Eastern Illinois University
The Keep

Masters Theses | Student Theses & Publications

1977

A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric

Richard C. Blakeman
Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in Speech Communication at Eastern Illinois University. Find out more about the program.

Recommended Citation

Blakeman, Richard C., "A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric" (1977). *Masters Theses*. 3354.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3354

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

3 May 1977
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because ______________________________

____

____

______________________________ ______________________________
Date Author

pdm

A Synoptic History Of Classical Rhetoric

(TITLE)

BY

Richard C. Blakeman

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master Of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1977
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

29 April 1977
DATE

29 April 1977
DATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. Chapter One--Prospectus 2
   a. Origin of the Study 2
   b. Purpose of the Study 3
   c. Review of the Literature 4
   d. Materials 5
   e. Method and Procedure 5
   f. Limitations of the Study 6
   g. Significance of the Study 7
   h. Organization of the Study 8

2. Chapter Two--The Sophistic Period 10
   a. General Background 10
   b. Rhetorical Emphases of the Spphistic Period 13
   c. Criticisms of Sophistry 16
   d. The Individual Sophists 18
      1)Corax and Tisias 19
      2)Protagoras 21
      3)Gorgias 24
      4)Hippias 26
      5)Thrasymachus 27
      6)Theodorus 28
      7)Prodicus 30

3. Chapter Three--The Greek Philosophers 33
   a. Plato 33
   b. Isocrates 41
   c. Aristotle 46
   d. Anaximenes' *Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum* 55

4. Chapter Four--The Roman Period 59
   a. The Transition From Greek to Roman Rhetoric 59
   b. [Cicero] *Rhetorica Ad Herennium.* 60
   c. Cicero. 65
   d. Quintilian 70
   e. Dionysius of Halicarnassus 76
   f. [Longinus] *On The Sublime* 78

5. Chapter Five--The Neo-Sophistic Period 83
   a. General Background 83
   b. The *Declamatio* of the Neo-Sophistic Period 86
   c. The Criticism of Neo-Sophistic Declamation 88
   d.

Table of Contents (cont'd)

Page

6. Chapter Six--Concluding Remarks 92
   a. Conclusions 92
   b. Directions for Further Research 95

Bibliography 98

Preface

I am deeply indebted to several people for both the origin and the conclusion of this study. First and foremost, to Dr. B.F. McClerren, Professor of Speech Communication, Eastern Illinois University, for his impetus, reinforcement, scholarly criticism, and continued support of my work in the field. To my committee members, Dr. Calvin Smith and R. Glen Wiley, for their seemingly endless hours of reading, commentary, and scholarly prodding. To my father-in-law, who made the typing of the study easier through the loan of his typewriter. Finally, to my dear wife Tammy, for putting up with my long hours at the typewriter and for supporting my entire life with her love.

CHAPTER ONE:

PROSPECTUS

For every tree to grow, there must be roots. The field of Speech, often as expansive as the largest oak, has roots that enable it to grow and continue to bloom. Yet for as much as no part of a tree can forget the importance of its roots, the field of Speech no longer seems to resemble a tree. There are those today who would dismiss the roots of the field as unimportant or even nonexistent: they would grasp exclusively after the superficial beauty of observation and experimentation as the only means to truth. Certainly, to the naked eye, the roots are not the most becoming part of a tree, but without them the growth of that which is aesthetically pleasing would not be possible. This study seeks to go beyond such superficial and seasonal beauty: it seeks to reveal the roots.

A. Origin of the Study

The basis for this study lies in a frustration to be found in any library of classical rhetoric: the lack of any single work to survey the entirety of the classical period of rhetorical history. While many authors have done extensive scholarly work on myriads of specific topics, yet the student finds it impossible to consult a single source which will convey both the overall feeling and the specific rhetorical emphases of the period as a whole. This study attempts to contribute such a text to the field of Speech.

A second origin for this study comes out of the contemporary rejection of the historical foundations previously mentioned. While the field of Speech, along with every other educational field, is being called upon to return to the "basics" of the field, some feel that these "basics" can be found somewhere other than in the rhetorical past. This work

is developed in order to trace out the major strains of the classical foundations of rhetoric. Some of that which is established will hopefully be seen as the "basics" that some are searching for.

B. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to discover the major theories and methods of rhetoric during the classical period. While the definitions of the terms "theories" and "methods" will vary from contribution to contribution, there must be some operational definition of the period of time that is under study. For the purposes of this study, the classical period will be defined as follows: the period of time which begins with the contributions of the Sophists and ends with the neo-Sophistic rhetoric of Seneca the Elder. Chronologically, the period extends from 500 B.C. through the year 100 A.D.

The specific purpose of this study does not include the study or investigation of any one theorist or theory in great depth, as such study has been adequately done by individual scholars in years past. This study intends to provide a general knowledge of the background, contributions, and unique features of each individual making a significant contribution to the classical period. The central idea which guides the entire work is that the author should provide for other scholars a work which may be examined in order to gain summary knowledge of any one theorist of the classical period, yet which also delineates the thread of rhetorical development as it exists in the classical period.

C. Review of the Literature

It has previously been stated in general that no single source exists which attempts the same purpose as does this study. Individual scholars have gone into great depth and detail in sub-areas of this study, such as Bromley Smith's articles on the Sophists[1] or Jebb's Attic Orators.[2] Baldwin's Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic[3] covers more breadth of the classical period, yet only discusses selected theories and theorists of interest. Kennedy[4] more than adequately covers the Greek period of rhetorical history, and Clarke[5] gives similar treatment to the Roman period, but neither extends coverage to both. Benson and Prosser[6] provide a useful anthology of original source materials from the classical period, but fail to tie together with any analysis the sources cited. Topical studies do extend throughout the classical period, such as the study of eloquence undertaken by Caplan,[7] but such works cover only one specific aspect of the entire period.

The one source which comes closest to the scope of this study is Everett Lee Hunt's article, "An Introduction to Classical Rhetoric."[8] The scope of this article parallels that which is undertaken here, and Hunt includes many of the theorists that are included here. However, the article consists only of a reading list for the prospective student of

---

[1] See specific citations accompanying the individual Sophists in Chapter Two.
[2] R.C. Jebb, Attic Orators, (London, 1876).
[3] C.S. Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, (New York, 1924).
[4] George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, (Princeton, 1963).
[5] M.L. Clarke, Rhetoric at Rome, (London, 1953).
[6] Thomas Benson and Michael Prosser, Readings in Classical Rhetoric, (Boston, 1969).
[7] Harry Caplan, et. al., Of Eloquence, (Ithaca, 1966).
[8] Everett Lee Hunt, "An Introduction to Classical Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XII (June, 1926), pp. 202-205.

classical rhetoric, leaving the investigation up to the individual student. It might serve well as an initial reading list for this work, and certainly many of Hunt's suggested selections will appear within the bibliography for this study. Following a review of all available indexes of scholarly writing in the field of Speech, it can be stated that there exists no other work which approaches the kind of study undertaken in this work.

D. Materials

No special materials are necessary for a historical survey such is represented in this work. Both primary and secondary sources are consulted for each contribution to the study, though due to the summary nature of the investigation, little of the source material is directly cited.

E. Method and Procedure

As suggested by Sattler,[9] the area under study must be established, limited, categorized, and arranged in chronological order. The establishment and limitation of the area of study are reflected in the previously stated purpose, and the categorization and chronological order will be apparent in the plan of organization yet to be set out. The overall description of this study as a historical survey is also set forth by Sattler, establishing this study as being part of the tradition of historical studies in the field of Speech.

---

[9]William M. Sattler, "The Library Survey," in Clyde W. Dow, ed., An Introduction To Graduate Study in Speech and Theatre, (East Lansing, 1961), pp. 37-38.

The empirical organization put forth by Auer[10] may be adapted into this historical study in order to provide a framework for the necessary research. The steps involved in this research are: 1)delineation of a problem, 2)methodological design, 3)discovery of historical data, 4)analysis of data, 5)conclusions drawn from research data. The specific methodological design into which this research is placed includes the background, topical content of the rhetorical treatise, and unique rhetorical aspects of each contributor surveyed.

F. Limitations of the Study

There are two major types of limitations to this particular study: those concerning the selection process and those concerning the summary nature of the work itself. The first selection to be made for this study is the overall period of time under review. The chronological limitations that exist here are placed for two reasons: 1)no significant systematic rhetorical theory exists prior to 500 B.C., 2)the period immediately after 100 A.D. is more Patristic than classical in nature, with the influence of the church changing the classical rhetorical emphases. The study is limited to this time frame, and any weakness due to such limitation is accepted as the burden of the author. The second selection made is that of the specific theories and theorists selected to be included in the study. The criteria for inclusion in this study are: 1)the theory or theorist must be recognized in classical literature, 2)the theory or theorist must be

---

[10] J. Jeffery Auer, An Introduction to Research in Speech, (New York, 1959), pp. 49-50.

significant to the history of rhetorical theory. The chief limitation here is the subjectivity of the terms "recognized" and "significant." This limitation applies to any study which is not totally inclusive within a time frame, but a review of the existing literature in the field will bear out the selections here as significant and recognized. Each contribution will be shown as either presenting unique material to the field or as presenting it in a manner which is specifically unique.

The second set of limitations of this work deal with its qualitative generality. The study covers an extremely broad area with little depth in any one area, for which the study may be criticized. Part of the purpose of the study is to provide such summary or general statements, so the limitation is weakened by the inherent necessity of such a scholarly style in a work of this sort. The lack of extensive quoted material or direct source citation also limits the study, but the purpose of the work demands such a great deal of condensing of material that considerable citation would not be plausible. In any case, the limitations above are recognized and taken under the scholarly responsibilities of the author.

G. Significance of the Study

This study has significance in three specific areas: the field of Speech, the student of rhetoric, and the preparation of the author. The study is significant to the field because no existing work covers the ground covered in this study. No single work synthesizes the plethora of information available in the field of classical rhetoric, enabling the scholar to use for purposes of backgrounding, review, or bibliography.

This text could also serve as a basic text for a course in classical rhetoric, or one of several courses to be used in a survey of rhetorical history.

The study is significant to the student of classical rhetoric, on either the graduate or undergraduate level. The student will find the summary statements on each contribution helpful in providing the background necessary for further study. The source citations, where appropriate, will help the student in areas of interest for individual study. Such a work can also be of value specifically to the graduate student in review of the classical period already studied, be it for scholarly purposes or in preparation for examinations.

This study is obviously of particular signifcance to the author. It began out of a reverence for the importance of the classical foundations of rhetoric, and aids in coalescing all that has been studied over the past five years in the field of Speech. It allows the author room for original phrasing, editing, and condensing, but also forces the complete mastery of sources upon the cortical center. It is the hope of the author that this work will prove as beneficial to the field as its development has been to the author.

H. Organization of the Study

This study is organized into four content chapters: Chapter Two--The Sophistic Period, Chapter Three--The Greek Philosophers, Chapter Four--The Roman Period, Chapter Five--The Neo-Sophistic Period. Each individual chapter will be delineated and organized as befits the content material to be covered in the chapter. Following the final content chapter will be a chapter containing conclusions and directions for future study.

The written material covering each individual contribution will follow another specifically

prescribed format: 1)background information, 2)topical content of the rhetorical work, 3)unique rhetorical contributions of the work or individual. Again, the structure may deviate when necessary. Corresponding footnotes will accompany the major sub-headings of each chapter, giving the reader some direction for further concentrated study.

CHAPTER TWO:

THE SOPHISTIC PERIOD

A. General Background[1]

An understanding of sophistry must begin with the etymology of the word "sophist." The Greek words sophos and sophistes were the original terms from which our word "sophist" evolved, with sophos being a descriptive term meaning "wise," and sophistes being the corresponding noun which denoted a wise man. The original use of the word was extremely complimentary, and was only given as a title to those who were considered to be learned men. Early in Greek history the Seven Sages were called sophists, due to their great wisdom (or sophia). A sophist was also considered to be a great teacher, as the wise men of the time were likely to be those responsible for the education of the young. A sophist wrote and taught because he had special skills and knowledge to impart which were of practical value to his students.

Few of the writings of the early Greek sophists remain today. What can be known about them must be gained from the writers and historians of later times. References to the sophists can be found in the works of writers such as Plato, Aristophanes, Philostratus, Isocrates, and Aristotle. The connotation of the term "sophist," however, when taken

---

[1]The best general picture of the sophistic period can be drawn from a review of the following sources: C.S. Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic (New York, 1924), T. Gomperz, Greek Thinkers, trans. by L. Magnus (London, 1901), W.K.C. Guthrie, The Sophists (London, 1971), Everett Lee Hunt, "On the Sophists," in Joseph Schwartz and John Rycenga, The Province of Rhetoric (New York, 1965), R.C. Jebb, Attic Orators (London, 1876), George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, 1963), Clarence McCord, "On Sophists and Philosophers," Southern Speech Journal, XXIX (1963), pp. 146-149, "Sophists," Encyclopedia Brittanica (15th edition, vol. 17), pp. 11-14.

from the majority of the later sources, is nothing like the complimentary term which its etymology would suggest. How could the interpretation of one word vary from complimentary to degrading within a single period in history? It is obvious that there are shades of meaning that have yet to be brought to the surface.

The term "sophist" began to change in meaning shortly after 465 B.C. In this year, the Greeks established a democracy in Syracuse following the overthrow of their Sicilian rulers. The new democracy left the Greeks with solitary control over their government, but they were also left with the problem of deciding the ownership of the land which had previously been under the control of the Sicilians. In order ot win back the land that had been taken from them, individual Greek citizens had to plead their own cases in court, with the court deciding upon the dispensation of the land. There developed in Syracuse a need for teachers who could teach ordinary citizens to be representatives in the courts. This need was so great that for the first time in Greek history, citizens were willing to pay for their instruction. Teachers began to accept money as a fee for their lectures and teachings. This change became the main quality associated with a sophist, and from this point forward, a "Sophist"[2] was known as a professional teacher who accepted money for the training of students.

Through the travels of the students of Corax and Tisias of Syracuse and Protagoras of Abdera, the Sophistic idea spread to Athens, At Athens, the custom of charging a fee for lectures became more widespread, and soon teachers of many subjects (not just legal speaking) became known as Sophists. Rhetoric was the initial area of Sophistic teaching, but Sophistries of culture and politics were equally popular in Athens. It is difficult to draw a generalized

---

[2]Note the change from "sophist" to "Sophist" which denotes the change in meaning.

picture of the typical Athenian Sophist, however, for two reasons: each of the Sophists had his own peculiarities and areas of specialization, and the amount of information about the individual Sophists is limited by the dependence upon secondary and tertiary sources. The key idea that ties Sophistic teaching to rhetoric can be drawn as the one common characteristic among the Sophists at Athens: rhetoric was a necessary tool in the Athenian lifestyle; therefore each Sophist stood to make a good wage from the teaching of rhetoric, regardless of what other subjects he taught. Even though the Sophists varied in their quirks and specialties, nearly all made some of their wage as teachers from the teaching of rhetoric.

B. Rhetorical Emphases of the Sophistic Period

As noted earlier, there was a great demand for the use of rhetoric in the Greek lifestyle. The practical uses of rhetoric were first categorized by the Sophists using terms that have survived until today. The speaking that was done in the law courts, whether to reclaim land of for other purposes, was labeled forensic speaking. Ceremonial speaking at funerals, weddings, and public assemblies was labeled epideictic speaking. Speaking done in the forum which concerned itself with the setting of future policy was labeled deliberative speaking. Individual Sophists might have been more skilled in one type of instruction or another, but all three forms of speaking were practiced and taught abundantly in Athens.

The common bond between the Sophists to this point has been the fact that they all accepted money for instruction in rhetoric. The original reason for the charging of fees in Syracuse was the great demand for such instruction, making the lessons almost invaluable

to the recipients of the lessons. Certainly the citizen who was successful in winning back his land or who could deliver an especially fine eulogy at a friend's funeral would feel that the lessons were of such great value that some fee ought to be remitted to his instructor: if this is indeed the case, the value of the lessons provided by the Sophists may be found in the common emphasis upon making effective speakers of their students. Each Sophist taught the importance of success in rhetorical efforts, not merely the importance of speaking well or speaking the truth. This emphasis upon giving effectiveness to the speaker evolved into two specific rhetorical emphases which need to be noted: 1) the emphasis upon style and delivery, 2) the emphasis upon the probable and the plausible in rhetorical proof.

