Politics-Debates-Concepts
Politik-Debatten-Begriffe
| 3

Kari Palonen

From Oratory to Debate

Parliamentarisation of Deliberative Rhetoric in Westminster

Nomos

Politics-Debates-Concepts
Politik-Debatten-Begriffe

Edited by

PD Dr. Claudia Wiesner
Prof. Dr. Kari Palonen

Volume 3

Kari Palonen

From Oratory to Debate

Parliamentarisation of Deliberative Rhetoric in Westminster

Nomos

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de

ISBN 978-3-8487-2913-5 (Print)
978-3-8452-7296-2 (ePDF)

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-8487-2913-5 (Print)
978-3-8452-7296-2 (ePDF)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Palonen, Kari
From Oratory to Debate
Parliamentarisation of Deliberative Rhetoric in Westminster
Kari Palonen
262 p.
Includes bibliographic references and index.

ISBN 978-3-8487-2913-5 (Print)
978-3-8452-7296-2 (ePDF)

1. Edition 2016

Acknowledgements

This book can be traced back to my Academy of Finland Professorship project *The Politics of Dissensus. Parliamentarism, Rhetoric and Conceptual History* (2008-2012, see https://www.jyu.fi/ytk/laitokset/yfi/en/old-research/clusters/dissensus). The project and its wider research environment were probably the most inspiring one during my academic career. It provoked us to detect all kinds of new aspects of the seemingly dry topic of parliamentary politics, not restricted to parliaments in the narrow sense. Now I notice that a growing number of publications and conferences around parliaments can be found on the agenda of scholarly debates, as if we would have been precursors of a new trend. I also find that the concept of dissensus has been increasingly recognised as an inherent part of the parliamentary style of politics.

Initially I had an over-ambitious plan to write a conceptual history of parliamentarism, including its governmental, rhetorical and conceptual aspects. A main inspiration was the insight that the Westminster procedure of debates had served as the historical model for Max Weber's radical reinterpretation of 'objectivity' (see Palonen 2010). I collected a great number of parliament- and rhetoric-related texts available online, combined with library visits, above all in Cambridge and Freiburg, where, thanks to the invitation of Jörn Leonhard, I served as a Visiting Fellow at FRIAS, School of History, in winter 2009.

In the course of the project I split my plan to two books on parliamentary politics. The first was *The Politics of Parliamentary Procedure,* studying the formation of Westminster procedure from interpretative and commenting tracts (Palonen 2014b). This volume adds to it a discussion of debates as key moment of parliamentary politics in rhetorical literature.

I am strongly indebted to a number of mainly younger scholars. The core project team – Tapani Turkka, Taru Haapala, Hanna-Mari Kivistö – was complemented by those funded in the project, or the support of the University of Jyväskylä for Academy Professorships, by a short-term basis – Anna Björk, Anna Kronlund, Jussi Kurunmäki, Anthoula Malkopoulou, Onni Pekonen, Suvi Soininen and Tuula Vaarakallio – the wider circle around the team – Ratih D. Adiputri, Marie-Christine Boilard, Sarita Friman-Korpela, Teemu Häkkinen, Pasi Ihalainen, Hanna Kallio, Raija-

Leena Loisa, Tuija Parvikko, Kyösti Pekonen, Evgeny Roshchin, Claudia Wiesner as well as Anitta Kananen as a coordinator. To this I add the cooperation with José María Rosales's 'network projects' *Democracy and Rhetoric* and *The Civic Constellation* – including the Málaga colleagues Rosario López, Marta Postigo and Manuel Toscano. These projects have until this date produced a number of dissertations and edited volumes with a varying constellation of authors included (Soininen and Turkka eds. 2008; Wiesner, Turkka and Palonen eds. 2011; Palonen and Malkopoulou eds. 2011; Rosales and Toscano eds. 2012; Haapala and Vaarakallio eds. 2013; Palonen, Rosales and Turkka eds. 2014; Palonen and Rosales eds. 2015; Soininen and Vaarakallio eds. 2015; Ihalainen, Ilie and Palonen eds. 2016) as well as books or articles of individual authors in refereed journals. I use also this occasion to thank the contributors to an unexpected *Festschrift* at the occasion of my turn to *emeritus* last January (Wiesner, Roshchin and Boilard eds. 2015). The cooperation will continue in the TRACE (*Transformation of Concepts and Institutions in Europe*) project of the Finnish Distinguished Professor Niilo Kauppi, whom we managed to recruit from Strasbourg to Jyväskylä (see https://www.jyu.fi/ytk/laitokset/yfi/en/research/projects/political-instituitions/trace).

