CHAPTER SEVEN
LEVELS OF VARIATIONS BETWEEN ENGLISH AND ARABIC USE OF RST IN POLITICAL TEXT

7.1 Preliminaries
In the two preceding chapters, we have presented the results arrived for the English and Arabic use of RST relations in political editorials. In this chapter, the following findings will be discussed:

1. Variations at the Level of Rhetorical Relations Identified
2. Variations at the Level of Text's Segmentation Process
3. Variations at the Level of Connectives
4. Variations at the Level of Spans ordering
5. The Global Patterns of Rhetorical Organization found in the Data

7.2 Variations at the Level of Rhetorical Relations Identified
The examination of the structuring system of both corpora has revealed drastic similarity between the two languages. The 20 articles (English and Arabic) contain (520) RST relations in total, each corpus identify (260) Rhetorical relations. The predominance of Informational relations is intuitively clear in both corpora. (400) spans are structured around Informational relations, (200) spans for each corpus respectively. This clearly verifies hypothesis number (2) which states that Informational relations (real- world- describing) are of crucial importance in the process of creating political editorials.

Subject Matters or Informational relations are those whose intended effect is that the reader recognizes the relation in question. Thus, the pre-eminence of Informational relations in political text is not surprising since editorials generally intend to prepare the reader for the main issue by Elaborating, Interpreting, Contrasting, or Joining the material in the nucleus.
Presentational relations, on the other hand, obtained (120) spans; (60) spans for each corpus respectively. Data analysis has displaced one prominent RST relation, namely the *Concession* relation, which is identified in (60) spans (i.e., 11.6%). Presentational relations are inherently *intentional*, i.e., they intend to change the attitude of the reader towards the presented information in some way (increase regard, increase belief, increase approval of ideas, etc.).

Concerning the number and kinds of RST relations, the study indicates that there is a distinction among essential, common, near-common, and rare RST relations in the research articles under investigation. Both corpora identify ELABORATION, CONCESSION, and CIRCUMSTANCE as essential elements of political discourse as they appear in the majority of articles. The informational relation "CIRUMSTANCE" occurs equally often in the data set, indicating that spatial and temporal frameworks are both important elements of political text organization.

Arabic corpus distinguishes INTERPRETATION and JUSTIFICATION as essential RST relations because they constitute the majority of Arabic texts spans. However, English corpus identifies them as common RST relations. While CONTRAST and CONJUNCTION are essential RST relations in English editorials, they are common elements in Arabic corpus. In addition, JOINT seems to be essential element in Arabic text, but common one in English text. Yet, other RST relations, including VOLITIONAL CAUSE, BACKGROUND, and SEQUENCE are distinguished as near-common elements in the research data. Note that EVIDENCE and CONDITION are common elements in the English corpus, but near-common in the Arabic one.

The study further indicates that some RST relations are possible although rare in political editorials, among them, for example, DISJUNCTION, PREPARATION, SOLUTIONHOOD, OTHERWISE, UNCONDITIONAL, and
ANTITHESIS. While NON-VOLITIONAL RESULT, NON-VOLITIONAL CAUSE, and MEANS appear to be near common in Arabic corpus, they are rare in the English one. Similarly, VOLITIONAL RESULT, EVALUATION, and LIST are rare elements in Arabic corpus, but near common in the English one.

Four of the 32 extended RST relations, among them, for example, MOTIVATION, ENABLEMENT, SUMMARY, UNLESS and MULTINUCLEAR RESTATEMENT do not appear in the data set at all. These relations are generally not expected to appear in political editorials. For example, the absence of ENABLEMENT and MOTIVATION relations is anticipated. ENABLEMENT and MOTIVATION are typical relations of advertising texts in which the intention is to motivate and enable the reader to buy a product or service.

No significant differences between the two corpuses are found in the use of Informational relations. However, significant differences are found in the use of Presentational relations, in particular "CONCESSION" and "JUSTIFICATION". In the case of "CONCESSION" relation, significant differences are found between the Arabic and English corpuses at the levels of signalling and order of spans (see sections 7.3.2 and 7.4).

The analysis of the data shows that English uses a significantly higher proportion of adversative relations, "CONCESSION" and "CONTRAST", than Arabic. This could either be due to the fact that English uses the adversative relations more frequently than Arabic, or that English finds it more necessary to signal these relations overtly. In addition to that, Arabic lacks the RST taxonomy of adversative relations into "CONCESSION, "CONTRAST" and "ANTITHESIS". These relations correspond to only one Arabic relation, which is that of "أستدراك" [`istidrā k].
The analysis of "JUSTIFICATION" relation, on the other hand, shows that Arabic uses a significantly higher proportion of this relation than English does. Either this could be because Arabic uses the causal relations more frequently than English (which seems rather counter-intuitive) or that Arabic finds it more necessary to signal this relation than English does.

Note that the variant use of CONCESSION and JUSTIFICATION relations in both corpora clearly confirms what Hatim (1997) admits that Arabic argumentation is heavy on "through –argumentation" (heavy on presentation with thesis to be supported, substantiation, and conclusion) unlike Western argumentation, which is characterized by counter-arguments (thesis to be opposed, opposition, substantiation of counter-claim, and conclusion).

It is worth noting here that Arabic uses 'الآن' [li’anna], 'بسبب' [bīsabab], 'فّا' [fa] that are translated as "for" and "because" to signal "CAUSAL" relations. Applying RST on Arabic text, the researcher comes out with the result that these "connectives" signals both "JUSTIFICATION" and "VOLITIONAL CAUSE" relations. This clearly indicates subtle differences between the two languages in the use of these relations. For the moment, it is sufficient to observe that the "JUSTIFICATION" relation is subsumed under Arabic Causal relations, which are treated as Informational ones in Mann and Thompson's RST.
Figure (11): The occurrence of Rhetorical Relations in English and Arabic Political Texts
7.3 Variations at the Level of Text Segmentation

In performing the RST analysis of the 20 articles, a few difficulties emerged with respect to the segmentation of units, the classification into RST relations, and the constraints placed on the application of schemas in a RST structure. There are four constraints in the application of schemas in a RST structure (See Mann and Thompson, 1987: 7-8).

1. **Completeness:** The set contains one schema application that contains a set of text spans that constitute the entire text'.

2. **Connectedness:** Except for the entire text as a text span, each text span in the analysis is either a minimal unit or a constituent of another schema application of the analysis.

3. **Uniqueness:** Each schema application consists of a different set of text spans, and within a multi-relation schema, each relation applies to a different set of text spans.

4. **Adjacency:** The text spans of each schema application constitute one continuous text span.