One way by which the speaker could gain effectiveness os presentation would be for him to please the ears of the listeners. Through training in style and delivery, the student could at least sound as if he were a good speaker (regardless of the content which he espoused). Gorgias and Thrasymachus were the two Sophists who placed eloguence of this sort in the highest esteem, but many others recognized its importance. Ordinarily, the teaching of style and delivery (the adornment of language and the physical presentation of a speech) is not held in disrespect, but Gorgias and Thrasymachus found themselves under fire for their instruction in eloquence. The first reason for such criticism was the idea that eloquence should be developed in order to help the speaker reach his persuasive goal. The critics held that eloquence indeed should be taught, but for the reason of giving aesthetic quality to the truth rather than to the speaker. A further reason for the criticism of the teaching of style and delivery was directed at the notion that through the teaching of eloquence, virtue would be developed in the speaker. While the Sophists supported this opinion, the

critics argued that virtue could not be "taught," or that if it could, eloquence was not the proper method of such teaching. In either regard, it is obvious that in their quest for the ultimate effectiveness of the speaker, eloquence was of more value to the Sophists than was virtue. Virtue might be admired by the judges, but eloquence of expression reaped the desired results.

A second generalized characteristic of the Sophistic teachers of rhetoric was their emphasis upon the probable and the plausible as forms of rhetorical proof. Prior to the establishment of democracy and the change to the Sophistic methods, rhetorical proofs were more philosophical than practical, as there was little need for courtroom or political speaking in an oppressed state. The involvement of Corax and Tisias in forensic rhetoric in Syracuse brought about a change in modes of proof that carried throughout the rest of the Sophistic period. Corax noted that absolute certainty was not possible in many legal situations, and therefore admonished his students to argue their cases in terms ofthe degree of probability of facts and occurances. For example, if a short-statured man were brought into court on the charge of assaulting a man nearly twice his size, Corax would have him argue on the basis of the degree of probability of such a happening (relatively slim).

As the theory of probability was carried to Athens by students of Corax and Tisias, it became somewhat misdirected from its original purposes. Probability as taught in Syracuse was concerned with the likeliness of something being true, but was still based deeply in both truth and reality. The brand of Sophistic rhetoric popular at Athens departed from the concepts of truth and reality almost completely. Students were taught the skill of making their contentions "appear" to be true, whether they were true or not. The aim of such proof was the same as that of the teaching of style and delivery: the pleasing of an

audinece in order to add effectiveness to the speaker and to help him gain his desired results. Many of the Sophists taught the plausibility of arguments rather than their probability, which was a giant step away from the roots of their profession. Through eloquence of delivery, appropriate adornment of language, and careful wording of arguments, the most effective students could make almost anything appear to be true in order to aid in their persuasive cause. It was this final flowering of Sophistry that has given Sophistry its bad name.

C. Criticisms of Sophistry

While it has been stated many times that few educational theories had as great an effect on a single society as Sophistry had upon the Greek society, it may also be true that few theories brought out as many objectors in both academic and philosophical circles as did Sophistry. Isocrates, Plato, Aristophanes, and Aristotle were among the Greek critics of the Sophistic movement, each voicing particular objections to this manner of teaching. Their criticisms correspond almost one-to-one with the major rhetorical emphases traced above. Such criticism falls into the general categories of the Sophistic departure from the truth and the Sophistic emphasis upon giving effectiveness to the speaker (though the line of delineation between these two categories may be rather opaque).

Plato severely criticized the Sophists in several of his dialogues, with his remarks in the Gorgias[3] being the most poignant. He was concerned with the departure from the truth that was present in much of the Sophistic rhetoric and teaching, as it did not conform to his own

---

[3] Plato, Gorgias, trans. and intro. by W.C. Helmbold (New York, 1952).

metaphysical and epistemological conceptions of absolute truth. The initial movement to the use of probability as a means of rhetorical proof concerned Plato somewhat, but the moral considerations involved in making something appear to be true (even if it is not) were nearly the antithesis of what Plato himself believed and taught. Aristotle was not quite as severe on this point, for while he condemned plausibility, he admitted that through the use of the enthymeme thetorical reasoning from probability was permissable and indeed very effective.[4] While many Sophists defined rhetoric as the _art_ of persuasion, Plato refused to admit that rhetoric was anything more than a knack. In the _Phaedrus_, he finally comes to define rhetoric as an art, but the restrictions which he places upon such an art certainly excludes the rhetoric practiced and taught by the Sophists.[5] For example, Plato's first rhetorical requisite was that the speaker must know the truth about that which he speaks: this alone might carry through to eliminate much of the Sophistic rhetoric.

A related criticism of Sophistry dealt with the overall purpose of giving effectiveness to the speaker--gaining desired results. It was the _purpose_ of Sophistic rhetoric--not always the means or method--that bore the brunt of criticism. The canons of style and delivery have had their populatity throughout history: yet the teaching of style and delivery was criticized when attempted by the Sophists. The purpose of such teaching, however, was not to develop the artistic qualities of rhetoric nor was it intended for the giving of effectiveness to the truth. The purpose for the teaching and practice of eloquence for the

---

[4] See further discussion of Aristotle's use of the enthymeme and probability in Ch. 3.
[5] See further discussion of Plato and the definiton of rhetoric as an art in Ch. 3.

Sophist was the winning of the proper end result--a decision by the judges in favor of the speaker. In the final analysis, though, it was not the method of teaching or the content taught which caused such consternation among the philosophers and historians of later times. Similar methods and subject matter have been taught and employed by rhetoricians of many ages, yet that which distinguishes Sophistry from these is the moral purpose involved. From the point of view of the critics, the true and noble purpose for rhetoric was the giving of effectiveness to the truth, as the truth would always reap the proper results. Many Sophists sought after effectiveness of another type, with results by any means being the primary objective.

D. The Individual Sophists[6]

Just as it has been difficult to generalize about the qualities of Sophistic teaching, it is also difficult to determine which individual Sophists ought to be included in a treatment of the Sophists as individuals. It is easy to recognize the roots of Sophistry in Corax, Tisias, and Protagoras, but it is difficult to draw a line which will show the end of the period in rhetorical history. In terms of the definitive characteristic of receiving funds for lectures, the label may be applied to Isocrates, the Attic orators, and others. In order to draw the line at some defensible point as well as to keep the period thematically intact, only those rhetoricians fitting the description laid out in the last two sections of text will be treated individually. This selection leaves the following as representatives of the

---

[6]Other than the references to be cited under the various sub-headings to follow, both Kennedy and Guthrie, op.cit., provide material on many of the individuals, along with Philostratus, Lives of the Sophists.

Sophistic period: Corax and Tisias, Protagoras, Gorgias, Hippias, Thrasymachus, and Prodicus.

1) Corax and Tisias (c. 470 B.C.)[7]

Corax lived in Syracuse at the time of the overthrow of the tyrants of Sicily, and was the first to answer the need for training in oratory so that citizens might win back their land in court. He has been credited with the "invention" of rhetoric, although this cannot literally be the case. Several reasons might account for such an attribution, though the primary one was that he was the first to record and teach systematic rhetorical theory: he set down rules which guided the development and practice of rhetoric. The written product of Corax's efforts has been lost, but it was known by such later writers as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Tisias is known as the primary student of Corax, and it is difficult to determine which of the two had the primary influence upon the brand of rhetorical theory that is attributed to them as a pair: in one secondary source it is attributed to Corax, while the same theory may be attributed to Tisias in yet another work. The one known denominator between the two is the fact that that Tisias was the student of Corax, and some of the later students of Tisias include such rhetoricians as Gorgias, Lysias, and Isocrates.

Several unique contributions to rhetorical theory can be traced to the work of Corax and Tisias. The first definition of rhetoric as the "art of persuasion" is attributed

---

[7]Individual references to Corax and Tisias include: Helen Cushman, "Corax--Secretary or Rhetorician," Pennsylvania Speech Annual, XX (1963) pp. 8-10, D. Hinks, "Tisias and Corax and the Invention of Rhetoric," Classical Quarterly, XXXIV (1940) pp. 61 ff., Bromley Smith, "Corax and Probability," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VII (1921) pp. 13-42.

to them, and such a definition remains as one of the most generally agreed upon definitions of the term to date. Corax and Tisias also divided the speech itself into parts: exordium (introduction), narration, proof, digression, and peroration (conclusion). With minor modifications from time to time, these same divisions can be found in the works of many of the later Greek and Roman rhetorical theorists. This treatment of arrangementsremains as an example of the sort of systematic rhetoric taught and practiced by Corax and Tisias.

The most important rhetorical contribution of Corax and Tisias was their emphasis upon probability. The foundationssof Corax's probability theory can be found in his general contentions concerning the common sense nature of mankind. Corax felt that men never made decisions on the basis of absolute certainty. Instead, men are more likely to act in terms of the degrees of probability involved in any given situation. One cannot say for certain that the sun will "rise" in the east tomorrow morning, but one can assume a high degree of probability in order to act on the basis of such a probable occurance. Corax taught his students that, since men do not act in terms of certainty, they should not attempt to convince an audience on the basis of certainty. Since the proof of certainty is difficult to attain, Corax saw it as both acceptable and effective to persuade by arguing the probability of the speaker's arguments being true in order to secure belief.

From the concepts laid out by Corax and Tisias in the area of probability came the Sophistic notion of rhetorical proof based upon the probability of arguments. Corax and Tisias made this first step away from the idea that only abolute truth should be

used to persuade, and therefore are branded as the first of the "Sophists." They placed the same emphasis upon the effectiveness of the speaker as did the later Sophists, which shaded the importance of their contributions in the eyes of later writers. In historical perspective, the importance of the sudden need for forensic training in Syracuse must be seen as it affected the rhetorical theory of Corax and Tisias. Few of the citizens who came to these Sophists for instruction in courtroom oratory were anything but average citizens: Corax and Tisias may well have come to the realization that such students could only be taught to be "effective" orators, not philosophers. Such training needed to be systematized and based in the easiest means to success, which in this case turned out to be the training in argument based upon probability.

2) Protagoras (c. 485)[8]

Protagoras of Abdera, whose rhetorical instruction flourished during the same time period as did Corax and Tisias, was credited by Philostratus as being the first to charge a fee for his lectures. This helps to place Protagoras in the beginning of the period which has been named Sophistic. He is further qualified as a Sophist because of his teachings, which were viewed as practical preparation for the lifestyle of a Greek citizen: Protagoras refused to teach theory without having its practical application demonstrated, and likewise refused to show his students the practical uses of rhetoric

---

[8]Individual references to Protagoras include: Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers, trans. and intro. by R.D. Hicks (New York, 1925), Bromley Smith, "The Father of Debate: Protagoras of Abdera," Quarterly Journal of Speech, IV (1918).

without first grounding them in theory.

Diogenes Laertius reports that Protagoras was a scholar in many fields, and catalogs a considerable number of his written works. His strengths include the major areas of grammar and rhetoric, with argumantative or adversary rhetoric his specialty. Protagoras was the first to record verb forms as falling into specific and regular categories, and also noted that there were three genders which he called by name. As far as his rhetorical contributions, Protagroas was specifically unique in his treatment of the adversary nature of rhetoric. This emphasis shows itself clearly in his peculiar divisions of the parts of a speech: entreaty, interrogation, answer, and injunction. Protagoras was interested in the training of students for careers in the courtroom, but prepared them in more areas than simply oratorical prowess. He was the first to discuss at length the argumentative form which would later be known as Socratic (after Socrates), in which the speaker leads his opponent to a preconceived solution through the asking of carefully worded questions which act as premises which lead to an unavoidable conclusion.

Protagoras was the first of the Sophists to teach that students should argue both sides of any particular rhetorical case. This comprised the major part of the training of his pupils, and makes Protagoras similar to Antiphon and some of the Roman teachers of declamation (the practice of speeches on prepared topics with arguments on both sides of an issue). He had his students practice such prepared cases in which they might have to argue one side and shortly thereafter argue the opposite side. His treatise <u>Antilogiae</u> remained as a collection of such contrary arguments for use by

other teachers and students in their practice of oratory. Another of his methodologies involved each student attempting to make a weak case into a strong case through the student's own oratorical skills. Protagoras realized that the relative strength or weakness of any legal case might not depend strictly upon the case itself, but in the attitude of the judge toward the case. Some cases might be structurally weak, but Protagoras stressed that such cases might be made strong by fluent and eloquent oratory.

While Protagoras was an itinerant Sophist, not located in any one particular place, he ended up being banned from the city of Athens because of his particular brand of Sophistic teaching. The authorities in Athens were concerned with the immorality of his teachings, especially those concerning adversary rhetoric. According to the Athenian philosophers, if one teaches a student that two sides of a case can be equally true, the student will develop no concept of absolute truth or morality. A second charge raised against Protagoras concerned his teaching students to make an inherently weak case into a strong case through eloquence and other oratorical powers. In the eyes of the philosophers, this was equal to the later Sophistic notions of plausibility, as it was based upon the skill of the orator and the desired results of the rhetoric rather than being based upon the absolute truth involved in the case.

As a partial answer to the charges made by the Athenians and following his expulsion from Athens, Protagoras brought forth his well-known statement "Man is the measure of all things." Arguments have been waged for centuries over the meaning of this phrase and its implications, but such arguments may be unnecessary if the statement is considered in the light of the oratorical context in which it was presented. Protagoras felt, much

like a modern psychologist, that the strength or truth of any legal case was dependent upon the perceptions of each individual who viewed the circumstances. In this case, no one side of an argument could be said to be absolutely right or wrong except as it was viewed by each independent judge: man as the measure. This same rationale covered the argument that he covered up "weak" cases with eloquence: if the judges would accept the case as being stronger, no one could question the method used. If man is the measure of all things, then each man's perception of the truth ought to be the measure of the truth.

3) Gorgias (c. 483 B.C.)[9]

Gorgias of Leontini is well known as being the mouthpiece through which Plato epitomizes the weaknesses of Sophistry in his dialogue Gorgias. Gorgias was a student of Tisias, although he did not carry on the demands of his teacher for complete and systematic teaching in rhetoric. Gorgias did insist that the key to success in oratory was the pleasing of the ears of the audience, but aimed his teaching at the art of fine speaking instead of the art of persuasion through various means. Gorgias himself was quite a talented speaker, and after the citizens of Athens had heard him speak they flocked to him for instruction, hoping that he could make them equally eloquent. Gorgias stressed the ability to speak well on any subject matter, as it was the ability to deliver well, not the mastery of content, which was the more persuasive tool.

---

[9] Individual references to Gorgias include: Bromley Smith, "Gorgias: A Study of Oratorical Style," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VII (1921), Plato's Gorgias.

Gorgias appears as the first of the Sophists to epitomize the split in rhetoric which has surfaced regularly throughout its history: the complete education of the orator vs. education in style and delivery (elocution) alone. While Plato insisted that the true and artful orator must know the entire truth concerning subject matter, Gorgias felt that eloquence could be transferred onto any subject matter. Gorgias also recognized the persuasive force of emotion, advising his students to recognize that judges could easily be swayed by appeal to their emotions. The end of speaking for students of Gorgias was beautiful and effective expression, not beautiful and effective expression aimed at bestowing glory upon the truth. Truth was more a minor concern as long as the eloquence of style and delivery could bring the desired results from the audience.

Since Gorgias was once a student of Tisias, it might well be expected that he would reflect the same attitude toward probability as did Corax and Tisias. Gorgias was not true to his predecessors, however, as he stepped away from the foundation in truth that probability theory had. Gorgias felt that no standard of absolute truth existed which could be used for judgment of either truth or probability. Like Protagoras, Gorgias presented a philosophical query in response to his critics:

1. Nothing exists.
2. If anything exists, it cannot be known by the thought of man.
3. Even if it can be apprehended, it cannot be communicated to another.

This statement of Gorgias' personal philosophy can be clarified by a two-part explanation. First, Gorgias felt that no absolute truth existed, therefore "nothing exists." He did admit that some absolute truths might exist, but such truths could not be known to man. The final premise admits that some truths may exist and be known to individual men,

yet such truths could never be universalized: they could never be understood by anyone other than the person to whom they were known.

The second explanation deals with the types of things which do exist. The facts which Gorgias admits as existing are qualitative facts. These facts, including things such as color, smell, and other such aesthetic experiences, do exist and can be known to man. This type of knowledge, because of its nature, cannot be communicated to anyone other than the one who experiences the actual sensory input. How is it possible to transfer with accuracy the fragrance of a rose or the color of an evening sky? Because of his dependence upon observation, experience, and the opinions of the individual, Gorgias belongs to the same class of Sophists as does Protagoras: in his teachings of style and delivery, he introduces yet another class.

