

TEXT TYPOLOGY, POLITICAL LANGUAGE AND RHETORIC AT THE *ELYSÉE*: A CASE STUDY

di Nicola Genga

Abstract

I testi politici possono essere letti in maniera differente: come sappiamo ogni messaggio può essere espresso diversamente. Tutto ciò ha un'influenza non solo sui contenuti, ma anche sul modo in cui il messaggio è recepito ed analizzato. Data la loro complessità, i testi che definiamo "politici" possono a mala pena essere raggruppati in classi specifiche. Tuttavia, emerge il bisogno di riflettere su alcune forme di tipizzazione. Questo articolo mira ad analizzare questa testualità attraverso un approccio teorico influenzato da uno metodologico. L'analisi si focalizzerà su problematiche riguardanti sia il discorso che la dimensione retorica. Fra le democrazie contemporanee il caso di studio del Presidente della Quinta Repubblica Francese è eccezionale perché dimostra come le prerogative politico-istituzionali possano influenzare la natura del testo e la sua classificazione.

Political texts are told to be different: as we know every linguistic message can have different ways of realizations. Which has an influence not only on the contents, but also on the way that message is received and analyzed. Given their complexity, the texts we define as "political" can hardly be clustered in mutually exclusive classes. Nevertheless, it doesn't mean that we don't need to reflect upon some forms of typifying. This article aims at analyzing textuality through a theoretical approach which also influences a methodological one. The analysis will be focused on issues concerning both discourse and rhetoric dimension. Within contemporary democracies the case study of the Fifth French Republic President is outstanding because it shows how the political-institutional prerogatives can affect the nature of the text and its classification.

23

Les textes politiques peut être lus différemment: nous savons, en effet, que chaque message peut être exprimé de façons très différentes. Tout cela exerce une influence non seulement sur les contenus, mais aussi sur la manière dont le message est accepté et analysé. Au vu de leur complexité, les textes que nous appelons «politiques» ne peuvent guère être rassemblés dans des classes spécifiques. Cependant, la nécessité s'impose d'envisager certaines formes de classifications. Cet article vise à analyser cette textualité à travers une approche théorique influencée par une approche méthodologique. L'analyse portera sur des questions relatives à la fois au discours et à la dimension rhétorique. Parmi les démocraties contemporaines, le cas du Président de la Cinquième République française est formidable car il montre

comment les prérogatives politiques et institutionnelles influent sur la nature du texte et sa classification.

1. Why do we need a text typology?

In political discourse studies textual typology is a disputed question. Despite all appearances that doesn't have merely theoretical consequences.

Political texts are told to be different: since they don't have the same valiance, they don't require the same analytical approach. As far as we are concerned every linguistic message occurs in a given time and space which have an influence not only on the contents, but also on the way that message is received or read¹. As Giorgio Fedel pointed out, political language doesn't work out in an empty space, but in relation to an *extralinguistic context* made of actors, events, circumstances². The language context, and not only the political context, widely contributed to let the audience understand the text. Since the language's main features such as vocabulary, style and phrasal structure depend on both the opportunities and the limits that the text itself offers, the interpretation of political language requires a preliminary distinction between texts produced in different speech contexts.

It's quite obvious to realize that any politician needs to use different registers if he's interviewed on TV as an MP, if he holds a meeting, if he writes a letter to a newspaper, or if he pronounces a presidential speech. It necessarily affects deeply the discursive performances of the speaker. This article aims at analyzing textuality through a theoretical approach which also influences a methodological one. Since political language studies cannot be generically approached, here my analysis will be focused on specific issues concerning discourse in order to avoid improper comparisons between incomparable elements.

First of all we need to keep in mind the main criteria to classify a text: its realization (written, spoken or transcribed) and the interactional exchange (monologue, dialogue). Then we need to consider the purpose of a text (expository style, arguing style), the rhetorical genre it belongs, the channels it uses³.

As remarked by Dell'Anna, a series of factors can influence the transmitter-receiver relationship in political communication. For instance, the quantitative consistency of the receiver, his ideological characterization and his membership to a political party should be taken into consideration. Other factors like the presence/absence of the receiver or of an external mediator

(such as an interviewer), the unidirectional or bidirectional feature of the message, and the grade of participation shown by the transmitter are concerned with the channel⁴.

