

relation between units of the text on the understanding of the content of the text.

Bibliography

- Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A., 1986, Rhetorical Structure Theory: description and construction of text structures, in G. Kempen (ed.), *Natural language generation: New results in artificial intelligence, psychology and linguistics*, processing of The Third International Workshop on Text Generation, (pp. 85-95), Nijmegen, The Netherlands, August.
- Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A., 1988, Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a functional theory of text organisation, *Text*, 8/3: 243-281.
- Mann, W. and Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., 1991, Functions of language in two frameworks, *Word*, 42/3: 231-249.
- Mann, W. and Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. and Thompson, S. A., 1992, Rhetorical structure theory and text analysis, in Mann and Thompson (eds.), *Discourse description: diverse linguistic analysis of a fund-raising text*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.



results, therefore, support the claim that a text analysis model is capable of detecting the writer's intended rhetorical relation between units of the text. In other words, it is possible to use RST and analyse a text from the writer's perspective when there is no access to the writer. Table 2 summarises the rhetorical relation that the two informants and I assigned to units of the text.

Recognising the rhetorical relation of text spans necessarily varies from person to person due to the differences in their understanding of the content of the units and the type of knowledge they bring into the text. This may result in establishing a different rhetorical relation between the same units of the text. The pioneers of RST did not consider this as a threat to the inconsistency of RST analysis. However, to solve this problem, the RST theorists suggest sources of multiple analysis. In their recent work of applying RST to a text Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson (1992) especially refer to 'Simultaneous Analysis' by which they mean the plausibility and compatibility of one analysis over the others to perceive the writer's intention.

The interviews with the informants illustrated that they tried to explain the contents of the passage in order to express their view about the relation of parts of the passage with each other. This implies that to recognise the rhetorical

Table 2. A summary of rhetorical relations the informants assigned to units of the texts

Passage	Pair Units	Informant A	Informant B	Researcher
One	2&1	Elaboration	Elaboration/Restatement	Elaboration
	3&1	Elaboration	Elaboration/Restatement	Elaboration
	3-4&5	Concession	Concession	Concession
	4&3	Elaboration	Elaboration	Elaboration
	6&2	Restatement	Restatement	Restatement
	11&10	Cause-and-Result	Cause-and-Result	Cause-and-Result
	12&10-11	Cause-and-Result	Condition?	Cause-and-Result
Two	2-4&1	Elaboration	Elaboration	Elaboration
	3-4&2	Cause-and-Result	Cause-and-Result	Cause-and-Result
	5-7&1	Elaboration	Elaboration	Elaboration
	8-10&1	Elaboration	Elaboration	Elaboration
	7&5	Restatement	Cause-and-Result	Cause-and-Result*
	5&6	Cause-and-Result	Cause-and-Result	Cause-and-Result*

* I considered units 6 and 7 together and assigned an Elaboration relation between these units and unit 5.

relation of units of a text, an understanding of the content of the units plays a significant role. This leads to a crucial question about the influence of comprehending the content of the units on the recognition of rhetorical relation of these units; and vice versa, that is the influence of recognising the rhetorical

4.1.4.1 Conclusion

Although the writer and the co-author believe that the textbook is “absolutely self explanatory,” the points they made indicate that background knowledge on sociology is needed to understand the text properly.

The views of the informants indicate that the ideas in units 2-4 are about a specific instance of the general point in unit 1. Therefore, according to RST, units 2-4 have an Elaboration relation with unit 1.

From what the author and the co-author stated about the relation of units 2-4 to each other the following three points can be concluded:

- a. Both informants referred to the same source of information, that is Parish Records which is not in the text, to explain the relation of the ideas in units 2-4 to each other.
- b. Unit 2 contains one of the central points of the passage.
- c. Units 3 and 4 mention, as the writer said, the reasons or, as the co-author pointed out, two conditions of the realisation of the situation that unit 2 describes. These features match with the definition of Cause-and-Result relation in RST. Therefore, we can say that the informants’ explanation indicates that units 3 and 4 have a Cause-and-Result relation with unit 2.

