

Marriage and Morals: A Rhetorical Reading of Representative Essays

This research paper makes a rhetorical analyses of three essays—"My Own Ten Rules for a Happy Marriage", "The Necessary Enemy", and "Marriage a la Mode"—by James Thurber, Katherine Anne Porter, and Russell Baker respectively. It examines the logical, emotional and ethical appeals that the essayists have dominantly used in the selected texts forming certain discourses about marriage and its morals. Taking these tools of appealing to audiences, and the issue that the essayists raise into account as a whole, I argue that Thurber, Baker, and Porter have been able to persuade their readers, that the married couples should promote a healthy marital life by avoiding discontents and disputes, by applying very dissimilar rhetorical strategies such as humor and irony, emotional argument and logical appeal respectively. The focus of the study is on kairos and the rhetorical situation of the argument, the nature of classical pisteis, stasis of the argument and synaesthesia. And these are precisely the reasons how the essayists convince the readers in the respective texts. The paper employs ideas on rhetoric from the work of Aristotle, Stephen Toulmin, Mark Garrett Longaker and Jeffrey Walker, and Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee. By doing so, this paper opens new avenues for those who are interested in rhetorical analysis, showing that the essays having similar sort of issue or theme can also be made convincing by deploying quite distinct method of appealing to audiences as done by the selected essayists. Because it primarily uses the method of rhetorical analysis, an examination of issue such as ideology falls outside the scope of this paper.

Key Words: Marriage, moral, rhetoric, argument, appeal

This paper analyses three essays: "My Own Ten Rules for Happy Marriage", "The Necessary Enemy", and "Marriage a la Mode" by James Thurber, Katherine Anne Porter, and Russell Baker respectively, using rhetorical analysis. The texts are written in the context of marriage and morals of mid and late twentieth century: what sorts of behaviors the society of

that time expected from married couples in the U.S. and what etiquettes the couples of that time and society performed. The essayists cite some examples of married couples of mid and late twentieth century of U.S. and discuss about the way of life they followed. Though the essays are written on the same theme of marriage and morals, they are presented very distinctly due to the application of diverse rhetorical tools. James Thurber's essay "My Own Ten Rules for a Happy Marriage" has dominant use of humor that work as a foundation to create satire. Katherine Anne Porter deploys logical argument in her essay "The Necessary Enemy" whereas Russell Baker applies emotional argument prominently in his essay "Marriage a la Mode". Though all these essayists of the selected texts write and address their readers on the same issue—marriage and morals—they have applied quite different techniques of appealing to the audiences. So, this contrasting use of rhetorical techniques by Thurber, Porter and Baker is the main focus of this thesis.

This research concentrates on the ways the essayists Porter, Baker and Thurber address their readers in the selected essays. For this to study, a rhetorical analysis of primary texts is carried out to understand how the essayists appeal their readers. So, this paper focuses on analyzing various tools of persuasion the essayists have deployed as a way of examining the difference in the application of rhetorical tools. It also evaluates the effectiveness of the rhetorical strategies employed by the writers. Second, because this paper studies the effectiveness of using contrasting rhetorical tools by the essayists in their respective essays, it analyses key arguments and the ways the arguments are made and sustained.

My research and analysis will benefit those who are interested in argument analysis. Such an analysis reveals the process of argumentation, a fundamental aspect of purposeful language use. Moreover, an analysis of topics also makes us understand how persuasive use of language is grounded in ideology. Similarly, the analysis of this nature leads to an understanding of social and cultural context as the ultimate focus of discursive practice.

The overall aim of this research is to gain an understanding of the ways of persuasion the essayists have deployed on their respective texts, with a view of offering a solution to how this issue marriage and morals has been made persuasive by applying quite distinct rhetorical strategies such as humor and irony, emotional argument and logical argument by Thurber, Baker and Porter respectively. The following objectives have been identified of paramount importance in helping to achieve the aforementioned aim: identify the rhetorical tools Thurber, Porter and Baker have dominantly deployed in their respective texts, analyze each essay to examine how each part supports the main argument of the rhetors, evaluate critically the tools of persuasion such as logos, ethos, pathos, kairos, irony, fallacies, humor and so on applied by the essayists and analyze how they have worked individually in different selected essays, review and assess the rhetorics developed on marriage and morals.

Since this research paper is a rhetorical analysis, it employs Aristotle's ideas on rhetorics interpreted on Mark Garret Longaker and Geoffery Walker's *Rhetorical Analysis*, Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee's *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*, and Theodore Buckley's *Aristotle's Treatise on Rhetoric*. Also, it deploys Stephen Toulmin's structure of analyzing an argument from his *The Uses of Argument*. The ideas like inartistic pisteis, stasis, kairos and the rhetorical situation: seizing the moment, ethos, pathos, logos, fallacy and Toulmin's pattern of analyzing an argument are brought from the above mentioned books.

Inartistic pisteis include witness, testimony, citations from authorities, documents, statistics, opinion, surveys and so on. They are significant to an argument analysis for they help confirm the fact that the rhetor cites for a claim. Furthermore, they act as source of credibility for an interpretation of an argument. Stasis, as Longaker and Walker put it, is "the crucial question at issue in the main point in dispute in a debate: in essence, the strategic point on which the rhetor takes a stand" (76). The rhetors have to identify the question they

are presented with and categorize it: whether this becomes a question of fact, a questions of definition, a question of quality or a question of policy. What determines the stasis is not always the original claim or argument, but the response that is most widely accepted. Stasis questions serve the purpose of discovering the true reason for the argument or debate and help writers determine how they should write and what direction to take their own argument.

Similarly, Kairos refers to "a notion of space, and or time" (Crowley and Hawhee 37). Kairos refers to context of the issue, the time and place or the circumstances of the argument. Kairos is used not to refer to linear time but a more situational kind of time close to opportunity. Crowely and Hawhee write that kairos refers to exact or critical time, season, opportunity; the temporal dimension of kairos can indicate anything from a lengthy time to a brief, fleeting moment. The success of any argument depends on its timing or kairos and its delivery. Kairos helps find out the contingencies of the issues and its situations. In rhetorical analysis kairos is important because it helps to enhance the understanding of why people disagree about a given issue at a particular moment on time. In short, it helps to know the issue's immediate relevance to the time, the place and the community in which it arises.

