

## Rhetoric and Contrastive Rhetoric: Linguistic and Pedagogical Approach

**Behzod R. Sultanov**

Head of English Language & Literature Department  
Gulistan State University  
Gulistan, Syrdarya Region  
Uzbekistan

### Abstract

*Important aspects of the relationship between rhetoric, linguistics and stylistics, especially cognitive stylistics, attract the attention of researchers of the 21st century and need research in this direction. There is a close connection between rhetoric, linguistics and stylistics. Stylistics, sometimes titled as linguistic science, is also called the successor of rhetoric. So to say, rhetorical studies investigate rhetorical forms in literary texts. Modern stylistics explores different types of speech, styles. Stylistics also holds the linguistic deviations. Rhetoric is an important bridge to cognitive linguistics. Rhetoric is closely associated with cognition, because it is more oriented towards intellectual goals. Stylistics is considered the most serious area of general linguistics, which looks like a living and dynamic entity. Cognition leads to clarity of relations between rhetoric, linguistics and stylistics. Consequently, rhetoric, linguistics and style are closely interrelated.*

**Keywords:** rhetoric, cognitive stylistics, linguistics, deviation, eloquence, dynamic essence

### 1.0. Introduction

Rhetoric was a central preoccupation of natural philosophers in eighteenth-century Europe as they strove to create audiences for their work and negotiated appropriate forms for communicating their discoveries. Rhetoric is addressed to the end of the intellectual taste through language ability. Geoffrey Finch claims that stylistics is a field of new linguistics, specific to the analysis of literary styles (cited from: De Quincey, 2010). The word «stylistics» that appeared in the nineteenth century began to be widely used only in the early twentieth century. The definition of the boundaries of stylistics, its relation to rhetoric has been closely linked to linguistic researches, i.e. stylistics based on rhetoric has emerged simultaneously with the emergence of new linguistics and has been exposed to some of its technical capabilities.

A striking but insufficiently examined feature of the current revival of interest in rhetoric is its positioning primarily as a hermeneutic metadiscourse rather than as a substantive discourse practice. When one invokes metadiscourse to account for a discursive practice, what one hopes to achieve is minimally a “redescription” of the latter. Rhetoric has entered the orbit of general hermeneutics.

### 2.0. Literature Review

Some scholars support such an idea that while rhetoric is a whole, the eloquence presents a part of integrity. Therefore, the eloquence is a prototype feature of a lexical paragraph, a sentence, and a text producer. They also note that eloquence refers to the form and lexical point of the lexicon, whereas rhetoric is merely meaning. From what we can say, many linguists and rhetoricians have distinguished stylistics from the rhetoric (Plett, 2010).

Some researchers consider stylistics as a branch of linguistic science. Stylistics is a field of theoretical linguistics, as it stands next to the syntactic theory. In the study of the style of literary texts, we can see that linguistic styling is enhanced by second-class literary research, such as history and social sciences. Historical relations between stylistics and linguistics through some literary critics have led to the mixing of the two sciences. But the matter was not over. Soon, the researchers opposed the difference between these two branches of science and their orientation. They have suggested that stylistics simultaneously uses the description and analysis to learn the quality of what is being said, and linguistics learns what is said.

The literal meaning of the word "rhetoric" means "accurate, straightforward and expressive". In Western languages (in French), the word "rhetoric" is used in the sense of "science", and eloquence is used in sense of "abilities" (Vibert, 2005). As a capability, rhetoric is literally used in a figurative, correct, in place and at the right time. In other words, it is sufficient and timely to express thoughts in an oral or written form (MacBride, 2014). Rhetoric is addressed to the end of intellectual pleasure through language ability (MacBride, 2014). The eloquence is an art of speech and influence, and science of persuasion (Éloquence est art de bien dire, science de toucher et de persuader) (Vibert, 2005). Plato exposes contemporary

rhetoric, or eloquence as false discourses of knowledge. He characterizes it as a form of deceptive flattery (flatter) and to cheat (tromper). Cicero defines rhetoric as the art of speaking with abundance and ornament. (MacBride, 2014).

### **3.0. Traditional and Modern Rhetoric**

The traditional rhetoric is limited to the insights and terms developed by orators, or rhetoricians, in the Classical period of ancient Greece, about the 5th century BC, to teach the art of public speaking to their fellow citizens in the Greek republics and, later, to the children of the wealthy under the Roman Empire. Public performance was regarded as the highest reach of education proper, and rhetoric was at the centre of the educational process in western Europe for some 2,000 years. *Institutio oratoria* (before ad 96; "The Training of an Orator"), by the Roman rhetorician Quintilian, perhaps the most influential textbook on education ever written, was in fact a book about rhetoric. Inevitably, there were minor shifts of emphasis in so long a tradition, and for a long time even letter writing fell within the purview of rhetoric; but it has consistently maintained its emphasis upon creation, upon instructing those wishing to initiate communication with other people.

Modern rhetoric has shifted its focus to the auditor or reader. Literary criticism always borrowed from rhetoric—stylistic terms such as antithesis and metaphor were invented by Classical rhetoricians. When language became a subject of sustained scholarly concern, it was inevitable that scholars would turn back to Classical theories of rhetoric for help. But modern rhetoric is far more than a collection of terms. The perspective from which it views a text is different from that of other disciplines. History, philosophy, literary criticism, and the social sciences are apt to view a text as though it were a kind of map of the author's mind on a particular subject. Rhetoricians, accustomed by their traditional discipline to look at communication from the communicator's point of view, regard the text as the embodiment of an intention, not as a map. They know that that intention in its formulation is affected by its audience. They know also that the structure of a piece of discourse is a result of its intention. A concern for audience, for intention, and for structure is, then, the mark of modern rhetoric. It is as involved with the process of interpretation, or analysis, as it is with the process of creation, or genesis.