I am also indebted to a number of senior colleagues. Frank Ankersmit and Nadia Urbinati wrote the reports in favour of the project application to the Academy of Finland. Quentin Skinner served among others as referee for the book series provoking revisions of the first and last chapter. The discussions with Pantelis Bassakos, Hubertus Buchstein, the late Michael Th. Greven, Cornelia Ilie, Markku Peltonen, Tuija Pulkkinen (and other *Redescriptions* editors), Willibald Steinmetz, Henrik Stenius and Vasileios Syros inspired this work in different ways. Claudia Wiesner persuaded me to include this volume to our Nomos book series.

Helsinki and Jyväskylä, October 2015

Kari Palonen

Table of Contents

Oratory is the discussion of a subject by one; debate is the discussion of a subject by more than one. Oratory considers the subject from one point of view; debate considers the subject from two or more opposed points of view.
(James De Mille 1878, 471)

1. Rhetoric as political action

In the quoted passage, the Canadian professor of rhetoric James De Mille (1830–1880) illustrates two perspectives on rhetoric as a form of political action. Rhetoric as a political action refers always to speaking *pro et contra*, which, however, can be understood from two different angles, namely those of oratory and debate.

1.1 Oratory and debate as forms of rhetoric

The two forms of rhetoric may always be related to each other: debate is an occasion in which oratorical competence may be manifested, and oratory can be understood as an intervention in one or more debates. Nonetheless, De Mille has a point in separating the two genres. The basic units of oratory are single speeches, which despite being a part of debate, are judged by different criteria. In the case of debate, we are interested in the art of confrontation between opposed points of view. The ideal orator is an artist; the ideal debater is a politician.

This contrast provides the starting point for this study. Existing 'rhetoric and politics' studies remain almost exclusively focused on oratory, without giving debate a position in its own right. This holds even for expositions of the deliberative genre, which is explicitly oriented towards *pro et contra* debate. Questions such as what constitutes a debate, what kinds of procedures regulate it, what kinds of rhetorical means are appropriate in it and what criteria can be used to judge its quality, are rarely asked in rhetorical studies. Even when using parliamentary examples of eloquence, an inherent connection of debate with the parliamentary form of politics in which debate is the main thing and the oratorical qualities subordinated to it, is rather an exception than a rule.

Indeed, there exist no thematically focused histories of either parliamentary rhetoric or parliamentary debate, not even when limited to certain countries or time periods, although interest has grown of late (see Ilie ed. 2010, de Galembert et al. ed., 2014 or Toye 2014). Proksch's and Shapin's recent book *The Politics of Parliamentary Debate* (2014) also deals rather with inter-party controversies in parliaments.

Rhetorical studies tend to show little interest in parliamentary politics, while parliamentary studies, for their part, tend to underplay the rhetorical substratum of parliamentarism. In this volume, I take steps towards a study of parliamentarisation viewed in terms of the rhetoric of debate. My aims are limited. I am not studying actual parliamentary debates themselves, but distinct thematisations of them in rhetorical genres of writing. My discussion is restricted to the historically paradigmatic Westminster-related context of parliamentary politics, roughly speaking from the mid-eighteenth century to World War II.

It is my thesis that parallel to the parliamentarisation of British political culture we can speak of a tendency in which oratory is replaced by debate in parliamentary rhetoric. How, when, in what situations and text and by whom has this parliamentarisation of rhetoric taken place? This requires a detailed analysis, to which I offer some contributions in this volume.

