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Rhetoric and Discourse Analysis*

This chapter explores the role of rhetoric in discourse analysis and the features and tools rhetoric may contribute to the task and strategies of analyzing discourses. First, an overview of the different definitions and roles of rhetoric are offered; the interpretative, analytical and productive roles of rhetoric are taken into account; and discourse is presented as a twofold phenomenon — as a linguistic construction and as a comprehensive space which encompasses the orator and hearer in line with a reading of Aristotle’s Rhetoric, 1358a38–1358b2. Polyacroasis, the plurality of listening and interpreting discourses, is presented as the basis of one of the links between rhetoric and discourse analysis. A number of trends in the reconsideration of rhetoric for the purposes of discourse analysis are discussed, with a particular focus on the following: new perspectives on elocutio, and new ways of dealing with elocutio and related issues (the constitution and role of certain figures, for instance, and cognitive theory of metaphor); the relationship between rhetoric and translation studies; and the proposal of a rhetoric of culture.

Keywords: Rhetoric; Discourse; Production; Analysis; Polyacroasis.

1. There is rhetoric in all discourses

On 25 March, 2009, the Spanish newspaper El País published, a chronicle by Miguel Mora, correspondent in Rome, which began as follows:

Habla claro y sin retórica. Comienza a soltar verdades entre sonrisas, con la voz suave y el índice levantado. Enseguida, en la platea se deshacen los corrillos y surge el entusiasmo. Su cara redonda de niña, coleta y flequillo, engaña. Tiene 38 años, es abogada, se llama Debora Serracchiani y es secretaria del Partido Demócrata (PD) en Udine (noreste de Italia). Y en

* This paper was written in the context of the research project “Cultural Rhetoric” (Reference FF12010-15160), funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation of Spain.
apenas dos días se ha convertido en la nueva esperanza de una oposición que busca desesperadamente una voz nueva y unitaria (Mora 2009).

When the writer tells us that Debora Serracchiani speaks without rhetoric, he means that she speaks without using rhetorical devices: we should understand that he is trying to tell that she speaks without the rhetoric usual among Italian politicians. Because Debora Serracchiani speaks with rhetoric, as we all do, since it is not possible to speak without rhetoric, as rhetoric is inherent to all human communication. Every discourse¹ has rhetoric, and there are different ways of using rhetoric, as well as different kinds of rhetorical discourses and even uses of rhetoric, which have been current from ancient times up to our own day. We live with rhetoric, even though we are not usually aware of it, because all our speeches and other linguistic expressions contain a rhetorical component within a communicative and semiotic dimension. Let us examine an example of the unconscious use of a communicative device or way of speaking, from Molière’s Le bourgeois gentilhomme, where Monsieur Jourdain learns from his master of philosophy that there are two means of expression, prose and verse, and that he does not use verse because he is using prose, even though he is not aware of doing so².

---

1  I am using the terms “discourse” and “text” as synonyms. However, “discourse” is used when I want to stress its rhetorical condition or its dynamic characteristics. I use the term “speech” to refer to oral discourse.

2  The quotation from Molière’s Le bourgeois gentilhomme follows:

   “M. JOURDAIN
   Je vous en prie. Au reste, il faut que je vous fasse une confiance. Je suis amoureux d’une personne de grande qualité, et je souhaiterais que vous m’aidassiez à lui écrire quelque chose dans un petit billet que je veux laisser tomber à ses pieds.”

   MAÎTRE DE PHILOSOPHIE
   Fort bien.

   M. JOURDAIN

   Cela sera galant, oui.

   MAÎTRE DE PHILOSOPHIE
   Sans doute. Sont-ce des vers que vous lui voulez écrire?

   M. JOURDAIN

   Non, non, point de vers.

   MAÎTRE DE PHILOSOPHIE
   Vous ne voulez que de la prose?

   M. JOURDAIN

   Non, je ne veux ni prose ni vers.

   MAÎTRE DE PHILOSOPHIE
   Il faut bien que ce soit l’un, ou l’autre.
In the words of José Luis Martínez-Dueñas, in his dialogue about rhetoric *El verbo con sentido*:

**H[ermia]:** Pero la retórica es algo antiguo. Yo siempre he leído de la retórica en las traducciones de griego, y en la literatura latina; además, siempre que mencionan la retórica es para decir algo peyorativo: “Sus palabras eran sólo retórica”, “Respondió con mera retórica”. Siempre se usa como algo del pasado y tú me dices que tu respuesta depende de la retórica. ¿Quieres decir que es huera? ¿Que no tiene sentido?

**L[concio]:** Nada más lejos de mi intención: todo lo contario. Lo que ocurre es que la retórica es tan antigua, se halla tan implantada en nuestra lengua, en nuestra competencia lingüística y comunicativa, que no se la reconoce; y sin embargo se le atribuyen desmanes y errores que no son en absoluto de su responsabilidad. Se suele decir hoy día, como algo común, que algo es retórico cuando su sentido es inoperante, o cuando hay ornato excesivo, o cuando se insufla mera palabrería, coherería verbal, pirotecnia ‘palabrasca’.

[…](Martínez-Dueñas 2003: 9-10).

Leoncio’s answer in the passage of the dialogue quoted clarifies the hidden or underlying nature of rhetoric in language and its relationship to the mistaken conception of rhetoric as a hollow and overblown way of speaking.

There are no discourses without rhetoric, but rhetoric adopts different forms in accordance with the kinds, features and character-

---

**M. JOURDAIN**

Pourquoi?

MAÎTRE DE PHILOSOPHIE

Par la raison, Monsieur, qu’il n’y a pour s’exprimer que la prose, ou les vers.

M. JOURDAIN

Il n’y a que la prose ou les vers?

MAÎTRE DE PHILOSOPHIE

Non, Monsieur : tout ce qui n’est point prose est vers; et tout ce qui n’est point vers est prose.

M. JOURDAIN

Et comme l’on parle, qu’est-ce que c’est donc que cela?

MAÎTRE DE PHILOSOPHIE

De la prose.

M. JOURDAIN

Quoi! quand je dis: « Nicole, apportez-moi mes pantoufles, et me donnez mon bonnet de nuit », c’est de la prose?

MAÎTRE DE PHILOSOPHIE

Oui, Monsieur.

