
An Introduction to Classical Rhetoric

“Rhetoric” is a conceptual, philosophical, psychological and linguistic system that emerged about 500 years bc. Since then, rhetoric has been a very active field with a large number of perspectives and controversies about its role in society. In this chapter, the main notions of rhetoric are introduced together with the terminology that will be used in this book. The goal of this chapter is to show how the philosophical and linguistic systems have been transposed or applied to music, in particular tonal music. This chapter should facilitate the understanding of the remainder of this book. This introductory chapter does not aim at presenting rhetoric in all its diversity and complexity; it rather concentrates on the conceptual elements that are important for an analysis of rhetoric in music, which will be discussed in the subsequent chapters. In particular, the complex linguistic figures of speech will not be presented if they do not have any direct counterpart in music. The aspects that are proper to musical rhetoric are presented in Chapter 2: music has indeed features that language does not have.

This book is not a treatise on music rhetoric or music analysis. It introduces a number of analytical elements related to music rhetoric from the Baroque, Classical and Romantic periods, with comparisons with language. Its main goal is the development of a computer modeling of a number of simple and relatively rational aspects of music rhetoric. For that purpose, besides music features that are important to rhetoric, it introduces computational formalisms and representations used in natural language processing which turn out to be useful for a “high” level of analysis of music. These tools include type feature structures and transformations or rewrite operations on these

structures. This book also includes a model for the representation of discourse relations in music, based on models used for modeling human dialogues. Finally, annotation schemas are introduced; this is a major activity in corpus analysis both in linguistics and in language processing which is of great interest to represent the structure of music.

The formal representations that are presented make it possible for an in-depth representation and indexing of musical works, which is useful for analysts and composers. These representations enable the development of information retrieval dedicated to music.

This chapter is organized as follows: it starts by basic definitions of what rhetoric is (section 1.1). Then, the nature and the structure of a rhetoric discourse is analyzed, in particular the forms of classical rhetoric (section 1.2). Then, some figures of style which are of interest to music are discussed (section 1.3). Next, considerations on the cooperation between argumentation and explanation are presented (section 1.4); this is a topic that is rarely addressed but crucial in most communication situations. The chapter ends with a few historical considerations presented as a brief synopsis meant to guide the readers who want to acquire more knowledge in this area (section 1.5). Some historical bibliographical references are given in section 1.6. The relations between language and music are investigated in Chapter 2, with a global presentation of the development of rhetoric and its structure in music over the centuries.

1.1. A few basic definitions

Basically, rhetoric is a discipline uses any type of discourse (e.g. spoken, written, gestural), with the aim of *persuading* an audience to approve or adhere to a fact, a decision or an attitude. The audience can be any group of

people, large public or a specialized audience; it can be a small or a large group, even a single listener. Persuading an audience includes expository modes (with the goal of informing the audience of certain facts or providing various explanations about these facts) and argumentative modes (with the goal of convincing the audience on the basis of the facts which are provided, whatever they are). Besides providing the audience with additional information, persuading an audience may also mean contradicting their beliefs. Rhetoric is therefore a subtle and well-organized combination of sequences of explanation and argumentation.

The term “persuading” obviously has a psychological dimension: the orator must deploy appropriate linguistic and gestural means to produce an effect on his/her audience. This means that the orator must organize his/her speech or written text following a strategy planned in advance that he/she finds efficient and optimal. Aristotle, considered as one of the main initiators of rhetoric, defines rhetoric as “the faculty of discovering all the available means of persuasion” that can be used in a given situation. Classical rhetoric (during the Greek and Latin periods) has introduced various rhetoric schemas to persuade an audience. These are presented in this chapter. These schemas combine explanation (with reference to previous situations and laws) with argumentation, language, and visual and vocal attitudes. Rhetoric is therefore clearly a matter of tactics.

It is quite difficult to precisely identify the origins of rhetoric. One of the main assumptions is that it emerged in Sicily in 467 BC in the city of Syracuse in a juridical context where farmers had to go to court to get their land back after the death of the tyrants Geron and Gelon. These farmers could get back their land armed with words. However, it seems that rhetoric was informally practiced several centuries before this date by Greek and Latin philosophers and lawyers who were conscious that facts, attitudes and

situations are never purely true or false as in Boolean logic. “Scientific” approaches to rhetoric became popular in Sicily, based on the use of rational arguments in areas as diverse as mathematics, law or religion. In parallel, several opposite views developed forms of “irrational” rhetoric where the form prevailed over the contents, on the basis of the seduction that words, language constructions (called rhetorical figures), attitudes and prosody deployed by the orator may have on a naïve audience.

We will not discuss the history of rhetoric here, which experience a number of ups and downs, however a few milestones are given at the end of this chapter. The elements we advocate here simply show that there are several views, sometimes opposing and contentious, of what rhetoric can be. There are also periods where rhetoric was a very influential philosophical activity and a major pedagogical means (e.g. following Plato) and, on the other extreme, where rhetoric was regarded as a dishonest process, a kind of duplicity or cheating. Under the influence of Aristotle, rhetoric became a science dedicated to the analysis of the means used to deploy persuasion. From his point of view, rhetoric has a direct relation with “dialectic” and “logic”, but with the difference that it is based on probable premises, not on true premises. Therefore, the conclusions that can be drawn from such a system are also probable and subject to refutation. Rhetoric is then the world of the “plausible”.

