

云红 著

This study sets up a new category of argumentation scheme which is called rhetorical argumentation scheme. Such a scheme includes three parts: logos argumentation, ethos argumentation and pathos argumentation. The last two have long been neglected in other fields of study, and even have been considered as fallacies. This study highlights the compelling persuasion power and the decisive role of long-neglected rhetorical argumentation in a speech.

西方修辞论 与应用研究

Studies in Western Rhetorical Argumentation: Theories and Applications



四川大学出版社
Sichuan University Press

云红 著

This study sets up a new conceptual scheme which is called 'rhetorical argumentation'. Such a scheme includes three parts: logos argumentation, ethos argumentation and pathos argumentation. The last two have long been neglected in other fields of study, and even have been considered as fallacies. This study highlights the compelling persuasion power and the characterizing function of logos argumentation, and the

西方修辞论辩： 理论与应用研究

Studies in Western Rhetorical Argumentation: Theories and Applications



四川大学出版社
Sichuan University Press

责任编辑:黄新路
责任校对:夏 宇
封面设计:米茄设计工作室
责任印制:李 平

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

西方修辞论辩:理论与应用研究 = Studies in Western Rhetorical Argumentation: Theories and Applications: 英文 / 云红著. —成都:四川大学出版社, 2011. 6

ISBN 978-7-5614-5337-7

I. ①西… II. ①云… III. ①修辞学—研究—西方国家—英文 IV. ①H05

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2011) 第 128100 号

书名 西方修辞论辩:理论与应用研究

Studies in Western Rhetorical Argumentation: Theories and Applications

| | |
|------|-------------------------|
| 著 者 | 云 红 |
| 出 版 | 四川大学出版社 |
| 地 址 | 成都市一环路南一段 24 号 (610065) |
| 发 行 | 四川大学出版社 |
| 书 号 | ISBN 978-7-5614-5337-7 |
| 印 刷 | 郫县犀浦印刷厂 |
| 成品尺寸 | 140 mm×202 mm |
| 印 张 | 8.25 |
| 字 数 | 217 千字 |
| 版 次 | 2011 年 7 月第 1 版 |
| 印 次 | 2011 年 7 月第 1 次印刷 |
| 定 价 | 26.00 元 |

版权所有◆侵权必究

◆读者邮购本书,请与本社发行科联系。电 话:85408408/85401670/85408023 邮政编码:610065

◆本社图书如有印装质量问题,请寄回出版社调换。

◆网址:www.scupress.com.cn

本书获

重庆医科大学博士科研启动资金资助

In memory of my mother

(1944-2009)

*who started as a penniless village-girl and ended as a
first-level teacher of a provincial key school,*

*who influenced her children with optimistic spirit and
appreciation of life and humor.*

*I will remember her words: Life is a river that always
flows on, so whatever happens, just follow it with
love, gratitude and a ready-to-learn spirit.*

*Dear Mother, I will try my best to follow it. May you
rest in peace!*

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Professor HU Shuzhong, without whose professional supervision, empathetic understanding, and kind help, the completion of this dissertation would be impossible. He has not only helped me write, revise, and polish this dissertation, but also shown me, with his charismatic teachings, how to be a functioning social being, from which I will surely benefit in my future career and life. In the dark days after my mother passed away, and at the same time, under the huge pressure of dissertation writing, I couldn't eat up, nor could I fall asleep. Sometimes I was even crack-brained. It was Professor HU who called and emailed me again and again, comforted me and enlightened me. He said, "Never say die, let's work it out!" It was Professor HU who ignited the light of hope in the darkness of my life. My gratitude to him is out of description.

My special thanks and love go to my late mother. It was my mother who encouraged me to pursue my Ph.D. study at the age of 37. She said, "Don't be afraid of challenge and change. Whatever the result is, the experience will be a treasure of your life which will enrich your understanding of the world." Despite her pains from cancer in the four-month treatment period, she always said to me, "Don't waste your time in the hospital. Don't worry about me. I am Ok. Go ahead with your dissertation." Mother, blessed with your deep love and unyielding spirit, I will go ahead as you wished.

My thanks also go to other Shanghai International Studies University professors, who either broadened my horizon with their lectures or inspired me in some other ways: Prof. HE Zhaoxiong, Prof. SHU Dingfang, Prof. ZHANG Jian, Prof. YU Dongming, Prof. ZOU Shen, and Prof. XIE Tianzhen.