4) Hippias (b. 450 B.C.)[10]

Hippias of Elis should be noted for three major characteristics, although only one of them is specifically rhetorical. Primary source material from Hippias is nonexistent, but Plato conveys the impression that Hippias was a well-rounded teacher. He taught more than just rhetoric, stressing all sevens areas of education which would later become known as the trivium (grammar, dialectic, rhetoric) and the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music). Hippias is remembered for his versatility, as his interests and instructional areas are probably the most diverse of all the Sophists

---

[10] The most comprehensive individual reference to Hippias is Bromley Smith, "Hippias and the Lost Canon of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XII (June, 1926).

to be mentioned here. As much as Plato praised the versatility and broad background of Hippias, he refused to classify him as a philosopher. The reasoning behind such a refusal should be noted as the second major contribution of Hippias. He held and taught the tenet that man was only accountable to natural law, and should not be held accountable to man-made laws. This teaching was well within the boundaries of the natural philosophy of the time, but because of the refusal to recognize submission to the laws of society as vital, Plato would not classify Hippias among the philosophers.

Hippias' concentration on the training of the memory was his key rhetorical contribtuion. He had a keen memory himself, and it is said that he could recall fifty names in order after hearing them only once. Since Hippias had such a fine memory, he felt that he could train others to use their memories more effectively in all areas of study. The system of memory training used by Hippias and later found in the Rhetorica Ad Herrenium did not survive in fully written form, though the emphasis placed upon the importance of memory in oratory continued in general throughout the classical period.

5) Thrasymachus (b. 457 B.C.)[11]

Thrasymachus of Chalcedon is yet another of the teachers of rhetoric who accepted fees for their lectures, and is allied most closely to the type of Sophistic teaching practiced by Gorgias. Thrasymachus chose to please the ears of the audience through excellence of style and delivery, which caused Plato to represent him in the dialogues and in the Republic with distaste similar to that shown other Sophists. The important

[11] The most comprehensive individual reference to Thrasymachus is Bromley Smith, "Thrasymachus: A Pioneer Rhetorician," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIII (June, 1927).

rhetorical contributions of Thrasymachus come in the area of style, although Aristotle noted that Thrasymachus was known for his systematic teaching of delivery and is said to have written the first treatise devoted solely to delivery. The contents of such a work are not specifically known, but the comments which come through secondary sources do make his contributions in the area of style very clear.

Thrasymachus taught and demonstrated the "middle" style of oratory. Such a style is neither too grand nor too simple, depending heavily upon the use of such rhythmical devices such as periods, clauses, and tropes (all mentioned by Thrasymachus). Many of the later Greeks drew heavily from this delineation provided by Thrasymachus, as the three styles (grand, middle, simple) were perfected and developed even further in later works. In order for the student to develop the proper use of the middle style and master the rhythmical devices, Thrasymachus relied on the use of recited passages and commonplaces in the training of his students. He is also remembered for his concentration on the appeal to the emotions, with special emphasis placed on the appeal to pity through pathetic commonplaces. In all use of recited material, however, Thrasymachus attempted to keep his students from sounding dull or banal: his emphasis upon vivacious delivery was equally important as the development of the proper style.

6) Theodorus (flourished c. 427)[12]

In Plato's Phaedrus, Theodorus of Byzantium is described as a "word-smith," due to his uncanny ability to come up with novel forms of expression and clever phrases.

---

[12]The best single reference to Theodorus is Bromley Smith, "Theodorus of Byzantium: Word-Smith," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIV (June, 1928).

The tradi tion of Gorgias and Thrasymachus would make Theodorus the third of the stylistic Sophists, but Theodorus went beyond his predecessors to be concerned with both form and content of oratory as well as style. Like many of the earlier Sophists, Theodorus taught students in preparation for a life of speaking in the courts and assembly, with one of his specific contributions coming out of his commentary on argumentation. Theodorus taught his students to rely on their own cases, but was the first to teach that orators should also take advantage of the mistakes and weaknesses in the opponent's case.

Most of the Sophists taught similar patterns of arrangement for speeches, but Theodorus went into much more detail on arrangement than any of the others. He extends both the sections of confirmation and refutation, developing the "further confirmation" in which the speaker returns to his confirmation and proof again later in the speech to ensure that the audience is convinced. He also added "further refutation" which consisted of drawing conclusions later in the speech which were formed as opposites of the opponent's charges. Theodorus divided the usual areas of narration into three parts: pre-narration, narration, post-narration. The speaker should begin the main portion of his speech with a preview of what is to come, and finish with a summary of the material established during the body of the narration. A handbook containing these contributions by Protagoras was known to Aristotle, but his unique categorization of the arrangement of an oration seems to have had little influence on other classical theorists.

7) Prodicus (fl. c. 431 B.C.)[13]

To this point in analysis, Plato has been seen as having been very critical of the Sophists both generally and individually. Through the alleged utterances of Socrates, however, Plato remarks at the excellence of Prodicus of Ceos. He admits his own weaknesses when compared to the strengths of Prodicus in the area of language. This may be admiration for the talents of a man, and not necessarily his teaching methods, but it is evident that Plato had a comparatively high view of Prodicus. During his time, Prodicus was the master of language usage, and his emphasis on precise language and the shades of meanings of words parallels similar emphases in contemporary semantic theory.

Although Prodicus has been given the title "sire of synonomy," his teachings in the area of the use of synonyms is only one of his contributions under the broad heading of language usage. Prodicus insisted that his students use language that was appropriate to their purpose and audience. He attacked the use of general terms, stressing the importance of words which convey precise meanings, leaving no room for error. Prodicus recognized that a single term might have several meanings, and insisted that his students be aware of the possible interpretations of such terms by different individuals. He abhorred the use of equivocal terminology, as it did not promote accuracy of transmission from speaker to audience. Prodicus bordered on the teaching of philosophy, as he urged his students to examine the meanings of terms

---

[13]The best single source for Prodicus is Bromley Smith, "Prodicus of Ceos: The Sire of Synonomy," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VI (1920).

such as God, life, and pleasure. The teachings of Prodicus were Sophistic in nature, however, because of his emphasis on particular speaking methods which would produce results, rather than emphasizing a higher moral purpose for oratory. Prodicus was not always concerned with the content of the message in terms of truth, probability, or plausibility, so long as the message was appropriate, precise, and accurate.

CHAPTER THREE:

THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS

Following the period (c. 500 B.C. to 400 B.C.) in which Sophistic rhetoric flourished, there developed a series of Greek rhetorical theories which were heavily steeped in the philosophy of the time. Instead of basing rhetoric upon its practical end (persuasion), the rhetorical theories of Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle, and Anaximenes began with a foundation in philosophical principles, each dependent upon the developments of those theorists prior to them.[1] Plato developed his definition of the art of rhetoric in partial reaction to the Sophists, whose teachings and methods he detested. Isocrates took the philosophical foundations of Plato and the practical theories of the Sophists and drew a line between the two. Aristotle noted some incompleteness in the rhetorical theories and emphases of Isocrates, and wrote his Rhetoric in order to provide a more thorough and polished definition of the scope of rhetoric. The Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum, attributed for many years to Aristotle, is now generally attributed to Anaximenes of Lampascus (although based heavily upon the thetorical contributions of Aristotle). These theorists, representing the period of rhetorical theory from 428 to 320 B.C., are the focus of this chapter.

A. Plato

Plato was born in 428 B.C., son of Ariston and Pericitone. He was a member of a distinguished Athenian family, and had the privilege of studying under the Athenian

---

[1]The most thorough overall treatment of this period comes from Baldwin's Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, Jebb's Attic Orators, and Kennedy's The Art Of Persuasion in Greece. These sources should be consulted along with the specific references to each theorist.

Philosopher Socrates. The teachings of Socrates greatly influenced the later teachings and writings of the adult Plato, as Plato fashioned his written dialogues in the form of dialogues between historical characters, with Socrates speaking the parts which bring out the beliefs of Plato. Plato taught in his own school in Athens, the Academy, which was established in approximately 387 B.C. In his curriculum were studies of Philosophy, Science, and Mathematics. He was not a teacher of rhetoric by any means, especially when considered in comparison to the popular Sophistic teachers of rhetoric who were his contemporaries. Plato taught a philosophy of absolute truth and principles which should guide the education of the philosopher-statesman. It is out of this philosophical base that his criticisms of Sophistry came, as the Sophistic conceptions of probability, plausibility, and argument on two sides of a question could not be accomated in a philosophy of absolutes.

Plato recorded his teachings and philosophy in many written works, with his dialogue The _Republic_ being the most widely read in modern times. Two of the dialogues in particular develop the rhetorical theory which is attributed to Plato,[2] his _Gorgias_[3] and _Phaedrus_[4] (384-322 B.C.). The _Gorgias_ belongs to a set of dialogues which were written fairly early in the career of Plato, though its precise date is not known. In this dialogue, Plato produces his conviction that rhetoric is not an art since it has no unique subject matter and

---

[2] A general background on Plato and his rhetorical theories can be drawn from: Edwin Black, "Plato's View of Rhetoric," _Quarterly Journal of Speech_, XLIV (December, 1958) pp. 361-374, Everett Lee Hunt, "Plato on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians," _Quarterly Journal of Speech_, VI (June, 1920) pp. 35-56, Friedrich Schliermacher, _Schliermacher's Introductions to the Dialogues of Plato_, trans. by W. Dobson (New York, 1973).

[3] Plato, _Gorgias_, trans and intro. by W.C. Helmbold (New York, 1952).

[4] Plato, _Phaedrus_, trans and intro. by W.C. Helmbold (New York, 1956).

confers no power upon its master. The rhetoric being criticized is specifically that which is practiced by Gorgias and his followers, although Gogias embodies (in this dialogue) all of the weaknesses which Plato saw as inherent in Sophistry. A later view of rhetoric is developed in the _Phaedrus_, where Plato defines his requisites for rhetoric to be considered an "art" (requisites quite different than those set forth by Gorgias for the "art" which he practiced and taught). In order to gain full understanding of the rhetorical theory espoused by Plato in these two works, the content of each must be investigated individually.

1. Plato's _Gorgias_

The setting for the dialogue is a discussion between Socrates, Callicles, Gorgias, Polus, and Chaerephon, beginning on the streets of Athens when Callicles and Socrates meet the others and begin to exchange ideas concerning the nature of that work of which Gorgias professed to be the master. Socrates begins his discussion with Gorgias by asking him to define and describe the art at which he is skilled, and thereafter the title by which he should be called. Gorgias responds that his art is rhetoric, and indeed he ought to be called a rhetorician. It soon becomes clear that Socrates is attempting to draw from Gorgias the basic tenets of his art so that he, in turn, can render some judgment upon them. Socrates asks the following questions: 1)With what thing is its skill (rhetoric) concerned? 2)What is its subject matter? 3)What specific sort of subjects does it deal with?

Gorgias aptly answers the inquiries of Socrates, replying that the skill of rhetoric is speech. Socrates contends that many arts may use speech as a skill, forcing Gorgias to define the specific skill of rhetoric as being persuasion, more specifically the sort

of persuasion that can be found in the courts and public assemblies. At this point, Socrates draws an important line of distinction between persuasion aimed at knowledge and persuasion that aims at securing belief. True to his Sophistic background, Gorgias says that rhetoric is persuasion which seeks to produce belief rather than knowledge. These premises set up the subsequent attack that Plato (through the mouthpiece of Socrates) makes on rhetoric. Plato insists that the rhetoric practiced by Gorgias and his pupils was not an art at all, since it did not base itself in knowledge, did not confer knowledge upon its audience, and had no subject matter which was uniquely its own. He called such rhetoric a "knack" rather than an art, as it was only a method or routine such as cookery, and aimed only at appearances rather than truth.

2. Plato's *Phaedrus*

As stated previously, the[2] *Phaedrus* of Plato is believed to have been written later than the *Gorgias*. This may lead scholars to believe that the view of rhetoric presented in the later work is a more refined view, and indeed constitutes a change of mind on the part of Plato (since he condemns rhetoric in the *Gorgias* and approves of it in the *Phaedrus*). It must be carefully noted, however, that Plato only condemns the sort of rhetoric practiced by Gorgias and his contemporaries. In the *Phaedrus*, it can be seen that Plato provides his alternative definition of rhetoric, defining rhetoric in terms of his own philosophical point of view. The setting of the dialogue is a conversation between Phaedrus and Socrates on the outskirts of Athens, concerning a speech just heard by Phaedrus, given by Lysias to a crowd on the streets of Athens. After discussing and presenting speeches by both Lysias and Socrates, the two interlocutors get around to the question which is the focus of this investigation: "What is rhetoric?" Socrates

presents a lengthy exposition of both the philosophical and the psychological considerations which must underlie any "art" of rhetoric. Rhetoric, according to Socrates is the art of winning the souls of men by the use of words.

Socrates initially defends four philosophical requisites for artful rhetoric. In summary form, they are:

1. The speaker must know the truth about that which he speaks.
2. The speaker must be able to define his subject area in terms of a universal class of things that exist.
3. The speaker must define his subject according to its specific classes.
4. The speaker must continue to classify and divide his subject matter until indivisible.

Plato's personal philosophy of absolute truth as the basis for all action and thought becomes the basis for his art of rhetoric, with the speaker beginning his rhetorical exercise by knowing the entire truth about his subject matter. Plato could not support the Sophistic notion of applying rhetorical skills to any subject matter without regard for truth, and made certain that his own rhetoric was based upon the truth and existed only as a means to further the truth. The other three philosophical steps continued this same notion, as a speaker who could treat his subject matter in such a way as to know its divisions and idiosyncracies would certainly have the command of the subject matter that was prerequisite to any rhetorical effort.

After the four philosophical steps of preparation have been accomplished, the speaker has yet to consider the hearers of his proposed rhetoric. Three psychological considerations of the audience must be made in order for the rhetoric to fit the mold established by Socrates as being an art:

1. The speaker must know the nature of the soul.
2. The speaker must know the means by which the soul is affected.
3. Knowing both the qualities of souls and of his subject matter, the speaker must point out the connection between particular souls and particular speeches, showing why one soul is persuaded by one sort of argument and another by different arguments.

The soul must be equated to the psychological state of being of persons in the general audience of all men. The rhetorician must know the general nature of all men, and must also be able to describe the specific nature of individual men. After discovering the nature of the soul, the speaker must be able to see how the soul is swayed by argument (emotional, logical, etc.). Finally, one who wishes to practice the art of rhetoric as set forth by Plato, must match the arguments of his subject matter to the types of souls that will be affected by the particular types. This psychological audience analysis, certainly aimed at the effective persuasion of men, need not be compared directly to Sophistic notions. Taken apart from the first four requisites, it is certainly no different than the Sophistic principles: based in truth and a total understanding of subject matter established in the prior steps, the rhetoric espoused by Socrates is a step in a philosophical direction not taken by any of the Sophists.

Any rhetorical analysis of Plato's Phaedrus would be incomplete if it did not note the material in the dialogue which precedes the discussion summarized above. Phaedrus presents, at the urging of Socrates, the speech given by Lysias on the subject of the preference for the non-lover as a friend as opposed to the lover. Socrates praises the speech of Lysias, but states that he can produce a better speech on the same subject, and proceeds to do so. After his speech, Socrates claims that he has committed blasphemy

by preferring the non-lover over the lover, as Eros is the Greek God of Love. He proceeds to produce a second speech espousing the value of having the lover as a friend instead of the non-lover. At first glance, the discussion of love and friendship seems to break up the unity of the work, if it indeed is a unified discussion of rhetoric at all.