The point that the writer and the co-author made about the relation between units 5, 6, and 7 shows that the situation in unit 5 provides a consequence of what is mentioned in unit 6; therefore according to the informants a Cause-and-Result relation exists between units 6 and 5.

The views of the informants about the relation of the ideas in units 5-7 and 8-10 to unit 1 show that units 5-7 and 8-10 specify two points of the general statement in unit 1, the same as what units 2-4 do to unit 1. Therefore, according to RST, the informants’ views clearly indicate that, units 5-7 and 8-10 have an Elaboration relation to unit 1.

The interviews with the two informants show that they observed the same rhetorical relation of pair units of the text. All of their rhetorical relation, except in one case, match with the ones that I had assigned to these units on the basis of RST assumptions.

5 General Conclusion

The talks with the two informants about the two one-paragraph size texts focused on exploring the intention of the writer concerning the relation of units of these texts with each other. The views of these informants about the relation of two non-overlapping units of the text to each other matched to a very large extent with the rhetorical relation I had assigned to these units. The

- (23) To provide a reason for 5...; 7 is a restatement of 5.

4.1.4 The Co-author's View on the Relation among Units of Passage Two

According to the co-author, the content of units 4-5

- (24) is a piece of an argument that industrialisation didn't create the nuclear family.

The view of the co-author about the relation of units 2-4 with each other did not completely match with that of the writer's. The co-author considered the relation between units 2 and 3 "as a logical condition." He said,

- (25) It is a logical condition... It is an empirically supported logic. I would say it is a deduction from the second.

The co-author did not believe that unit 3 introduces a cause for the idea mentioned in unit 2; instead, he pointed out that "unit 3 is a deduction from demography." Having considered the idea in unit 4 as "another example," the co-author added,

- (26) Unit 4 describes the precondition under which the proposition 2 is correct.

He regarded the idea in unit 4 as a 'condition' for constructing pre-industrial nuclear family:

- (27) I think there are two conditions: people did not live very long, condition one; condition two, people did not have many resources. Therefore, they would have to be a nuclear family. Most of these families were nuclear family before the industrial revolution.

The co-author expressed two views about the relation of 2-4, 5-7, and 8-10 to unit 1. Initially, he said:

- (28) Units 5-7 are "really emphasising the point made in units 2 to 4 by suggesting another piece of evidence that is more striking as it says at the beginning of unit 5.

He believed that "2-4 and 5-7 may well come from the same source..., which is a historical debate about the nature of families between 1540-1900, and 8-10 relate to the sociology about Britain." Then he said,

- (29) It would not be unreasonable to deduce that units 2-4 and 5-7 refer to two studies. I mean points 2-4 are made as if there were a logical observation whereas points 5-7 are made as empirical observation. The same book may have said both things. Though I have reason to believe that they, in a sense points 2-4, are associated with one study and points 5-7 with a different one.

The co-author believed that,

- (30) 7 is a consequence of 6. It is an outcome. It is a necessary outcome/effect.

the text is condensed, the writer expects that “a teacher or other books will cover the debate. It is intended as an orientation device”.

The co-author, summarised the message of this passage as: “the nuclear family existed before. The pre-industrial family was not an extended one”.

With respect to the issue of possible hidden intention in this text the co-author said that “it assumes that people would know there would be some debate about extended and nuclear families... So it is alluding to a debate in sociology about the origin and typicality of the nuclear family in western societies”.

4.1.3.1 Writer's Comment on Passage Two

The writer was asked whether he has any hidden intention in the text that should be detected if the text is going to be understood completely, or whether the text is explicit enough for its readers. He said “the hidden intention is actually generated by having more than one reader in mind.” He acknowledged that the writers of the textbook considered both the students and their teachers while they were writing the textbook, so there are some sections in which “the full meaning of the debate would not be obvious to students who read the text. It is only obvious to our colleagues”.

To answer the question about the relationship between units 2-4 and unit 1 the writer said,

- (20) This is the first of the objections to 1 namely that the pre-industrial family was extended is the argument. But it is not. It was nuclear.