It is almost impossible to express sufficiently my appreciation of my fellow Ph.D. candidates in Shanghai International Studies. WANG Zhiwei, a real gentleman, who becomes my teacher by giving me his hand when I was in difficulty and sharing with me his experience and materials on study. CUI Shuzhen, who is just like an elder sister, has provided constant support, advice, and encouragement in my each step no matter in academic field or in daily life. YUAN Ying is my academic idol. She made many valuable comments to my article from which this dissertation has been developed and she keeps updating me about the latest development in our research field. Special thanks should go to LI Yanfang, ZHANG Yufang, and many others who lent a lot of books to me. I also want to thank YUAN Xue, CAO Lei and LONG Jinshun, as they are always happy to discuss argumentation with me, and their insights are truly helpful.

Special thanks should go to WEN Bing and LI Fei who patiently helped me to produce computer graphics of the dissertation and attentively did the job of proofreading. I am indebted to my other friends in the Ph.D. program of SISU who have collected materials for me or supported me in other ways: FENG Jun, SUI Xiaodi, TANG Shuhua, PENG Kangzhou, GU Zhizhong, LI Xiaokang, SUN Xu, LIU Qiufen, YU Xianqin and

etc. They have turned my otherwise boring, lonely and hard campus life colorful, and I will cherish our shared laughs and fond memories in the innermost part of my heart.

I also owe my thanks to Doctor LIU Hui of Beijing University, who, while already overburdened with her research, took the time to assist me in getting valuable information from libraries in Beijing. Doctor WANG Yongmei kindly bought books for me from beyond the Pacific and searched materials in American libraries.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their unfailing love and support. It is my husband – LI Hongliang's devotion and generous love that have supported me throughout this academic journey. My lovely son LI Tanzhen learned to take care of himself at an age when Mum's warmth is most needed, and he managed to become a student at the best middle school in Chongqing through highly competitive examinations. I'm so proud of him and he is my inexhaustible source of inspiration and consolation. Such pride has driven me to complete my dissertation and bring out my potentiality. Without their support, patience, love and care, I would never have completed my dissertation.

序

迄今为止，对于西方辩论理论的研究，学界还未有一个普遍接受的统一框架。这就意味着在该领域内还有许多内容尚待拓展和挖掘。

与传统的关注法律、逻辑和实证主义的辩论理论观点相比，云红的这项研究另辟蹊径，把辩论作为一种特殊的说服方式来研究其本质。讨论主要围绕以下方面进行：1) 重新定义修辞辩论，将辩论定义成一个根据论题、言语体裁、交际环境和听众(读者)特点合理安排论据和论述手段，旨在维护观点、说服对方、促使其采取行动的过程；2) 明确说服是修辞辩论的核心功能；3) 阐述辩论与修辞学的关系，辩论与逻辑的关系，以及辩论与非形式逻辑的关系；4) 阐释辩论的修辞论证——修辞推论的特点及其说服力；5) 描述修辞辩论类型及其如何在演讲中产生说服力；6) 尝试建立一个辩论中的目标--情境导向听众概念。

该研究在辩论和修辞理论上得出了很有意义的结论。其原创性主要体现在以下三个方面：1) 从修辞的角度重新定义了辩论，提出修辞辩论是一个劝说的过程，目的在于维护观点，说服对方，促使其按辩论者的思维采取行动。作者还首次将西方古典修辞学的 *logos*, *ethos* 和 *pathos* 引入了辩论研究领域；2) 建立了一种新的辩论类型——修辞辩论类型，指出修辞辩论由理性辩论、信誉辩论和情感辩论三部分组成。后两种修辞辩论方式在其他领域长期被忽视，甚至被认为是谬误，而该研究恰恰强调了以上修辞辩论方式产生的强大说服力以及在辩论中的决定性作用；3) 建立了独创性的目标导向——情境导向听众的分类。该研究分析了 Perelman 普遍听众理论框架，提出辩论中的

目标—情境导向听众这一概念对于听众类型的区分或许有所裨益。

在国内，当今对修辞论辩理论的研究甚少，论辩理论的研究亟待引起学界关注。云红的这项研究在修辞论辩方面的探索可为国内的西方论辩理论研究及创建新的修辞论辩理论提供理论参考，同时还可应用于实践领域，如演说、辩论等。