Following Cella Ristaino and Di Termini's analysis of the difference between the language used in the political arena and the political language of theory and research⁵, Dell'Anna made a further distinction between *primary* texts (produced by politicians) and *secondary* texts (observation, comment and interpretation of political facts). Even though this classification is addressed to the Italian political situation, it seems to be also meaningful for the political language area of every contemporary democracy. In this classification we find the typical texts of «politics in the newspaper» (interviews, leading articles, features) and «politics on the radio» (interviews, election advertising), «politics on the internet». Those can be labeled as «informational and political communication texts». Within the scope of the political language *stricto sensu* are those texts Dell'Anna considers as «politics on TV» (debates, forum, interviews, pre-recorded discourses) and other examples of political language which is not mediated like meetings, parliamentary intervention, conference relations, programmatic documents⁶.

This latter series of texts that we define «political texts» are spurious on a typological level because they mix different ways of realizations, dynamics of interactions and media channel. Given their complexity, they are difficult to be classified in a binding typology composed by mutually exclusive classes. Nevertheless, it doesn't mean that we don't need to reflect upon some forms of typifying. It seems rather useful to reflect upon a «extensional classification» of the textual elements⁷.

2. Why the *Elysée* as a case study?

Before recurring to any classificatory operation, we first need to look at the institutional and social conditions of production and reception of texts, according to Bordieu's and Desideri's definitions⁸.

A relevant «condition of production» in the classification of political texts refers to the orator's role, or, in linguistic terms, to the speaker's role. Some aspects such as the social image and role of the speaker, or in other words his *ethos*, is a core question.

As fundamental as them are the relationships between political language and the decisional power the speaker has⁹. The relationship between language and power is in fact bidirectional and complementary. If political

language finds its highest expression in the power, the power, on the other hand, shows itself through the language, which according to John Locke can be «the great instrument and common tie of society»¹⁰.

Edelman, in particular, showed how the power exercised by public and national leaders is able to catch the audience's attention and to generate a collective identification¹¹. Obviously not all politicians are equal. As Orwell would have said, some are «more equal than others». Within contemporary democracies the case of the President of the Fifth French Republic is outstanding. He was emphatically defined the «republican monarch», the head of the state in France is considered a «structural referent modeling and gathering people expectations, offering a support for multiple projections and founding an ethical attachment»¹².

The direct election by universal suffrage which was introduced in 1962 and the imprinting of such an historical prominent figure as De Gaulle had an important role for such a symbolic reinforcement.

The case study concerning the Elysée is interesting also because it shows how the political-institutional prerogatives of the speaker could be projected on the discourse by interfering on the nature of the text and on its classification. As we have seen above, when we study political language we cannot ignore the structure of regimes, its variables and channels where political roles are¹³.

The president of the Fifth French Republic has a sort of *pontifical* charisma and he embodies an institutional legitimacy which doesn't depend upon the idiosyncratic presence of the temporary office holder¹⁴. Paradoxically, though, this *charismatic president* acts in a very unclear political-constitutional area. The locution «semi-presidential» coined by Duverger¹⁵ to denote French political system records a *sui generis* institutional model. It is characterized by a dualistic structure of the executive power that expresses itself in the oscillation in the effective control of the government between the Head of the State and the Prime Minister¹⁶. In French semi-presidentialism cultures coming from bonapartism and parliamentarism coexists in a *flexible diarchy*¹⁷ depending on the majority combinations produced by parliamentary elections outcomes.

A relevant aspect of such a «costumary law»¹⁸ concerns the changeable grade of the presidential politicization. The political role of the head of the state is affected by the conjuncture and is, somehow, *amphibious*. This president is the leader of the majority that led him to the power and at the same time the representative of all the French. He is a «bifrons Janus»¹⁹ or, to use Massot's metaphor taken from football «a referee and a captain»²⁰.

