

# Superspeech and Its Rhetorical Figures

Lepota Lazar Cosmo<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Independent Scholar, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, USA

## Email Address

lepota.cosmo@hotmail.com (Lepota L. Cosmo)

\*Correspondence: lepota.cosmo@hotmail.com

**Received:** 29 July 2018; **Accepted:** 23 July 2019; **Published:** 15 August 2019

---

## Abstract:

Humour is the remnant of perfect language, the residuum of pristine speech. Superspeech as wordiness, long-windedness, grandiloquence, garrulousness, chattiness, glibness, is formal expression of talkativeness, purposeful and stylish speech within limited budget of time and colloquial words. Speech is imposed but with intent purpose and metalinguistic discourse, positioned within linear budget and its transcending function. Its rational limitations are rather projected to transcendental style of rhetoric, or funds of noncolloquial word and expressions. Superspeech is metalingual phenomenon whereas its metalinguistic nature produces useful lingual values. In concept of lingual vocation, superspeech is intentional rhetoric capability, a great lingual practice of genuine ability to use words, phrases or voices.

## Keywords:

Rhetorical Figures, Superspeech, Language and Education, Philosophy of Language

---

## 1. Introduction

Humour is the remnant of perfect language, the residuum of pristine speech. Satire once was prior source of rhetoric with countless forms of expression. We easily generate new figures and linguistic solutions, a form of speech as the instrument that is pre-set to ordinary speech and linguistics, level of conversation [1]. Words are game of meanings. Superspeech is metalinguistic post-meaning and by itself figure of speech or meta-linguistic figure. And, superspeech is quoting itself, using itself as meta-subject, taking word as modality, and using modality as an instrument; as original language can be pro and post, in priority to citations. Its metalogic is of the same structure, so that transcendental logic could be researched through improved logic because it seems the logic is the pure remitent of transcendental logic of speech. What will be said nobody said before, and even more nobody will say after. My creation is restrain for futher creation, the bigger creation, the scarciere creativity in future will be. By creating new we prevent new. By creating new we distroy past, and prevent future by reducing opportunities of expression. The scarciere opportunities, the scarciere production will be. The more I have said it, it seems that the less it will be said. Immense talk, creates immense silence. Logic is understood as fund, technical category with semantic bugdet and limited production [10]. Limits of production are repeatable, so that elements, forms, should be combined only once or to creation of one output that can not be used furhter in linguistic function. If the language function

is linear it will diminish the future. Different talks are expressed in functions of meanings, as functions are understood as curves that rub in colloquium or linear interchange. Colloquium stands opposite to original language, as the original language has its limitations in linear function. Try to escape trap of linear functions is made by metalinguistics in the category of metalogic. Productivity should not be limited or impose limits, implying that there are no scarce funds, words are not real, there are not expendable nor repeatable. Metalinguistics would provide us with assumption that words production would merge in metalogical sense creating original speech, where the future would be in dialogue with the present, creating even more original flow. Creativity could not diminish further creativity, although it can use wide scopes of forms and categories. In ordinary view, once something is created it can never be created again. [8] Metaspeech, however, will produce metaspeech. Creative talk will perpetuate creative talk based on transcendental logic and its metaforms. Metalanguage is in the discourse of creative reception. Creativity is a continuous process as original speech would rather have dialogue than thematical future. Creation is unlimited in its process, forms are not. Form is limited without productivity, with the creativity it is in dialogue with metaspeech. Creativity will be incentive for creation in future, and will not produce scarcity of the expression, but rather proliferation of forms and words in dialogue with its metalinguistics. That forms here could be labeled as metaforms. Oratorical skills will include ordinarily modalities, producing them from conditional to the semantic. By changing conditional, semantic becomes conditional, and words produce reality. Words once were conditions, conditions as ranks of words, the modalities of understanding that speaker will express. By expressing it, he proves that modalities are of linguistic nature. Speaker speaks to change the world, not to be boring. Speaker changes world with skilful expression, speaking strangely about ordinary, speaking on condition of listening, and by turning it into an ordinary and expressing new words that yet become conditions, to produce modalities, the words of a higher rank. Speech aims to encourage, change, create. Its guidance is recognized in the creation of conditions, conditions that have been changed through proactive locution and linguistic order. Accepting the new conditions of speech as a basis requires changing of active listeners in relation to the subject, the subject that is not always the speaker, and the speaker who is always the subject. Metaspeech is interesting because it says more than expected. It is ontological linguistics, expression of both speaker and listener. Listener is not trill because speaker says so much, as for the reason that it is expression about him. Meta speech talks to the subjects a priori. It is expression of modality and inner form of speechless subject. Lovers do not love song, but their love within the song. Listeners are realised as expressed subjects. Subject is identified with metaspeech, although it is not his, he is in dialogue with perfect language. It seems that the perfect language is something within modality, modality of changing and capturing words. Words become real when modality is colloquial. Changing ranks of words, simply by moving in lingual logic, or the linguistics of ranks, makes metalanguage interesting enough. Metaspeech is the process reverse to logic of the linguistics. Metalinguistics is rather applied logic or linguisation of logic, here defined as metalogic. Subject is perceptive to the poetry of structure, and unarticulated. Creativity is therefore, metaphysics of art.