The book is a sequel to my *The Politics of Parliamentary Procedure: The formation of Westminster procedure as a parliamentary ideal type* (Palonen 2014b). Parliamentary procedure is inherently linked to debate, to its agenda-setting and to the regulation of its practices. In this volume I will move from the study of procedural tracts to an analysis of a broader genre of parliament-related reflections on the rhetoric of parliamentary debate.

As with my procedure volume, this book corresponds to the research agenda of a Max Weber scholar. The parliamentary quality of procedure and of debate refers to historical ideal types, for which Westminster parliamentary politics provides the best historical approximation. In this volume I use writings on rhetoric as sources of thematisation and interpretation of a parliamentary ideal type of politics, conceptualising the rhetoric of debate as a specifically parliamentary modification of the deliberative genre.

This ideal-typical research agenda has, as in *The Politics of Parliamentary Procedure,* an important qualification. Although I analyse sources that refer to the Westminster parliament, the subject matter is not the British parliament or its history. Rather than a rhetorical perspective on parliamentarisation, the topic concerns the rhetoric of debate as shaped by parliamentary rules of procedure and parliamentary government. This book aims therefore at a reinterpretation of the parliamentary type of politics, its formation and its modifications, using the Westminster parliament as its exemplary model.

As in my procedure book, the topic is for the most part studied not through 'real' debates, but through 'intermediary' sources, in this case rhetorical writings on Westminster parliamentary debate. Such intermediary sources, while they have no claim to being exhaustive or fully representative, can offer us a manageable sample of the transition from oratorical to debate criteria in the evaluation of parliamentary speaking.

1.2 The singularity of parliamentary debate

Besides separating oratory from debate, James De Mille's *Elements of Rhetoric* also singles out what distinguishes 'parliamentary' debate from mere 'controversy'. De Mille never gives a precise interpretation of controversial debate, but illustrates it as follows:

> Controversy still flourishes, and must continue to do so while the human mind is active and energetic. Science affords as great a field for this as religion; and the disputes that rage about the one are as eager, as bitter, and as uncompromising as those of the other. In politics is found the most familiar sphere of controversy, for every country has its political parties, who contend through the medium of the press. These show that the *odium theologicum* which was once supposed peculiar to religion, is merely that odium which belongs to human nature, and is felt against all who differ in opinion on any point from ourselves. (De Mille 1878, 472)

Controversies are thus disputes between persons or groups rather than over subject matter, and there is no explicit procedure for the conduct. The case is different with parliamentary debate: "The peculiarity of parliamentary debate is that the subject to be examined is presented in a formal statement, called a resolution, or question, to which alone the discussion must refer." (ibid.) The parliamentary genre is based on a strict separation and succession of items on the agenda; the items must be deliberated one by one and in a certain order.

De Mille separates debate from discussion; in the latter, viewpoints are not 'contrary', but merely 'different'. Discussion is a debate suited more to meetings of persons associating for a purpose other than debate, whereas in parliament, contrary perspectives are the expected norm and controversies continue until 'the question is put'. A parliamentarian may raise a debate on procedure in the middle of another member's speech by asking whether the speech is related to the actual 'matter' on the agenda. This illustrates the debt to rhetorical tradition, as opposed to such normative theories which regard agreement upon the question as a necessary

condition of a debate. For De Mille the distinctive quality of parliamentary debate is, on the contrary, the presence of opposed points of view:

> The aim of parliamentary debate is to investigate the subject from many points of view which are presented from two contrary sides. In no other way can a subject be so exhaustively considered. (ibid. 473)

This concise formulation demonstrates an excellent understanding of the procedural character of parliamentary politics. It expresses the precise conceptual and historical link between parliament and rhetoric, between the political form of parliamentary debate and the rhetorical view of knowledge. Strictly speaking, we can detect three components to parliamentary debate: the motion on the agenda to be debated; the presentation of multiple perspectives as a precondition for understanding a motion's possible strengths and weaknesses; and a pro-and-con debate on the motion between members. The necessity to judge motions from opposed points of view is a conceptual precondition of parliamentary procedure itself, and when the points of view at hand do not suffice, possible objections to the motion are imagined and invented in order to understand the issue thoroughly, although hardly 'exhaustively'.

