

Model for Rhetorical Action

Contents [hide]

Beginning

Introduction

Problem Statement

Scope Statement

Provenance of the Model for Rhetorical Action

Assumptions Underlying the Model

▼ The Model: Four Steps of Rhetorical Action

Step 1: Communicator Intent

Step 2: Linguistic Operation

Step 3: Cognitive Relationship

Step 4: Communicative Enhancement

Annotating the Unit of Rhetorical Action

Analytical Significance of the Model

Relationship with the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric

Limitations of the Model

Summary

See Also

References

Page History

Page Discussion

Read

From The Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric

Introduction

Rhetoric is a communicative phenomenon in which the form, organisation, or delivery of a message is used to influence how that message is interpreted, experienced, evaluated, or responded to. When an instance of such communicative activity - a rhetorical action - is realised through language, it constitutes a [linguistic rhetorical action](#), as distinct from rhetorical action realised through non-linguistic means such as gesture, image, sound, or other communicative resources. Across languages and cultures, different rhetorical traditions have developed ways of describing, analysing, and classifying aspects of [linguistic rhetorical action](#). The Arabic communicative science of *al-balāgha* (Arabic rhetoric) is one such linguistic rhetorical tradition.

The **Model for Rhetorical Action** (MRA) is a theoretical framework developed as part of the [Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#) to explain how [linguistic rhetorical action](#) operates in Arabic rhetoric. The **Model** explains a [linguistic rhetorical action](#) as a [four-step](#) process through which a [communicator](#) typically acts with a communicative intention and employs a [rhetorical device](#) as the instrument of an identifiable linguistic action. This linguistic action is capable of establishing or activating a cognitive relationship between the [communicator](#) and the [addressee](#), which may produce an enhancement of the [communicative effect](#) of the [communicator](#)'s message in the [addressee](#). Consequently, the Model exposes three principal analytical targets: (i) the linguistic operation, (ii) the cognitive relationship, and (iii) the communicative enhancement. The **Model** does not consider the communicator's intention as a principal analytical target.

The **Model** provides the epistemological and theoretical foundation for the [Encyclopedia](#)'s approach to the identification and analysis of Arabic [rhetorical devices](#). The [Encyclopedia](#) principally identifies and classifies rhetorical devices through the linguistic-operation level of the Model, while the cognitive-relationship and communicative-enhancement levels explain how and why those devices are capable of rhetorical action. The **Model** is the basis of the [Encyclopedia](#)'s conceptual and methodological framework, which consists of the [Design Principles of the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#), the [Criteria for Inclusion in the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#), and the [Principles for Identifying Arabic Rhetorical Devices with the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#).

Problem Statement

The application of quantitative and computational analytical methods to Arabic rhetoric creates opportunities for the systematic investigation of the frequency, distribution, combination, variation, and other measurable properties of [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) across texts, authors, genres, periods, registers, and corpora. Any such analysis depends upon the ability to determine what constitutes Arabic rhetoric, what constitutes a discrete rhetorical unit, or a [linguistic rhetorical action](#), within Arabic rhetoric, and to consistently and reproducibly identify discrete [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) as explicit analytical targets in [discourse](#).

Arabic possesses an extensive and sophisticated rhetorical tradition extending over more than a millennium. This tradition provides the essential scholarly foundation for the study of [linguistic rhetorical actions](#), and supplies a substantial body of definitions, classifications, analyses, and examples. However, when describing [linguistic rhetorical actions](#), sources differ in a large number of aspects including nomenclature, the granularity of classification and subtypes, the scope of communicative purposes and communicative effects, the boundaries drawn between related [linguistic rhetorical actions](#), and in the overlap between [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) and other linguistic domains.

Therefore, the contemporary methodological challenge is the need for an explicit operational layer through which source-attested Arabic [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) can be consistently identified, classified, and annotated for quantitative and computational analysis. The methodological challenge does not arise from an absence of rhetorical theory, but from operationalising this established body of scholarship for the consistent and reproducible identification of [linguistic rhetorical actions](#). The challenge begins with a conceptualisation of what constitutes Arabic rhetoric, and results in an operationalised taxonomy of Arabic [linguistic rhetorical actions](#).