7.3.1 The Segments into Units

This proved to be one of the most problematic areas of the research. The problem arises because of the difficulty of formally defining the written Arabic sentence in Arabic. In English, the written sentence always begins with a capital letter and ends with a full stop. However, even if a text is unpunctuated, sentences can usually be picked out. This is because English has a clear distinction between subordinating and coordinating conjunctions on the one hand and discourse adjuncts on the other. For example, without additional punctuation, two clauses cannot be joined by the discourse adjunct 'however' but they can be joined by the conjunction 'although'.
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None of these criteria is applicable to Arabic. There are no capital letters in Arabic, and punctuation is used very erratically. This combines with three other factors to make the formal definition of the Arabic written sentence impossible, if not misguided. Firstly, there is no clear distinction between subordinating and coordinating conjunctions on the one hand and discourse adjuncts on the other. This means that both 'although' and 'however' can be translated by the Arabic [ma za 'anna] "مع أن". Secondly, the Arabic "و " [wa] is used both as a coordinator and as a subordinator, and in places to hold clauses apart rather than to draw them together. Thirdly, in Arabic the indefinite relative clause is structurally independent of its containing clause. Thus, asyndetically linked clauses may be structurally related whereas syndetically related clauses need not be structurally related. Fourthly, preposed clauses introduced by words like [maça 'anna] "although", [lī 'anna] "because" etc., which might on semantic grounds, be considered dependent on a following main clause, are very rare. The only exception to this is the case of conditional clauses introduced by (إن) [in], (إذا) [idha] or "لـ” [law]. This means that the Arabic reader is very insensitive to formal subordination as it does not coincide in his/her experience with linear modification nor has it been reinforced by the influence of Greek or Latin grammar.

For the purpose of this study, the articles are segmented into distinct units of rhetorical relations. Generally, following Mann and Thompson (1987), independent, subordinate, and non-restrictive clauses are considered distinct units whereas embedded clauses are kept with the embedding phrase and subclausal constituents are not considered separate RST units. However, section (7.3.2) below presents a few instances in which this segmentation of RST units proved problematic.
In addition to unit segmentation stipulated above, we report here on a technique to segment the Arabic texts while respecting their semantic. The technique is based on connecting words (cue phrases) between sentences and clauses as Arabic writers in known literature usually use them (Touir, et al. 2008).

In spite of these guidelines, noun phrases are considered distinct RST units in two instances: noun phrases in apposition and noun phrases as part of a list. Appositive noun phrases are here seen as a reduced form of non-restrictive relative clauses and therefore considered distinct units. Noun phrases are also regarded as distinct units when they are part of a list specifically mentioned by the editor. In Art.2, text 7, span (1-2), for instance, the writer explicitly creates a list of three noun phrases (*An invasion that lacks a broad base of support in the Islamic community is likely to cause severe disruption and damage to the security, intelligence, law enforcement*) (and judicial cooperation that the U.S. government has built in Muslim countries since 2001.).

Consider also Art no.7, text no. 6, span (1-2)

*(Army Maj. Gen. George Fay, who investigated Abu Ghraib, wrote in his report that "CIA detention and interrogation practices led to a loss of accountability, abuse, reduced interagency cooperation," (and an unhealthy mystique that further poisoned the atmosphere.")*)

In the same way, Arabic articles treat noun phrases as distinct units when they are part of a list. In Art no.10, text no. 5, span (6-7), the writer creates a list of five noun phrases:

*(مع ازدياد البطالة، وعدم توفير الحد الأدنى من الخدمات، وغياب القانون، واستشراء الفساد، (وانخفاض المستوى الصحي والتعليمي في بلد كان يفخر بأنه في رأس قائمة بلدان العالم الثالث من حيث التعليم والصحة.)*}
Adding to that, the increase of unemployment, unavailability of the minimum services, absence of law, spread of corruption,\textsuperscript{5} and deterioration of health and education in a state that used to be proud of being on the top of the list of the third world states with regard to education and health.\textsuperscript{6}

A point to be noted here is that the researcher sometimes deviates from purely clausal unit segmentation when appropriate. Following Marcu (2000: 410) who states that "in the texts that I analyzed, I did not use an objective definition of elementary unit. Rather I relied on a more intuitive one: whenever I found that a rhetorical relation held between two spans of text of significant sizes …, I assigned those spans an elementary unit status, although in some cases they were not full-fledged clauses". Many linguists discuss problems of unit segmentation at length. Taboada and Mann point out that one method of unit segmentation may not be appropriate in all instances. For example:

Art no.3, text no.3, span (1-2)

(\textit{Mr. Bush also braced Americans for retaliatory attacks at home and abroad and assured them that security measures were being taken to protect them,})\textsuperscript{1} (including the deportation of "certain individuals with ties to Iraqi intelligence services" and higher security at airports and seaports.)\textsuperscript{2}

Art no.9, text no.4, span (3-4)

("It's a legal mess," says the official,)\textsuperscript{3} (citing uncertainty about the application of U.S. law for an alleged crime committed in Iraq, as well as the status of an Iraqi statute promulgated soon after the U.S. invasion designed to shelter contractors from prosecution.)\textsuperscript{4}
The reader can easily recognize, in both spans, that the second clause (S), which is "restrictive apposition", is "ELABORATION" as providing additional detail for N. R identifies the elements of subject matter (security measures) and "a legal mess" for which detail is provided.

Art no.7, text no.2, span (1-3)

(By dissociating potential criminal responsibility from overly aggressive interrogation practices that could be classified as "minor" breaches of the Geneva Conventions,)\(^1\) (and setting up a situation in which different interrogation practices can be used by our military and the CIA,)\(^2\) (our national leadership has ensured more abuse scandals.)\(^3\)

As it is known, "by" is a preposition, which expresses the meaning of "by means of". Following Mann and Thompson's segmentation technique, prepositional phrases are not considered separate RST units. However, the prepositional phrase (By dissociating potential criminal responsibility from overly aggressive interrogation practices that could be classified as "minor" breaches of the Geneva Conventions,)\(^1\) provides the method or instrument (in S) that tends to make realization of N more likely. That is, it identifies the rhetorical relation of "MEANS".

In the same way, the prepositional phrase "according to a Pentagon assessment of progress in Iraq released yesterday" constituents an EVIDENCE satellite that increases reader belief of N in

Art no.6, text no.1, span (2-3)

(but most of the nation's army battalions are able to fight with help from U.S. and coalition forces,)\(^2\) (according to a Pentagon assessment of progress in Iraq released yesterday.)\(^3\)

For more examples, see Art no.1, text no.6, Art no.5, text no.1, and Art no.6, text no.4.
Similarly, Arabic corpus presents some instances in which the segmentation of RST units proved problematic. Consider the following examples:

Art no.2, text no.12, span (5-6)

(واعتق صدام انه سيستطيع ان يبتلع هذه اللقمة)\(^5\) ( مقابل منح أمريكا كل ما تريد من امتيازات في المنطقة)\(^6\)

Saddam thought that he could occupy Kuwait (N) in return for giving America all the privileges it wanted in the region(S).

Art no.9, text no.12, span (3-4)

(ولكن هل ستتورط هذه القوات في حال حدوث حرب اهلية نتيجة لهذا الانقسام العراقي الاخطر والأكثر دموية)\(^3\) (في حال لجوء طرفيه او اطرافه الى السلاح والعنيف لحسم الوضاع؟)\(^4\)

Yet, will these forces get themselves involved in case a civil war takes place due to this Iraqi dissection, which is the most dangerous and bloody,(N) when the two parties resort to arms and violence to settle the conflicts?(S).