M. JOURDAIN

Par ma foi! il y a plus de quarante ans que je dis de la prose sans que j’en susse rien, et je vous suis le plus obligé du monde de m’avoir appris cela. Je voudrais donc lui mettre dans un billet : Belle Marquise, vos beaux yeux me font mourir d’amour; mais je voudrais que cela fût mis d’une manière galante, que cela fût tourné gentiment” (Molière 1968: 55–57).
isidiosyncracies of discourses. The speaker or producer of discourse is “homo rhetoricus” (Garrido Gallardo 1994). We can find rhetorical structures and components in speeches, which can be considered to be the canonical linguistic expressions of rhetoric, but also in literary works, in everyday communication, in digital communication, even in slogans, one of the shortest rhetorical expressions, characterised by the semantic and pragmatic intensity of their construction and communication and by their brevity and incisive nature – as we know, the English word “slogan” comes from Scottish Gaelic “sluagh-ghairm”, which means ‘war cry’. Both canonical rhetorical expressions and non-canonical ones share rhetoricalness (Albaladejo 2005a; López Eire 2006), because of the rhetorical nature of language (López Eire 2006) and the rhetorical pregnancy of language (Ramírez Vidal 2004), which provide the basis for the rhetoric of linguistic expressions.

2. Rhetoric: a field in continuous expansion

There are different definitions of rhetoric. They represent different views of persuasive communication and the techniques that can be used. Aristotle defines rhetoric as follows:

Rhetoric then may be defined as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever. This is the function of no other of the arts, each of which is able to instruct and persuade in its own special subject; thus, medicine deals with health and sickness, geometry with the properties of magnitudes, arithmetic with number, and similarly with all the other arts and sciences. But Rhetoric, so to say, appears to be able to discover the means of persuasion in reference to any given subject. That is why we say that as an art its rules are not applied to any particular definite class of things (Aristotle 1982: 1355b25-34).

Quintilian gives the following definition: “Rhetorice ars est bene dicendi” (‘rhetoric is the art of speaking well’) (Quintilian 2001: 2, 17, 38) in opposition to grammar, which is defined by him as “recte loquendi scientia” (‘the study of correct speech’) (Quintilian 2001: 1, 4,
2). We can find other definitions of rhetoric, such as the following: rhetoric is the art of persuasion (Kennedy 1963; Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005; Spang 2005), rhetoric is the technique of producing public speeches, rhetoric is the systematisation of common sense concerning communication, and so on. Let us read the following explanation of rhetoric given by George A. Kennedy:

*Rētorikē* in Greek specifically denotes the civic art of public speaking as it is developed in deliberative assemblies, law courts, and other formal occasions under constitutional government in the Greek cities, especially the Athenian democracy. As such, it is a specific cultural subset of a more general concept of the power of words and their potential to affect a situation in which they are used or received (Kennedy 1994: 3).

Kennedy’s use of the expression “metarhetoric” is significant, in that it names the theory of producing and communicating discourses and distinguishes it from its concrete practice: “In recent years, the term ‘metarhetoric’ has been coined to describe a theory or art of rhetoric in contrast to the practice or application of the art in a particular discourse” (Kennedy 1994: 3). Although the Latin term “oratoria” is the translation of the Greek term “rhetorikē”, we can use “oratory” (from Latin “oratoria”) in a concrete sense to refer to the practical use of system and rules of rhetoric for the production and communication of concrete speeches and to of the entirety of the rhetorical discourses managed by an orator.

Nonetheless, in addition to these definitions, I would like to stress the definition of rhetoric provided by James J. Murphy at the beginning of his essay on the origins and early steps of rhetoric, because of its explicit relationship with the analysis of discourses:

*Rhetoric, the systematic analysis of human discourse for the purpose of adducing useful precepts for future discourse, is one of the oldest disciplines in the Western world. Long before 700 B.C., the Greeks learned to arrange speeches in ways that they were calculated to achieve a desired effect (Murphy 1983: 3. Italics are mine).*

Murphy’s definition places rhetoric in the area of analysis for learning and using the learnt issues. His definition, which maintains the link
with discourse production and connects it with analysis, is highly pertinent to our aim of connecting rhetoric and discourse analysis.

On this basis, we can see that rhetoric has two dimensions: that of the technique for producing and delivering discourses, and that of the analysis of discourses. These dimensions are connected, because it is not possible to analyse discourses if these have not been produced, but it is not possible to produce discourses if the producer (the orator) lacks the technique which has been obtained from the analysis of previously delivered discourses, and from the consciousness of language, speech and communication which is peculiar to human beings.

Since its birth and all through its history, rhetoric has continuously expanded of its scope of practice and study without relinquishing any space which it formerly occupied. Rhetoric was born in Sicily as a tool of communication to persuade hearers to agree that the proposals made by the orator would be accepted. Discourses delivered in courts were the original practice and object of rhetoric. The birth of rhetoric was impelled by the need to defend the rights of property of landowners whose properties had been confiscated by the tyrant in Syracuse (Murphy 1983: 6-7; Cole 1991: 22ff.; López Eire 1998; Perrot 2000). Rhetoric then passed from Sicily to Athens, where it became an important tool for persuasion in legal affairs and democracy and flourished as a creative human art. The Greeks used rhetoric because they wanted their speeches and communication to be as efficient as possible. Rhetoric is a tool to aid human life together, and society cannot lack rhetoric in its relationships and organisation since it makes it possible to solve problems by means of language in discourse. The Spanish philosopher Juan Luis Vives connected rhetoric to free societies (Vives 1531: 47v), and identified language in discourse (sermo) as one of the main bases of human society, together with iustitia (Vives 1998: 2–3).

Rhetoric became established as a system (Volkmann 1987; Lausberg 1966-1967-1968; Albaladejo 1991: 21ff.) that is the result of an explicit systematisation of human communicative power by means of discourse, and it has had a long history (Hernández Guerrero & García Tejera 1994). Many rhetorical resources result from the transformation into communicative rules of practical hints based on common sense about communication. This is the case, for example, with the notion of taedium as an effect that must be avoided by means of
ensuring that discourse is pleasant and not unnecessarily long, because otherwise hearers can become tired and their attention may wander.