With regard to units 2, 3 and unit 4, the writer said,

- (21) Units 3 and 4 are two reasons for unit 2. They are attempting to justify unit 2. Unit 2 contains a descriptive claim... Nuclear families are actually common for people who actually have looked at the Parish Records... units 3-4 are an incomplete explanation of why that should be such so. The weight is placed simply on the descriptive of the empirical finding that the nuclear family was common. So that 2 is undeniably true.

The writer explained the relation between units 3 and 4 as:

- (22) Unit 4 is intended to supplement 3 not controverse it,... it is a kind of adding to 3 but it actually does so indirectly. That is the problem. It does indirectly, because it is a sort of cause on other aspects of the debate.

Concerning the relation of units 5-7 and 8-10 to unit 1 the writer of the passage said that units 5-7 and 8-10 have the same relation to unit 1 as units 2-4 do.

Concerning units 5, 6, and 7 the writer believed that his intention was

these two units are different. The co-author believes that unit 12 is the result of units 10-11 whereas the writer did not. The relation I had assigned on these units, that is a Cause-and-Result relation, matches with that of the co-author's.

The two informants mentioned the same points as they were describing the relation of units of the text. Their initial views on the first three units of the passage implied a Restatement rhetorical relation. But their complementary views, that is their explanation concerning the content of these units, showed that these units have an Elaboration relation with each other. The clarification of the points in these units suggests that an Elaboration relation of these units is more plausible than a Restatement relation. This also implies that an accurate understanding of the content of the units of the text plays a significant role in order to assign a rhetorical relation between this type of units. The informants concurred on all other rhetorical relations of the text but the rhetorical relation of units 10-11 to 12. These rhetorical relations match with the ones that have been assigned to the units of the text in terms of RST.

4.1.3 Passage Two

The writer of this passage, as it appears in Figure 2, said that the passage introduces “a very extremely conventional debate in sociology in a very summary form” and the “reader ought to go away with some kind of framework in his/her mind.” According to the writer, since

Figure 2, Passage Two

1. The idea that industrialisation created the relatively isolated nuclear family has been very influential in the sociology of family and has stimulated a wider range of studies, many of which have been critical.
2. First a number of historical studies have shown that the nuclear family was common before the industrial revolution,
3. if only because people did not live long enough for older relative to live near or with their younger kin.
4. Furthermore, it is doubtful if the pre-industrial family had the resources to serve the function of education, medical care or support of the elderly.
5. Perhaps even more striking, is the finding that the upheaval of the industrial evolution actually promoted the formation of extended family groups.
6. In this period of rapid social change, involving families moving from the countryside to the town, the support given by the wider network of relatives was of great importance for individual families.
7. For a short time at least families became relatively less isolated.
8. Last, a good deal of research effort has been put into the study of families in contemporary society.
9. One of the conclusions of this research is that nuclear families are not isolated,
10. but are actually placed in a network of relationships with kin and other.

- (19) 10, 11, and 12 tended to have a causal/effect relationship. 10 and 11 have a causal relationship in the world except in this analogy. Then take 11, or take 10 and 11 together, have an effect on the difficulties in sociological analysis. So there are two causal relations there, one 10 to 11 and 10-11 together to 12.

The co-author's explanation on the relation of the last three units of the text reveals that there are two Cause and Result relation between these units. A Cause and Result relation exists between units 10 and 11 and another Cause and Result relation between units 10-11 and unit 12.

4.1.2.1 Conclusion

It should be mentioned that in my analysis I first regarded units 2 and 3 as a restatement of unit 1, because it appeared to me that almost the same idea is repeated in these units. But a closer examination of the content of these units led me to assign an Elaboration relation to these units.

The points that the writer of the text and his co-author made illustrate that firstly these units are not exactly restating each other. Secondly, recognising a 'restatement' of an idea even in an introductory specialised text without bringing necessary specialised knowledge into the text or understanding the content of the units appears to be problematic, if not distracting. Because the writer and his co-author first said that these three units are restating, albeit roughly, each other, they changed their view when they unpacked the contents of these units and related their content to the sociological knowledge. This, therefore, suggests that to realise a rhetorical relation of units of a text demands an accurate understanding of the content of the units.

