

Tribhuvan University

High and Low Ethos in Emile Gaboriau's *The Lerouge Case*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U.

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Chandni Sah

Roll No: 16

T.U. Regd. No.: 9-2-0462-0001-2010

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

May 2019

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English

Letter of Approval

This Thesis entitled “High and Low Ethos in Emile Gaboriau’s *The Lerouge Case*” Submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by ChandniSah has been approved by the undersigned member of the Research Committee:

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head
Central Department of English
Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I am above all indebted to my respected Supervisor Lecturer Shiva Raj Panta for his unconditional and untiring guidance in the successful completion of this research. I would like to express my wholehearted gratitude to him for his priceless time, friendly guidance and continuous motivation to explore more which assisted in the entire construction of the thesis. His academic command throughout the thesis is incomparable.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to respected Lecturer Hem LalPandey for his valuable assistance in helping me to sort out qualities of a research paper, ways of researching and writing a research paper as well as to shape my thesis proposal. I am thankful to the team of proposal defense that includes Lecturer JivaNathLamsal and Pro. Dr. DhrubaKarki. My gratitude goes to Pro. Dr. AnirudraThapa, Head of Central Department of English for accepting my thesis proposal and academic comments to conduct this thesis.

Lastly, I am always indebted to parents, Mahi Narayan Sah and Uma Devi Sah for their motivation, unconditional love and support that encourages me to do more and better every day. I am also grateful to my friends for their contribution in completion of this thesis.

May 2019

Chandni Sah

High and Low Ethos in Emile Gaboriau's *The Lerouge Case*

Abstract

This research paper attempts to scrutinize the high and low ethos of characters in Emile Gaboriau's The Lerouge Case. It examines the types of ethos characters have used in the fiction in order to persuade each other through their rhetorics, especially through the ethos. The issue of accountability, persuading each other, moral values, norms and characteristics of different characters is examined in this paper. By taking the theoretical insights on rhetorical issues proposed by theorists like Aristotle, Kenneth Burke, and Gerard A. Hauser, the study reveals the ethos chosen by characters and their ethical background. The novel is a detective fiction where characters like; Tabaret, Valerie, Claire, Albert, Noel, Marie Pierre Lerouge, M. Daburon, Gevrol, and others have used persuasive positions according to their characteristics, background and the need to persuade other. This fiction is filled from of suspense as it is the genre of detective fiction where characters' ethos is changeable according to the situation they are facing. It has shown the changeable rhetorics of character according to their motif, purpose, and desire which is analyzed in detail in this paper.

Keywords: Rhetor, ethos, pathos, morality, ethical values

The research paper explores high and low ethos in Emile Gaboriau's *The Lerouge Case* in order to argue the protagonist and antagonist's credibility and build their character. The researcher has tried to discover how the protagonist and antagonist have convinced their audiences and other fellow characters. There are different characters who have their credibility issues during the investigation. Some of them are accountable in terms of their ethical and moral values whereas some of them are presented as a fall from their ethos and morality. They have shown the contemporary people's society, thoughts, and moral values. As Kriszner and Mandell says, "All stories are told or narrated, by someone, and one of the first choices writers make is who tells the story. This choice determines the story's point of view- the angle or vantage point from which events are presented" (168). This is the contextual fiction where writer chooses third person narrator and the writer's point of view shows neutrality because this fiction shows those realistic time, lifestyle of people, culture and context. It was written how it is presented. Anyone can interpret the fiction. The author is dead.

Emile Gaboriau was well known French novelist, writer, and journalist and considered as a pioneer of the modern detective novel. John Scaggs has studied about crime fiction. He argues, "The violent and bloody spectacle of public execution, as a form of revenge in which the sovereign restores order and stability, also served as a warning, and similar warnings were an integral part of the broadsheet accounts of the crimes and punishments of major criminals" (8). This fiction is also known as crime fiction which might be following the trails of eighteenth century crime fiction's vibe. *The Lerouge Case* was his first detective novel. This novel is the English translation of French title *L'Affaire Lerouge*. In *The Lerouge Case*, Gaboriau implements an entire departure in French fiction: a detective, Pere Tabaret as a protagonist. His subsequent

novels, all his detective fiction are equally successful and serialized; celebrate the good decisions of a second detective, Monsieur Lecoq, a disciple of Tabaret.

Gaboriau was the dramatist who dramatized full-scale police investigations and made them heroes for the different fictional detectives; the eccentric amateur, Pere Tabaret, the zealous and brilliant professional, Monsieur Lecoq and the genius outsider who can guess the situation and the culprit. Thomas in *Review on the L’Affaire Lerouge* brings the ideas of Howard Haycraft writes, “In the sense that it (*L’Affaire Lerouge*) was the first story of novel length to employ detection as an important theme, it is perhaps entitled to the appellation ‘the first detective novel’” (qtd in Thomas). Gaboriau has dramatically presented all the details of incident.

However, Gaboriau’s method of inserting a long detailed historical romance explicating the character’s motives and histories in the middle of the investigation has created different images in the field of the detective novel. In David F. Bell’s view, *The Lerouge Case* is “The manifest cruelty of the murder scene at the beginning of *L’Affaire Lerouge* is thus compounded by a cultural allusion calculated (or perhaps unconsciously evoked) to reinforce the violence described” (92-93). It has shown the cruelty of one murderer and his motif to murder has shown the cultural allusion which unconsciously evoked to reinforce the violence. Sherlock Holmes’s techniques and characteristics can also be traced directly to Gaboriau’s first detective, Pere Tabaret, comes to a realization of his ‘vocation’ towards the end of his life when he begins reading police memoirs which are very likely “ I, too, can read; and I read all the books I bought. I collected all I could find related, no matter how little, to the police. Memoirs, reports, pamphlets, speeches, letters, novels, - all suited me; and I devoured them” (20). It is likely from where he has collected his idea of detective.