Rhetoric has always been an extremely powerful tool for oral communication. However, the conditions of oral communication have changed since the early, classical developments of rhetoric. Political conditions changed in the classical cultural space between the time when rhetoric was at its peak in Greece and its transfer to Rome. The evolution of Roman rhetoric came to a stage when it was no longer politically useful, but it maintained considerable cultural and educational weight, and became an important part of the education of Roman citizens. Rhetoric adapted itself to new circumstances, and it continued to be a system of knowledge for communication and life in society, since for one thing, courts did not lack rhetoric. The figure of Quintilian (Kennedy 1994: 177ff.; Pujante 1999), who wrote his systematic treatise *Institutio oratoria* when conditions for rhetoric in political life were not the best, is a testimony to the value and validity of rhetoric beyond concrete circumstances. Of course, the full implication of rhetoric in the life of society is achieved when political and social freedom forms the context of production and delivery of discourses and also of its reception and interpretation.

The original channel of communication for rhetoric is the oral one. Rhetoric began its career in orality (Ong 2002; Assmann 2011) and there it developed a complex and complete instrument for discursive production and for face-to-face communication in the delivery of discourse. Many items within the system of rhetoric were created for direct and immediate communication to the hearers, and consequently they gave rhetoric an oral basis that provided a shape that became present even in non-oral uses of rhetoric. Orality has accompanied rhetoric from its origins until now, and shows one of the most social aspects of the art of persuasion. Orality is connected to immediateness and directness in communication, as well as to public sessions. The orality of rhetoric is a collaborating constituent of law and justice: trials could not be carried out without orality, because of the need for communication in public hearings, with public questions, answers, witnesses, evidence and, of course, speeches. Therefore, orality is one of the main original features of rhetoric, with an essential role in its practice, and it remains one of its main contemporary features. Today, we can hear oral discourses just as Greeks and Romans heard them in
courts, in political chambers, and other public places and communicative situations.

However, the orality of today’s rhetoric presents some differences with respect to its former orality. Nowadays, the orality of rhetorical discourse is supported by technical means which allow discourse to reach more and more hearers (Albaladejo 2001). Electronic devices like microphones or mass media like radio and television are communicative prostheses of rhetorical discourse and they help communication by offering it to hearers who otherwise could not hear, see, receive or interpret it. The technique of microphones has changed the practice of discourse in parliaments and courts, where oral communication is achieved not only through the orator’s own voice, since his voice is aided by technical applications. Radio and television can broadcast discourses everywhere, making it possible for hearers who are not present in the place of delivery to hear them. The role of the magnetic and digital register of voice or image is similar to the role of these media.

But rhetoric has not developed only the practice and theory of communication through the oral channel. It was extended to the written channel by transferring its notions and components to writing. Let us think of the case of the *artes dictaminis* in the Middle Ages (Murphy 1981: 194-268), which constitute the assumption of foundations and master lines of oral rhetorical discourse for a canonical kind of written discourse. But the conquering of new areas of communication by rhetoric does not stop in written discourse: rhetoric has not only extended to different kinds of written discourse, like letters, applications or journalism, but it has also continued its spread into other fields, like those of visual and plastic communication, media and digital communication. Rhetoric is open to new languages, new kinds of discourses and new ways of communication (Pujante 2011).

There are three kinds of rhetorical genre or rhetorical discourse: forensic, deliberative and epideictic (Aristotle 1982: 1358a37-1358b8). The forensic kind of discourse, used in the courts, was the original discursive area of rhetorical practice, but it extended soon to the deliberative and epideictic kinds of discourse in the political or civic realm. Early rhetoric began to explore all the possible occurrences of public oral discourse, and thus deliberative discourse became an important tool for decisions in political life and for the organisation
and running of society, while epideictic discourse contributed to the cohesion and civic consciousness of society.

The connection to literary text is one of the historical associations of rhetoric (García Berrio & Hernández Fernández 2004: 105ff.). The constitution of the system of figures and tropes in the realm of rhetoric was no doubt an opportunity for bringing together the two classical disciplines of discourse: rhetoric and poetics (García Berrio 1984). The adoption by poetics of rhetorical figures and tropes established an open and permanent way of connection and interchange between it and rhetoric. In addition to this, the constitution of the epideictic kind of discourse narrowed the gap and even brought to light common interests for both disciplines. As is well known, epideictic discourse is the closest of all rhetorical discourses to literature, to the field of poetics. The relationship between rhetoric and theatre (Chico Rico 2010) offers another close connection between rhetoric and literature.

The birth of journalism provided an adaptation of rhetoric to the characteristics of this new kind of written communication that hosted new configurations of discourse. In its turn, oral and image media required rhetoric to pay attention to them. But the rhetoric of journalism (Villanueva 1995; Hernández Guerrero 2006; Casado-Velarde 2010; Garrido Gallardo 2010; Llamas Saíz 2010), the rhetoric of radio and the rhetoric of television, as well as of advertising, are adaptations of rhetoric, and they maintain the master lines and the essential constitution of rhetoric. They are not a realisation of rhetoric that is different from the foundations of this discipline. The historical and systematic communicative strength of rhetoric enables it to deal with new kinds of discourse, since they keep the essential components of rhetorical discourse. Cyber-rhetoric or the rhetoric of digital discourse (Albaladejo 2005a) could be considered one of the latest steps in the evolution of rhetoric. Digital discourse is a complex construction consisting of linguistic, visual and phonic components, which has a rhetorical foundation and manifestation as a whole. In addition to the rhetorical shape of digital discourse, one must also take into account the rhetorical construction of all written and oral texts contained in web sites, as well as the rhetorical discourses hosted by them, as in, for example, Martin Luther King’s discourse *I have a dream*, which can be read, heard and seen on the World Wide Web.
Nevertheless, cyber-rhetoric is basically nothing other than rhetoric. Cyber-rhetoric is rhetoric, as the rhetoric of written discourse is rhetoric, and the rhetoric of journalism and other mass media is rhetoric. The different prefixes, adjectives and nominal complements added to the noun rhetoric are used in order to delimit an area within the wide field of rhetoric, and they must not be understood to be a way of proposing or promoting a rhetoric different from rhetoric as a comprehensive system that was historically founded and developed. They are rather a way of enriching rhetoric by stressing its plurality and suitability for the different kinds of discourse and the different means of achieving communication.

