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Abstract

The present paper carries out a study about the possibilities of mutual enrichment resulting from the interrelationship of the Text-Structure World-Structure Theory (TeSWeST, from the German “Text-Struktur Welt-Struktur Theorie”) by János S. Petőfi and the rhetorical model, that is, the explanatory system for the construction and communication of rhetorical discourse within the framework of the so-called *rhetorica recepta*, traditionally formed by the operations —*partes artis or oratoris officia*— of *inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria* and *actio/pronuntiatio*. More specifically, our aim is, on the one hand, to account for the enrichment of TeSWeST from the examination of rhetorical *elocutio* —an enrichment which also leads us to the need for a redefinition of the traditional rhetorical operations in the light of the components and categories of TeSWeST; and on the other, to try and explain the enrichment of the traditional rhetorical system through the recovery of the rhetorical operation of *intellectio* —from the review of historic texts dealing with rhetorical theory, such as *Institutiones oratorias*, by Sulpitius Victor, and *De rhetorica liber*, by Aurelius Augustinus.
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1. Discovering Petőfian linguistic-textual thinking

My first contact with János S. Petőfi’s theoretical-linguistic thinking took place during the 1981-1982 academic year, when I was an undergraduate student in the last year of the Degree in Hispanic Philology and, more precisely, in the subjects History of the Spanish Language and Romance Linguistics — imparted by Tomás Albaladejo, who had just arrived at the University of Alicante.

The classes dedicated to the description and explanation of the Text-Structure World-Structure Theory (TeSWeST, from German “Text-Struktur Welt-Struktur Theorie”), developed by János S. Petőfi,\(^1\) in its relationships with the treatment of discourse and its communication seemed to me not only very interesting, but also suggestively provocative for what would shortly after be the foundations of my Master’s Thesis on the textual treatment of the article in Spanish (Chico Rico 1983) and, especially, of my Doctoral Thesis, which revolved around the study of the compositional and pragmatic spaces and their connection from the linguistic and theoretical-literary point of view in argumentative and narrative discourse (Chico Rico 1986).

In addition to the publications by János S. Petőfi that were made available to me thanks to Tomás Albaladejo’s generosity, a number of works in Spanish recently published at the time by Antonio García Berrio, Agustín Vera Luján, János S. Petőfi and Tomás Albaladejo\(^2\) were at my disposal too, as well as the significant overview entitled *Introducción a la lingüística del texto* [Introduction to Text Linguistics], published by Enrique Bernárdez in 1982 (Bernárdez 1982). A special mention should be made amongst those works of *Lingüística del texto y Crítica literaria* [Text Linguistics and Literary Criticism] (Petőfi and García Berrio 1978), written by János S. Petőfi and Antonio García Berrio — with Tomás Albaladejo’s collaboration — and of paramount importance for the introduction and early applications of the linguistic-textual theory of the Hungarian theorist in Spain\(^3\); in turn, Tomás Albaladejo had developed and presented his Extended

---

\(^1\) These are the works which essentially contributed to the gradual consolidation of this general text theory: Petőfi 1971; 1973; 1975; 1978a; 1978b; 1978c; 1978d; 1978e. Their practical operability can be observed in Albaladejo 1978.


\(^3\) Applications which gave rise, amongst other things, to the development of a textual typology — semantic or thematic and syntactic or constructive — for the classical love sonnet, carried out by Antonio García Berrio from a linguistic-textual examination of thousands of sonnets from the
TeSWeST I (E TeSWeST I) in 1981 (Albaladejo 1981) and was giving the final touches to his Extended TeSWeST II (E TeSWeST II) (Albaladejo 1983), which saw the light in 1983. In this regard, if we are indebted to János S. Petőfi for having constructed one of the linguistic-textual theories with a greater descriptive-explanatory capacity as far as the reality of linguistic communication is concerned, and with a strong analytical potential for literary as well as non-literary texts, our thankfulness should also go to Antonio García Berrio and Tomás Albaladejo for the effort that they both undertook to make known and disseminate that theory in Spain. Their effort proved highly useful, at least in my case, insofar as that theoretical approach was going to shape the essential theoretical-methodological framework for my theoretical and critical research activity in several of the research lines that I have been working on over the years.

