



Opción  
ISSN: 1012-1587  
revistaopcion@gmail.com  
Universidad del Zulia  
Venezuela

Seilbek, Saken; Zhunissova, Maira; Koshekova,  
Ainur; Kadyrov, Zhanbai; Zhainagul Duisebekova  
Rhetoric as art of eloquence in the ancient greek culture  
Opción, vol. 34, no. 85, 2018, January-April, pp. 374-393  
Universidad del Zulia  
Venezuela

Available in: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=31055914018>

- ▶ How to cite
- ▶ Complete issue
- ▶ More information about this article
- ▶ Journal's webpage in redalyc.org



Scientific Information System Redalyc  
Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and  
Portugal

Project academic non-profit, developed under the open access initiative

# opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,  
Lingüística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 34, abril 2018 N°

# 85

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

ISSN 1012-1587/ ISSNe: 2477-9385

Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia  
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias  
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas  
Maracaibo - Venezuela

## **Rhetoric as art of eloquence in the ancient greek culture**

**Saken Seilbek**

Kazakh State Women's Teacher Training University,  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
[seilbeksaken2207@mail.ru](mailto:seilbeksaken2207@mail.ru)

**Maira Zhunissova**

AbayKazakh National Pedagogical University,  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
[zhmaira\\_71@mail.ru](mailto:zhmaira_71@mail.ru)

**Ainur Koshekova**

Kazakh State Women's Teacher Training University,  
Almaty, Kazakhstan  
[koshekova71@mail.ru](mailto:koshekova71@mail.ru)

**Zhanbai Kadyrov**

North Kazakhstan State University named after  
ManashKozybayev, Petropavlovsk, Kazakhstan  
[zhkadyrov\\_777@mail.ru](mailto:zhkadyrov_777@mail.ru)

**Zhainagul Duisebekova**

SuleymanDemirel University, Almaty, Kazakhstan  
[zhainagul.duisebekova@sdu.edu.kz](mailto:zhainagul.duisebekova@sdu.edu.kz)

### **Abstract**

Throughout the period of the ancient culture, rhetoric predetermined not only the style of speech, but also substantially views and behavior as life philosophy. Works of ancient speakers on rhetoric exerted huge impact on all further development of the theory of oratory; they made a significant contribution on development of practical eloquence. Speakers in the works open the problems relevant today. They were interested in a question: what is necessary for the good speaker, and drawn a conclusion that the perfect speaker must have natural talent, memory, to have skill and knowledge, to be an educated person and actor.

**Keywords:** rhetoric, oratory, art of eloquence, the sophistical rhetoric, the syllogistic conclusions, polemics, episteme, enthymemes.

# La retórica como arte de la elocuencia en la antigua cultura griega

## Resumen

A lo largo del período de la cultura antigua, la retórica predeterminó no solo el estilo del habla, sino también sustancialmente las visiones y el comportamiento, como filosofía de vida. Los trabajos de los oradores antiguos sobre la retórica ejercieron un gran impacto en todo desarrollo adicional de la teoría de la oratoria; hicieron una contribución significativa en el desarrollo de la elocuencia práctica. Los oradores en las obras abren hoy los problemas relevantes. Estaban interesados en una pregunta: qué es necesario para el buen orador, y llegaron a la conclusión de que el orador perfecto debe tener talento natural, memoria, habilidad y conocimiento, ser una persona educada y actor.

**Palabras clave:** retórica, oratoria, arte de la elocuencia, la retórica sofística, las conclusiones silogísticas, polémicas, episteme, entimemas.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Rhetoric is the art of persuasion and is based on the systematic analysis of natural or non-artistic eloquence. Eighteenth-century rhetoric is characterized above all by its urge to observe the natural sources of eloquence, to describe the phenomenon of untaught excellence in speaking and writing. A philosophical rhetoric is one that identifies the general causes of eloquence (SHINER, 2001). The doctrine of eloquence was arisen from generalization and systematization of those methods of conducting polemics, disputes and debates which were widely adopted in

antique Greece with its developed political life and fight of different parties for influence on masses. In these conditions the ability to convince people, to adduce convincing arguments against the opponents, to substantiate them with evidence, to affect not only the mind, but also feelings and emotions of the listeners, is gained extremely important value. That is why in antique Greece elaboration of rhetoric problems began long before when there were created the reliable logical-methodological, psychological and moral bases and principles on which the convincing dispute, dialogue, a debate or polemics should be based. More precisely, these principles and methods were formed gradually in the course of generalization and systematization of those methods, arguments and ways of conducting polemic or a debate which practiced in the public speech.