Several scholars support the view that Plato's Phaedrus is indeed a unified work.[5] Weaver, among these scholars, interprets the meaning of the speeches in light of the types of rhetoric and language usage of which the speeches are models. The three speeches (Lysias on the non-lover, Socrates on the non-lover, and Socrates on the lover) are viewed as being the speeches of the non-lover, the evil lover, and the noble lover. The non-lover, preferred by Lysias, is detatched, unemotional, and not concerned. The rhetoric modeled after the non-lover is neutral, scientific, and precise. It is not to be preferred for usage, as it cannot represent all of the components if human nature that cannot be expressed in scientifically precise terminology. Likewise the rhetoric of the evil lover (the lover condemned in Socrates' first speech) is not to be preferred, as it represents aggressive, exploitative, and destructive rhetoric. The

---

[5]See specific discussion in the following: Oscar L. Brownstein, "Plato's Phaedrus: Dialectic as the Genuine Art of Speaking," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LI (December, 1965) pp. 392-398, W. Helmbold and W. Holther, "The Unity of The Phaedrus," University of California Publications in Classical Philology, XIV (1952), Gustav E. Mueller, "Unity of the Phaedrus," Classical Bulletin, XXXIII (March, 1957) pp. 50-53 and (April, 1957) pp. 63-65, W. Scott Nobles, "The Paradox of Plato's Attitude Toward Rhetoric," Western Speech, XXI (Fall, 1957) pp. 206-210, Peter J. Schnakel, "Plato's Phaedrus and Rhetoric," Southern Speech Journal, XXXII (1966) pp. 124-132, Richard Weaver, The Ethics of Rhetoric, (Chicago, 1953).

rhetoric of the evil lover endangers those who hear it, embodying all of the negative emotions from which the non-lover remains detatched. The rhetoric to be preferred is that embodied in the final speech of Socrates. The noble lover is concerned about both the well-being of others and the truth, is emotionals for the sake of empathy rather than sym pathy, and seeks the truth as a basi for all action. The language used by a rhetorician of this sort is precise enough so as not to be vague or detatched, but is emotional enough so as to convey the essence of meaning.

There can be no question as to whether intended the Phaedrus to be a unified work set out to define the nature of rhetoric: any interpretation drawn in this direction must be speculative at the very best. While there may not be any specific historical evidence to substantiate such analysis, the interpretation of the work as unified does add continued substance to the philosophical basis which Plato supported for all rhetorical activity. The key rhetorical contributions of Plato can be seen with or without the final analysis of the three speeches. Plato viewed the rhetoric of the Sophists with malcontent, preferring the definiton of the art of rhetoric which he sets forth in the Phaedrus. As the foundation for anything rhetorical is the truth, once such truth is discovered in its totality it must be applied to the specific audience to ensure the rhetorician's ability to win the souls of the audience to the truth.

B. Isocrates

1. General Background[6]

Isocrates was born in Athens in 436 B.C. He grew up in the period in which Sophistic rhetoric flourished in Athens, and sat under the tutelage of Athenian Sophists. His treatment of rhetoric as both subject matter and method for education comes from the influences of Prodicus, Tisias, and Protagoras, with special emphasis from both Gorgias and Socrates. The philosophical principles of Socrates combined with the practical rhetoric taught by the Sophists guided the development of Isocrates' rhetorical theory which emphasized the education of students in philosophy, with rhetoric being both the method of instruction and the practical end of that which was studied.

Isocrates inherited much of his wealth, but subsequently lost it and was forced to work for a living and to regain his social position in Athens. He became known for his ability in speech writing, and because of his large following, opened his own school. Some scholars place Isocrates under the heading of Sophistry, especially because of his early association with the Sophists and his skill at writing speeches for others (a typical Sophistic profession). Isocrates did not claim the title of "Sophist"

[6]For specific references to Isocrates see: J.W.H. Atkins, Literary Criticism in Antiquity, (Gloucester, Mass., 1961), Werner Jaeger, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, (New York, 1944), R.C. Jebb, Attic Orators, R. Johnson, "Isocrates' Methods of Teaching," American Journal of Philology, LXXX (1959) pp. 25-36, Russell H. Wagner, "The Rhetorical Theory of Isocrates," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VIII (November, 1922) pp. 322-337.

for himself, though he did call himself a philosopher. It was the aim of Isocrates to make practical philosophers of his students, which places him in teaching somewhere between the Platonic and Sophistic schools of thought.

2. Topical Content of Isocrates' Works

Although any rhetorical texts written by Isocrates do not remain in the form of systematic or complete treatments of the "art" of rhetoric, there are two specific works remaining which do give some insight into the educational and rhetorical practices and philosophies of Isocrates. The two works are Against the Sophists (c. 391 B.C.) and Antidosis (c. 354 B.C.),[7] with the former being an essay on education and the latter being a speech supposedly given by a fictional character who represents Isocrates in a legal dispute. The two works are complementary, as the first defends his educational theories and the second defends his art and his own life.

Against the Sophists protests the educational systems of the time in which it was written. Isocrates specifically denounces three groups of educators: the eristics (those who taught theory without any practical application), the teachers of practical rhetoric (political discourse), and the writers of handbooks. In his criticism of the eristics, Isocrates argued against their self-proclaimed ability to impart knowledge and virtue in exchange for a fee. The criticism levied against the teachers of purely

[7]See Isocrates, "Against the Sophists" and "Antidosis," in Isocrates, Vol. 2, trans. and intro. by George Norlin, (Cambridge, 1929).

practical rhetoric was equally vehement: Isocrates did not denounce the aim of such teachers, as he himself taught rhetoric for its practical uses. His major point of contention with the teachers of practical rhetoric was their claim to be able to teach any student, regardless of ability, to become an effective orator through the mere adoption of a set of skills. Isocrates preferred to come between the two that he criticized, combining both theory and practice in education. His final argument was aimed at the writers of handbooks, although his criticism once again was not aimed at the purpose for such writing. Isocrates felt that there was great value in the attempt to synthesize rhetorical theory, but was convinced that the handbooks of the time were neither comprehensive nor complete enough to be recorded as texts claiming to be manuals of rhetoric. HHis main argument was specifically that the texts covered only forensic rhetoric, and that rhetoric certainly had more scope than this and deserved more thorough treatment.

The format fot Isocrates' Antidosis evolves out of a particular historical situation in which Isocrates was involved. It was the custom of the time for wealthy Athenians to bear the expense of public service, with the duties of such public service being called "liturgies." One particular liturgy was the fitting out of a ship of war, which was specifically termed a "trierarchy." At any time, a citizen of lower wealth and social status could challenge a more wealthy citizen with the choice of either performing a liturgy or exchanging property with him. Because of his influence and the popularity of his school in Athens, Isocrates was evidently viewed as being a person of great wealth and high character: in any case, Isocrates was challenged to perform a

trierarchy by another citizen, Megakleides. The issue was taken to court, and Isocrates was made to fit out the ship of war, lest he have to exchange property with Megakleides.

The challenge put to citizens such as Isocrates was termed an "antidosis." Isocrates wrote his work of the same name in order to establish the truth about himself, turning about the false conceptions which may have abounded concerning his teachings and subsequent wealth. He formed Antidosis as a speech made in court against a fictional opponent, who for all practical purposes represented Megakleides. In this work, he first defends himself, setting forth examples of his true character, philosophy, and reason for being. He follows with a defense of his art, which he developed as being different from that of the Sophistic rhetoricians of the time. He presented a view of himself which was opposed to the public notion that he was wealthy from his teaching, and proposed that he was not wealthy as were the Sophists, who charged exorbitant fees for their lectures.

3. Rhetorical Emphases of Isocrates' Works

The unique contributions of Isocrates in terms of rhetorical theory fall specifically under the heading of rhetorical education. Isocrates was an educator, not a theorist or an educator. His underlying philosophy of education consisted of three parts: 1)native ability, 2)practice and experience, 3)education. Isocrates was convinced that a certain amount of native ability was important in educating a student, though he did not spell out the minimum guidlines for the amount of ability necessary: in any case, the native ability of the student was the basis from which all education

began. Secondly, the overall education of the student must be accomplished through practice and experience. For this reason, Isocrates adopted rhetoric as his method through which all subject matter was taught. Regardless of the content, the student should be exposed to the practice of the theory that is taught, and the most effective avenue to such practice was through the means of rhetoric. Finally came the importance of education in specific areas of subject matter.

Five qualities epitomize the educational process as viewed by Isocrates: his teachings were practical, moral, patriotic, broad, and thorough. The emphasis upon practice and experience previously noted is the basis for the area of practicality of rhetorical education, and certainly his training under the Sophists had some influence in this area. In opposition to the Sophists, however, Isocrates felt that rhetoric was not merely practical, but involved a philosophy or set of basic philosophical principles. Morality was a chief feature of the education of Isocrates' students, as he saw the culmination of education as being the development of the orator-statesman. In addition to the moral teachings, Isocrates relied heavily upon an emphasis on national devotion as an attribute of the statesman. Isocrates himself had an extremely strong allegiance to both Athens and Greece which he instilled in his students. Finally, Isocrates believed in a broad and thorough training of the individual. He taught his students in many areas, although his teachings in the areas of politics and rhetoric have come under the most scholarly scruitiny. Through an educational philosophy based upon these five areas, Isocrates sought to form men who were capable of forming sound opinions which would benefit themselves as well as society.

To this point, the chief contributions of Isocrates have been noted int the area of education, but in summary form they may be seen as a bridge in rhetorical theory which helps to unify the period under study. His overall tendency to combine the theories of practical and philosophical rhetoric puts him in a class uniquely his own. Secondly, while Socrates and Plato used rhetoric to teach such subject matter as philosophy and the arts, Isocrates used rhetoric as a method to teach all subjects, including rhetoric itself. A third unique contribution is Isocrates' insistence upon the equality of oratory and politics (the training of the "orator-statesman"), as politics and oratory are placed on separate levels by earlier theorists. In order to draw a final picture of the rhetorical contributions of Isocrates, the idea of a bridge between the extreme views of the Sophists and Plato must be remembered as the central factor of importance.

C. Aristotle

1. General Background

Aristotle was born in 384 B.C., the son of the Athenian doctor Nichomachus. He was sent to study at the Athenian Academy of Plato in 367, where he remained for twenty years. Aristotle went on to be a tutor to Alexander the Great, and later founded and directed his Lyceum in Athens, a school rival to the Academy. Aristotle was the first of the Greeks to record a systematic treatise of logical thought, with his specific explanation of syllogistic reasoning being recorded in the <u>Prior</u> and <u>Posterior</u>

Analytics.[8] He develops his usage of dialectical syllogisms further in the Topics,[9] and directs the specific rhetorical use of reasoning in his Rhetoric.[10] The rhetorical contributions of Aristotle come as a result of his keen powers of observation: his Rhetoric is composed of organized observations of the rhetorical situation as it existed in Athens during his life.[11]

Rhetoric and logical reasoning are far from being the only interests of Aristotle. He had a deep regard for philosophy, stemming from his relationship with Plato at the Academy. He also delved into the area of prose writing and used it for the basis of one of his major works, his Poetics.[12] Aristotle's psychological observations are also apparent in in his categorization of the emotions of the audience in his Rhetoric, as well as the qualities he ascribes to men of varying ages and social classes. The logical bases of thought developed by Aristotle are the foundations of most all scientific thought and investigation.

2. Topical Content of Aristotle's Rhetoric

The majority of Aristotle's contributions to rhetorical theory came from the one source, his Rhetoric. While the bases for both inductive and deductive modes of proof

---

[8] Aristotle, Prior and Posterior Analytics, ed. and trans. by J. Warrington (New York, 1964).

[9] Aristotle, Topica, trans. by E.S. Forster (Cambridge, 1960).

[10] Aristotle, Rhetoric, trans. by Lane Cooper (New York, 1932).

[11] For specific references to Aristotle see: Lane Cooper, "The Rhetoric of Aristotle," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXI (February, 1935) pp. 10-19, E.M. Cope, An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric, (London, 1867), Everett Lee Hunt, "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians," in Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans, (New York, 1965), W. Rhys Roberts, Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism, (New York, 1963)

[12] Aristotle, Poetics, trans by S. Butcher (New York, 1961).

are described in other works, their specific rhetorical uses come through in the Rhetoric. This work is divided into three books, and they can individually be described as the books of the speaker, the audience, and the speech. In order to save space and avoid excess verbiage, the content of each of three books will be summarized below in outline form.

Book One--the book of the speaker

1. Rhetoric is the counterpart (complement) of dialectic.
2. Definition of rhetoric--the faculty (or power) of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion.
3. The enthymeme is a rhetorical form of syllogistic reasoning.
4. Two types of proof--artistic and non-artistic proof
    a. artistic proof--logical, ethical, and emotional proof
    b. non-artistic proof--documents, oaths, and testimony
5. Three types of rhetoric
    a. deliberative
    b. forensic
    c. epideictic (panegyric)

Book Two--the book of the audience

1. The speaker must consider the frame of mind of the audience in all situations.
2. Three important impressions must be made by the speaker on his audience--wisdom, virtue, good will.
3. The emotions of the audience as a collective body must be considered. The following emotions are detailed specifically: anger, love, fear, shame, benevolence, pity, envy, emulation, and theri opposites.
4. The speaker must consider the character traits of the audience. Aristotle describes the traits of youth, old age, and those in their prime, as well as the effects of social rank, power, and good fortune.
5. Aristotle further describes the uses of common topics in speaking.
6. The enthymeme ;and its specific rhetorical uses are detailed.
7. Fallacies of argument and their refutation are detailed.

Book Three--the book of the speech

1. Chapters 1-12 are devoted to a discussion of style.
2. Chapters 13-19 are devoted to arrangement.
3. Delivery, style are treated together. Delivery is treated as a necessary evil, discussed briefly then dismissed.
4. The speech is arranged into four major sections: exordium, statement of facts, proof, and peroration. While all four are detailed, Aristotle feels that only the statement of facts and proof are of necessity.

3. Unique Features of Aristotle's Rhetoric

In order to begin a summary of the important rhetorical contributions of Aristotle, there must be an initial understanding of his definition of rhetoric. For Aristotle, rhetoric was concerned with observing the available means of persuasion for any given case. The emphasis is upon observation, which guides the reader through the entirety of the three books of the treatise. Aristotle prescribes and describes based upon his particular observations of the available means of persuasion. He is interested in what "works"--what methods of persuasion will succeed, based upon an analysis of the particular case, the state of mind of the audience, and the necessary forms of proof. This emphasis upon the means of persuasion and upon observation set Aristotle apart (at least in analysis of extant works) from earlier theorists in terms of his definition of rhetoric.

Aristotle's definition of rhetoric and his emphasis upon methods might lead one to believe that Aristotle gleaned little from his studies at the Academy and would tend to side with the Sophists. Such an assumption is refuted in the first sentence of the Rhetoric, when Aristotle states that "rhetoric is the counterpart of dialectic." Aristotle, much like Isocrates, prefers to draw a line between the two extremes exemplified

by Platonic philosophy and Sophistic practicality. In setting forth rhetoric to be the counterpart of dialectic, he showed the notion that the active lifestyle of rhetoric and the contemplative lifestyle of dialectic (searching for truth) are mutually interdependent. Rhetoric cannot exist nor can it be effective unless it is based in a dialectical search for truth. Dialectic has no means for the conveyance of the truths that are discovered, unless it be rhetoric. The tool to be used by responsible citizens is rhetoric, especially in the pursuit of an establishment of truth used for the good of society.

The contents of Aristotle's Rhetoric are not only accurate observations about the rhetorical situation at Athens, as Aristotle takes his observations and groups them together into definitive categories. Many of the observations are not unique, but his categories and terminology are often uniquely original. Such is the case with his categorization of the forms of proof to be used in rhetorical argument. He first delineates between non-artistic and artistic proofs, non-artistic being those which exist independent of any rhetorical effort (oaths, testimonies, documents) and artistic proofs being those which must be invented by the speaker in the context of the particular rhetorical situation. Aristotle dismisses any further discussion of non-artistic forms of proof, choosing instead to focus the majority of his work on the invention and application of artistic forms of proof.

Artistic proofs are of three types: ethos (ethical proofs), pathos (emotional proofs), and logos (logical proofs). Ethical proof is that by which audiences are convinced on the basis of the credibility of the speaker. In many cases, Aristotle admits that the

character of the speaker (as perceived by the audience) may be the most effective vehicle of persuasion. Some speakers may bring a certain degree of credibility or character with them to a rhetorical situation, but such ethical proof by prior opinion of the speaker is deemed inartistic by Aristotle, as true ethical proof must be developed within the context of the individual speech. Emotional proof is that proof by which the audience is persuaded when their emotions are swayed by the speaker. The hearers themselves become agents of this form of proof, as the proof is contingent upon the proper emotions being stirred toward the desired action or belief. Logical proof is either deductive or inductive, with deductive proof coming through the use of the rhetorical syllogism (or "enthymeme") and inductive proof accomplished through the use of examples.