Ethos, pathos and logos are, modes of persuasion used to convince the audience, known as artistic proofs as well as classical pisteis. Logos refers to appeal to reason, a means to convince an audience by use of logic and reason. It is an appeal to mind made through facts, statistics, authorities, proofs, evidence and so on. Ethos refers to the character of the speaker that includes reputation, credentials, knowledge of the subject and the general moral quality. Pathos is an appeal to heart, means to persuade an audience by appealing to their emotions. It is used to evoke empathy and sympathy in audiences to make the audiences feel what the rhetor wants them to feel. A common use of pathos can be to draw pity or anger from audiences. Also, it helps to sustain argument and builds bridge between audiences and the speaker.

Fallacies are faulty way of reasoning. They seem to be convincing to the audiences. However, there is a flaw either in their nature or in their structure. Longaker and Walker define fallacies as "logically illegitimate (though often effective) argumentative moves that a critical thinker should reject. Seen from a rhetorical point of view, most of these fallacies are matters not of formal invalidity, but of problematic reasons or assumptions that as audience (or its notion of a reasonable person) will not accept" (64).

In Toulmin's model, argument begins with a claim that is accompanied by evidence and reasons. In this, there must be a logical and persuasive connection between a claim and a reason or data, supporting it. Toulmin calls this connection the warrant; which, is a step from data to claim, or the answer of how exactly do I get from the claim to the data. Warrant is often implied and should be strong and reasonable to have a valid argument. The evidence offered to support a warrant is called backing. Furthermore, Toulmin teaches to use qualifiers properly to limit responsibilities in an argument. Such qualifiers are the phrases such as usually, sometimes, most, often, some, few, and so on that specify argument. Nonetheless, there still lies a condition of threat to the argument which Toulmin calls conditions of rebuttal: potential objections to an argument. Examining Toulmin's structure of argument, Wouter H. Slob writes that "Toulmin distinguishes between data, warrant, Backing, rebuttal qualifier and conclusion. The basic line goes from data to conclusion. The warrant is added because it indicates why the data are relevant for the conclusion. Backing is added to support the warrant itself. The rebuttal is added because there may be counter considerations to reckon with" (173).

Synaesthesia is an aesthetic element that I. A. Richards claims harmonizes the impulses of the readers. In a work of art, when the writers present any idea, they try to convince the readers by appealing to their senses like hearing, sight, smell, and touch. Synaesthesia occurs when there is the use of emotive language which amalgamates maximum

numbers of sense organs.

Marriage and its morals are widely discussed issues by different writers and critics. The question of what sorts of marriage morals are suitable or accepted largely depends on one's own culture. In ancient Egypt, the manners of marriage were strictly followed by contemporary people because of strict marriage contract. James Bronson Reynolds writes that "Adultery with a married woman was a moral wrong and a crime. Abandonment by the husband was condemned. It was regarded as violation of marriage contract . . . if a husband had failed to provide for his wife, she was then free to seek another husband" (24-25). According to him, Ancient moral laws regarding marriage seem to be "imposing more upon husband" (24). So, in ancient time, adultery was not considered a moral of marriage. Husbands had to play the role of bread winner and the wives were those who keep on extending their demands. So the rhetoric of marriage at that time could be like the stronger the husband is financially, the stronger the relation remains.

Andrew J Cherlin talking about modern American concept of marriage writes that "Although nearly all Americans, whether poor or well to do hold to marriage as an ideal, today marriage is increasingly optional. Marriage now exists in a very different context than it did in the past. Today it is but one among many options available to adults choosing to shape their personal lives" (41). This modern American concept of marriage discussed by Cherlin resembles the rhetoric of marriage developed by Baker in his essay. For Baker, marriage is just a way for one's own personal development. People choose to marry because they see some advantage there for themselves. In his essay, the husband, for example, decides to get married just because he can lower his tax by two per cent every year, so that shaping his personal life. So, here, marriage is associated with self interest and is taken as optional. The strict marital constrains and ethics related to them are no longer followed. Similarly, Rebecca L. Davis argues that after women won the franchise in 1920, marriage no longer

created a "legally or potentially cohesive unit", industrialization and urbanization had led to "decline of the patriarchal family" and "attenuated the traditional functions of marriage" (1138). Hence, the attitude of people towards marriage morals has got a greater shift from ancient time to modern time. In modern time, people regard marriage according to their comfort; it has created lots of alternatives for people to select from.

Dr. Larry Crabb, also, talks about the modern reception of marriage. He states that "The stain of self-centeredness has discolored every motivation within us. We are utterly incapable of providing a mate with the unconditional and selfless acceptance he or she requires. Most couples today block any hope for developing substantial oneness at the level of the deepest personal needs" (476). Rudiger Schnell and Andrew Shields talk about what sorts of discourses of marriage were constructed in medieval marriage sermons in their article "The Discourse on Marriage in the Middle Ages". They write "The discourse on marriage found in the sermon works with model of the sexes that, though it may only rarely encroach on the husband's authority, still strongly asserts the wife's functional equality" (776). According to them, the perspective of marriage sermons at that time was quite far from androcentrism and both partners were viewed as contributing to the success or failure of their marriage. Such ideologies of the marriage were created in medieval period; nonetheless, the subtle remark of such ideals is that there used to be the violation of the morals constructed by such marriage institution as marriage sermons.