Analyzing these speeches, ancient Greeks aimed to explain among the first what is the convincing power of speech: why do we agree with one speech, and with another — we do not do it, why does one of them convince us and force to recognize arguments of the speaker, and in another we find shortcomings both in arguments, and in the creation of the speech? Sophists began to investigate these problems the first, many of them were also teachers of rhetoric as special art of eloquence, though this art arose long before appearance of the sophists. Attractive features of sophistic rhetoric were the democratic spirit, aspiration to help anyone who wants to learn the art of eloquence, ability to argue convincingly and reasonably with their opponents. Sophists also paid attention to the upbringing of their students, the desire for freedom of expression of their opinions and the ability to protect them, regardless of any authority. They dealt with special questions of utterance and speech construction as well

(WINTERER, 2004). The sophistic rhetoric, especially in days of its decline, was not guided entirely by search of the truth and knowledge (“episteme”), but it was aimed on the protection of opinions (“Doksa”), claiming that such opinions constantly change at the same person over time and furthermore they are various at different people. This orientation was based on the principles of philosophical relativism, which was put forward by such prominent sophists as Kratil, Gorgas, and Protagoras. Relativists consider that as our knowledge is constantly changed, then they have nothing authentic and absolute. They try to justify such conclusion with references to dialectics. So, for example, one of the founders of sophistic rhetoric - Protagoras, incorrectly interpreting Heraclitus’s dialectics, so exaggerates the moment relative and transient in human knowledge that the last absolutely loses objective contents and turns into subjective representation of the human. “The person is a measure of all things existing that they exist, nonexistent that they do not exist” (REINCHENBACH, 1978). In the history of rhetoric Protagoras was remembered as the resourceful sophist, capable “to do the weaker argument into stronger”.

## **2. DISCUSSION**

Socrates was one of the first Greek philosophers who opposed sophistry and the rhetoric based on it, we can judge his views on dialogues of his student - Plato as he preferred to state the doctrine in oral conversations and did not leave any written compositions. As for Plato, his relation to sophistry and even to former rhetoric was very negative. Therefore it is necessary to be limited only to achievement of the practical

purposes and first of all to try to obtain a victory over the opponent by means of the dexterous and estimated on outer effect persuasion techniques. According to Plato, “art of convincing people is much higher than all arts as it makes everyone to be the slaves voluntarily, but not on coercion” (MURPHY, 1981). Plato in the first part of dialogue “gorgy” convincingly shows that such claims of sophistical rhetoric are not based on anything and those definitions of rhetoric, which are given by sophists, do not endure criticism. First, the rhetoric, or art of eloquence, does not come down to creation of the speeches which power is found in a word. Socrates’s lips Plato says that there are other art forms or activity in general which use a word as well. It is impossible to call, for example, by eloquence the account art and furthermore doctoring or gymnastics (KENNEDY, 1998). Secondly, it is impossible to consider eloquence as “ability to convince a word and judges in the court and councilors in the council, and the people in people’s assembly and at meeting – citizens”. According to gorgy, owning such power, you will keep the doctor in slavery, and teachers of gymnastics and concerning to our operator, it will turn out that he does not acquire money for himself, and for another — for you, possessing a word and ability to convince crowd” (Ruzavin g.i.,1985, 452). Difference between belief and knowledge, plausibility and knowledge plays an essential role in the doctrine of Plato where only the truth (“episteme”), but not opinion (“Doksa”) gives original persuasion. Plato considers sophistical rhetoric not as art and as “skill and knack” which is according to the destination similar to cooking. All skills of this sort, though give pleasure, but represent kinds of servility and serve not fine, but low passions. Therefore he characterizes sophistical eloquence as “cooking for soul” (CHANKONG and HAIMES, 2008).