3. The speaker status of the French president

The discursive reverberations coming from this peculiar configuration of power emerge in the constitutional disposition which explicitly regulate the activity of the president as a speaker. The capital of discursive interference of the French president, that some commentators have associated with the Verb²¹, finds, indeed, its formal legitimacy in the constitution of the Fifth Republic. The 16th article of the 1958 Constitution, for example, gives the president the faculty of sending a message to the nation in the event that “the institutions, the independence of the country, its territorial integrity or the fulfillment of international agreements are threatened by an immediate severe danger which is able to interrupt the normal functioning of constitutional public power”²². The text of constitution emanates here a *right of speech* which is not addressed to the parliament, as the constitutions wanted, but to those citizens Duverger considered as keepers of post 1958 republican order²³. Moreover, article 18 reformed in 2008 gives the president the possibility to talk in front of the two «houses» assembled in a congress: he then pronounces a politically unquestionable speech that can be an object of a debate but not of a vote.

Contrary to what provided by the previous republican constitutional texts, and with the exception of article 16, the president of the Fifth Republic does not have neither explicit constraints to the expression nor obligations of notice. In addition, the time available for him to pronounce his discourse on TV is not included in the 3 out of third counting (one for the government, one for the majority party, one for the opposition) monitored by the guarantor authority *Conseil supérieur de l'Audiovisuel*²⁴.

Besides the fact that the president of fifth French Republic has the political hegemony of the country, he is one of the freest speaker of the political history of France²⁵. He has no limits of expressions, he can intervene whenever he likes, wherever he wants and with whom he prefers.

This singular institutional frame basically renders the French president a controversial figure also about the way of managing his *public speaking agenda*. As a speaker, the President can be neither compared to other presidents nor Prime Ministers existing in parliamentary systems²⁶. This happens because he cumulates and exceeds the discourse prerogatives of these latter. The French president attends social events more than a head of the State who doesn't have powers of political directions, but he is more solemn than a normal head of the state. Like any president of a parliamentary republic he addresses his New Year's wishes to the nation. Like any *premier* he calls press conference, he is a radio or TV show host, he is interviewed by

newspapers and TV news programs. He often attends TV talk shows without causing any particular recriminations from the opposition or any democratic alarms. But, at the same time, he is the *dominus* holding relevant public rituals.

4. Presidential speeches and discursive genres

According to what we have said so far, we need to remark that the French president has to put together some communicative functions which in other national contexts are split between the head of the State and the leader of the executive branch. The post-Gaullist phase of the Fifth Republic starting in 1974 with President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing is characterized by the bipolarization of the political system and by the mass medial centrality of the *neotelevision*²⁷: in this phase the hieratic authority of the republican monarch is associated with a public exposition of a politician *comme les autres*. This event has some consequences on the nature of presidential statements by causing the flowering of multiples kinds of texts which, consequently, are influenced by specific elements affecting their outline: discursive genres²⁸.

Why do we need to talk about discursive genres rather than types of texts? Firstly, the unity of a text itself is «too complex and too heterogeneous to present regular linguistic features that can be studied and observed»²⁹. The concept of discourse is, on the contrary, opened to different situation of utterance and interaction. Secondly, the genre, in a different way from the type, is a practical-empirical category consisting in an acknowledgment of the socio-cultural diversity of human discursive practices and it represents the ideal bridge between text and discourse³⁰.

Similarly to any head of State, the habits favored the consolidation of some discursive genres corresponding to particular rituals of French political life. Since 1970s the presidential speeches agenda has been more or less regularly set. The main dates in agenda are the speech the president delivers after his election (maiden-speech) or re-election; the investiture acceptance speech, the New Year's Eve's wishes, the January Speech to the constituted Corps, the speech addressed to the Army and the interview given every July 14th³¹.

Besides these «ordinary» speeches, there are some «extraordinary» ones, not less important. This may be considered also a form of ritual with reference to standardized sequences used in some circumstances of great symbolic relevance³².

Beyond the prepared speeches that usually take place (as a habit), the president has to deliver French people some speech concerning extemporary publically relevant circumstances on simultaneous broadcast TV show.

The classificatory distinction based on the dynamic of communicative interaction leads us to distinguish between two main macro genres of president's speech: monologue and dialogue. As we have already pointed out, a further distinction depends on the ordinary or extraordinary feature of those speeches. While the dialogue can take place in the electoral debate, the traditional 14th July interview and any debate involving the president, the monologues delivered by the president of the Fifth Republic appear as rituals with homogeneous features.