Similarly, Shelly Lundberg and Robert A. Pollak also talk about the performance of very diverse marital behavior by American couples after the 1950s. In middle ages, as described by Rudiger Schnell and Andrew Shields, gender consciousness altered the connubial manners a lot. It is because people were more conscious about the traditional gender roles and the domination of the superior sex to inferior one. That's why the marriage sermons consciously made the rules that did not segregate the sexes. But in ancient time, as

described by Renolds, it was not so. Such sermons were full of the strict and tough rules, which were considered the morals and manners of marriage that were aimed at particular gender, and has to be followed anyway without any violation. Shelly Lundberg and Robert A. Pollak, nevertheless, discuss about the changing concepts of marriage and morals. They write, "Since 1950, marriage behavior in the United States has changed dramatically. Cohabitation has become commonplace as either a precursor or an alternative to marriage, and a growing fraction of birth takes place outside marriage" (29). They further write that "Specialization [exclusive work of wife at home and husband in the market] and vulnerability plausibly described most marriage in the 19th and early 20th centuries, but they are less and less plausible as a rationale for contemporary American marriage" (36).

Jack Dominian states that, in modern time, what spouses are in search for in each other is the "presence and demonstrations of love", conventionally, such love was to be found in "the execution of certain duties in marriage: the husband being provider and wife housekeeper" that made them "faithful" to each other, then "marriage was considered to be good and loving" (159). Similar ideas on marriage are provided by Renata Grossi who argues "Marriage is now more closely tied to love than ever before. This is evident in the social and cultural discourse of marriage, and in empirical studies on why people marry" (37). Marriage morals are found to be changed time to time while going through the history of it. From classical time to modern time, people's concept, attitude and take on the marriage morals has largely been transformed. People of modern age do not seem to follow the strictures of marital rules as that of ancient time did. So many critics and writers, in this way, have talked about what kinds of rhetoric were created about marriage morals from very early time to now. Nevertheless, they rarely seem to examine how people were persuaded in distinct rhetoric constructed on marriage and its morals.

James Thurber begins his essay with an anecdote. He narrates an event of witnessing

a couple quarreling and fighting in an apartment, nearby his own residence. The anecdote consists of his personal experience. He writes "I watched a couple from mine gesturing and banging tables and throwing objects d' la art at each other. I couldn't hear what they were saying, but it was obvious, the shot-put followed the hammer throw that he and/ or she (as the lawyers would put it) had deeply offended her and/ or him" (462). Personal experience is crucial here since it enhances the credibility of the rhetor. However, personal experience should "make a point" and "evidence based on your own experience must be pertinent to the topic, understandable to the audience, and clearly related to your purpose and claim" (Lunsford and Ruskiewicz 482). The main claim of Thurber's essay is that there actually exists "Running feud in marriage" (467). So, though he offers solutions to the marital discord, he makes fun of them at the end saying "in glancing back over these rules, that some of my solutions to marital problems may seem a little untidy; that I have, indeed, left a number of loose ends here and there" (467). Therefore, he literally does not mean to provide solutions. Rather, he, more subtly, tries to claim that the dispute between husband and wife is ever existing phenomenon. Hence, the personal experience, because it presents conflicts between spouses, directly relates to his purpose and claim thereby being pertinent to the topic of the essay. This anecdote, also, helps readers to have a mind set upon the concept of the entire essay.

In the introduction section of his essay, Thurber promises to his readers that he would avoid "timeworn admonitions" such as "praise her new hat, share his hobbies, be a sweet heart as well as a wife" and so on (462). Such promises at the beginning work as the magnet to draw the attention of the audiences inside the text. He also says that his purpose is to provide the "brand-new set of rules" that solve marital problems (462). So, a curiosity among audiences arises to some extent that he is directly rejecting some way of consolidating the dispute and claiming that he wants to offer new rules. Also, the rules he offers do not come in

void, according to him, "there they come, the result of fifty years (I began as a little boy) spent in studying the nature and behavior, mistakes and misunderstandings, of the American male and his Mate" (462). Since this text is a product of fifty years of study and research, it becomes credible enough to the audiences and by saying this, the rhetor establishes authority over the subject matter, and earns audiences' trust. By presenting his experience of fifty years of study, Thurber becomes what Aristotle argues "When a speech shall have been spoken in such a way as to render the speaker worthy confidence . . . moral character nearly. I may say, carries with it the most sovereign efficacy in making credible" (12). Character and the personality of the rhetor established through argument gives reader a reason to trust the rhetor's argument.

However, since Thurber's main purpose is to satirize the married couple, humor and irony serve his purpose henceforth. Thurber's technique of employing humor is to draw the attention of the audiences on the morals of marriage. His first rule is one of the instances of how he creates humorous periphery and makes his audiences embrace his idea:

Neither party to sacred union should run down, disparage or badmouth the other's former girls or beaux, the tendency to attack the character, looks, intelligence, capability and achievement of one's mate's former friends of the opposite sex is a common cause of domestic discontent . . . here are some of the expressions that should be specially eschewed: you know the girl I mean—the one with the hips who couldn't read, that old flame of yours with the vocabulary of a hoot owl; and you remember her—that old bat who chewed gum and dressed like Daniel Boone. This kind of derogatory remark will surely lead to divorce or, at best a blow on the head with a glass ash tray. (463)

In this seemingly amused extract, there exists a message appealing married couples to maintain morals and civility in their relationship with each other. Though the expressions

such as "you know the girl I mean—the one with the hips who couldn't read", "one dressed like Daniel Boone", and "surely lead to divorce or, at best a blow on the head with a glass ash tray" are humorous, they embody a deep social interaction that the ethics of marital relationship are disappearing. The phrase "sacred union" is the representative of the morality of marriage and it demonstrates the idea of what marriage should be like. However, the phrase "former girls or beaux" indicates that marital relation has not been a "sacred union" at all, and it lacks moral part of it and it is the time the married couples should maintain that "sacred union" so that the laws or rules cannot be implemented upon them: the "divorce".

Similarly, another instance of humor is when Thurber suggests wife "draw for her husband a detailed map of the house, showing clearly the location of everything he might need" (465). According to Thurber, husband is lost at home; he should "try to remember where things are around the house so that he does not have to wait for his wife to get home" (465). This is a satire to the traditional gender role that prevents husbands from working at home. Also, it, in a more subtle way, represents the cult of true manhood and womanhood. By this solution, what Thurber aims at is to break traditional stereotypes glued to the roles of wife and husband and create new ethics for them. The new ethics of marital life he suggests would, for him, console the discontents at home. But he is not sure that if the husband would take care of the map wife draws: "Trouble is, I suppose, he would lay the map down somewhere and not be able to find it until his wife got home" (465). Thurber, by suggesting solutions and making fun of them, has been able to satirize the married couples. However, he does not mean to show his own weakness in the argument by not being able to construct solid rules. He, indeed, has been satirical to the decreasing value of morals in marriage. His satire has the positive impact that the discontents should be avoided and civility should be maintained in the marital relationship.