Tabaret becomes fascinated by the mysterious power emanating from the Rue

de Jerusalem, admires the artful and penetrating detectives. . . which follow crime on the trail, armed with the law, through the brushwood of legality, as relentlessly as the savages of Cooper pursue their enemies in the depth of the American Forest and is seized by the desire to become wheel of this admirable machine, a small assistance in the punishment of crime and the triumph of innocence (20). Here, we can see Tabaret is affected by emotional belief. Pathos plays a crucial role to convince people because in all cases hard facts, shreds of evidence, proofs are unavailable and we have to use emotional experiences and common sense.

In *The Lerouge Case*, the main detective is Pere Tabaret. Tabaret keeps his hobby a secret, fearing the disapproval of friends and neighbors to explain his irregular hours, he allows them to believe that he gratifies in various social vices. It is an interesting and significant comment on the stigma attached to police work that this moral activity should be concealed by something that even then would have been seen as immoral. Lecoq, a junior police officer, merely advises the examining magistrate, Daburon to engage Tabaret to solve the murder of Madame Lerouge. Tabaret finds many clues missed by Lecoq's incompetent superior Gevrol, and his investigation occupies the major part of the novel. A complication is provided by Daburon's former romantic attachment to the mistress of the principal suspect, Commarin: Tabaret initially convinced of Commarin's group, eventually realizes that another man is guilty and despite Daburon's reluctance to acknowledge this, he finally proves his case.

This novel overflowed with surprises, reversals of fortune, recognition and threatened and actual violence. Each episode in the novel ended as a note of suspense, to ensure that the public would purchase the next issue and the more horrific the violence, the more virginal the victim or intended victim, the better the public liked

them. It has been also called a melodramatic and sensationalist novel. For Nancy Oakes writes in her blog review, “*The Widow Lerouge* is a solid mystery story. It's a bit frustrating because there are a number of coincidences that turn things on their heads and that have a bearing on the later parts of the tale”. Gaboriau's plots are certainly filled with dramatic incidents that have carried the features of the detective novel. Like; suspense, murders, violence, immoral and unethical characters, treasury, plotting against each other and so many other characteristics. Different characters explain the event in their own way which made investigators confused either it is true or false. Some evidences like babies swapped at birth, paired contradictory situations, exposes of scandalous situations in the nobility and dramatic reversals of fortune fill the narrative and height of the conspiracy. So, Gaboriau makes ample use of techniques and motifs that were popular in Victorian novels.

The rhetorical communication helps an attitude by the receiver towards the speaker. How speaker persuades others, communicates with others and influence others, everything depends on their use of rhetoric. Gerard A. Hauser has studied about rhetorical use in the language. For him:

Communication is universally recognized as vital to our everyday lives. It is recognized as essential in business, in the professions, in science and technology, in interpersonal relations, in community affairs, in political processes, in institutions of all sorts. References to communication as either a problem or a salvation have been common since the first quarter of the twentieth century. (1)

Every day, we use the language according to our needs and situation to communicate with each other. The level of persuasion and quality of communication depends upon our self-perception and self-presentation. Aristotle thought that “such trust-inspiring

qualities were communicated principally through the speaker's self-presentation" (qdt in Walker 45). While communicating, language must be trustworthy and inspiring; otherwise, it may fail to function. Those trustworthy and inspiring properties of language rely on the speaker's self-presentation, s/he presents him/herself.

In *The Lerouge Case*, characters use persuasive language. Every time, they have presented strong arguments which are inspired by their ethos to persuade other characters and most of the time, they are successes. According to Hauser,

Rhetorical communication occurs whenever one person engages another in an exchange of symbols to accomplish some goal. It is not communication for communication's sake; rhetorical communication, at least implicitly and often explicitly, attempts to coordinate social action. (3)

Every word used in communication has its own place and purpose as Hauser claims. In this fiction also, character's speech has reflected moral values, norms, and ethos which has strongly carried the theme of the fiction.

Classical thinkers were quite aware of how important trust could be in any rhetorical situation. They speak at length of ethical appeal. Socrates contended that "character is the strongest source of persuasion" whereas Aristotle contended if the rhetoric could not forge an ethical connection with the audience, then he would never move them rationally or emotionally. Rhetorical theorists have put the rhetorical characters at the center. Similarly, Cicero has maintained that a "rhetor's character is central to his persuasive potential" whereas Quintilian has put moral character at "the center of rhetorical education" (232). Another rhetorical theorist Kenneth Burke, who maintained that "ethical appeal lays the foundation for all other communication" (232) but staying on their ground, Gaboriau has presented his own different view. For him, "Rhetoric is an art; its practice, no matter how intelligently executed, does not

guarantee a favorable outcome” (11). Whatever they argue but for all of them, rhetoric is always center and the rhetorical characters are at the center of stories. In this novel also, central characters have impressive rhetorical qualities. Every time they speak, the listener gets influenced with them and even their lies are granted as truth.

Classical theory especially refers to ethos, logos, and pathos. In this paper, the researcher is especially exploring the high and low ethos used by characters in Gaboriau’s *The Lerouge Case* using the theory of ethos generated by Hauser. In Hauser’s opinion, “rhetoric arises in contexts open to choice. It flourishes in an environment in which these choices are made freely . . . in short, rhetoric makes commitments: to the self, to others, to the truth of our ideas, and to our view of what is required for humane social relations” (62). He has deeply analyzed the rhetoric of language in his text. As he analyzes, rhetoric depends on the context and the personal values which are easily flourished in an environment. In *The Lerouge Case*, characters belong to the different field like a detective, judge, high-class people, low-class people, and the language they have used varies according to the environment and their positions.

