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The rise of the classical Christian school movement over the past twenty-five years has led to a renewed interest in the art of rhetoric among Christian educators. While many good college-level rhetoric textbooks from secular publishers are available today, there is a clear need for a complete and robust rhetoric curriculum for high school students written from an explicitly Christian point of view. *Fitting Words: Classical Rhetoric for the Christian Student* was written to meet that need.

**CLASSICAL SOURCES**

This rhetoric curriculum gleans practical lessons from the best available ancient sources—the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria*, and more—examined in the light of biblical truth. Several of the greatest speeches from history and the Bible are presented and used as examples of the concepts taught throughout the course. The text of the historical speeches can be found in Appendix B, and a listing of every biblical speech in Appendix C at the end of this text. Examples are also drawn from other historical speeches, and biblical and literary sources. To help you follow along in the original sources, citations of classical works (i.e., ancient works that have been translated into English and have several modern versions) will be parenthetically inserted in the text in this book, as will scripture citations. All other sources will be cited as endnotes for each lesson.
A complete list of works cited appears at the end of the book. Also, be aware that as a rhetoric text, this book will occasionally include famous quotations that have passed into common currency. These will be attributed to the generally accepted originator (e.g. “as Benjamin Franklin said”), but without a specific citation in the endnotes.

FOUNDA TIONAL CONCEPTS

The textbook is arranged around the five faculties of rhetoric, the five skills that a student must master to be an effective orator: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Following the pattern of the ancients, much of the text concentrates on the first skill, the invention of arguments, including lessons on specific concepts and methods of formal logic.

The Rhetorica ad Herennium 1.2 states that these faculties can be acquired by three means: theory, imitation, and practice. The theory is contained in the concepts taught in each lesson. The speeches included throughout the text provide clear models for imitation. But the final step to learning rhetoric must be continual practice on the part of the student. Therefore, each lesson includes one or two corresponding exercises in the Student Workbook designed to help students apply the concepts. Students will also write and deliver several speeches throughout the course. These speeches should be presented to someone, a teacher or a parent, who is qualified to judge them, following the judging sheets included in the student workbook and the test packet.

The outline at the left shows a complete overview of key concepts in Fitting Words. Sections of this outline will be repeated throughout the text to help orient you as you work through the lessons. Think of them "you are here" maps. Other marginalia include definitions of the key concepts and biographical sketches of famous orators and rhetoricians, usually (but not always) referred to in the lessons in which they appear.
SPEECH ASSIGNMENTS

Since practice in speaking is an integral part of learning rhetoric, this course assigns five speeches to be delivered by the student to a parent, teacher, or other judge. These speeches are assigned after Lessons 13, 14, 15, 16, and 30, and are intended to give the student practice applying the concepts from the lessons. Judging sheets are included in the Student Workbook (for the student to see the criteria by which he or she is judged) and in the Exam Packet for the judge to copy and use.

OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENTS

In addition, every lesson concludes with optional material to help the student develop his or her rhetorical skills. The optional material is easily identified by its corresponding icon.

Thinking Deeper

Thinking Deeper includes a few questions for more in-depth discussion for a class, or for research by the individual student. The questions relate to the concepts taught in the lesson (some more directly than others), and are intended to go a bit deeper for the sake of interest and discussion.

Developing Memory

Developing Memory gives the students exercise in improving that skill by suggesting material to memorize, including Bible verses, book or speech excerpts, or other relevant sources. The student may find it helpful before starting this course to read Lesson 29, which presents some methods for memorizing.
Reading Further

Reading Further suggestions are given for the student or teacher who wants to learn more about the topic in the lesson. These are often sections of books referred to by the author to verify his own understanding of the concepts in each lesson. The readings are completely optional; the information in the lessons are sufficient without them. They are included for those who want to do further research.

TESTS
Tests are provided in the exam packet and should be taken after the corresponding lessons are completed and reviewed.

VIDEO COURSE

In the video course that accompanies this text, the author introduces and teaches through each lesson. Each lesson also introduces a figure of speech or thought (retaught together in Lessons 27 and 28), suggestions for the optional Thinking Deeper discussions, and suggestions for completing the exercises. Lessons just prior to tests or speeches will include related helps.

COMMONPLACE BOOK

Students should purchase a blank book for the recording of commonplaces: quotes, excerpts, or sayings gleaned from what they read, hear, or see that can be used to develop their copiousness. Topics for commonplaces are suggested in the video lessons. For more on copiousness and commonplace books, see Lesson 10.

We hope that this curriculum will provide Christian students the tools they need to learn the art of classical rhetoric.
This text was written with one goal in mind: to help Christian high school students learn to speak with elegance and persuasion. It does so through the three-fold method of theory, imitation, and practice: teaching students the tools of classical rhetoric, demonstrating their use by the greatest orators in the best speeches available, including many biblical speeches, and helping students to skillfully wield those tools themselves, to the end that they can confidently deliver well-prepared speeches in any situation, to the glory of God.

Why should students strive toward this goal? Throughout their schooling, and later in their private and professional lives, they will frequently find themselves in situations where they are expected to speak thoughtfully and skillfully before an audience. Students and teachers, doctors and lawyers, salesmen, engineers, police officers, pilots, pastors, and people in nearly every other vocation need to communicate effectively through speaking. And while everybody uses words, believers, as people of the Word, should be especially deliberate in the study and practice of using words well.

Perhaps most importantly, the skills learned in rhetoric include gathering scattered particulars of knowledge into a coherent whole, organizing them into a useful synthesis, and communicating that knowledge and understanding effectively in order to benefit others. Given this, rhetoric can teach students on a small scale how to approach everything in their daily lives.
with wisdom, building upon the reasoning skills learned in the study of formal logic.