It is clear that the spans, indicated above, have no subtle elementary unit boundaries. Nevertheless, in both spans (5-6) and (3-4) respectively, the sense of "CONDITION" is intuitively obvious; making R recognize how the realization of N depends on the realization of S.

For additional examples, see, Art no.1, text no.12, Art no.2, text no.6, Art no.3, text no.2, and Art no.7, texts no. 1, 3, 4 &7.

7.3.2 Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses and Apposition as Continued RST Relations

Compliant with the unit segmentation guidelines stipulated above, non-restrictive clauses and apposition are always separated as distinct RST units. This created problems when these clauses modified final and non-final elements of a sentence (e.g., subjects). For example, in Art no.5, text no.2, span (1), a non-restrictive relative clause modifies the subject of a sentence and thus splits the main clause into two:
(Charles A. Duelfer, whom the Bush administration chose to complete the U.S. investigation of Iraq's weapons programs, said Hussein's ability to produce nuclear weapons had "progressively decayed" since 1991.)

(Inspectors, he said, found no evidence of "concerted efforts to restart the program.")

Rhe-rel (a-b & c of 1 Continued)
Rhe-rel (1-2 Evidence)
Moreover, in the same article, text no.10, span (1), a non-restrictive relative clause modifies the object of the preposition (the exhaustive report), and thus splits the main clause into two:

(Democrats seized on the exhaustive report, which comes amid a presidential race dominated so far by the Iraq war, to argue that the administration misled the American public about the risk Hussein posed and then miscalculated the difficulties of securing post-war peace.)

Rhe-rel (a-b of 1 Continued)
Rhe-rel (1-2 Purpose)

Figure (12): Non-Restrictive Clause as a Continued Relation
In the same way, non-restrictive apposition adds some information on the final and non-final elements of the main clause and as a non-restrictive relative clause splits the main clause into two units. Consider the following examples:

Art no. 6, text no. 5, span (1)

(Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), a member of the Armed Services Committee, b said it is "obvious that the training program is in trouble") c (and argued that the readiness evaluations of Iraqi forces should made be public.) d

Rhe-rel (a-b & c of 1 Continued)
Rhe-rel (1-2 Conjunction)

Art no. 8, text no. 4, span (2)

(But the war might have spun out of control even under wiser leadership.) e (Decisions that seem so obviously wrongheaded now, a such as disbanding the Iraqi army or deploying too few troops, b had smart people arguing both sides at the time.) c 2

Rhe-rel (1-2 Concession)
Rhe-rel (a-b & c of 2 Continued)

Figure (13): Non-Rrestrictive Apposition as a Continued Relation
To address this issue, a multinuclear pseudo-RST relation called CONTINUED is created. CONTINUED does not constitute a real RST relation; rather it indicates that one RST unit is split into several parts. Hence, the pseudo-units a,b and c in span (1) in Art. No.5, indicated above, constitute one real RST unit (see also Art.1, text.2, Art.2, text.10, Art.5, texts. 4, 8, and 10, Art.6, texts. 5 & 7, Art.7, text 6, Art.8, texts. 4 & 9, and Art.10, text.10 for additional examples).

Likewise, the Arabic articles have also identified non-restrictive relative clauses and apposition as CONTINUED relations. For example, the N of the rhetorical relation CONTRAST in Art no.1, text no.10, span (1) has the pseudo relation of CONTINUED (the underlined italic sentence)

Moreover, we see the US Administration, and especially Bush, decide to officially appoint a super racist, Daniel Pipes, who hates and resents the Arabs and Muslims, as a member of the Board of Trustees of the American Institute for Peace. He ignores the Senate, which is supposed to approve each member in the Board of Trustees.
Moreover, we see the U.S. administration, and especially Bush, decide to officially appoint a super racist Daniel pipes as a member of the board of trustees of the American institute for peace.

Who hates and resents the Arabs and Muslims He ignores the senate, which is supposed to approve each member in the Board of trustees

Figure (14): Non-Restrictive clause as a Continued Relation in Arabic

In addition, the non-restrictive apposition, which is contained in the satellite of the BACKGROUND relation in Art no. 9, text no. 8, span no. 3, has the pseudo relation of CONTINUED:

Is it the US stupidity, Iranian cunning, Arab shortsightedness, Israeli slyness, or all these together? All what we know is that Iran, which is the arch-enemy of America and the main rival to its dominance of the oil and its exports and reserves, has been the biggest winner until now.

For more examples, see Art no.7, text no.7, and texts. 4, 9, 10, 12&13 of Art no. 9.
7.3.3 Multiple RST Relations

Regarding the classification of units, it is further found that some spans permit multiple simultaneous RST relations. The current study revealed some instances in which the same span could be expressed with different rhetorical relations. This clearly weakens the "uniqueness" constraint, which stipulates that each schema application consists of a different set of text spans, and within a multi-relation schema, each relation applies to different sets of text span (Mann and Thompson 1987: original emphasis).

In Art no.1, text no.5, for instance, *(The resolution is ambiguous on the question of force.)*\(^1\) *(It does not give explicit approval for war, but neither does it require a second resolution to authorise military action.)*\(^2\), the span (1-2) permits two rhetorical relations INTERPRETATION and ELABORATION, generalization: specific.

Similarly, the S (unit 3) of span (2-3) in Art no. 2, text no.10, can be seen as a NON-VOLITIONAL RESULT or an INTERPRETATION for N (unit 2) as follows:

*(In addition to weakening this work, a unilateral invasion of Iraq would strengthen the popularity of Islamist political parties at the expense of moderate groups.)*\(^2\) *(This would make it easier for terrorist groups to operate.)*\(^3\)

Likewise, the S (unit 1) of span (1-2) in Art no.10, text no. 11, could be seen as a JUSTIFICATION or EVIDENCE for N (unit 2) as follows:

*(A January report to Congress by the Pentagon said that as of last fall, 17 of the Iraq Army's 174 combat battalions were capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations without American support.)*\(^1\) *(All of Iraq's army is dependent on the American military for intelligence, logistics and air support.)*\(^2\)
Moreover, in Art no. 9, text no. 2, (A Washington, D.C., grand jury is currently hearing evidence involving one of the episodes.)¹ (The first of the two incidents occurred on Christmas Eve 2006, when a reportedly drunk Black water staffer allegedly killed an Iraqi guard inside Baghdad's Green Zone.)² (The second occurred on Sept. 16, 2007, when Black water guards protecting a vehicle convoy may have killed as many as 17 Iraqis in a fire fight.)³, the satellites (spans 2&3) of the ELABORATION relation could signal the rhetorical relation of "CIRCUMSTANCE" as follows:

(The first of the two incidents occurred on Christmas Eve 2006,)¹ (when a reportedly drunk Black water staffer allegedly killed an Iraqi guard inside Baghdad's Green Zone.)² (The second occurred on Sept. 16, 2007,)³ (when Black water guards protecting a vehicle convoy may have killed as many as 17 Iraqis in a fire fight.)⁴

Rhe-rel (1-2 Circumstance)
Rhe-rel (3-4 Circumstance)

For more examples, see Art no.6, text no. 4. The S (unit 2) in span (1-2) could be segmented into two spans to express CONJUNCTION.