After reading of this dialogue, there can be made an impression that Plato transfers the negative attitude to all rhetoric existing before and does not notice that positive actual material which was saved up in development of oratory. But from the dialogue text it is impossible to receive the clear answer to this question. Apparently, Plato's position in relation to the previous rhetoric was not entirely negative, but he considered its theoretical bases quite unsteady and sophistical approach – unacceptable. Plato expressed the constructive position about the plan of creation and substantiation of new rhetoric in dialogue “Fedr”. According to Isocrates, the rhetoric was only practical art which has to rely on opinion, advantage and expediency but not so much on knowledge and the truth. It is no accident, therefore, speakers at his school were taught not to pursue some unattainable truth and justice, but to try to obtain benefit and to please listeners. Such approach in principle was unacceptable for Plato. Moreover, he does not allow in rhetoric of probable arguments and blames Gorgias and Tisias, “who saw that probable has to prefer true and which, thanks to word power, force to seem small - great, great - small, new - old, old – new” (RIEKE and SILLARS, 1984). As for logical means and the rhetorical technique, it is possible to find in Plato's compositions only the recommendations of general character. So, in “Fedr” he lists the main parts of the speaker speech, namely the introduction, statement, where the assumptions have to be provided, and they are supported with the corresponding evidence, the facts and other types of confirmation. In addition, in the accusatory and defensive speech it is necessary to give detailed denials and also collateral explanations. First of all, Plato tried to make a firm foundation for a new rhetoric by means of such philosophy in which instead of opinions and the probable assumptions the truth and reliability entirely would dominate. Though from the modern point of

view, it seems absolutely unrealistic not to consider roles of the assumptions, plausible or probabilistic judgments in the course of persuasion and comprehension of the truth in general, nevertheless, it is worth to remember that such approach to Plato's rhetoric was dictated by criticism of relativistic philosophy of sophists, absolutized the meaning of opinion, relative and subjective nature of knowledge. Thanks to the criticism of sophistical rhetoric, Plato promoted to raising of level of oratorical skill, appearance of the brilliant group of outstanding speakers among whom there was the greatest speaker of antiquity - Demosthenes who was a diligent listener of Plato. However the main merit of Plato consists in development and improvement of that method of conversation, polemic and a debate which was widely practiced by his teacher Socrates. On this basis this method is often called Socratic, or dialogical. Many believe that the dialectics originates exactly from there, if to be guided by etymological origin of the ancient Greek word "Dialego" meaning - to dialog, polemic, and a dispute. But Plato uses this term in "Fedr" in other sense, and Aristotle means the theory of the non-syllogistic conclusions.

Socrates, as it is possible to judge by Plato's illustration, considered dialogue as a question-answer method of search of the truth in which, at least, two people participate, one of whom asks questions, as a matter of fact, directs dialogue, and another answers on them. It is possible by systematic statement of questions to come finally or to the decision of a question or as much as possible to pull together positions of participants of dialogue. That is why art of purposeful statement of questions to lead the interlocutor to a contradiction with earlier suggested, Socrates calls *Mayevtika* or art of the midwife, as the *Mayevtika* helps the truth birth. In this case, we are not talking about how to expose the

opponent disparagingly and to win in a dispute, but aspiration to find the truth by joint efforts. Such method of search of the truth made the stimulating impact not only on traditional rhetoric but on development of the corresponding style for argument which we are met today, for example, in judicial dialogues of the accuser and lawyer, at activation of training at school when pupils not just passively perceive knowledge, but they enter live dialogue with the teacher. Fruitful dialogue appears also at holding various discussions and debates. Here it was important to pay attention to dialogue as a specific form of the argument, the most approximate to real practice of communication, polemic, a dispute between people (RIEKE and SILLARS, 1984).

Plato, being Socrates's student, contributed in the most cases the development and promotion of dialogue as new method of the argument, which to a great extent corresponded to the searching, creative spirit of an antique thought. As a matter of fact, we are also obliged to him by acquaintance to this method of the argument which Socrates widely used. All works of Plato, except for "the apology of Socrates", are written in the form of dialogues where the position of the author is expressed by Socrates. Live exchange of opinions on controversial issues, the careful analysis of pros and cons, identification of contradictions and refusal of the former assumptions and generalizations, the detailed analysis of the facts and continuous search of the truth – exactly it wins the experienced modern reader in skillfully written Plato's dialogues which throughout nearly two and a half millennia are considered as brilliant samples of intellectual art prose. The relation to rhetoric did not remain at Plato invariable. If in "gorgy" he identifies it with skill and knack like cooking then in "Fedr" it has already been considered as the certain art, needing