Basically, speakers with high ethos are more likable than those low ethos. These both can affect one’s opinion. Rhetorical communication always contains pragmatic intent. Its goal is to influence human choices on specific matters that require attention, often immediately. Sometimes the speakers do have a reputation or have established their competence and experiences with the audience; the speaker has a much greater chance of shifting their attitude. Like, Pere Tabaret, Monsieur Lecoq, M. Daborun, Noel Gerdy, Madame Juliette Chaffour, and Valerie have changed their ethos according to the situation they had faced in *The Lerouge Case*. The discontinuities of experience are as important as the unities when communication has

occurred because communication is an ongoing process but also experience of discontinuities which can be seen in *The Lerouge Case* at most of the time. Characters have broken their communication so many places when they are trying to hide something or in the middle of exposing someone.

Rhetoric provides appeals that advise us about belief and conduct in a particular case. It invites us to interpret reality in terms of hypotheses about prudent conduct. Rhetoric's appeals depend on and are drawn from audience opinions. Ethos is about characters based on the presentation of the self. Hauser claims, "It attempts to evoke moral, emotional, and rational commitments to belief and actions through appeals designed to reach an intersection between ideas and experiences" (30). In any argument, when making an ethos appeal, the speaker asks for the audience's trust based on his/her character- the speaker demonstrates that he/she is a person of sound character by addressing the audience in a way that they will likely appreciate. Their credibility is shown through their ethical ground and their likeliness through the audiences.

The novel starts like this, "ON Thursday, the 6th of March, 1862, two days after Shrove Tuesday, five women belonging to the village of La Jonchere presented themselves at the police station at Bougival" (1). Shrove Tuesday is a traditional feast day after fasting of forty days on Wednesday and the Widow Lerouge was assassinated on the same night. She was fond of good living, spent a good deal on her food, and bought wine by the half cask. This whole story is about the investigation of the assassination of the old widow lady. The situation was very minor in the sense like that when the police and amateur detective came to investigate, inside the house, they found the place was mess, the furniture had been knocked over, the drawers have been broken open and in the bedroom is the Widow Lerouge lying near the fireplace with

her face in the ashes. That was not the kind of robbery. So, the investigating magistrate M.Daburon, the chief of detective, police Gevrol and his subordinate Lecoq, it also takes a certain M. Tabaret or Tiraclair, who is a protagonist who uses deduction with a lot of intuition and imagination thrown in.

There are several fictional characters in this novel. Some of the major characters are Pere Tabaret, Monsieur Lecoq, M. Daborun, Noel Gerdy, Albert de Commarin, Madame Juliette Chaffour, Valerie, M. Gevrol and others. And each of them has some major and minor role which helps to investigate the police and detective as well. The murder was becoming so mysterious so that they are taking the statement of neighbors. This novel has already introduced one grand setting and major incident of the fiction at the beginning to create rhetorical magic in the fiction through its different characters.

Similarly, the good characterization and human description of people's motives in this novel are Widow Lerouge, M. Daburon, Albert, Tabaret, Lecoq and among others. Lecoq was a major and powerful character and had an influence on Sherlock Holmes and other characters. Gaboriau offered three conflicting versions of Lecoq's origin. The first version is *The Lerouge Case*. In Rick Lai chronological construction of Lecoq's origin, he combines elements of all three conflicting stories. He theorizes that actually Lecoq actually became a criminal for a short period, but never was formally charged with any crimes. So, Lecoq was an ex-criminal and he had become reconciled to the law and was now a member of the French police. The researcher can claim: that is there an ethos to establish their credibility? Lecoq establishes its authority in his work in less striking ways. He is sincere in his job which shows the high ethos and his past shows low ethos which is immorally unexpected.

As we can put ethos and pathos on the same level as rational arguments, all the three factors receive a separate treatment but in this fiction, Lecoq has used most of the time logical rhetors on the basis of his ethos and playing with pathos. Jakob Wisse defines ethos as, “the presentation of the character of the speaker” (4) where as pathos as “the playing upon the feeling of the audience” (4). Lecoq is a detective who is emotionally and morally connected with the case of Lerouge. Although an inspector, Lecoq is still subordinate to Gevrol. When Gevrol investigates the murder of a woman named Lerouge, Lecoq seeks to embarrass him by persuading the supervising magistrate to bring Tabaret into the case.

Ethos is not only about being honest but also about presenting values, sharing values with audiences, which can show the qualities of high and low ethos. According to Lunsford and Ruskiewicz:

Ethos can be created in two ways: first, they shape themselves at the very moment they make any argument. They do this by language, evidence, respect and presenting way through gestures, eye-contact, posture, tone. Second they bring their previous lives, work and reputations while making an argument. If they are well known, linked and respected that will contribute to their persuasive power. If their character is problematic then it would be very difficult to reshape audience’s perception. (64)

The gestures and postures shows the body movement and involvement of the speaker and the listener, eye-contact helps to communicate whether you are confident or not on what you are saying and the tone have high, middle and low tone which shows the pitch variations that affect the meaning of the word. Rhetoric is broadly social in its goals; it concerns it with people acting communally-as drama ordinarily does both within the boundaries of the stage and in relating to an assembled audience beyond it.

In rhetorical theory, moral authority is indispensable to winning the assent of such audiences, so Aristotle understandably gives ethos priority among the three modes in modes of persuasion. But, Hauser has studied with its overlapping quality. Rhetoric and ethics are overlapped in human communication. Hauser writes,

Rhetoric and ethics overlap insofar as ethics studies the consequences of human choices . . . It is concerned exclusively with the interaction among thought-language-presentation-participants that occurs within the boundaries of a message, the options available to performers (rhetors) for managing this interaction in desired ways, and the consequences of the rhetors' choices. (33)

There is persuasion through character whenever the speech is given in such a way as to make the speaker worthy of credence for we believe fair-minded people to a greater extent and more quickly.