Scope Statement

The **Model for Rhetorical Action** addresses the foundational part of this challenge by providing an account of [linguistic rhetorical action](#) in the context of Arabic rhetoric. This provides the theoretical basis for describing [rhetorical devices](#) as discretely identifiable linguistic actions through which [linguistic rhetorical action](#) is realised.

The **Model** is not proposed as a general theory of rhetoric, a replacement for classical Arabic rhetorical theory, a comprehensive account of rhetorical communication, or a psycholinguistic model of how rhetorical language is processed in real time. The **Model**'s contribution is in integrating established theoretical components into a single overarching architecture for identifying [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) in Arabic.

Cite this page

🔗

Live DOI

10.64393/balagha.model.rhetorical.action

🔗

Date

16 August 2026

PDF

Download PDF

📄

The resulting architecture is proposed as an operational model rather than as the only possible theoretical account of rhetorical communication. Its explanatory adequacy is open to evaluation against the source-attested [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) that it is intended to describe.

Provenance of the Model for Rhetorical Action

The **Model for Rhetorical Action** is an analytical synthesis developed through the systematic examination of [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) attested within the Arabic rhetorical tradition. The **Model's** theoretical provenance rests upon well-established concepts within Arabic rhetoric, pragmatics, linguistic theory, and theories of communication. The **Model** abstracts recurring functional distinctions and explicit and implicit assumptions in Arabic rhetorical theory into a common analytical architecture suitable for classification, identification, annotation, and quantitative analysis.

The evidential basis for individual [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) is documented on their respective pages in the [Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#), where their definitions, linguistic actions, potential communicative effects, and examples are grounded in multiple contemporary sources derived from the classical Arabic rhetorical tradition. The **Model** depends upon triangulated multi-source evidence rather than upon the classification or terminology of any single source.

For source-attested [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) to function as discrete analytical units within the **Model**, their source descriptions must additionally provide sufficient basis for stable delimitation from related [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) and for the derivation of consistently applicable recognition criteria. These requirements provide the theoretical and methodological basis subsequently operationalised through the [Criteria for Inclusion in the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#).

Assumptions Underlying the Model

The **Model for Rhetorical Action** relies upon a set of analytical assumptions when describing Arabic [linguistic rhetorical action](#). These assumptions permit components of a single [linguistic rhetorical action](#) to be examined separately, as well permitting multiple co-existing [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) within a single expression to be analysed independently.

- An identifiable, unusual, patterned, or salient grammatical, lexical, phonological, rhythmic, prosodic, or other linguistic feature does not in itself constitute a [rhetorical action](#) solely by virtue of its presence. [Linguistic rhetorical action](#) requires an additional condition which distinguishes it from the mere occurrence of the linguistic feature.
- Each of the following aspects of [linguistic rhetorical action](#) is analytically distinct and may be independent:
 - The communicative purpose a [communicator](#) seeks to achieve in the [addressee](#),
 - The linguistic action performed in pursuit of the [communicator's](#) purpose,
 - The identifiable condition through which the linguistic action becomes capable of enhancing the [communicative effect](#) of the [communicator's](#) message in the [addressee](#), and
 - The final communicative effect in the [addressee](#).
- A linguistic action may produce different communicative effects according to [addressee](#) and context, and a communicative effect may be produced by different linguistic actions.

The Model: Four Steps of Rhetorical Action

The **Model for Rhetorical Action** adopts a broad conception of rhetorical effectiveness centred upon effective communication, as recognised within Arabic rhetorical theory. The **Model** states that a grammatical construction, lexical phenomenon, phonological pattern, or prosodic feature may be recruited into a [rhetorical action](#) where it performs an identifiable linguistic action capable of establishing or activating a shared understanding between the [communicator](#) and the [addressee](#), through which an enhancement of the [communicative effect](#) of the [communicator's](#) message in the [addressee](#) may occur.