however in reforming on the basis of the philosophical and psychological principles. It is necessary to pay attention that Plato considers acceptable in rhetoric only true arguments though it is possible in dialogues to meet both analogies and plausible generalizations. He almost does not concern the logical party of the argument in the compositions. Rhetoric problems from the logical point of view were especially carefully investigated by Plato's student Aristotle who devoted a number of compositions from them it is necessary to mark out his well-known "rhetoric". In this one the rhetoric is defined as the doctrine promoting "to find possible ways of persuasion concerning each given subject". According to Aristotle, "it doesn't make a task of any other art because each other science can teach and convince only concerning that it belongs of its area" (ANDERSON, 1987). The general character of rhetoric as persuasion arts, by the nature is similar to dialectics which, according to Stagirite, also "deals with all sciences, but not with any one certain sort". Both in rhetoric, and dialectics it is necessary to convince people both to understand and to support some opinion, both to justify, and to accuse (ANDERSON, 1987). For the correct understanding of Aristotle's views it is necessary to consider that distinction which he carries out between analytics and dialectics. The analytics is identical to formal logic for him, more precisely, than the theory the syllogistic conclusions. It is analyzed the creation ways of the correct syllogisms and mistakes which meet in such conclusions. The dialectics is considered the general questions connected with use the non- syllogistic conclusions, namely reasoning's on analogies and inductive generalizations. As the conclusions of such reasoning's have only probabilistic or plausible character, they represent opinions, but not proofs. The rhetoric is differed from analytics and dialectics first of all in the applied character as it is intended to convince people during

polemic, of the public speech or lawsuit. But as the proof has the best power of persuasion which is studied in analytics, Aristotle considers the last theoretical fundamentals of rhetoric. However, it was difficult to use the developed syllogisms in oral speech therefore instead of them there is addressed to the reduced syllogisms or enthymemes. The dialectics acts as theoretical fundamentals of rhetoric and there are studied such non-syllogistic forms of reasoning's as induction and analogy. Speakers most often use the examples for brevity speeches instead of full transfer of cases on which inductive generalization is based. Thus, enthymemes and examples are the main ways on which the speaker forms the logic of persuasion.

As for the process of persuasion, the author of "rhetoric" distinguishes, on the one hand, ways or methods of persuasions which "are invented not by us" and calls them "nontechnical", and with another – "technical" methods which "can be created by us by means of a method and our own means". The various facts, data, evidences, etc. Premises on which are based in evidential and plausible reasoning's belong to the first type. Aristotle ranks to them eyewitness account, written contracts, oaths and even evidences given under torture. In modern logic they most often are called premises, the proof bases, and often as arguments. In order to avoid misunderstanding we will notice what further we will understand as the argument not only the analysis of arguments, but all process of persuasion including also discussion of the conclusion ways of the conclusions from these arguments.

Aristotle carries to technical means of persuasion just these ways of a conclusion by means of which arguments, i.e. Nontechnical ways of persuasion on his terminology, which are contacted with conclusions

made from them. The most common forms of a logical conclusion are deductive conclusions in which the conclusion with logical need follows from premises as arguments. Aristotle investigated most often the found syllogistic conclusions or if to be shorter, syllogisms. They are investigated in detail in “analysts”. But except them he addresses also to plausible or probabilistic reasoning’s which he calls dialectic, and opposes them evidential. “proof, – we read in “Topeka”, – is available when conclusion is based of true and the first (provisions), i.e. From such where knowledge of which originates from these or those first and true (provisions). Dialectic conclusion is that, which is created from plausible (provisions)”. It is interesting to note that he defines probable as “what happens mostly, and not just what happens, as define some, but what can be happened and differently”. In this definition we can notice similarity to modern frequency interpretation of probability. Thus, the persuasiveness of any speech, a position in a dispute, a public statement is based, according to Aristotle, first, on the validity or at least plausibility of the adduced arguments, premises which he calls nontechnical, not created by us the means of persuasion. Secondly, it depends also on those methods or logical rules by means of which of the available arguments are removed or, more precisely, the decisions are received. There can be spoken about a conclusion only in deductive, evidential conclusions. In not deductive reasoning’s, in particular inductive, it is necessary to be limited to the term “targeting”.

As, however, the obvious and developed use of deductive and inductive conclusions extremely would complicate the speech, in rhetoric Aristotle recommends to use more flexible and weakened their variants, namely instead of syllogisms – enthymemes, and induction — examples.