One of the characteristics of the development and evolution of rhetoric is the expansion of its area of practice and study within the field of communication, together with the fact that rhetoric has never been withdrawn from the spaces where it has previously worked. Thus, today we can hear oral rhetorical discourses, such as those delivered in courts and parliaments, but we can also read written rhetorical discourses, like editorials or leading articles in newspapers, and we can also see, hear and read digital rhetorical discourses. Rhetoric has carried to new communicative areas the experience that it has obtained in the areas where it has formerly worked. In this way, rhetoric has enriched itself and has provided tested and renewed tools for the practice and study of discursive and persuasive communication. Adaptation to the needs that have arisen in the ongoing evolution of communication has always been a challenge for rhetoric, but this is the key to its usefulness. This adaptation of rhetoric has been possible because of the presence of basic notions and components which constitute the master lines of the rhetorical system, and the idea of discourse as a whole with internal and external coherence and consistency.
3. Rhetoric and the analysis of discourses. The constitution of rhetorical discourse analysis

As James J. Murphy has stated, rhetoric consists of analysis of discourses in order to produce new discourses. Murphy’s definition is a manifestation of the double dimension of rhetoric, as an instrument for the production of discourses in communication, and as an instrument for the analysis, description and explanation of discourses. Hence, rhetoric is a technique but also a science. Rhetoric produces discourses and studies them, too. If we ask ourselves which discourses are to be studied by rhetoric, the answer will contain not only canonically rhetorical discourses, but also all other kinds of discourses, since they are built upon the rhetorical nature of language and, therefore, have rhetorical components even though they are not rhetorical discourses. Rhetoric is able to study all discourses, literary works, advertisements, web pages, etc. because of its analytical power, which it has obtains from its role in the production and communication of discourses. Although rhetoric was originally thought out in the context of those discourses which are canonically rhetorical, it has demonstrated its suitability to deal with discourses other than the canonically rhetorical ones, but which are characterised by having a rhetorical character. The analytical use of rhetoric comes from its experience during Antiquity and subsequently in the production and communication of discourses (Kinneavy 1980; Connors, Ede & Lunsford 1984), which has been transferred to the realm of their interpretation and analysis. The role of rhetoric in discourse analysis is parallel to its role in the production not only of rhetorical discourses, but of all kinds of language. Rhetoric can thus contribute to the analysis of all discourses.

Human beings live thanks to language, which is language in discourse, and language through discourse. Their relationship with discourses takes the form of production, interpretation, communication, identity, difference, etc., and an implicit or explicit analysis of these in order to understand tsociety, the world, themselves and others. I refer to this discursive reality as a galaxy of discourses we live by (Albaladejo 2011a). Discourses constitute a galaxy and we are inside it, listening, interpreting, producing, communicating, understand-
ing, meaning, etc. and, of course, creating relationships which contribute to build human society. The galaxy of discourses has always existed, but nowadays it has enhanced its size, activity and role in human life because of the function of the media (Martínez Arnaldos 1990; Martínez Arnaldos 2001) and the new enlarged possibilities of communication.

There is a confluence between the aims of rhetoric and those of discourse analysis as proposed by Zellig S. Harris (Harris 1952). He writes:

Discourse analysis yields considerable information about the structure of a text or a type of text, and about the role that each element plays in such a structure. Descriptive linguistics, on the other hand, tells only the role that each element plays in the structure of its sentence. Discourse analysis tells, in addition, how a discourse can be constructed to meet various specifications, just as descriptive linguistics builds up sophistication about the ways in which linguistic systems can be constructed to meet various specifications. It also yields information about stretches of speech longer than one sentence; thus it turns out that while there are relations among successive sentences, these are not visible in sentence structure (in terms of what is subject and what is predicate, or the like), but in the pattern of occurrence of equivalence classes through successive sentences (Harris 1952: 30).

The determination to go beyond the sentence in analysing language characterises Harris’s research, where the study of distribution is at the service of relationships between sentences within discourse. Linguistic distributionalism becomes thus one of the means of overcoming the limits of sentence (García Berrio 1967–1968). Harris’s discourse analysis is one of the most important precedents for text linguistics, and his proposal is taken into account and discussed by Teun A. van Dijk in Some Aspects of Text Grammars (van Dijk 1972: 26ff.). It is one of the essays collected by Wolfgang U. Dressler in his edited book Textlinguistik (Dressler 1978). Rhetoric is considered to be one of the main classical foundations of text linguistics (van Dijk 1972; García Berrio 1979b; García Berrio 1984; López Eire 1995; López Eire 1996: 137ff.). The linguistics of the twentieth century has made a great effort to reach the suprasentential level of language and communication and to arrive at the textual one. Different approaches from linguistics itself, including other approaches based on pragmatic and semiotic positions, have come together to produce text linguistics.
(Petöfi 1971; Petöfi 1975; van Dijk 1972; van Dijk 1977; Petöfi, Rießer 1973; Güllich & Raible 1976; Schmidt 1978; Petöfi & García Berrio 1979; Ramón Trives 1979; Bernárdez 1982, Bernárdez 1987; Albaladejo 1982; Chico Rico 1992; Casado-Velarde 2000 y 2009). The efforts of stylists to conduct a literary analysis with the help of linguistics cannot be omitted (Enkvist 1978; García Berrio 1979a; García Berrio 1979b; Petöfi & García Berrio 1979; Muñoz Cortés 1986; Albaladejo & Gómez Alonso 2001; Gómez Alonso 2002). The awareness that linguistic communication is achieved by means of texts (discourses) is the foundation for the development of textual studies, where discourse analysis and discourse theory (Kinneavy 1980) are included as a necessary and important part of those studies which look at text/discourse as the linguistic unit of communication.

In addition to the fact that rhetoric is one of the precedents for text linguistics, one can find a confluence between these two disciplines, in such a way that it can be considered that there is a methodological opening not only from rhetoric to text linguistics and discourse analysis, but also from these to rhetoric. Rhetoric is able to provide a very rich set of instruments for the analysis of standard discourses and literary discourses. Antonio García Berrio has connected rhetoric to the discursive analysis and the modern disciplines of discourse within his proposal for general rhetoric: “it is absolutely necessary that the somewhat empty denomination of rhetoric or neorhetoric be endowed with its genuine stock of principles, categories and hermeneutical strategies for the analysis of literary discourse” (García Berrio 1992: 113). García Berrio’s proposal is placed within his idea of the recovery of historic thought:

The history of rhetoric, like that of poetics, is so rich, and the documents that constitute it are so numerous and, in spite of appearances, varied, that the current project of scientifically laying the foundations for a re-implantation of rhetoric at the center of the disciplines of discourse presupposes a preceding stage dedicated to the adequate recovery of historic thought (García Berrio 1992: 114).