Arabic articles, in line with the English ones, obtained spans that yield multiple RST relations. Consider the following examples from Art no. 2, text no.1 and Art no. 3, text no. 4, spans (1-2) respectively. In both spans, the satellite (unit 2) can be seen as a JUSTIFICATION or an INTERPRETATION for nucleus (unit1). INTERPRETATION is a subject matter relation whereas JUSTIFICATION is a presentational relation.
In the modern history of the Arabs, the dark days are countless. The last century has witnessed a series of defeats, disasters, calamities, and setbacks since the West occupied and exploited this area of the world.

We hope that the Iraqi politicians pass over the concept of extirpation in their country. The photos of Saddam’s execution have established a serious and sectarian logic that uncovered the extent of the vengeance the supporters of the new Iraq project carry for the Arab national project in the Mesopotamia.

Moreover, in Art no. 9, texts no. 9, span (1-2), the satellite (unit 2) could be a JUSTIFICATION or a VOLITIONAL CAUSE for the nucleus (unit 1):

Ironically, Dr. Iyad Allawi, Washington’s closest ally among the Iraqi politicians and the most effective factor in the plans of ousting the previous regime, is the only one who has not been invited to visit Tehran. This could be attributed to the fact that he is the most prominent secular who has won the majority in the last elections with the votes of the Sunnis.

It must be emphasized here that the spans that yield multiple rhetorical relations could be spans of two units (i.e., N-S or S-N) or a span of only one unit (i.e., N or S). The following examples will clear this:
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(Clearly, we were insufficiently skeptical of intelligence reports.)¹
(It would almost be comforting if Mr. Bush had "lied the nation into war," as is frequently charged.)²
Rhe-rel (1-2 Solutionhood)

Note that the N (span 2) of the SOLUTIONHOOD relation, as identified above, yields the informational relation of "CONDITION" as follows:

(It would almost be comforting)¹ (if Mr. Bush had "lied the nation into war," as is frequently charged.)²
Rhe-rel (1-2 Condition)

Consider also Art no.1, text no. 5, span (1-2).
(The resolution is ambiguous on the question of force.)¹
(It does not give explicit approval for war, but neither does it require a second resolution to authorise military action.)²

The reader can easily recognize that the second span (unit 2) of the INTERPRETATION relation can be further segmented into two alternative units to signal the multinuclear relation of "DISJUNCTION" as follows:

(It does not give explicit approval for war,)¹ (but neither does it require a second resolution to authorise military action.)²
Rhe-rel (1-2 Disjunction)

Arabic corpus also identifies such spans that permit different rhetorical relations. Consider the following span:

Art no.9, text no. 2, spans (3-4)
(وعندما انفضحت هذه الاكذوبة بالدلائل العملية،)³ (رفعوا شعارات الديمقراطية وحقوق الإنسان لتبرير غزوهم، واحتلال بلد، وقتل مليون من إبنائه، وتشريد أربعة ملايين طفل، وتهجير حوالي ثلثي هذا الرقم على الأقل إلى دول الجوار، أو داخل العراق نفسه.)⁴
When that lie was made clear with practical evidence,^3 they raised the slogans of democracy and human rights to justify their invasion, occupying a state, killing a million people, orphaning 4 million Iraqi children and displacing nearly two-thirds of that number to the neighboring states or inside Iraq.^4

The N (unit4) of the CIRCUMSTANCE relation, as identified in the data, permits the multinuclear relation of "LIST" as follows:

(they raised the slogans of democracy and human rights to justify their invasion, occupying a state, killing a million people, orphaning 4 million Iraqi children)^1 (and displacing nearly two-thirds of that number to the neighboring states or inside Iraq.)^2

Rhe-rel (1-2 List)

Moore and Pollack (1992) argue that the belief of RST in a single relation between consecutive discourse units is problematic and the cause for much of the ambiguity surrounding RST analyses. They suggest that a subject matter and a presentational RST relations may simultaneously relate discourse units. Taboada and Mann (2005) also concede that multiple relations may hold in certain situations. Unit 2 in Arabic Arts.no 2 & 3, indicated above, may be a case in point that on a presentational level, it provides a justification for unit 1 and on a subject matter level, it interprets unit 1. For the sake of simplicity, only one rhetorical relation is considered in this study.
7.3.4 The Adjacency Constraints

A third difficulty in carrying out the RST analysis is related to the adjacency constraint, which essentially stipulates that a relation’s nucleus and satellite must be adjacent text spans. This adjacency constraint proved problematic in Art no.1, texts no. 4&8, Art no. 2, text no. 10, Art no.4, text no. 2, Art no. 6, text no. 5, Art no.7, texts no. 2&3, Art no. 8, texts no.1&10, and Art no. 9, text no. 2. Consider the following examples:

(Art no.1, text no. 8, span (1-3)
(Even if the inspectors decide that the warheads are insignificant,)\(^1\) (Iraq would remain under extreme pressure.)\(^2\) (America will point to the discovery of undeclared chemical munitions as another example of Iraq's "pattern" of non-compliance.)\(^3\)
Rhe-rel (1-3) Concession

(Art no.2, text no. 10, span (4-6)
(Islamist propaganda has already identified the United States as the main enemy and sensitized Muslims in their Middle East and Asian heartlands,)\(^4\) (as well as Muslim migrant communities in North America, Europe and Australia.)\(^5\) (An invasion of Iraq would give a new lease on life to existing and emerging terrorist groups.)\(^6\)
Rhe-rel (4-6 Interpretation)

(Art no. 6, text no. 6, span (1-5)
(Pentagon officials said they have no intention of releasing specific information about the progress of Iraqi troops)\(^1\) (because they fear it would give insurgents an advantage.)\(^2\)(They said there are 171,300 troops trained and equipped.)\(^3\) (Many of those forces are in the early stages of development.)\(^4\) ("The enemy's knowledge of such details would put both Iraqi and coalition forces at increased risk," the report said.)\(^5\)
Rhe-rel (1-5 Volitional Cause)
Likewise, Arabic Articles reveal the use of non-adjacent spans as in the following examples:

Art no. 4, text no. 1, spans (1-3) and (1-4)

(بلاد الرافدين مولد أول الحضارات،) (١) (حيث اختراع أول حرف وأول عجلة وأول قانون،) (٢) ومن هنا بدأت السياسة وعرف الإنسان الآلة ونظم الزراعة والري وحرث الأرض، (٣) ومن هنا بدء العلم الحديث وتعلم الناس الكيمياء والفيزياء والرياضيات وعلم الفلك.) (٤)

Mesopotamia is the origin of the first civilization. (١) The place witnessed the invention of the first letter, the first wheel, and the first law. (٢) It is where politics first started, and man first knew machines, farming, irrigation, and blowing systems. (٣) It is here where modern science started, and people learnt chemistry, physics, mathematics, and Astronomy. (٤)

Rhe-rel (1-3 Circumstance)
Rhe-rel (1-4 Circumstance)

Art no. 5, text no. 5, span (1-3)

(فهناك من يجد في غزارة القوات الأمريكية فرصة سانحة للاعتماد على الذات،) (١) (والتأي بالعراق بعيدا عن الاعتماد على الولايات المتحدة،) (٢) (ابتداء من إعادة النظر في التوازنات السياسية القائمة، ومراجعة أغلب ما تم الاتفاق عليه مسبقا،وكترميم المؤسسات الدستورية، أو تعديل النهج المتبوع في أدارة الدولة.) (٣)

Rhe-rel (1-3 Elaboration, process: step))

Some people find the US Forces pullout as an opportunity for self-defense (١) and for taking Iraq away from depending on the USA. (٢) This starts with reconsidering the current political balances and reviewing most of what was agreed upon previously, such as rehabilitating the constitutional institutions or reforming the system followed in administering the state. (٣)
The most important reconciliation, which Obama has promised to achieve between America and the Islamic World, is, however, the one which has been aborted. In fact, the reconciliation remained a cell and has never been developed into an embryo. This is due to the long-standing feud between the US administration and everything that is Arab or Muslim.