The informants' views about units 3, 4, and 5 indicate that the writer advocates the view in unit 5 while he neither rejects nor believes in the point made in units 3 and 4. This, therefore, implies that unit 5 has a Concession relation with units 3-4. I also assigned a Concession relation between units 5 and 3-4, because I thought the writer mentioned the analogy in order to simplify the understanding of 'interdependence' of social institutions. But he contends that this analogy may be misleading.

To sum, the view of the informants on the relation of units 1, 2, and 3 with unit 6, shows that the idea in unit 2 is reiterated in unit 6. In other words, these two units have a Restatement relation with each other. I also found that a Restatement relation exists between units 6 and 2.

The two informants expressed the same idea about the relation between units 10 and 11. Their explanation indicates a Cause-and-Result relation between these two units. Their view concerning the relation of unit 12 with

3 and 2. He considered the idea in unit 3 as “a theory of social systems.” This explanation indicates that according to the co-author units three and two have an Elaboration relation to unit one. The co-author however believed that units 1, 2, and 3 “are doing different kinds of things”. To clarify the relation of the first three units of the passage he explained:

- (15) Units 1, 2, and 3 are doing different kinds of things. I think 3 is an attempt to take a special case of both 2 and 1 namely a theory which treats society as like organisms and then looks at that special case. It does so because again it is a common sense analogy that the students will be familiar with the idea that organs in a body relate to one another as parts of a system. So, it looks like a common sense move to make it to say that society is like that. So 3 is a subset of 2.

Since this view clearly demonstrates that units 3 and 2 are details of the idea in unit 1, according to RST definition, they have an Elaboration relation with unit 1.

To clarify the relation among units 3, 4, and 5, the co-author pointed out that the writer expected the reader:

- (16) First of all to think about bodies, bodies as the collections of parts, but not just as collections, but parts which have an independence; and then to consider that model, that analogy. Although it helps you to understand the notion of the social system because you see it like a body, it can be very misleading. So that it is initially helpful but do not push it too far.

The co-author said that the ideas in units 3 and 4 can be true generally but the author’s idea is mentioned in unit 5. He also elaborated the point in these three units and said:

- (17) It is like using drugs in order to cure the illness. That can be very helpful for somebody but they can have side effects which means that you should not over-use them.

The co-author’s comments in (16) and (17) indicate that the writer aimed to develop a concession relation between unit 5 and units 3-4.

With regard to the relation of units 1, 2, and 3 with unit 6 the co-author said:

- (18) Unit 6 says that despite one version of the system notion being potentially faulty, actually nonetheless societies do behave like systems in that clearly one institution affects those of another. So 6 says that 2 is OK if understood properly.

The view of the co-author in (18) shows that unit 6 has a Restatement relation with the first three units of the text. However, its Restatement relation with unit 2 is more conspicuous.

Concerning the relation between units 10, 11, and 12 the co-author explained:

With regard to the relation of units 10, 11, and 12 the writer first said:

- (9) It is if, then, and thus and the consequence; three conditional clause statements.

He rejected the idea that they have a Cause-and-Result relation with each other and emphasised that they are “more conditional than Cause-and-Result.” He added:

- (10) ... because the point in 12 is not actually about the world but about the sociological analysis of the world. It is literally cause.

Having mentioned this, the writer tried to explain the content of these units and its rhetoric:

- (11) I am using mosaic as an analogy as a metaphor. Society is not a mosaic. Society is *like* a mosaic. If you have a mosaic and you shift the bits around you have something different. Actually 12 is not a consequence. I would have said there was some shifty logic involved in this. In fact, what it is saying in 11 is the effect of 10. It puts in an if-then statement for reasons, because 12 is not on the same empirical order. You could say that 11 is an effect of 10. Mosaic changes cause the whole pattern to be altered. However, proposition 12 in fact says something that how difficult it is to do sociology. It is actually a different logical category altogether. So I don't think it would not be an effect of 10 and 11. Since they are not about the same sort of thing.

The writer's comprehensive explanation in (11) implies that he intended to develop a Cause and Result relation between units 10 and 11. He objected to see unit 12 as a result of the points made in units 10 and 11.

