

ENGLISH RHETORIC

英语修辞学

张秀国 著

清华大学出版社
北京交通大学出版社

· 北京 ·

内 容 简 介

本书第1章论述修辞学的定义及其与演讲术的相互关系。第2章介绍英语修辞学及其产生渊源。第3章分析学习英语修辞的重要意义。第4、5章分别讨论选词和用句。第6~11章重点讨论英语修辞格。其中,第6章讨论修辞格的定义、功能及其使用原则;第7章讨论音形类修辞格;第8、9章讨论句法结构类修辞格;第10章讨论语义类修辞格;第11章讨论逻辑类修辞格。为帮助读者掌握各章内容,每章之后均安排思考题或多种形式的练习题,书末安排综合测试题,并提供部分参考答案。

本书为英语专业本科学生使用的教材,也可供英语修辞研究者及具备相当英语阅读能力的其他英语学习者学习参考。

版权所有,翻印必究。举报电话:010-62782989 13501256678 13801310933

本书封面贴有清华大学出版社防伪标签,无标签者不得销售。

本书防伪标签采用特殊防伪技术,用户可通过在图案表面涂抹清水,图案消失,水干后图案复现;或将表面膜揭下,放在白纸上用彩笔涂抹,图案在白纸上再现的方法识别真伪。

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

英语修辞学 = English Rhetoric/张秀国著. —北京:清华大学出版社;北京交通大学出版社, 2005. 5

ISBN 7-81082-377-9

I. 英… II. 张… III. 英语-修辞学-高等学校-英文 IV. H315

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2005)第028978号

责任编辑:张利军 特邀编辑:伍伟

出版者:清华大学出版社 邮编:100084 电话:010-62776969 <http://www.tup.com.cn>

北京交通大学出版社 邮编:100044 电话:010-51686414 <http://press.bjtu.edu.cn>

印刷者:北京宏伟双华印刷有限公司

发行者:新华书店总店北京发行所

开本:175×235 印张:17.75 字数:350千字

版次:2005年5月第1版 2005年5月第1次印刷

书号:ISBN 7-81082-377-9/H·51

印数:1~4 000册 定价:25.00元

本书如有质量问题,请向北京交通大学出版社质监组反映。对您的意见和批评,我们表示欢迎和感谢。

投诉电话:010-51686043, 51686008; 传真:010-62225406; E-mail: press@center.bjtu.edu.cn。

序

修辞学是一门传统学科，追根溯源已有两千多年的历史。然而近几十年来，它不断受到周边学科的渗透和影响，其传统的内涵和外延日益拓宽，自身的界定也逐渐模糊。因此，国内外的语言学家对修辞作定义时往往仁者见仁，智者见智。比如，英国语言学家 Geoffrey Leech 在 *The Principles of Pragmatics* (1983: 5) 一书中认为语义学是以规则为基础的 (rule-based)，属语法性质；而一般的语用学是以原则为指导的 (principle-controlled)，属修辞范畴。而美国的 Patrick Hartwell 在其 *Open to Language* (1982: 34) 一书中则指出，修辞是在一定的语境下为了一定的交际目的所做的选择。同时，国内外不少学者认为，修辞与文体学有诸多相似之处；而有人则把修辞与写作技巧过多地联系在一起。修辞学这种跨学科的特点和自身界定的模糊性展现了该学科兼容并蓄的特点，它既是一件好事，同时又带来了一定的负面影响。比如在编写教材时，特别是编写适合英语专业本科生使用的教材的时候，人们颇感其范围难以确定，致使近几年来这类教材似乎特别少见。所能见到的一些，要么过多地聚焦于写作技巧，要么连篇累牍地介绍修辞格，而且举例陈旧，编排传统，观念比较老化，缺少时代特征。

修辞是一门重要的课程，它对于提高学习者对语言的悟性，增强他们语言表达的得体性至关重要。张秀国教授深刻地体会到这一点，他孜孜不倦，几年伏案笔耕，终于完成了《英语修辞学》这本书。我阅读了他的书稿后，觉得该书在相当程度上填补了上述教材的空缺，适应了目前市场的需求。

该书在内容的定位上，既有传统的思考，又有新的交叉和拓展；既有历史的回顾，又有符合时代特征的新视角。该书的第 2 章详细地概述了修辞学的发展轨迹，从公元前 5 世纪一直到 20 世纪 90 年代，历数不同流派，纵览百家之说，读后使读者对修辞学的来龙去脉有了宏观的了解，使他们能从历史的角度解读其今天的发展。