2. The Text-Structure World-Structure Theory (TeSWeST) and Rhetoric

Amongst all the possibilities that the linguistic-textual model corresponding to Janos S. Petőfi’s TeSWeST and Tomas Albaladejo’s developments of E TeSWeST I and E TeSWeST II offered me, the one which deserves to be highlighted on these pages in my opinion refers to its interrelationship with the rhetorical model, that is, with the system that explains the construction and communication of rhetorical discourse within the framework of *rhetorica recepta*, which traditionally includes the operations —*partes artis* or *oratoris officia*— of *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria* and *actio/pronuntiatio* (Reyes 1940; Lausberg 1960; Martin 1974; Murphy 1983; Chico Rico Spanish Siglo de Oro [Golden Age]. Vid. in this respect García Berrio 1978a; 1978b; 1978-1980; 1980; 1981; 1982a; 1982b.

4 These extensions of János S. Petőfi’s TeSWeST by Tomás Albaladejo significantly contributed to enrich the general model through the design of important theoretical constructions that underlie the reality of linguistic communication, such as the representation component, which shapes E TeSWeST I, and the text pragmatic component, which results in E TeSWeST II. The representation component in E TeSWeST I allows producer and receiver linguists to formalize the outcomes of their respective processes (Albaladejo 1981, 130). As for the text pragmatic component in E TeSWeST II, developed along with the representation component, it makes TeSWeST become a linguistic-textual model which, on one side, intuitively and formally reproduces the linguistic-textual-communicative competence of the common producer and receiver and, on another, reflects the relation existing between text linguistics and linguistic pragmatics, since E TeSWeST II constitutes a pragmatic-based semiotic textual model (Albaladejo 1983, 42-43).

5 “Rhetorica recepta” is understood —following Tomás Albaladejo— as the system inherited from this science of discourse (Albaladejo 1989a, 19; 1998).
1987; Albaladejo 1989a; Mortara Garavelli 1991; López Eire 1996; Pujante 2003). The aforesaid interrelationship was grounded on two facts:

1) the verification that the linguistic-textual theory has its most solid foundations and precedents in rhetorical theory, as shown by the similarity between the underlying communicative reality schemes proposed by Rhetoric and Text Linguistics (Van Dijk 1972, 24-25, 134-139; García Berrio 1978c, 260-262; 1979a, 152 ff.; 1989, 86 ff.; Missac 1983; Pozuelo Yvancos 1988a, 206-211; 1988b, 162-168); and

2) the suggestion, made by Antonio García Berrio, to build a General Rhetoric as a general science of discourse from two essential demands: a) the complete recovery of historical thinking about the two classical sciences of discourse —Rhetoric and Poetics—; and b) the close collaboration between the latter and the two modern sciences of discourse —Text Linguistics and Linguistic Poetics— (García Berrio 1984a; 1989, 140-179). Within the context of Literary Theory, the connection of this discipline was undoubtedly favoured by the interest in establishing a true General Literary Rhetoric —or General Poetics— that could programmatically complement the rhetorical contributions with the traditional and modern poetic contributions as well as the linguistic-textual contributions (García Berrio 1984a; 1984b; 1989, 140-179; 1990; 1994).

It is indeed this proposal carried out by Antonio García Berrio in 1984 to build a General Rhetoric —truly general, unlike that made in 1970 by the Group µ or Group of Liège, which was confined to the rhetorical operation of elocutio (Groupe µ 1970)— that really encouraged me to relate the rhetorical model formed by the operations of inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria and actio/pronuntiatio to the linguistic-textual model of TeSWeST and, more specifically, of E TeSWeST II. The main task sought with this task consisted not only in proving that the linguistic-textual theory has its most solid foundations and precedents in rhetorical theory through the verification of the similarity between the underlying schemes of communicative reality suggested by Rhetoric and Text Linguistics, but also in trying to enrich the categories and instruments of Text Linguistics from Rhetoric, as well as to redefine and/or reinterpret —enriching them too—the categories and instruments of Rhetoric from Text Linguistics in a kind of theoretical-methodological circle where they feed one another.
The aspect of this research project that will be covered here is the enrichment of the E TeSWeST II model entailed by the study of rhetorical *elocutio*, giving rise to what could be referred to as E TeSWeST III (Chico Rico 1989a), and the redefinition and/or reinterpretation of traditional poetic operations in the light of E TeSWeST II components and categories.