4.1.2 The Co-author's View on the Relations among Units of Passage One

To elaborate the relation of units 1, 2, and 3, the co-author initially said that the first three units of passage one restate each other. This clearly indicates that these units have restatement relation with each other. But later on the questioned the Restatement relation of unit 2 to unit 1 and said:

- (12) Although I said that it is restatement, it is not in a way. It is the introduction of a concept. It expressed in technical language in terms of a social system.

With regard to the relation of units 3 and 1 the co-author believes that

- (13) 3 provides a specific version of a sort of theory of 1.

The co-author did not believe that unit 3 exemplifies the idea in unit 1 nor does it restate unit 1. He said:

- (14) It is providing a particular theory of how parts interrelate. So, 1 says parts interrelate; 3 says here is the theory of how parts interrelate.

The co-author pointed out that the same explanation is true concerning units

He also added that the first unit introduces the word “interdependent” which is not common knowledge. He explained how the concept of “interdependence” was elaborated in the first three units of this passage.

- (3) Propositions 2 and 3 are designed to give some illustration of what interdependent might be. Firstly, by giving an alternative word for it, “system”. Secondly by giving an alternative analogy for it again which is used in sociology of something that is organic, like a body. So, they are about the same idea. But proposition 2 *adds information* to the technical term which sociology talks and item 3 *gives some sense* to anybody who does not understand what a system or interdependence is, or what that might entail.

The author’s explanation about the detail of the word “interdependence” in the text and the use of “adds information” and “gives some sense” indicates that units 2 and 3 give further information about unit 1. This explanation indicates that they have an Elaboration relation with unit 1. However, later in the talk, the writer said units 2 and 3 are “alternative ways of formulating the set of relationship” that unit 1 introduces. This view indicates that units 2 and 3 have a Restatement relation with unit 1.

Concerning the relation among units 3, 4, and 5 the writer believed that:

- (4) 5 is qualifying the view put forward in units 3 and 4.

To respond to the question whether the idea in unit 5 is his, the writer said:

- (5) I am not the only person who believes it.

I also asked the writer if he would reject the idea in unit 3. He said:

- (6) I don’t reject it out of hand. I am casting doubt on its usefulness. I am not rejecting it. No.

The writer’s comments in (4), (5), and (6) implies that he established a concession relation between units 5 and 3-4.

Concerning the relation between units 1, 2, and 3 to unit 6 the writer believed:

- (7) Unit 6 is a kind of restatement of units 1, 2, and 3, more probably 2. ... I am re-emphasising the point; and for reference would be to use this, then unit 2 making some sense.

To talk about the “however” in unit 6 the writer also pointed out:

- (8) I am reasserting my point in 2 given that I cast some doubt on the appropriateness of the system-like nature of societies. Probably it is not the most appropriate word. What I actually mean is I wish to reiterate what I have really meant.

The points the writer made in (7) and (8) indicate that he aimed to establish a Restatement relation between unit 6 and the first three units of the text.

structure coherence of the text. However, the question is “Does this particular approach in text linguistics match with the views of the writer and the co-author?” The views of these informants on the relation of text parts appear in the following section.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Informants' View on the Rhetorical Relations of Two Passages

The writer and his co-authors of the textbook commented on the relation of parts of two one-paragraph size texts once as the writer on the text written by himself and also as a co-author on the texts written by his colleagues. On the basis of the informants' explanation I derived the rhetorical relations of the parts of the text and compared them with the rhetorical relation I assigned to the text units of these passages.

4.1.1 Passage One

The writer summarised the key point of passage one, appears in Figure 1, as “social institutions are interdependent.” Passage one has been divided into twelve units of analysis. It is supposed that the writer established a rhetorical relation between these units.