Among the ordinary monologues there are the so called *State discourses*. They concern the speeches delivered to the State, i.e. to public officers operating in the Civil service. Moreover, these speeches deal with the periodical ceremony of institutions and are *about* the State and the values that each president attributes to this concept and using it rhetorically for his political and institutional action.

On the other hand we have the *Nation discourses*. They have a double meaning: in the first case they are rites of passage; in the second case they are like moments where the president meets the citizens, the members of his *imagined community*³³.

5. The ritual monologue as an epideictic discourse

A consideration of a triple classification of rhetoric genres (deliberative, judicial and epideictic³⁴) could be necessary to focus on the main features and purposes of the presidential monologue as a discursive macro-genre. According to the classical classification of rhetoric the political language is deliberative: a rhetorician makes his speech to give advice or to warn the members of an assembly of taking a step against or for the public benefit³⁵. Such a consideration results appropriate if it is referred to parliamentary debates, which are configured as a series of interventions that take place one after the other. Nevertheless, it cannot be generalized to the entire survey of political language, where other examples of monological speech don't correspond to deliberative goals. Within contemporary political debates of the mass communication era, political speech have acquired a mixed function which cannot be exclusively traced back to one of the genres of the classic classification. De Gaulle's radio speeches from London are an example of «appeal in crisis time»³⁶ where the call for national unity are both epideictic and demonstratives. The calls that the leader of the *France libre* delivered had explicit references to the war context and they were invites for the choice to make for the nation's sake. But in a peaceful context where the public life

follows the routine procedures that the Constitution establishes *de iure* or defines *de facto*, the deliberative purpose of the presidential speech is approximately residual.

Even though the acknowledgment of the mixed genre of the presidential language, his characterization mainly demonstrative is, thus, a constant. Then presidential monologues are basically epideictic discourses responding to «the necessity of publically glorifying the values of tradition, and evoking the importance and meaningfulness»³⁷. This epideictic rhetoric main goal is amplifying some values recognized and shared by the audience. When the president invokes the epideictic resources, he does not invest his own *ethos* to the purpose of a changing of ideas, but points out at intensifying, through *pathos*, the support to what is already admitted by a large consensus³⁸. The epideictic rhetoric, indeed, «aims at reinforcing feelings not simply towards a contingent decision (judicial or political), but towards the great values of a society»³⁹. In every society which is linked to its own traditional values there's the need of favoring regular occasions for epideictic speeches⁴⁰. This happens in the 31 December's wishes speech⁴¹, and, in French contexts, the frequency of presidential «extraordinary» speeches grew up during the two terms of Jacques Chirac at Elysée.

However, there's a *topos* transversally belonging to any French presidential speech so that it becomes the real epideictic element: the praise to France, to its values, traditions, history. The fragments for the out of context celebration to France are almost always part of the presidential monologues.

It is not by chance that *France* has been the most quoted name in the presidential *corpora* since De Gaulle onwards⁴². This is not a surprise but it induces an analysis on the semantic and syntactic relevance of the term. *France* is indeed a real entity which is able to embody the changeable functions of the subject, the object and the addressee of the presidential discourse. It often produces a grade of vacuity and abstraction concerning the contents of the presidential speeches⁴³.

An outstanding example of the both lexically and thematically preeminence of the term *France*, besides its interchangeable syntax, is constituted by De Gaulle's speeches. At the beginning of his leader career, De Gaulle used to talk about France and not to French (people). His use of the word referred to an entity full of history, interests and goals that not always matched with the ones of the French citizens. For instance during the Vichy regime most of them can have betrayed the very same spirit of the nation⁴⁴. If French people could be affected by the weight of particularism, in De Gaulle and his followers' point of view the term *France* is an uncontaminated and idyllic dimension worth of uncritical praise.

In the president's discourse, *France* does neither mean citizens, institutions, and State, nor Republican shared values. Far from being a national aggregate it seems to be an ethical-spiritual category.

Like De Gaulle, Mitterrand used to prefer to address to *France* rather than to the *French*⁴⁵, and the debate between these two concepts is made implicit in some of d'Estaing and Chirac's speeches too: in here France and the French are separated, as if it was a sort of unconscious automatism.

In conclusion, the main rhetorical feature of the presidential monologue is to be an epideictic discourse, focused on the values of France and framed in a well-defined ritual.