3. Towards an E TeSWeST III

Along the lines of discourse synthesis or production within the framework of text basis —which can broadly speaking be identified with the dimension of macrostructure in the context of the linguistic-textual model developed by the Dutch theorist Teun A. van Dijk⁶— the role of transferring the semantic-intensional information associated with the sense structure to the linear text manifestation in E TeSWeST II is performed by the mapping component with the support of the lexicon component which, in this part of the model, obtains the lexical manifestations from the linear text manifestation on the basis of the semantic-intensional lexical explanations for the sense structure (Petőfi 1971; 1973; 1975, 2; 1978c, 166; Eikmeyer 1980, 75 ff.; Albaladejo 1983, 25-26; 1984a, 275-276). It is worth asking ourselves at this point what the justification could be for the existence of such relevant stylistic phenomena within literary/poetic discourse as those represented by the artistic-verbal procedures or figures or the ones that depend on rhetorical *compositio* and poetic *versificatio* (Lausberg 1960, § 911) —taking the linguistic-textual model under analysis as a reference point.

The key was provided to us by the actual dynamic —or expressed differently, dispositive— conception which characterises the rhetorical operation of *elocutio*. Poetic-rhetorical theory has tended to associate *res* with *inventio*, *verba* with *elocutio*, and the Horacian duality as a whole —*res/verba*— to the operation of *dispositio*.⁷ Therefore, in addition to organising discursive totality, the *dispositio* understood as an operation related to *res* in the inventive or heuristic context, and to *verba* in the elocutionary field directly collaborates with *inventio* and *elocutio* when building their corresponding linguistic

---


⁷ Quintilian explains it as follows: “[...] orationem [...] omnem constare rebus et verbis; in rebus intuendum inveniendum, in verbis elocutionem, in utraque conlocationem, quae memoria complectetur, actio commendaret” (*The Orator’s Education*, VIII, Pr., 6). Vid. in this respect García Berrio 1977b, 51 ff., 413 ff.; 1984a, 26-27, 51; Albaladejo 1986a, 121-122.
description levels (García Berrio 1977b, 51 ff.): a) the inventive or heuristic level—which has a semantic-extensional as well as a semantic-intensional nature from a semiotic point of view because it corresponds to the referential set structure or text referent within the framework of the text extension component, and to the basis syntax level or syntactic-semantic macrocomponent of the sense structure within the framework of the text intension component—(Chico Rico 1987, 65-106); b) the dispositive level—of a syntactic-semiotic nature and equivalent to the text basis or macrostructural text dimension in its whole complexity and width--; and c) the elocutionary level—which, strictly speaking, is also syntactic from a semiotic point of view because it identifies with the linear text manifestation or microstructural text dimension.

Tomás Albaladejo already saw the need to complete the semantic-intensional inventive or heuristic part of Petőfi’s linguistic-textual model with a mapping component section of a dispositive nature, thus showing the dynamics inherent to the sense structure derived from the global textual topic and from the remaining topical organization of the text (Albaladejo 1984a, 275-278). This mapping component section within the sense structure is the one which makes it possible to build the intensional fable of the text or basis macrosyntactic level (García Berrio and Albaladejo 1983, 155-156), conceived as the level used to reproduce the group of events which are transmitted to us throughout the work in accordance with their natural, chronological and causal order, regardless of their particular artistic organization in the linear text manifestation of the literary work, whereas the mapping component as such allows for the construction of the transformation macrosyntactic level in the narrative text (García Berrio and Albaladejo 1983, 155-156).

