

(別紙 1)

論文の内容の要旨

論文題目 Rhetoric as a Critique of Grammatology: Orality and Writing in Hugh Blair's
Rhetorical Theory
(グラマトロジー批判としての修辞学—ヒュー・ブレアの修辞学理論にお
ける声と文字)

氏名 兼武 道子

In my doctoral thesis, I have explored and examined the rhetorical theory of Hugh Blair, who was active in Edinburgh in the latter half of the eighteenth century and whose *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* retained its widespread influence well into the nineteenth century as the most popular textbook on rhetoric not only in Britain but also on the continent of Europe and in America. In particular, I focused on the issue of the written voice, or the voice represented in writing, which was a paradox at the very heart of the concerns of classical rhetoric, and elucidated the implications of this in Blair's theory. In doing so, I have examined Derrida's grammatology, which is perhaps the most influential twentieth-century approach to the issue of voice and writing. By reading this alongside Plato's *Phaedrus* and Rousseau's *Essay on the Origin of Languages*, I have assessed the validity of Derrida's thoughts as readings of these two texts. His insights into the problem of the voice and writing, in the meantime, helped me clarify the achievements and impasses Blair encountered in his rhetorical theory and in his critical practice, as realised in *A Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian*.

In Chapter One, I discussed the question of the written voice, taking Plato's *Phaedrus* as a focal text. In *Phaedrus*, philosophy is defined as dialectic, which is a pursuit of truth and exact knowledge through dialogue. Rhetoric, on the other hand, is described as a written speech which has more to do with clever manipulation of popular opinion and offering only a semblance of truth. Plato, thus, contradistinguishes philosophy from rhetoric in terms of the status of knowledge and the means of investigation and transmission, and appears to disparage both rhetoric and writing. However, if we read *Phaedrus* closely, we find many instances of the uncertainty and unreliability of the speaking subject exposed by Plato's manner of writing. Most importantly, Socrates, who represents philosophy and dialectic, is described as a lover of Isocrates, who represents rhetoric and written speech, at the very end of *Phaedrus*. The dramatic setting and the textuality of this work throughout also implicitly point to the shadowy figure of Isocrates. In this way, while philosophy and rhetoric

are outwardly presented as being antithetical to each other, they are also in a complementary relationship. Speech, therefore, as Plato represents it, is already contaminated by writing. It is strange then that Derrida overlooks the importance of the presence of Isocrates in his “Plato’s Pharmacy,” as Socrates and Isocrates encapsulate the “grammatological structure” which Derrida claims to have been systematically suppressed by the Western metaphysical tradition. A similar disregard for rhetoric is also evident in his “White Mythology,” where he quotes Blair out of context and distorts his contention. Derrida says that Blair agrees with and endorses Aristotle’s stance on metaphor, and in doing so commits himself to the alliance of the metaphysics with *phōnē sēmantikē*, but in fact Blair was not only relatively indifferent to figurative language but even emphasised the importance of *phōnē asēmos* such as connective particles. Derrida, thus, seems to distort the detail of the expositions of rhetoric which he examines, and his theme of the supplementary relationship between self-present voice and writing has always been among the central concerns of the rhetorical tradition in the Western civilisation.

In Chapter Two, I examined how Hugh Blair, writing in the eighteenth century, inherited and explored this rhetorical problem of the written voice. Blair’s theory is based on the primitivist assumptions about the origin of language derived from Condillac and Rousseau, and Blair thinks that language was born of cries of passion, which turned first into song before becoming language. As a consequence, for Blair the ideal form of eloquence is best described as an effusion of passion and a euphonious and natural vocal expression of the speaker’s psyche. The best medium for conveying such an eloquence, according to him, is the living voice of the speaker, and he at several points in his argument manifests his phonocentric values and affirms that writing is much inferior to speech in terms of its strength of impression. Blair at one point seems to echo *Phaedrus* in affirming that writing almost always has to resort to the paternal authority of speech in order to make itself understood clearly. Blair’s rhetoric, in this sense, is nothing but an attempt to restore the lost orality to written language. In order to compensate for this fundamental loss, he emphasises the importance of syntax and musical arrangement of periods as a surrogate voice. However, if we examine his theory, we find that it manifests a crucial logical flaw in its treatment of connective particles and musicality of a discourse. Connective particles, which are vital for constructing a periodic sentence, are lauded as marks of civilisation in Greek, while in English they are criticised for clogging and encumbering style. As for musicality, the more Blair seeks to achieve it in written discourse, the more artificial, contrived and enervated language becomes, and he is led by his own argument away from his ideal of a primitive and spontaneous cry of passion. Thus, Blair’s self-contradictory mission as a primitivist with a retrogressive tendency and a sentimental nostalgia for the hypothetical golden age of speech, and an Enlightenment thinker who believes in social progress

and improvement through the cultivation of literacy manifests its aporia in the above two points when he seeks to achieve orality in writing.