De Mille clearly recognises the novelty of the form of parliamentary debate; he also recognises its procedural forms as originating in Westminster:

> The form of parliamentary debate is modern. It was created and developed in England. It was born in the English Parliament, and has spread thence to other parliaments, and also to other public assemblies which have no connection with politics. So useful is it that it is employed even where there is no debate proper, but only discussion; where speakers agree upon the question, and consider it, not from contrary, but from different points of view. This is illustrated by the 'speeches to the question' at the meeting of any society. (ibid. 472–473)

My procedure book (2014b, esp. 31–38) attests the origins of a distinct parliamentary form of debate to the creation of procedural tracts in the late sixteenth century (Thomas Smith, John Hooker and William Lambarde) and seventeenth century (Henry Elsynge, Sr., William Hakewill, Henry Scobell). De Mille understands the wider political significance of parliamentary debate.

> A parliamentary debate, when carried on by able men, is one of the finest exhibitions of the powers of the human mind that can be witnessed. We see well-informed and well-trained intellects turning all their powers to the discussion of a subject from many points of view, in which two opposite

> forces struggle for the victory. In such a struggle all the highest intellectual forces are put forth. We encounter broad and deep knowledge, quick apprehension, argumentative power, great command of language, together with all the resources of wit, humor, and pathos; the sharpness of epigrammatic statement, the vehemence of denunciation, the keenness of the quick retort, sharp repartee, or biting sarcasm. (ibid. 473)

For De Mille parliamentary debate is an ideal-typical expression of civilised dissensus. As such it may be a measure of the art and degree of parliamentary qualities in an assembly, a gauge of how far and in what respects they may deviate from the ideal type. In the 'parliamentary view of knowledge' (see Palonen 2010 on Weber) debate and dissensus are revaluated as the finest achievement of the British parliamentary culture.

In this volume De Mille's remarks serve not only as an historical expression of the singularity of parliamentary debate, but as the core of my research programme for studying the conceptualisation of parliamentary rhetoric in terms of debate.

There exist a growing number of historical studies dealing with British parliamentary rhetoric, eloquence and oratory (e.g. Mulvihill 2004, Bevis 2007, Reid 2012, Peltonen 2013). These studies (with the partial exception of Toye 2014) have dealt mainly with 'rhetoric in parliament', not with the 'parliamentary form of deliberative rhetoric' let alone the 'parliamentarisation of deliberative rhetoric'. In contrast, my focus to analyse how parliamentary politics with its procedural, temporal and other presuppositions have contributed to a shift from 'art of oratory in parliament' to the 'debate as the parliamentary form of politics'.

1.3 Aims, questions and sources

The main aim of this book lies in reconnecting the parliamentary vision of politics with a historical study on the parliamentarisation of the deliberative genre of rhetoric. This volume connects the parliamentary theory of politics with different types of rhetoric-related writing that deal with the British parliament as the main focus. The study takes up both rhetorical writings' contribution to an understanding of parliamentary debate as a subgenre of deliberative rhetoric and the significance of the parliamentarisation of rhetoric for our understanding of the singularity of parliamentary politics.

More specifically, I deal with the following questions of parliamentary scholars: How has the distinct parliamentary quality of the rhetoric of

debate been identified and conceptualised among writers on parliament and rhetoric who use the British parliament as their point of reference? How have the procedural and other political changes in nineteenth-century Westminster altered the conceptualisation of the parliamentary forms of debate and their political significance? What does the parliamentarisation of rhetoric in terms of debate mean for parliamentary politics as practised in Westminster and beyond?

For the study of political rhetoric the following questions are discussed: How does the addition of the parliamentary criterion of debate give a new tone to the deliberative genre of rhetoric? How have the writers on rhetoric understood the modifications of the parliament, its procedures and political practices, their role for the deliberative genre of rhetoric and for the form and quality of political debate?