1.2. The structure of rhetoric

In this section, the facets of rhetoric are discussed in more detail. The objective is to provide a better understanding of the structure and the power of rhetoric. Its transposition to music will then become easier to understand.

1.2.1. *Rhetoric and communication*

First, it is important to be able to contrast rhetoric with the three other main modes of communication: *demonstration*, *dialectic* and *sophism* (also termed sophistry).

First, demonstration operates in an impersonal mode and deals with what is necessarily true (axioms and inference rules on the one hand, and facts that are true on the other hand). There are several ways to establish a demonstration (we recommend the reading of [PAR 90] for an accessible introduction). There are also various types of logics that can be considered. Areas that are covered by the demonstration activity include logic, mathematics and exact and natural sciences in general and probably metaphysics.

Dialectic is the art of dialogue; it does not deal with truth or falsity, but rather with what is probable. Compared to sophism, dialectic bears on rigorous means of reasoning with the goal to reach the best decision or consensus. Dialectic is established between groups of people, where at least two of them have different views on a topic. The goal is to reach a consensus possibly via the development of argumentation and negotiation. Dialectic covers almost any area among which are law, social sciences and the humanities. Negotiation is an important aspect of dialectic. A large number of features of dialogue are developed in the proceedings of [TSD 13].

Finally, sophism is the area of duplicity and cheating; it is based on false assumptions which seem plausible to the audience. For example, [EEM 92] presents a theoretical perspective on sophism and its role in communication. False assumptions are used in various forms of reasoning which are themselves more or less rigorous.

1.2.2. *The structure of classical rhetoric*

The structure of a discourse that aims at persuading an audience is composed of four main components which are the different steps that an orator must follow. These steps are the main parts usually found in rhetoric treatises. Let us assume that the discourse is oral, a text that is only written and aimed at being read would require a slightly different plan. Before going through these steps, the orator must identify exactly what he wants to demonstrate, and what conclusion(s) he wants to reach. Then, the four steps which must be considered are:

1) *Invention* (Greek *heuresis*, Latin *inventio*): the orator must search for the arguments and the persuasion means he needs to reach his conclusions in an optimal way.

2) *Arrangement* (Greek *taxis*, Latin *dispositio*): the orator must organize his arguments in a logical and coherent way so that his conclusions seem obvious and natural. The result is a kind of plan.

3) *Style*, also called elocution or expression (Greek *lexis*, Latin *elocutio*): this concerns the way the discourse is linguistically realized. This includes the choice of words and the syntactic constructions. Rhetoric has developed figures of speech that the orator can use for this purpose.

4) *Delivery* or action (Greek *hypocrisis*, Latin *pronunciatio*): this is the way the discourse is delivered to the audience, with vocal effects, mimics, gestures, etc.

These four parts are presented in more detail in the following sections. These are essential for the preparation of an efficient discourse. They may not necessarily follow each other: they may be intertwined in the preparation of the discourse. A fifth step is the *memorization* of the speech since it is preferable not to read a text in front of an audience but to present it as if it were natural and almost

spontaneous. Memorization helps improve the delivery step. It is crucial for performers in music.

These four steps emphasize the three main components of rhetoric:

- 1) the speech and its contents;
- 2) the speaker, his profile and its postures (gestures, voice, tone, etc.);
- 3) the audience with its professional and psychological profile.

These three elements are also found in music rhetoric. A difference is that the speaker may not be the author of the work, but rather the performer(s) (a single person, a small group of persons such as a string quartet, or a conductor for symphonic works). Therefore, the personality of the performer(s) is also crucial, since he probably has a slightly different view on the work than the composer.

1.2.3. *The invention step*

The first step is *invention*. It is important to exactly identify the topic of the discourse, its conclusions and its main articulations before elaborating it. The genre of the discourse is also important in this step. According to the Greek tradition, three main genres emerged: *judicial*, *deliberative* and *epideictic*. These three main genres correspond to the three main types of audiences that an orator can have. They also correspond to three main types of discourses.

The *judicial* genre charges or defends. It has to deal with events that occurred in the past and is aimed at judging them according to local laws and traditions. The audience are the members of a court. The *deliberative* genre introduces a discussion and an argumentation on the main

elements of interest to the society (e.g. taxes, budgets, laws, etc.) in order to advise the audience and help with making decisions. It deals with the future since these decisions concern the future. The audience are national or local groups of people who have been elected (e.g. senators, congressmen, etc.). Finally, the *epideictic* genre is designed to blame or congratulate a person or a group of persons for a specific act or attitude, such as war heroes and poets. This last genre deals with the present, the audience is any kind of group of people.