In addition, another example of humor is when Thurber satirically states that "A

husband should not insult his wife publically, at parties. He should insult her in the privacy of home" (464). The statement "A husband should not insult his wife publically, at parties" because insulting her publically leads to conflict at home is a common value shared by the community and is widely accepted. Crowley and Hawhee put it as "commonplaces" (95). Thurber inserts such common values of the community in his arguments that "harbor proofs" in themselves (96), thereby convincing his audiences. Insulting someone publically leads to dispute is a common knowledge and "the common sense of a community" (Crowley and Hawhee 96), that does not necessarily require the additional evidences to trust on. Also, this statement represents moral norms and values of society that every member of the society accepts and wants it to be followed.

Irony presents the gap between what is said and what is meant. Irony, in this essay is pretty explicit. The rhetor, at the beginning of the essay, seems to be providing solutions to the marital problems, he means to prove that there actually exist "running feud" (467), instead. Therefore, he states that "certain critics of this rule will point out that the specific comments I would substitute for the old familiar generalities do not solve the problem. They will maintain that the husband and wife will be sore and sulky for several days, no matter what is said" (464). From here, it becomes clear that Thurber does not aim at solving the marital problems, but purposes to convince his audiences that such problems keep on happening, nevertheless the "sacred union" should not be violated (462).

Thurber wrote "My Own Ten Rules for a Happy Marriage" in 1953. The marriage prescription of the 1950s was like it was mainly women's job to foster a happy marriage and steer it away from divorce. Celello writes: "To be a successful wife is a career in itself, requiring among other things, the qualities of a diplomat, a businesswoman, a good cook, a trained nurse a school teacher, a politician, and a glamour girl" (77). Since Thurber wrote this essay in 1953, it must have been affected from the kind of scenario of marriage in the 1950s

that Celello describes. Thurber, therefore, though in a humorous way, sets up rules for each gender by stereotyping a traditional man and traditional women. For instance, he regards women as neat, organized, emotional, and so on and assumes men as messy, unorganized and untidy. In his rule six, he writes a husband always has hard time remembering "where the things are around the house" so that "every wife should draw for her husband a detailed map of the house, showing clearly the location of everything he might need" but the problem could be that "he would lay the map down somewhere and not be able to find it until his wife got home" (465). This is a good example of the deliberate shaping of kairos by Thurber. If there had been no segregation between husbands and wives, there had been no occasion for Thurber to stereotype husbands and wives either. The rhetorical situation is that he was provoked to set up rules after witnessing disputes between couples. If he had written this essay without any context, there would have no particular audiences for his rhetorics.

Thurber has well achieved his stasis. Stasis is determined by the argument a rhetor makes. Also, stasis determines what techniques to employ to persuade the audiences. After making an argument and recognizing stasis questions, rhetor has to categorize the stasis question into question of fact, definition, quality and policy, so that the rhetor can make his stance stronger in his argument. After making a claim that there actually exists running feud in marriage, the most effective and important technique Thurber deploys is to leave so many loose ends in his rules that create humor in the audiences. If Thurber had been too rigid to his rules, he would not have been able to argue and convince his readers that marital problems are ever existing phenomena. This is what Longaker and Walker put as "conjecture" that helps rhetor know if debate exists or not (77). He uses humor to satirize married couples for he knows what is at issue for him—"definition"—and how the audiences would respond (77). He writes that "Now I realize in glancing back over these rules, that some of my solutions to marital problems may seem a little untidy; that I have, indeed, left a number of loose ends

here and there" (467). This sense of recognition is called "quality" for it helps rhetor to justify his stance against the disputes and disagreements with his ideas (Walker and Longaker 77).

Synaesthesia is another element that helps Thurber to persuade his audience irrespective what rhetorical tools he deploys. Readers experience synaesthesia when he writes "I've seen a lot of women in my life, Nellie, but I've never seen one who could touch you" (461). In this statement, there is a combination of two senses "seen" and "touch". When reading the whole sentence at once, the readers feel like awe. Such feeling comes only after internalizing what the rhetor has said. As the readers already awed on what the rhetor says, they have been convinced for such synaesthetic sentences have a sort of persuasive force within themselves.

Further example of synaesthesia in this essay is "When I watched a couple in an apartment across the court from mine gesturing and banging tables and throwing objects d' art at each other. I couldn't hear what they were saying" (463). Here, Thurber combines more than two senses such as sound, sight and kinesthetic together. Mark Payne argues that "A synaesthetic poem produces sounds for hearing, colors for seeing, and smell for smelling and these senses are harmonious when they happen together because of a natural affinity between them" (43). As per him, the harmony among the senses is considered so natural when bringing multiple senses together. Thus when readers get to see such statements in the work of art, they are convinced instantly for their sense organs have a natural link with each other.

The major rhetorical strategy applied by Russell Baker in his "Marriage a la Mode" is an appeal to emotion that is aroused by means of diction, repetition and thick description. Baker, in the beginning of his essay, writes that "My wife telephoned to ask if I would like to meet her . . . it had been seven years since I had met anybody at all, and though I had recently thought it might do me good to meet somebody—if only to see whether people still looked

the way they used to—I did not want to start by meeting my wife" (103). The repetition of certain words such as "my wife", "meet", and "want" appeal to heart because the repetitive words are the specific terms that are woven into emotionally powerful associative network that is represented by the pathetic expressions such as "my wife telephoned me", "It had been seven years since I had met anybody", "it might do me good to meet somebody" and so on. Such an emotionally powerful associative network is termed as "pathemata" that "lay before the audience something moving" and that include "memories, convictions, and relationship" (Walker and Longaker 219). Baker, here, puts certain words and situates them in a network that represents the moving relationship of husband and wife in the U.S.