Figure 1, Passage One

1. One of the outstanding features of societies is the way in which component parts are highly interrelated, or interdependent.
2. This interdependence is often expressed in technical language in terms of a social system.
3. Or, sometimes the social system is described as an 'organism' societies being likened to animal bodies
4. in which the various organs – heart, liver, lungs – all work together to keep the animal alive.
5. Like most analogies, the model of organism can be misleading if used too literally.
6. There *is*, however, something system-like about social organisation, with one institution affecting many of the others.
7. Thus, for instance, the social organisation of work affects the way education is organised, changes the role of the family in bringing up the children, and results in unequal distribution of income and wealth.
8. It is this, the interdependence of social institutions,
9. which makes sociological explanation so difficult and complicated.
10. If one part of the mosaic changes
11. then the whole pattern is altered,
12. making it difficult to pin-point a single cause of any particular event, process or change.

4.1.1.1 The Writer's Comment on Passage One

With regard to the first three units of this passage the writer said:

- (1) They are actually saying more or less the same thing.
- (2) They are not exactly restating each other.

Table 1. Definitions of the selected rhetorical relations of Mann and Thompson (1988)

Rhetorical relation	Definition
Concession	<p>Constraints on N: W has positive regard for the situation in N. Constraints on S: W is not claiming that the situation presented in S doesn't hold. Constraints on N + S combination: W acknowledges a potential or apparent incompatibility between the situations presented in N and S; W regards the situations presented in N and S as compatible; recognising that the situations presented in N and S as compatible; recognising that the compatibility between the situations presented in N and S increases R's positive regard for the situation presented in N. The effect: Reader's positive regard for the situation presented in N is increased. Locus of effect: N and S.</p>
Elaboration	<p>Constraints on N + S combination: S presents additional detail about the situation or some element of subject matter which is presented in N or inferentially accessible in N in one or more of the ways listed below. In the list, if N presents the first member of any pair, then S includes the second: 1. set: member 2. abstract: instance 3. whole: part. 4. process: step 5. object: attribute 6. generalisation: specific The effect: R recognises the situation presented in S as providing additional detail for N. R identifies the element of subject matter for which detail is provided. Locus of effect: N and S.</p>
Restatement	<p>Constraints on N + S combination: S restate N, where S and N are of comparable bulk. The effect: R recognises S as a restatement of N. Locus of effect: N and S.</p>
Non-volitional Cause	<p>Constraints on N: presents a situation that is not a volitional action Constraints on N + S combination: S presents a situation that, by means other than motivating a volitional action, caused the situation presented in N; without the presentation of S, R might not know the particular cause of the situation; a presentation of N is more central than S to W's purposes in putting forth the N-S combination. The effect: R recognises the situation presented in S as a cause of the situation presented in N. Locus of effect: N and S.</p>
Non volitional Result	<p>Constraints on S: presents a situation that is not a volitional action. Constraints on N + S combination: N presents a situation that caused the situation presented in S; presentation of N is more central to W's purposes in putting forth the N-S combination than is the presentation of S. The effect: R recognises the situation presented in N could have caused the situation presented in S. Locus of effect: N and S.</p>

N: Nucleus S: Satellite W: Writer R: Reader

“rhetorical relation” of the text portions with each other to show the macro

Result¹, Restatement and Elaboration. The definitions of these rhetorical relations appear in the Table 1.

3 Method

To accomplish the purpose of this study I interviewed the writer of the text and his co-author who are two distinguished scholars in the department of sociology at a university in United Kingdom. They are native English speakers.

The interview with the two informants were structured and carried out in an informal context. The questions in the interviews were formulated in a way that I could expect the writer and his co-author to explain the connection of the ideas in the text spans to each other. Both of these interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Although the interviews were structured, some questions were modified during the interviews in order to direct the talks towards understanding the rhetorical relations of the text as the writer and the co-author conceived them. Moreover, to refresh the memory of the interviewees the extracts which were to be talked about, were given to them in advance. Along with the extracts the informants also received a note containing the purpose of the talk and some general questions which were to be discussed during the interview.

The interviews consisted of two sections. In the first section the interviewees answered some general questions which seem to play a significant role in determining the structure of the written language used in the textbook and influence the readers' process of the text. In the second section they responded to some specific questions about the relations between the parts of the texts. In this paper, I focus on the informants' response to questions on the rhetorical relations of the passages. These questions were typically formulated as:

How are the ideas in the text, related to one another?

How can this meaning relation be detected in the text? And how explicitly?