The genre of the discourse being identified, the primary task is to elaborate arguments that support the conclusions the orator wants to reach. According to Aristotle, three types of arguments can be used that belong to the following categories: *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*. *Ethos* includes the elements and attitudes that the orator must adopt so that the audience can give him his trust independently of the strength and the validity of the arguments. *Pathos* includes elements such as emotions and sentiments which the orator must develop in his audience [WAL 92, MAC 14]. This type of argument involves an analysis of the psychological profile of the audience. This profile may depend on external circumstances.

Finally, *logos* deals with the argumentation itself. This is the most rational among the three types of arguments and the closest to dialectic. To construct his argumentation, the orator has several types of proofs: laws, witness statements, contracts, etc. Arguments may be elaborated on the basis of *topoi* which are classes of schemas of arguments [EEM 96, BES 08, WAL 08]. They follow logical rules that organize the structure of the argumentation so that it looks like a demonstration [DUN 06].

As the readers may note, the first step, the invention, is quite complex and somewhat ambiguous since it mixes the elaboration of the “what to say” with, to some extent, the

“how to say it”, in relation with ethos and pathos. This situation is exactly the same in music rhetoric since, for example, melodic creativity mixes the *what* with the *how*.

1.2.4. *The arrangement*

The arrangement, in modern terms, is the planning of the discourse. The objective is to organize the material to be presented in a logical way so that understanding is easy. A good organization, together with a good presentation, makes a discourse much more persuasive. In classical rhetoric, a discourse aimed at persuading an audience is usually structured into two to seven parts, depending, e.g., on the tradition and the difficulty to communicate with the audience. Let us present here a typical organization of a discourse organized in four parts: *introduction*, *narration*, *proof* and *conclusion* also called *peroration*. This organization is also an essential part in the rhetoric of music where a large number of forms have been defined. These are introduced in Chapters 3 and 5.

From a theoretical perspective, [EEM 04] presents a formal approach to the use of speech acts in argumentation and rhetoric. Linguistics and computational linguistics aspects are, respectively, discussed in [MOE 02] and [GRO 86].

The *introduction* (Greek *proximion*, Latin *exordium*) starts a discourse. This part has several purposes. The first purpose is to introduce the subject of the talk, quite often the conclusion(s) the orator wants to reach, and the possible circumstances that come with it. The second purpose is to stimulate the interest of the audience, and the third purpose is to attract his goodwill and indulgence (because the orator may not be as good as necessary for such a noble cause). In music, an introduction can be a prelude (a prelude followed by a fugue or by a series of dances, for example) or a short

introductory section (e.g. an adagio before an allegro in the first movement of a sonata). Examples are presented in Chapter 5.

The ethos and the pathos of the orator must constantly be used to give the best feeling possible (serious, honest, competent, accessible, benevolent, etc.). The orator must stimulate the desire of the audience to understand, learn and participate in the debate. He must also make sure that the audience has some partiality toward his opinions. Rhetoric of all periods abounds in advice and recipes to make a good exordium. Then, the discourse is ready to start. However, to maintain the attention and the good will of the audience at a high level, it may be necessary, from time to time, to have a short resurgence of the introduction.

The *narration* (Greek *diegesis*, Latin *narratio*) can now start. It presents the facts, the background and the circumstances of the case to be discussed. It should be efficient, clear, short and persuasive. Obviously, the presentation of the facts and the circumstances may be oriented toward the conclusion the orator wants to reach. Even if it is not fully objective, it must look like it is. The *logos* is the main type of argumentation used.

Clarity of the presentation is reached by a good organization of the material, e.g. following the temporal structure of the elements and facts which are presented. Clarity is also reached by a simple syntax, with words that are easily accessible to the audience (technical terms can obviously be used with the appropriate audience, since these will be more efficient). Sequences of causes and consequences must clearly be established and reported. Brevity can be reached by a certain economy of means, avoiding useless terms, complex constructions or indirect speech, for example. Speech act verbs (e.g. [WIE 87]) are particularly important and should be chosen with care.

Constructions such as metaphors are of interest since they can have a strong impact on listeners in just a few words. The main elements of the discourse should be constantly emphasized. In fact, these recommendations or guidelines are general and must be considered for almost any type of discourse that has a certain level of objectivity or efficiency such as technical texts (procedures, specifications), didactic texts, medical texts, etc.

The third step is the *proof*, also called confirmation (Greek *pistis*, Latin *probatio*). This is probably the most important step. The orator presents his arguments, in a certain order, so as to show the soundness and the validity of the conclusions he wants to reach. He may also introduce additional arguments and facts in order to anticipate and refute future counter-arguments that the audience may raise. Different types and levels of arguments are used, from basic ones, based on examples, to abstract ones which constitute rules or laws. Argument schemes [WAL 08] are often used because they correspond to already established and evaluated structures. In case of refutation of an argument of the orator, after debate with the audience, the initial argument may be reformulated and adapted so that the different points of view can be accommodated and accepted by everyone. An argument is, in general, something quite flexible, even with laws, where adaptations, interpretations and reformulations are frequent.