Rhetoric, generally and basically, is a mode of discourse that serves the purpose of reaching an agreement. At the beginning of the fiction, there is one witness woman, who has details of all incidents about the murder day. She does not have any high position but whatever she speaks, she only speaks about the truth and her words are reliable and trustworthy. She states:

I was coming to that presently. She was last seen and spoken to on the evening of Shrove Tuesday, at twenty minutes past five. She was then returning from Bougival with a basketful of purchases . . . for this reason; the two witnesses who furnished me with this fact, a woman named Tellier and a cooper who lives hard by, alighted from the omnibus which leaves Marly every hour, when they perceived the widow in the cross-road, and hastened to overtake her. They conversed with her and only left her when they reached the door of her own house. (6)

Her every word is purposefully used to convince her listener, who belongs to a higher authority. Her every word is true and she has the authority to speak them. Her role in the fiction belongs to the lower class as a minor character because, throughout the fiction, she never appears twice but the light she sheds at the beginning of the fiction validates her words throughout the fiction.

Rhetorical characters who hold the ethical values in this fiction, are concerned about bringing an argument in the logical ground with their moral values and ethos. Pere Tabaret is another powerful character who is an unofficial member of the French police and mentor of Lecoq. Tabaret is working for the identified firm. Tabaret considered making somebody else his heir, and but the conclusion of the case rendered such action impossible. He is a man of higher ethos and moral values although, at some places he is misled by the false pieces of evidence, he always turns back and provides justice to the victims. At the beginning of fiction, when he is called for observation, Tabaret says:

Who but I should have, by the sole exercise of observation and reason, established the whole history of the assassination? I must shift to the bottom all the particulars and arrange my ideas systematically before meeting him [the judge, M. Daburon, before whom Tabaret is presenting the case] again. (13)

His every word counts for his ethos and moral values. At some places, he shows the less moral and establishing low ethos but at some places, he stands as a pillar of moral values and ethos.

In the fiction, “The old fellow allows himself to be carried away to much by appearances. He has become an amateur detective for the sake of popularity, just like an author; and, as he is vainer than a peacock, he is apt to lose his temper and be very obstinate” (9). Here, Tabaret gesture shows the confidence in him. He does his job for

the sake of popularity. He pretends like he can explain everything on the instant. Tabaret has dragged the case in the wrong route but changed his mind in the later course and decides the alleged perpetrator is innocent and vows to bring the real criminal to justice. Tabaret is described as “the old amateur detective” he sharpens his mind in all his investigations. He uses plaster to cast a footprint, then to match to the suspect’s boot. Gevrol exclaimed about Tabaret “He is an extraordinary man! He was formerly a clerk at the Mont de Piete, but he is now a rich old fellow, whose real name is Tabaret. He goes in for playing the detective by the way of amusement” (8) here this shows that Tabaret’s real name was old Tiracular and later on he changed his name. Again Lecoq said that “No danger of that. He works so much for the glory of success that he often spends money from his pocket. It’s his amusement, you see! At the Prefecture, we have nicknamed him ‘Tiracular’ from a phrase he is constantly in the habit of repeating. Ah! He is sharp, the old weasel! It was he who in the case of the banker’s wife, you remember, guessed that the lady had robbed herself, and who proved it”(8). He is here a trustworthy character. He is loyal to his job and he does his job sincerely. These characteristics show the high ethos of Tabaret as Hauser describes, “Arguments are reasoned appeals based on evidence of fact and opinion that lead to a conclusion. Through arguments, rhetors attempt to provide an audience with a solid basis for holding a belief and coordinating actions with that belief” (103). More than this, Hauser claims:

Political science, sociology, history, management science, and psychology come readily to mind. . . In rhetorical transactions, this form of personal power is an important source of persuasion, commonly called ethos. Before we turn to ethos itself we should illustrate some problems in the way authority is understood in order to provide a context for understanding ethos. (146)

Ethos carries every knowledge and aspects of human life from political science to the psychology of a speaker. Tabaret is an old detective but possesses great knowledge and himself finds out his loop points to come back. He has each quality as Hauser describes. His speech at the murder place while investigating the scene, his every word carries his high knowledge in the related field. As he argues with Gevrol:

Have you examined the dead woman's finger-nails, M. Gevrol? No. Well, so, and then tell me whether I am mistaken . . . he wanted, what he sought, and what he found, were papers, documents, letters, which he knew to be in the possession of the victim. To find them, he overturned everything, upset the cupboards, unfolded the linen, broke open the secretary, of which he could not find the key, and even emptied the mattress of the bed. At last he found these documents. (16)

His each word carries his heart, his moral values, ethical beliefs, knowledge, experiences and so on through which he is able to convince everyone, who are present in the murder place. He has presented all details with proper evident to convince his audience as Kenneth Burke says:

Rhetorician is most effective if he can bring before the audience the actual evidence of hardship and injustice suffered. Thus, in proportion as “imagination” went up in the scale of motivational values, one might come to speak of an appeal to the imagination in many instances which classical theory might have treated as- persuasion by the appeals of pathos and ethos (appeals to “emotion” and by “character” or personality). (81)

Even Tabaret’s monologues consist of his ethos with proof. He murmurs all the time when he reached his room after seeing the murder scene of the Widow Lerouge. He murmurs, “The Widow knew the person who knocked. Her haste to open the door

gives rise to this conjecture; what follows proves it. The assassin then gained admission without difficulty. He is a young man, a little above the middle height, elegantly dressed. He wore on that evening a high hat” (15). His words are based on his assumptions but still hold his moral values, ethos, and credibility because it has truth and continuity which has visualized the scene and he holds the authority to do it.