As it was already noted above, an enthymeme means the reduced syllogism in which this or that premise is passed, though it easily is meant, and in case of need it is easy to restore it. In a real reasoning, people do it practically constantly and for this reason Aristotle recommends to approach to rhetoric as well. It is enough to refer to a typical example which can guide at inductive generalization in the same way in the usual speech. Therefore induction is called targeting. Accurate difference between the basic concepts and methods of logic and dialectics, on the one hand, and rhetoricians, with another, Aristotle carries out it in the main work on rhetoric. “as for ways to prove in valid or seeming way, – he writes, – then as in dialectics is targeting, a syllogism and the seeming syllogism, in the same way is here, because the example is no other than targeting, an enthymeme – is a syllogism, the seeming enthymeme – is the seeming syllogism. I call enthymeme – a rhetorical syllogism, and an example – rhetorical targeting: because all speakers state the arguments, or giving examples, or created enthymemes, and in addition they do not use any ways of the proof” (ANDERSON, 1987). Enthymeme, according to stag rite, has to play a crucial role in rhetoric as they convince stronger, than examples. “examples, – he writes, – it is necessary to use in that case when you have no evidence, so in order to convince, it is required proof (some); when enthymemes are, examples should use as evidences, placing them after enthymemes in the form of the epilog. If to put them at the beginning, then they resemble targeting, and targeting is not peculiar to rhetorical speeches, except for the few cases; when they are placed at the end, they resemble as evidences, and evidences always excite trust. The author of “rhetoric” pays special attention to difference between enthymeme of two types: dialectic and rhetorical in which premises have the general, universal character, on the

one hand, and with another, enthymeme of private character. For the characteristic of the first Aristotle uses a concept of “top”, or a commonplace (PRIGOGINE and STENGERS, 2018). “In them we speak commonplaces – tops”. In the enthymemes of private character as premises serve the judgments relating to separate types of the phenomena and concrete events. Though knowledge of the last promotes the best understanding concrete, special sciences, nevertheless knowledge of “tops” and the syllogisms based on them allows to reveal, first, relation between the general and private, secondly, was able to use them as the conventional means of persuasion. Such is Aristotle’s concept of rhetoric in general, which is based, as we saw, it is rather on logic, than on philosophy and a dialectic method in Socratic-platonic understanding of this term. Unlike Plato for Aristotle the dialectics means the analysis of all the non-syllogistic forms of reasoning, in particular analogy and induction. His merit consists that he has considerably expanded those ways and methods of the argument which are based on plausible conclusions and which were widely used in public speeches, disputes over judicial and other questions though earlier they were often ignored by philosophers as simple opinions.

In spite of the fact that Aristotle remained the highest authority on the field of rhetoric for antique Rome, nevertheless romans gave much valuable and deserving attention in this science and especially practice of oratory. First of all their merit consists in development of methods of drawing up speeches, the analysis of those arguments which satirize called nontechnical, and improvement of style and beauty of the speech. Here the roman speakers followed that tradition which was arisen in works of Aristotle’s student - Theophrastus than him. They considered what his

“rhetoric”, despite indisputable advantages, is suitable for the analysis of ready speeches than for their drawing up. Therefore for the roman rhetoricians and speakers the much bigger value had the manual “about a syllable”, written by Theophrastus – and not evaluable to us now, in which he, based on the principles of the teacher, generalized the enormous experience accumulated by the predecessors in the field of style and pronouncing the speech. The roman judicial speakers were attracted by the scheme of the data of all diverse cases and motives to the uniform system of difficult and branched types and versions – the so-called statuses. Bases of such system were developed in the middle of the ii century be by Herm agoras who is considered as transitional figure from the Hellenistic rhetoric to the roman. The roman speakers refused also from Aristotelian division of premises on the general and private. Instead they began to characterize them as categories of a certain type, such as cause and effect, valid and possible, etc. Thanks to it they managed to carry out more subtle difference between premises rather on their quality, than quantity or volume (the general and private judgments). Under the influence of Herm agoras the roman judicial speakers began to use in the speeches in advance prepared forms, or structures, arguments which could be used in future speeches. However subsequently Cicero and quintillions opposed such dogmatic schemes, fairly emphasizing that the creation and finding of suitable arguments and schemes of reasoning represents creative process and demands broad and free education. Efforts of ancient roman speakers were concentrated mainly around problems of political struggle in the senate, at national forums and also judicial proceedings of civil and criminal cases. Therefore they were not thought about theoretical questions of the argument and rhetoric in general. Perhaps, the outstanding speaker of antique Rome mark Julius Cicero was the only

exception from them who was permanently emphasizing in the compositions about need of a combination of eloquence to persuasiveness, rhetoric with philosophy.