In doing so, the **Model** recognises four analytically distinct steps of a [linguistic rhetorical action](#). Step 1 may initiate the process but is not always present or identifiable; Steps 2–4 form an ordered analytical sequence in which the Linguistic Operation is capable of establishing or activating a Cognitive Relationship, through which a Communicative Enhancement may arise.

1. **Step 1: Communicator Intent** - the [communicative purpose](#) that the [communicator](#) seeks to realise in the [addressee](#), where such an intention exists.
2. **Step 2: Linguistic Operation** – an identifiable linguistic action which is capable of establishing or activating of the Cognitive Relationship.
3. **Step 3: Cognitive Relationship** – a communicatively relevant shared understanding established or activated between the [communicator](#) and the [addressee](#) through the [addressee's](#) perception of the Linguistic Operation, involving concepts, meanings, expressions, sounds, structures, assumptions, contextual knowledge, or other relevant elements of the discourse, and capable of producing Communicative Enhancement.
4. **Step 4: Communicative Enhancement** – the enhancement of one or more [communicative effects](#) invoked in the [addressee](#) as a result of the established or activated Cognitive Relationship.

Step 1: Communicator Intent

The Communicator Intent Step concerns the [communicative purpose](#) that the [communicator](#) seeks to realise in the [addressee](#), where such an intention exists. It represents the purpose that precedes and motivates the [communicator's](#)

addressee, where such an intention should not precede the purpose that precedes and motivates the *communicator*'s selection of a particular way of expressing something. Communicator Intent is therefore concerned with what the *communicator* seeks to achieve through the *rhetorical action*, rather than with the Linguistic Operation subsequently selected to pursue that intent, or the Communicative Enhancement that the *rhetorical action* ultimately produces. Where Communicator Intent exists, it precedes and motivates Step 2.

While Communicator Intent is relevant to explaining *rhetorical action*, it is not a necessary condition for *rhetorical action* to occur: an identifiable Linguistic Operation may function rhetorically for an *addressee* even where the *communicator* did not consciously intend that *rhetorical action*. Where Communicator Intent does not exist, Steps 2–4 may nevertheless constitute a *rhetorical action*.

Analytically, the *communicator*'s actual intent cannot ordinarily be established reliably post hoc from linguistic evidence alone and is therefore not required for the identification of a *rhetorical action*. Where a rhetorical interpretation is supported by the identifiable Linguistic Operation and its contextual relationship with the *addressee*, the absence of demonstrable Communicator Intent does not preclude its identification as a *rhetorical action*. The **Model** therefore distinguishes between the theoretical role of Communicator Intent in *rhetorical action* and its analytical recoverability. Contextual evidence may support a rhetorical interpretation for an *addressee* without establishing what the *communicator* actually intended.

Theoretical foundation: Communicator Intent reflects the established treatment of communicative intention within pragmatics and theories of speaker meaning and speech acts.^{[1][2][3][4]}

Step 2: Linguistic Operation

The Linguistic Operation Step concerns what the *communicator* does with language in performing the *rhetorical action*. At this step, the *communicator* executes an identifiable semantic, conceptual, lexical, syntactic, phonological, rhythmic, structural, or other linguistic action that is capable of establishing or activating a Cognitive Relationship between the *communicator* and an *addressee* and producing a Communicative Enhancement in the *addressee*. The Linguistic Operation Step describes the operation performed through language, rather than why the communicator performs it or what communicative effect it ultimately produces.

Theoretical foundation: Linguistic Operation draws upon the longstanding rhetorical and linguistic practice of describing identifiable operations performed through expression and meaning, including operations such as comparison, repetition, deletion, contrast, and semantic transfer. Within the Encyclopedia, these operations are grounded in attested Arabic rhetorical theory.

The Role of Rhetorical Devices within the Model

Within the **Model for Rhetorical Action**, a Linguistic Operation consists of exactly one identifiable linguistic action that is capable of establishing or activating a Cognitive Relationship. A *rhetorical device* is the conventional rhetorical description and classification of such a Linguistic Operation, giving that operation a recognised identity such as Simile, Metaphor, Antithesis, or Rhymed Prose.