Tabaret has proved Albert as a criminal at first but later on, realized his mistakes. In the review of *The Lerouge Case*, Kim writes, “Tabaret is an amateur sleuth, who ‘goes for playing to detective by way of amusement’ and this act of amusement has put one innocent soul to jail. He himself commits that, “Albert is innocent, and it is I who has cast suspicion upon him. It is I, fool that I am, who have infused into the obstinate spirit of this magistrate a conviction that I can no longer destroy. He is innocent and is yet enduring the most horrible anguish”

(128).Furthermore, he devoted himself to save him as accountable for his words, “I have ruined him: I will save him! I must, I will find the culprit; and he shall pay dearly for my mistake, the scoundrel!” (128).His moral values and beliefs cannot let him to

punish one innocent man. It is his ethos, which is coming out through his words. He is a man of truth and morality who can do anything to save his moral values and a an innocent person as he has done in the fiction.

There is one another character that is similar to Tabaret in the fiction and also adores Tabaret as his mentor, he is Lecoq. Lecoq is who always stands on his cultural ground with his ethos and logic to solve the mystery behind the murder and the murderer. In the fiction, Lecoq is described as “A smart fellow in his profession, crafty as a fox, and jealous of his chief, whose abilities he held in light estimation. His name was Lecoq” (5). He is actually clever as a fox that never missed any single

loophole in the fiction. He is dedicated towards his profession and shows accountability for his every single word come out from his mouth. He has worked together with Taberet and M. Daburon cooperatively. Although there is another character M. Gavrol, who is chief detective, he doesn't like Taberet and Lecoq and their point of view to see that murderous action. That's why he has gone on his own way to find out that suspected person, who is, later on, turns out to be the husband of the Widow Lerouge.

M. Daburon was the magistrate and he was also the investigator of that assassination. He has prepossessing appearance; sympathetic notwithstanding his coldness; wearing upon his countenance a sweet and rather sad expression. His pitch of tone is of middle tone. He talks in the same tone as he is the magistrate detective which shows their full textual, social and psychological context. He has given the complete description of the murderer. By looking the situation of murder, the commissary argues:

Oh! Oh! The poor devil was busy with her cooking when he struck her; see her pan of ham and eggs upon the hearth. The brute hadn't patience enough to wait for the dinner. The gentleman was in a hurry, he struck the blow fasting; therefore he can't invoke the gayety of dessert in the defense! (7)

This is evidence that shows the killer was in a hurry. The robbery was the motive of crime but he did not rob. The murderer of the widow lady was so clever that he made such circumstances where the character named Albert de Commrian was trapped in crime.

Albert de Commarin is presented very sympathetically in the fiction. He was involved unknowingly in the crime though he was innocent. The whole Commarin family appeared nobly carrying the high ethos and family values although they lacked

it at some places. He was innocent but all the proofs were against him. His crime was skipped over and whereas his daring escapes have dwelled on it exciting detailed. He is a central character of this fiction because fiction and justice always move around him throughout the fiction. Even his love towards the Mademoiselle d'Arlande (Claire) has shown his morality because when he purposed her, he is rejected by her but respectfully accepted her decision and supports her later on to save Albert. As he has committed with Claire, "Whatever may happen, remember that there is one unfortunate being in the world that belongs to you absolutely. If ever you have need of a friend's devotion, come to me, and come to your friend. Now it is over . . . I have courage. Claire, mademoiselle, for the last time, adieu!"(68). He has supported her staying within his boundaries, completing his duties. He has shown his higher ethos, credibility, values, respects, and morality. If he wants to punish Albert, he can misuse his power but he has taken the side of justice as his duty demands. His tone of language changes everytime because once he was talking side of Neol then Lecoq and at last he was regretting because the true killer was Neol.

Albert is laborious, patient, and acute, he knew with singular skill how to disentangle the skein of the most complicated affair. He is armed with an implacable logic as required by his position and family status. He is a man of high ethos with high morality although, at some places, he loses his morality and credibility at some places in the fiction. His specialty is his triumph, glory, a memory of faces, so prodigious as to exceed belief. The effect of higher ethos rubs off on the speaker communicator is that the speaker is in the midst of higher ethos. The impossibilities of place, the unlikelihood of circumstances, and the most incredible disguises will not lead him astray. The reason for this, so he pretends, is because he only looks at a man's eyes, without noticing any other features. In the line, "The difficulty he

experienced in uttering the first words had now given place to a dignified and proud demeanor. He expressed himself clearly and forcibly, without losing himself in those details which in serious matters needlessly defer the real point at issue” (85). He is the intellectual and philosophical character in this fiction. During his testimony his gesture, posture, eye-contact shows the truth in his each words and the tone was high and similar in whole fiction. Though he was victim in this fiction he was very calm and innocent.

Moreover, Albert is a statue of high ethos and moral values. Whatever happens, he never let his ethos and values to fall down. Even he knows that he is no more a legitimate son of M. de Commarin, he happily accepts that which can be seen in his conversation with the M. de Commarin, “Sir, on Sunday morning, a young man called here, stating that he had business with me of the utmost importance. I received him. He then revealed to me that I, alas! Am only your natural son, substituted through your affection, for the legitimate child borne you by Madame de Commarin” (85). He has listened to him and understand the condition what is he going to face but he does not have any idea, it all about Noel plotting against him.

A rhetorical analysis of ethos avoids trait ascriptions as qualities that communicators actually possess. According to Hauser, “A rhetorical analysis focuses on ethos as a judgment that is caused by the speech itself . . . Ethos is eventful in this respect, as is all rhetoric, occurring in the context of a response to a rhetorical demand” (158-159). In the fiction, Albert has expressed his feelings with the Count, “My duty, father, is very plain. Before your legitimate son, I ought to give way without a murmur, if not without regret. Let him come. I am ready to yield to him everything that I have so long kept from him without a suspicion of the truth—his father’s love, his fortune, and his name” (87). Each second he stands for justice and

his words provoke for justice.