Since Aristotle is one of the founders of systematic logic and reasoning, it should be reasonable to expect that one of his key rhetorical contributions would be found in the area of rhetorical reasoning. Although he does discuss inductive reasoning and the use of the example, the majority of the emphasis is placed upon deductive rhetorical reasoning. In both the _Prior_ and _Posterior Analytics_, Aristotle develops the idea of syllogistic reasoning. The syllogism is a form of deductive reasoning through which specific conclusions can be drawn from general principles. According to Aristotle, there are three types of syllogisms, varying according to their purpose and form: scientific syllogisms, dialectical syllogisms, and rhetorical syllogisms (or enthymemes). A lengthy analysis of the first two in a study of rhetorical theory is unnecessary, but some basic knowledge must be developed in order to set the rhetorical syllogism apart

from the scientific and the dialectical. A summary of the characteristics may be found in comparative form in the following table:

Types of Syllogisms

	Scientific Syllogism	Dialectical Syllogism	Rhetorical Syllogism[13] (Enthymeme)
Purpose	To prove or demonstrate	To inquire; to search for truth through dialectic	To persuade
Premises (subject matter)	Premises are made of the first principles discovered by the philosophers.	Premises are based upon the opinions of the wise. They are tested in order to discover truth.	Premises are not necessarily and absolutely true. Based upon the probable opinions of the majority or of the audience.

The rhetorical syllogism can be set apart by two major characteristics. The first difference is the purpose of the enthymeme. The enthymeme is used to persuade rather than to prove or search for truth. Since rhetoric is the counterpart of dialectic, it is hoped that the speaker would be well-versed in the dialectical syllogism, but the purpose of such understanding would be a personal search for truth rather than the persuasion of an audience. Scientific and dialectical syllogisms have formal rules which lead to certain conclusions, but enthymemes have no formal rules by which the audience is to draw conclusions. Since the premises for enthymemes are based in the

[13] For a detailed discussion of the enthymeme, see: Lloyd Bitzer, "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (December, 1959) pp. 409-414, Gary Cronkite, "The Enthymeme as Deductive Rhetorical Argument," Western Speech, XXX (Spring, 1966) pp. 129-134.

opinions of the audience, the audience may help the speaker to complete the persuasive process. The speaker must use accurate observations of the audience as premises for enthymemic reasoning, but he must rely upon the audience to accept his conclusion (especially since there are no formal rules which would make a conclusion certain or necessary).

The part played by the audience is important to the persuasive power of the enthymeme, but this should not lead to the conclusion that an enthymeme is not a complete syllogism. Certainly the speaker may assume that one or more of his premises is readily accepted by the audience, and he may even leave one of the premises unstated: this form is not, however, necessary or typical of the enthymeme, leading the enthymeme to be described as a "truncated syllogism." That which distinguishes an enthymeme from the other forms of deduction is its purpose--to persuade. Aristotle observed that audiences were more easily persuaded by deduction that was personal, not scientific, and for that reason urged the use of enthymemes with their premises based upon majority opinions: however, if a formally valid and completely scientific syllogism was used to persuade (and not to prove), it would become a rhetorical syllogism (or enthymeme) on the basis of its purpose.

Aristotle's heavy concentration upon the logical forms of proof does not lead him to be incomplete in other areas of rhetorical theory. He was the first of the theorists of his day to treat the importance of the state of mind of the specific audience in the rhetorical act, and spends a great deal of time categorizing the characteristics of audiences. Aristotle believed that a speaker must know the emotions of the audience

in order to use emotional proof effectively, as well as stressing that the speaker understand the general character of specific portions of the audience in order to choose the forms of proof to be adapted to the different sections of the audience. The descriptions of the emotional states and general characteristics of people of certain age groups and social ranks served as a guide for the aspiring Athenian rhetor who wished to perceive the expected reactions of the audience to his specific rhetorical effort. Aristotle did not, however, expect that his descriptions would fit every individual in the audience, but instead viewed his descriptions as those which depicted groups of people within any audience. Much like the other observations within the Rhetoric, the categorization of the emotions and character cannot be transferred indiscriminately to another society, culture, or time period, but it is certainly accurate to state that most of the general statements made by Aristotle concerning the emotions do indicate a generalized set of observations which are fairly accurate concerning human nature in general.

Little of Book Three of the Rhetoric is specifically unique, as Aristotle restates many of the earlier principles of style, delivery, and arrangement. He gives the same basic organizational format for speaking, although giving unique emphasis to the sections of the statement of the case and proof. The most unique feature of organization is the overall organization of the Rhetoric itself: the speaker, the audience, and the speech. These sections do overlap and duplicate to some extent, but no other work previous was able to classify and describe the individual features of the entire rhetorical situation as did Aristotle. As a result, the student finishes with a view of the process of rhetoric that is vastly different from that of any previous

rhetorical theory. Aristotle should be remembered for his emphasis upon the method of observing the things which will persuade, and the consequent application of the proper forms of artistic proof to the specific situation.

D. Anaximene's Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum

1. General Background

This work takes the form of a letter from Aristotle to Alexander, setting forth rhetorical principles and teachings. Because of this, the work was attributed for many years to Aristotle himself. Scholars have been able to delineate some definite changes in style which have led them to believe that Aristotle is not the author of the Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum (c 340 B.C.).[14] The stylistic differences appear as the first of several keys to the removal of the authorship from Ariatotle, as the work does not have the emphasis upon logic that Aristotle had, and was not in any way philosophically oriented. The probable author of the work can be found by looking to another of the tutors of Alexander, Anaximenes of Lampascus. Anaximenes, Born circa. 380 B.C., was a Greek orator, teacher of rhetoric, and logographer (speech writer). He was influenced to some degree by aristotle, as the text does cover some of the same topics as can be found in the Rhetoric, and many of the subjects are given similar treatment to that of Aristotle.

---

[14]For a discussion of authorship and of the text itself, see: [Aristotle] Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum, trans. and intro. by H. Rackham (Cambridge, 1957), E.M. Cope, An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric.

2. Topical Content of the Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum

Anaximenes begins his work by setting forth three types of rhetoric:

Parlimentary--dealing with exortation and disuasion
Ceremonial--dealing with eulogy and vituperation
Forensic--dealing with prosecution and defense

He goes on to discuss common topics for rhetorical discourse, describes the forms of proof as direct and supplementary, and then discusses the style and arrangement of words. In the area of style, Anaximenes leans heavily upon the devices of antithesis, parallel construction, and parallel sound construction. While this work is not nearly as comprehensive as that of Aristotle, it does treat the content that is discussed in a fashion similar to that of the Rhetoric.

3. Unique Features of the Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum

The main contribution to classical rhetorical theory that can be found in this work is its unique development of the arrangement of the three types of speeches. The delineation of parlimentary (deliberative), ceremonial, and forensic speeches is not new, but Anaximenes goes beyond previous theory and sets forth specific patterns for each type of speech. The arrangement of parlimentary speeches follows a pattern of introduction, exposition, anticipation of opponent's arguments, and appeal to the feelings of friendship, gratitude, and pity in the audience. He sets forth no particular pattern for ceremonial speaking, choosing instead to record commonplaces and topics to be used in such speeches.

Anaximenes develops the speeches in prosecution and defense of forensic topics to the fullest extent of all three types. His arrangement for the prosecution speech

(the first speech in a forensic situation) goes a follows: introduction (securing good will), proof of the charge, anticipation of the defendant's arguments, recapitulation of arguments. The speech in defense replies by initially refuting the charges of the prosecution, replying to their anticipations, asking rhetorical questions, of the judges, and a final appeal to the good will of the judges. While it might be argued that Aristotle himself might scorn such a heavy emphasis upon arrangement (and especially upon forensic arrangement), the fact remains that Anaximenes leaves the most complete treatment of rhetoric which is at the very base of the Greek and Sophistic periods in rhetorical history.

CHAPTER FOUR:

THE ROMAN PERIOD

A. The Transition from Greek to Roman Rhetoric[1]

The well developed system of rhetoric which flourished in Athens at the time of Aristotle underwent a drastic change following his death (322 B.C.). Aristotle, Demosthenes, and Alexander the Great all died within twelve months of one another (323-322 B.C.), leaving behind a change in the Athenian situation. The center of cultural, political, and philosophical learning moved from Athens to Alexandria, with Athens forced to submit to Antipater (319 B.C.) under terms which all but extinguished oratory in the practical life of the average Athenian citizen. No extant works may be found which represent the period of Greek rhetoric which existed in the three hundred years which followed this decline. Some of those educated under the fourth century Greek system evidently travelled to other parts of the world, as several "schools" of rhetorical thought having a strong foundation in the Greek system sprang up around the hemisphere.

The first of the schools to be established outside of the Greek sphere was the Asian school. It is widely remembered for its emphasis upon an exaggerated and artificial style of oratory, returning rhetoric to the notions developed in the Sophistic realm of practicality, success, and results. A second Asiatic school developed later, in part as a negative

---

[1]For general references to the entire Roman period see: Baldwin's Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, D.L. Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education, (New York, 1957), M.L. Clarke, Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey, (London, 1953), Duff, J. Wight, A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age, (London, 1953), Aubrey Gwinn, Roman Education From Cicero to Quintilian, (Oxford, 1926).

reaction to the first. Its emphasis was on a more sophisticated and elevated style and purpose of rhetoric. Concurrent with the development of these two schools of rhetorical thought was that which existed on the island of Rhodes, the so-called Rhodian school. It was this school that had an influence on many of the Roman rhetorical theorists, with Cicero having been trained under its auspices, and Quintilian having mentioned its importance.

The rhetorical theory that began in Athens and was modified through these schools finally made its way to Rome in the first century B.C. The rhetoric which existed and was taught at Rome came through the teachings of Romans who were acquainted with Greek rhetoric as well as with the theory of the time. The period which is subsequently defined here as the Roman period in rhetorical history is bounded by the years 100 B.C. and 100 A.D., with the contributions ranging in this span from the *Rhetorica Ad Herrenium* to Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*. The important rhetorical theorists of this time span were not all Romans, however, as two contemporary Greek critics must be included. In order, the theorists to be included here are: [Cicero] *Rhetorica Ad Herrenium*, Cicero, Quintilian, and the literary criticism coming from Dionysius of Halicarnassus and [Longinus] *On the Sublime*.

B. [Cicero] *Rhetorica Ad Herrenium*

1. General Background

This rhetorical treatise, addressed to Gaius Herrenius, was listed among the works of Cicero until the fifteenth century A.D. It was written at approximately

the same time as Cicero's De Inventione (c. 66-62 B.C.), and treats many of the same subjects as the latter work did. Under close scholarly scruitiny, however, the attribution of this work to Cicero does not hold up.[2] While there are some obvious similarities between this work and that of Cicero, there are as many differences in doctrine which confuse the problem of authorship. The pattern of thought and the style of the Ad Herrenium is also different than the early Ciceronian writings. One final aspect which leads away from an attribution to Cicero is the idea that this work is not mentioned by any later Roman historian, cataloguing the writings of Cicero. Scholars as early as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have attempted to ascribe the work to Cornificius, but it seems most plausible to state that the Rhetorica Ad Herrenium was written by an author who is unknown to this date, although certain traits may be inferred from the contents of the work itself: the author may well have been a Roman who was quite familiar with the Greek heritage of rhetorical thought, as many of his conceptions come through as reminiscent of earlier Greek writers.

2. Topical Content of the Rhetorica Ad Herrenium

The work is divided into four books: the first and second deal with the requirements for invention and arrangement; the third treats delivery and memory, and the fourth discusses style. The overall focus of the treatise is on judicial (forensic) speaking,

---

[2]For individual reference to authorship and content of the work, see: [Cicero] Rhetorica Ad Herrenium, trans. and intro. by Harry Caplan, (Cambridge, 1954), Ray Nadeau, "Rhetorica Ad Herrenium: Commentary and Translation of Book One," Speech Monographs, XVI (August, 1949) pp. 57-68.

though the areas of deliberative and epideictic receive cursory treatment. The contents of the four books are summarized below:

Book One

1. Preview--three types of speaking (judicial, deliberative, epideictic)
2. Means of acquiring competence as a speaker--theory, imitation, practice
3. Treatment of invention under the specific headings of arrangement (introduction, statement of facts, division, proof, refutation, conclusion)
4. Three states of the cases to be considered when developing proof and refutation
    Conjectural--questions of fact
    Legal--questions of definition
    Juridical--questions of right or wrong

Book Two

1. Specific development of conjectural, legal, and juridical issues
2. Artistic development of arguments
3. Invention of concluding remarks

Book Three

1. Invention and arrangement for speeches deliberative and epideictic (though given less detail than that given previously to judicial)
2. Delivery--divided into vocal quality and physical movement
    Vocal quality further divided into three "tones"--conversational tone, tone of debate, tone of amplification
3. Memory--systematic treatment of a visual mnemonic system

Book Four

1. Overall emphasis of entire book is on style for all three types of speaking
2. Examples from past orators and poets are to be used in conjunction with imaginative materials developed by the speaker
3. Division of style into three types (with their corresponding negative types)
    Grand style--Swollen style
    Middle style--Slack style
    Simple style--Meagre style
4. Great detail given to a listing of types and examples of both figures of thought and figures of speech.

3. Unique Contributions of the Rhetorica Ad Herrenium

The most obvious point which sets this work apart from the other works of the period is the fact that it is the earliest Latin work which attempts a complete treatment of rhetoric in terms of the inclusion of all of the traditional five canons of rhetoric (invention, arrangement, style, delivery, and memory). The detail which is provided in each of the five sub-areas of the work is unlike any other work to date, and the content of each of the five areas presents its unique rhetorical contributions. The first of these comes in the specific treatment of invention and arrangement. The author discussed both invention and arrangement, but seems to place arrangement as being of lower importance than the process of invention. Each of the six parts of a speech (introduction, statement of facts, division, proof, refutation, conclusion) was given its own prescriptive rules of invention. The most unique of these contributions comes in the area of the invention of arguments to be used in proof and refutation. The author sets forth three issues which may be the focus of the proof or refutation: conjectural issue, legal issue, juridical issue. The focus of this area of invention (commonly referred to as stasis, stock issues, or states of the case) is on the delineation of the type of argument which should be central in the speech.[3] The arguments in a judicial speech should focus on one of three questions: 1)conjectural--Did the event actually take place? 2)legal--What exactly did take place? What shall it be called? 3)juridical--What judgment or

---

[3]For detailed information on stasis, see Otto Alvin Loeb Dieter, "Stasis," Speech Monographs, XVII (November, 1950) pp. 345-369.

value shall we ascribe to the act? Is it good or bad, right or wrong?

The treatment of delivery in the Ad Herrenium is very concise and prescriptive, providing the student with specific rules for the delivery of an oration. The author presents his dissatisfaction with the Greek systems of delivery, warning students against being overly dramatic in the imitation of model speeches. This work also separates memory from delivery as a separate entity. The text speaks of a visual system of mnemonics in which the speaker uses visual backgrounds (buildings, scenery, etc.) into which the material to be remembered can be placed. In order to recall the material, the speaker need merely recall the scene into which it was placed, and the scene will help him to reconstruct the material to be remembered. This is the earliest recorded treatment of such a mnemonic system, but the author seems to assume a certain knowledge of the system on the part of the reader, indicating that it may have been a modification of a previously existing mnemonic program. Later references to such a system come in the works of Cicero and Quintilian, yet in no single place is it defined, described, or detailed any more than in the Ad Herrenium.

The final contribution of the Ad Herrenium comes in the area of style. The author gives more emphasis to this canon than any of the Greek philosophers, devoting nearly half of the work to its discussion. He provides the familiar three divisions of style as Grand, Middle, and Simple, and includes some contrast by providing the negative counterparts of each (Swollen, Slack, and Meagre). He delineates between figures of thought and figures of speech, and details hundreds of examples of such figures to be used in oratory. In concluding his discussion of style, the author advises the

student to practice moderation in all cases, which takes the emphasis away from the concentration on style for its own sake. The Rhetorica Ad Herrenium should be remembered for its thorough treatment and synthesis of all of the areas of rhetoric, rather than specific concentration on any one limited area.