In Chapter Three, I treated Rousseau's *Essay on the Origin of Languages* and Derrida's *Of Grammatology*. Rousseau, who also is a primitivist, thinks that language originates in cries of passion and stresses that it derives its persuasive power from its capacity to imitate or mimetically represent the emotions and passions by the modulation of vocal sound. Behind Rousseau's thesis is the theoretical background of discourses concerning musical mimesis, which is a traditional concept in aesthetic criticism that also formed the basis for the latter-day semiotics through its interest in the relation between the aural sign and the referent. Derrida criticises Rousseau's *Essay* on the grounds that his phonocentrism unfairly undervalues articulation and writing. However, when we read the *Essay* closely, we find that Rousseau explicitly affirms that articulation plays a vital role in the birth of language. In Rousseau's vision, primitive language is characterised by a melodious modulation of "sound," or vocal tones, and a large number of vowels which are rendered easy to pronounce by interposed articulated consonants. In this way, both sound and articulation are necessary for the inauguration of language. Derrida seems to overlook the importance of the concept of sound in Rousseau, which is precisely the theoretical prerequisite of musical mimesis. In addition, despite Derrida's claim, Rousseau shows no sustained hostility to writing; instead, he in fact seems to endorse the union of the voice and writing by proposing an effective use of accent marks in modern French. He also comments warmly on Chinese characters as a form of writing that truly speaks to the eye, while he says of the alphabet that it analyses, not depicts, speech. Rousseau, thus, does not subordinate articulation and writing to the order of the self-present voice. Rather, Derrida's representation of Rousseau seems to be a teleological privileging of the two. It is manifest in Derrida's argument where he claims that Rousseau clandestinely admits that the first sign was spatial and visual rather than aural, for Rousseau's primitivism assumes a no less fundamental mimetic relation between the vocal sound and the referent.

In Chapter Four, I examined Blair's notion of linguistic sublimity and discussed how he describes it as the nearest equivalent to the ideal fusion of orality and writing, which takes place in the reader's mind. Linguistic sublimity is closely associated with the primitivist assumptions and their vision of the primordial eloquence. Accordingly, Blair uses the term "sublime" to describe styles that convey intense emotions. Blair also stresses the importance of syntactic considerations and euphonious arrangement of members in a sentence in arousing the readers' interest and making them take part in a creative reception of meaning. This bears a strong affinity to Longinus's stylistic ideals. In particular, Longinus and Blair use similar language in describing the moment of aesthetic perception, and say that the readers feel as if they have themselves created what they have just heard.

Derrida's formulation of "hearing-oneself-speak" applies to Blair's and Longinus's descriptions of the rhetorical sublime, indicating the phonocentrism inherent in the moment of such an experience. Sublimity is thus an instance of orality inhabiting writing, but it is also a moment when writing intrudes upon the primordial voice, as witnessed in Blair's treatment of the Vehement style. As an instance of supreme sublimity, Blair upholds the Ossian poems and discusses them in *A Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian*. In this treatise, however, Blair's treatment of the sublime manifests a logical rupture. The characters in the poems are martial and ferocious, but at the same time they manifest eighteenth-century politeness of manners and civility of taste. Instead of provoking doubt about the poems' authenticity, such an incongruity inspires surprise which is the source of a sentimental sublime. Sublimity arises when there is a fusion of the opposites, such as simplicity of Celtic ways of living and civilised and well-developed order of the bards. Most importantly for our concern, however, Blair acknowledges that Ossian's spirit is best represented in writing rather than in oral performance, and discusses the allegedly bardic poems as a written work throughout in the *Dissertation*. Here we find the utmost instance of the fusion of orality and writing. For Blair, in this way, the Ossian poems exemplify his sentimental aesthetics of the sublime as the primordial eloquence, but he is at the same time led to admit that it is realised in writing. The rhetorical sublime thus reveals the paradoxicality of the voice represented by writing.

The problematic of the written voice, thus, connects Blair's work to one of the first books on rhetoric, *Phaedrus*. Blair's rhetorical theory is an eighteenth-century variation of this question, and the paradox is most apparent in his primitivist assumptions that are often phonocentric, and his role as an Enlightenment thinker and a belletrist who aims to advance learning and improve society through the cultivation of literacy and individual literary tastes. Derrida's grammatology, which is a twentieth-century response to the same question, sheds light on Blair and brings his achievements and logical impasses into sharp focus. Yet, the problematic itself has always been within the rhetorical tradition as contradistinguished from philosophy, and Derrida at several important points in his philosophy seems to overlook this, while he subordinates rhetoric to metaphysics. In this thesis, I hope to have shown the strength of Blair's text whose complexity attests to its direct relevance to the fundamental paradox of the written voice in the larger context of classical rhetoric, and also to the concerns of one of the major responses to the same question in our own time.