## 2. Political Ontology of Words

Why does humor has such power with words? Does humour has its power as metalinguistics or is it because of its play with words. Humour is form of language, rather than play with language [17]. Outermost level of humor is in dealing with

words. The value of the internal structure of humour, the real power of humour, power of words, is in its metalogic, logic toward ranks of words, the established order of words in the modality. To be clear, the modality that is understood as logic of colloquium, in current ranks of words, within its unanticipated language. Logic itself could play with ranks, but, as such, it is part of the metalogic. Innermost level of humour is therefore nothing other than language, an original perfect language [16]. Positioned within metalogic, with use of right words. Should we say, humour is extension and sarcasm is expression? Extensive use of figures of speech distinguishes humour as metalanguage [7]. Humour is political and, therefore, original language that creates by speaking, uses by producing, it is the highest style, by speaking unassumed, uses the words used all the time. It changes ranks of words, words that create the words, words that correspondent to words, as in metalanguage, and its creativity is original although it uses the same words, because of political value of words that are structured in ranks. Thus linguistics has political value due to its creativity, ability of words to change and create meaning. Political value of language is in its logic, or precisely in the structural linguistics. Every creativity of language is political in its label. Political here has its linguistic interpretation. Capability of creating reality that is expressed. Capability of creating reality by words that is structural within political ontology and its semantics [17]. Power of words lies within their use, and consequently within their value. Political subject has ability to change the reality by speaking, so the words are by itself realities that exists in relation to the subject and reality. Words are always politically original, words are therefore, in true language always realities, realities of multiplied speakers. Should words be sometimes realities and reality sometimes changeable? Answer of rhetoric is yes, in endeavor. We live in poetic society. Everything is possible when playing words. Subject exists in metaspeech, speech that is well pronounced to the perceptive literature. In the terms of metalanguage there are no differences between creativity of speaker and creativity of receptor, creativity is equal therefore perceptive. Difference lies in terms of metalogic, necessary to distinguish quality of speaker to listener, speaker to speaker, as we do in logic. In original language there is no difference, without creativity, perception would not be creative, without creativity of perception creativity would not be perceived as creative, product of words would be disposable. There is reciprocity, within passive speaker lies creativity that is equal to the perceived creativity. And correspondences, within active speaker are realities. Sign correspondent to metasign, metasigns correspondent to reality. Should we speculate on superspeech, we will find that superspeech is a part of metaspeech, output of metalogic, with desire to speak always and to speak in all modes? Speak always and speak everything, speak when speaking is pointless, speak for the speaking sake. Someone would speak something, everyone will speak everything. Superspeaker will talk for the society, because in metaspeech there is no difference between the unit and the whole, because there is no difference between twos, the expression of one subject is expression of the other, the expression of the subject is perfect and delegated to the whole. In fact, no one can speak originally; original language would imply total expression, which is expression of everything for the first time. Thus, creator, or as we named it speaker, seeks out innovation moving towards perfect language.