该书在内容的编写上注意吸收了当前语言学研究的最新成果，比如对隐喻 (metaphor) 和借代 (metonymy) 等修辞格的解释就吸收了以 Lakoff 为代表的认知语言学方面的有关观点。作者认为，隐喻不仅是语言的问题，更是人们的一种认知能力，是人们思维的一种定势和知识建构的一种途径，它表现于隐喻

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

概念和概念隐喻。

我比较仔细地阅读了张教授的书稿，觉得它另一个显著的特点就是语料丰富，举例鲜活，多数例句来源于现当代的相关文本、书籍和网上资源，且语料和举例通俗易懂，富有时代气息。

该书为了满足本科教学的需要还在每一章之后编写了形式多样、难度适中的练习，并配有答案，从而提高了它在教学中的可操作性。

总之，我觉得张秀国教授的《英语修辞学》富有特色，符合当前相关的教学需求，实用性强。这是他严谨治学、多年辛劳的结果。我祝贺他的成功，祝愿他再接再厉，争取更大的丰收。

方文礼

2005年4月于扬州

前言

修辞在语言交际中的重要性尽人皆知。修辞学习其实是伴随语言学习同时进行的，不过在语言学习的开始阶段人们没有意识到它或不去着意提它罢了。随着语言表达能力的逐步提高，修辞也就越发显得重要。对英语学习者来说，英语修辞的学习也同样是贯穿于英语学习始终的，不过愈到高级阶段英语修辞就愈发显得重要。可以说，每个英语学习者和使用者都应当学习英语修辞。

国家教育部 2000 年批准实施的《高等学校英语专业英语教学大纲》规定修辞学为一门重要的专业知识选修课程。目前已经有相当多高校的英语专业专门开设了英语修辞学课程。尚未开设该门课程的高校其英语专业学生也往往通过自学或通过其他课程陆续、非系统地在学习英语修辞知识。英语专业本科学生中，相当一部分学生的学年论文或毕业论文的选题都和英语修辞有关。

本人从 1996 年开始讲授英语修辞学课程。当时一方面深感该门课程的重要，另一方面也深感当时教学资料尤其是英文版资料不足给该门课程教学造成很大困难。近几年，英语修辞方面的书籍渐渐多了起来，但是适合作为英语专业高年级本科教材的英文版教学书籍仍然十分短缺。本人感到有必要为改变这种状况尽自己绵薄之力。在过去 8 年英语修辞教学过程中，本人不断发掘资料、丰富教学内容，采用新的学术视角，吸取新的知识，在教学中不断进行新的思考，从而在多年教学讲义基础上逐步整理形成了本书。本书读者对象是高年级英语专业本科学生，同时也包括具有相当英语水平的社会上其他英语学习者和英语爱好者。

全书分 3 个部分，共 11 章。第一部分由第 1、2、3 章组成，其中以第 2 章为重点。第 1 章为导论，论述修辞学的定义。本章分析了修辞学与演讲术的相互关系，在列举众多定义基础上提出修辞应当具备的五个要素。第 2 章为第一部分的核心。该章介绍包括英语修辞学及其渊源——西方修辞学的历史分期和主要代表人物的修辞观点。第 3 章从英语修辞与掌握听、说、读、写、译等语言技能的关系入手，分析学习英语修辞的重要意义。第二部分包括第 4、5 两章。第 4 章讨论选词，第 5 章讨论用句。本部分所讨论的选词和用句原则是英语修辞的基本内容，掌握了这些原则就打好了英语修辞的基础。第三部分包括第 6～11 章，重点讨论英语修辞的精华部分即修辞格。其中，第 6 章为第三部分的

导言, 讨论修辞格的定义及其由来, 种类划分, 修辞格的功能及其使用原则。第7章讨论音形类修辞格, 包括头韵、元韵、辅韵、拟声、双关等7种修辞格。第8、9章讨论句法结构类修辞格, 包括重复、平行结构、对照、渐升、渐降、一语双叙、交错配列等15种修辞格。第10章讨论语义类修辞格, 包括明喻、隐喻、转喻、提喻、换称、拟人等9种修辞格。第11章讨论逻辑类修辞格, 包括寓言、典故、反语、夸张、低陈、委婉、矛盾修饰、类比等10种修辞格。第三部分总共讨论了41种修辞格。