6. The *non-ritual* Sarkozy presidency

From the end of the 90s can be noticed the abandonment of the presidential speeches as an authoritative discursive realization of the national power. In many ways Jacques Chirac contributed to a sort of debunking of the republican ritual. He has progressively *americanized* the background of his TV speeches recurring to frame them with the image of the grass lawns surrounding the Elysée palace⁴⁶. And he did so also by overuse. He often addresses to French people on the most ragged issues like Mururoa nuclear tests, mad cow disease, the abolition of military service, the First Employment Contract, the reduction of the presidential term of office, September 11th, the Clearstream *affaire*, the early dissolution of the National Assembly in 1997, the confirmation of European Constitution, the Kosovo War in 1999.

Sarkozy will finally work on the diminishing of the ritual presidential speech through both the refusal of the 14th July interview and the proliferation of fragments of speeches in order to succeed the communicative *deregulation*⁴⁷. By using new medial channels such as the so called *Nicolas Sarkozy TV*, *Le président de la République* web TV, and other social network like Twitter and Facebook Nicolas Sarkozy drifts away from the presidential tv-politics to make a step forward to a non-ritual and multimedia way of communication where the political speech occurs *offsite*.

The changeover between Chirac and Sarkozy produces a loss of TV central power: it is no longer the privileged place for the presidential celebration and for the growing of a political conscience. The scarcely hieratic integrity of presidential speeches is hence destabilized by the medial chaos. The "media colonization of politics"⁴⁸ presents a highly spectacular performance of the debate and in a general boast of leadership producing a

fragmented presidentialism. Notwithstanding with the self-evident presidentialization of the polity⁴⁹ the shifting from the republican monarch to an *omnibus* president doesn't contribute to consolidate the rhetoric *ethos* used by the Head of the State. On the contrary, the ubiquity of new media seems to have banished the official speech of the presidential king. Words at the Elysée are just a melting pot of sounds and frames where the traditional political cultures can hardly find a steady reformulation, and the presidential voice tends to become less noticeable and authoritative.

¹ For a model of communication factors and functions see R. Jakobson, *Linguistics and Poetics*, in T. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge 1960, pp. 350-377. For a theoretical framework about text typology see also A. Trosborg, *Text Typology: Register, Genre and Text Type*, in J. Benjamins, A. Trosborg (eds.), *Text Typology and Translation*, Benjamins Translation Library, Aarhus 1997, pp. 3-23.

² G. Fedel, *Saggi sul linguaggio e l'oratoria politica*, Giuffrè, Milano 1999, p. 25.

³ A text is here assumed as a «complex structure and coherent set of utterances», P. Desideri, A. Marcarino, *Testualità e tipologia del discorso politico: bibliografia*, Bulzoni, Roma 1980, p. 11 (my transl.). See also G. Brown, G. Yule, *Discourse analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1983.

⁴ M. V. Dell'Anna, *Lingua italiana e politica*, Carocci, Roma 2010, pp. 12-13.

⁵ Ivi, pp. 36-37. Also see P. Cella Ristaino, D. Di Termini, *Politica e comunicazione. Schemi lessicali e analisi del linguaggio*, Name edizioni, Genova 2007, pp. 23-28.

⁶ M. V. Dell'Anna, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-56.

⁷ «Through extensional classification, the objects or events of a given set are grouped into two or more subsets according to the perceived similarities of their states on one or (more frequently) several properties; subsets may be successively grouped into subsets of wider extension and higher hierarchical level». See A. Marradi, *Classification, Typology, Taxonomy*, "Quality and Quantity", XXIV, n. 2, may 1990, pp. 129-157.

⁸ P. Bourdieu, *Ce qui parleur veut dire. L'économie des échanges linguistiques*, Paris, Fayard, 1982, p. 105. P. Desideri, *La comunicazione politica: dinamiche linguistiche e processi discorsivi*, S. Gensini (ed.), *Fare comunicazione. Teoria ed esercizi*, Carocci, Roma 2006, p. 165.