### **3. Metaspeech as Original Language, on Metalinguistics**

By innovative speech, colloquium however resembles original language. But how much could we create in process of speaking? It seems that speech has its intuitive limits. Although speech is literary activity, making and moving rules of writing and

thinking. Original language would imply that speaker should say nothing more than what hearer wants to hear but would be even more pleased to hear and that no one could repeat what once was said. It means that language stands in creation as dynamics and that no category is liable only to figure of speech. Speech creates always something new to the ordinary language, and linguistics standing to metalinguistics is borrowing science, science as language of formal signs thinking of forms as the relations. In linguistics once there were metaforms, forms transcendent to forms as an original language; flows and forms as metalinguistic solutions. Once the speech is perceived, it will remain as metaform, if taken as an object, or an element, or is assigned, will be language of linguistics. Difference is changed and has new quality. Its advanced logics takes in favour of situation creating perpetual structure, structure that is close to language structure. The rules of transcendental logic are the same as the rules of logic. This projection is not to be applied in case of the metalinguistics. Metalanguage does not have any tangible lines in between, language to metalanguage. Categories for itself are not projections, metalinguistics are beyond domain of colloquial speech or level of letters. Original speech uses rhetoric in monologue for satire in dialogue. It is in relation to the subject, and not to the object. In debate/prominent speech, superspeech is very useful rhetoric. Particularly in debate, protagonists tend to see subject as object, creating underlanguage, and reducing even ordinary rhetoric. This happens desirable in rhetoric when the speaker becomes a listener. Super speech can reduce power of speech, or improve, depending of participant speakers. Superspeech is in relation to object and uses monologue as in prominent speech, or is in relation to subject and uses dialogue as in debate. It will use sarcasm or satire on listener or itself, not to third person whether is intended speech. It is dialogue between subject and object, as in perfect speech, object is always listener and words are interchange. Because of importance of speech, speaker doesn't think on anybody else but on second part and is creative in the meaning of true metalinguistics. It seems that only live impression can have property of perfect language. If it widens listener's perspective or speak in terms of lingual logic. Speech is intended to listener, not to third person. Just as someone should listen what speaker said from the listener, which should not be prominent speech? Our own creative speech could not be made from words of others. Humour and sarcasm are made of metalinguistics. We should use superspeech, when speaking in forms and again it would be metalogic. Our creative speech is made of words that we create. Reader does not speak, reading is not creative language, in true reading we are perceiving, and if perceiving we do not speak. We are not oriented toward third person, because the object of our speech is the second participant, which once was speaker and now speaks language inferior to the language of the listener. This listener can interchange in perfect language, making the speech of dialogue, which was the basis of perfect language, with no difference between listener and speaker. Instead of two objects in superspeech, we have two subjects. Humour holds the knowledge of forms. Play with meaning if not humour will become sarcasm, metalanguage that is intended toward others, on behalf of others, unique humour of rhetoric, humour which tries to capture attention. Humour that has power, or force listener, is distinctive sarcasm, if sarcasm could be distinctive, as higher degree of humour, intended metaspeech [20]. Metaspeech do not speak but interact, do not speak to silence but to hearing, and etc. Speaks, than hears, speaks, than hears heard, speaks to heard. If having no benign reception, humour of rhetoric will produce sarcasm. Humour is the most benign reception of rhetoric. Super speaker will always speak, no matter what but will speak to situation. Humorists are in fond of hyperspeech, but only rhetoric uses sarcasm. Sarcasm gives insight in metaspeech.

Although sarcasm is a conservative device, difference is positive, not negative; there is difference between subjects, not their ability. My perfect language means that I can express modalities as well as simple forms, but my ability is political not instrumental, words are not instruments, not a priori; there are forms of perfect speech. Linguistics are hollow in outform, linguistics is not the form but the process, speech in creativity, and its creativity, its metaspeech of modalities is creative to its instrument, it does not change only the language, and values of language, it changes also the subjects.. We can change by creating, because of the ontology of the language. Formal or logical change of modalities that are ranks, is structural, therefore not formal, but inner politics. Political ontology says that words have political values that mean that they change reality of their perception, not as the form but as the quality because it is process between the subjects that is creativity not the objects. Low language do not change world. Colloquium is not changeable, it is not political. Politics are ontological, within modality of one subject, within modality of words [2,4]. Speech is only part of metaspeech; therefore it is ontological in its value. Superspeech can create and by creating it resembles original language, further, political speech provides insight in, how could we speak without listening poetry, can clamor prevail poetry, can only poetry surpass poetry, speaker uses however simple words.