For more examples, see Art no. 5, text no. 5, span (1-3), Art no. 9, text no. 13, span (1-4), and Art no.10, text no.9; span (1-3).

Accordingly, the non-adjacent units are rhetorically related. Knott et al. (2001) discuss similar cases and maintain that parallelism in discourse structure is particularly problematic for RST’s adjacency constraint. Despite the violation of the adjacency constraint, the articles indicated above are coherent texts (although arguably, a restructuring of the discourse units would make the article even more coherent). RST should therefore allow for non-adjacent RST relations.

7.3.5 The Connectedness Constraints

Regarding the segmentation of units into nucleus-satellite and multinuclear, it is further found that this form-based definition of units does not always meet the requirements of a symmetric -based analysis such as RST. The current study revealed some instances in which the same span (one RST unit) has double functions. In other words, the segmented span (one RST unit) could be nucleus and satellite at the same time. This is clearly manifested in Arabic corpus more than in English one. And this is attributed
to the fact that Arabic lacks clear-cut boundaries between subordinate and coordinate units on the one hand and discourse adjuncts on the other. Arabic, as researchers (Arabs and non-Arabs) have frequently claimed it, is a language that favors coordination at the expense of subordination. Consider the following spans:

**Art.no.1, text no.12, span (4)**

Bush is trying to appoint such persons in the cultural fields and scientific institutions. This is a bad omen that indicates Bush does not seek peace, but rather he intends to go on using “terrorism to achieve political and personal objectives, and probably rather ideological objectives.”

**Art no. 2, text no.2, span (2)**

It is possible to say that 15 May 1948, the date in which Palestine was occupied, has been the worst day for the plight of the Arabs. Palestine was lost, and it was somewhat like another Andalusia. Yet, it was in the heart of the Arab homeland and not in Europe and Spain.

In both texts, units (4&2) respectively could be satellites for the antecedent nucleus (units3&1) to express INTERPRETATION; and nucleus for the following satellite (units 3&5) to signal CONCESSION.
Irrespective of the electoral rights,¹ the Kurds and the Islamic Supreme Council keep on imposing a reality that is difficult to deny on the ground.² They are two of the most prominent founders of the political process in post-9-April Iraq.³ Moreover, they have militias that have years of experience during the former regime, such as Peshmerga and Badr Organization.⁴

According to the analysis of the above indicated text, span (1-2) signal the presentational relation "CONCESSION". Unit (3) has multiple functions; S that relates N (unit 2) to a framework of ideas not involved in the knowledge presented in N itself to signal INTERPRETATION, and N to form (with unit 4) a multinuclear relation of JOINT.

For more examples see Art no.1, text no.10, span (3), Art no.2, text no.6, span (5), Art no.9, text no.7, span (3), and Art no.10, text no.8, span (3).

English articles, on the other hand, rarely reveal spans, which could be N and S at the same time. This is because English has a clear distinction between subordinating and coordinating conjunctions on the one hand and discourse adjuncts on the other. However, this structure can be found in non-marked RST relations. For example, in Art no.7, text no.5, *(Our military and civilian intelligence agencies do not operate in mutually exclusive bubbles.)*¹ (A great deal of interaction occurs as military units capture suspected personnel, hand them over to interested agencies and, often, witness the interrogations.)², span (1-2) signals the informational relation of "INTERPRETATION". Unit (2) of this span can be segmented into two units to signal the rhetorical relation of "LIST" as follows:
(A great deal of interaction occurs as military units capture suspected personnel, hand them over to interested agencies\(^1\) (and often, witness the interrogations.)\(^2\)

Moreover, in text no. 4 of the same article, *(The interrogation abuses could be linked to three main areas of breakdown:) \(^1\) (confusion in the military ranks about what was acceptable behavior, given the conduct of civilian contractors and "other governmental agencies");\(^2\) (migration of certain techniques within the intelligence community without an understanding of how to implement them properly);\(^3\) (and exploitation of the ambiguity in apparently innocuous interrogation tactics.)\(^4\) the satellites (units 2, 3, and 4) of the ELABORATION relation could be segmented into comparable linked items (multinuclear units) to signal a LIST relation as follows:

*(The interrogation abuses could be linked to three main areas of breakdown: confusion in the military ranks about what was acceptable behavior, given the conduct of civilian contractors and "other governmental agencies”; migration of certain techniques within the intelligence community without an understanding of how to implement them properly; (and exploitation of the ambiguity in apparently innocuous interrogation tactics.)\(^1\) (and exploitation of the ambiguity in apparently innocuous interrogation tactics.))\(^2\)

For more examples, see Art no. 8, text no.9; span (2).

The observation that one span of the text plays a central and supporting roles with antecedent and following spans often been promulgated in the analysis of the data set under investigation. This multi-functional spans add to the definition of "connectedness" constraint which stipulates that, according to RST, each text span in the analysis is either a minimal unit or a constituent of another schema application of the analysis.
7.4 Variations at the Level of Connectives
Having divided the texts into units on the basis described above, we can see
that discourse often contains linguistic devices that facilitate the signalling of
RST relations. Linguistic devices are supporting evidence to the cognitive
activity of deducing the relations. Connectives are apparent means whereby
textual relations can be signalled to the reader/hearer. However, some texts
may not involve explicit devices to express functional relations between text
segments. In such cases, the reader needs to infer RST relations. We thus
conclude that Mann and Thompson were wrong in their claim that
connectives serve merely to constrain rhetorical interpretation, but right in
observing that there are a considerable number of connectives operate
"loosely". In other words, connectives are not always informative about their
underlying rhetorical relations (see section 2.6).

What Mann and Thompson did not pay attention to is the sliding nature of
the relationship that exists between the linguistic sign used and the semantic
nature of the underlying clause relation? They state that two clauses are
related because of their semantics irrespective of the connective that joins
them, or the lack of one. In fact, a connective can do more than signal a
preexisting clause relation or highlight one element of a complex clause
relation. This is important because it gives the basis for an important cross-
language measure, the degree to which clause relations are overtly signalled.
It is also important as a source of the constantly sliding relationship between
form and meaning.