Perhaps Baker's most significant trick in this essay to evoke emotion in audience is by bringing reference of god. God is, most often, linked with emotion and morality. Even in a contesting debate, when somebody says that everything is because of god's wish, people do not argue much, for god is considered a self evidently immense and powerful. Hence, Baker brings god, human and machine together, showing that human and machine are creation of some superpower like god and whatever god wishes happens to be true:

'You may not want to see a human being', said the machine, 'but I'd like to, once in a while'. 'Nonsense', I said, 'you see me 24 hours a day'. 'People ought to see people, ought to talk to people', said the machine. 'If god had meant people to see people, he wouldn't have created electronic living', I said. 'If god wanted people to talk to people, he wouldn't have given us the telephone-answering machine'. (104)

When there happens a heated debate between machine and human, Baker, by his wit, brings god in between so that he becomes successful to convince his readers that because god created telephone-answering machine, avoiding physical meetings with wife is not immoral thing, for it is what god wishes us to do.

Another significant technique Baker uses to evoke emotion in audiences is by

storytelling and the use of past tense. When he narrates his story of how he married in the past tense, the audiences become able to distinguish narrator's present self from the past one and they feel pity to the present self of the narrator who is now narrating his story to his readers. So, by showing his past self a culprit that did not care about his wife's emotion, Baker has been successfully implanting the seed of emotion to the readers.

It was a simple matter to plug into the central information bank, obtain the names of several thousand single women in the same tax predicament and for a small fee, have the engagement and marriage arranged by the bank. The ceremony was performed by a minister of the Ecumenical Computer Church . . . at the appropriate moment I punched 'I do' and 'I will' into my computer and after she did likewise I switched the computer into check account shopping mode and ordered my bank to authorize an Oregon Jeweler to deliver her a wedding ring. (103)

Storytelling, here, has allowed narrator be isolated from what he did in the past and analyze the past to the readers. How readers are drawn into this is by what John D Ramage et al call "Turning the abstractions of logic into something palpable and present" and "Conveying value, beliefs and understanding of the writer in the story imaginatively to the reader" (81). For Baker, storytelling has become an appropriate way of conveying a pathetic appeal to the audiences in this essay. It has transformed the abstract logic on computer, computer marriage and electronic living into a tangible story that readers can imagine of, live into and feel what the writer has felt about his electronic marriage and agree with what he has said. By this, rhetor establishes what John D Ramage et al further call "Bridge building goal" (121). Here, narrator talks about his past electronic living creating an emotional atmosphere thereby connecting readers empathetically.

Bertrand Russell argues that "Marriage in the Orthodox Christian doctrine has two purposes; one that recognized by St. Paul [that is marriage is to be regarded solely as a more

or less legitimate outlet for lust]; the other, the procreation of children " (24). Such was considered ethic of marriage in traditional Christian marriage. However, in Baker's essay the purpose of marriage is somewhat different. "At that time of course I did not intend to marry. I changed my mind only after setting up my tax picture in the computer and discovering that a wife of a certain income profile would cut my tax bill by nearly 2 percent" (103). So, by wedding someone with certain income, he would be able to manage his living cost. Hence the purpose of wedding is perhaps to sustain the livelihood. So, by this Baker attracts attention of readers. Readers realize that the husband even does not have enough for his subsistence so that he is obliged to marry. John D Ramage et al argue that "Pathos helps us see what is deeply at stake in an issue, what matters to the whole person" (112). As Ramage et al said, what lies at stake is manifested through emotional use of language here. Managing a livelihood by wedding somebody lies at the stake of the narrator and that is what matters a lot to him for he would not be able to continue his electronic living without paying tax. The phrase "of course" indicates the state of acknowledgement which further makes readers more convinced that the rhetor is speaking the truth that either he has to get married or has to leave living electronic life. By creating such choices in the mind of audiences, rhetor, here, convinces them emotionally thereby making them agree with him that it is ethical to seek for ease in marriage by either of the sexes.

Other techniques used to create emotional periphery is by thick description, choice of diction, analogy and metaphor. When rhetor talks about any event here he provides a detail description that makes readers believe in what he says. For instance, when he talks about how he married, he offers so long detail. And, the choice of certain words provokes emotion to the readers. "My wife" (105), "I am your wife and I am dying for love" (104), "kiss me" (104), "it had been so long since I had met anybody. I thought of going to the window, raising the blinds, but I didn't"(105), for instance, promote the readers to have an emotional bonding

with the rhetor. That means, readers are taking a share of rhetor's pathetic situation, and identifying themselves with rhetor and regarding rhetor's problem their own problem. This way, an emotional connection is created via certain emotional expressions. Metaphor has also been used here. In "My wife? But I was married to a tax-shelter" (105), "tax-shelter" stands for wife. So, here is an analogy between wife and tax-shelter and using symbol to represent wife, rhetor establishes a state for the reception of his ideas.

Baker deploys an appeal to emotion. It is because at time when he wrote his essay "Marriage a la Mode" in 1981, people had been more instrumental and mechanical because of the excessive innovation in technologies and computers. There was an emergent need of pathos in marriage to keep marital life working. The husband and wife, Baker talks about, are busy with machines and computers. They fulfill their needs by the use of machine. So, Baker, talking about the interference of machine, internet and computer in marital life in early twentieth century would probably sound ridiculous. However, when he wrote his essay in 1981, there was already a lot of invention in the field of technology and people's life was being affected by the use of machine, more recognizable form of online world was after 1990, after the development of World Wide Web, though. Moreover, Baker does sound convincing when one takes his essay as prophetic one, too. However, had Baker written this essay in the 1930s, so early to the initiation of the online world, he would not have been convincing to the readers. So it is all about kairos that makes something very convincing to people at particular time period.