There is an abundance of literature on argumentation that the reader may refer to; a synthesis is given in [EEM 96] and [BES 08]. Argumentation and persuasion have been developed from several perspectives: in philosophy, in psychology and communication (e.g. [EEM 04]), in linguistics, and in more formal sectors such as artificial intelligence (e.g. [MAC 14]). Note that rhetoric should not be confused with the rhetorical structure theory (RST) that deals with the conceptual and linguistic structure of

discourse [MAN 88, STE 12]. This is discussed in Chapter 5. However, it is clear that discourse analysis has an important role to play in rhetoric. Argumentation is now a major field that has a large number of applications, e.g. in business and commerce. Argumentation is not straightforwardly realized in music; however, we will present in Chapters 4 and 5 a number of examples where music, together with a “context” (e.g. historical and, personal), can deploy very efficient forms of argumentation. In what concerns persuasion, it is clear that music, via its inherent forms of ethos and pathos, is an extremely powerful means to influence an audience.

The last part of classical rhetoric is the *conclusion* or peroration (Greek *epilogos*, Latin *peroratio*). This part aims at summing up the main arguments and providing the audience with a clear formulation of the conclusion(s), as often initially presented in the introduction. This part may be a combination of rational elements (the arguments) with more emotional elements so that the conclusion sounds natural and is well understood and accepted. In the legal domain, in order to decrease tensions, some digressions (Greek *ekphrasis*) are frequently inserted between the arguments. Digressions may also be used to reinforce persuasion. The peroration ends the discourse and may contain several forms of recapitulation or summary.

1.2.5. *The style or elocution step*

The style or elocution step deals with the way the discourse is realized in language. This includes word selection as well as sentence construction and semantic effects such as focus shift (placing complements or adjuncts at the beginning of a sentence makes them more significant).

Orators can make extensive use of figures of speech. The choice of words is a crucial step because different words

in a given context may have very different persuasion and emotional effects. Orators are expected to develop forms of language which are correct and pleasant to read or to hear. Correctness of the language is also a mode of persuasion: the orator shows his competence in language, and, by association, he indirectly shows his competence to deal with the topic he is talking about.

The main features of the style that is expected in a discourse can be summarized as follows:

1) correctness of word selection and grammar in general, with respect to the genre (the judicial is more formal than the deliberative genre);

2) clarity of the expression, with no ambiguity, and a fluid language;

3) pleasant to listen to; this is realized through an appropriate use of ornamentation with, in particular expressive metaphors, and adequate figures of speech and thought (e.g. irony and allegory);

4) appropriateness of style and contents with respect to the discourse and the audience.

In addition, the style must follow one of the three main following modalities:

1) *Simple* (or *plain*) to explain with simple and direct terms something to the audience or to develop arguments. This is the domain of the *logos*, mainly used in narration, proof, confirmation and summary.

2) *Middle* (*medium*) to please and to give a good impression to the audience. This is the domain of *ethos*. This modality is mainly used in the introduction and in various digressions. More complex language forms, images and metaphors, and poetical uses are favored over direct terms.

3) *Noble* or *sublime* to move the audience and to develop persuasion. This is the domain of *pathos*. This modality is mainly used in the conclusion and in digressions. The language is more elaborated, in particular at the lexical level. Appropriate metaphors are used, which reinforce positive or negative feelings.

1.2.6. *The delivery or action*

The delivery is the oral presentation of the discourse to a given audience. This latter step, which can involve the *memorization* of the text, is crucial for the success of the ideas the orator wants to put forward. This step includes the control of the voice (the speed of the speech, the volume, the pitch, etc.), the attitude (e.g. the self-confidence), the gestures (e.g. of the eyes, the hands, the smiles, etc.) and the general presentation (e.g. the way of dressing).

A discourse that is delivered orally, in contrast with a text that is read, must have well-established oral style features. For example, compared to a written text, it must be more repetitive with shorter sentences so that the audience can easily follow what is said. On the contrary, a text that is designed to be read must not be repetitive (unless it is very long) and sentences can be more elaborated.

In music, the delivery step is obviously a crucial element. A major difference with textual rhetoric (either read or orally presented) is that in general it is not the author of the piece of music (the composer) that delivers it, but one or more performers, from a single performer (e.g. piano sonata) to a large orchestra with a choir. Composers usually provide indications (tempo, nuances, accents, ties, etc.) but a substantial part of the delivery is a matter of personal interpretation. In a group of musicians, interpretation is either collectively discussed (e.g. in a string quartet) or there is a leader who makes most of the decisions (e.g. a conductor

for orchestras, or a choir master for a choir). Interpretation often undergoes major variations over decades and centuries. The evolution of Baroque music interpretation is a typical example (e.g. [HAR 98] among many others).

1.2.7. The facets of rhetoric

Rhetoric is the art of communication and persuasion. Depending on the historical period and the culture, rhetoric was a traditional and natural activity (e.g. when bargaining), an activity related to teaching (in ancient Greece and India) or an artificial activity, highly codified and conceptualized, with its own purpose and logic. Let us give here a few milestones to guide the readers. Comparable milestones will be given in the next chapter for music rhetoric.