It needs to be emphasized here that Presentational relations in general except
"CONCESSION" are not signalled. Presumably, their illocutionary nature
makes it easy to infer the coherence of these relations and the relations
themselves without any need for overt cues. By comparison, Arabic uses
"لَأَن"[lī‘anna], "فَ"[fa] and "لَ"[li] to signal "JUSTIFICATION" relation and "قد"
[qi‘ad], "بل"[bal] to occasionally signal "EVIDENCE".
Informational relations, on the other hand, are in general signalled with the exception of "ELABORATION", "INTERPRETATION", "EVALUATION", and "SOLUTIONHOOD". These relations tend to be unsignalled because they are readily inferrable. However, there are connectives that signal each of "ELABORATION" and "INTERPRETATION" in Arabic. For example, [bikalimatin‘ auxrā] (in other words), [açni] (I mean to say), ["ay] (that is to say), [mithalu dhālika], [mathalan] (for example), [mithalu al-mithal] (for instance), [şal wajh al-xuṣuş] (particularly), [xaṣatan] (in particular), and [haithu].

It appears that the total number of connectives used in the two languages varies only minimally. However, the number of connectives used with multiple functions is consistently larger in the Arabic corpus than the English one.

7.4.1 English Connectives

The connective "But" normally expresses "CONTRAST ". Mann and Thompson (1987) define it as connecting two nuclei; the situations in these two nuclei are (a) comprehended as the same in many respects (b) comprehended as differing in a few respects and (c) compared with respect to one or more of these differences. However, the data analysis reveals instances in which "but" is used to signal the presentational relation "CONCESSION". "But" expresses the notion of "CONCESSION" when it is roughly equivalent to "this is at least true".

"BUT" as a connective of "CONTRAST" as in

(Al Qaeda operatives have traveled in and out of Baghdad,)⁵ (but there is no evidence of state sponsorship.)⁶ Art no.2, text no.3, span (5-6)
(Iraqi security forces are not yet ready to defend their country on their own against a stubborn insurgency,)^1 (but most of the nation's army battalions are able to fight with help from U.S. and coalition forces.)^2 Art no.6, text no.1, span (1-2)

(The risks of war with North Korea or Iran are evident;)^1 (but the cost of leaving nuclear weapons in the hands of a Mahmoud Ahmadinejad or a Kim Jong Il may not become evident until the price has been paid.)^2 Art no.8, text no.11, span (1-2)

(Still, Mr. Obama has a high-level adviser for Afghanistan and Pakistan, for Middle East peace negotiations, and for Iran,)^3 (but there is no marquee name for Iraq to ensure that the president and the bureaucracy are fully engaged.)^4 Art no.10, text no.7, span (3-4)

"BUT" as a connective of "CONCESSION"
(But the war might have spun out of control even under wiser leadership.)^1 (Decisions that seem so obviously wrongheaded now, such as disbanding the Iraqi army or deploying too few troops, had smart people arguing both sides at the time.)^2 Art no.8, text no.4, span (1-2)

(Violence is down,)^3 (but extremists are still trying to spark a new cycle of attacks and retaliation.)^4 Art no.10, text no.5, span (3-4)

(We understand that for political reasons, in both countries, the United States cannot be seen to micro-manage events.)^1 (But there are still many problems that need sustained and high-level American attention.)^2 Text no.8, span (1-2)
"AND" as a connective of "CONJUNCTION" and "JOINT"

Art.no.6, text no.2, span (1-2 Conjunction)
(The 23-page report was presented to Congress as a detailed review of where the war in Iraq stands,)\(^1\) (and much of the document argued that economic, political and security indicators are heading in the right direction.)\(^2\)

Art.no.8, text no.8, span (7-8 Joint)
(It must not be left to the generals in the field.)\(^7\) (And it must assume, based on experience from Germany to Korea to Afghanistan that a U.S. commitment, once embarked upon, will not soon be over.)\(^8\)

"OR" as a connective of "DISJUNCTION" and "OTHERWISE"

Art no.1, text no.2, span (2-3 Disjunction)
(Do the warheads point to the existence of a secret stock of chemical agent,)\(^2\)
(or are they a quartermaster's oversight?)\(^3\)

Art no.3, text no.1, span (1-2 Otherwise)
(President George Bush last night gave Saddam Hussein and his sons 48 hours to give up power and go into exile)\(^1\) (or face invasion by more than a quarter of a million US and British troops massed on Iraq's borders.)\(^2\)

"SO" as a connective of "VOLITIONAL RESULT " and "PURPOSE"

Art no.8, text no.2, spans (7-9 and 8-9 Volitional Result)
(The cost in lives, injuries and dislocations, to Americans and Iraqis, has been tragic ;)\(^7\) (the opportunity costs for U.S. leadership globally have been immense.)\(^8\) (So there is an obligation to reassess.)\(^9\)

Art no.10, text no.12, span (3-4 Purpose)
(The United States is also going to have to help Iraq build an air force and a navy)\(^3\) (so it can defend its own borders.)\(^4\)
"FOR" as a connective of "JUSTIFICATION", "PREPARATION" and "VOLITIONAL CAUSE"

Art no.2, text no.2, span (1-2 Justification)

(Al Qaeda is growing.)¹ (For every Al Qaeda and Taliban member captured or killed in Afghanistan, the group has been able to recruit another one or two members.)²

Span (3-4 Preparation)

(For every terrorist support cell detected and disrupted, even in Europe,)³ (Al Qaeda has been able to establish a new cell to disseminate propaganda, raise funds and recruit.)⁴

Art no.6, text no.3, span (1-2 Volitional Cause)

(Senior Democrats in the House and Senate assailed the report)¹ (for discussing details of the readiness of Iraqi security forces only in classified annexes, which they said keeps the public in the dark about the status of the war.)²

7.4.2 Arabic Connectives

"و " [wa] "and": The conjunctive particle [wa] is the most generally used connective in Arabic. It is multi-functional; it can be coordinating and adversative to signal "CONJUNCTION", "JOINT" and "CONTRAST" as indicated in the following spans:

Art no.2, text no.8, span (3-4 Conjunction)

(وفي نفس الوقت عبرت الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية عن رضا عميق تجاه نتيجة هذه الحرب)³ (و عن مبادرة غير مباشرة للدور الذي قام به النظام العراقي لتحجيم إيران)⁴

At the same time, America expressed its deep relief concerning the result of that war¹ and wa indirectly blessed the role played by the Iraqi regime to curb Iran.²
In 2005, Iraq turned to be a democratic system through the passing of the 2005 Constitution that is not free of confusion for sectarian allocations. And it is ludicrous that even oil imports are to become democratic!

Dissection returned back: between those who forgot Saddam’s crimes and consider him a righteous and martyr only because he was executed in a questionable manner that had different justifications, and wa others who considered him a criminal who deserved to be treated in a manner that no other human deserved.

"لكن" [la:kinna] or [la:kin] as a connective of "CONCESSION", and "CONTRAST". This connective is translated either as "but" or "however" as indicated in the following spans:

The Iraq-Iran war, which lasted for 8 years and exhausted both Iran and Iraq and weakened the region, was, therefore, an early start that revealed the initial features of the US scheme. The Iraqi occupation of Kuwait in 1990, however la:kin, put that scheme to the direct test, as we all know now very well.
Blair indicated that the justification to going to war for both USA and Britain was not the increase in the capacities of Saddam’s regime, but the change in the concept of danger for both states.