---

8 This twofold attachment of the inventive or heuristic level to the referential set structure or text referent within the framework of the text extension component on one side, and to the sense structure at the level of the basis syntax or syntactic-semantic macrocomponent within the framework of the text intension component on another, fully matches the distinction drawn by Tomás Albaladejo after a thorough analysis of the Stagirite’s Poetics (Albaladejo 1986a, 123 ff.) between the two different but also complementary dimensions which characterise the Aristotelian concept of ‘fable’: a) that corresponding to the ‘extensional fable,’ conceived as a set that includes the beings, states, processes, actions and ideas selected by the author of the narrative text for the construction of its semantic structure; and b) the one referring to the ‘intensional fable,’ understood as the reproduction of the extensional fable in the sense structure, since the narrative text fable is globally regarded as an extensional system of worlds which becomes incorporated into the co-textual field from the semantic-extensional one; that is, which becomes intensionalised (Albaladejo 1986a, 50-58; 1986b; 1989b; 1989c; 1990a; 1992).

9 The intensional fable of the narrative text or basis macrosyntactic level coincides with the ‘fable’ or ‘story’ of the Russian formalist school (Tomashesky 1928) and of all the subsequent structurally-semiologically-oriented neoformalist tradition.

10 In turn, the transformation macrosyntactic level identifies with what was referred to as ‘plot’ by Russian formalists (Tomashesky 1928).
understood as the reproduction of the same set of events as they have been artistically arranged and inserted in the linear text manifestation of the literary work.

It seemed necessary for us to include another section of the mapping component in the elocutionary context of the Petőfian linguistic-textual model, that is to say, in the lexicon component, with the aim of reflecting the dynamics which are typical both of this component and of the corresponding operation in the linguistic communication reality. Such dynamics stems from the respective dependence of that component and that operation on the categories and operations which modify the normal use of language, universally summarised in the rhetorical assumptions of Quintilian’s quadripertita ratio, namely: adiectio, detractio, transmutatio and inmutatio. These are the operations which—from Quintilian himself (The Orator’s Education, IX, I, 4-7)—have served as the basis for most rhetorical classifications, based on the generic oppositions defined by the trope/figure and figure of speech/figure of thinking dualities. Tropes, as verba singula or barbarismi (Lausberg 1960, §§ 475, 532, 541), are produced from modifying operations of inmutatio (Lausberg 1960, § 552); figures, in turn, as verba coniuncta or soloecismi (Lausberg 1960, §§ 496-527, 537, 599-1054), find their origin in the operations of adiectio, detractio and transmutatio that modify the lexical signifier level, in which case we find ourselves before figures of speech —figurae elocutionis (Lausberg 1960, §§ 604-754)—or those modifying the lexical meaning level, in which case we are dealing with figures of thinking —figurae sententiae (Lausberg 1960, §§ 755-910).

The recognition of a lexical dynamics, selective-paradigmatic on one side—characteristic of tropes—and combinatorial-sintagmatic on another—which determines figures—(Pozuelo Yvancos 1983, 87 ff.; 1988b, 170 ff.; Albaladejo 1984b, 197 ff.;

---


12 In fact, rhetorical typologies such as those developed by the Group µ or Group of Liège (Groupe µ 1970) or Kurt Spang (Spang 1979, 131 ff.), to quote but two, owe their foundations to classical Rhetoric and try to make elocutionary re-elaborations based on modern linguistic trends. Vid. in this respect García Berrio 1984a, 7-24; Pozuelo Yvancos 1983, 87 ff.; 1988b, 170 ff.; Albaladejo 1984b, 197 ff.; Albaladejo and Chico Rico 1994, 262 ff.
Albaladejo and Chico Rico 1994, 262 ff.), according to the well-known Jakobsonian distinction (Jakobson 1956), not only implies the already-mentioned inclusion of a mapping component section in the lexicon component within the Petőfian linguistic-textual model, but also the creation of a new category. This category —termed as ‘linear text structure’ in our paper— is directly built by the lexicon component and constituted by the definitive organisation of the text in its macrostructural and consequently more superficial sentence developments, thus coinciding with Van Dijk’s concept of ‘microstructure,’ which contains the set of deep structures corresponding to the sentences that the text is made up of (Van Dijk 1972, 5-6, 17, 130 ff.).

In parallel to the aforementioned basis macrosyntactic level and the transformation macrosyntactic level, respectively built by the mapping component section included in the sense structure and by the mapping component strictly speaking, the level corresponding to the linear text structure built by the mapping section included in the lexicon component was called ‘manifestation macrosyntactic level’ (Chico Rico 1989a, 337), this appearing as the main identifying characteristic of E TeSWeST III which distinguishes it from the previous versions of the linguistic-textual model conceived and developed by János S. Petőfi and Tomás Albaladejo.