Although several authors from the Greek period to the western Middle Ages attempted to develop formal models of rhetoric, it seems that rhetoric failed to be captured in a single formal system because of the numerous facets it is composed of which are difficult to formalize, e.g. the psycholinguistic effects. Rhetoric is also not a unique, uniform and homogeneous theory: depending on the authors and the period, it shows a large number of strands of thought and a number of uses in everyday life.

One of the foundational facts of rhetoric is that it is designed to persuade an audience via argumentation and emotion: a combination of rational and psychological factors. The proportion between these two factors depends on the topic that is addressed, on the audience and on the orator.

Rhetoric is also viewed in a more negative way as, e.g., a decorative system, set up for the pleasure of speaking in an elaborated manner, with complex figures of speech, in order to arouse the admiration of the audience.

Persuasion is no longer the main goal. There is a shift from argumentation to literature and poetry, with a much more personal context. With respect to the initial goals of rhetoric, decorative rhetoric is artificial, superficial and misleading. It reveals the author and his language capabilities. To a certain extent, this form of rhetoric, which is still alive today, could have been the death of the initial rhetoric.

Music rhetoric, as will be seen in the next chapters, also “suffered” from these opposite views. While some composers (e.g. J. S. Bach and L. van Beethoven) are clearly on the persuasion side, others are more attracted by decorative music (e.g. the French suites for harpsichord, close to dances, or the decorative organ music of the 17th Century in France, e.g., by Clérembault, Dandrieu, Boyvin, Jullien, Marchand, etc.) still with some form of emotional contents but with less reference to an abstract context (in sharp contrast with the theological context of J. S. Bach, N. Titelouze and many others).

In the contemporary world, rhetoric is no longer a purely “textual” system, based on argumentation and language. Although the content remains the key issue, the delivery and style aspects are often paired with images, sounds and music.

In advertisement for a product or a service, in political campaigns presented on TV or via posters, major communication elements such as images, sounds and basic music (e.g. soft music) have a strong suggestive power on consumers or electors. The generated effects have been extensively investigated in psychoacoustics, with clear and striking results.

However, images essentially develop the style facet of rhetoric, with little real argumentative contents. Images and sounds must be paired with text to be meaningful in

advertisement. These evolutions make an analysis of the ethics of rhetoric even more crucial; this will not be addressed here although it is a central problem.

1.3. Some figures of speech

1.3.1. *Introduction*

This section deals with figures of speech in textual rhetoric which may be relevant for music rhetoric. Textual rhetoric abounds in complex figures of speech which do not have any correspondence in music. Conversely, music has its own figures of speech. These are described in Chapter 3. Music is considered in this book as an independent means of communication, *a priori* independently of a possible text it may be associated with such as in *Lieder*. However, the importance of a text must not be neglected since it introduces a context. The text may be very closely related to music, e.g. to a melody via its prosody and meter. This is the case, for example, in Gregorian song and in a number of French melodies from the 20th Century (e.g. melodies by Debussy, Duparc and Poulenc).

A figure of speech is a predefined form, quite precisely defined, syntactically and with respect to its function(s) that allows orators or writers to express themselves in a very free manner with the goal of being easily understood by their audience. For example, metaphors are quite complex figures of speech, but the most frequent ones are very regular over conceptual domains [LAK 99], and are understood by most readers or listeners with little effort. Metaphors are a powerful means to express complex and often abstract contents by means of a few words, which are often concrete, while maximizing the expected effects [LAW 00].

A simple example is the case of concrete resources such as food and money, which can both be saved. A metaphor is

often the reuse of a concrete situation and its adaptation to an abstract situation where the reuse is perfectly adequate from a conceptual point of view. It is, therefore, perfectly clear to say “*I save time*”, meaning that you want to avoid wasting your time doing useless things, as it would be the case with wasting money to buy useless objects. An important class of metaphors in language is orientation metaphors: going up or forward is positive while going down or backward is negative. An utterance such as “*The security level in our plant has been constantly going up*” means that safety has been improved, which is a positive evaluation.

In textual rhetoric, four main figures of speech are identified.

– *Figures of words*, where the goal is to play with words and produce a certain effect. In this category fall, for example, puns.

– *Figures of construction* such as ellipsis that codify a number of constructions within a sentence.

– *Figures of meaning* such as metaphors as explained above.

– *Figures of thought* that manage the relations between the orator, its topic and the discourse. In this class fall, for example, various forms of irony and emphasis.

1.3.2. The major figures of speech of interest in music rhetoric

Let us now briefly present and comment on the major figures of speech which are of interest to music. The two paradigms are developed to emphasize similarities and differences. Figures of sound are further addressed in Chapters 3 and 5.

The first group of figures are those that are related to words. In this class, there are many figures of sound. They introduce sound effects on phonemes, syllables or even words as a whole. Among them, the most interesting for our purpose are alliterations which characterize forms such as close repetitions of the same sound, possibly with light alterations. Forms of repetition, whatever they are, have an important impact in music: e.g. they are a form of instance, of non-differentiation, a form of prearticulation before a theme emerges, etc. When they occur at the phrase level, they are called *epanalepsis*.