C. Cicero

1. General Background[4]

Marcus Tullius Cicero was born in 106 B.C. near Arpinum, a small village outside of Rome. He studied under the leading philosophers in Rome, receiving influence from both the political sphere of Rome and the oratorical history of the Greeks. He began to write rhetorical works as early as age nineteen, publishing De Inventione in 86 B.C.[5] Cicero was politically active in Rome, starting out as a lawyer of some repute and continuing into the higher echelons of the political situation in Rome. Dozens of his personal orations survive, both forensic and deliberative in nature. Other than incidental references coming through his orations, Cicero recorded six more works that were specifically rhetorical in nature: De Oratore (55 B.C.), De Partitiones Oratoria (54 B.C.), Brutus (46 B.C.), Orator (46 B.C.), De Optimo Genere Oratorum

[4]For references to Cicero's rhetoric, see: Baldwin, Clark, Clarke, and Cicero, Cicero On Oratory and Orators, intro. by Ralph Micken, (Carbondale, 1970), John C. Rolfe, Cicero and His Influence, (New York, 1963).

[5]See specifically: De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica, trans. and intro. by H.M. Hubbell (Cambridge, 1949), De Oratore, De Partitiones Oratoria, trans. and intro. by H. Rackham (Cambridge, 1942), Brutus, Orator, trans. and intro. by G.L. Hendrickson (Cambridge, 1949).

(46 B.C.), and his Topica (44 B.C.). Cicero was forced to leave Rome several times under the pressure of political situations, each time returning to his native land. He was finally killed by the soldiers of Anthony, shortly after the assassination of Caesar.

As earlier noted, Cicero wrote many works concerning rhetoric. Of all his written works, only two shall be considered here as representative of his rhetorical theory: De Oratore and the Orator. Taken together, these works outline the overview that is necessary in order to place Cicero within the period of rhetorical history. De Oratore is written much in the same style as the Platonic dialogues, with Crassus and Antonius being the major interlocutors. In this work, Cicero outlines his entire theory concerning the practice and learning of oratory. In the Orator, he concentrates on the topic of style, providing the student with prescriptions and examples of good style for contemplation and use.

2. Topical Content of De Oratore and the Orator

De Oratore

Book One

This book begins with a delineation of the five parts of the art of rhetoric (the canons), and continues with a hypothetical philosophical discussion between Crassus and Antonius regarding the nature and importance of rhetoric.

Crassus, in Book One, represents the view that the learning of rhetoric involves more than the mere learning of a skill (against the Sophistic point of view), and stresses the importance of invention. In his emphasis upon the philosophical and intellectual approach to rhetoric, Crassus regards the Aristotelian concept of the understanding of human nature in high regard.

Antonius is the mouthpiece for Cicero on style in this book, stressing the importance of elocution (style) as the major function of rhetorical learning and practice. Antonius would prefer that the orator be one who is skilled in fine speaking.

The book closes with the understanding that the two views are complementary--neither can exist without the other, and neither should be taken at its extreme.

Book Two

The roles reverse for the second book, with Antonius becoming the organ for the Ciceronian treatment of invention, arrangement, and memory.

The types of rhetoric are delineated as two--forensic and deliberative.

The typical divisions of an oration are delineated, with the stress placed on the learning of arrangement through practice and imitation.

Invention deals with the investigation of the facts and the character of the case (stasis, main issue, etc.).

Following the traditional order of arrangement, Antonius relates that it is important to weigh and arrange proofs in a geometric progression.

Antonius' treatment of memory is similar to that found in the Ad Herrenium, though not as thorough or detailed. The system described involves the visual association of images and ideas as the key aspects of memory.

Book Three

Crassus discusses style in Book Three. He prefaces his remarks by saying that rhetoric is inseparable from philosophy--this provides the idea that even though Cicero is to present a discussion of style at some length, the reader is not to forget what has been said in the previous two books.

The two major concepts of style dealt with are the choice of words and the movement of sentences.

Cicero gives cursory treatment to delivery, giving it much less emphasis than style, invention, etc.

The book closes with the idea that the style of an oration is inseparable from the substance.

The Orator

This work begins with a delineation similar to that found in the previous work--rhetoric limited to forensic and epideictic speaking.

Three fourths of the work is devoted to a discussion of style.

Cicero sets forth three types of speaking--plain, grand, and middle. He correlates the three styles with three varied purposes for oratory: plain--to prove, grand--to please, middle--to move.

There is a lengthy discussion of harmony and rhythm as the major components of style. Harmony consists of balance and symmetry which should exist in all speaking, with rhythm being regarded as the flow of one word to another, one sentence to another, or one unit to another.

3. Rhetorical Contributions of Cicero

Cicero must be recalled as both an orator and a rhetorical theorist. For as much as he wrote concerning oratory, Cicero was as great a practitioner of the art as any of his contemporaries. He has been a model of both theory and practice in recurring periods of rhetorical history, pointing towards his impact on the art of rhetoric. There are certainly some specifically unique contributions to be noted from Cicero, though they may be few in number. He was first and foremost an orator, relying upon his own philosophical grounding to establish his ideas and upon his natural ability to carry out his excellencies of style. With his treatment of style being so extensive in *De Oratore* and the *Orator*, this area must be investigated for its rhetorical significance.

Specifically, Cicero's unique contributions to stylistic theory are three in number: 1)the three typical styles combined uniquely with three purposes for speaking, 2)his emphasis upon harmony and balance, 3)his insistence upon the importance of natural ability as the basic denominator of style.[6] Earlier rhetorical theory had listed the three styles of speaking in a form similar to that which Cicero presented (specifically the *Ad Herrenium*), but no previous work combined each style with a particular purpose for speaking. Cicero saw the plain style as being best suited to proof, especially such as might exist in forensic or courtroom speaking. The grand style was correlated with the purpose of pleasing the audience, reminiscent of some of the

---

[6] For specific discussion of Cicero on style, see: Edwin C. Flemming, "A Comparison of Cicero and Aristotle on Style," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, IV (1918) pp. 61-71, Harry M. Hubbell, "Cicero on Styles of Oratory," *Yale Classical Studies*, XIX (1966) pp. 171-186, Ralph S. Pomeroy, "Aristotle and Cicero: Rhetorical Style," *Western Speech*, XXV (1961) pp. 25-32.

Sophistic notions. Finally, the middle style was viewed by Cicero as befitting the purpose of moving an audience to a belief or an action.

Cicero goes beyond the prescriptiveness of some of the earlier Greek theorists, making rhetorical style more than just a scientific study of grammar and construction. Although he held grammatical form in high regard, Cicero also stressed individuality of taste in the formation of oratorical style. His inclusion of a discussion of harmony and rhythm evidence the importance of the entire flow and feeling of a speech as important alongside its specific construction. His overall emphasis in the area of style also moves away from prescription, as Cicero viewed the natural ability of the student as being the chief mediator of style. The proper style for the occasion, audience, and speaker could not be developed artificially, as it had to begin in the natural prowess of the individual speaker.

Careful consideration of Cicero's contributions outside of the area of style must be taken in order to show that Cicero is indeed above a simplistic or one-valued rhetorical theory. While Cicero himself was an excellent stylist and insisted on the same from others, he emphasized the importance of ideas and philosophy above that which he so dearly loved. Although he adds nothing new to the relationship between philosophy and rhetoric (returning once again to the Platonic idea of the philosopher--statesman and Isocrate's orator--statesman), Cicero would have the student be a master of both wordly and scholarly knowledge, both of sciences and of oratory. The constant fluctuation in <u>De Oratore</u> between the ideas of Crassus and Antonius leads the reader to the conclusion that philospphy and rhetoric are complementary, with both giving substance to the cultured excellencies and graces of style.

Rather than continue to repeat the Ciceronian concentration on both style and ideas, it may be more advantageous to let Cicero speak for himself, in summation:

> At this stage I give full leave to anybody who wishes, to apply the title of orator to a philosopher who imparts to us an abundant command of facts and of language, or alternatively I shall raise no obstacle if he prefers to designate as a philosopher the orator whom I on my side am now describing as possessing wisdom combined with eloquence: only provided it be agreed that neither the tongue-tied silence of the man who knows the facts but cannot explain them in language, nor the ignorance of the person who is deficient in facts but has no lack of words, is deserving of praise. And if one had to choose between them, for my part I should prefer wisdom lacking power of expression to talkative folly; but if on the contrary we are trying to find the one thing that stands at the top of the whole list, the prize must go to the orator who possesses learning. And if they allow him to be a philosopher, that is the end of the dispute; but if they keep the two separate, they will come off second best in this, that the consummate orator possess all the knowledge of the philosophers, but the range of the philosophers does not necessarily include eloquence; and although they look down on it, it cannot but be deemed to add a crowning embellishment to their sciences.
>
> After saying this Crassus himself was silent for a space, and nothing was said by any of the others either.[7]

D. Quintilian

1. General Background

Marcus Fabius Quintilianus was born in Spain in 35 A.D., and became one of several Spaniards to influence contemporary Roman rhetorical theory. He was educated in Rome, but soon after retruned to his native land to instruct in rhetoric. In 68 A.D. he retruned to Rome for good, establishing a school and beginning to

---

[7] Cicero, De Oratore, III. xxxv. 142-143.

write his Institutio Oratoria (95 A.D.).[8] Quintilian's life in Rome was spent under the reign of the emperor Domitian, whose tyrranical rule almost shut off any pracitcal use of rhetorical tools. He is best known for his educational theory, developing in great detail the aspects of education from birth through death. Of his Institutio Oratoria, the major thrust comes across not in his definition or description of the process of rhetoric but in his contributions concerning the ethical, scholastic, and practical preparation of the student.[9] In comparison to the rhetoricians previous to him, Quintilian must be seen as the greatest of the rhetorical educators.

As one of the last professors of practical oratory at Rome, Quintilian drew heavily from earlier sources in rhetorical history. Although opposing those who would establish systematic rules for oratory, Quintilian does reflect the earlier Greek and Roman divisions of speeches, types of oratory, canons of rhetoric, and qualities of good style. His chief rhetorical theory is that "the perfect orator is the good man speaking well." In stating that the good orator must be both a good man and a polished speaker, Quintilian extends both the philosopher-statesman of Plato and Isocrates and the excellent orator of Cicero into one theoretical perspective. In order to describe the theories of Quintilian in more detail, a brief sketch of his major work is needed.

---

[8] Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, trans. and intro. by H.E. Butler, (London, 1922).

[9] For individual references to Quintilian's educational and rhetorical theories, see Baldwin, Clark, Clarke, also: Earnest Brandenburg, "Quintilian and the Good Orator," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIV (February, 1934) pp. 23-29, H.F. Harding, "Quintilian's Witnesses," Speech Monographs, I (1934) pp. 1-20, J.P. Ryan, "Quintilian's Message," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XV (April, 1929) pp. 171-180, William N. Smail, Quintilian on Education, (London, 1938).

2. Topical Content of the *Institutio Oratoria*

Quintilian's work is divided into twelve books dealing with the education of the orator. Each of the books is summarized below.

Books 1-2--
Deals with the early studies to be undertaken in both the home and the school. sets forth the importance of the education of the parents, guardians, nurses, and anyone else who will influence the development of the child.

Books 2-3--
Defines rhetoric, setting forth the parts and types of rhetoric familiar from earlier works. Recapitulates Cicero's ideas concerning the aims of rhetoric (to inform, to win sympathy, to move).

Books 3-4--
Describes the types and uses of stock issues, reminiscent of both the *Ad Herrenium* and Cicero.

Books 4-7--
Treats the topic of arrangement, setting forth the typical parts of an oration.

Books 8-9--
Discussion of style, repeating many of the Ciceronian doctrines. Major emphasis in this area is on expression (style) for the furtherance of content, rather than for its own sake.

Books 10-11--
More detailed discussion of education specifically for oratory. Three-step learning process for oratory is delineated: study of models, extensive reading, extemporaneous speaking.

Book 12--
Develops the main content of his "good man" theory--the consummate orator-statesman is the good man who speaks well. Shows concern for statesmanship, citizenship, and moral character as well as invention and style.

3. Rhetorical Contributions of Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria

The Institutio Oratoria represents the last of the complete rhetorical texts to come out of the Roman period of rhetorical history. Three tasks must be completed in order to create a concise view of the place of Quintilian's rhetorical theory in the period: 1)a sketch of the similiarities between Quintilian's view of rhetoric and those previous to him, 2)the development of his educational theory, 3)a summary of his "good man" theory. As for the first of these, several threads developed in previous rhetorics can be found in the rhetorical theory of Quintilian. He accepts the five canons of rhetoric, although he treats as major divisions only two of the five: invention (with arrangement subservient), and style (with delivery and memory subservient). He describes the familiar three types of oratory, choosing like others to concentrate upon forensic oratory. Quintilian shows little regard for systematic rules for the learning or practice of rhetoric, preferring instead a more natural method which would evolve out of study and knowledge. Many of Quintilian's specific stylistic tenets are similar to those of Cicero, but he underplays the importance of style a bit more than did his predecessor.

Quintilian's treatise does not concentrate upon rhetoric alone, but focuses as a single entity upon educational theory. It was written as a pedagogic manual to guide the total education of the Roman citizen. This emphasis is unique when compared to the works to this date, but in terms of rhetoric may seem insignificant at first glance. Deeper investigation will show, however, that rhetorical significance does exist in his educational theory. Quintilian uses rhetoric as the key method for education

(similar to Isocrates), be it education for rhetoric or for some other field. Rhetoric is the tool which Quintilian uses for the education of all people, making his educational theories in general important to the student of rhetorical history. The following summary provides some of the unique points which Quintilian makes concerning education:

1. He shows a great deal of concern over those who influence young children. His specific comments cover such things as the quality of the nurse (nanny), the education and the character of the parents, the actions which the child may perceive around the home, and the use of proper language around the home.

2. He stressed the importance of a slowly evolving scheme of education for the child, recognizing the importance of play in the earliest years.

3. Quintilian was a proponent of a broad-based knowledge, including readings in all fields of study. Reading and study are the basis for all of the knowledge which may come in later life through other means.

4. Declamation is an important tool in the education of the young, so long as it is not over-used or misdirected.

5. The ultimate concern of the educator should be to serve as a model of moral excellence for his students, that they may embody what they see exemplified in their teachers.

Quintilian is known by many in rhetorical ciricles as being the proponent of the theory which has been deemed the "good man" theory. As a unique rhetorical contribution, this theory may be subject to some question, especially when the student recalls the perspectives of Plato, Isocrates, and Cicero who emphasized the importance of ethics, philosophy, and knowledge along with oratory. Plato did emphasize the importance of knowledge and philosophy as a basis for rhetoric, but placed his major emphasis more on the philosophical side than the rhetorical one.

Isocrates emphasized the orator-statesman as did Cicero, but both provided other rhetorical contributions of equal importance. To Quintilian, the good man theory is the only perspective of any importance in terms of rhetoric: without it, rhetoric is neither justified not useful. Quintilian goes beyond Plato in supporting the idea that the rhetorician must be a good man, urging that the ultimate embodiment of a Roman citizen is to be a man of good character who is trained in speaking.

> My aim, then, is the education of the perfect orator. The first essential . . . is that he should be a good man, and consequently we demand of him not merely the possession of exceptional gifts of speech, but all of the excellencies of character as well. For I will not admit that the principles of upright and honorable living should, as some have held, be regarded as the peculiar concern of philosophy. The man who can really play his part as a citizen and is capable of meeting the demands of both public and private business, the man who can guide a state by his counsels, give it a firm basis by his legislation and purge its vices by his decisions as a judge, is assuredly no other than the orator of our quest.[10]

This message prefaces the entire treatise, and should be taken as a guide to the work as a whole. While the more specific aspects of the requisites for the good man speaking well are found in the last book of the work, the overall concept does guide thecontent throughout the Institutio Oratoria: when discussing educational theory, one must remember that Quintilian's major concern is with the moral character of the student and those who influence him. The emphasis upon ethics makes its way into the rhetorical contributions as well, with Quintilian's stress of the content of the message as more important than the style. While Plato, Isocrates, and Cicero all

---

[10]Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria I

concentrated on the importance of the thought patterns which must preface any rhetorical activity, Quintilian went one step further by insisting that a speaker be knowledgable, skilled in speaking, and above all, a man of good character.

E. Dionysius of Halicarnassus

1. General Background

Dionysius of Halicarnassus was one of the first of the Roman teachers that had been educated and brought up in a Greek atmosphere. The actual date of his birth is not known, but it can be set as falling between the years 60-55 B.C. Little is known about the life history of the man, and what is known comes chiefly through his own writings. Along with being a teacher of rhetoric in Rome, Dionysius was known as a historian and literary critic. His Roman Antiquities was a work which categorized and discussed the history of Rome in his own time, and several of his works treat the criticism of literary works of the time. The single work in which Dionysius' chief contributions to rhetoric can be found is De Compositione Verborum (Ont the Arrangement of Words). Rather than being a complete or systematic rhetorical treatise, the work of Dionysius is devoted solely to style, and more specifically to composition and sentence movement.[11]

---

[11] See extensive treatment of Dionysius' rhetorical contributions in C.S. Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities, trans. and intro. by Earnest Cary (Cambridge, 1937).