In his Rhetoric, Aristotle gives an explanation of rhetorical discourse (lógos) which offers a full view of the pragmatic and referential implications and constituents of discourse: “For every speech is composed of three parts: the speaker, the subject of which he treats, and the per-
son to whom it is addressed. I mean the hearer, to whom the end or object of the speech refers” (Aristotle 1971: 1358a38-1358b2). Aristotle’s explanation constitutes what we can call ‘discursivisation’ of the speaker, the hearer and the referent of the speech. Aristotle stresses the function of the hearer (akroatés), and this works as the instance or basis for the classification of rhetorical discourses. Ezio Raimondi explains, in the context of the importance of the addressee, that when we deal with the public, we are dealing with rhetoric:

Ma quando parliamo di pubblico torniamo a parlare di retorica, che è in fondo, da qualunque lato la si guardi, una teoria del destinatario: chi ascolta deve essere conquistato e ciò avviene solo attraverso qualcosa che è già in comune, per esempio una credenza condivisa durante un rito liturgico (Raimondi 2002: 68).

The speaker and the hearer are connected by discourse, and discourse can be thought to embrace both of them. José Antonio Hernández Guerrero’s and María del Carmen García Tejera’s words are important as to this interpretation of rhetorical discourse as a (communicative) embrace:

El discurso oratorio es una prueba de reconocimiento y ofrecimiento – de hospitalidad – mutuos entre orador y el público. El discurso es una expansión y, sobre todo, una forma privilegiada de la compañía que requiere el calor de la acogida recíproca.

Por todas estas razones, decimos que el objetivo del discurso – proceso abierto y dinámico de conexión profunda – es la comunicación interpersonal. En el discurso público, el lenguaje favorece la comunicación de las personas bajo la forma de una explicitación de valores: cada uno da recibiendo porque cada uno recibe dando (Hernández Guerrero & García Tejera 2004: 15).

Aristotle’s attention focused on the hearer of the rhetorical discourse is the key to the reversible condition of rhetoric, which was born as a technique centred on the speaker’s perspective, although oriented to the hearer, but has received a decisive backing as a technique centred on the hearer’s view, too, without missing out the discourse itself. The core of Aristotle’s Rhetoric is constituted by the axis rhetor (ho légon) – discourse – hearer; these three categories build up rhetorical communication, where the poetic and onomasiological perspective is completed by the aesthetic and semasiological one. As to the role of
the speaker in rhetorical discourse, Antonio López Eire has written: “Mientras que, en virtud de la ‘retoricidad’ del lenguaje, la realidad siempre aparece alejada de su imagen lingüística, el hablante, el usuario del lenguaje, está siempre presente en la imagen con la que intenta reproducir la realidad” (López Eire 2006: 11).

Consequently, rhetoric is concerned with global communication, whose parts related to production and reception, to synthesis and analysis, are included within its realm, which no doubt has a pragmatic nature (López Eire 1995: 135ff.; López Eire 2006; Albaladejo 1993a; Albaladejo 1993b; Hernández Guerrero 1998), explained from the pragmatic perspective connected to textual linguistics (van Dijk 1977; van Dijk 1997a; van Dijk 1997b; Garcia Berrio 1979a; Petöfi & García Berrio 1979). The role of the hearer, together with the role of the orator (ho légon, who speaks) is one of the foundations of the pragmatic dimension of rhetoric. The consolidation of rhetoric as an instrument for the analysis of speeches and all kinds of linguistic expressions of textual dimension is the bridge to its connection with discourse analysis widely understood as equivalent to text linguistics, its central interests being those of explaining discourse through its analysis. Rhetoric provides the analytical study of discourse from a complex and plural perspective, which is syntactic, semantic and pragmatic, within a semiotic framework.

Because of the reduction of the realm of rhetoric during the 18th and 19th centuries, with significant precedents in the 16th century (Albaladejo 1991: 28-31), from the whole field of the production of discourse defined by the rhetorical operations (partes artis) inventio (inventio), dispositio (arrangement), elocutio (expression or style), memoria (memory) and actio/pronuntiatio (delivery) to the sole operation of elocutio, the global shape of rhetoric decreased and even disappeared. A rhetoric centred on elocutio is a “rhétorique restreinte” (Genette 1972) which lacks the instruments for production and analysis of the other rhetorical operations and their results, and hence loses its view of the entire object constituted by discourse, communication and, of course, the orator or producer and the hearer or receiver. However, now rhetoric has retrieved the missing operations, after hard work in the second half of the 20th century, with encouraging contributions by Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1989), Antonio García Berrio (García Berrio 1984),
Francisco Chico Rico (Chico Rico 1987), José Antonio Hernández Guerrero and María del Carmen García Tejera (Hernández Guerrero & García Tejera 1994; Hernández Guerrero & García Tejera 2004), Stefano Arduini (Arduini 2004), and other authors, within a renaissance of rhetoric (Battistini & Raimondi 1990: 496ff.). The renewal of the study of figures can be considered as another important support for achieving a global rhetoric, since it reinforces and motivates the search for the roots of the devices of *elocutio*, which are connected with other parts of rhetoric (Arduini 2000; Arduini 2004) and with the production and analysis of literary works (García Berrio 1998: 415ff.). We should also refer to the Groupe μ, whose *Rhétorique générale* (Groupe μ 1970) was mainly an attempt to provide a new interpretation of rhetorical figures from a structuralist perspective.

The retrieval of the breadth of rhetoric has prepared it to be one of today’s most powerful instruments for analysing discourses, through its connection to views and tools from text linguistics (Albaladejo 2003a). Rhetoric provides the tools for analysing canonical rhetorical discourses and also all kinds of discourses which have a rhetorical character. The contribution of rhetoric in the analysis of discourses can be named *rhetorical discourse analysis*.