### **4.0. Rhetorical Analysis**

Rhetorical analysis is actually an analogue of traditional rhetorical genesis: both view a message through the situation of the auditor or reader as well as the situation of the speaker or writer. Both view the message as compounded of elements of time and place, motivation and response. An emphasis on the context automatically makes a rhetorician of the literary critic or interpreter and distinguishes that approach from the other kinds of verbal analysis. Critics who have insisted upon isolating, or abstracting, the literary text from the mind of its creator and from the milieu of its creation have found themselves unable to abstract it from the situation of its reader. Certain modern critics have joined with rhetoricians in denouncing the folly of all such attempts at abstraction. In interpreting any text—say a speech by Elizabeth I of England at Tilbury, Essex, or a play by the great Hindu poet of the 5th century, Kālidāsa—the rhetorician must imaginatively re-create the original situation of that text as well as endeavour to understand those factors that condition a present understanding.

Rhetorical analysis is concerned with the construction of discourse, giving priority to the communicative purpose of each genre (Azaustre & Casas, 1997). Rhetoric aims at discourse from its intentional (purpose driven) and instrumental (means of fulfilling the purpose) perspectives. Thus, rhetorical discourse organization is an approach where textual structures are employed to achieve a desired effect (Connor, 1996). These structures provide a framework for articulating diverse discourses in a particular manner and textually constituting their relations.

Based on the framework of rhetorical analysis, genre analysis involves the analysis and description of a text in terms of rhetorical moves or rhetorical structures, which denote the functional parts or sections of a genre. The particular conformation of the text surface is defined by text organization levels, which is known as rhetorical discourse organization. In such a way, the structural units identified by genre analysis can be characterized as moves subdivided into steps, referring to those passages of the text that are larger than the largest grammatical units, e.g., clauses, and sentences, and possess some unity grounded in a common function and meaning.

### **5.0. Contrastive Rhetoric in Teaching Foreign Languages**

Contrastive rhetoric as a research field came into existence with Robert Kaplan's 1966 study, in which Kaplan made the pronouncement that "each language and each culture has a paragraph order unique to itself, and that part of the learning of a particular language is the mastery of its logical system" (cited from: Connor, 1996, p. 14). His study had provided insights into problems EFL students encountered while adjusting to English rhetoric by referring to rhetoric strategies of their first language and began to influence EFL writing teaching immediately. With the growing of contrastive rhetoric, its position of shaping writing class has been enhanced but also seriously challenged. However, as a living and breathing research field, contrastive rhetoric is adjusting itself all along to tackle challenges and criticism by

means of expanding itself to encompass new dynamics brought by postmodernists and globalization. This thesis will present the impact of contrastive rhetoric on the teaching of EFL writing from the inception of the study to its maturity as a research field. And it concludes that contrastive rhetoric cannot blossom on its own without EFL writing providing it with meaningful research topics.

## 6.0. Conclusion

Since its appearance in the domains of linguistics, stylistics, and critical pedagogy, contrastive rhetoric has been used as an approach to critically investigate the cultural and linguistic differences involved in structuring texts. Based on the assumptions behind poststructuralist, postcolonial, and postmodern critiques of language and culture, this study attempts to examine new and additive approach to the issue of rhetoric both in linguistics and pedagogy. Rhetoric in general has its origins in the notions of language at the discursive and inter-sentential levels. Its goal is “to describe ways in which language texts operate in larger cultural contexts” by seeking a better “understanding of ways in which the language operates and the way in which the language diverges from spoken languages. Contrastive rhetoric is especially said to be deeply rooted in the two main beliefs that “each language or culture has rhetorical conventions that are unique to it and that the rhetorical conventions of the students’ native language interfere with the target language in the process of acquisition.

## References

- Azaustre, A., & Casas J. (1997). *Manual de retórica española*. Barcelona, ES: Ariel.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- De Quincey T. (2010). *Selected Esseys on Rhetoric / De Quincey T., Burwick F., Potter D.* – Carbondale and Edwardsville: SIU Press. 320 p.
- Kennedy, G. (2000). *An introduction to corpus linguistics*. New York, US: NY Press.
- MacBride T. (2014). *Preaching the New Testament as Rhetoric: The Promise of Rhetorical Criticism for Expository Preaching*/MacBride T. – Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers. 274 p.
- Manrique, B., Zapata, C. M., & Burgos, D. (2013). Exploring MWEs for knowledge acquisition from corporate technical documents. In *Proceedings of the 9th Workshop on Multiword Expressions MWE 2013*(p. 82-86). Atlanta, GE.
- McCarthy, M., & Handford, M. (2004). Invisible to us: a preliminary corpus-based study of spoken business English. In U. Connor, & T. A. Upton (Ed.), *Discourse in the professions* (p. 167-202). Amsterdam, ND: Benjamins.
- Meurer, J. L. (2002). Genre as diversity, and rhetorical mode as unity in language use. *Revista Ilha do Desterro A Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*, 1(43), 61-82.
- Nickerson, C. (1999). The usefulness of genre theory in the investigation of organizational communication across cultures. *Document Design*, 1(3), 203-215.
- Plett H. (2010). *Literary Rhetoric: Concepts–Structures–Analyses / Plett H.* – Leiden-Boston: Brill. 232 p.
- Vibert A. (2005). Fontanier: autour et au delà. *La Rhétorique dans le premier tiers du XIX siècle / Vibert A.* – *Revue d’histoire littéraire de la France*, № 2, pp. 369-393.