"آن" [li’anna]² translated as "for" and "because" to signal "JUSTIFICATION" and "VOLITIONAL CAUSE" as follows:

As mentioned above, the matching attitudes of Iraq and America to strike Iran did not mean that America was concerned with helping Saddam to achieve his ambitions to gain power and superiority, for li’anna it was only concerned with achieving its interests by exhausting and weakening everybody.

Saddam did not realize that the Gulf States assumed that position because li’annaha they had suffered from the greed of the Iranian regime at the time of the Shah;
"فَ" [fa] "then", "therefore", "for" etc. This connective, according to some linguists is called the "particle of classification". 'Fa' is a multi-functional connective; it is used to signal "SEQUENCE", "JUSTIFICATION", "VOLITIONAL and NON-VOLITIONAL RESULTS or CAUSES" and occasionally "INTERPRETATION"

Art no.3, text no.3, span (8-9 Sequence)

But after years of bloodshed and tens of thousands of casualties, it was realized that the only policy that would save the country was real conciliation, dialogue and political sharing. The situation, then fa, calmed down and improved until the dawn break in Algiers.

Art no.9, text no.5, span (3-4 Non-Volitional Result)

When that backfired, America wanted to correct its mistake in the second elections. the results were, therefore fa, more catastrophic, or that is what we think.

Art no.8, text no.3, span (1-2 Justification)

Blair tried to clear himself by emphasizing that his decision was correct for fa Iraq now was better than it used to be under the reign of Saddam who tried to threaten the international peace.
Blair warned against the danger that threatened the world represented by Iran and its attempts to develop nuclear weapons. The present Iranian regime is more dangerous than Saddam Hussein’s Iraq.

"أو" ['aw] ‘or', "أم" ['am] ‘or’, both signal the RST relation of "DISJUNCTION" in the following examples:

and whether they were hidden intentions to lay a trap for the Iraqi regime to fall in the abyss of occupying Kuwait, or that America waited until Saddam fell in the trap by himself.

Will Obama’s responsible decision be studied in a manner that actually ensures the stability and security of Iraq? Or will it be equal to Bush’s decision when he decided to sweep Iraq with a responsibility nearer to absurdity than organization, a matter that cost Iraq more than can be explained?
"بَلّ" [bal] as a connective of "EVIDENCE" and "CONCESSION"

Art.no.3, text no.2, span (6-7 Evidence)

ويطارد أهلها من أبناء بلدهم٦ (بل [bal] ويطلب البعض من زعماء العراق من أمريكا البقاء إلى حين.)٧

This is the first time in history in which the resisting people are pursued by their own people.٦ In fact bal, some Iraqi leaders ask America to stay in Iraq for a period of time.٧

Art.no.4, text no. 4, span (6-7 Concession)

والعراق لم يكن خارج إطار النظام الديمقراطي في التاريخ الحديث والمعاصر.٦ (بل [bal] هناك)٧

Iraq was not away form Democratic systems in the modern and contemporary history.٦ In fact bal, there was Royal Constitutional Democratic system according to 1925 constitution.٧

"ل" Ilām, [li], this connective is used to indicate the purpose for which, or the reason why, a thing is done; and hence Arab grammarians take it to stand in all cases for fuller لأن [li'ana] or لكي [likay]. لأن [li'anna] signals "JUSTIFICATION" whereas لكي [likay] signals "PURPOSE". It is also used to occasionally indicate "NON-VOLITIONAL RESULT".

Art.no.8, text no.4, span (8-9 Purpose)

وكأنه يطالب واشنطن وإسرائيل بالقيام بهجوم عسكري على إيران٨ (ليممها [limanča] من تطوير برنامجها النووي.)٩

He (Blair) looks as if he demands Washington and Israel to lounge a military attack against Iran٨ to li prevent it from developing its nuclear program.٩
The weakest point in this equation is represented by the Sunni parties, who have been exhausted by the current violence that has swept their cities since the beginning of changing the last regime. They have become, therefore li, the first to go out of the struggle, though indirectly.

The engineers of the last war against Iraq, the neo-conservatives and their supporters and affiliates – the Arabs in particular, used the pretext that Iraq owned WMD to justify li their aggression.

7.5 Variations at the Level of Spans Ordering

Under a text semiotic perspective, the canonical order of text spans can be related to the semiotic parameter of “iconicity” (Dressler 1989, 2000, who relies on Peirce’s differentiation between iconic, indexical and symbolic signs). Thus, in the case of an "EVIDENCE" or "ELABORATION" relation it is more iconic to present an assumption or statement first (i.e., the nucleus) and to provide evidence or further elaborations (i.e., satellite(s)) afterwards, whereas in the case of a "JUSTIFICATION" relation it is more iconic to present the premises (i.e., the satellites) first and then draw a conclusion(cited in Gruber and Muntigl, 2003: 86). Despite this "iconicity", some strong patterns of ordering particular rhetorical relations have become evident in text analysis done so far. The researcher presents them here as strong tendencies rather than as constraints.
The empirical analysis of both corpora shows that most RST relations follow the canonical order as presented by Mann and Thompson (1987:17), in particular, the nucleus-satellite patterns. The variation happens at the satellite-nucleus pattern of such relations; "CONCESSION", "JUSTIFICATION", "BACKGROUND", "ANTITHESIS" and "SOLUTIONHOOD" (see sections 5.5 and 6.5 for more details).

The empirical analysis of Arabic text shows that "JUSTIFICATION" and "CONCESSION" are the most RST relations that have strong tendency towards a "canonical order" of nucleus–satellite patterns. This is ascribed to the positions of connecting words⁵ that signal these relations in Arabic text (see section 3.7.1). Cantarino (1975: 45) writes:

\[\text{wa la:kinna}\] actually precedes the sentence without having any ties which might structurally connect the particle with the sentence. Hence, Arabic may use this particle to introduce clauses in adversative relationship to the preceding situation or statement, even in cases when the subordinate precedes the main clause. In the instance, the main clause is introduced by the conjunctive [\text{fa}] or, at times, also by [\text{wa}].