Figures of constructions are more interesting in music. First, *ellipsis* in language is a means to shorten an expression to avoid repetition. In the following example: *John likes novels and Mary poems*, the repetition of the predicate *like* is skipped because it is unnecessary for the understanding of the second proposition. This form of subtraction of linguistic material is frequent in theme elaboration and variation in music. Another figure, *aposiopesis*, interrupts a sentence before its end in order for the audience to guess what the end could be.

In music, such forms of interruption of theme dislocation are also frequently found. *Chiasmus* creates a kind of opposition by inversion, i.e. the music fragment A B becomes B A, where A and B are musical motives. Forms of repetitions, strict or with slight variations, are much more frequent in music than in texts, where they would rapidly become very boring. Music is much more creative in terms of variations than language.

Figures of meaning most prominently include *metaphors*. There are several types of metaphors which are frequently used in music, in particular orientation metaphors: melodies moving up (positive), down (negative), chromatic movements (feelings of sadness), sudden large up or down intervals, etc. These are very frequent in baroque music. Forms of

emphasis or overemphasis (*hyperboles*) often related to metaphors to increase the emphasis effect are also frequently found. These figures are further discussed in Chapter 3.

Figures of thought are, by definition, independent of constructions and meanings. They concentrate on the relations between propositions and are realized at the discourse level. Forms of irony, apostrophe or humor are not very frequent in music. Music has its own forms of thought, for example in the realization of contrasts between themes or the evolution of cyclic themes. An important issue in music is the different forms of transitions between theme presentations (e.g. in the sonata form) that prepare the coming exposition, and the various forms of thematic development which implement figures of thought. This is addressed in detail in Chapter 5.

Laurin [LAU 12] classifies figures of sound into three categories: figures of repetition, figures of silence and figures of contradiction. Their purposes and effects are close to their counterparts in language, except that they are made up of notes. Figures of repetition can occur within a musical motive or between motives that are repeated. Repetition can be realized within the same register, or on lower or higher registers, possibly at a different speed. Repetition often means intensification of expressivity or ideas, or possibly the existence of a doubt, since the same element is repeated as if the orator was unsure of what he says and needs some confirmation. This means a complex interpretation work for the performer that may include forms of, e.g., acceleration to reach a certain climax, different articulations or the use of various levels of intensity.

The figure of silence is characterized by unexpected pauses in the middle of a musical motive or between motives (*aposiopesis*). The goal is often to create a very dramatic effect, a strong tension and also the expectation of a

resolution. Figures of silence also include omissions of fragments of motives (*ellipsis*). This strongly alters the dynamics of the theme in which the motive occurs and creates a feeling of instability.

Figures of contradiction involve the juxtaposition of very much contrasted motives, the insertion of accidental notes, the use of an unexpected dissonance not prepared or some form of chromaticism. The objective is often to create a feeling of discomfort, pain and instability proper to contradiction.

In an unpublished work, Blake Wilson proposes a more elaborated classification realized from several German authors of the early baroque period. The following categories of figures are identified: figures of melodic repetition, figures based on fugal imitation, figures formed from dissonances, interval figures (which correspond to metaphors), *hypotyposis* figures (realistic and striking motives describing a scene or a mood), sound figures and figures of silence. More elaborated discussions on figures of sound can be found in [BAR 97]. The following link can also be explored: <http://www.musicapoetica.net/figures.htm>.

1.4. Argumentation and explanation

The relations between argumentation and explanation [WRI 04] have been the subject of long debates. Both paradigms are central to rhetoric. While argumentation has been explored in detail in philosophy as well as in linguistics and in communication and psychology, very little attention has been paid so far to explanation. Except for some works in didactics and in psychology [WIE 87], explanation remains a notion with vague functions. Let us say that explanation essentially provides new information to listeners, possibly by contradicting their beliefs, while argumentation does not

provide any new information but is meant to convince a listener of a certain point of view or attitude.

Rhetoric discourses and texts have a backbone formed of sequences of arguments which could be viewed as the “logical” dimension of such discourses. Arguments are associated with explanation under the form of affirmative statements and reported statements. Besides these statements, explanation also includes discourse structures such as advice, warnings (both can also be analyzed as arguments), definitions, affirmations (to provide direct, factual information) contextual restrictions, conditions, expression of preferences, evaluations, reformulations and user interest stimulations. The result is a very complex structure. Besides argumentation, it is of great interest to identify explanation strategies deployed by orators: when to insert information, how and how much, and how this information is assimilated by listeners and how it interacts with arguments.

Let us first consider subclasses of arguments relevant to rhetoric developed in [BOU 11]. Arguments related to goals are the most frequent ones. They usually motivate and support a statement which is a crucial step in the discourse, leading to the target conclusion. They must not be confused with purpose or causal clauses: their role is to establish and justify the statement, outlining its importance. They have several origins including previous situations of the same kind, laws or generally admitted attitudes. Prevention arguments are based on a “positive” or a “negative” formulation. Their role is basically to warn the listeners from false presuppositions or incorrect beliefs they may have or inadequate entailments they could draw from explanation or a previously given argument. Performing arguments are less imperative than the previous ones; they express advice or evaluations so that the listener himself can measure the well-founded character of the elements of the discourse.