⁹ H. Lasswell, N. Leites, *Language of politics: studies in quantitative semantics*, Stewart, New York 1949. From E. Landowski's point of view political discourse is «*la parole of those actors who are allowed to keep the discourse of Power or challenge it within the boundaries of an institutionally limited space*», Id., "Le pouvoir du 'Pouvoir'", *Documents de travail et prépublications*, Urbino, Centro internazionale di semiotica e di linguistica, n. 86, 1978 (my transl.). According to Paola Desideri, political discourse analysis involves «a research about the modalities/procedures of its production and the possibilities of its recognition: an examination on those forms of power that have founded it», in P. Desideri, A. Marcarino, *op. cit.*, p. 12 (my transl.).

¹⁰ J. Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), The Pennsylvania State University, 1999, p. 387. On the overlapping between discourse and power see M. Foucault, *L'ordre du discours*, Gallimard, Paris 1971.

¹¹ M. Edelman, *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana 1964.

¹² P. Braud, *La réactivation du mythe présidentiel. Effets de langage et manipulations symboliques*, in B. Lacroix, J. Lagroye, *Le Président de la République: usages et genèses d'une institution*, PFNSP, Paris 1992, p. 377 (my transl).

¹³ G. Fedel, *op. cit.*, p. VIII.

¹⁴ B. François, *Le président, pontife constitutionnel. Charisme d'institution et construction juridique du politique*, in B. Lacroix, J. Lagroye, *op. cit.*, p. 306-331. See also E. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1957.

¹⁵ M. Duverger, *Institutions politiques et droit constitutionnel*, PUF, Paris 1970, p. 277.

¹⁶ M. Volpi, *Forma di governo e revisione della Costituzione*, Giappichelli, Torino 1998, p. 39. On French Fifth Republic institutional system see M. Baudrez, B. Ravaz, *La Quinta Repubblica: regime semi-presidenziale o parlamentarismo?* in L. Pegoraro, A. Rinella (eds.), *Semipresidenzialismi*, Cedam, Padova 1997, pp. 45-59. G. Quagliariello, *De Gaulle e il gollismo*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2003. For an up-to-date commentary on 2008 reform see B. François, *La constitution Sarkozy*, Odile Jacob, Paris 2009; O. Duhamel, *Droit constitutionnel et institutions politiques*, Seuil, Paris 2011; F. Lanchester, V. Lippolis (eds.), *La V Repubblica francese nel dibattito e nella prassi in Italia*, Jovene, Napoli 2009; G. Pasquino, S. Ventura (eds.), *Una splendida cinquantenne: la Quinta Repubblica francese*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2010.

¹⁷ G. Sartori, *Ingegneria costituzionale comparata*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2004, p. 139.

¹⁸ U. Coldagelli, *La quinta Repubblica. Da De Gaulle a Sarkozy. L'evoluzione di un presidenzialismo extra-costituzionale*, Donzelli, Roma 2009, p. 47 (my transl.)

¹⁹ J. Chapsal, *La vie politique sous la Ve République*, II, 1974-1987, PUF, Paris 1993, p. 215.

²⁰ J. Massot, *L'arbitre et le capitaine. Essai sur la responsabilité présidentielle*, Flammarion, Paris 1987.

²¹ P. Lehingue, *La parole présidentielle. Travail de codification et définition du poste*, in B. Lacroix, J. Lagroye, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

²² My transl.

²³ M. Duverger, *La République des citoyens*, Ramsay, Paris 1982.

²⁴ J. Gerstlé, *La communication politique*, Colin, Paris 2008 (2004), p. 159.

²⁵ P. Lehingue, *op. cit.*, pp. 133, my transl.

²⁶ See the accurate typology of Italian presidential speeches set by Mario Dogliani, *Il "potere di esternazione" del Presidente della Repubblica*, in M. Luciani, M. Volpi (eds.), *Il Presidente della Repubblica*, Laterza, Bari 1997, pp. 221-246.

²⁷ See U. Eco, *Tv: la trasparenza perduta*, in Id., *Sette anni di desiderio*, Bompiani, Milano 1983, pp. 163-179.

²⁸ This classification of discursive genres is used as an analytic framework in N. Genga, *Le parole dell'Eliseo. I discorsi dei presidenti francesi da Giscard d'Estaing a Sarkozy*, Aracne, Roma 2012.