本书撰写主要遵循以下原则。

1. 填补空白, 形成特色。目前国内英语修辞学英文版书籍较少, 并且缺少英语修辞学发展介绍和具体修辞方式研究两者兼备的英文版书籍。为填补这一空白, 本书既对英语修辞史作较为系统全面的介绍, 又对具体的修辞方式进行深入研究, 以满足读者要求。

2. 照顾全面, 突出重点。全书分三个部分, 其中以第三部分为重点。各部分也尽量突出自身的重点。其中, 第一部分以第2章修辞学史介绍为重点, 第二部分以第5章句型选用为重点, 第三部分以第7~11章为重点。各章又有各自重点, 尽量不平均使用篇幅。

3. 运用新的语言理论, 体现时代性。本书在修辞格分类方面, 采用20世纪70年代以后列日学派结构主义的修辞理论。在分析具体修辞格时, 尽量运用新的语言理论如社会语言学、功能语言学、认知语言学、心理学等原理对修辞现象进行深入的分析。同时, 在英语修辞学史介绍的范围上涵盖当代, 以体现时代性。

4. 理论与实践结合, 体现实用性。各章之后均附有思考题或练习题, 以帮助读者理解与消化该章内容。在分别介绍四十余种修辞格之后, 本书安排综合练习题, 帮助读者对所学的各种修辞格进行回顾与梳理, 使之达到融会贯通、熟练掌握的程度。此外, 除了思考题等, 练习题一般均提供参考答案, 有的还配有较为详细的说明。练习的设计, 目的是既方便学习者深化对该部分内容的理解和掌握, 同时也方便教师教学使用。

本书得以完成, 首先我要感谢这些年来选修英语修辞学课程的我的学生们。他们学习该门课程的热情鼓舞着我撰写此书, 没有他们的热情参与和支持是不可能完成此书的。其次, 我要感谢我的同事和家人。在本人写作此书的多年里, 特别是在紧张而关键的近两年中, 他们承担了本应由我完成的工作或事务, 为我创造了良好的写作环境, 使我能够安心完成此书。此外, 我要特别感谢南京大学外国语学院博士生导师王守仁教授。他的指导和帮助对本书的最终形成起了非常关键的作用。我还要感谢扬州大学原外语学院院长方文礼教授, 他在

百忙中审阅书稿并提出不少宝贵建议，同时还为本书热情作序。对他的热忱之心和无私精神，我在此表示由衷的钦佩和诚挚的谢意。

最后，本书的责任编辑张利军同志为提高本书的质量和本书的出版尽心尽责，做了大量工作，对此本人深表谢意。

本书虽是在多年讲稿基础上完成，但因本人水平所限，其中浅陋之见和错误之处在所难免。恳请广大读者不吝指正。

张秀国
2005年4月



Chapter 1

What Is Rhetoric?

1.1 Rhetoric and oratory

Rhetoric is primarily concerned with oral discourse. This can be clearly seen from its word origin. The word “rhetoric” derives from the Greek word “rhētorikē”, and “rhētorikē” comes from the Greek word “rhētōr”. “rhētōr” as a verb means “to speak”, and, as a noun, means “orator”, or “public speaker”. In ancient Greek times, teaching students rhetoric meant teaching them to become orators. The word “rhetoric” was then used to refer to the art of effective public speaking.

Oratory can be considered the foundation of rhetoric. Oratory is more than ordinary speech but a special kind of public speaking. The orator speaks for a special purpose, in a special way and at a special time. Oratory rises above the common level of speech and has a greater level of appeal and emotional impact of the audience. Its purpose is to impress, convince, or move the audience to action. Oratory had been practiced long before the ancient rhetoricians developed a theory and a vocabulary for rhetoric. The ancient rhetoricians observed that certain orators were effective and others were not. They then developed a set of principles for successful communication. These principles make up the art of rhetoric.

1.2 Connotation of rhetoric

Over the years the word “rhetoric” has taken on a wide range of meaning. People may use the term to refer to skillful, but often deceptive, eloquence. They



view rhetoric as a fraudulent practice which is intended to give some people an advantage over others by appealing to their emotions or prejudices. Allied with this view is the notion that rhetoric deals exclusively with language, rather than with ideas. People who hold this view believe that flowery figures of speech and double-talk give the appearance of substance, while the “real questions” go unanswered. This view has had formidable support, most notably from Socrates and Plato. For instance, in his *Gorgias*, Plato criticized the rhetoricians, “The rhetorician need not know the truth about things; he has only to discover some way of persuading the ignorant that he has more knowledge than those who know.”