Threatening arguments have a stronger impact on the user's attention than warnings. The goal of the orator is to inform listeners of the risks and problems that could follow from inappropriate decisions. Threats are more personal and involve the listeners.

Explanation is basically a cognitive and communication activity. Its relation to language and linguistics is a relatively new and vast area of investigation. Explanation analysis involves the consideration of a large number of language aspects, including syntax, word selection, semantics, pragmatics, domain and contextual knowledge, and listener profiles. Let us very briefly analyze here some facets and subtypes of explanation in relation to argumentation. These facets are crucial for the organization of a rhetoric discourse. Let us report here the main functions introduced in [BOU 11], which are defined from the analysis of didactic and technical texts that are of interest for rhetoric. The functions which are introduced are prefixed by E- to avoid any confusion with rhetoric relations of the RST.

The aim of the *E-explicit* function, which operates at the ideational level, is to enhance, reinforce, or possibly weaken or contradict the beliefs of the reader, as anticipated by the author of the text or discourse. This is realized by providing more specific information, clarifications or precisions on some aspects of the action at stake. This is the main function of explanation in the context of rhetoric. It includes several forms of elaboration which are not, in general, neutral with respect to the argumentation.

E-framing indicates, via a statement often starting a sentence or a paragraph, the context and the limits of an argument. It is also used to introduce some forms of persuasion, such as the commitment of the orator, the authority of the sources of the facts or arguments that are reported or their moral value. *E-expected-result* describes the target result or situation as envisioned by the orator.

E-definition gives a definition of a certain concept in order to ensure that the reader has a good knowledge of that concept. This function is more limited than the E-explicit function in the sense that it does not have *a priori* any impact on the listener's beliefs. *E-reformulation* states the same information with different words or constructions, but there are no new informational contents. Reformulation helps the listener to understand complex arguments or information.

E-illustration gives one or more relevant examples in relation with the argument (circumstances where this argument has been judged valid, for example). This function is stronger than reformulation in the sense that it probably gives some additional information to the listener via the examples which are provided. *E-evaluation* provides a precise evaluation of what should be concluded at this point, often paired with an *E-summary*. This latter function is a way to conclude on some point by simply making a synthesis of the main points at stake. *E-contrast* introduces a comparison or a difference between two methods, objects or situations in order to improve the efficiency and the persuasion strength of an argument. *E-analogy* is a form of comparison to help understanding, similar to an illustration but in a different register.

Let us now consider a few discourse relations which are not explanation functions but are important articulations in a rhetoric discourse. The first structure is conditional expressions which are used to express assumptions, hypotheses or basic alternatives in relation with a condition. The second main discourse structure is causality. Basically, causality involves a statement and an ensuing situation or consequence. Causal structures and their impact are investigated in detail in [TAL 01]. Causality may be associated with hypothetical reasoning in order to suggest to the listener the consequences of a situation that is not expected. Finally, concessions are often used to soften

arguments that are too strong by allowing exceptions which could be admitted.

These abstract functions are realized in language by means of explanation schemes, comparable to the argumentation schemes presented in [WAL 08].

1.5. Conclusion: a few historical milestones of traditional rhetoric

Rhetoric has had several ups and downs over the centuries. It has also had several uses, interpretations and definitions corresponding to different views. In this section, a few elements are introduced for readers who want to deepen their knowledge on this topic. A large number of books, translations of original texts, and web pages are devoted to this topic. This section is quite schematic and constitutes an overview of these documents. A short list of the main references by historical period is given at the end of this chapter.

From the Greek tradition, rhetoric is first a social activity oriented toward controversy and discourse. From a more recent literary tradition, rhetoric is also a set of techniques designed to create good quality texts, with appropriate articulations, developments and style. From its original persuasion and argumentation uses, moving on to a more aesthetic point of view, rhetoric became an important element of poetry. Then, the study of argumentation and demonstration became a part of philosophy and logics, whereas, quite independently, linguistics and pragmatics developed models for the language aspects of rhetoric.

The main Greek sources are the sophists (such as Protagoras and Gorgias), where the contents of a discourse and its organization were more crucial than the language form. Authors also include Socrates' contribution which is

essentially visible in Plato's dialogues. Isocrates established a school in 390 BC, putting emphasis on morals. He developed a sophistic rhetoric with an emphasis on the style, with the development of complex forms, sacrificing clarity to form. This approach has been very influential on literature and theater.

In a very different perspective, Plato developed an analysis of the differences between the objectives of philosophy and rhetoric, while Aristotle established most of the main structures, categorizations and classifications presented in this chapter. Other Greek sources include, e.g., Démosthènès (realization of rhetoric, he was an excellent orator), Demetrius (focus on style), Dyonisus (arrangements of words) and Longinus (development of the sublime).

The main Latin sources include Anon, Tacitus and Cicero who described the virtues of the ideal orator and his qualifications (*De Inventione*, *De Oratore*, *Brutus*, etc.). Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria*) developed several foundational aspects of rhetoric and showed its importance in political and judicial institutions. Finally, he discussed forms of education that the orator should follow.