Further, to convince M. de Commarin he has used emotionally and logically loaded words that have expressed logos and ethos both at the same time. He states, “Suppose for a moment that this young man has a soul sufficiently noble to relinquish his claim upon your rank and your fortune. Is there not now the accumulated rancor of years to urge him to oppose you? He cannot help feeling a fierce resentment for the horrible injustice of which he has been the victim” (88). In this speech, he has shown his true color of heart and purity of his soul pouring all his morality and credibility. In response to it, he has faced the anger of his father who has charged him with immoral words saying, “Cruel, ungrateful boy!” (91) But at the same time, he valorized his Albert decision because his cruel heart is already moved by Albert words of love and values. In M. de Commarin words, Albert is great, noble and generous. Moreover, each time, Albert has expressed the words with powerful ethos, logic, and values. He is trying to prove himself as his words count for it, “I am innocent” (125) which is repeatedly used by him. He has chosen to suffer inside the cell although he can expose the night meeting with Claire. He respects her love and prestige. Instead of exposing her, he suffers and waits for her.

Mademoiselle d'Arlange is a poor girl but her heart is purest and the truth is in her blood. She is ready to do everything to save his love. Without thinking about other and moral values of society, she has poured her heart in front of the Magistrate who has proposed her before although he is telling her to leave her efforts to save him. But, she has proved him with evidence. Her words with M. Daburon are so powerfully loaded with logic, enough shreds of evidence, truth, trust, and her ethos. She speaks very softly and sweetly in middle tone. As she states:

I was in despair, when nine o'clock struck. At the third stroke, Albert knocked.

. . he had to say admitted of no delay; that, during three days he had hesitated about confiding in me. . . . At last, he declared that he would climb over the wall. I begged him not to do so, fearing an accident. The wall is very high, as you know; the top is covered with pieces of broken glass, and the acacia branches stretch out above like a hedge. But he laughed at my fears, and said that, unless I absolutely forbade him to do so, he was going to attempt to scale the wall...He went back in the same manner, only with less danger, because I made him use the gardener's ladder, which I laid down alongside the wall when he had reached the other side. (160)

She has confessed all the details. This is a place where one woman can be proved as moral-less because she has revealed her relationship with a man but at the same time, this is the place which can be proved as morality, high ethos and as a speech of logic which spontaneously runs from her heart for her lover.

Moreover, Claire knows Albert; a person of his own moral values who respects her most even he has suffered in order to save her status. As she says, “It seems to me, sir that an honorable man cannot confess that he has obtained a secret interview from a lady, until he has full permission from her to do so. He ought to risk his life sooner than the honor of her who have trusted in him, but be assured Albert relied on me” (162). This is the truth and the center of the whole story to prove Albert innocent and still left the question if he is innocent then who is the culprit of the incident until Marie Pierre Lerouge who is a husband of The Widow Lerouge isn't introduced in the story.

Pierre is the person who is suspected at the beginning of the story on the basis of witnessing of one young boy who has seen him. A young boy is a minor character but his innocent heart has set the one track for the story to move on. As he speaks,

“Well, sir, I was passing when I saw this fat man at the gate. He appeared very much vexed, oh! But awfully vexed! His face was red, or rather purple, as far as the middle of his head, which I could see very well, for it was bare, and had very little hair on it” (10). Mr. Gevrol, a chief detective has gone behind to find him because he suspected him as a murderer. Pierre is a most loyal person in this fiction as he himself told me that I had never stood for the side of wrong and never let it happened.

Ethos is a caused response. It is developed through rhetor’s choices of inclusion and exclusion. Hauser examines, “how we appear to others depends on the choices we make in presenting our message and ourselves. We can guide interpretations of our mental, emotional, and moral dispositions by the ways we argue, including the language we select, the tone we take, and the nonverbal cues we present” (148-149). He is a person of high ethos and values although he falls in love and gets married to the wrong woman who never understood him. His honesty, loyalty, modest talk and revelation of sin act which never occurred, make him the man of high ethos. He has revealed the truth which was grounded from years. As he states:

She said to me, shaking her pocket full of money, 'See here, my man, we shall always have as much of this as ever we may want, and this is why: The count, who also had a legitimate child at the same time as this bastard, wishes that this one shall bear his name instead of the other; and this can be accomplished, thanks to me. . . We shall be put in the same room, and, during the night, I am to change the little ones, who have been purposely dressed alike. For this the count gives me eight thousand francs down, and a life annuity of a thousand francs. (181)

This long speech has revealed so many things at the same time, the high ethos of Pierre in contrast to the low ethos of the Widow Lerouge. He explains everything in

normal tone that was very effective and his gestures shows the behaviour of innocency.

Rhetoric focuses on symbol and persuasive forms of language. Hauser has claimed, “The special focus of rhetorical theory is on the use of symbolic forms, especially persuasive appeals, to engender social action . . . rhetoric achieves its finished artful form in the actual performance of a communicative transaction” (12). Pierre’s higher ethos, moral values, authority to speak, witnessing of the scenario, and the way of speaking has achieved the successful communicative transaction. He further pulls the thread of plot one by one of the story:

I was so choked with rage. . . . The count is the only one who wants this change made; and he is the one that's to pay for it. His mistress, this little one's mother, doesn't want it at all . . . She added that, if I would agree not to change the children, and not to tell the count, she would give me ten thousand francs down, and guarantee me an annuity equal to the one the count had promised me. . . . That, sir, is word for word what Claudine said to me. (182)

Claudine has proposed the villainous act to perfume to an honest man which he is unable to bare at first. Not to let it happened, he had not resolved his sight as performing role of an honest man. “As Claire was half-rising to depart, M. Daburon detained her by a gesture” (157) Her low tone suspected by M. Daburon which was not trustworthy.

