

## RST Analyses from the RST web site ([www.sfu.ca/rst](http://www.sfu.ca/rst))

### The Two Frameworks Text

This text is the title and abstract of the article indicated. Like the other abstracts on the website, it is a complete text in the sense that abstracts are in part intended to allow the reader to decide whether to read the article, and for that purpose cannot rely on the unread text of the article.

The text was also chosen because it describes the relationship between Systemic Functional Linguistics and RST.

We are very interested in developing knowledge of how RST compares with other approaches to discourse analysis. So, we expect to add to the site some analyses or links to alternate analyses of the same or similar texts.

Reference: WORD, 42(3), William C. Mann and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen, December 1991, p. 231-249.

### The text:

#### 1) Functions of Language in Two Frameworks

##### Abstract

2) Some of the most central problems in linguistics concern how language fills its characteristic roles: how it is useful, the nature and extent of its translatability, and the nature of the integrity of texts. 3) Within linguistics there are many kinds of description that bear on such questions, 4) one kind being the description of language in terms of its functions. 5) Comparing these functional descriptions, 6) the various descriptions do not all cover the same ground. 7) Rather, each is quite partial, 8) and appropriate ways to combine them into a more comprehensive account are not evident. 9) It is hard to know wherein they conflict, wherein they agree, and where they simply speak of different things.

10) This paper is part of an effort to relate various accounts. 11) It is the first in a pair of papers that compare two particular accounts: Rhetorical Structure Theory and Systemic Linguistics.

12) Rhetorical Structure Theory, initially formulated in 1983, describes texts in terms of functionally-defined relations that hold between their parts. 13) Systemic Linguistics is a much more comprehensive view of language initiated in the early 1960s. 14) Where the two approaches are comparable, 15) Systemic Linguistics describes texts in terms of categories of processes which the texts perform.

16) The paper focus on correlating the relations used in rhetorical structure theory with the categories of function found in systemic linguistics. 17) The correlation employs descriptions of speakers' intentions in an essential way. 18) A surprisingly strong correlation results.

19) Ref.: WORD, 42(3), William C. Mann and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen, December 1991, p. 231-249.