As to the analysis of rhetorical discourses, the system of rhetoric has a double set of operations which are the *partes artis*. I have divided them into rhetorical operations which build discourse (*inven-tio, dispositio and elocutio*) and rhetorical operations which do not build discourse (*memoria and actio/pronuntiatio*) (Albaladejo 1991: 53-60). The former ones are the processes of production of discourse (Albaladejo 1993b) and the latter ones work with the produced discourse, in order to memorise and to deliver it (Albaladejo1991: 58-59; Gómez Alonso 1997; Martín Cerezo 2003). The situation of the so-called sixth rhetorical operation, *intellectio* (Chico Rico 1987: 139ff.; Chico Rico 1989; Chico Rico 1998; Albaladejo & Chico Rico 1998), is special, because it does not build discourse but it has a poietic or creative role, since the understanding of communication and situation, as well as the possibilities of discourse depend on it. Its role is a creative one, like that of discourse-building operations, and can be contrasted with the practical role of *memoria* and *actio/pronuntiatio* (Albaladejo & Chico Rico 1998).
Rhetorical operations have been ordered theoretically in the system of rhetoric as a set from the beginning of discourse production to the end of it. The reversible condition of rhetoric allows us to use the rhetorical operations for analysing discourse and its production, and in this way they become an instrument for research, analysis and explanation of rhetorical discourse from the point of view of the receiver, a category where the critic of discourse is included. The analytical application of rhetoric does not work only for rhetorical discourses, since it can also deal with all discourses, including literary works. Hence, rhetorical discourse analysis is done according to the system of rhetoric. One of the features of this analysis is its comprehensiveness, for it can reach all levels and all devices of expressiveness of discourse. It is clear that the canonical rhetorical discourses are the etic realities corresponding to the emic unit\(^3\) which is rhetorical discourse, and consequently the knowledge of concrete or etic discourses is mapped onto the knowledge of the abstract or emic unity constituted by the category of discourse. The rhetorical system is present, of course, in the tokens which rhetorical discourses are, but also in the tokens of discourses other than rhetorical ones, and their ways of being present are very different and are connected with each kind of discourse. For instance, parliamentary discourse, poetry and advertisements can be analysed by means of rhetoric in a suitable way if their features and characteristics are taken into account in analysis. Rhetorical discourse analysis is focused on each of the devices and levels of discourse and communication corresponding to the rhetorical operations in rhetorical discourses and even in discourses belonging to other kinds.

The rhetorical analysis also comprises the examination of the *partes orationis*, i.e., the parts of discourse, which are another master line of the system of rhetoric. The analysis of these parts of canonical rhetorical discourse and, above all, of forensic discourse: *exordium* (introduction), *narratio* (statement of facts), *argumentatio* (argumentation), with its parts *probatio* (proof) and *refutatio* (refutation), and *peroratio* (peroration), allows us to know the organisation of discourse as a field which connects the orator and the hearer, and the possibility of special ways of ordering it with the aim of getting the hearer’s at-

---

\(^3\) I refer to the concepts of *etic* and *emic* according to Pike (Pike 1967: 37–38).
tention and support to the speaker and his ideas and proposals expressed in his discourse. But an analysis of textual structures corresponding to the *partes orationis* of discourses which are not canonically rhetorical can also be performed with the help of rhetoric. The textual organisation of narrative as well as that of some poems depends on a structure of introduction, exposition, climax and resolution, which is similar to the structure of the parts of rhetorical discourse. Rhetoric is able to offer a rich instrument for the analysis of order in the presentation of events in literary texts, advertisements, essays, text of scientific spreading (Fernández Rodríguez 2008), etc. The macro-structural order of discourse (García Berrio & Albaladejo 1988) is ruled by the attention paid by the speaker or author to the paths of interpretation of the hearer, spectator or reader.

Rhetorical discourse analysis plays an important role in explaining the devices of expressiveness of language which are placed on the level of the operation of *elocutio*. This analysis concerns the canonical rhetorical texts as well as those texts which are not rhetorical discourses but have rhetorical qualities. Thus, rhetorical analysis works to detect and explain linguistic devices which support the expressiveness of discourse and its communicative efficacy, mainly as to its persuasive goals. The analysis of figures and tropes as devices of expressiveness draws our attention to one of the major issues of rhetoric: the role of the rational and the irrational as contradictory but complementary features of rhetorical communication. The elocutive construction of rhetorical discourse is characterised by the rational linguistic elements but also by the irrational use of language in order to appeal to the emotional dimension of receivers. Nonetheless, the analysis and research of the cooperation of the rational and the irrational extends beyond the level and the limits of *elocutio* and reaches the space of other rhetorical operations, like *inventio, dispositio* and *actio/promuntuatio*. Invention comprises the finding of rational as well as irrational content elements to be included in the rhetorical discourse, but also in all kinds of discourses. The choice of inventive elements includes rational and irrational items, and both contribute to the influence of discourse in the audience. The analysis of these items is a contribution of rhetorical discourse analysis to general discourse analysis in the fields of fiction and imagination as components of the referent of the text which is transformed into linguistic material of representation by
means of the process of *intensification* (Albaladejo 1990), i.e. the transformation of the extension or referent into intension or linguistic construction of textual meaning and structure which are mapped onto the elocutive manifestation of discourse. On the other hand, the arrangement of intensionalised elements can be organised in *dispositio* in order to produce rational effects and/or irrational ones; this is the case with telling issues against the rational or within the rational expectations of the hearers. As to the delivery of discourse, the producer can use elements attached to a rationalistic perspective or elements appealing to the irrational through effects on the affective domain of the audience, and also a combination of both elements.

The rhetorical analysis of discourse also contributes to the knowledge of discourse communication by means of the research on the nature and composition of audiences. Because rhetoric has great experience in dealing with the realm of hearers, it has offered ever since Antiquity a reflection on audience and on the differences existing inside them. This fact has allowed me to propose the term and the notion of *polyacroasis* (from *polýs*, *pollê*, *polý*, ‘many’ and *akróasis*, ‘hearing’), which can be defined as the plural hearing and interpreting of rhetorical discourse (Albaladejo 1998a), understood as an oral discourse. But many features and components of polyacroasis can be extended as far as general oral communication and even written and general communication, in such a way that polyacroasis can be used as an explaining tool for the rhetorical analysis of rhetorical discourses, and also for the rhetorical analysis of discourses other than the rhetorical ones (Albaladejo 2009b). Polyacroasis can be taken into account for simultaneous reception of discourses by plural audiences and for successive and different audiences, whose plurality depends not only on their internal differences, but also on the differences produced by time when there are several communications of the same discourse with a relationship of succession in time between them.