云红的新作付梓之前，邀我作序，我虽不专门研究修辞学，但作为一个语言研究者，作为一个外语界的同行，我为一个年轻学者取得这样的成就而感到高兴，也就贸然写下以上这些话，作为向读者的一个推介。

束定芳

2011年6月

于上海外国语大学

Abstract

Argument is one of the most common, useful human communicative practices. It is done frequently—daily or hourly, by virtually everyone. But argumentation theory is a relatively new arena of scholarly pursuit which has its contemporary roots back in the 1950s. Not until the end of 20th century did it assume a shape that is sufficiently definable so as to be considered a relatively independent sub-area endeavor. It is a virtually new field that has been created on the old foundations. Since Aristotle time, there have been two basic ways to study argumentation. The first way is formal logic. The second way is rhetoric. This dissertation will take rhetoric in antiquity as an important background to studies of Western rhetorical argumentation theory.

The study of argumentation has so far not resulted in a universally accepted theory. That means there is room for further research and exploration. Since the late 1950s the study of argumentation has gradually developed from a marginal part of logic and rhetoric into a genuine and interdisciplinary academic discipline in the west. The state of the discipline cannot be explained by describing one leading theory. It is characterized by the coexistence of a variety of approaches, differing considerably in conceptual breath, scope of horizon, and degree of theoretical refinement. However, the research of Western argumentation theory has not received sufficient attention in China. Such a situation should be changed, as the study of argumentation is very important to developing capacity for critical thinking and value

judgments.

This dissertation primarily adopts a qualitative research method, progressing logically with verbal description assisted by tables and figures where necessary. The methodology is qualitative, interdisciplinary and integrative in nature, interpretive and analytic in practice. Its principle of case study sampling has been employed in selecting representative texts from different orations. The theories involved are mainly from Western classical rhetoric, logical study, philosophy, cognitive psychology and so on. As to the rhetorical theory itself, the exploration is based upon classical Western rhetoric, supported by its contemporary research.

This study aims at exploring argumentation theories from the perspective of Western rhetoric. Different from conventional views of argumentation which focus on law, logic and positivism and etc, the ongoing study seeks to understand argumentation as a special means of persuasion, through which people address and interact with each other in order to achieve temporary agreement on the issue under consideration. The discussions revolve around the following aspects: 1) redefining properly the key term of “rhetorical argumentation”. Rhetorical Argumentation is a social activity which is perceived as an overall art of persuasion based on discursive efficacy and consisting of discourse strategies intended to make an audience adhere to a given thesis by putting forward a constellation of propositions justifying or refuting the proposition according to different theses, different genres, different communicative environments and different audiences’ characteristics; 2) clarifying the essential function of rhetorical argumentation, this study points out that the essential function of

rhetorical argumentation is persuasion; 3) elaborating the relationship between argumentation and logic, relationship between argumentation and rhetoric, and relationship between argumentation and informal logic; 4) illustrating the argumentation rhetorical proof—enthymeme’s characteristics; showing the persuasive power of enthymeme; 5) describing the role of rhetorical argumentation schemes in producing persuasion power in speeches; 6) rebuilding a tentative form of rhetorical aim-situation-oriented audience of argumentation.

The present study attempts to understand speech from a new perspective with reference to diverse levels and dimensions of rhetorical argumentation, concerning process as well as product and effect of persuasion, involving the characteristics of rhetorical proof—enthymeme, rhetorical argumentation schemes and rhetorical audience-aim-based argumentation. The main purpose of the analysis and study is to prove the persuasive power of rhetorical argumentation, so that we can provide certain theoretical and methodological orientation for the production and consumption of speech in the future.

The present study purports to make contributions to both argumentation and rhetorical theory, and also their applications in speeches. The originality is seen in the following three aspects: 1) New definition will be given to argumentation from rhetorical angle, focusing on its persuasive role and putting logos, ethos and pathos in this conception. 2) This study sets up a new category of argumentation scheme which is called rhetorical argumentation scheme. Such schemes include three parts: logos argumentation (i.e. argumentation based on induction, comparison, causal links

and examples), ethos argumentation (i.e. argumentation by appeal to the reputation of oneself or a third person) and pathos argumentation (i.e. argumentation by appeal to the popularity and mercy). The last two have long been neglected in other fields of study, and even have been considered as fallacies. This study highlights the compelling persuasion power and the decisive role of long-neglected rhetorical argumentation in a speech. 3) This study sets up its own category of aim-oriented audience and situation-oriented audience. Its response to Perelman's argumentation theory is to analyze the universal audience and the confusion of universal audience. The construction of aim-situation-oriented audience of argument may cast a new light on the category of audience.