Below I shall take up different subgenres of rhetorical writing on British parliament and their attempts to parliamentarise the deliberative genre. These questions are dealt in different kinds on writings on parliament and rhetoric. In other words, I study aspects of the self-understanding the interpreters and practitioners of parliamentary rhetoric and politics, as expressed in the different subgenres. However, my primary audience is not that of historians or 'school rhetoricians', but rather historically oriented political theorists and scholars of parliamentarism and political rhetoric.

My central analytical tool for studying the programmes of parliamentary rhetoric lies in making a distinction between parliamentary *outsiders and insiders* among the writers on rhetoric. Taking Quentin Skinner's insight that "the political life itself sets the problems for the political theorist" (Skinner 1978, I, xi) as the point of departure, we might ask whether, just as political agents may lose the theoretical commitments involved in their activity, political theorists may lose the point of the very political life that they study.

Parliamentary outsiders might have a better understanding than the agents themselves because they look at the phenomena from a distance that enables them to avoid the blindness of the insiders towards their own activity. Thus, outsiders may be in a position to understand some aspects of it better than the agents do themselves. Conversely, the outsiders are bound to vocabularies and traditions that present obstacles for their understanding of some unprecedented and unexpected phenomena, since they tend to use old classifications.

The strength of the *parliamentary insiders* – including members, staff, journalists and scholars – is to know by hearth the very distinct parliamentary rules and practices as well as the parliamentary concepts that either do not exist elsewhere or have a different sense than the same words in the everyday language (see Palonen 2012c). It is well known that for new members of parliament, even if they may experienced party activists or election campaigners, the parliamentary learning takes time and includes some unlearning of some of their previous habits.

The study is based on a selection of sources from writers and political agents with different backgrounds and different interpretations and evaluations of the parliamentarisation of rhetoric. The aim is to provide a number of examples in order to discuss the concept from several interconnected but differing angles. The coordinating principle remains the political strength of the parliamentary variety of deliberative rhetoric in Westminster.

In the selection of sources, I have not used one single type of corpus. Besides using the cross-references in the primary sources and scholarly literature, I have first identified a number of subgenres of rhetorical literature, such as advice-books, speech collections, introductions to rhetoric and oratory as well as debate manuals. Especially among the numerous introductions to rhetoric I simply selected those to my corpus, in which the search option made it visible that parliament has been frequently thematised. Conversely, among the writings of parliamentary insiders I looked for those, who thematise debate, eloquence, oratory or rhetoric. In thematic terms I focus on two major parliamentary theorists and a few selections of real parliamentary debates, in which the rules and conditions of debate itself have been at the focus.

1.4 The parliamentary variety of deliberative rhetoric

Rhetorical genres are applied as the main interpretative tools in this volume. To the three classical genres of deliberative, forensic and epideictic rhetoric I have added a fourth, the rhetoric of negotiation (see Palonen 2010b, chap. 2). It can be seen as a borderline case of deliberative rhetoric in which a fixed number of parties confront each other over the same but mutually exclusive aims. Diplomacy between governments is the historical paradigm of negotiation situations, and I shall use this as well as the rhetoric of ‘conferences’ between parliamentary chambers (see Hatsell

1818, vol. 3), coalition governments as well as negotiations between parties in the labour market.

Parliamentary rhetoric is a historically powerful example of deliberative rhetoric. The interesting question is the change that the parliament has brought deliberative rhetoric, when compared with the deliberations practised in popular assemblies, in the Roman Senate and in medieval representative assemblies. As De Mille notes, the distinct parliamentary subgenre of deliberative rhetoric was first developed in Westminster. The studies on early modern English rhetoric (Mack 2002, 2008; Colclough 2005; Peltonen 2007, 2013) still tend to analyse parliamentary speeches and debates without seriously considering how the parliament itself, with its procedures, practices and political constellations, has modified the criteria for evaluating deliberative rhetoric. These questions have also not been thoroughly taken up in linguistic-based volumes on parliamentary rhetoric (see e.g. Bayley ed. 2004, Ilie ed. 2010).