2. Topical Content of De Compositione Verborum

A. Subject Matter
  1. invention and selection
  2. arrangement (division, order, revision)
B. Style
  1. choice of words (precision, imagery)
  2. sentence movement (composition)
    a. nature
    b. force
    c. processes (in phrases, in clauses, in periods)
    d. charm and beauty (melody, rhythm, variety, aptness)
    e. kinds (strong, smooth, blended)
    f. verse and prose

3. Unique Contributions of Dionysius' Rhetorical Theory

When viewed in comparison to the other teachers of rhetoric and rhetorical theorists of the time in which Dionysius flourished, his scope and depth of treatment do not seem to be on a similar plane. He was specifically concerned with literary and oral composition, moving away from any emphasis on eloquence of delivery, invention of proofs, or arrangement of arguments. According to Dionysius, composition is the best of studies to be undertaken in one's youth, with studies of word choice, arrangement of words, and the movement of sentences being tantamount. Of these particular studies, the most beneficial as well as the most effective is that of the movement of sentences.

Style, in the rhetorical theory of Dionysius, is not inherent in the particular words that are chosen by the speaker, but is independent from such restriction. The key to style lies in the combinations of words and sentences: for Dionysius, the whole is more important than the sum of the parts. Ordinary terms and phrases may

become stylistically inviting through the proper use of mood and flow of sentences and entire units within the oration. While discussing the composition of individual sentences, Dionysius urges that the composer refrain from feeling tied to the logical structures of grammar. Instead, rhythm is to be the guide for sentence construction, with artistic qualities being elevated above logical and grammatical sanctions.

The overall view of style as compositio sets Dionysius apart from the rhetorical theorists of his time. His specific contributions regarding the prescriptions for such composition are not as profound or unique as others of his era, as they can be found in similar form in the works of other authors and theorists. He is obviously a contemporary of Cicero in his treatment of the use of phrases, clauses, and periods in the composition of an oration, and his qualities of charm and beauty (variety, aptness, rhythm, melody) are reminiscent of earlier treatments of the qualities of vocal delivery, if not the Ciceronian graces of verbal style. Dionysius must be viewed in his contribution to rhetorical theory as his approach to composition suggests: while his theory may not appear unique in terms of its parts, the whole (in this case, the emphasis on sentence movement and composition) provides a fresh approach to stylistic theory in general.

F. [Longinus] On the Sublime

1. General Background

The key concept to be developed concerning the background of this work is that of its authorship. As the title is read, the work may be attributed to Longinus (more specifically, Cassius Longinus). This attribution of the authorship is faulty, because

of three major concerns:

1. The work is not quoted or mentioned by any classical writer or theorist.
2. The work is not mentioned by classical historians as belonging to the works of Longinus.
3. The style and thought patterns of this particular work are not strictly compatible with other works attributed to Longinus.[12]

The scholarly approach to this work is to state that it is of unknown authorship (though the mind-set of the author may point to a Greek background). There are far too many textual and critical holes for the author to be established with any degree of certainty, and there are equivocations within the work itself which make identification even more difficult. The final problem of establishing authorship is that of identifying the person to which the work is addressed; Terentianus. Such an establishment would at least place the work within a group of contemporary works or authors, making its identification feasible.

2. Rhetorical Contributions of [Longinus] On the Sublime

A delineation of both the topical content of this work along with the rhetorical contributions would be redundant in this case: the rhetorical contributions follow in suit parallel to the content of the text. The overall attitude of the author is that of literary critic, with his commentary on style being critical of both literature and oratory. It must be kept in the back of the mind of the reader that the comments

[12] For a thorough discussion of authorship and the work in general, see: the following three translations of On the Sublime: G.M.A. Grube (Indianapolis, 1957), W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge, 1899), D.A. Russell, (Oxford, 1965).

of the author of the work are not prescriptive, but descriptive. In either case, the categorizations which make up the descriptions of style are unique, and represent an approach to rhetorical style which can be found in no single previous source.

As the title of the work implies, it deals with the "sublime." The English language equivalent of this term does not convey the proper meaning, however, and one should not assume blindly that the author is speaking of an extremely "elevated" style, as our term might suggest. The sublime style presented here has two contrasting sets of components, the first being nobility and impressiveness of style, and the latter being completeness and thoroughness of style. The sublime style should seek to please the ears of the hearers, yet not do such to the degree that the subject itself is lost in the scutfle. In this sense, the sublime style realizes the best of both the scholarly style and the beauty of adornment.

The author cites five major sources for the sublime in style. The first and foremost source is thought. If style is to be grand, thought must be grand. Likewise, if style is to be concise and logical, the corresponding thought must be the same. Each of the other four bases of sublimity are of less importance than the first, but each has equal stature to the others. Inspired passion aids in the formation of the sublime style, adding emotional attatchment to the adornment of language. Figures of speech help to express the sublime, as does noble phrasing. Finally, the arrangement of words and concepts must correspond in degree of elevation to the other sources of the sublime. These five sources (patterns of thought, inspired passion, figures of speech, noble phrasing, and elevated arrangement) form the

style ot speaking which the author terms "sublime".

Although there is constant interplay of both the complete and the aesthetic styles, it is obvious that the author leans more toward the aesthetic. As a guide for the develppment ot the sublime style, the author sets the imagination of the speaker above the formal rules of invention and arrangement. If both Cicero and the author ot this text were to be put on a fence between wisdom and eloquence, it might be that Cicero would fall on the side of wisdom, but this author would without question fall on the side ot eloquence. There are certainly some advantages to be had by reviewing the approach to style in terms ot the sublime: the speaker must strive not only for eloquent style, but must also understand the sources ot such eloquence. The five sources of the sublime style that are set forth in this work establish a framework for such analysis.

CHAPTER FIVE:

THE NEO-SOPHISTIC PERIOD

Each of the first three periods in classical rhetorical history (Sophistic, Greek Philosophers, and Roman) had a plethora of contributors, contributions, theorists and theories. The fourth period, the Neo-Sophistic period, is unique, in that it has one major focus, one major contributor, and one major rhetorical theory. The focus of the period (55 B.C. to 100 A.D.) is in part reminiscent of the Sophistic period, as rhetoric returns in emphasis to the teaching of style and delivery for their own sake. The major contributor to the theory of the period is Seneca the Elder, and his theory which epitomizes the period is that ot declamation. Declamation, or the giving of practice speeches on prepared subjects, was the method, content, and end of rhetoric in the period. Because of this definitive unity in the Neo-Sophistic period, there is little need for summarization (in comparison with previous periods which demonstrated less unity). For this reason, the basic notion of organization and approach to the study will be changed, and the representatives of the period will speak for themselves directly.

A. General Background

While this chapterrsets out to show that declamation was the major focus of the Neo-Sophistic period, it would be specious indeed to assume that the concept of declamation had no history prior to the advent of this period. The practice of declamation has no less a history in the classical era than does invention, style, or any other of the rhetorical concepts delineated to this point in the study. The origins of declamation can be found back in the Greek period:

> . . . Isocrates' insistence on the necessity of practice was not forgotten. It became a regular part of the school routine to make practice speeches on themes of the type that might arise either in the courts or the deliberative assemblies. It was generally believed that this practice dated from the time ot Demetrius of Phalerum . . . whatever the truth--and Antiphon's tetralogies suggest that something similar had been done well before Demetrius' time--it is significant to note that this development was associated with the end of Athenian independence . . . Declamation, to use the term which became familiar in the Roman world, flourished when political oratory declined.[1]

This summary contributes a great deal to an understanding of the concept of declamation. Declamation involves the giving of practice speeches on either forensic or deliberative subjects. In both the Greek and Roman periods, the subjects for declamation were drawn up so as to be similar to what the student might expect to encounter in the real-world rhetorical situation (in the courts or assembly). The purpose ot declamation as a part of rhetorical training was to involve students in situations in the classroom which would prepare them for their later careers. General references to the practice of declamation may be found in the writings of the Greek theorists, with specific references to the Latin term declamatio [illegible] in the texts of Cicero, Quintilian, and others of the Roman period.

The Roman theorists add great detail to the notion of giving practice speeches that originated in the Greeks. Latin terms were coined for the ideas of speaking on forensic and deliberative subjects, with suasoriae being declamations on forensic subjects and controversiae referring to the deliberative. The suasoriae were most often given by the younger students, as they were considered the easier of the two types of exercises.

---

[1]M.L. Clarke, Higher Education in the Ancient World (Albuquerque, 1971), p. 30.

In these sorts of declamations, students were provided the details of a historical situation, and were to make speeches which would give advice to the characters in the particular situation. The *controversiae*, on the other hand, were reserved for the more advanced students. The subjects of these declamations were legal cases of the sort which might come before the courts. The student was expected to present a speech on one side of the case or the other.

Cicero and Quintilian, in their remarks concerning the use of declamation as a rherorical tool, stress the importance of the content of the cases for declamation. This comment by Crassus in Cicero's *De Oratore* gives the view of Cicero:

> "I certainly approve," replied Crassus, "of what you yourselves are in the habit of doing, when you propound some case, closely resembling such as are brought into court, and argue it in a fashion adapted as nearly as possible to real life."[2]

Cicero insisted that the cases used for declamation be realistic, and at the same time gives a hint of the idea that the arguments presented by the students should also be tied closely to such as would be acceptable in the courts. Quintilian sounds the same counsel:

> I must say a few words on the theory of declamation, which is at once the most recent and the most useful of rhetorical exercises . . . it is possible to make a sound use of anything that is naturally sound. The subjects chosen for themes should, therefore, be as true to life as possible, and the actual declamations should, as far as may be, be modelled on the pleadings for which it was devised as a training.[3]

---

[2]Cicero, *De Oratore* I, xxxiii, 149.
[3]Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, II, x., 2-3.

B. The Declamatio of the Neo-Sophistic Period

With the advent of the rhetorical training provided by Seneca the Elder (b. 55 B.C.), two major changes took place in the Roman theory concerning declamation. The first change had to do with the purpose of the exercises. In the rhetorical training of Cicero, Quintilian, and other Romans, declamation was but a part of the overall training of the orator: it was in fact only one method by which the student was prepared for future oratorical efforts. In the rhetorical training of Seneca, declamation became an end unto itself. Students no longer declaimed as practice for their future careers, instead giving practice speeches for the sake of giving practice speeches.

> Declamation in the sense of making practice speeches as a part of the training of an orator was of course not new; what Seneca observed in his lifetime was rather a change in its character. It became an end in itself, a type of oratory in its own right, rather than a preparation for advocacy.[4]

The major use of declamation in this era was that of training students in the excellencies of style and delivery. With style and delivery becoming the method and end of rhetoric, this period is reminiscent of the Sophistic period: hence the title "Neo-Sophistic" period. The rhetoric of this Neo-Sophistic period was even further removed, however, from the classical canons and completeness of training than was the Sophistic period. The Sophists did train their students for the practical use of rhetoric, but the Neo-Sophistics used declamation as a tool to teach only declamation for the purpose of impressing their fellow students and friends.

---

[4]Clarke, op. cit., p. 40.

The second area of change in declamation brought about by Seneca was in the area of the cases used for declamatory practice. Keeping in mind the counsel of both Cicero and Quintilian concerning the content of cases for declamation, these cases left by Seneca need to be considered:[5]

<u>Suasoriae</u>[6]

1. Alexander debates whether to embark on the ocean.
2. Cicero debates whether to appeal to Antonius for mercy.
3. Cicero debates whether to burn his writings, Antonius having offered him immunity on this condition.

<u>Controversiae</u>[7]

1. A father gives poison to a son who was raging and did violence to himself. The mother brings action for cruelty. (Speak for either the father or the mother)
2. A sick man has asked his slave to give him poison. The slave has not given it. The master provides in his will that his heirs shall crucify the slave. The slave appeals to the tribunes. (Speak for either the appellant of the respondent).

These cases are representative examples of those which Seneca provided for his students. Obviously there subjects differ a great deal from reality, especially if one considers the absurdity ot the idea that Cicero would be asked to butn his writings or that one of the <u>suasoriae</u> might actually have appeared in court. This sort of analysis must be undertaken with qualification, however, as both Cicero and Quintilian only mention the teality of cases, not recording any ;examples of what they might actually have used.

---

[5] For reference to Seneca, see: W.A. Edwards, <u>The Suasoriae of Seneca</u>, (Cambridge, 1920).
[6] C.S. Baldwin, <u>Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic</u>, (Gloucester, 1959), p. 90.
[7] <u>ibid</u>. p. 93.

C. The Criticism of Neo-Sophisitic Declamation

Three types of criticism of Neo-Sophistic declamation must be considered: that given prior to the time in which it flourished, that given concurrent with the period, and that given in retrospect. Cicero comments one upon one negative aspect of declamation, as he cries out against its use for training solely in style and delivery:

> Most students, however, in doing so, merely exercise their voices (and that in the wrong way), and their physical strength, and whip up their rate of utterance, and revel in a flood of verbiage. This mistake is due to their having heard that it is by speaking that men as a rule become speakers.[8]

This critical remark is obviously not aimed at the declamation or any of his contemporaries, but it is apparent that such a remark could have been made by a student of Cicero upon hearing Neo-Sophistic declamation.

Quintilian, living and teaching at the same time as the Neo-Sophistics, aims his criticism in another direction, looking down upon those who would not follow his advice concerning realistic cases for declamation:

> Wizards, pestilences, oracles, stepmothers more cruel than those of tragedy, and other topics even more imaginary, we seek in vain among real law cases . . . at least let such be grand and swelling without being silly and to critical eyes ridiculous.[9]

The remarks of Quintilian are more relevant than those of Cicero, as he lived to see the advent of the Neo-Sophistics as well as its complete development. His criticism is particularly valid when taken in comparison with another of Seneca's _suasoriae:_

---

[8] Cicero, _De Oratore_ I, xxxiii. 149.
[9] Quintilian, _Institutio Oratoria_ II, x. 6.

> The law demands that in the case of rape the woman may demand either the death of her seducer or marriage without dowry. A certain man raped two women in one night; one demanded his death, the other marriage.[10]

Any critical comments which are made prior to or during a period in history are subject to some inherent weaknesses, as the context of social and historical factors cannot be placed in perspective until after the era has passed (or at least been in existence for some time). The criticism of Neo-Sophistic declamation that is found in the writings of Tacitus (b. 55 A.D.) is of this type, and enables the scholar to complete a view of the period. Tacitus was a major Roman historian, having recorded the major volumes of the Annals and the Histories.[11] His Dialogue on Oratory (75 A.D.) provides the view that rhetoric had changed since the time of Cicero. In this work, Tacitus takes an objective look at the reasons for the change as well as recording his personal criticism of the new rhetoric.

The key contribution of Tacitus is his observation that the change in the theory of declamation was due to a change in governmental form in Rome. The change in theory from declamation used for practical training to declamation used for training in style and delivery (and declamation itself) corresponds with the decline and fall of the Republic. During the lifetime of Seneca, there was little or no practical use for rhetoric, as under the Empire the rhetoric of the courts and public assemblies had all but been eliminated. This puts the change in declamatory purpose in perspective, and indeed may justify it

---

[10] Clarke, op. cit., p. 41.

[11] For further reference see: Cornelius Tacitus, The Complete Works of Tacitus, trans. by A.J. Church and W.J. Brodribb, (New York, 1942).

to some degree. If there is little useful purpose for rhetoric in society, at least rhetoric developed for its own sake would manage to preserve some semblance of the art form. This historical change may also dilute the charges against the cases used, as the correspondence between cases and reality is difficult when few actual cases exist or are practiced.