What is required for realising the relation of the ideas which appear in the text, language knowledge, field knowledge, or something else?

Theoretically speaking, to find a response to these questions, linguists in general and text analysts in particular suggest some solutions and frameworks of inspecting what a text contains. One of these attempts has been initiated by Mann and Thompson (1988). As I explained above, they tried to detect the

1) Mann and Thompson (1988) introduced four rhetorical relations to explain Cause and Result relationship between units of text. They are non-volitional cause, non-volitional result, volitional cause, and volitional result. For the purpose of manageability I reduced these relations to Cause and Result.

that the rhetorical relation between parts of a text can be detected from the writer's perspective without access to the writer. To examine this assumption, I analysed some passages from a sociology textbook in terms of the RST criteria and detected all applicable rhetorical relations that I judged exist among two non-overlapping units of these texts. I then checked these rhetorical relations with the writer and his co-author in two separate interviews. This study more specifically aims to find an answer to the following question "To what extent does the rhetorical relation of text units in an RST analysis correspond to the rhetorical relation that the writer and his/her co-author intend to establish between these units?" Prior to discussing the method and the results of this study, I introduce RST very briefly.

2 Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST)

RST is a description of "relational proposition that arises from two parts of a text but is not independently derived from either of them" (Mann and Thompson, 1988: 258). RST, Mann and Matthiessen (1991: 232) believe, is an approach to a "functional" description of the text that concerns with "a major aspect of the organisation of natural text" (Mann and Mathiessen, 1991: 233). RST describes those functions and structures of the text that "make text effective and comprehensible tools for human communication" (Mann, Thompson and Matthessen, 1992: 43).

RST "characterises a text in terms of relations which hold between its parts" (Mann and Mathiessen, 1991: 233). These relations hold between "meaning and intentions" that constitute the text (*ibid.*) RST clarifies the combination and structure of the meaning and intention that word sequences convey. These relations also "reflect a set of distinct kinds of knowledge that are given special treatment in text organisation" (Mann and Thompson, 1986: 92).

In an RST analysis, the text is divided into two categories of text spans called nucleus and satellite. Nucleus are those parts of the text that contain its central points and satellites are those that embody its minor points. Relations are assigned to two non-overlapping parts of the text, mainly one nucleus and one satellite. Four kinds of objects, that is relation, schema, schema application, and structure were identified in the definition of RST.

To clarify Relations, Mann and Thompson (1988) specified four fields as: (1) Constraints on the nucleus. (2) Constraints on the satellites. (3) Constraints on the combination of nucleus and satellites. (4) Effect. These fields have been clarified in the definition of all of the 33 rhetorical relations in RST. In this paper I focus on four rhetorical relations, that is Concession, Cause-and-

Exploring Rhetorical Relations of Text: Using Writer and Co-writer Explanation

S. Mohammad 'Alavī

Assistant Professor of the Faculty of Foreign Languages,
University of Tehran

چکیده

نظریه پردازان «نظریه ساختار بلاغی» (Rhetorical Structure Theory, RST) معتقدند که صرفاً با به کارگیری تعاریف ارائه شده برای «ارتباط بلاغی» (Rhetorical Relation) می توان ارتباط بلاغی مورد نظر نویسنده را در متن شناخت. در این تحقیق ارتباط بلاغی که نویسنده در بین واحدهای متن ایجاد کرده با آن دسته از ارتباطات بلاغی که با استفاده از تعریف های نظریه ساختار بلاغی (RST) در متن شناسایی شده، بررسی شده است. در این بررسی از شیوه مصاحبه استفاده شد. نتایج به دست آمده تأییدی بر ادعای نظریه ساختار بلاغی است. این تحقیق همچنین نشان داده است که اختلاف در شناسایی ارتباط بلاغی نتیجه تفاوت در درک محتوای متن است.

Key Words

Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST), Rhetorical Relation.

1 Introduction

In this paper I examine the rhetorical relations of parts of two paragraph length texts I extracted from a sociology textbook, as they are introduced in Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) (Mann and Thompson, 1988) in terms of the intention of the writer of the text and that of his co-author. RST theorists, who developed this model of text analysis initially for text generation, claim