*Table 1. Proactive rhetorical figures and devices.*

<b>Elucidation</b>	<b>Figure/Device</b>	<b>Elucidation</b>	<b>Figure/Device</b>
Interruption of speech of interlocutor	Almastinephrax	Verbum volitans, word that floats in the air	Ftero úgisma
Verba ex ore, taking the words out of someone's mouth	Pyrhazoepraxis	Override the voice	Apophasis
Uelut loqui, interference of speak by speaking	Paremvolia	Denying that it should be brought up	Anapodonton
Articulating science or mood	Diathesis	Exhortation	Parrhesia

#### **4. Superspeech and its Ligual Values, Rhetorical Figures**

Superspeech is metalingual phenomenon. Its metalinguistic nature produces useful lingual values. Whereas its rhetorical and psychological label clearly indicate the intentional or unintentional discapabilities. Superspeech is comprehensive chatter, long, excessive and exaggerated speech, with involuntary forms and unique postive side-effects of language [15][19]. In concept of lingual vocation, superspeech is intentional rhetoric capability, superb lingual practice unique ability to use words, phrases, or a speech in such a way to prevail an opponent speaker. Subject is a speaker, accomplice, or interlocutor with formal or informal priority in the group. The speaker, who talks a lot, is using the same devices as the orator with limited period of time [22]. Directional rhetoric is trying to establish itself as the valuable discourse. Therefore, time is intensive metalinguistics with the applied style of profitable devices [9]. Speaker will not talk all the time, but will have magnetic and comprehensive speech, will use right words, be opened, speaking what others would speak but speaking for itself. Superspeaker talks all the time, intuitively captures the reality, speaks before something is created, further he creates by speech. Elements of this can be read in the vernacular and rhetorical devices (Table 1):

- (1) Of course i will not tell that (then telling), obivous hypercolloquium,

- (2) Surely you know that, i know what you're gonna say, the imposition of intent,
- (3) Interruption of speech of interlocutor, jumping in someone's speech, almasinephrax, stinephrax,
- (4) Taking the words out of someone's mouth, speaking of what the interlocutor wanted to say, device verba ex ore, pestering by expression, pyrhaezepraxis,
- (5) Thinking aloud, decide aloud, apophas éidynata,
- (6) Interference of speak by speaking, uelut loqui, paremvolia
- (7) Articulating science or mood, figure of diathesis,
- (8) or the word that floats in the air, on which everyone is thinking, is about to be imposed, a word which came about during the dialogue, ftero úgisma, verbum volitans,
- (9) Talk of thoughts instead of talk of words, in the promotion and prevention of speech, indirect device, does not speak directly by words; do not articulate the intention, syzitisitonskepseon,
- (10) Deliberate speech, speech which is not the purpose of the speech, deliberate talk, and talk in order to talk, deliberata sermonis,
- (11) Protheseos (ek protheseos th áryvo), override the voice, apophasis,
- (12) Wherein the speaker or writer brings up a subject by either denying it, or denying that it should be brought up, anapodonton,
- (13) A figure of speech or open speech that is free discourse, or parrhesia,
- (14) Word at the top of the tongue, "momento verbum" effect, recordabantur, anapolo,
- (15) Speak in such a way that others wish to speak, not to oppose than to join the conversation, epithymonexphrasos, exhortation, exoptamus.

## 5. On Some Metalingual Conclusions

Superspeech as wordiness, long-windedness, grandiloquence, garrulousness, chattiness, glibness, is formal expression of talkativeness, purposeful and stylish speech within limited budget of time and colloquial words. Speech is imposed but with intent purpose and metalinguistic discourse [6]. Positioned within linear budget and its transcending function. Its rational limitations are rather projected to transcendental style of rhetoric, or funds of noncolloquial word and expressions, as forms and devices. Ranks of words and basic modalities of lingual logic are exposed to lingual metalogic. Metaspeech is formulated in flosculus as a whole, which are playful with modes of formal logic. Its ability to change modes, shows that it is not something within mode, but rather transcendent to it, as creation to the object, or insight to the phenomenon. Further words are active realities; they correspondent to realities, all words are ontologies, phaenomenon in productione, things that produce things. So all subjects are political ontologies, ontologies that are not normative, but producible, capable of creating realities, which are not only new words but also colloquiums. Treating subjects and object as words in logic, and corresponding words to the realities, would neglect possibility of metalinguistics, that the the things (in this case the object) is not formal ontology, in its projection to the words and linear logic, but original ontology with transcendental function.