In Baker's essay, the stasis is determined after he makes an argument. His argument is that the technologies like computer and internet have interfered the close relationship between husband and wife. Husband and wife have been more mechanical, they lack emotional and physical contact in every aspect of life. The stasis question he recognizes is that the readers would argue that the technology like computer has eased the life of couples; it

helps them to be in contact even when they are at distance. To respond to such potential responses of audiences, Baker in the essay brings machines into life and injects emotion to it. In the conversation, he presents machine more emotional and husband and wife mechanized. For instance, in a conversation with machine, husband says that he has not seen humans for seven years and does not want to see his wife either but machine replies that it wants to meet humans and establish relationships. In this way, by inserting emotion to machine Baker has been able to convince his audiences and achieve his stasis that husband and wife have been more instrumental because of excessive use of machinery equipments.

Katherine Anne Porter's essay "The Necessary Enemy" has dominant use of logical argument. Her essay can be rhetorically analyzed in two ways: analyzing the entire essay as having one idea and the rest as supporting details—that follows Toulmin's pattern of argument analysis—and analyzing each paragraph as having a idea and sufficient details supporting the idea.

When we take one paragraph from this essay, we can find Porter making a claim and proving it with appropriate details. She, in one of the paragraphs, for instance, makes a claim that "Marriage is not end but only the beginning of true happiness, cloudless, changeless to the end" (436). The reasons she provides to support this claim are because love within marriage is "changeless, faithful, passionate and its sole end is to render the two lovers happy . . . and sufferings as the lovers may cause to each other are only another word for delight; all real troubles come from without, they face them unitedly in perfect confidence" (436). The claim Porter makes is properly warranted by rational reasons. Because the difficulties caused within the couples are those that provide them a sense of thrill, the problem caused outside marriage is nothing but the source of "beginning of true happiness" (436). Therefore, Porter here has offered specific premises for her readers to believe on her. And, because the claim and the reasons are appropriately bridged, Porter easily grasps the attention of her audience.

Porter's entire essay can be analyzed deploying Toulmin's structure of argument, as a whole. The major claim or what Toulmin calls a conclusion of Porter's whole essay is hatred of wife towards her husband is an important part of her marital life; it is her necessary enemy and ally at the same time: "Her hatred is a part of it [marriage], the necessary enemy and ally" (438). Toulmin states "One distinction to start with: between the claim or conclusion whose merits we are seeking to establish (C) and the facts we appeal to as a foundation for the claim—what I shall refer to as our data (D)" (90). So, a claim or conclusion is just a general statement that always raises questions and provokes curiosity of how. In case of Porter's claim the probable question to be addressed is why hatred of wife towards husband is a part of a female's marital life and how is hatred towards husband a necessary enemy and ally to a wife? Such questions bring about what Toulmin calls data that he states "appeal to as a foundation for a claim" (90). Thus, claim/ conclusion, here, is a starting point of an argumentative journey.

Porter not only makes a claim, she substantiates her claim with sufficient data / reasons. The first reason that works as a foundation for her claim is "At times she feels a painful hostility toward her husband, and cannot admit its reality because such an admission would damage in her own eyes her view of what love should be, an absurd view, based on her vanity of power . . . she is afraid her marriage is going to fail" (438). In conventional sense of marriage, wife had to compromise to maintain morals in marriage. Porter's premises mean because wife is scared of being failed in marital relation, because she does not want to fall from what society constructs as ideal, she cannot expose her hatred towards her husband. Exposing hatred means being unethical for her. It is therefore, hatred towards husband becomes a part and partial of marriage and a necessary enemy for a wife. This reason while implying to orthodox Christian Society of early 20th century seem to fit and sounds convincing for it was a sort of lived experience of the women of that time in America.

Furthermore, another data incessantly supporting Porter's main claim is "She would have to hide from her husband, if she could, the same spot [hate] in her feelings she had hidden from her parents and for the same no doubt disreputable, selfish reason; she wants to keep love" (435). So, there is no big reason behind accepting hatred as an ally and necessary. It is just for love. Thus, according to Porter, to get love of husband wife hides the feeling of hatred towards the husband. It also sounds logical as far as it is true that when wife shows hatred towards husband a husband also hates her back.

Argument consists of not only data and conclusion. There comes another thing in between that is what Toulmin calls a warrant. Warrant according to Toulmin determines the legitimacy of claim and data. Toulmin states:

Our task is to strengthen the ground on which our argument is constructed, but is rather to show that, taking these data as a starting point, the step to the original claim or conclusion is an appropriate and legitimate one. At this point, therefore, what are needed are general, hypothetical statements which can act as bridges and authorize the sort of step which our particular argument commits us. (91)

The validity of an argument can, therefore, be determined by warrant: a hypothetical statement that connects data to conclusion. Regarding all the data and claim discussed above, the following warrant can be formed of Porter's argument: keeping the feeling of hatred towards husband within women can get love from their husband and it is less likely that marriage would fail. Since Porter draws this warrant from commonplaces that are shared values of the community her readers reside in, it is pretty receptive to the readers. Crowley and Hawhee state that "People readily accept lines of argument relying on commonplaces because audiences feel that they are actually participating in the construction of the argument when they adhere to beliefs used by a rhetor" (119). This warrant, on the other hand, makes it sure that, according to this essay, in the U.S. of 1948, women would rather be deprived of

marital happiness than to fall of ethics and morality. It is because, as per this essay, women believed that keeping some bad habits or feelings, such as the feeling of hatred, at bay could prevent the marital life from failing.

Other things to be considered in an argument, according to Toulmin, are qualifiers and conditions of rebuttal. The qualifiers used in Porter's argument are "if she could" (435), "perhaps" (435), "at times" (438), "above all" (435), "one good thing" (437), "even if not always" (437), and so on that "specify our data, warrant and claim" (Toulmin 93). By placing such words and phrases on claim, warrant and data, Porter prevents her argument from vagueness and ambiguity and makes it more receptive to her readers. Porter, also, acknowledges the condition of rebuttal in her argument. That's why, she responses those all possible objections by stating that "She knows it is perfectly natural for people to disagree, have fits of anger, fight it out; they learn quite a lot about each other that way, and not all of it disappointing either" (435). Lunsford and Ruszkiewicz write that "In the Toulmin's system, understanding and reacting to these conditions are essential not only to buttress your own claim where they're weak, but also to understand the reasonable objections of people who see the world differently" (162). This addresses the response of those people who may argue that it is very natural to have feeling of hatred and temper and disagreement in marriage why does one have to hide all such feelings. Porter argue that though a wife knows all these feelings are common in marriage, she still hides them to maintain her civility to fit the system created by the society as well as her own ideology.

