The Art of Persuasion:
Intro to Rhetorical Analysis
What is Rhetoric?
What is Rhetorical Analysis?

While the term "rhetorical analysis" is, at first, rather intimidating for many people, it is easily understood (at least at its most basic) when broken down and defined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetoric</th>
<th>The art of persuasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>The breaking down of something its parts and interpreting how those parts fit together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In rhetorical analysis, then, we examine how authors attempt to persuade their audiences by looking at the various components that make up the art of persuasion.
Every text—oral, written, or visual—is, in some sense rhetorical; each one is a strategic presentation of particular ideas.

Human beings both produce and receive such texts; as such, we must understand what they mean. Typically, this is done implicitly; we understand the meaning of a text without thinking about how or why it works the way it does.

Rhetorical analysis asks us precisely that: to understand how texts create meaning, how they construct knowledge, and how they make us take action.

Rhetorical analysis, then, helps us to understand explicitly (rather than simply implicitly, as most of us do) how the language of a text works and how we can use such language to work for us.
Rhetorical Analysis
Using the Joliffe Framework Design
Jolliffe’s Rhetorical Analysis Framework Design

Rhetorical Situation

- Exigence
- Audience
- Purpose

Appeals

- Ethos
- Tone
- Pathos

Organization/Structure/Form

- Diction
- Syntax
- Imagery
- Figurative Language

Surface Features
Rhetorical Situation: Exigence

Problem, incident, or situation causing the writer to write the piece

What prompted the writing of this piece?

Most likely, the piece would not have been written if it had not been for this.
Rhetorical Situation: Audience

An audience has either an:

1. Immediate response
2. Intermediate response (think about later)

So, which type of response does the author want from the audience?

In this way, the audience shapes the rhetoric.

No audience is a *tabula rosa*.
Rhetorical Situation: Purpose

The author considers a purpose of the writing in a sense of consideration for what the audience feels.
Appeals
Appeals: Logos

- An appeal to logic
- An attempt to persuade the reader by presenting a logical argument
- If, then statements
- Syllogistic inferences/conclusions
- Deductive reasoning
Appeals: Logos

The central appeal of anything is that it must be logical.

Without logic, nothing that follows is reasonable.

You must consider the logos within the author’s writing.
Appeals: Ethos

- The ethical appeal
- An attempt to persuade based on moral grounds
- Right vs. Wrong
- Good vs. Evil
Appeals: Pathos

- An appeal to emotion
- An attempt to persuade the reader by causing them to respond to the way an issue/topic makes them feel
- Can invoke bias or prejudice
- Uses non-logical appeals
- Informal language
Aristotle’s Rhetorical Triangle

Writer/ Ethos

Audience/ Pathos

Context/ Logos
Aristotle’s Rhetorical Triangle

Writer/ Ethos
- Written voice
  - Make audience believe writer is trustworthy
- Demonstrate research time
  - Support reasons with appropriate, logical evidence
- Carefully crafted and edited
  - Writer knows and respects audience
- Concern about communicating with audience
  - Convince audience writer is reliable, knowledgeable

Audience/ Pathos
- modes of discourse
- inductive reasoning
- deductive reasoning
- cite commonly held beliefs
- cite traditional culture

Context/ Logos
- evidence
  - testimony
- authorities
- research, facts
- analogies, metaphors
- chronological order
- Allusions (Bible, lit., myth)
- style manipulation
- mode of discourse
- modes of discourse
Tone

- You must understand Logos, Ethos, and Pathos to understand the Tone
- Logos, Ethos, and Pathos all contribute to determining the Tone
- If you don’t recognize the Tone of the piece, you miss everything that follows
What is **Tone**?