Creativity is an act of symbolic expression. As an act, it is eventful because it occurs at a particular time and place. He is continuously speaking using symbols, and moral values to persuade others. At some places, he has stopped and asks for other opinions and moves on. He states:

I kept him all the evening on my knees, and to be all the surer, I tied my

handkerchief about his waist. Ah! The plan had been well laid. . . . The innkeeper said that the two nurses might sleep in one room, and Germain and me in the other . . . I knew very well that I was doing wrong; and I almost wished myself dead. Why is it that woman can turn an honest man's conscience about like a weather-cock with their wheedling? (182)

An honest man is pouring his heart what is hidden there from the years. Rhetorical participants respond to each other to find out, responses are fitting with each other or not. In Hauser's opinion, "The rhetorical participants responding to each other make fitting responses as they address the issue in terms of the question it poses and the points for decision in resolving the question" (133). While speaking, Pierre is consciously checking other's responses and understanding to him.

As communication deals collectively with our common problems, a rhetorical theory must account for the influence of emotions, ethics, values, interests, and level of trust in addition to reason. With carrying his emotions, ethics and values, he further speaks:

Towards midnight, I heard Claudine moving. I held my breath. She was getting out of bed. Was she going to change the children? Now, I knew that she was not; then, I felt sure that she was. . . I spoke in a loud voice . . . Not knowing what I was doing, I drew from my pocket a long Spanish knife, which I always carried, and seizing the cursed bastard, I thrust the blade through his arm, crying, "This way, at least, he can't be changed without my knowing it; he is marked for life!" (183)

He had stopped the plotting nearly killing one child and never let the exchange happens. Hauser argues, "Ethos is not a thing or a quality but an interpretation that is the product of speaker-audience interaction," (147) which are well conducted and

visible in Pierre's speech because ethos is dynamic and eventful, its rhetorical presence depends on how arguments and appeals are managed, how the ingredients of needs and perceptions are included in interpreting a rhetor's character through the give and take of a rhetorical exchange. Unknowingly, he has revealed the murderer and his motive behind the assassination. It was none other than Noel, who is using Lerouge and Valerie letters to get the property of M. de Commarin and his status simply to get the girl Juliette. He has burned those letters which proved that exchange did not happen and kept those which had shown the possible exchange.

Noel Gerdy is a noble and intelligent man. He has large black eyes and black hair which curled naturally. He is an obstinate worker, cold and meditative, though devoted to his profession, a great rigidity of principle and a trustworthy manner. Ethos has a reality for us as a result of our discourse about it rather than as a quality or an attribute that a person possesses, such as weight or height. Martin Priestman has studied about the crime fictions and their characters where same person can have the high and low life. He finds out,

Critics of Newgate fiction developed its mixing of high and low life characters and the combining of high and low class characteristics in single character.

They objected mixed motives and mixed morality, preferring the security of a moral universe in which the good and bad, the criminal and the law abiding are readily identifiable as such. (50)

Noel has exact characteristics of this mixed morality and mixing of high and low life characters. Although he seems decent and gentle, he has the most corrupt heart and clever mind that does not hold any significant ethos, weight, and height. In Aristotle's view, "Concept of pathos is in fact exactly complementary to that of ethos, for it comprises all emotions, vehement ones as well as gentle gentle ones such as

sympathy. Whereas, sympathy is no part of ethos. It is therefore not omitted but belongs to the department of pathos” (qtd in Wisse, 34). Lecoq is master of the art in the ground of pathos who easily persuades other through his emotionally charged language.

Noelis adept at commanding personal resources of thought, strategy, and language to give ideas effective expression. Most of the time, he used words of emotion and tries to persuade others but deep down his words, his fallen ethos relies on. Rhetoric is conscious because it is a way of planning talk or writing and executing the plan in order to accomplish human goals and he has well used it. While talking with Mr. Tabaret, he opens the secret about the Commarin family showing his relationship with them. He argues,

Yes, she pretended she could show me I was wrong. It was easy, was it not, with the proofs I held against her? The fact is she adores her son, and her heart is breaking at the idea that he may be obliged to retribute what he has stolen from me. And I, idiot, fool, coward, almost wished not to mention the matter to her. I said to myself, I will forgive, for after all she has loved me! Loved?
(38)

Intensely, he is trying to convince Mr. Tabaret towards his proofs of his origin because he knows the link of Tabaret with police and intently trying to divert them towards the Albert without letting Tabaret know about his secret connection with police is no more secret to Noel. To show himself innocent and descent, he further adds his words as pretending like he is a pure soul who doesn't want to harm anyone. He states:

Oh! I did not decide on doing so all at once. At first my discovery almost drove me mad. Then I required time to reflect. A thousand opposing

sentiments agitated me. At one moment, my fury blinded me; the next, my courage deserted me. I would, and I would not. I was undecided, uncertain, and wild. The scandal that must arise from the publicity of such an affair terrified me. I desired. I still desire to recover my name that much is certain. But on the eve of recovering it, I wish to preserve it from stain. I was seeking a means of arranging everything, without noise, without scandal. (38)

His long speech is able to convince Tabaret but his language does not show any moral values and ethos. He has low ethos which is easily shown in his tone of language.

Noel is a real son of Madame Gerdy as he has scars in his hand to prove it which is given by Pierre in his childhood. His gesture and posture shows an intellectual crime-minded man. His every act shows that his character is with low ethos. Ethos is a dynamic process that is developed through the way we talk.