One criterion for distinguishing 'parliamentary rhetoric' from 'rhetoric in parliament' lies in the relationship between genres of rhetoric. In parliaments there are also epideictic aspects in rituals and ceremonies as well as acclamation aspects that insist on the need for unity in parliament. The Westminster parliament was long called The High Court of Parliament, and the court-like character is crucial for some of its of proceedings, above all for the Speaker as a referee who interprets the rules of procedure. Negotiations also play a prominent role in parliamentary agreements between parties or between government and opposition. Such elements might strengthen or weaken the deliberative core of parliamentary rhetoric depending on whether they remain complementary or begin to compete with the deliberative aspect. In this volume, however, I am only interested in the deliberative genre of parliamentary rhetoric.

What makes an assembly a parliament? De Mille refers to the idea that procedure makes parliamentary debate not merely an expected, but an institutionalised activity. A motion on the parliamentary agenda requires a thorough and fair debate on its pros and cons through a systematic confrontation between alternative points of view, presenting perspectives that require a re-evaluation of the motion's strengths and weaknesses. This dissensual aspect is the decisive factor in distinguishing the parliamentary from other forms of deliberative rhetoric. To this other aspects may be added, such as the rise of a new parliamentary vocabulary (cf. Palonen 2012c).

A parliament can deal solely with questions that are set as items on its agenda in definite regulated forms. A crucial rule concerns the separation between items, speeches, speakers and allotted times: "Only one topic will be under consideration at any one time, and only one person at a time will be speaking" (Brewer 1916, 291). The separateness implies the discreteness of the subject matters and the order and irreversibility of agenda items in time. The matters may be more specific – for example, legislation to regulate candidacy in parliamentary elections or a government's declaration on a current foreign policy issue – but it is the Speaker and the House itself that decides whether a member is 'speaking to the matter' or not. Such rules and conventions give to a debate its 'parliamentary' attribute.

The term 'unparliamentary' refers to violations of the tacit practices and conventions of respect for other members and the parliament itself. It allows the parliamentarians to distinguish to hold radically different political views while maintaining mutual respect for fellow parliamentarians as persons as a key characteristic of parliamentary politics. By excluding such turmoil and guaranteeing freedom of speech and freedom from arrest (parliamentary immunity) for members, the parliament enlarges the range of political dissensus. In other words, 'parliamentary' refers not only to explicit rules, but also to tacit principles of how to act in a parliamentary manner, above all, in accordance with the principle of fair play (see Campion 1958).

In addition, parliament operates with the politics of time (see Palonen 2014b, chaps. 5 and 6). This is above all due to the multi-stage concept of parliamentary debating, including the three readings, the interchange between the House and the committee form of debates, and the different regulations for the different types of debate. The difference between House and committee in Westminster, is temporal in the sense of alternation between the types of deliberations: in the House a member shall speak to a motion only once, whereas in the committee no such limit exist. Interrupting the ordinary course of debates as well as moving amendments and adjournments are main political instruments in the struggle between members over parliamentary time (see e.g. Campion 1958).

The tension between spending and saving time form another aspect of the parliamentary politics of time. An amount of time is consciously reserved for deliberation from opposite angles. However, parliamentary time is always scarce, and an inherent part of parliamentary procedure concerns how to limit the use of time in a fair and appropriate manner,

enabling debate on all aspects of the item and offering all members a chance to speak on it, while avoiding waste of time. In the course of the nineteenth century, the debates over the 'parliamentary calendar' became the focus of procedural controversies (on the concept of *fair* in the 1882 procedure reform debates, see Palonen 2014a).

1.5 The story of parliamentarisation

The second chapter of the volume discusses briefly 'rhetoric in parliament' for the period leading up to 1640, as described by existing studies, above all, those by Peter Mack and Markku Peltonen. They follow Quentin Skinner's thesis on 'Renaissance rhetorical culture' (Skinner 1996) in assuming continuity with the ancient forms of rhetoric.

In parliament the rhetorical culture persisted beyond the decline of academic rhetoric. There exist hardly any studies that assess parliamentary debates in Westminster in a broad historical perspective. An exception is, however, D.H. Hegewisch's *Geschichte der englischen Parlementsberedsamkeit* from 1804, which contains a historical interpretation and standards for evaluating and celebrating certain types of parliamentary speaking and debating. I discuss this book in the first section of the second chapter.