Consider the following spans:

Art no.2, text no.6, span (1-2)

We cannot claim that we know the specific scenario;¹ however \text{wa la:kinna}, the vagueness and the mysteries that surrounded Iraq for the last 35 years, including the secrets of the beginning and end, invite us to conclude that there is a previously designed plan.²
The most important reconciliation, which Obama has promised to achieve between America and the Islamic World, is, however, the one which has been aborted.\textsuperscript{4} In fact \textit{bal}, the reconciliation remained a cell and has never been developed into an embryo.\textsuperscript{5}

By comparison, the English corpus identified few examples of "CONCESSION" relation that follow the nucleus-satellite pattern. For example:

Art no.5, text.no.11, span (1-2)

\begin{quote}
(\textit{Neither Bush nor challenger John F. Kerry spoke directly about the report yesterday,}) \textsuperscript{1} (though at a campaign appearance in Pennsylvania the president emphasized that Hussein was a threat to the United States.)\textsuperscript{2}
\end{quote}

Art no.6, text.no.8, span (1-2)

\begin{quote}
(\textit{The Iraqi security force numbers indicate that they are unlikely to be able to take control of major parts of the country any time soon,}) \textsuperscript{1}(even with what Pentagon officials have cited as significant progress.)\textsuperscript{2}
\end{quote}

It is worth noting here that "JUSTIFICATION" in both corpora tends towards the canonical order of nucleus-satellite pattern, as indicated in the following examples:

Art no.1, text no.6, span (5-6)

\begin{quote}
(\textit{But Arab countries, and others opposed to war, are likely to make a final argument to delay military action,})\textsuperscript{5} (saying that the discovery of a "smoking gun" proves the inspectors are effective and can disarm Iraq.)\textsuperscript{6}
\end{quote}
(The possibility that few or none of the Black water personnel involved in the killings will be prosecuted has aroused the ire of critics.)¹ (Human Rights First, a Washington advocacy group, has released a report citing "scores of well-documented reports of serious abuse by private contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan," none of which has been prosecuted.)²

The mad adventure that led to the disaster of Kuwait was waited for anxiously by the USA ³ because li’anna it would provide it with an opportunity to fabricate consequences and conditions that would achieve its craving and dream to occupy Iraq and turn it into an ideal strategic focal point for controlling the region.⁴

In his life and after his death, Saddam Hussein represented a topic of great controversy in the Arab and international world.¹ fa That president was disruptive for this nation in more than one level.²

He was not sorry for ousting the Iraqi dictator and changing the regime even though there were no mass destructive weapons.³ fa The previous Iraqi president intended to acquire those weapons to spread fear and terror in the world.⁴
It needs to be emphasized here that such reservations, conversing the canonical order of spans, does not reduce the English text quality and often improves it. However, it affects the readability of the Arabic text due to the positions of connectives that signal the above-mentioned RST relations.

7.6 Global Patterns of Rhetorical Organization

In RST terms a "text span is an uninterrupted linear interval of text" (Mann and Thompson 1987: 4, original emphasis). The model assumes that text spans do not overlap but that one span can be composed of other spans (which are part of a lower hierarchical level). On the lowest level of analysis each span is composed of at least two minimal units (normally, but not necessarily, clauses, bigger minimal units are possible).

The observation that one part of the text plays a central or dominant role has often been promulgated in the analysis of the rhetorical relations of texts (Mann and Thompson, 1987). In this approach, termed Rhetorical Structure Theory, texts are viewed as hierarchically organized, consisting of a central nucleus and a set of satellites. Given that, different approaches and perspectives to text organization are possible.

Regarding global patterns of rhetorical organization, the data set reveal eight macrostructures of political text (5 in English and 6 in Arabic). These macrostructures are "ELABORATION", "CONCESSION", "CIRCUMSTANCE", "CONJUNCTION", "INTERPRETATION", "JOINT", "JUSTIFICATION" and "CONTRAST". In the ELABORATION structure, the comprehensive locus of effect constitutes the first clause of the span and is followed by one or more satellites. In the CONCESSION structure, the comprehensive locus of effect (N) is either preceded or followed by the S that increases R's positive regard for N. In the CONJUNCTION structure, the first clause is always (N1) and the second clause constitutes (N2), which are conjoined to form a unit in which each span plays a comparable role. In the INTERPRETATION structure, the
locus of effect constitutes N of the span and is followed by the S that assesses the N material in terms of new reference that is not part of N itself. In JOINT structure, (N1) always precedes (N2) to form a multi-nuclear span that W thinks they are important for the R (in Arabic literature). In the CIRCUMSTANCE structure, the temporal and spatial spans constitute S that sets a framework to interpret N, which either precedes or follows S. In the JUSTIFICATION structure, the S that presents the premises is either preceded or followed by the N that draws a conclusion. And, in CONTRAST structure, the (N1) always precedes (N2) to form a span that comprehended as differing in many or few respects.

The macrostructures of "ELABORATION", "CONCESSION", and "CIRCUMSTANCE" occur equally often in the data set, indicating that they are essential elements of political editorials organization.

Schema applications of "INTERPRETATION", "JUSTIFICATION" "JOINT", "CONJUNCTION" and "CONTRAST" vary between English and Arabic corpora. The macrostructures of "INTERPRETATION", "JOINT" and "JUSTIFICATION" are more dominant in Arabic rather than in English. The opposite is true concerning "CONJUNCTION" and "CONTRAST" schemata; they are more promulgated in English texts than in Arabic ones.

If we compare our Arabic texts with English texts of the same length, we would realize that Arabic texts use a much larger number of additive (JOINT) structures than would the English texts. This is explained by the intensive use of [wa] 'and' in Arabic, to introduce the majority of "clauses" [jumlas]. Its intensive use makes a text sounds like one cohesive discourse. [wa] 'and' could be used to express "JOINT", "CONJUNCTION" and sometimes "CONTRAST" (see section 7.3.2). It also creates parallelistic structures; it is an external marker of text-internal parallelism. Look at the following figures:
We raised such issues in our prewar editorials but within sufficient force. In February 2003 for example we wrote that the precedent must finally address, seguarely in public, the question of how Iraq will be secured and governed after a war that removes Saddam Hussien, and what the U.S. commitment to that offer will be …

Many of these questions appear not to have been answered even inside the administration. They were still unanswered when the war, which was never supported began.

Figure (15): RST Schema for Elaboration and Concession Relations in Arabic
7.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the researcher has tried to lay the groundwork for the conclusions in the chapter that follows. It sheds light on the variations noticed between English and Arabic texts in the use of RST as a theory of discourse structure. A detailed analysis of the data (English and Arabic political editorials) has been carried out according to the model decided in chapters 5 and 6. This has been systematized and organized to enable the researcher to come to important findings and draw conclusions as seen in the next chapter.
Notes

Punctuation marks had not been known and used maturely in Arabic language until 1912 when Ahmed Zaki Basha first wrote his book Al-tarqeem wa Alamatuh fi Al-loqah Al-arabiah (Punctuation and its marks in Arabic Language). He defined the rules of writing the different punctuation marks based on his study on French. Punctuation marks had not been known in the Arabic writing culture until the beginning of last century. Arabic writers then started using the punctuation marks in their writings. However, many writers still do not give them high attention. Because of this, many Arabic manuscripts are still written without enough attention to the punctuation marks. Since such marks are important indicators of the text segments boundaries and are normally used in text segmentation, the absence of them in Arabic texts makes the segmentation process of texts more challenging.

2 Other translations of [li'anna] are "due to", "this is due to", "this because", etc.

3 [bal] expresses "Confirmation" in Arabic, and this relation is equivalent to "Evidence" in English.

4 This co-coordinator is used in questions to express alternative interrogation. It is called equation ['am] أم

5 "CONCESSION" is signalled by multiple connectives in Arabic like لكن [laki:nna], بل [bal], مع أن [maça 'anna] بالرغم من [bil rughmy min], etc.

6 It must be emphasized that JOINT in Arabic has different sense rather than none effect. It presents a span that is important in global organization of text. It accompanies all rhetorical relations as " Joint and Evidence", " Joint and Concession", etc.