Step 3: Cognitive Relationship

The Cognitive Relationship Step concerns a communicatively relevant shared understanding between the *communicator* and the *addressee* which is established or activated for the *addressee* through perception of the Linguistic Operation. The shared understanding may concern concepts, meanings, expressions, sounds, structures, assumptions, contextual knowledge, or other relevant elements. It provides the cognitive connection through which the Linguistic Operation becomes capable of producing an enhancement of *communicative effect* for the *addressee*.

Cognitive Relationships may take different forms according to the Linguistic Operation and communicative context. They arise broadly through two distinct routes according to the nature of the Linguistic Operation:

- In semantic Linguistic Operations, the shared understanding may depend upon an inferred or recognised connection between knowledge, meanings, concepts, or assumptions which the Linguistic Operation activates for the *addressee*.

Consider when the *communicator* wishes to explain how brave Ahmed is. The *communicator* could say an ordinary statement such as, "Ahmed is brave" (*Aḥmad shujā'un*). This would be an adequate statement. However, if the Communicator Intent was to intensify the *addressee*'s impression of Ahmed's bravery, a Linguistic Operation such as, "Ahmed is like a lion in bravery" (*Aḥmad kal-asad fī al-shajā'a*) could be used.

The Linguistic Operation of explicit comparison causes a semantic transfer from the source domain (a lion) to the target domain (Ahmed). It establishes a Cognitive Relationship between the *communicator* and the *addressee* which involves a shared understanding - that lions are exceptionally brave - that enables the bravery of the source domain to be applied to the target domain. The Communicative Enhancement may be emphasis, compression, or emotional force - which may or may not correspond with the *communicator*'s original intent. This is an example of the rhetorical device *Simile*.

- In structural Linguistic Operations, the shared understanding may depend upon perceived equivalence, recurrence, contrast, correspondence, or patterning between sounds, expressions, structures, or other linguistic elements. It may depend on the *addressee*'s recognition that the *communicator* has performed a deliberate Linguistic Operation at all. This recognition licenses an inference as to why the *communicator* performed it and what it is intended to draw the *addressee*'s attention to, from which the Cognitive Relationship is established. An *addressee* who lacks the competence to recognise a formal pattern as deliberate - rather than as incidental or unremarkable - does not

undergo this inference, and the Cognitive Relationship accordingly fails to be established for that [addressee](#).

Consider when the [communicator](#) wishes to say, "We want truth and justice" (*Nurīdu al-ḥaqqa wa-al-'adla*). If the communicator intended to enhance the message's impact and acceptance by the [addressee](#), an expression with greater rhythmic cohesion and aesthetic salience could be used, such as the constructed rhymed expression, "Truth is sought after, and justice is aimed for" (*al-ḥaqqu manshūdun, wa-al-'adlu maqṣūdun*).

In this Linguistic Operation, the corresponding phrase-endings *manshūdun* and *maqṣūdun* are organised so that they agree in both morphological weight and final rhyme-letter. The resulting Cognitive Relationship does not depend upon a semantic inference between the meanings of those words. Instead, a competent [addressee](#) first recognises that the recurrence of sound is a deliberate Linguistic Operation rather than an incidental feature of the words chosen, prompting the [addressee](#) to consider why the [communicator](#) performed it and what it is intended to draw attention to. This recognition constitutes the Cognitive Relationship: a shared understanding, between [communicator](#) and [addressee](#), that the patterned recurrence is purposive rather than accidental. This relationship may produce Communicative Enhancements such as rhythmic cohesion, aesthetic salience, emphasis, or memorability. This Linguistic Operation is therefore an instance of the rhetorical device [Rhymed Prose](#).

The Cognitive Relationship is therefore addressee-dependent. Where the [addressee](#) lacks the shared knowledge, linguistic competence, contextual assumptions, or perceptual access required to recognise the relevant aspect of the Linguistic Operation, the Cognitive Relationship may fail to be established or activated.