²⁹ J.-M. Adam, *Linguistique textuelle. Des genres de discours aux textes*, Nathan, Paris 1999, p. 82 (my transl.). M. Reisigl (*Analyzing Political Rhetoric*, in R. Wodak, M. Krzyzanowski (eds.), *Qualitative discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Palgrave

MacMillan, Basingstoke 2008) proposed a pattern of distinctions between concepts such as text, communication and discourse genres or types.

³⁰ Cfr. J.-M. Adam, *op. cit.*, pp. 40, 92-93. For 1928 Bakhtin's idea discursive genres see T. Todorov, *Mikhail Bakhtine: le principe dialogique. Écrits du Cercle de Bakhtine*, Seuil, Paris 1981, p. 127.

³¹ A draft of french presidents' speech rituals calendar is in P. Lehingue, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

³² See D. I. Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics and Power*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1988; L. Cedroni, T. Dell'Era, *Il linguaggio politico*, Carocci, Roma 2002, p. 107. For a general approach to the concept of rite see also E. Durkheim, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse. Le système totémique en Australie*, PUF, Paris 1912. With regards to the Elysée case see D. Fleurdorge, *Les rituels du président de la République*, PUF, Paris 2001.

³³ B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origins of Nationalism*, Verso, London 1991 (1983).

³⁴ According to Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* (III, 4, 9) Anaximenis distinguishes three rhetorical genres: deliberative (*symboleutikon*), epideictic (*epideiktikon*) and judicial (*dikanikon*).

³⁵ Aristotle *Rhetoric*, 1358 b.

³⁶ «Appello nella fase di crisi», L. Cavalli, *Governo del leader e regime dei partiti*, Il Mulino, Bologna 1992, p. 202.

³⁷ G. Fedel, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35, my transl.

³⁸ See Ch. Perelman, *Rhétorique et politique*, in M. Cranston, P. Mair (eds.), *Langage et politique. Language and politics*, Bruylant, Bruxelles 1982, p. 7.

³⁹ G. Preti, *Retorica e logica*, Einaudi, Torino 1968, p. 151, (my transl.).

⁴⁰ Ch. Perelman, L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *La nouvelle rhétorique: traité de l'argumentation*, PUF, Paris 1958.

⁴¹ See J.-M. Leblanc, W. Martinez, *Positionnements énonciatifs dans les vœux présidentiels sous la cinquième République. Analyse des marques personnelles par les méthodes de cooccurrence*, "Les corpus politiques: objet, méthode et contenu", 4, december 2005. On italian presidents see M. A. Cortelazzo, A. Tuzzi, *Messaggi dal Colle. I discorsi di fine anno dei presidenti della Repubblica*, Marsilio, Venezia 2007.

⁴² J.-M. Cotteret, R. Moreau, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du Général de Gaulle: analyse statistique des allocutions radiodiffusées (1958-1965)*, A. Colin, Paris 1969, p. 7; D. Labbé, *Le vocabulaire de François Mitterrand*, PFNSP, Paris 1990, p. 24; D. Mayaffre, *Paroles de président: Jacques Chirac, 1995-2003, et le discours présidentiel sous la Ve République*, Champion, Paris 2004, p. 25.

⁴³ D. Mayaffre, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

⁴⁴ S. Bartolini, *Riforma istituzionale e sistema politico. La Francia gollista*, Il Mulino, Bologna 1981, p. 17.

⁴⁵ D. Labbé, *Le vocabulaire de François Mitterrand*, *cit.*, pp. 24-25.

⁴⁶ C. Delporte, *La France dans les yeux. Une histoire de la communication politique de 1930 à nos jours*, Flammarion, Paris 2007, p. 413.

⁴⁷ See the tv shows *Face à la crise* (February 5th 2009 and October 27th 2011), *Paroles de français* (January 25th 2010) on TF1. On January 29th 2012 Sarkozy has been interviewed by four journalists and declared his candidacy for a second term.

⁴⁸ T. Meyer, *Media democracy: how the media colonize politics*, Blackwell, Oxford 2002.

⁴⁹ See B. Clift, *Dyarchic Presidentialization in a Presidentialized Polity: The French Fifth Republic*, in T. Poguntke, P. Webb (eds.), *The Presidentialization of Politics A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007 (2005), pp. 221-245.