Reactions change moment by moment as audiences receive with pleasure, uncertainty, amusement, fear, agreement, and so forth the specific reasoning and exhortations that comprise the whole of a rhetorical transaction. Only by understanding this process of interactive engagement can we appreciate the essential character of ethos as a social construct, as an interpretation developed through give-and-take, as an event rather than an entity. But Noel does not possess any of these qualities. For instance, his words to Tabaret about the Widow Lerouge in his study room. He utters, “She was the slave of Madame Gerdy, devoted to her in every way! She would have sacrificed herself for her at a sign from her hand” (27) although she is a nurse. He is criticizing a woman who once takes care of him. This is nothing in front of his deepest cruel monster.

Although he knows the truth of his real identity, he has presented himself as an unfortunate man criticizing his own mother for his situation. In his words:

I, who loved this woman, who knew not how to show my affection for her, who, for her sake, sacrificed my youth! How she must have laughed at me! Her infamy dates from the moment when for the first time she took me on her knees; and, until these few days past, she has sustained without faltering her execrable role. Her love for me was nothing but hypocrisy!” (29)

He is ready to do whatever for to getting money and a girl, on whom he has already spent his all money. Even he has rejected her mother and is trying to pretend that he still loves her. He has feared that if he doesn't have money, she will leave him. His fear converts him as a murderer, a killer and at last leads to the suicide. Juliette is a girl, who wants his love and care but their love life has no ethos and values as they have seen each other as a means to fulfill their desire. On the other hand, love between Albert and Claire has a high ethos and moral values where they are ready to do anything for each other.

Juliette is a modern blond beauty who truly loves Noel but hides her feelings. Noel is unable to understand her love and granted her a girl who goes for money. In another word, Juliette also takes him as a person who runs for beauty. She is a minor character of the fiction that does not possess any significant ethos and moral values. There is one contrast; she is the one who unknowingly revealed the murder of the crime and the place where possible evidence to prove criminal can be found with Tabaret. In her words, “Last Tuesday, we went to the theatre! He hired an entire box. But do you think that he sat in it with me? Not at all. He slipped away and I saw no more of him the whole evening” (196). Furthermore, she adds, “No. At the end of the play, towards midnight, he deigned to reappear. We had arranged to go to the masked ball at the Opera and then to have some supper” (196). Her sad love story reveals everything. Her words do not have any remarkable ethos and quality, still, they

carried the truth which is valid and credible.

There are some other minor characters, some of them have a high ethos and some of them don't possess any powerful ethos and moral values. In this fiction, there are two policemen, who have arrested Albert to fulfill their duty. The Widow Lerouge herself, a central character without any significance words, but presented as moral-less and ethos less character. Manette and Joseph are minor characters (servants) who are sincere in their duty and hold loyal values.

However, different characters are lead as their role in the fiction; Gaboriau is able to give justice to his characters in terms of their language. Their language and way of communication has created and shown their real identity as well as changing personality. The special focus of rhetorical use is on the use of symbolic forms, especially persuasive appeals, to engender social action. Its subject matter includes the techniques of managing symbols as well as what transpire through their management in a rhetorical transaction. What types of morality and values they possess is reflected through their choice of words and way of communicating with each other. Rhetorical communication occurs whenever one person engages another in an exchange of symbols to accomplish some goal and Gaboriau's characters have well accomplished that.

Indeed, rhetoric is a symbolic means of inducing cooperation and plays the vital role to establish successful conversation. Consequently, a rhetorical perspective toward social action is not only concerned with the act of social bonding through the cooperative exchange but also with how such acts are induced. We typically think that rhetorical communication requires common ground, and the factors listed could work against the consensus on values, principles, interests, or ends which carries the ethos in characters. In *The Lerouge Case*, characters belong to different profession and

class, which is indirectly seen in their rhetorical use. Some of them use highly rhetorical language with different symbols showing their high ethos although some of them possess language of low ethos according to their background and motif. Far from this, some characters have changeable ethos, which changes according to their situation. Moreover, these inducements are symbolic in characters and represent their nature.

Works Cited

- Bell, David F. "Reading Corpses: Interpretive Violence." *Substance*, vol. 27, no. 2, 1998, pp. 92–105. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3685652.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. California University Press, 1960.
- Gaboriau, Emile. *The Lerouge Case*. Esprios Digital Publishing, 1950.
- Goulet, Andrea. *Legacies of the Rue Morgue: Science, Space, and crime Fiction in France*. Pennsylvania Up, 2016, pp. 295-297.
- Hauser, Gerard A. *Introduction to Rhetorical Theory*. Waveland Press, 2002. Print.
- Kim. Review of *The Lerouge Case* by Emile Gaboriou in 1866.
https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/3320955-the-lerouge-case?fbclid=IwAR2xEBFm407HeI8EHBHwmM3fnN5RxERYEF5K8N_Mdwmlt3F3IMpNXdA1DH4.
- Kriszner, Laurie G, Stephen R.Mandell. *Literature: Reading, Reacting, Writing*. Heinle&heinle, 2000.
- Longaker, Mark Garrett, Jeffrey Walker. *Rhetorical Analysis: A Brief Guide for Writers*. Longman Publication, 2011.
- Lunsford Andrea A. and John J. Ruskiewicz. *Everything is an Argument*. Bedford/St. Martin's press, 2007.
- Nancy Oakes. "19th Century Mystery/Crime Fiction". <http://www.crimesegments.com/2017/09/the-widow-lerouge-by-emile-gaboriau.html>
- Priestman, Martin. *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction*. Cambridge Press, 2003. www.cambridge.org/9780521803991.
- Scaggs, John. *Crime Fiction New Critical Idiom*. Taylor & Francis Routledge, 2005.
- Thomas, Drew R. "Review on *the L’Affaire Lerouge*". <https://www.worlds-best->

detective-crime-and-murder-mystery-books.com/thewidowlerouge-
article.html.

Wisse, Jakob. *Ethos and Pathos from Aristotle to Cicero*. Adolf M. Hakkert
Publisher, 1989.