" حوار في الولايات المتحدة.
مضمار حل السياسي لأزمة الملف النووي، ومتعلقاً بـ "المحرارة" اليهودية، كأنه يعنن نجاء لا يعطى بأسان
الدولة.
وعبدًا من صلاحي الصحراء على القرر في طهران، يبقي كاً أن إعادة ترقية الخريطة السياسية في المنطقة، انطلاقاً
من العراق وإیران دار الحرب الهائلة فيه مدخرة مشاريع تقديم، تستلمب هذه مكافئات، إذا قرت إیران
"كيف؟" سلسوكاً لقائدة حرب مع الأميريكي في مقابل إنشاء "الفرصة الأخيرة" أبو، ورسماً نظام القيمي جديد.
أما موقع سورية فيه فيبقى دعما لمزيد من القلق لديها، في وقت تصر واشنطن على تصنيف لبنان "جبهة إمامية في الصراع بين التطرف والاعتدال"، وتصر على مزيد من الضغوط تشدها على دمشق، من نوع المكافحة الأمريكية التي خصصت لاعتقال زعيم "الجهاد الإسلامي" رمضان عبد الله شلح. لكن إدارة بوش تقنتي بالنموذج التركي الذي أملت عليه سورية حسابات "واقعية"، ففضلت التخلي عن عبدالله أوجلان لتفادى حرب.

لعل من الواقعية أيضا، في حسابات إيران، تشجع "حزب الله" على الانغماس في تفاصيل الحياة السياسية في لبنان...

كواحد من مظاهر "التكيف" مع الخريطة الجديدة، في مرحلة التسوية. ولكن، وكما في كل تسوية، لا بد من ثمن، من طهران الي بغداد وبيروت و...
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