During the Middle Ages, rhetoric was part of the *trivium*; it was somewhat in opposition to the views of the Catholic Church where argumentation was not admitted in a number of sectors. A stricter use of grammar and logic was preferred to rhetoric (Donatus, Priscien). Rhetoric was essentially taught to political and administrative managers, diplomats and judges so that they can adequately express themselves and present their ideas, motivations and arguments in an accurate and efficient manner. Rhetoric was also used for sermons and religious predication, with the aim not to discuss religious principles but to convince the audience of the religious dogma.

The resurgence of rhetoric occurred during the Renaissance, in association with poetry. However, during the Renaissance, dialectic was the most prominent discipline; therefore, argumentation got some autonomy with respect to rhetoric. Erasmus (*De Duplici Copia Verborum et Rerum*, 1512) is probably the most prominent figure of this period with major contributions to the areas of elocution and invention. The art of making a good speech with appropriate words and language forms was developed by major orators and poets such as Boccaccio, Dante and Petrarch.

At this period, the importance of the various forms of art (painting, music, sculpture and architecture) that could contribute to rhetoric was emphasized. The scholars of this period investigated how the principles of textual rhetoric were realized in these arts, whose goal was not only to please and touch but also to instruct. The *inventio* and the *dispositio* are central in art (*what to say* and *how*). In addition, in music the study of metrics and rhythms (*elocutio*), memorization and restitution to an audience was, and still is, very crucial.

From the 15th Century until the end of the 17th Century, a number of scholars and composers developed music composition principles in relation with rhetoric. J. Burmeister, J. Mattheson, J.J. Quantz and J.P. Kirnberger are the main authors and theoreticians whose writings are still of interest for musical analysis and interpretation of the baroque and early classical periods. Unfortunately, their treaties and books are only available as facsimile in few libraries.

From the 17th Century, rhetoric and language were closely interrelated with the goal of defining the ideal social person, such as the courtiers found in royal or prince courts in Europe. Theoreticians and writers of this period include B. Lamy and N. Boileau.

Rhetoric then tended to disappear during the 19th Century and the rationalist period, where it was felt to be a useless form of chatter, or worse, a kind of trickery. The revival of rhetoric in the 20th Century is due to a few major philosophers such as C. Perelman [PER 73], artists (e.g. [PRE 06]) and theoreticians of argumentation. An initial trend aimed at analyzing, by means of rational and scientific methods, the structure of messages produced by orators from the linguistic, psychological and logical perspectives. This scientific approach was combined with an in-depth analysis of argumentation processes and schemes, value systems and how judgments are formed. These analysis were based on empirical analytical approaches; it is therefore much more foundational and scientific than in the previous periods.

More recently, with the development of media such as TV and the Internet, the analysis of social discourse and its persuasion effects on the public became prominent. Several research trends and research groups (e.g. the Mu group) emerged dealing with various kinds of formal logic, speech act theories and development around central topics in rhetoric such as persuasion and psycholinguistics, symbolism (e.g. K. Burke), poetry, communication and sociology. Discussing these approaches goes beyond the scope of this chapter, but these trends reveal a very active and productive revival of rhetoric in various domains of analysis.

1.6. A few historical references for classical rhetoric

In this section, we propose a few major historical references that are important milestones of the development of classical rhetoric. These are essentially translations of Greek and Latin texts. Recent commentaries of these texts are also available. Contemporary references are given in the Bibliography at the end of this book.

Classical period

- ARISTOTLE, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civil Discourse*, KENNEDY G.A. (trans.), Oxford University Press, 1991.
- The Complete Works of Aristotle*, the revised Oxford translation, Princeton University Press, 1984.
- PLATO, *Complete Works*, COOPER J.M. (ed.), Hacklett Publishing, 1997.
- CICERO, *The Fragmentary Orations: An Edition with Commentary*, CRAWFORD J.W. (ed.), English Scholar Press, Menston, 1994.
- CICERO, *Rhetorica Ad Herennium: Books I and II: On the Theory of Public Speaking*, Createspace, 2014.
- CICERO, *Defense Speeches*, BERRY D.H. (trans.), Oxford's World Classics, 2008.
- ISOCRATES, *The Panegyricus of Isocrates*, Nabu Press, 2013. [in Greek]

Medieval

- BOETHIUS, *Boethius's De topicis differentiis*, translated, with notes and essays on the text, ELEONORE A.S. (ed.), Cornell University Press, 1978.

Renaissance

- ERASMUS D., *Collected Works of Erasmus*, Literary and Educational Writings 2: De Copia, De Ratione Studii, THOMPSON C.R. (ed.), University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- RAMUS P., *Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian* (1549), NEWLANDS C., MURPHY J.J. (trans.), University of Northern Illinois Press, 1983.

Eighteenth century

- BURKE E., *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful* (1757), University of Notre Dame Press, 1958.

DAVID H., *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 3 vols, London, (1739–1740), CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2011. Same for *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, 2011.

LOCKE J., *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, FQ Books, 2010.

FÉNELON F., *Selections from the Writings of Fénelon*, Book on Demand Ltd., 2013.