The online sources indicate that the concept of 'parliamentary oratory' or 'parliamentary eloquence' was hardly used before the mid-eighteenth century. The last third of the century experienced, however, an unexpected rise in the grand style of parliamentary rhetoric, presumably connected to the diffuse political constellations of the time. A few master speakers soon received a canonical reputation as parliamentary speakers. The section 2.2 deals with scholarly expositions of rhetoric in the second half of the eighteenth century, including David Hume's essay *Of Eloquence* and comments on parliamentary speaking in his *History of England*, followed by remarks on the work of Hugh Blair and other 'school rhetoricians'. Soon other genres, including advice books for parliamentary speakers and the collections of the most eloquent speeches in Westminster (after the license to publish parliamentary speeches was granted in 1771) began to appear.

As a final expression of Westminster's late-eighteenth-century self-understanding of parliamentary eloquence I present William Gerard Hamilton's *Parliamentary Logick,* a list maxims collected from 1754 to

1796 when he was a MP and published posthumously in 1808. The maxims largely represent classical and Renaissance views on deliberative rhetoric. The perspective of these maxims is that of a long-term parliamentary insider, who nevertheless views debates from the detached point of view of an observer. Interesting here is the unscrupulous use of rhetoric, without trying to hide it behind 'higher' purposes – a point for which he was criticised by Bentham (1824) and largely ignored by other writers on the British parliament.

The rise of parliamentary eloquence and its relationship to debate will further be discussed in relation to the canonisation of William Pitt, Sr. (Lord Chatham), Edmund Burke, Richard Sheridan, Charles James Fox and William Pitt, Jr. as master parliamentary speakers. For later rhetoric writers their oratory was of unsurpassed quality. The period from the 1760s to 1806 has been frequently referred to as 'the golden age of parliamentary eloquence' (Gauger 1952). Christopher Reid's recent study *Imprison'd Wranglers: The rhetorical culture of the House of Commons, 1760–1800* (2012) provides the background for understanding the parliamentary rhetoric of that period, although he, as a literary scholar, does not ask about the relationship between oratory and debate nor about the parliamentary variety of the deliberative genre of rhetoric.

The chapters three to five discuss the thesis that the ideals of oratory ideals were superseded by those of parliamentary debate. The chapters deal with three different, although partly overlapping subgenres of writings on rhetoric, which, though they still have distinct focuses of their own, are based on different writing intentions.

Among the outsider writings I include parliamentary speech collections, introductions to rhetoric, scholarly contributions to rhetoric and its history as well as debate manuals. They still tend to have a mainly artistic focus on parliamentary eloquence, but the role of debate is evaluated differently.

The year 1806, when both Fox and Pitt, Jr. died, marked a starting point for a major genre of discussing parliamentary eloquence, namely, speech collections. Some collections of the 'best' parliamentary speeches were published in the late eighteenth century, but around 1810 three extensive collections of parliamentary speeches, by Nathaniel Chapman, Thomas Browne and William Hazlitt, were edited. They establish the genre of parliamentary speech collections, and this genre was continued throughout the nineteenth century in Britain and in the United States (where Westminster speeches were published also). The speeches are as a rule presented to the readers in 'raw' form, including few commentaries and interpretations

and extracted directly from their debate contexts, unlike Cobbett's and the later Hansard publications of debates. In the course of the nineteenth century, the genre of speech collections underwent a change towards relative acceptance of the debate-character of parliamentary speeches.

Across the Atlantic numerous rhetorical tracts, from elementary textbooks to more ambitious volumes, were published in the nineteenth century. Several of them include political oratorical practices and put a special emphasis on parliamentary eloquence. Although subsumed under a wider rhetoric agenda, the pages dedicated to the parliamentary subgenre of deliberative rhetoric are worth closer attention. A special feature of the North American rhetorical literature is that they discuss 'parliamentary law' as a *terminus technicus* for conducting meetings, associations and organisations. Not only *pro et contra* debates, but also their distinct procedural regulations are considered and discussed as a major part of the parliamentary political culture, one that reaches well beyond parliament itself.