Polyacroasis can also be explained, in connection with its main meaning, as a mechanism of discourse which avoids the exclusion of actual and possible receivers, even though these were not explicitly foreseen when the discourse was being produced or when it was delivered for the first time. Rhetoric can contribute in this way to discourse analysis by stressing the attention paid not only to the primary receivers of discourse, but also to the secondary ones (Albaladejo
1994), i.e. those who are not the addressee of the discourse, but are able to receive and interpret it outside the defined audience of discourse or to read it afterwards.

The analysis of discourse carried out by means of rhetoric also allows us to distinguish between receivers whose persuasion is the goal of discourse and receivers who are taken into account as possible targets. Persuasion and conviction (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1989: 65ff.) are two faces of the aim of rhetorical communication, and this idea can be transferred to literary discourse as well as to several other kinds of discourse. Persuasion and conviction are connected with each other, although they have different effects as to the receivers. There are receivers within a general audience who have the competence to decide as to the discourse and its proposal, while other receivers are not appointed to decide, but they can be convinced in spite of the fact that they cannot decide. The notion of polyacroasis is useful to distinguish these two kinds of receivers from discourse itself and to explain their different roles as to the same discourse. Polyacroasis can be considered as a notion with enough strength for playing a useful role in the analysis of the complexity of discourse in connection with the complexity of audiences, which are increasingly broad and at the same time are more and more specialised (Albaladejo 2001). Discourse analysis counts on rhetoric to explain the interpretative projection of discourses onto their audiences. Polyacroasis is present in many discourses, although it is not linguistically represented in all discourses; one of the ways of representing what I have called polyacroasis is the divided illocution as proposed by Alwin F. Fill (Fill 1986).

Polyacroasis can work as a discursive organiser and distributor of argumentation. An analytical study of the well-known speech delivered by the president of the Spanish Government Adolfo Suárez on 10th September, 1976, and broadcast by Radiotelevisión Española to announce the Bill for the Political Reform, should not lack the analysis of polyacroasis and its intensionalisation in the linguistic expression of discourse. Let us read the following paragraph of this speech:

Hace poco más de dos meses, después de jurar mi cargo ante Su Majestad el Rey, me dirigía a los españoles en un breve mensaje. Les invitaba a iniciar juntos un camino de futuro, que ha de evitar caer en cualquiera de estas dos
tentaciones: el partir de cero haciendo tabla rasa de lo que constituye nuestra propia historia, y el entramado de nuestras mismas vidas, o el confiado “aquí no pasa nada”, que ignora la profunda transformación real que se está operando, en todos los niveles, en la sociedad española (Suárez 1976).

Argumentation is distributed in this speech to three branches of polyacroasis: that of possible receivers who want to change everything, that of possible receivers who do not want to transform Spanish society in order that it becomes adapted to the new reality, and that of a majority which wants to change institutions peacefully, without a revolution. The orator wants the political institutions and everyday life to agree: “Con ello comenzamos a convertir en realidad lo que ya dije en otra ocasión: elevar a la categoría política de normal lo que a nivel de calle es simplemente normal” (Suárez 1976). Adolfo Suárez is aware that he is being listened to not only by people who want a peaceful transformation of the political institutions of Spain (which constitutes the main branch of polyacroasis), but also by those who want a quick rupture with the past and those who want nothing to be changed, and hence he takes them into account, too. This organisation of polyacroasis allows the orator to argue in favour of his proposal of a peaceful transformation or transition to democracy, a process which received the name of Transición (Albaladejo 2003b). His argumentation in favour with his proposal arises from the opposition between two contrary extreme attitudes, within a polyacroatic organisation of discourse, and by not excluding possible individual or collective receivers from the audience. The role of polyacroasis is connected with the reality of society and audiences which are part of society. Rhetoric contributes to the analysis of discourses arising from society, and hence it works as rhetoric in society (Albaladejo 2009c), producing and analysing discourses, in accordance with Murphy’s definition quoted above.

Another way of using polyacroasis in argumentation is to divide the audience into two parts or branches: on the one hand, that of the receivers who adhere to the orator’s proposals; on the other hand, that of the receivers who decline to follow them. Thus, for instance, one of both parts is that consisting of the people who do what is just and good, and another is that consisting of those who clamp down on the
just and good way of behaving. Let us examine Jesus Christ’s *Sermon on the Mount*:

Every one then who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise man who built his house upon the rock; and the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, but it did not fall, because it had been founded on the rock. And every one who hears these words of mine and does not do them will be like a foolish man who built his house upon the sand; and the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell; and great was the fall of it (Matthew 7, 24–27).

The polyacroasis of this passage of St. Matthew’s Gospel is a tool for rhetorical argumentation in favour of the adherence to the orator’s ideas and proposals and their practice. Two similes contribute to the strength of argumentation, a positive simile as to those who follow Jesus Christ’s words and a negative one as to those who disregard them, and both similes have, as an argumentative whole, a polyacroatic organisation, with a reinforcement provided by the verb “to hear”⁴. It agrees with one of the features of the notion of polyacroasis, which is the orator’s will of not excluding possible hearers of his discourse, even those who are opposite to his proposals, as well as absent and future hearers. The parallelism existing in this passage, frequent in the *Sermon on the Mount* and in many other biblical texts, reinforces the polyacroatic structure of communication out of discourse and intensionalised inside it. “Every one then who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise man...” and “And every one who hears these words of mine and does not do them will be like a foolish man...” establish the similarity and the difference between the two

---

4 Jesus’s speeches and their cultural context strongly influenced the medieval art of preaching. James J. Murphy writes: “Preaching is not a medieval — or even a Christian invention —. In the Gospel of Matthew (4: 17) Jesus Christ first appears in his public life when he comes in from the desert ‘preaching and teaching’. In other words, Christianity begins in his preaching. It is clear that the Gospel writer of the first century expected his readers to be familiar with the concept of ‘preaching’. Indeed, the orality of the ancient Judaic liturgy was so pervasive that the regular Jewish worship service itself provided Christ with a regular and traditionally acceptable format for his speaking” (Murphy 1981: 269). For rhetoric and persuasion in biblical texts of the Old Testament, see Kennedy (Kennedy 1994: 257-258; Kennedy 1998: 133ff.).
kinds of hearers which can be foreseen for the speech, and starting
from what is similar allows the speaker to stress the two different
ways of behaving of hearers as their respective responses to Jesus
Christ’s words.