Porter supports her warrant with what Toulmin calls backing to further respond to the potential rebuttals. "Above all, she wants him to be absolutely confident that she loves him, for that is the real truth, no matter how unreasonable it sounds, and no matter how her own feelings betray them both at times. She depends recklessly on his love; yet while she is hating him, he might very well be hating her as much or even more" (435), is the backing she offers

to strengthen the warrant. And, the backing again emphasizes that hiding the feeling of hatred and maintaining civility in marriage would make her husband sure that she loves him to the bit, no matter if she hates him internally and he also does the same. The point is wife wants her marital life be beautified with all the virtues of marriage externally, no matter if it is already broken inside. Porter here seems to satirize our social system that does not let women be who they are.

Porter wrote this essay in 1948. She claims in this essay that though women used to have feeling of hatred towards their husbands, they keep it secret; they made it their ally for they did not want their marital life be a mess and they wanted to be loved by their husbands. This claim sounds convincing when we situate it in the context of 1948. It was an aftermath of Second World War, considering the date the essay was written. During the Second World War, wives were home alone because husbands had to go for military service. Because of this the previous lifestyle of women working exclusively at home was transformed. Women had grown more confident; they had internalized the situation—that they had to work, earn and raise the children alone—war had brought to them. That is why women had enhanced such capacity that they could face the difficulties that interrupt them, alone. And, because the decade of the 1940s was marked by Second World War, 1948 was the time the soldiers returned home with physical and mental problems due to the war. So, as the war was over, it left many couples with the task of adjusting to normal life once again. It was turn of wives to be calm and accept the consequences. It is therefore, Porter argues that wives kept the sense of hatred towards husband secret that helped them to be well settled and adjusted.

In this sense Porter's argument is quite kairotic; it is situated in particular time and context and is persuasive for the readers of that time. However, when the same argument is taken to another time and context, it may sound ridiculous to the readers. It is because the concept on marriage and morals may have already changed as the time passes. Kristin Celello

states that "In the 1960s and 1970s, second wave feminists would begin to question the validity of the assumption that marriage should be solely a wife's job" (102), for instance. In 1948, it was considered that wives can protect marriage from broken, as Porter, too, argues the same in this essay. But the same argument does not pledge audience of the 1960s and 1970s as argued by Celello. Crowley and Hawhe talking about kairos state that

The ancients used kairos to suggest a more situational kind of time, something close to what we call 'opportunity'. In this sense, kairos suggests an advantageous time, or as lexicographers put it, 'exact or critical time, season, opportunity'. The temporal dimension of kairos can indicate anything from a lengthy time to a brief fleeting moment. In short, Kairos is not about duration but rather about a certain kind of time.

(37)

So a particular argument is convincing only in an "advantageous time" and is ephemeral. Therefore, Porter's argument was valid for her time of writing because of fleeting nature of time and the obvious change it brings in the concept of any issue. Because Thurber and Baker have written their essay on the similar issue to that of Porter in a temporal gap, they have been able to convince their audience by deploying dissimilar rhetorical tools to that of Porter.

Crowley and Hawhee write "Stasis refers to the place where one rhetor takes a stand. Seen from the point of view of two disputants, however, the stasis marks the place where two opposing forces come together, where they rest or stand in an agreement on what is at issue" (53). However the stand a rhetor takes on an issue does not last longer. It suspends only for some moments until the writer jumps out of the dispute. In Porter's essay, for example, the dispute is in the argument that it is solely wife's job to protect marriage from being broken by keeping their feelings secret. While the feminists would certainly disagree on this argument, Porter purposely moves out of the dispute by adding phrases like "necessary enemy" so that it would sound more flexible to the audience. Putting the two oxymoronic words together in the

title is one of the techniques she has adopted to achieve her stasis, making her stance stronger in her argument. Another tactics that Porter applies to achieve her stasis is by bringing references of 20th century's ideology of perfect couple. According to her, wife had to sacrifice a lot to meet the ideology of good couple no matter if she does not love her husband truly. She had to think of ideology and follow them than to her own feelings towards her conjugal affairs. Hence, by citing such instances of 20th century Christian American ideology on marriage and its morals, she has been able to earn the trust of her audiences thereby achieving her stasis. Therefore, it is because of the stand the essayists take, at the time of dispute, they have successfully drawn their readers to their arguments despite the fact that they use different rhetorical tools.

Similarly, synaesthesia, an aesthetic element, can also be found in this essay. Synaesthesia is created when she states her ideas by using the words, that refer to sense organs and connecting them to create poetic quality. "Hate needs no instruction, but waits only to be provoked [. . .] hate, the unspoken word, unacknowledged presence in the house, that faint smell of brimstone among the roses, that invisible tongue-tripper, that unkempt finger in every pie, that suddenly oh-so-curiously chilling look" (436). Though it is an extract from an essay, it sounds pretty poetic because of the allegory it has consisted of and obviously the admixture of multiple senses. Here is combination of sight referred by "look", sound by "unspoken word", taste by "tongue-tripper", and smell by "the faint smell of brimstone among the roses" and kinesthetic by "chilling". Such an amalgamation of maximum number of senses brings what I. A. Richards calls "a balance and harmony within our impulses" that is from "the supreme form of emotive language" shared by "synaesthesia (qtd in Selden 167). The selection of words such as "unspoken", "oh-so-chilling look", and "faint smell of brimstone among the roses" produce a soothing music that stimulates readers' senses. Cretien Van Campen argues that synaesthesia refers to "figures of speech in which

meanings are transferred from one sensory domain to another" (91). Here, Porter, too, produces meaning via figures of speech that is through allegory and the combination of exact opposites such as "unacknowledged presence" and "unspoken word". A "word" is always spoken; we can pronounce it, and a "presence" is always acknowledged otherwise it would not be presence at all.