Wordiness of superspeech is proven by phrases in given modalities, devices that stand always contrary to the expected creating positive lingual effect by producing different modalities of reception or articulating modalities of speech, to inflexion or motivation. That is position of superspeech, its possibility to be expressed in rhetorical devices, in articulation that changes reality, which is in original language of literal creativity.

## Conflicts of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

## References

- [1] Attardo, S. Linguistic theories of humor (Vol. 1). Walter de Gruyter. 1994; ISBN 9783110142556.
- [2] Antony, L. Meta-linguistics: Methodology and ontology in Devitt's Ignorance of language. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 2008, 86(4), 643-656, DOI: 10.1080/00048400802340683.
- [3] Coomaraswamy, A. K. A Figure of Speech, or a Figure of Thought. *Journal of Philosophy*, 1944, 41, 134-135
- [4] Devitt, M. Ignorance of Language. 2006; ISBN 9780199250967
- [5] Bateson, G. The position of humor in human communication. In *Cybernetics Ninth Conference*. New York: Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation, 1-47; 1953; ISBN 9783037345986
- [6] Gombert, J. E. Metacognition, metalanguage and metapragmatics. *International Journal of psychology*, 1993, 28(5), 571-580, DOI: 10.1080/00207599308246942.
- [7] Fahnestock, J. Rhetorical stylistics. *Language and Literature*, 2005, 14(3), 215-230, DOI: 10.1177/0963947005054478.
- [8] Hopper, R. Speech errors and the poetics of conversation. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 1992, 12(2), 113-124, DOI: 10.1080/10462939209359641.
- [9] Klujeff, M. Rhetorical Figures and Style as Argumentation. *Studies in Rhetoric: Rhetorica Scandinavica*, 2005, 1997. 302-22; ISBN 9789186093099.
- [10] Lyotard, J-F. The Sublime and the Avant Garde 1. Paragraph, 1985. 6(1), 1-18.
- [11] McComiskey, B. Gorgias and the new sophistic rhetoric. SIU Press. 2002; ISBN: 9780809390137.
- [12] Miller, A. Rhetoric, paideia and the old idea of a liberal education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 2007. 41(2), 183-206.
- [13] Morreall, J. A new theory of laughter. *Philosophical Studies*, 1982, 42(2), 243-254, DOI: 10.1007/BF00374037.
- [14] Newmeyer, F. J. Has there been a 'Chomskyan Revolution' in Linguistics. *Language*, 1986, 1-18, DOI: 10.2307/415597.
- [15] Paulos, J. The Logic of Humour and the Humour in Logic. In *It's a Funny Thing, Humour: Proceedings of The International Conference on Humour and Laughter 1976* (p. 113). Elsevier. 2013; ISBN 978-0-08-021376-7

- [16] Raskin, V. Semantic mechanisms of humor (Vol. 24). Springer Science & Business Media. 1985; ISBN 9789027718211
- [17] Raskin, V. (Ed.). The primer of humor research (Vol. 8). Walter de Gruyter. 2008. ISBN 978-3-11-018616-1
- [18] Segalowitz, N. On the evolving connections between psychology and linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 2001, 21, 3-22, DOI: 10.1017/S0267190501000010.
- [19] Simons, P. M. A semantics for ontology. *Dialectica*, 1985, 39(3), 193-216.
- [20] Simons, P. On the discourse of satire: Towards a stylistic model of satirical humour (Vol. 2). John Benjamins Publishing. 2003.
- [21] Utsumi, A. A cognitive approach to poetic effects of rhetorical figures: toward a unified theory of cognitive rhetoric. In Proceedings of the 19th Congress of the International Association of Empirical Aesthetics (IAEA2006), 2006, 413-417.



© 2019 by the author(s); licensee International Technology and Science Publications (ITS), this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)