The complexity of discourses which are the object of analysis
can in this way, with the help of the notion of polyacroasis, be taken
into account and explained by examining the relationship between the
receivers and their intensionalisation from the pragmatic and exten-
sional-semantic realms, with their subsequent presence in discourse,
as well as the role of alternative and complementary receivers of rhe-
torical argumentation. The application of rhetoric in discourse analysis
contributes to unearth relationships and features of discourse from the
experience obtained by combining the study of all levels connected to
the different rhetorical operations or partes artis, and also the explana-
tion of the partes orationis as an ancient and prestigious proposal for
understanding discursive organisation and the different possibilities of
arranging it in accordance with ordo naturalis and ordo artificialis,
depending on the artistic will of the producer of discourse and the
desired effects on the audience.

4. Current trends and areas of research in the rhetorical
analysis of discourse

Rhetorical discourse analysis cooperates with other forms of discourse
analysis, and, of course, with text linguistics and the theories and
methods coming from it or elaborated from its development and en-
largement, like János S. Petöfi’s semiotic textology (Petöfi & Vitacol-
onna 1996; Petöfi 2011; Vitacolonna 2010). Rhetoric is not intended
to be a hegemonic discipline, but to work together with other disci-
plines of discourse so that all of them offer a rich and plural perspec-
tive of the reality, characteristics and problems of discourse.

Therefore, rhetorical discourse analysis hosts a new reflection
on the figures and tropes (Arduini 2000), linked mainly by elocutio
but also connected with the levels corresponding to other rhetorical
operations or partes artis. This enables research on some devices which can be viewed from characteristics of modern literary works, as is the case of the old figure of thought (figura sententiae) called sustentatio, a device which is a discursive inflection that works by addressing the receiver’s attention to a determined meaning and by breaking his interpretative expectations and addressing discourse to another path of meaning (Pujante 1999: 223; Pujante 2003: 259ff.), as occurs, for instance, in Pedro Salinas’s poem Navacerrada, abril, from his book Seguro azar, or Haruki Murakami’s Nyū Yōku tankō no higeki (New York Mining Disaster). The study of anaphora with new perspectives and methodological instruments is another trend of rhetoric’s contribution to discourse analysis (González 2009; Llamas Saíz 2010); the role of this figure as an organiser and distributor of discourse is very important for the structure and meaning of all kinds of discourses. The connection between rhetoric and discourse analysis is reinforced by anaphora in the structure of discourse on all semiotic levels (syntactic, semantic and pragmatic) which work jointly inside the text and in the realm of communication by means of the projection of syntactic and semantic levels onto the pragmatic dimension (Ramón Trives 1980), with sharing of the discursive keys by the producer and the receivers of discourse.

Metaphor is one of the main rhetorical and poetic devices (Le Guern 1985; Ricoeur 1980; García Berrio 1985; Pujante 2003: 207ff.; Bobes Naves 2004; Haverkamp 2007). The cognitive theory of metaphor is receiving increasing attention and is being stimulated in the areas of cognitive linguistics and literary criticism and theory (Arduini 2000; Arduini 2007; Fernández Cozman 2008; Pérez & Langer 2008). Despite the problems which this perspective of the study of metaphor has, it is no doubt a valuable methodological position for connecting rhetoric and the production and interpretation of discourses as far as their cognitive foundations are concerned.

The relationship between rhetoric and translation (Arduini 1996; Chico Rico 2001; Chico Rico 2002; Chico Rico 2009; Moreno Hernández 2010) is another area of rhetorical discourse analysis, because translation itself is an issue strongly connected to discourse analysis, and rhetoric can provide useful and tested tools for the analysis and explanation of those discursive devices which are rhetorical or have a rhetorical character. The analysis of the translation of metaphor
and other tropes as well as figures offers a major interest for the rhetorical analysis of those discourses where they are placed and function as creative and expressive devices. Among other figures, anaphora should be the object of our attention in rhetorical terms, because of the need to translate the anaphoric expressions literally in order to maintain the role and strength of this figure in the goal-text, where it must keep, by means of reiteration, the same functions as it has in the source-text.

Other trends of rhetorical discourse analysis are the rhetoric of legal argumentation (García Amado 1998), which has a long tradition, but can be dealt with more and more deeply by means of the combination of rhetoric and discourse analysis. Rhetorical discourse analysis goes deeply into the study of advertising discourses, too, within the important paths established by the rhetoric of publicity (Spang 1991; Spang 2005: 153-193; Urbina 2008). The study of digital discourse is also an object of rhetorical analysis (Albaladejo 2005b; Albaladejo 2009a; Fernández Rodríguez 2010), since rhetoric provides very powerful categories to exploit this kind of discourse, which is multimodal like the oral rhetorical discourse that characterised the beginnings of rhetoric.

Of course, all areas within rhetorical study and all fields within discourse analysis are possible objectives of study by rhetorical analysis. Hence, the study of political discourse as well as the study of journalistic discourse, which have been part of the usual space of rhetorical research, can be reinforced by the cooperation between rhetoric and discourse analysis, and indeed constitute a very fruitful and promising realm for rhetorical discourse analysis. Cultural rhetoric, which I have proposed for the study of discourse and literature as cultural constructions and as parts of culture, could be another approach to discourse analysis within the cooperation between it and rhetoric, taking into account the textual or discursive dimension of culture and the persuasive components of discourse and literature (Albaladejo 1998b; Albaladejo 2009b; Albaladejo 2011b). Culture and rhetoric are connected, and rhetoric is deeply cultural (Barei & Molina 2008: 10). Ezio Raimondi’s perspective is important for thinking of the cultural links of rhetoric: “L’analisi della cultura, dunque, è una scienza interpretativa, un’ermeneutica alla ricerca di significati, codificati in
forme, in tecniche, in procedure, in istituzioni, che mirano a certi effetti e hanno quindi una costituzione retorica” (Raimondi 2002: 68).

I need to end this article by offering a notion that runs parallel to its beginning: if all communicative activity is concerned with rhetoric, all analytical approaches to discourse can be connected with rhetoric, and rhetoric is entirely at the disposal of discourse analysis for working collaboratively. This synergy undoubtedly offers mutual enrichment, since both rhetoric and discourse analysis open their perspectives towards the reality of discourses and the tools we have inherited for their analysis and explanation. This will enable us to gain broader and deeper knowledge of discourse, language and communication, all of which are vital issues in human society.
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