Cicero regards pithiness and persuasiveness of the speech as of paramount importance, but not its external form and beauty. “Really, what can be as ridiculous as an empty ring of phrases though the most perfect and magnificent, but behind which there is neither knowledge, nor own thoughts”. An ideal of the speaker for him was not the craftsman who is well-spoken, and the wise man knowing science about beauty of expression. Therefore training and education of the speaker has to be based so that to develop his natural qualities because without natural talent, quick-wittedness and feeling it is impossible to influence listeners, to convince them of something. “Therefore, it is necessary to remember, first, that the purpose of the speaker is convincing to speak; secondly, that for any speech as a subject serves either the question uncertain ... or a case”. The speaker has to concentrate the proofs and denials on such questions. Controversial points can be very various and therefore they demand special ways of the proof in each case. Characterizing structure of the public speech, Cicero pays attention that “all forces and abilities of the speaker serve performance of the following five tasks: first, he has to seek contents for the speech; secondly, to arrange found one after another, having weighed and having estimated each argument; thirdly, to invest and decorate all this with words; fourthly, to strengthen the speech in memory; fifthly, to deliver it with dignity and pleasantness”. But before starting to do it, Cicero warns, it is necessary to win listeners favor at the beginning of the speech, then to establish a subject of a dispute and only after it to begin to prove what the speaker insists on and what he

disproves. At the end of the speech it is necessary to sum up the results of talking, namely “to develop and glorify what speaks for us and to shake and deprive of value what speaks for opponents.

More detailed discussion of the listed five tasks is given in the treatise “speaker” where he pays the main attention to what to tell, where to tell and how to tell. In this triad the main role is played, according to his opinion, a process of finding of what needs to be told and with what arguments to confirm told. “Really, it is a great cause to find and choose what to tell: it is like a soul in a body”. As in the judicial and political speech it was necessary to concentrate efforts first of all on a dispute subject so far as were subjected to examination, “first, whether the act took place, secondly, how it determines and, thirdly, how it estimates”. The solution of the first question is reached by means of the proof. As premises of such proofs Cicero considers not only the facts, but also judgments of the general character which Aristotle calls “tops”. On their basis “it is possible to develop the speech and pros and cons”, but they should be used not thoughtlessly, but it is necessary to weigh everything and make a choice before applying to a particular case. Determination and assessment of an act is carried out by correlation to the corresponding type on the basis of concepts and definitions. At permission of the third question there are used concepts of correctness and a wrongfulness, justice and injustice. It is remarkable that in the treatise “speaker”, Cicero for the first time clearly points to relation of the main ideas with the logical principles of Aristotle rhetoric. Really, when he speaks about proofs in the judicial speech, then he pays attention to value of commonplaces, or “tops”, and at the same time specifies as premises of a reasoning - what large role is played the private judgments which act as evidences, the

facts, contracts, legal norms, etc. Nontechnical means of persuasion. Moreover, such concrete arguments convince also judges at meetings, and listeners of people's assembly, and legislators in the senate more, than the abstract principles and the general reasoning's. But it does not mean that Cicero did not recognize a role of logic and philosophy in rhetoric. However, he was skeptical, for example, to the logic of the stoic chrysippus as too artificial and therefore as little use in oratory art, where, according to him, it is necessary to rely on Aristotelian logic and dialectics. Though Cicero was busier with applied rhetoric, with success making public speeches at first in people's assembly, and then in the senate, but in the written works he steadily adhered to high models of the theoretical analysis of the great predecessors Plato and Aristotle. Therefore his treatises about oratory are written not in the form of traditional handicraft manuals and directions, which were widespread at rhetorical schools of that time, but in the form of free dialogue in which thoughts of the author are expressed by the best-known speakers in the past. Some western researchers consider an original contribution of Cicero to rhetoric, first, development of a concept about a duty of the speaker, secondly, underlining of a role of style and execution of the speech. However, it is easy to show that tasks which are set for the speaker by Cicero were clearly and are accurately formulated still by Aristotle, and partially and Plato. Really, the requirement to prove the discussed case was developed in detail and found out by Aristotle not only in "rhetoric", but also in "analytics" and "Topeka". It is slightly more difficultly the situation with a duty of the speaker to achieve consent with audience and also to put some idea to listeners about action and to induce them to such action. There is Cicero, relying on the experience and practice of that

time, stated a number of the original ideas which at Aristotle act as appeals to morality and to emotions.

