



LUND UNIVERSITY

Curbing Janus

Historical Perspectives on Ambiguity as a Rhetorical Device

Bruhn, Tommy

2015

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bruhn, T. (2015). *Curbing Janus: Historical Perspectives on Ambiguity as a Rhetorical Device*. Abstract from 20th Biennial Conference of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric, 2015, Tübingen, Germany.

Total number of authors:

1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

Abstract ISHR

Curbing Janus

-Historical perspectives on ambiguity as a rhetorical device.

Following the so called *linguistic turn* the ambiguity of language has surfaced as a theme in many academic texts. When we consult historical sources on the subject of ambiguity, we also find it as a recurring catalyst and focus of study. But in prescriptions for *rhētorica utens*, we find strong recommendations against ambiguity, and a conception of it as sophistry. In Aristotle we find ambiguity as a family of logical fallacies in the *Sophistical refutations*, and in *Rhetoric* the use of ambiguous language is dismissed as a device to hide that the orator has nothing to say, or as a trick of oracles (1407a-b). Quintilian firmly rejects ambiguity by naming *perspicuity* the “first virtue of composition” (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.2.22). Where ambiguity is discussed as having positive uses, such as where *ad Herennium* IV:67 discusses *emphasis*, its use is qualified to only those cases where it can be used ... unambiguously. Much later, in George Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie* however, we find a more allowing view. Puttenham recommended that *amphibologia* is avoided *unless* it is used “for the nonce and for some purpose” (III.XXII.218). More recently, beginning in the 20th century, scholars have studied ambiguity as a productive rhetorical strategy under the umbrella term *polysemy*.

In this presentation, I focus on the evaluations of ambiguity as a rhetorical device through some important historical treatises on rhetoric. I test the hypothesis that the valence of ambiguity as a rhetorical device in a treatise is related to the extent that it dichotomizes rhetoric and poetics, with the goal showing that the cultural views on art as political influences the conception, and valence of rhetorical ambiguity.