4. The redefinition and/or reinterpretation of the rhetorical system from E TeSWeST III

As regards the redefinition and/or reinterpretation of the traditional rhetorical operations in the light of the components and categories of E TeSWeST III, and sticking to discourse-building operations —inventio, dispositio and elocutio— (Albaladejo 1988-1989; 1989a, 57-64), inventio, defined by classical Rhetoric as the detection or finding of discourse ideas, can be reinterpreted as the rhetorical operation in charge, firstly, of adopting or building a specific world model as the semantic-extensional basis for the construction of discourse semantic structure; and, secondly, of selecting from such world model those semantic-extensional elements which the producer is interested in transmitting, thus giving rise to the constructive level corresponding to the referential set structure or text referent. So far, inventio would be an operation of a strictly semantic-extensional nature; however, as it was previously explained when referring to the distinction between the two dimensions —extensional and intensional— of the fable, our
reinterpretation of *inventio* presents it as a semantic-extensional operation from which derives the referential set structure or text referent within the framework of the text extension component, with semantic-intensional developments related to the conversion of the text referent semantic-extensional explanations into semantic-intensional ones, in the form of topical material inserted in the sense structure within the framework of the text intension component.

*Dispositio*, defined by classical Rhetoric as the organisation of the semantic material previously detected or found by *inventio*, can be reinterpreted as the rhetorical operation in charge, firstly, of structuring the semantic material of the sense structure in accordance with the global compositional structure or superstructure\(^{13}\) of the text type in question —argumentative, epistolary, narrative, etc.—, giving rise to the basis macrosyntactic level, which coincides with the intensional fable and, consequently, with the level of the formalist fable or story; and, secondly, where applicable, of restructuring the first dispositional level in accordance with what was referred to in Rhetoric as an *ordo naturalis* or an *ordo artificialis* or artificiosus (Lausberg 1960, §§ 448, 452), reaching the transformation macrosyntactic level, identified with the plot level; and finally, of introducing the figure engine\(^{14}\) —rhythmic-musical engine, dispositive or dynamising engine, metaphorical engine, etc.— as a strategy for the alteration of normal language usage on any of the natural language text linguistic description levels, thanks to the mapping component section included in the lexicon component.

Finally, *elocutio* —defined by classical Rhetoric as the assignment of *verba*, words, to the discourse *res*— can be reinterpreted as the rhetorical operation in charge, firstly, of assigning semantic-extensional lexical constructions to the referential elements of the referential set structure, endowed with logical existence/non-existence and truth/falseness values according to a specific world model; secondly, of assigning

\(^{13}\) The global compositional structure or superstructure of a discourse, as it has been called by Teun A. van Dijk, can be intuitively characterised as the global form of a text, which defines the global discourse arrangement and the (hierarchical) relationships existing between its respective fragments. Such superstructure, similar in many aspects to the syntactic form of a sentence, is described in terms of categories and formation rules. Vid. in this respect Van Dijk 1977a, 226-229; 1978, 141-173; 1983, 52-56.

\(^{14}\) We propose the concept of ‘figure engine’ from the concept of ‘metaphorical engine’ suggested by Tomás Albaladejo within the framework of a Cultural Rhetoric (Albaladejo 2009; 2011; 2012; 2013; 2014a; 2014b; 2016). It is precisely the figure engine that explains the dynamic foundation of all the mechanisms which alter normal language usage, identified by rhetorical theory as figures, on any of the natural language text linguistic description levels, from the phonetic-phonological one to the semantic-intensional or lexical-semantic one.
semantic-intensional lexical constructions to the topical elements of the sense structure; thirdly, of building the linear text structure through the shaping of text sentence deep structures; and, finally, of reaching the lexical manifestations of the linear text manifestation from the previous category.