As for the roman rhetoric after Cicero, the need for public speeches was considerably fallen after falling of the republic and emergence of monarchy, except for judicial oratorical skill. But even the nature of judicial eloquence was considerably changed. The official style began to prevail in it and instead of verbose and long reasoning's there is began to be used the short, precise formulates which are better approached to the nature of judicial proceedings. Short rise of oratory and rhetoric after Cicero was connected with a name of mark fabiusquintilian who was considered as the best-known speaker in the last quarter of the century ad. Though Quintilian was also a great admirer of Cicero, but he was guided in the rhetoric not so much for the people and general democratic public, but the coterie of connoisseurs of style and beauty of the speech. Therefore he wanted to see in the speaker not so much the thinker, then the stylist. It is characteristic that he defines also rhetoric as art to speak well.

### **3. CONCLUSION**

Concluding the brief review of Aristotle's views on rhetoric, it should be noted that all major principles on which the substantiality, emotional and psychological and stylistic adequacy of the public speech is based have found reflection in his compositions. It is possible to tell with full confidence that Aristotle's "rhetoric" the most in-depth and systematic study of the major problems of oratory, in particular represents those which are connected with the argument. On this basis in the ancient world the Aristotle tradition was created which, unlike Plato's, transfers the

center of gravity from dialogue to the public speech, whether it was a speech at forum, or at people's assembly, in court session, etc. In this regard there were considerably extended and were enriched the methods and ways of an argumentation, and together with them and possibilities of the rhetoric. Therefore, it is possible to tell that Aristotle laid the foundation for rhetorical system which was received the name "classical" and which throughout over two and a half millennia was accepted as a model for training in art of the public speech. Moreover, Aristotle's ideas formed a basis for emergence of one of the modern directions in the theory of the argumentation, and ancestor –Belgian philosopher kHz. Perelman called it "new rhetoric". It demonstrates that the Aristotle's rhetoric was guided first of all by the logical principles of persuasion that gave to it the strong, reliable bases and provided symmetry and the sequence in the course of the argumentation. Withdrawal from antique tradition in rhetoric, though was designated in the latest roman rhetoric, nevertheless was not expressed in obvious and moreover in a sharp form. Therefore this stage of rhetoric development can be characterized as transitional from antiquity to the Middle Ages when belief was come to the place of persuasion, which, according to fathers of the church, had to replace also all earlier created means of persuasion. The rhetorical culture of antiquity is the cornerstone of Europe humanitarian education since the renaissance up to the xviii century. It is not a coincidence that today the remained texts of speeches of antique speakers have historical interest, and moreover they exert powerful impact on the present events, keep huge cultural value, being the role models of convincing logic, inspired feeling and truly creative style.

**REFERENCES**

Anderson, James Arthur, 1987. **Communication research: Issues and methods**, McGraw-Hill College,

Chankong, Vira and Haimes, Yacov Y, 2008. **Multiobjective decision making: theory and methodology**, Courier Dover Publications,

Kennedy, George Alexander, 1998. **Comparative rhetoric: An historical and cross-cultural introduction**, Oxford University Press, USA,

Murphy, James Jerome, 1981. **Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: a history of rhetorical theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance**, Univ of California Press,

Prigogine, Ilya and Stengers, Isabelle, 2018. **Order out of Chaos**, Verso Books,

Reinchenbach, Hans, 1978. **The present state of the discussion on relativity**, Springer,

Rieke, Richard D and Sillars, Malcolm Osgood, 1984. **Argumentation and the decision making process**, Addison-Wesley Longman,

Shiner, Larry, 2001. **The invention of art: A cultural history**, University of Chicago Press,

Winterer, Caroline, 2004. **The culture of classicism: Ancient Greece and Rome in American intellectual life, 1780-1910**, JHU Press,



**UNIVERSIDAD  
DEL ZULIA**

---

# **opción**

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 34, N° 85, 2018

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.

Maracaibo - Venezuela

[www.luz.edu.ve](http://www.luz.edu.ve)

[www.serbi.luz.edu.ve](http://www.serbi.luz.edu.ve)

[produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve](http://produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve)