

The Communicational Mask of the Globalized Rhetoric: The Modern Interpretation of Aristotle’s “not Invedit and “Invedit Proofs”

A. Triantari Sotiria

Department of Early Childhood Education,
University of Western Macedonia of Greece, Florina, Greece

ABSTRACT---- *The purpose of this study is to demonstrate the change of the importance of the “proofs not invedit (artless)” and “proofs invedit (art)” in Aristotelian rhetoric and their use in the modern communicative spirit of the Unified Europe. The “proofs not invedit (artless)” in modern communication systems are the events themselves, which are converted in the news. The “proofs invedit” (art) are reasoning, whose arguments are based on causes and effects. The pointing out of the change and false use of two important Aristotelian proofs should be for the modern European citizen and political the starting point for a change in the political and social character of the European Union. This change will be an important factor for the cohesion of the countries of the European Union.*

Keywords--- rhetoric proofs, persuasion, communication, democracy

1. INTRODUCTION

Aristotle’s Rhetoric is the most constituted manual of the rhetoric in antiquity. Its importance is not limited to antiquity but extends to the present day (Corbett, 1969). Aristotle’ rhetoric is an art of praxis, is a civic practice through which politician can intelligently rule on the place of rhetoric in the polis (Garver, 1994). Rhetoric centered on those political activities, which aim the interest of citizens. Aristotle offers us a concise and comprehensive view of the art of Rhetoric. The structure, style, terms and kinds of Aristotelian rhetoric are an important part of European culture and communicational policy of the European Union. I think that Aristotle’s Rhetoric can provide solutions to contemporary problems the European Union face. It is about problems concerning communication between states and citizens, lack of democratic principles and beliefs, economic misery and immorality, mental and physical violence, language misunderstanding and lack of understanding.

The Aristotelian rhetoric is the tool of communication in political, cultural, economic and educational levels. This view was based on the argument that Aristotle explained rhetoric in terms of persuasion. He recognized that rhetorical persuasion proceeds by words, which must be selected and arranged in order that the orator may express himself clearly. Hence, rhetoric is the capacity of orator to compose manner arguments and correct syllogisms (Fortenbaugh, 1991).

Aristotle consider the “proofs not invedit” and “proofs invedit” as the basic condition for the composition of arguments and syllogisms. Today, the European politicians use the two proofs either linguistic or not linguistic. In this case the politician uses the two proofs with the modern form of “visual rhetoric” to forge the truth of a situation. Aristotle defined rhetoric “as a discovery of all the available means of persuasion” (Aristotle, 1355a). By this aspect E. T. J. Corbett pointed out that rhetoric is like “the open hand and the closed fist which have the same basic skeletal structure”. Hence, rhetoric as the same hand can open and close as the occasion demands. (Corbett, 1969). Corbett’s view reflected in the following Aristotelian thesis, according to which Aristotle argued that “the rhetoric masquerades as political science” (Aristotle, 1356a). Indeed, Aristotle’s rhetoric as an instrument of communication practice often appears with the mask of the globalized rhetoric by the modern politicians, who aim to economic and personal benefits.

2. “PROOFS NOT INVEDIT” (ARTLESS) AND “PROOFS INVEDIT” (ART) IN ARISTOTLE

The art of rhetoric from the ancient times to the late nineteenth century occupied an important position in education. Rhetoric was studied by ancient Greeks and Romans and was adopted by early Christian thinkers in their proclamation of

the Christian doctrine (Ijesseling, 1976). Aristotle was the first Greek philosopher and thinker, who spoke systematically about rhetoric. His treatise *Rhetoric* is important until today for the originality of thought (Poulakos, 2002).

Aristotle in the first Book of *Rhetoric* defined the rhetoric as the orator's ability to find or perceive those manners with which he can persuade his audience (Aristotle, 1355a-1356a; Kennedy 2000). Rhetoric is the art of persuasion and in Aristotle's thought it is the practical art that is defined from the modes, the proofs (*pistis*) of persuasion (Fortenbaugh, 2010;) The proofs are of two kinds, "not *invedit*" (artless) and "*invedit*" or artistic (art). In the "not *invedit*" proofs (artless) the orator can use evidence, probative evidence, written agreements etc. In the "*invedit*" proofs (art) the orator invents probative syllogism and proofs (Aristotle, 1355a; Carey, 1994 ; Garey, 2003).

Aristotle distinguishes both kinds of proofs and pinpoints the three modes with which the rhetorical speech acts persuasively. The three modes are the character of the orator, the specific disposal, which the orator creates to the soul of the audience and the probative arguments that he creates (Brauw, 2010). In these modes the orator seeks to appear himself as a credible source of information and as a vehicle of the valid view (Carey, 1994). The "not *invedit* (artless) proofs", since they are based on presumptions, (visible proofs) at first glance are tangible and credible. When Aristotle refers to the "*invedit* (art) proofs", he has in his mind how somebody can take advantage of their existence. The bad usage of the "*invedit* (art) proofs" led essentially to their undermining and the need of the orator to analyse his syllogism, improving and developing the form of the "*invedit* (art) proofs". The "*invedit* (art) proofs" display mostly the ingenious character of the orator and therefore they show mainly the importance of the three persuasive modes that render the orator as a credible and valid source of information to his audience (Mirhady, 1991).

Aristotle considered the character of the orator to be an important mean of persuasion and he emphasized that "Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible" (Aristotle, 1356a; Fortenbaugh, 2010). On both kinds of proofs Aristotle bases the persuasiveness of the orator on his good character and through the honesty of the orator's character he emphasizes on the orator's ability to constitute a deliberative oratory. In the second book of *Rhetoric*, Aristotle defines three things in the character of the orator that inspire confidence of the audience: "good sense, moral character, and goodwill" (Aristotle, 1378a; Garver, 1994).

Aristotle connects the "not *invedit* (artless) and *invedit* (art) proofs" with the three modes of persuasion. He considers the constitution of syllogism, the appearance of arguments of the orator and his moral character as a necessary condition for the appearance of the "*invedit* (art) and not *invedit* (artless) proofs" and he does ascribe an ethical dimension to rhetoric (Day, 2010; Ryan, 1984).

Aristotle understands as necessary the relationship of proofs with the character of the orator in deliberative oratory. He argues that the absence of three things or one of these in the orator's character shows that the orator does not tell the truth or does not advise right:

False statements and bad advice are due to one or more of the following three causes. Men either form a false opinion through want of good sense; or they form a true opinion, but because of their moral badness do not say what they really think; or finally, they are both sensible and upright, but not well disposed to their hearers, and may fail in consequence to recommend what they know to be the best course (Aristotle, 1378a).

Aristotle attributes the success of the presentation of the "not *invedit* (artless) and *invedit* (art) proofs" to the orator's ability to think logically, to understand the human character and virtues and provoke the passions of audience. Aristotle speaks for the constitution of syllogism and he refers to the "*invedit* (art) proofs", connecting them mainly with the practice of rhetoric (kinds of syllogisms, speech forms, style, *topoi*, disposition of speech). From this point he connects the ethic with the practice of rhetoric and he concludes that:

It thus appears that rhetoric is an offshoot of dialectic and also of ethical studies. Ethical studies may fairly be called political; and for this reason rhetoric masquerades as political science (Aristotle, 1356a; Garver, 1998; Wörner, 1990; Day, 2010).

The combination of the intellectual activity of the two proofs with the moral conduct of the orator through his character makes the Aristotelian rhetoric a practical art or an art of the action. Aristotle bases mainly this success on the orator's character, without underestimating the importance of the other means for the success of the proofs and thus he appears that rhetoric is an offshoot of ethical and also of political science. In the thought of Aristotle rhetoric is an art of the politics in which is connected the knowledge of the rules of rhetoric with the moral action of the orator as a citizen and politician (Garver, 1994)¹.

¹. Garver pinpoints that "Aristotle articulates a civic art of rhetoric, combining the almost incompatible properties of *technē* and appropriateness to citizens". Also, Garver emphasizes that "a professional art of rhetoric, like any power, proves opposites, while civic activities are oriented toward the good".

As long as rhetoric is moral-political science, the deliberative orator or political orator has to aim at the happiness of the city that indicates the happy and safe life of citizens: “For all advice to do things or not to do them is concerned with happiness and with the things that make for or against it” (Aristotle, 1360b). The deliberative or political orator ensures the happiness of the city determined as his aim the interest of citizens and therefore the good:

Now the political or deliberative orator’s aim is utility: deliberation seeks to determine not ends but the means to ends, i.e. what it is most useful to do. Further, utility is a good thing (Aristotle, 1362a).

According to Aristotle the statesmen can intelligently use the rhetorical proofs (“not *invedit* (artless) and *invedit* (art)”) in the city as means for the final aim which is the interest of the city. The proofs in combination with the three modes of persuasion and the three elements in the character of the orator (prudence, virtue, goodwill) compose the means for the achievement of the aim which is interest of the city (Fortenbaugh, 1992).

The “not *invedit* (artless) and *invedit* (art) proofs” seem to redefine the classical view for the politics as the highest form of human endeavor and for the deliberative or political orator as his natural capacity to pursue the common good and treat the moral judgment. This is an essential element in political action (Connolly, 2009).

Today, in the era of globalism, the politics and the politicians redefine through the modern interpretation and usage of the “*invedit* (art) and not *invedit* (artless) proofs”. This element determines the therapy of the moral and financial crisis of our times too.

3. THE MODERN INTERPRETATION OF THE “NOT INVEDIT (ARTLESS) AND INVEDIT (ART)” AS DETERMINATING FACTOR FOR THE EUROPEAN POLITICS

Let us transfer the “not *invedit* (artless) and *invedit* (art) proofs” of Aristotle in modern communicative systems. The “not *invedit* (artless) proofs” are the out-rhetorical proofs and are the same events, as for example the raised middle finger of Aphrodite in journal Focus (2010), which was a bad political and cultural event. The immoral image of Aphrodite insinuated more senses than the same words. It is about a visual phenomenon that creates a similar response to that of verbal discourse. The “visual rhetoric” is a communicative creation of modern orators, who want communicate through the symbols (Fow, 1982).

The “visual rhetoric” is the development of the Aristotelian “not *invedit* (artless) proofs” in relation to the usage of the two logical forms of the Aristotelian rhetoric, the image-comparison and the metaphor that is connected with the voice and the rhythm, which has the rhetorical speech (Aristotle, 1406b):

Rhetorical speech must not be either with rhyme or completely without rhythm. Actually, in the first case speech wouldn’t be persuasive, because it seems, to be pretended and distracts audience from meaning ... when again speech does not completely rhyme, the phrase seems incomplete (Aristotle, 1408b).

Rhetoric attempts with speech to form intellectually a visual creation of image, with the proper enriching tone of voice, as it emerges from rhythmic rhetorical speech. Obviously, Aristotle had in your mind to create relationships between intellectual and visual images, influencing their audiences deeply (Triantari, 2012). Aristotle’ thought was the background for the form of “Visual rhetoric”, which can involve a theoretical perspective with a deeper interpretive analysis. This perspective is often created by colors, lines, textures and rhythms, which we give aesthetically to picture.

The “visual rhetoric” as a form of development of the “*invedit* (art) proofs”, as Aristotle relates in his *Rhetoric*, does not have its starting point in us. Consequently, it is not about the arguments that are formed by the orator. In the modern interpretation, we would say, that the orator tries to constitute the arguments and he communicates with audience through a painting, an advertisement, a photograph (Foss, 2004; Brummett, 1991). In this case, the orator has as starting-point tangible evidence, which is based on the visual symbols. The orator tries to make this proof more symbolic through his personal intervention.

Thus, the journal *Unfollow* reflects the forging photograph of Greek Premier, who appears seriously wounded. The visual orator is interested in the impact of visual symbols on viewers with the perspective this symbol to create a bad or goodwill in the soul of viewer. The rhetorical visual induces the answer of audiences that is given through the psychological processes, emotional reactions and analytical thought (Foss, 2004).

In the modern form of the “visual rhetoric” are combined the Aristotelian “not *invedit* (artless) and *invedit* (art) proofs”. The modern orator creates a forging picture and he argues on this basis. The “*invedit* (art) proofs” are in-

rhetorical proofs and are based on the usage of speech. The speech articulates through the image, which can be received by viewers as a communicative message (Foss, 2005). However, there is a basic difference between verbal and visual symbols. The language symbols are general and abstract, while images are tied to a physical form (Foss, 2005).

Modern political leaders emphasize the aims of the European Union with arguments, like the effort for financial stability, the cultural and social solidarity, simultaneous communication in the whole planet. Thus, they attempt to create a global conscience in sections, like economics, environment, education, and information etc. But they compose arguments that are not connected with the general image of the European Union. Thus, the images, which are sometimes true and sometimes forged, are opposed to the semi-true verbal arguments, forming one rhetoric that is dressed the mask of communicative globalism. Actually, it is about one anti-communicative rhetoric which does not persuade with its moral, but it creates social, psychological and mainly economical conflicts in the whole world.

The rhetoric of modern political leaders does not persuade the people and often is the cause to invite passions, as anger, hate, and indignation. Passions lead to violence and terrorism that is a global phenomenon. In some cases the rhetorical speech is rapid, absolute and anti-democratic, like the speech of the German Minister of Finance, who declared in reference to the German indemnities that "the matter is closed". It is about arbitrary political expression, without arguments and proofs, which are based on judicial decisions. This fact violates the rules of rhetoric, which today is necessary, because with its help we can ensure the solidarity and the inter-respect in Europe, excluding every form of the imperialistic financial domination.

The German kangkelarios Angela Merkel in a recent speech said that "countries facing economic crisis are on the right road". In her speech is distinguished the irony by the rhetorical verbal speech. The consequences of the economic crisis created many problems to less powerful countries and particularly the powerless social classes. The German kangkelarios considers right to people committing suicide, because they fail to pay their debts, or have been dismissed from their jobs due to the economic crisis. Merkel's speech is a closed fist than a persuasive speech, because it causes negative feelings and passion.

The rhetoric figure of irony is an artful deviation in the form taken by a statement of the German kangkelarios. The irony shows a statement that means the opposite of what is said. The irony is a function of the rhetorical operation of destabilization. The speech of German kangkelarios has a destabilizing effect that liberates a variety of the meanings for the recipients (Mick, 1996).

Today the proofs can be used by European politicians to guide to positive consequences for whole Europe. The two proofs help on a communicative practice and dialogue. The correct usage shows the orator's morality and appears in his wisdom and friendliness towards his audience and his ability to distinguish and study different types of human characters in relation with certain factors, such as their emotions, their desires, their habits. Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* mentions that the clarity and lucidity of the arguments, which the interlocutors use, reflect the moral quality of their communication (Aristotle, 1410b).

I think that Aristotle offers the Rhetoric and especially the rhetorical proofs as a new draft of educational policy for the politicians, but also for all European citizens. This means that a change in the speech of politicians is necessary, with a basic common purpose the consent for the organization of a democratic society and assurance of the public interest (Giroux, 2000).

Regarding the important issue of the cold war in Ukraine, representatives of the two great powers, Russia and America, claiming everyone the rights of peoples, which is one of the main goals of rhetorical proofs. Obama said: "Russia violated of the sovereignty of Ukraine." And Putin answered: "Moscow reserves the right to protect its interests and those of Russian people in Ukraine". The history as a rhetorical example refutes the argument of Obama because America previously violated the territories of Iran, Iraq, Serbia and Syria to consolidate its sovereignty. A good orator is a good consultant, and according to Aristotle, he should constitute "the invedit proof" (art), having in his mind the historical examples. Aristotle said:

As to Peace and War, he must know the extent of the military strength of his country, both actual and potential, and also the maturity of that actual and potential strength; and further, what wars his country has waged, and how it has waged them. He must know these facts not only about his own country, but also about neighbouring countries; and also about countries with which war is likely, in order that peace may be maintained with those stronger than his own, and that his own may have power to make war or not against those that are weaker. He should know, too, whether the military power of another country is like or unlike that of his own; for this is a matter that may affect their relative strength. (1359b-1360a).

The argument of President Obama was interpreted by the peoples of Europe as an attempt to maintain the domination of the U.S.A The Russian invasion to Crimea appears as a direct threat to the global order under American

leadership. Therefore, if President Putin achieves his goal, and then other governments, such as China or Iran, may think that it is not as dangerous to oppose America.

Rhetoric with visual and verbal symbols is a determining factor for the image and the understanding of the way of action of the European politics. Aristotle emphasized that “rhetoric masquerades as political science” (Aristotle, 1356a). Aristotle’s view makes today necessary the change of the content of the rhetoric speech, when it is expressed with visual symbols. This pointing out leads to the conclusion that the “not invidit (artless) and invidit (art) proofs” can be changed into their form, but mainly they changed into their content. The change shows a distorting communicative politics, from which the rhetorical education is absent. At the sometime is missing the rhetorical criticism too, that concerns the choice of the orator to choose right images, verbal structures and arguments.

The rhetorical criticism claims the orator to understand the psychology of the public and primarily to interpret carefully the content of his arguments or his proofs, showing respect to the interactions with others (Foss, 2006).

4. CONCLUSION

Globalism is a political union of the European States in various sections. This involves that the modern political leaders as deliberative orators must not forget the Aristotelian view according to which “The deliberative orator must not forget the end (*telos*) of each constitution” (Aristotle, 1366a). The aim is connected with our choices and preferences. The right and critical usage of the “not invidit (artless) and invidit (art) proofs” is based on the choice and the preference of the European leaders, who are directed to the aim of globalism that is the protection of democracy in the interior of societies. The right usage of proofs leads to persuasion, which, according to Aristotle, is succeeded “not only with probative syllogism, but moral syllogisms too” (Aristotle, 1366a).

The correct usage of proofs presuppose political orator to be aware of history, to think about the consequences of his arguments. In the composition of a correct “invidit proof” (art) there should be no contradiction. Aristotle said: The example is an induction, the enthymeme is a syllogism, and the apparent enthymeme is an apparent syllogism. I call the enthymeme a rhetorical syllogism, and the example a rhetorical induction. Everyone who effects persuasion through proof does in fact use either enthymemes or examples: there is no other way (1356b).

The correct usage of two proofs shows that the language functions as a means of communication which is destined to influence individual behavior and corporate action. The sense of the practical usage of language is strengthened by human actions, which are the result of rational arguments. The two fields, which prevail the practical speech, are politics and ethics.

Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* reminds to all Europeans that democracy, free and thoughtful speech which is conditioned by elegance and clarity of style and verbal formats, was born in Greece. The echo of the past can help the European Union to balance the ideological conflict between market forces and supporters of the development of a welfare state. In this conflict we need to take into account the manners and customs, traditions, habits and psychology of the citizens of the EU countries. Rhetorical functions of destabilization in “the proofs invidit” or “proofs not invidit” can bring destabilization in Europe (Nash, 1989).

The modern politician must have the knowledge of rhetoric and use it for the interest of societies. The change in the political and social person of the European Union will emerge through the intellectual and moral cohesion of politicians and citizens. The *Rhetoric* of Aristotle offers the cohesion to the modern Europe, reminding that the sense of the modern globalism historically and ideologically has its roots on the Hellenic culture.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Aristotle, *The art of Rhetoric*. Editor, translator, introduction H. Lawson-Tancred. London, 1991.
- [2] Brauw de Michael “The Parts of the Speech”. In *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Ian Worthington (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 187-202, 2010.
- [3] Brummett, Brummett, B. *Rhetorical dimensions of popular culture*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1991.
- [4] Carey, Ch. “Artless Proofs in Aristotle and the Orators”. *BICS* 39, pp. 95-106, 1994.
- [5] Carey, Ch. “Άτεχνοι πίστεις στον Αριστοτέλη και στους ρήτορες” Μτφρ. Αλ. Δ. Μελίστα. Πειθώ. Η ρητορική. Δεκατρία μελετήματα. Επιλογή-Επιμέλεια: Δ. Γ. Σπαθαράς, Λένια Τζαλλήλα. Αθήνα: Σμίλη, pp. 117-142, 2003.
- [6] Connolly, J. “The politics of rhetorical education”. In *the Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric* (Ed. E. Ganderson). U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [7] Corbett, E. P. J. “The Rhetoric of the Open Hand and the Rhetoric of the Closed Fist”. *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 20, No. 5, pp. 288-296, 1969.

- [8] Day, Jane M. “Rhetoric and Ethics from the Sophists to Aristotle”. In *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Ian Worthington (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 378-392, 2010.
- [9] Fortenbaugh, W.W. “Aristotle’s Art of Rhetoric”. In *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Ian Worthington (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell publishing Ltd, pp. 107-123, 2010.
- [10] Fortenbaugh, W.W. “Persuasion through Character and the Composition of Aristotle’s Rhetoric”. *RhM* 134, pp. 152-156, 1991.
- [11] Fortenbaugh, W.W. “Aristotle on Persuasion through Character”. *Rhetorica* 10, pp. 207-244, 1992.
- [12] Fow, Sonja K. “Rhetoric and the Visual Image: A Resource Unit”. *Communication Education*, Vol. 31: pp. 55-66, 1982.
- [13] Foss, S. K. “Framing the Study of Visual Rhetoric: Toward a Transformation of Rhetorical Theory”. In *Defining Visual Rhetorics*. Ed. Charles A. Hill and Marguerite Helmers. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 303-313, 2004.
- [14] Foss, S. K. “Theory and Visual Rhetoric”. In *Handbook of Visual Communication: Theory, Methods, and Media*. Ed. Ken Smith, Sandra Moriarty, Gretchen Barbatsis, and Keith Kenney. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 141-52, 2005.
- [15] Foss, Sonja K. “Rhetorical Criticism as Synecdoche for Agency”. *Rhetoric Review*, 25, pp. 375-79, 2006.
- [16] Garver, E. *Aristotle’s Rhetoric. An art of character*. U.S.A.: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- [17] Garver, E. “Rhetoric”. In E. Craig (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 8. London: pp. 305-310, 1998.
- [18] Giroux, S.S. «Race, Rhetoric, and the Contest over Civic Education». *A Journal of Composition Theory*, v20, n2, p.311-348, 2000.
- [19] Ijesseling, S. *Rhetoric and Philosophy in conflict*. Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976.
- [20] Kennedy, G. *Ιστορία της κλασικής ρητορικής*. Μτφρ. Ν. Νικολούδης. Αθήνα: Παπαδήμας, 2000.
- [21] Mick, D. G. “Figures of Rhetoric in Advertising Language”. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 424-438, 1996.
- [22] Mirhady, D. “Non Technical Pisteis in Aristotle and Anaximenes”. *AJP* 112, pp. 5-28, 1991.
- [23] Nash, W. *Rhetoric: The Wit of Persuasion*, Cambridge: Blackwell, 1989.
- [24] Roulakos, J. “Η ρητορική θεωρία του Αριστοτέλη”. *Ρητορική, Επικοινωνία Πολιτική και Φιλοσοφία*. Αθήνα: Κ. Βουδούρης, pp. 175-190, 2002.
- [25] Ryan, E. *Aristotle’s Theory of Rhetorical Argumentation*. Montreal, 1984.
- [25] Triantari, S. A. *Rhetoric of Aristotle in «lifelong education»*. Lambert Academic Publishing (LAP), 2012.
- [26] Wörner, M. H. *Das Ethische in der Rhetoric des Aristoteles*. Freiburg, 1990.