This redefinition implies a definitive abandonment of the successive and compartmentalised conception about the operations which form the rhetorical system as a descriptive and explanatory model for text construction and communication, a consideration which was already suggested by Cicero in his De oratore\textsuperscript{15} and perpetuated in most of the subsequent rhetorical treatises (García Berrio 1979b, 36).\textsuperscript{16} This was mainly due to the highly technical nature of those treatises, and it eventually led not only to a treatment of the different rhetorical operations based on their disconnection, but also to a reduction of the twofold productive-receptive perspective —present in every traditional conception of Rhetoric—in favour of synthetic unidirectionality, the tendency to ignore the existence of a discourse production and reception plan focused on the simultaneity of synthesis and analysis operations and, ultimately, the disordering of the real rhetorical order underlying linguistic communication (Lausberg 1960, §§ 444-445; García Berrio 1973, 209; 1979a, 156-157; 1979b, 36; 1984a, 27 ff.; 1989, 153 ff.; García Berrio and Albaladejo 1983, 131-133).

5. Towards an extended model of the traditional rhetorical system: intellectio

Along the same lines of recovering the historical thinking about the two classical sciences of discourse demanded by the premises for a General Rhetoric, our examination of classical and traditional Rhetoric and Poetics served to rescue the rhetorical operation of intellectio—from a review of historic rhetorical theory texts such as Institutiones oratoriae, by Sulpitius Victor,\textsuperscript{17} and De rhetorica liber, by Aurelius Augustinus\textsuperscript{18}— and to integrate it into the traditional rhetorical system, placing it within the context of the

\textsuperscript{15} Vid. in this respect García Berrio and Albaladejo 1983, 132.
\textsuperscript{16} Heinrich Lausberg, in his monumental Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study, also frequently tends towards that confusion (Lausberg 1960, §§ 260, 443, 453). Nevertheless, he openly admits the total interdependence of rhetorical operations sometimes (Lausberg 1960, §§ 444-445).

Intellectio is described and explained as an instructive rhetorical operation which does not result in a constructive level within the context of rhetorical construction—a set which consists of the syntactic-semiotic structures and elements of rhetorical discourse, and of the semantic-extensional structures and elements established as a referential set structure or referent for their representation in such discourse (Albaladejo 1989a, 43-53; 1990b)—, but rather in an instructive level corresponding to the rhetorical event—which covers both the rhetorical discourse and the relationship which that discourse maintains with the speaker, the audience, the referent and the context where communication takes place (Albaladejo 1989a, 43-53; 1990b)— (Albaladejo and Chico Rico 1998). This level contains the set of semantic-semiotic or semantic-extensional, syntactic-semiotic—macrostructural and microstructural—and pragmatic-semiotic or pragmatic-communicative instructions aimed at inventio, dispositio and elocutio, at memoria and actio/pronuntiatio, which must be suitably fulfilled by the latter faithfully respecting the principle of decorum or aptum, a component which structures textuality as well as rhetorical communication. Therefore, intellectio constitutes a rhetorical operation that precedes the series of discourse-building operations—inventio, dispositio and elocutio—as well as the series of non-discourse-building operations—memoria and actio/pronuntiatio— (Albaladejo 1988-1989; 1989a, 57-64), especially from a theoretical-operational or abstract point of view, but also from the specific temporal perspective referred to the rhetorical constructive-communicative process which it necessarily entails, even though its activity is maintained during the development of this rhetorical constructive-communicative process (Albaladejo and Chico Rico 1998). Intellectio enables the speaker to organise and implement the aforesaid operations of inventio, dispositio and elocutio within a systematic text production strategy which takes into account all the elements that shape the rhetorical event or are related to it. Intellectio also makes it possible for the speaker to organise and implement the operations of memoria and actio/pronuntiatio counting on the whole rhetorical event. It is thus the

---

mission of intellectio to initiate the activity of the series formed by the five traditional rhetorical operations and its maintenance under the communicative conditions best suited to the communicative situation as a whole and to each one of its components in particular. For all these reasons, intellectio actually constitutes a rhetorical pre-operation which, acting as a primer or trigger, allows for setting in motion the group mentioned above, which includes inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria and actio/pronuntiatio, understood as a systematic globality, as well as specifically activating each one of these rhetorical operations and, where applicable, modifying and readjusting each of the processes corresponding to those operations, once the former has placed the speaker in a position to examine the cause and the communicative situation in which that speaker finds himself, along with its possible changes through the evolution of his communicative-textual activity.