Finally, it is because of the nature of classical *pisteis* the essayists have been able to convince the audience irrespective of the rhetorical tools they have deployed. Classical *pisteis* such as *logos*, *ethos* and *pathos* work together in an argument, though they are considered as isolated elements, by nature. Longaker and Walker state that it is better to think of the classical *pisteis* as "Simultaneous dimensions of persuasion, though one appeal or another may dominate" (47). This paper has claimed that the key rhetorical device used by Porter is *logos* in her essay. It does not mean that *ethos* and *pathos* are totally avoided. So, in one way or the other, the classical *pisteis* are working together to convince the readers, there may be the presidency of one *pisteis* over another, though. Also, it is not that *logos* is only logical *pisteis* and the remaining are not logical. Even in an emotional argument, there are reasons to make it emotionally convincing. Longaker and Walker further write "All the appeals have a logical dimension as well as a pathetic dimension. The *ethos* appeal, for instance, arises if reasons for trust have been presented . . . the *pathos* appeal arises if reason for emotion have been presented" (48). Hence, even within one *pisteis*, the other are emerged naturally to make one valid. It also means that they share characteristics of one another. So, saying this, it is in itself an answer of how Porter, Thurber and Baker come up with same issue by applying quite different *pisteis*.

This paper is a rhetorical analysis of the selected essays. The major point it has examined and explored is the contrast in the use of rhetorical tools, combining all the essays, having issue of marriage and morals, together. The essayists James Thurber, Katherine Anne

Porter and Russell Baker have used very diverse techniques of appealing to the audiences such as humor and irony, logical argument, and emotional argument in their essays—"My Own Ten Rules for a Happy Marriage", "The Necessary Enemy" and "Marriage a la Mode" respectively. Taking the issue being raised and the diverse strategies used to appeal to the audiences into an account, the essayists have been able to persuade their audiences that the disputes and discontents should be avoided from the sacred marital relationship and the married couples should follow the path of morality for a blissful marital life. Kairos and the rhetorical situation of the argument, stasis of the argument, the nature of classical *pisteis* and *synaesthesia* are the reasons how Thurber, Baker and Porter have been able to convince their audiences, while they employ distinct rhetorical tools. Because it primarily uses the method of rhetorical analysis, an examination of issue such as ideology falls outside the scope of this paper.

Works Cited

- Baker, Russell. "Marriage a la Mode." *Elements of Literature*, 4th ed, edited by Robert Scholes et al, Oxford University Press, 1941, pp. 102- 105.
- Buckley, Theodore. *Aristotle's Treatise on Rhetoric*. Harvard College Library, np.
- Campen, Cretien Van. *The Hidden Sense: Synaesthesia in Art and Science*. The MIT Press, 2007.
- Ceello, Kristin. *A History of Marriage and Divorce in the Twentieth Century United States: Making Marriage Work*. University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Cherlin, Andrew J. "American Marriage in the Early Twenty-First Century." *The Future of Children, Marriage and Child Wellbeing*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2005, pp. 33-55. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3556562>.
- Crabb, Dr. Larry. *The Marriage Builder: Creating True Oneness to Transform Your Marriage*. Zondervan ebooks, 2013.
- Crowley, Sharon, and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetorics For Contemporary Students*. 3rd ed, Pearson education, 2004.
- Devis, Rebecca L. "Not Marriage, but Simple Harlotry." *The Journal of American History*, vol. 94, no. 4, 2008, pp. 1137-1163. *JSTOR*, [http:// www.jstor.org/stable/25095323](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25095323).
- Donimian, Jack. "Marriage: Growth and Decline." *The Furrow*, vol.43, no.3, 1992, pp. 158-163. *JSTOR*, [http:// www.jstor.org/stable/27662156](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27662156).
- Grossi, Renata. *Looking for Love in Legal Discourse of Marriage*. ANU Press, 2014.
- Longaker, Mark Garret, and Jeffrey Walker. *Rhetorical Analysis: A Brief Guide for Writers*. Longman, 1949.
- Lundberg, Shelly, and Robert A. Pollak. "The Evolving Role of Marriage: 1950-2010." *The Future of Children*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2015, pp. 29 -50. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43581971>.

- Lunsford, Andrea A., and John J. Ruszkiewicz. *Everything's An Argument*. Bedford/ ST. Martin's, 2007.
- Payne, Mark. "The Understanding Ear: Synaesthesia, Paraesthesia and Talking Animals." *Synaesthesia and The Ancient Senses*, edited by Shane Butler and Alex Purves, Routledge, 2013, pp. 43-52.
- Porter, Katherine Anne. "The Necessary Enemy." *The Oxford Book of Essays*, edited by John Gross, Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 434-438.
- Ramage, John D., John C Bean and June Johnson. *Writing Arguments: A Rhetoric with Readings*. Longman, 2010.
- Reynolds, James Bronson. "Sex, Morals, and Law in Ancient Egypt and Babylon." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 5, no. 1, Northwester University, 1915, pp. 20-31.
- Russell, Bertrand. *Marriage and Morals*. Routledge Classics, 1929.
- Schnell, Rudiger, and Andrew Shields. "The Discourse on Marriage in The Middle Ages." *Speculum*, vol. 73, no. 3, 1998, pp. 771-786. *JSTOR*, [http:// www.jstor.org/stable /2887497](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2887497).
- Seldon, Roman, editor. *The Theory of Criticism: From Plato to The Present*. Longman, 1998.
- Slob, Wouter H. "The Voice of The Other: A Dialogico-Rhetorical Understanding of Opponent and of Toulmin's Rebuttal." *Arguing on the Toulmin Model: New Essays in Argument Analysis and Evaluation*, edited by David Hitchcock and Bart Verheij, Springer, 2006, pp. 165- 180.
- Thurber, James. "My Own Ten Rules for a Happy Marriage." *The Oxford Book of Essays*, edited by John Gross, Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 462- 468.
- Toulmin, Stephen. *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.