Theoretical foundation: Cognitive Relationship is informed by inferential and cognitive approaches to communication in which interpretation depends upon relationships established or recovered through the interaction of an utterance with contextual knowledge and assumptions.^{[5][6][7]} It is also informed by accounts of formal equivalence and patterning as communicatively significant properties of linguistic expression.^{[8][9]}

Step 4: Communicative Enhancement

The Communicative Enhancement Step concerns the enhancement in [communicative effect](#) invoked in the [addressee](#) through the Cognitive Relationship established or activated by the Linguistic Operation. Such effects may include, for example, clarity, emphasis, intensification, vividness, concision, praise, criticism, persuasion, humour, emotional force, memorability, aesthetic enhancement, or other context-dependent responses. The Communicative Enhancement is the downstream consequence of the Linguistic Operation and may not correspond exactly with the [communicator](#)'s original intent; a single linguistic operation may also produce more than one [communicative effect](#).

Theoretical foundation: Communicative Enhancement reflects the longstanding concern of rhetoric and pragmatics with the effects that linguistic actions may exert upon an addressee. Related theoretical concepts include perlocutionary effects in speech-act theory and cognitive effects in relevance-theoretic accounts of communication.^{[2][5][10]}

Annotating the Unit of Rhetorical Action

Within the **Model for Rhetorical Action**, a single [rhetorical action](#) contains one identifiable Linguistic Operation. That operation may establish or activate one or more Cognitive Relationships and may produce an enhancement of one or more [communicative effects](#). Where multiple [rhetorical devices](#) occur within the same linguistic expression, they are analysed as multiple co-occurring [rhetorical actions](#) rather than as multiple linguistic operations within a single [rhetorical action](#).

For the purpose of identifying and recording discrete instances of [linguistic rhetorical action](#), the **Model** treats the presence of an identifiable [rhetorical device](#) — the instrument of the Linguistic Operation — as the fixed textual property that constitutes a [linguistic rhetorical action](#) for annotation purposes. The Cognitive Relationship and Communicative Enhancement function analytically as corroborating evidence that a Linguistic Operation capable of establishing the Cognitive Relationship and producing the Communicative Enhancement is present. Conversely, the absence of any plausible Cognitive Relationship or Communicative Enhancement — where no shared understanding could reasonably be activated by the candidate operation for a competent addressee — weighs against treating the candidate linguistic action as a [rhetorical device](#). Analytically, a noticed effect, or a plausible shared understanding suggested by the context, directs the analyst's attention to the Linguistic Operation that may have produced it.

The identification of a [rhetorical device](#) is independent of evidence that a Cognitive Relationship has been established or activated for a given addressee or annotator, or that a Communicative Enhancement has occurred. An addressee's failure to perceive a [rhetorical device](#), whether from lack of competence, context, or attention, does not indicate that no device is present; it indicates only that the Cognitive Relationship was not activated on that occasion.

Analytical Significance of the Model

The four-step **Model for Rhetorical Action** can be applied to any Arabic [linguistic rhetorical action](#), irrespective of whether the Linguistic Operation is semantic or structural. The **Model** illustrates the exceptional communicative power of [rhetoric](#). From the selection and execution of a context-appropriate Linguistic Operation, to the establishment or activation of one or more Cognitive Relationships between [communicator](#) and [addressee](#), and ultimately to one or more Communicative Enhancements produced in the [addressee](#), [rhetorical action](#) can involve a cascading amplification of communicative force as each stage of the causal sequence enables and acts upon the next.

From the rhetorical critic's point of view, the **Model** exposes the discrete components of [rhetorical action](#) for separate analytical consideration. The distinction between these four steps is necessary because rhetorical analysis may otherwise

collapse analytically distinct aspects of [linguistic rhetorical action](#), contributing to inconsistency or disagreement in analysis. Notably, multiple Linguistic Operations and [rhetorical devices](#) may establish similar Cognitive Relationships between [communicator](#) and [addressee](#). The resulting Communicative Enhancements may or may not correspond with the [communicator](#)'s original intent. A [rhetorical device](#) that performs a Linguistic Operation is not identical to the Cognitive Relationship it creates, nor to the Communicative Enhancements it produces, which in turn may not be the outcome that was intended.

Mere perception of a linguistic feature or incidental regularity does not by itself constitute a Cognitive Relationship for the purposes of the **Model**; the relationship must be communicatively relevant for the [addressee](#) and capable of supporting Communicative Enhancement. Consider the constructed Arabic expression: "Khalid arrived at the house, and left the book with his friend" (*Waṣala Khālidun ilā al-bayti, wa-taraka al-kitāba 'inda al-ṣaḍīqi*). The endings *al-bayti* and *al-ṣaḍīqi* share a final /i/ sound. This phonological similarity alone, however, does not meet the threshold for a Linguistic Operation as it is not capable of establishing or activating a rhetorically useful Cognitive Relationship between the [communicator](#) and the [addressee](#). Therefore it should not be annotated as an instance of the rhetorical device [Rhymed Prose](#), even though it may meet the criteria for the lexical feature of the same name.

Relationship with the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric

Built upon the theoretical foundation provided by the **Model for Rhetorical Action**, the [Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#) primarily catalogues [rhetorical devices](#) at the Linguistic Operation Step using a typology based on linguistic actions, as described in the [Design Principles of the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#). [Rhetorical device](#) descriptions include possible enhancements to [communicative effects](#). A separate page describes common [Rhetorical Relationships](#). The **Model** is itself operationalised through explicit and transparent [Criteria for Inclusion in the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#). The [Principles for Identifying Arabic Rhetorical Devices](#) operationalise the four-step Model for practical rhetorical analysis.

The relationship between the theoretical **Model** and the [identification framework](#) is shown below:

Model for Rhetorical Action step	Identification consequence
Communicator Intent	Excluded from direct analysis (Principle 1)
Linguistic Operation	Evaluated in Step 1 ("Identification of a hallmark linguistic operation") and Step 2 ("Substitution with non-rhetoric equivalent")
Cognitive Relationship	Evaluated in Step 3 ("Identification of positive contextual indicators of rhetorical usage")
Communicative Enhancement	Evaluated in Step 4 ("Evidence of possible Communicative Enhancement")

The **Model for Rhetorical Action** thus forms the first link in a dependency chain through which [rhetorical actions](#) may become subject to systematic quantitative analysis. The **Model** defines the process of [rhetorical action](#). The [Inclusion Criteria](#) determine whether attested candidate phenomena qualify as distinct [rhetorical devices](#) within that domain. The [Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#) organises those [rhetorical devices](#) into a linguistic-operation taxonomy. Device-specific recognition criteria make instances operationally identifiable for annotation. Instance counts derived from that annotation can subsequently support quantitative measures of rhetorical frequency and [rhetorical density](#).

A potential quantitative analysis workflow for [rhetorical devices](#) could be:

Model for Rhetorical Action → [Inclusion Criteria](#) → [Rhetorical Device Taxonomy](#) → [Identification and Annotation](#) → [Device Counts](#) → [Rhetorical Density](#)

Limitations of the Model

The **Model for Rhetorical Action** is intended as a contemporary analytical and operational framework, and should not be viewed as a reconstruction of how classical Arabic rhetoricians conceptualised Arabic rhetoric. The **Model**'s categories represent a modern explanatory architecture applied to phenomena attested within the classical Arabic rhetorical tradition.

The **Model** is not claimed to be the only possible theoretical or conceptual model to explain Arabic rhetoric.

The **Model** is intended to accommodate the breadth of source-attested Arabic rhetoric, but its present architecture is still under development. Further examination of the rhetorical tradition, or difficulties encountered in applying the framework, may justify refinement of its categories or relationships.

The **Model** does not settle certain ambiguities which are an integral part of rhetorical analysis, such as how strong a Cognitive Relationship must be to be considered rhetorically meaningful, and where exactly to draw that line in borderline cases. The **Model**'s role is to bring consistency to areas which can be standardised, acknowledging that not all of rhetorical criticism is amenable to standardisation.