Since it consists in a process of cognitive-subjective activity (Chico Rico 1987, 26-29, 132-135), of verification, of determination, of definition and of comprehension, intellectio is a noetic operation for us, in an attempt to recover the Greek term corresponding to that rhetorical operation — νόησις (Lausberg 1960, § 97; Martin 1974, 15, 213; Chico Rico 1998a; 1998b)—, as opposed to the poietic operations —inventio, dispositio and elocutio— on the one hand, and the practical operations —memoria and actio/pronuntiatio— on the other, marked by their non-discourse-building nature (Albaladejo 1988-1989; 1989a, 57-64)—in the case of memoria and actio/pronuntiatio—and by their poietic activity —as regards inventio, dispositio and elocutio—, but also, and above all, for their instructive nature at an abstract level of communicative-linguistic functioning different from the one in which the group of semantic-extensional, syntactic-semiotic —macrostructural and microstructural— and pragmatic-communicative instructions elaborated by intellectio linguistically materialise in a specific inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria and actio/pronuntiatio.

For their part, each one of the poietic operations —the discourse-building ones— (Albaladejo 1988-1989; 1989a, 57-64) gives as a result a constructive level in rhetorical construction as a semantic-extensional and syntactic-semiotic object produced by those operations. In other words, there is a constructive level of inventio—which, as said above, can be semiotically said to have a semantic-extensional as well as a semantic-intensional nature because it shows a correspondence with the referential set structure or text referent within the framework of the text extension component, and with the basis syntax level or syntactic-semantic macrocomponent of the sense structure within the framework of the
text intension component—; a constructive level of _dispositio_ —of a syntactic-semiotic nature and equivalent to the text basis or macrostructural text dimension in all its complexity and breadth—; and a constructive level of _elocutio_ —which strictly speaking is also syntactic from a semiotic point of view because it identifies with the linear text manifestation or microstructural text dimension. These three levels jointly belong to the area of the text referent and of the text or rhetorical discourse itself, that is, to the context known as ‘rhetorical construction,’ which covers what can be seen as communicative materialisation elements in the rhetorical event.

Finally, _memoria_ and _actio/pronuntiatio_ constitute practical operations, insofar as they consist in objective activity processes (Chico Rico 1987, 26-29, 132-135) oriented to performative action and with a non-productive nature, from which no products that can objectively remain —like the rhetorical discourse— are obtained, but a development which culminates in itself, and from which a specific effect on the audience is the only thing that remains. They imply activities performed on discourse from its elaboration which are not essential for the establishment of the rhetorical construction (Albaladejo 1989a, 58).

These six operations are consequently compartmentalised into three series:

1) that of noetic-activity-based rhetorical operations —formed by _intellectio_, which, as a rhetorical operation, matches the functions carried out by the text pragmatic component of E TeSWeST II, dominating and covering the whole textual-linguistic model—;

2) that of poietic-activity-based rhetorical operations —which include _inventio_, _dispositio_ and _elocutio_, respectively reflected in: a) those components which give rise to the referential set structure within the framework of the text extension component and to the basis syntax level or syntactic-semantic macrocomponent of the sense structure within the framework of the text intension component; b) those components which give rise to the text basis or macrostructural text dimension in all its complexity and breadth; and c) those components which give rise to the linear text manifestation or microstructural text dimension—; and

6. Conclusion

After studying the possibilities for mutual enrichment resulting from the interrelationship of TeSWeST and the rhetorical model, or expressed differently, the explanatory system for the construction and communication of rhetorical discourse within the framework of *rhetorica recepta*, it becomes necessary for me to state that the theoretical-linguistic proposals along with their application-oriented developments carried out by János S. Petőfi initially in the context of TeSWeST, and subsequently in that of Semiotic Textology, lie at the foundation of an important and necessary task centred on recovering the historical thinking of Rhetoric and Poetics as classical sciences of discourse. Thanks to this task, it is currently possible to speak about the theoretical-methodological globality which characterises the most sensible studies about discourse, a globality that refers to the interdisciplinarity based on the interaction not only of intra- and extraphilological disciplines —such as Linguistics, Literary Theory, Psychology, Sociology or Anthropology—, but also the past, present and future disciplines of discourse.
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