Although many people attach negative connotations to “rhetoric”, other people do not. They regard all uses of language as inherently suasive, in effect removing the onus of deception or manipulation. Historically, “rhetoric” had positive connotations, suggesting a commendable skill with words. Today rhetoric, as it was in history, is something that people have to resort to. The Declaration of Independence, for instance, eloquently expresses the consensus of a people persuaded to uphold certain self-evident truths. Similarly, writers of great literature have employed language powerfully to make us cry, to poke fun at our human frailties, and to command our support for important causes. As Gerard A. Hauser explains in his *Introduction to Rhetorical Theory*:

Today *rhetoric* is most generally understood as *the management of symbols in order to coordinate social action*. *Management* refers to the *purposive selection and arrangement* of symbols. . . . *Symbols* refer to any meaningful system of signs that is referential. Music, dance, painting, mathematical notation, cinema, to cite but five, comprise such systems. They can influence our perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, and even behaviors. . . . Among human symbol systems, language is the most basic. It is also the most pervasive and most complex of these systems and the one most clearly and explicitly used to influence others. *To coordinate social action* implies *influence* of some sort. At the very least it would include the inducement of an attitude, but it can extend to moving others to cooperative physical actions. (23)

Rhetoric is generally understood as a tool or a method. Its content is more concerned with the hows of what people are talking about than the whats of what



people are talking about. As a tool, rhetoric is inherently neither good or bad. A deceitful person will use it to deceive and an ethical person will use it to make truth and justice prevail.

1.3 Definitions of rhetoric

The word “rhetoric” has been defined differently. Look at some of the following definitions given by scholars.

Anonymous :

Rhetoric is the science which refreshes the hungry, renders the mute articulate, makes the blind to see, and teaches one to avoid every lingual ineptitude.

Rhetoric published at Memmingen, 1490—1495, quoted
from Harry Caplan “Classical Rhetoric and
the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching”
Of Eloquence : Studies in Ancient and Mediaeval Rhetoric.

Anne King, Helen North, ed.
Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970. 109

Aristotle :

Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion. This is not a function of any other art.

Rhetoric. Book 1, Chapter 21. 26

Francis Bacon :

[Rhetoric is a technique making it possible] to apply reason to imagination, for the better moving of the will.

Advancement in Learning. Book 2

Charles Bazerman :

The study of how people use language and other symbols to realize human goals and carry out human activities... ultimately a practical study offering people great control over their symbolic activity.

*Shaping Written Knowledge : The Genre and Activity
of the Experimental Article in Science*.
Madison University of Wisconsin Press, 1988. 6



Patricia Bizzell:

Rhetoric is the study of the personal, social, and historical elements in human discourse — how to recognize them, interpret them, and act on them, in terms both of situational context and of verbal style. This is the kind of study one has to perform in order to effect persuasion, the traditional end of rhetoric.

“Foundational and Anti-Foundationalism”
Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness.
Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 1992. 218

Carole Blair:

There is obviously no unrhetorical “naturalness” of language to which one could appeal; the language itself is the result of audible rhetorical arts. . . . Language does not desire to instruct, but to convey to others a subjective impulse and its acceptance. . . . Language is rhetoric, because it desires to convey only doxa [opinion], not an episteme [knowledge].

“Nietzsche’s Lecture Notes on Rhetoric”
Philosophy and Rhetoric. 1983(2): 106 – 107

Wayne Booth:

The art of changing men’s minds.

The Prospect of Rhetoric. Bitzer, Black, ed. 1971. 95

Donald C. Bryant:

Rhetoric is the method, the strategy, the organon of the principles for deciding best the undecidable questions, for arriving at solutions of the unsolvable problems, for instituting method in those vital phases of human activity where no method is inherent in the total subject matter of decision. The resolving of such problems. . . is rhetoric. (11)

Rhetoric is the rationale of informative and suasory discourse; it operates chiefly in the areas of the contingent; its aim is the attainment of maximum probability as a basis for public decision; it is the organizing and animating principle of all subject-matters which have a relevant bearing on that decision. (12)

[Rhetoric is the practice of] adjusting ideas to people. . . and people to ideas.
(19)

此为试读, 需要完整PDF请访问: www.etongbook.com “Rhetoric: Its Function and Scope”



The Province of Rhetoric. Joseph Schwartz, John A., ed.
Rycenga, 1965

Kenneth Burke:

The basic function of rhetoric [is] the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents. . . . For rhetoric as such is not rooted in any past condition of human society. It is rooted in the essential function of language itself, a function which is wholly realistic, and is continually born anew; the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols (56 – 57).

Rhetoric is par excellence the region of the Scramble, of insult and injury, bickering, squabbling, malice and the lie, cloaked malice and subsidized lie. . . . Rhetoric also includes resources of appeal ranging from sacrificial, evangelical love, through the kinds of persuasion figuring in sexual love, to sheer “neutral” communication (communication being the area where love has become so generalized, desexualized, “technologized,” that only close critical or philosophic scrutiny can discern the vestiges of the original motive) (543).

A Rhetoric of Motives. Cleveland: World Press, 1962

George Campbell:

The grand art of communication, not of ideas only, but of sentiments, passions, dispositions and purposes. . . . That art or talent by which the discourse is adapted to its end.

The Philosophy of Rhetoric. Lloyd Bitzer, ed.
Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963. xiix

Cicero:

. . . eloquence to persuade their fellows of the truth of what they had discovered by reason.

De inventione. H. M. Hubbell, Trans.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976. 7

No man can be an orator possessed of every praiseworthy accomplishment, unless he has attained the knowledge of every thing important, and of all liberal arts, for his language must be ornate and copious from knowledge, since, unless there be beneath the surface matter understood and felt by the speaker, oratory



becomes an empty and almost puerilic flow of words.

On the Character of the Orator. J. S. Watson, Trans.
Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986. 11

Thomas B. Farrell:

Rhetoric is an acquired competency, a manner of thinking that invents possibilities for persuasion, conviction, action, and judgment; it may be developed and sophisticated and, above all, critiqued and improved.

Norms of Rhetorical Culture.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993. 16

Michael Hyde and Craig Smith:

The primordial function of rhetoric is to “make-known” meaning both to oneself and to others. Meaning is derived by a human being in and through the interpretive understanding of reality. Rhetoric is the process of making known that meaning. Is not rhetoric defined as pragmatic communication, more concerned with the contemporary audiences and specific questions than with universal audiences and general questions?

“Hermeneutics and Rhetoric: A Seen but Unobserved Relationship”
Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1979, 65 (4): 347

George A. Kennedy:

Rhetoric, in the most general sense, is the energy inherent in emotion and thought, transmitted through a system of signs, including language, to others to influence their decisions and actions.

Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse.
New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. 7

George Briscoe Kerferd:

The superiority of one logos to another is not accidental, but depends on the presence of specific features. The study of these is the study of the art of rhetoric.

The Sophistic Movement.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. 82

Richard McKeon:

The new art of rhetoric is the art of discovery. It is not a heuristic method or a



radical interpretation but an art of topics or a selection of elements which opens the way to the recognition of new facts and to the perception of unnoticed structures and sequences.

“Philosophy of Communication and the Arts”
Rhetoric: Essays on Invention and Discovery.

Mark Backman, ed. Woodbridge: Ox Bow, 1987. 110

Chaim Perelman:

It is not a poetical discipline but a practical technique with a view to producing an effect on an audience, if the resulting discourse has artistic value, that is but a consequence, not the aim of the actors endeavors. . . . Since the aim of every discourse is in reality to influence an audience, its action can only concern the future; the point is to bring people to act, to create or reinforce in them the disposition to act.

The Prospect of Rhetoric. Bitzer, Black, eds. 1971. 115 – 116

Chaim Perelman and Olbrechts Tyteca:

As soon as a communication tries to influence one or more persons, to orient their thinking, to excite or calm their emotions, to guide their actions, it belongs to the realm of rhetoric. Dialectic, the technique of controversy, is included as one part of this larger realm.

The Realm of Rhetoric. William Kluback, Trans.

Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982. 162

Plato:

For if this matter is really two-fold, part of it will doubtless be a form of flattery and a shameless method of addressing the public; the other may well be beautiful, a genuine attempt to make the souls of one’s fellows as excellent as may be, a striving always to say what is best, whatever the degree of pleasure or pain it may afford the audience. But a rhetoric such as this you have never accounted . . . (77).

The moral artist, the true orator. . . will always fix his mind upon engendering justice in the souls of his fellow citizens and the eradication of injustice, the planting of self control and the uprooting of uncontrol, the entrance of virtue and the exit of vice (79).