- The writer’s or speaker’s attitude toward a subject, character, or audience

- Conveyed through the author’s:
  - Choice of words (diction)
  - Word order (syntax)
  - Detail, imagery, and language (figurative language)
| adjective   | adjective      | adjective | adjective | adjective | adjective | adjective | adjective | adjective | adjective | adjective |
|-------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| aggravated  | discouraged    | irreverent | shrewd     | somber     | soothing  |
| aggressive  | disdained      | irritated | stern      | strong     | sultry    |
| agitated    | disgusted      | jealous   | surprising | surreptitious |
| agreeable   | disheartened   | joyful    | sweet      |
| alarmed     | disinterested  | laconic   | sympathetic |
| allusive    | disturbed      | learned   | taunting   |
| amiable     | dominating     | lethargic | threatening |
| angry       | domineering    | lonely    | timid      |
| apathetic   | dramatic       | loud      | tired      |
| apologetic  | dreamy         | loving    | turgid     |
| arrogant    | ecstatic       | lugubrious| urgent     |
| artificial  | effusive       | majestic  | vengeful   |
| audacious   | elated         | malicious | vexed      |
| authoritative| elegiac        | manipulative| visible   |
| baffled     | embarrassed    | melancholy|文创       |
| banal       | encouraging    | moralistic| wit        |
| bantering   | enthusiastic    | morose    |
| benevolent  | envious        | mystical  | vivid       |
| bewildered  | euphoric       | nervous   | vicious    |
| bitter      | evil           | obsessive | vindictive |
| bleak       | explosive      | obnoxious | violent    |
| bored       | exuberant      | obsessive | weary      |
| boring      | facetious      | outraged  | whimsical  |
| burlesque   | factual        | overwhelmed| wrathful   |
| calm        | fanciful       | paranoid  | zealous    |
| candid      | fearful        | passionate|            |
| caustic     | flippant       | passive   |            |
| cautious    | frantic        | patronizing|           |
| chaotic     | frightened     | peaceful  |            |
| chauvinistic| frivolous      | pedantic  |            |
| cheerful    | furious        | persuasive|            |
| childish    | gentle         | perturbed |            |
| clinical    | giddy          | petty     |            |
| colloquial  | happy          | pitiful   |            |
| complacent  | harsh          | pleasing  |            |
| complimentary| haunted      | pleasant  |            |
| concerned   | humble         | presumptuous|          |
| condescending| humorous      | pretentious|            |
| confident   | hypnotic       | proud     |            |
| confused    | hypocritical   | questioning|          |
| consoling   | impartial      | remote    |            |
| contemptuous| impatient      | restrained|            |
| contented   | impious        | revengeful|            |
| convincing  | impotent       | rude      |            |
| critical    | incisive       | sad       |            |
| curious     | indignant      | sarcastic |            |
| cynical     | inflammatory   | sardonic  |            |
| dejected    | informative    | satiric   |            |
| depressed   | innocent       | scornful  |            |
| desperate   | insipid        | seductive |            |
| detached    | insolent       | sentimental|            |
| determined  | inventive      | serious   |            |
| didactic    | ironic         | sharp     |            |
| diffident   | irrational     | shocked   |            |
| disbelief   |               |           |            |
Organization/Structure/Form

- Always work chronologically when analyzing a piece of literature.
- You cannot identify shifts in tone and other elements if you don’t look at it chronologically.
Surface Features
Surface Features: Diction

- What is diction?
- Diction is word choice intended to convey a certain effect
  - To communicate ideas and impressions
  - To evoke emotions
  - To convey your views of truth to the reader
Surface Features: Syntax

- What is Syntax?
- The arrangement and order of words in a sentence
Surface Features: Syntax

1. Sentence Structure
   - Short sentences are often emphatic, passionate, or flippant
   - Longer sentences often suggest the writer’s thoughtful response

2. Arrangement of Ideas in a Sentence
   - Are they set out in a particular way for a purpose?

3. Arrangement of Ideas in a Paragraph
   - Is there evidence of any pattern or structure?
Surface Features: Imagery & Figurative Language

The use of language to appeal to the senses

- Simile, metaphor
- Allusion
- Alliteration
- Etc.
Surface Features

- Consider how surface features contribute to the message
- Syntactical elements are usually there for either parallelism or difference
- All of those multisyllabic terms are there to show how things in the piece are the same or different (antithesis, parallelism, etc.)
- Figurative language is metaphorical; therefore, it makes abstract things concrete
The Cannons of Rhetoric
Aristotle and other Greek rhetoricians thought of rhetoric as having five canons or established principles. These principles outline the systems of classical rhetoric:

- **Invention**: To discover the available means of persuasion
- **Arrangement**: To select and assemble the argument effectively
- **Style**: To present the argument cogently and eloquently
- **Memory**: To speak extemporaneously
- **Delivery**: To effectively use voice, gestures, text, and images
Invention:
To discover the available means of persuasion

- Exigence and audience are the primary building blocks of a rhetorical situation, in which a person is compelled to communicate with an audience.

- We must figure out what to say to achieve our desired goal. And this is the role of the first canon of rhetoric: invention.

A rhetorical situation demands that we discover:
- The audience and their needs/desires/thoughts regarding the situation.
- What types of evidence (facts, testimony, statistics, laws, maxims, examples, authority) to employ with the particular audience.
- How best to appeal to the audience (logic, emotions, character).
- Which topics to employ to examine the situation and generate ideas.
- The best timing and proportion for communication (kairos).
Arrangement:
To assemble the argument effectively

- The 5-paragraph essay model many of us learned is based on classic Greek and Roman structures. Its parts include:
  - Introduction (exordium)
  - Statement of fact (narratio)
  - Confirmation or proof (confirmatio)
  - Refutation (refutatio)
  - Conclusion (peroratio)

- In the classic model, the introduction must also set the tone for the audience and make them favorably disposed toward the speaker.

- The Greeks especially were concerned that any who would speak in public establish his ethos and community connection as part of introducing an issue.

- The confirmation or proof section contrasts with the refutation. The former constructs the argument; the latter challenges the argument of the opposition.
Style:
To present the argument cogently and artistically

- The canon of style concerns the choices rhetors make to form statements that will have calculated (surmised) effects on the audience.

- Style is most often thought of as making choices about the levels of language, i.e. grand, middle, and low. And style also concerns the choices one makes of tropes and schemes.
Memory
To speak extemporaneously

- The ancient Greeks thought that reading a speech from a text was sign of a poor rhetor. And a poor rhetor was an ineffective politician. A citizen might hire a logographer to write a speech, but the citizen would then memorize it for delivery.

- In addition, the systems of classical rhetoric were designed to be used on the fly. Several of the famous Sophists used to entertain crowds by expounding upon any given subject extemporaneously. The canon of memory helped them retain and marshal set bits of argument as well as whole discourses.

- Modern rhetors no longer rely on the canon of memory. We have computers and Tele-Prompt-Rs to help us deliver effective addresses. The ability to sustain an effective extemporaneous speech has been largely lost except to those rare individuals who have a natural talent for speaking on the fly.
Delivery:
To effectively use voice, gestures, text, and images.

- For the Greeks, a good speaker was a good person. It was difficult for them to believe that eloquence could reside in an unworthy individual.

- This idea seems naive to us today, especially after a parade of sliver-tongued, 20th century despots and scoundrels. In many cases today, we believe that too much skill in public speaking must be a sign of the speaker's deceptive ability and intent. How far we've come from that Greek ideal.

- But, like the Greeks, we still find the ability to speak effectively, or write well, a prime source of entertainment. Anyone who would engage the public sphere on issues of civic concern would do well to consider the canon of delivery, i.e. the conventions of modern speaking and writing.
Rhetorical theories & strategies
Make way for the mighty enthymeme!!
(And syllogism)
The Syllogism

- A syllogism is a kind of logical argument in which one proposition (the conclusion) is inferred from two others (the premises) of a certain form.

- In Aristotle's Prior Analytics, he defines syllogism as "a discourse in which, certain things having been supposed, something different from the things supposed results of necessity because these things are so." (24b18–20) Despite this very general definition, he limits himself first to categorical syllogisms (and later to modal syllogisms).

- The syllogism is at the core of deductive reasoning, where facts are determined by combining existing statements, in contrast to inductive reasoning where facts are determined by repeated observations.
The Syllogism

- A syllogism (henceforth categorical unless otherwise specified) consists of three parts: the major premise, the minor premise, and the conclusion.

- In Aristotle, each of the premises is in the form "Some/all A belong to B," where "Some/All A" is one term and "belong to B" is another, but more modern logicians allow some variation.

- Each of the premises has one term in common with the conclusion: in a major premise, this is the major term (i.e., the predicate) of the conclusion; in a minor premise, it is the minor term (the subject) of the conclusion.

- For example:
  - Major premise: All humans are mortal.
  - Minor premise: Socrates is a human.
  - Conclusion: Socrates is mortal.
Examples of Syllogisms

- Example #1
  - All men are animals.
  - All animals are mortal.
  - All men are mortal.

- Example #2
  - No reptiles have fur.
  - All snakes are reptiles.
  - No snakes have fur.

- Example #3
  - All kittens are playful.
  - Some pets are kittens.
  - Some pets are playful.
An enthymeme, in its modern sense, is an informally stated syllogism (a three-part deductive argument) with an unstated assumption that must be true for the premises to lead to the conclusion.

In an enthymeme, part of the argument is missing because it is assumed.

In a broader usage, the term "enthymeme" is sometimes used to describe an incomplete argument of forms other than the syllogism.
Three Parts of an Enthymeme

- The following quotation is an example of an enthymeme (used for humorous effect).
  - "There is no law against composing music when one has no ideas whatsoever. The music of Wagner, therefore, is perfectly legal." — Mark Twain.

- The three parts:
  - There is no law against composing music when one has no ideas whatsoever. (premise)
  - The music of Wagner, therefore, is perfectly legal. (conclusion)
  - Wagner has no ideas. (implicit premise)
Pulling Enthymeme from Argument

- If intelligent design people won’t name the designer,
  - (every effect in a logical argument must have a cause)

- Then intelligent design isn’t a logical argument.

- If intelligent design people do name the designer,
  - (And if such a metaphysical designer must be outside the realm of science)

- Then intelligent design isn’t science.
Martha: What issue do you have exactly with teaching both approaches, intelligent design and evolution, in school? Isn’t this hijacking Darwin and forcing him to teach biology? Since when does being balanced mean believing in only OE approach, belief, theory, etc.?

David: Oh, I’m certainly for teaching both sides, whenever there are two of them. But in this case—creationism and biology—we’re dealing with a logical fallacy: if intelligent design people refuse to name the designer, then they have an effect without a cause, a disconnect that Aristotle, pagan as he was, abhorred. If they can name the designer, then they’re in the realm of faith, not science.
The theory of argument that informs discussion of argumentative invention in this course is drawn from Stephen Toulmin's *The Uses of Argument*. Toulmin's theory was designed, among other things, to analyze the practical arguments of everyday life.

Toulmin's theory based on a layout of argument elements (as depicted below). The basic elements may be defined roughly as follows:

- **Claim**--A statement or proposition that the arguer wants the audience to accept.
- **Data**--The statements or reasons put forward by the arguer to get the audience to accept the claim.
- **Warrant**--When the arguer relates the data to the claim, a relationship between the two is asserted or assumed. The warrant is an inference rule that "authorizes" this relationship. (Warrants are best thought of as conditional statements in "if, then" form.
- **Backing**--The principles of the field at stake in the argument from which the warrant is abstracted or drawn.

In Toulmin's view, every acceptable argument may be laid out using these elements. However, arguments in actual discourses infrequently express their warrants and backing in words. These elements are usually suppressed by arguers.
Example Toulmin layout

**Back**: The following statutes and other legal provisions.

**Warrant**: A man born in Bermuda will generally be a British citizen.

**Grounds**: Harry was born in Bermuda.

**Modality**: so, presumably.

**Claim**: Harry is a British citizen.

**Rebuttal**: Unless both his parents were aliens or he has become a naturalized American.
Stasis Theory

- Stasis names a procedure within rhetorical invention by which one would ask certain questions in order to arrive at the point at issue in the debate, the "stasis."

- Four such basic kinds of conflict were categorized by the Greeks and Romans: conjectural, definitional, qualitative, and translative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to Find</th>
<th>Type of Question</th>
<th>Type of Stasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did he do it?</td>
<td>Of fact</td>
<td>Conjectural stasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did he do?</td>
<td>Of definition</td>
<td>Definitional stasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was it just/ expedient?</td>
<td>Of quality</td>
<td>Qualitative stasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it the right venue for issue?</td>
<td>Of jurisdiction</td>
<td>Translative stasis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stasis Theory

- Stasis is a way of looking at an argument’s structure to decide the type of issue the argument addresses.

- The questions would be posed in sequence, because each depended on the question(s) preceding it. Together, the questions helped determine the point of contention in an argument, the place where disputants could focus their energy, and hence what kind of an argument to make.

- A modern version of those questions might look like the following:
  - Did something happen?
  - What is its nature?
  - What is its quality?
  - What actions should be taken?
  - Here's how these questions might be used to explore a "crime."
A History of Rhetoric
Rhetorical skills were required and found wanting in biblical figure Moses as mentioned in Torah (c.1313 BCE)[6], where Moses argued with God that he should not be the one to deliver the message to the people by saying "Please, my Lord, I am not a man of words..." (Exodus 4:10).

To this God responded "Is there not Aaron, your brother, the Levite?" (Exodus 4:14). Levites were the priestly tribe of Israelites that were occupied primarily with teaching, at that time, in public, therefore Aaron was expected to be such a "man of words".
The earliest mention of oratorical skill occurs in Homer's Iliad, where heroes like Achilles, Hektor, and Odysseus were honored for their ability to advise and exhort their peers and followers (the Laos or army) in wise and appropriate action.

With the rise of the democratic polis, speaking skill was adapted to the needs of the public and political life of cities in Ancient Greece, much of which revolved around the use of oratory as the medium through which political and judicial decisions were made, and through which philosophical ideas were developed and disseminated. For modern students today, it can be difficult to remember that the wide use and availability of written texts is a phenomenon that was just coming into vogue in Classical Greece.

In Classical times, many of the great thinkers and political leaders performed their works before an audience, usually in the context of a competition or contest for fame, political influence, and cultural capital; in fact, many of them are known only through the texts that their students, followers, or detractors wrote down. As has already been noted, rhetor was the Greek term for orator: A rhetor was a citizen who regularly addressed juries and political assemblies and who was thus understood to have gained some knowledge about public speaking in the process, though in general facility with language was often referred to as logon techne, "skill with arguments" or "verbal artistry." See, Mogens Herman Hansen The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes (Blackwell, 1991); Josiah Ober Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens (Princeton UP, 1989); Jeffrey Walker, Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity (Oxford UP, 2000).

Rhetoric thus evolved as an important art, one that provided the orator with the forms, means, and strategies for persuading an audience of the correctness of the orator's arguments. Today the term rhetoric can be used at times to refer only to the form of argumentation, often with the pejorative connotation that rhetoric is a means of obscuring the truth. Classical philosophers believed quite the contrary: the skilled use of rhetoric was essential to the discovery of truths, because it provided the means of ordering and clarifying arguments.
A Brief History of Rhetoric:
The Sophists

- Organized thought about public speaking began in ancient Greece. Possibly, the first study about the power of language may be attributed to the philosopher Empedocles (d. ca. 444 BC), whose theories on human knowledge would provide a basis for many future rhetoricians. The first written manual is attributed to Corax and his pupil Tisias. Their work, as well as that of many of the early rhetoricians, grew out of the courts of law; Tisias, for example, is believed to have written judicial speeches that others delivered in the courts.

- Teaching in oratory was popularized in the 5th century BC by itinerant teachers known as sophists, the best known of whom were Protagoras (c.481-420 BC), Gorgias (c.483-376 BC), and Isocrates (436-338 BC).

- The Sophists were a disparate group who travelled from city to city making public displays to attract students who were then charged a fee for their education. Their central focus was on logos or what we might broadly refer to as discourse, its functions and powers. They defined parts of speech, analyzed poetry, parsed close synonyms, invented argumentation strategies, and debated the nature of reality.

- The word "sophistry" developed strong negative connotations in ancient Greece that continue today, but in ancient Greece sophists were nevertheless popular and well-paid professionals, widely respected for their abilities but also widely criticized for their excesses.
Isocrates (436-338 BC), like the sophists, taught public speaking as a means of human improvement, but he worked to distinguish himself from the Sophists, whom he saw as claiming far more than they could deliver.

He suggested that while an art of virtue or excellence did exist, it was only one piece, and the least, in a process of self-improvement that relied much more heavily on native talent and desire, constant practice, and the imitation of good models. Isocrates believed that practice in speaking publicly about noble themes and important questions would function to improve the character of both speaker and audience while also offering the best service to a state.

He thus wrote his speeches as "models" for his students to imitate in the same way that poets might imitate Homer or Hesiod. His was the first permanent school in Athens and it is likely that Plato's Academy and Aristotle's Lyceum were founded in part as a response to Isocrates. Though he left no handbooks, his speeches ("Antidosis" and "Against the Sophists" are most relevant to students of rhetoric) became models of oratory (he was one of the canonical "Ten Attic Orators") and he had a marked influence on Cicero and Quintilian, and through them, on the entire educational system of the west.
A Brief History of Rhetoric: Plato

- Plato (427-347 BC) famously outlined the differences between true and false rhetoric in a number of dialogues, but especially the Gorgias and the Phaedrus. Both dialogues are complex and difficult, but in both Plato disputes the Sophistic notion that an art of persuasion, the art of the Sophists which he calls "rhetoric" (after the public speaker or rhêtôr), can exist independent of the art of dialectic.

- Plato claims that since Sophists appeal only to what seems likely or probable, rather than to what is true, they are not at all making their students and audiences "better," but simply flattering them with what they want to hear.

- Plato coined the term "rhetoric" both to denounce what he saw as the false wisdom of the sophists, and to advance his own views on knowledge and method.

- Plato attempts to distinguish the rhetoric common to Socratic questioning from Sophistry.
A Brief History of Rhetoric: Aristotle

- Plato's student Aristotle (384-322 BC) famously set forth an extended treatise on rhetoric that still repays careful study today.

- In the first sentence of *The Art of Rhetoric*, Aristotle says that "rhetoric is the counterpart [literally, the antistrophe] of dialectic." As the "antistrophe" of a Greek ode responds to and is patterned after the structure of the "strophe" (they form two sections of the whole and are sung by two parts of the chorus), so the art of rhetoric follows and is structurally patterned after the art of dialectic because both are arts of discourse production. Thus, while dialectical methods are necessary to find truth in theoretical matters, rhetorical methods are required in practical matters such as adjudicating somebody's guilt or innocence when charged in a court of law, or adjudicating a prudent course of action to be taken in a deliberative assembly.

- He identifies three steps or "offices" of rhetoric--invention, arrangement, and style--and three different types of rhetorical proof: ethos, logos, and pathos.
A Brief History of Rhetoric: The Romans

- The Romans, for whom oration also became an important part of public life, saw much value in Greek rhetoric, hiring Greek rhetoricians to teach in their schools and as private tutors, and imitating and adapting Greek rhetorical works in Latin and with Roman examples.

- Roman rhetoric thus largely extends upon and develops its Greek roots, though it tends to prefer practical advice to the theoretical speculations of Greek rhetoricians.

- Cicero (106-43 BC) and Quintilian (35-100 AD) were chief among Roman rhetoricians, and their work is an extension of sophistic, Isocratean, Platonic and Aristotelian rhetorical theory.

- Latin rhetoric was developed out of the Rhodian schools of rhetoric. In the second century BC, Rhodes became an important educational center, particularly of rhetoric, and the sons of noble Roman families studied there.