The rhetorical critic must not be too quick to take the view ot Tacitus concerning the reasons for the change in rhetoric to mean that Tacitus himself approved of the Neo-Sophistic practice of declamation: part of the purpose of writing the Dialogue was to make clear the reasons why Tacitus was turning his back on oratory and focusing instead on history. In a speech by Messala in the Dialogue, Tacitus confirms his strong criticism ot declamation:

> . . . the boys are taken to schools in which it is hard to tell whether the place itself, or their fellow scholars, or the character of their studies, do their minds the most harm . . . As for the mental exercises themselves, they are the reverse of beneficial . . . It comes to pass that subjects remote from all reality are actually used for declamation. Thus the reward of a tyrranicide, or a remedy for a pestilence, or a mother's incest, anything, in short, daily discussed in our schools, never, or but very rarely in the courts, is dwelt on in grand language.[12]

This criticism of Tacitus leaves but one conlusion: rhetorical and declamatory theory underwent a major change in both practice and purpose from the time of the Greeks
underwent a major change in both practice and purpose from the time of the Greeks
to the Neo-Sophistic declamation of Seneca. What had once been a method of teaching and practicing rhetoric in the classroom (under the Greeks, Cicero, Quintilian, and others) became both the purpose and practice of the entire art of rhetoric.

---

[12] Cornelius Tacitus, Dialogue On Oratory, 35.

CHAPTER SIX:

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As set forth in the first chapter of the study, the purpose has been accomplished: the major theorists, theories, and emphases of the classical period have been uncovered and described. As the data exists in its present form, it is a compilation of the separate theories and theorists as separate entities (organized into periods prior to the analysis). Two tasks remain in order that the study might be concluded: 1)to briefly summarize the four periods, noting the major theoretical emphasis to be remembered from each contributor, 2)to set some directions for further research into the area covered by this study. In order to provide a concise summary of conclusions and avoid undue redundancy, a modified outline format will be used to note the important emphases.

A. Conclusions

1. The Sophistic Period

a. Sophistry developed out of a need for instruction in practical public speaking for use in the courtroom.
b. A Sophist is a teacher who accepts money for his instruction.
c. The overall emphases of the entire period were on: 1)style and delivery, 2)probable and plausible proofs, 3)success or results of the rhetorical effort as the criterion for evaluation
d. The Sophists were criticized (most heavily by Plato) for their departure from the truth and emphasis upon style and delivery alone.
e. Each of the individual Sophists had unique rhetorical emphases:

Corax and Tisias--defined rhetoric as the art of persuasion, emphasized probability theory as the criterion for the invention of arguments.

Protagoras--emphasized the adversary nature of rhetoric, taught students to argue both sides of a case, viewed strength or weakness of a case as relative to the hearer or judge.

Gorgias--taught the art of fine speaking, intent on pleasing the ears of the audience as the key to persuasion, emphasized the relativity of truth.

Hippias--well-rounded teacher, remembered for his versatility, had a keen memory himself and sought to develop the memory of his students as an important aspect of education.

Thrasymachus--emphasized both style and delivery, emphasized the development of the "middle" style and the appeal to the emotions.
Theodorus--uniquely categorized the parts of a speech, remarked that speakers should take full advantage of the weaknesses in the opponent's case.
Prodicus--emphasized the use of appropriateness of language, instilled the criteria of precision and accuracy as important measures of language.

2. The Greek Philosophers

a. Period developed in succession, beginning with Plato's reaction to the Sophists, Isocrates' adaptation of Plato's ideal into a bit more practical focus, Aristotle's adoption of the position of Isocrates and further development of the method of rhetoric, and Anaximenes' rhetoric based heavily in the contributions of Aristotle.
b. Plato recorded his comments of rhetorical importance in his dialogues Gorgias and Phaedrus. Rhetoric, as practiced by the Sophists, was viewed as a knack rather than an art, as it did not have a basis in the truth (as Plato saw it), did not confer knowledge upon the audience, and had no subject matter that was uniquely its own. His "art" of rhetoric was dependent upon a knowledge of the entire truth on the part of the part of the speaker, and accurate analysis of both human nature and the specific nature of the audience, with the result being a rhetoric which bestowed knowledge of the truth upon the audience.
c. Isocrates emphasized rhetorical education, with an overall emphasis upon the importance of the education of the orator-statesman. He combined the ideas of practical use of rhetoric and philosophical grounding for rhetoric, placing them on equal levels of importance. Forms a bridge between Plato and the Sophists.
d. Aristotle places his emphasis upon the discovery of "the available means of persuasion." Brings forth the idea that rhetoric is the counterpart of dialectic (philosophical discussion), that one cannot exist without the other. Three forms of proof for use in rhetoric are mentioned: ethical proof, logical proof, and emotional proof. Develops the enthymeme as a form of logical proof for rhetorical usage. Describes and categorizes the emotions and character of audiences as a basis for analysis of emotional proof.
e. The Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum, once attributed to Aristotle but generally ascribed to Anaximenes, developed the specific patterns of arrangement to be used for different types of speaking.

3. The Roman Period

a. Rhetorical theory disappeared from Athens after the deaths or Aristotle, Demosthenes, and Alexander (and the concurrent shift of culture and learning to Alexandria). The concentration of rhetorical theory and instruction surfaced in Rome in the first century B.C.

b. The Rhetorica Ad Herrenium, mistakenly attributed to Cicero but actual author unknown, focused on all of the canons of rhetoric (invention, arrangement, style, delivery, memory). Uniquely emphasized the main issues to be developed in forensic speeches (stasis). The work separated memory from being a part of delivery, and described a visual pattern for memory. Nearly half of the work was devoted to style, with the heaviest emphasis placed upon the development of three styles (Grand, Middle, Simple) and the corresponding figures to be used in conjunction with them.

c. Cicero emphasized two specific areas of rhetoric: style and knowledge. He was a great orator in his own right, depending heavily upon his own natural ability as an orator. In terms of his emphasis on style, Cicero combined the three styles of speaking with three different pruposes for speaking, developed the importance of harmony and balance in style, and insisted that natural ability was the common denominator of good style. Although placing alot of importance on stylistic qualities, Cicero emphasized the importance of broad knowledge and sound rhetorical content as being more important than good style (although the ideal orator would embody both).

d. Quintilian developed new insights on both educational and rhetorical theory during this period. He urged the complete education of the orator from birth until death, and stressed the importance of a morally based educational philosophy. His moral emphasis carried over into his rhetorical development, as his "good man" theory postulated that the consummate orator must be both a man of good character and an excellent speaker.

e. Dionysius and the author of On the Sublime ([Longinus]) were interested in the literary and prose characteristics of rhetorical style. Dionysius uniquely emphasized sentence movement and composition. The second author suggested a style that was both aesthetically pleasing and thorough in usage. He sets forth the sources in man which would develop such a style, with the thought patterns of the individual speaker being the foremost source of the sublime style.

4. The Neo-Sophistic Period

a. The emphasis of the period as a whole was on declamation, or the giving of practice orations on prepared subject areas.

b. Declamation itself has its roots in the Greek realm of rhetoric, and was also used by both Cicero and Quintilian (as well as the Neo-Sophistics).

c. The declamation of the Neo-Sophistic period had a particular flavor and purpose in comparison with earlier declamation. The central proponent of the newer declamation was Seneca the Elder, who moved declamation away from its use as practice for speaking in the courts and assemblies. Seneca's declamatory exercises were used solely for practicing oratory for its own sake.

d. Neo-Sophistic declamation was criticized by Quintilian and Tacitus. Quintilian argued that the cases used for the practice speeches were not tied to reality. Tacitus explained that the reason for the declamation not being preparation for real-life oratory was the fact that no real-life oratory existed under the Empire. He did, however, criticize the contemporary use of declamation as being anything but beneficial to the students.

B. Directions for Further Research

The construct used for evaluation of the classical theorists in this study is only one of the several that are possible. This study attempted to show the individual contributions and theories as separate entities, noting uniqueness and completeness (or the lack of) in each of four periods in rhetorical history. In setting direction for further research in this area, six other approaches to the study are suggested.

1. Comparison/Contrast of the individual theories and theorists within each period.
   This approach could note the influence of individuals within a period upon one another, as well as suggesting some development of theory within each period.

2. Viewing each period individually.
   This approach could establish unifying principles within each period, noting the departure from such theory by each theorist or the development of the principles within the period.

3. Comparison/Contrast of the four periods.
   This approach could note recurring trends in rhetorical theory form one period to another; establishing inter-periodic influences of one theorist or theory up on another.

4. Viewing the overall historical development of classical rhetorical theory.
   This approach, almost a different type of study entirely, could view the flow of development of the history, philosophy, culture, and rhetoric of the classical period (or any of the sub-periods), in order to trace the influences on rhetorical theory.

5. Establishing rhetorical trends running through all periods.
   This type of approach would be topical, developing such ideas as the changes (or lack of) in the canons of rhetoric, the purposes of rhetoric, the types of rhetoric, the methodology of rhetoric, or any other topic which could be traced through the entire classical period.

6. Establishing a unified theoretical perspective of the classical period.
   This approach could attempt to establish a generalized "classical" theory of rhetoric, noting the theories or theorists who contributed to its development. Such a study would be useful as a point of departure for any further study in any area of rhetoric, be it historical or otherwise.

Other than the six areas suggested here as being appropriate for further study, it should be obvious
be obvious that any one particular area of this study could be used for further specific analysis and survey, as well as any one period. This study has accomplished its purpose if it has given summary details of each of the important classical contributions to rhetorical theory, and left the student of classical rhetoric with a cogent understanding of those contributions. Any weaknesses in the selection of those contributions is accepted, and further research to uncover and describe the holes in this study is urged.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Aristotle. Poetics. Trans. by S. Butcher. New York: Dutton, 1961.

________. Prior Analytics and Posterior Analytics. Ed. and Trans. by J. Warrington. New York: Dutton, 1964.

________. Rhetoric. Trans by Lane Cooper. New York: D. Appleton, 1932.

________. Topica. Trans. By E.S. Forster. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Atkins, J.W.H. Literary Criticism in Antiquity. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1961.

Auer, J. Jeffery. An Introduction to Research in Speech. New York: Harper, 1959.

Baldwin, C.S. Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959.

Benson, Thomas W., and Prosser, Michael H. Readings in Classical Rhetoric. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.

Bitzer, Lloyd. "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (December, 1959) pp. 409-414.

Black, Edwin. "Plato's View of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (December, 1958) pp. 361-374.

Brandenburg, Earnest. "Quintilian and the Good Orator," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIV (February, 1934) pp. 23-29.

Brownstein, Oscar L. "Plato's Phaedrus: Dialectic as the Genuine Art of Speaking," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LI (December, 1965) pp. 392-398.

Carmack, Willaim R. "A History of Greek Rhetoric and Oratory," Quarterly Journal of Speech, IIL (December, 1963) pp. 325-328.

Cicero. Brutus and Orator. Trans. and intro. by G.L. Hendrickson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

________. Cicero on Oratory and Orators. Intro. by Ralph Micken. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.

________. De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica. Trans. and intro. by H.M. Hubbell. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Cicero. De Oratore and De Partitiones Oratoria. Trans. and intro. by H. Rackham. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Clark, D.L. Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education. New York: Columbia University University Press, 1957.

________. "Some Values of Roman Declamatio, the Controversia as a School Exercise in Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXV (1949) pp. 280-283.

Clarke, M.L. Higher Education in the Ancient World. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1971.

________. Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey. London: Cohen and West, 1953.

Cooper, Lane. "The Rhetoric of Aristotle," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXI (February, 1935) pp. 10-19.

Cope, E.M. An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric. London: MacMillan, 1867.

Cronkite, Gary. "The Enthymeme as a Deductive Rhetorical Argument," Western Speech, XXX (Spring, 1966) pp. 129-134.

Cushman, Helen. "Corax--Secretary or Rhetorician," Pennsylvania Speech Annual, XX (1963) pp. 8-10.

Dieter, Otto Alvin Loeb. "Stasis," Speech Monographs, XVIII (November, 1960) pp. 345-369.

Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers. Trans. and intro. by R.D. Hicks. New York: Dutton, 1925.

Duff, J. Wight. A Literary History of Rome From the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age. London: T.F. Unwin, 1953.

Edwards, W.A. The Suasoriae of Seneca. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920.

Flemming, Edwin C. "A Comparison of Cicero and Aristotle on Style," Quarterly Journal of Speech, IV (1918) pp. 61-71.

Fritz, Charles A. "A Brief Review of the Chief Periods in the History of Oratory," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VIII (1922).

Gomperz, T. Greek Thinkers. Trans. by L. Magnus. London: J. Murray, 1901.

Grimaldi, William. "Rhetoric and the Philosophy of Aristotle," Classical Journal, LIII (1958) pp. 371-375.

Guthrie, W.K.C. The Sophists. London: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Gwynn, Aubrey. Roman Education From Cicero to Quintilian. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926.

Harding, H.F. "Quintilian's Wittnesses," Speech Monographs, I (1934) pp. 23-29.

Helmbold, W. and Holther, W. "The Unity of the Phaedrus," University of California Publications in Classical Philology, XIV (1952).

Hinks, D. "Tisias and Corax and the Invention of Rhetoric," Classical Quarterly, XXXIV (1940) pp. 61 ff.

Hunt, Everett Lee. "An Introduction to Classical Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIIIXIII (June, 1926) pp. 2021205.

________. "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians," in Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans. New York: Russell and Russell, 1965.

________. "Plato on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VI (June, 1920) pp. 35-56.

Isocrates. Isocrates. Trans. and intro. by George Norlin. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Jaeger, Werner. Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1944.

Jebb, R.C. Attic Orators. London: MacMillan, 1876.

Johnson, R. "Isocrates' Methods of Teaching," American Journal of Philology, LXXX (1959) pp. 25-36.

Kennedy, George. The Art Of Persuasion in Greece. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

[Longinus]. On The Sublime. Trans. by G.M.A. Grube. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1957.

________. On the Sublime. Traas. by W. Rhys Roberts. Cambridge: University Press, 1899.

________. On the Sublime. Trans by D.A. Russell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

McCord, Clarence. "On Sophists and Philosophers," Southern Speech Journal, XXIX (1963) pp. 146-149.

Mueller, Gustav E. "Unity of the Phaedrus," Classical Bulletin, XXXIII (March, 1957) pp. 50-53.

Nadeau, Ray. "Rhetorica Ad Herrenium: Commentary and Translation of Book One," Speech Monographs, XVI (August, 1949) pp. 57-68.

Nobles, W. Scott. "The Paradox of Plato's Attitude Toward Rhetoric," Western Speech, XXI (Fall, 1957) pp. 206-210.

Philostratus. The Lives of the Sophists. Trans. and intro, by W.C. Wright. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1920.

Pomeroy, Ralph S. "Aristotle and Cicero: Rhetorical Style," Western Speech, XXV (1961) pp. 25-32.

Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria. Trans. and intro, by H.E. Butler. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Roberts, W. Rhys. Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1963.

Rolfe, John C. Cicero and His Influence. New York, 1963.

Ryan, J.P. "Quintilian's Message," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XV (April, 1929) pp. 171-180.

Sandys, J.E. A History of Classical Scholarship. Cambridge: University Press, 1906.

Sattler, William M. "The Libraty Survey," in Clyde W. Dow, ed., An Introduction To Graduate Study in Speech and Theatre. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1961, pp.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. Schleiermacher's Introductions to the Dialogues of Plato. Trans. by W. Dobson. New York: Arno Press, 1973.

Schnakel, Peter J. "Plato's Phaedrus and Rhetoric," Southern Speech Journal, XXXII (1966) pp. 124-132.

Schwartz, Joseph and Rycenga, John. The Province of Rhetoric. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1965.

Sinclair, T.A. A History of Classical Greek Literature. London: Routledge, 1949.

Smail, William N. Quintilian On Education. London: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Smith, Bromley. "Corax and Probability," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VII (1921) pp. 13-42.

________. "Gorgias: A Study of Oratorical Style," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VII (1921).

________. "Hippias and the Lost Canon of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIII (June, 1926).

________. "Prodicus of Ceos: The Sire of Synonomy," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VI (1921).

________. "The Father of Debate: Protagoras of Abdera," Quarterly Journal of Speech, IV (1918).

________. "Theodorus of Byzantium: Word-Smith" Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIV (June, 1928).

________. "Thrasymachus: A Pioneer Rhetorician," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIII (June, 1927).

"Sophists." Encyclopedia Brittanica, (15th ed., vol. 17) pp. 11-14.

Tacitus, Cornelius. The Complete Works of Tacitus. Trans. by A.J. Church and W.J. Brodribb. New York: The Modern Library, 1942.

Thonssen, Lester, and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1948.

Wagner, Russell H. "The Rhetorical Theory of Isocrates," Quarterly Journal of Speech, VIII (November, 1922) pp. 322-337.

Weaver, Richard. The Ethics of Rhetoric. Chicago: H. Regnery, 1953.