Richard M. Weaver:

Rhetoric moves the soul with a movement which cannot finally be justified logically. (23)

... Rhetoric at its truest seeks to perfect men by showing them better versions of themselves, links in that chain extending up towards the ideal, which only the intellectual can apprehend and only the soul have affection for ... (25)

The Ethics of Rhetoric. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1953

Here are some of the definitions given in a few dictionaries published in the twentieth century: Rhetoric is —

“the art of using language so as to persuade or influence others; the body of rules to be observed by a speaker or writer in order that he may express himself with eloquence”

The Oxford English Dictionary, 1933

“the art or science of using words effectively in speaking or writing, especially of literary composition”

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, 1972

“the art of persuasive or impressive speaking or writing; language designed to persuade or impress (but perhaps insincere or exaggerated)”

The Concise Oxford Dictionary, 1982

“language used to persuade or influence people, especially by politicians; the art of speaking or writing to persuade or influence people”

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1995

1.4 Five assumptions

Obviously, people are not so much defining rhetoric as offering their definitions of the angle from which they regard rhetoric and expressing their respective understanding of it. Their opinions vary so considerably that it is impossible to give a satisfactory definition to it. According to Erika Lindemann, the following five assumptions govern the use of the term “rhetoric”.



1) Rhetoric is both a field of humane study and a pragmatic art; that is, we can read about it as well as practice it.

2) The practice of rhetoric must be viewed as a culturally determined, interdisciplinary process. Rhetoric enables writers and speakers to design messages for particular audiences and purposes. Since people in various cultures and historical periods are likely to adopt different perspectives on what makes communication effective, rhetoric will accommodate the needs of those who practice it.

3) When we practice rhetoric, we use language, either spoken or written, to “induce cooperation” in an audience.

4) The purpose of rhetoric, inducing cooperation, involves more than mere persuasion. Discourse, which affects an audience, has a rhetorical aim. Not all verbal or written communication aims to create an effect in an audience. But when we use language in formal ways, with the premeditated intention of changing attitudes or behaviors, of explaining a subject matter, of expressing the self, or of calling attention to a text which can be appreciated for its artistic merits, our purpose is rhetorical.

5) Rhetoric implies choices, for both the speaker or writer and the audience. When we practice rhetoric we design the message, first by making decisions about our subject, audience, point of view, and purpose. Then, we select our best ideas, the best order in which to present them, and the best resources of language to express them. In other words, we develop strategies for creating an effect in our audience. However, the notion of choice carries with it an important ethical responsibility. Our strategies must be reasonable and honest. Furthermore, the audience must have a choice in responding to the message and must be able to adopt, modify, or reject the message.



Exercises

Questions for discussion.

1. What is the relationship between rhetoric and oratory in history? Describe the origin of western rhetoric.
2. Do you think that rhetoric is a neutral tool in human communication? Do you agree that all discourses are persuasive?
3. What is your opinion of the five assumptions of rhetoric?

Chapter 2

Brief History of Western Rhetoric

2.1 Classical rhetoric (5th c. B. C. — 5th c. A. D.)

2.1.1 Ancient Greece and ancient Greek democracy

Ancient Greece was one of the largest contributors to present-day civilization. Democracy, philosophy, astrology, biology, mathematics, physics, and the theatre are only a few of its contributions to us. Words and thoughts from great men such as Plato, Socrates, Pythagoras, and Aristotle are still taught in universities to this day.

The ancient Greeks (mainly the Athenians) were a unique people. They believed that individuals should be free as long as they acted within the laws of Greece. This allowed them the opportunity to excel in any direction they chose. Individuality was the basis of their society. The ability to strive for excellence was what the Athenians dearly believed in. This strive for excellence was the method from which they achieved great accomplishments.

Athens, where the Athenians lived, was the intellectual center of Greece. It was named after Athena, the goddess of wisdom and the city's patron. In 508 B. C. , the city of Athens became one of the first polis, or one of the first city-states in ancient times. The city-states at the time were small, independent communities which were male-dominated and bound together by race. Originally the " polis " referred to a defensible area to which farmers of a particular area could retreat in the event of an attack. The citizens in any given polis were related to one another by blood and family ties were very strong. As boys, they grew up together in schools, and as men, they served side by side during times of war. They debated one another in public assemblies — they elected one another as magistrates — they cast their votes as jurors for or against their fellow citizens. In such a society of the polis, all citizens were intimately and directly involved in politics, justice, military service, religious ceremonies, intellectual discussion, athletics and artistic pursuits.