The *insiders of parliamentary politics* include several types of writing: parliamentary journalism, the writings of parliamentary officials as well as essays by members of parliament themselves.

Parliamentary journalism has taken up rhetorical topics since the last decades of the nineteenth century (Henry Lucy, Michael Macdonagh, J.A. Spender et al.). The parliament as a deliberative assembly and the value of debate is defended by most of these authors. Nonetheless, in many journalistic writings, some form for nostalgia for the great speeches of the past in contrast to the contemporary 'bread-and-butter' debates is obvious.

The famous Clerk of the House of Commons Thomas Erskine May is a good example of another type of parliamentary insider. Despite having discussed him and later Clerks in the procedure volume, I will discuss May, Reginald Palgrave and Courtenay Ilbert here also as rhetoric authors.

Among members who discussed parliamentary oratory and debate are Thomas Babington Macaulay as well as William E. Gladstone, whose essay, publishes as 'Public Speaking' in 1953, written when he was a young MP in 1838, served as a touchstone for discussing other writings for the period after the first Reform Act of 1832. In the early twentieth century we find several former or sitting MPs writing on parliamentary eloquence: the Irish former radical John O'Connor Power, the front-bench Conservative Earl George Curzon, and the Liberal, later Labour MP Arthur Ponsonsby are discussed.

Among these insiders we can detect a recognition that parliamentary eloquence is constituted by debate and one of the first steps in conceptualising the special parliamentary variety of deliberative rhetoric. This aspect is perhaps even more emphasised in the work of two of probably the most important thinkers among nineteenth-century British parliamentary theorists, namely John Stuart Mill and Walter Bagehot, who are discussed in a separate chapter as 'political theorists of parliamentarism'. The work of both is also related to George Grote's studies of ancient Greek history, for which in terms of the parliamentary aspect he drew upon his own experiences. In the work of Mill and Bagehot something of what I have in mind and call, in the context of Weber, 'the parliamentary theory of knowledge' (Palonen 2010), is clearly visible.

Finally, I analyse the conceptualisation of parliamentary debate in *excursions into two actual debates*. As an example plenary debate I take up those over the 1882 procedural reform (see Palonen 2014a). I further focus on the materials of the Select Committees on procedure reform for the period of the 1832 Reform Act to the 1920s. Some of these committees provide extraordinary source material for conceptualising the self-understanding of parliamentary politics (see Redlich 1905). While the late-nineteenth-century procedure committees and the reforms actually passed aimed at stricter regulation of debating procedures, the committee led by Thomas Whittaker (1913–1914) took up the possibilities for improving the situation of 'private members' in the House of Commons. The question posed is: How might an ongoing debate itself provoke conceptual revisions and innovation of a kind perhaps beyond the reach of more detached writings, even writings by the parliamentarians themselves? In Skinnerian terms, the procedure debates moved political analysis a step closer to political life. Rhetoric and debate are frequently subordinated to the parliamentary government perspective, but in Westminster, debate itself is a powerful part of how parliamentary politics is understood.

The last chapter concludes the book with a construction of ideal-typical possibilities for the parliamentary variety of deliberative rhetoric. I discuss how far the rhetorical literature has problematised the main aspects of parliamentary debate, especially the dissensus of perspectives, the procedural character of parliamentary deliberations and the politics of time (time in in the dual sense of intra-parliamentary stages and in the clash of parliamentary items with the ordinary calendar). The point is that the relationship between debate and deliberation gives rise to all parts of proce-

dural regulation. In this sense the study is connected to what I have written in *The Politics of Parliamentary Procedure.*

The role of two rhetorical categories, *inventio* and *dispositio,* or the distinction between agenda and debate regulations, is treated both as abstracted from time and including time. The timeliness of parliamentary politics is also discussed in two phases: one involves the inherent temporality, in a formal sense, of key parliamentary moves; the other deals historically with the increasing shortage of parliamentary time. With the resulting four categories, I illustrate how the procedural character of parliamentary politics has transformed speaking practices and set a new agenda for studying rhetoric's distinctively parliamentary form of deliberative rhetoric.