It is envisaged that the exploration of rhetorical argumentation may provide theoretical reference for the improvement of existing Western argumentation theory research and for the construction of new rhetorical argumentation theory in China. The research will also serve as a theoretical guide in both argumentation teaching and critical thinking teaching, and may offer help to applied areas such as speech making and so on.

Key words: rhetorical argumentation; rhetorical proof—enthymeme; rhetorical argumentation schemes; aim-situation-oriented audience; persuasive power; oration

Contents

| | |
|--|--------|
| Chapter One Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Trigger of the Present Study | 2 |
| 1.2 Purpose of the Present Study | 7 |
| 1.3 Methodology and Scope of the Present Study | 8 |
| 1.4 Originality of the Present Study | 9 |
| 1.5 Organization of the Book | 10 |
| Chapter Two Literature Review | 14 |
| 2.1 Historical Background of Modern Argumentation Theory | 14 |
| 2.2 Studies in Argumentation Theory Abroad | 17 |
| 2.3 Studies in Argumentation Theory in China | 33 |
| 2.4 Summary | 37 |
| Chapter Three Argumentation: Definition & Related Disciplines | 41 |
| 3.1 Definition of Argumentation | 42 |
| 3.2 Logos, Ethos and Pathos | 50 |
| 3.3 Basic Concepts of Argumentation | 57 |
| 3.4 Related Disciplines | 63 |
| 3.5 Summary | 81 |
| Chapter Four Argumentation Rhetorical Proof—Enthymeme | 82 |
| 4.1 The Importance of Enthymeme | 82 |
| 4.2 The Definition of Enthymeme | 84 |
| 4.3 The Characteristics of Enthymeme | 95 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.4 Case Study—David Duke’s Enthymeme..... | 109 |
| 4.5 Summary..... | 116 |
| Chapter Five Argumentation Scheme..... | 118 |
| 5.1 The Traditional Theories of Argumentation Schemes..... | 119 |
| 5.2 The Modern Theories of Argumentation Schemes..... | 132 |
| 5.3 The Present Study’s Topics..... | 136 |
| 5.4 Case study 1—Rhetorical Argumentation in Obama’s Inaugural Address..... | 141 |
| 5.5 Case Study 2—Rhetorical Argumentation in Obama’s Shanghai Speech..... | 151 |
| 5.6 Summary..... | 158 |
| Chapter Six Audience Perspective of Argumentation..... | 160 |
| 6.1 Perelman’s Argumentation Theory..... | 160 |
| 6.2 Analysis of Perelman’s Argumentation Theory..... | 174 |
| 6.3 Construction of Aim- and Situation-Oriented Audience of Argument..... | 181 |
| 6.4 Summary..... | 191 |
| Chapter Seven Conclusion..... | 194 |
| 7.1 Major Research Contributions..... | 195 |
| 7.2 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research..... | 206 |
| Appendix 1 Barack Obama’s Inaugural Address..... | 208 |
| Appendix 2 Barack Obama’s Shanghai Speech..... | 217 |
| Bibliography..... | 226 |

Chapter One

Introduction

Argument[ion] theories are often expressions of our highest hopes, embodiments of our dreams for a better world.

(Willard, *A Theory of Argumentation* 6)

Argumentation theory is a new arena of scholarly pursuit which has its contemporary roots back in the 1950s. Not until the end of 20th century did it assume a shape that is sufficiently definable so as to be considered a relatively independent sub-area endeavor. It is a virtually new field that has been created on the old foundations. Since Aristotle time, there has been two basic ways to study argumentation. The first way is formal logic. The second way is rhetoric. In addition to formal logic and rhetoric, argumentation theory draws upon formal dialogue theory, the philosophy of language (especially in the form of speech act theory), communication theory, discourse analysis, and several areas of psychology. The beginning of logical positivism, existentialism of last century challenged Western rhetoric. Logical positivism and existentialism paid attention to the experiments and looked down upon the other ways. They believed intuition couldn't serve as the basis for value judgments. Rhetoric was forced to counterattack the challenge. The only way was the introduction of argumentation to rhetoric.