The **Model** borrows the idea of a "competent addressee" from existing work in linguistics and communication theory. The **Model** mentions but does not define what makes an [addressee](#) "competent" enough to perceive a given Linguistic Operation.

The **Model** is not intended to serve as a step-by-step annotation guide. Procedures for resolving specific annotation disputes - including cases of overlapping or nested rhetorical devices within a single expression - fall outside the **Model**'s scope.

Summary

Quantitative analysis of rhetoric requires rhetorical phenomena to be identified and counted. With Arabic, this requires a principled account of what constitutes Arabic rhetoric, what differentiates Arabic rhetoric from other linguistic phenomena, and how to identify and classify [rhetorical devices](#).

The **Model for Rhetorical Action** therefore arose from a practical methodological problem. It was developed to provide a coherent account of the diverse source-attested rhetorical phenomena recognised within the Arabic rhetorical tradition. For any such phenomenon, the **Model** must explain why it belongs within Arabic rhetoric, what linguistic operation is performed, what communicatively relevant cognitive effect this has on the [addressee](#), and how this may result in an enhancement in the communicative power of the [communicator](#)'s message. The resulting architecture of the **Model** provides a common framework through which structurally diverse rhetorical devices can be understood as instances of [linguistic rhetorical action](#).

The **Model** is an analytical synthesis derived through the operationalisation of source-attested [linguistic rhetorical actions](#) in the Arabic rhetorical tradition and is open to evaluation according to its ability to provide a coherent account of those [linguistic rhetorical actions](#). Within the **Model**, Arabic rhetoric is realised when a [communicator](#) uses an identifiable Linguistic Operation to establish or activate a Cognitive Relationship with an [addressee](#), through which one or more Communicative Enhancements may be produced.

The **Model** therefore distinguishes four discrete components of this process: Communicator Intent, Linguistic Operation, Cognitive Relationship, and Communicative Enhancement, the latter three of which are targets for analysis. The Linguistic Operation is the annotatable and measurable unit of [linguistic rhetorical action](#); its identification is supported by analysis of Cognitive Relationship and Communicative Enhancement. A [rhetorical device](#) is the instrument of the Linguistic Operation. The **Model** does not claim that every marked, unusual, or communicatively significant linguistic phenomenon is rhetorical. Grammatical, lexical, phonological, and prosodic phenomena may participate in [rhetorical action](#), but their mere presence does not establish rhetorical status. The **Model** acknowledges that the presence of a [linguistic rhetorical action](#) may not correlate with Cognitive Relationship and Communicative Enhancement in every [addressee](#).

The **Model** provides a principled boundary for determining what may count as a [rhetorical device](#). This boundary supports the [Criteria for Inclusion in the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#), the [Arabic Rhetorical Device Taxonomy](#), practical identification and annotation, and ultimately the quantitative measurement of [rhetoric](#) through measures such as [Rhetorical Density](#) [↗](#).

See Also

- [Design Principles of the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#)
- [Criteria for Inclusion in the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#)
- [Principles for Identifying Arabic Rhetorical Devices with the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#)

References

- ↑ Grice, H. P. (1957). "Meaning". *The Philosophical Review*, 66(3), 377–388.
- ↑ ^{a b} Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- ↑ Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press
- ↑ Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- ↑ ^{a b} Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell
- ↑ Carston, R. (2002). *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell
- ↑ Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
- ↑ Jakobson, Roman (1960). "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics". In Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 350–377
- ↑ Tsur, R. (1992). *Toward a Theory of Cognitive Poetics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- ↑ Wilson, D. and Sperber, D. (2004). "Relevance Theory." In L. R. Horn and G. Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 607–632.

Page History

- 2026-08-16 - Page created [Model for Rhetorical Action](#) by promoting the **Model for Rhetorical Action** section from [Design Principles of the Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric](#) to an independent document.

Category: [Encyclopedia Pages](#)

Cite this page: Dr Mandar Marathe  (2026). "Model for Rhetorical Action". *al-Balagha.com: The Encyclopedia of Arabic Rhetoric*. <https://doi.org/10.64393/balagha.model.rhetorical.action>