This text is not a commentary on the *Ad Herennium* or Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*; rather, it teaches the practical art of rhetoric from a Christian perspective with those classic works (and others) as primary sources. So it is not a guide to Aristotle, but allows Aristotle to be a guide to us, as Vergil was a guide to Dante, a pagan thinker leading a Christian pupil through unfamiliar territory. As such, we shall neither receive nor reject all that Aristotle and the other classical rhetoricians offer; rather, in the tradition of the Christian church through the centuries, we shall seek to redeem Aristotle by considering and appropriating many of the truths that he and others through common grace noted and taught, as viewed through the lens of biblical wisdom.
| Lesson 1: A Christian View of Rhetoric | 9 |
| Lesson 2: The Birth of Rhetoric | 15 |
| Lesson 3: First Excerpt of *Phaedrus* | 21 |
| Lesson 4: Second Excerpt of *Phaedrus* | 31 |
What is rhetoric? We could say that rhetoric is the art of effective communication, but this would be too broad a definition. A bully harassing a youth out of his lunch money; a wayward woman winking at a hapless sap on the street—both communicate effectively, but that is not the kind of communication that rhetoric really encompasses.

Could we define rhetoric as the art of effective verbal communication? This is better, because rhetoric has more to do with words than with physical force or imagery. This definition is also brief, and fairly complete. But to some extent it does not obey itself—that is, it does not yet effectively communicate the point that needs to be made. How do people communicate through words? There are only two ways: speaking and writing, tongue and pen. Learning rhetoric means learning how to speak and write effectively.

Kicking this further down the road, what do we mean by effective? Effectiveness depends on the goal. Sunglasses are effective when they block surplus sunlight, and effective advertising makes you want to buy them. Something is effective if it does what we want it to do. What do we want to achieve through speaking and writing? According to the great Roman orator Cicero, the threefold goal of rhetoric is to teach, to move, and to delight.¹ Now, these three goals line up with singular appropriateness to the three standards of truth, goodness, and beauty. Effectiveness in rhetoric can be measured against our ability to teach men the truth, to

**KEY CONCEPT**

★ **Rhetoric Defined**

The five faculties of oratory
The modes of persuasion

★ **Rhetoric:** the art of persuasive speaking and writing; the goals of rhetoric are to teach men the truth, to move men to goodness, and to delight men with verbal beauty
move men to goodness, and to delight men with beauty—that is, to *persuade*. Note that beauty here means verbal beauty, the beauty of a pleasing poem or a well-turned phrase. Effective speaking and writing is informative, powerful, and elegant. Thus rhetoric can be defined as the art of persuasive speaking and writing.

Something is truly effective if it does what we want it to do in the way that it ought to be done. The sunglasses wouldn’t be effective if they blocked sunlight by poking you in the eye. But that word “ought” implies a standard, often an ethical standard, which for Christians is found in the Word of God. According to the Scriptures, how ought we to use our words?

Consider first that in using words to communicate effectively we are imitating God, who characterizes Himself as a speaking God, as contrasted with dumb idols (Isa. 46:5–11). What does God accomplish through words? By His powerful Word, the Lord created all things (Gen. 1:3, Ps. 33:6), sustains all things (Heb. 1:3), and saves His people (James 1:21, Luke 8:15). God says His word is effective: “So shall My word be that goes forth from My mouth; It shall not return to Me void, but it shall accomplish what I please, and it shall prosper in the thing for which I sent it” (Isa. 55:11). In a similar way, God has given us the ability to speak and accomplish things through words. As His gift, the ability to speak should be employed in the way that He desires as taught in His word.

The Bible has a lot to say about what we say, so we will consider only a few key passages. Proverbs 10:19–21 commends righteous speaking in this way:

> In the multitude of words, sin is not lacking, but he who restrains his lips is wise. The tongue of the righteous is choice silver, the heart of the wicked is worth little. The lips of the righteous feed many, but fools die for lack of wisdom.

We are made to speak, but because we are sinners, verse 19 says that we should speak with restraint (cf. Prov. 17:27–28, Eccles. 5:2–3, James 3:1–2). A fool says everything he thinks, and in this modern age he can now blog every thought and tweet his folly around the globe in seconds. We would be wise rather to prepare
what we say before we say it, and to speak only when it improves on silence. Benjamin Franklin once remarked, “Remember not only to say the right thing in the right place, but far more difficult still, to leave unsaid the wrong thing at the tempting moment.”

Verses 20–21 provide the proper balance; at times it is best to speak, to build one another up. Our words are compared here to riches and food. The righteous man speaking a kind word that benefits his brother, or a word of rebuke to silence a scoffer, is like a good neighbor feeding the man that the priest and the Levite passed by. If we can meet such needs with our words, then it may not only be right to speak, but wrong not to.

So as Christians we must speak righteously. But we should also speak appealingly, pleasantly, which includes speaking with proper style. Proverbs 15:26 says, “The words of the pure are pleasant words.” But what is less pleasant than listening to the pretentious prattle of a bag of breeze? While some critics mistakenly connect any stylistic devices with that sort of bombast, that is not what is meant by speaking with proper style.

We will say more about style in Unit 6, but for now we should simply realize that style is inescapable. You must choose some words and not others. How do you decide? By what standard? The standard is to love your neighbor as yourself. When your teacher speaks, you want to understand her, so you, too, should speak to be understood. You are bothered when your friend is insincere, so you should speak with sincerity. You enjoy a powerful metaphor or a delightful turn of phrase, so you should use such rhetorical devices in an enjoyable way. As Arthur Quiller-Couch said, “Essentially it resembles good manners”—good style means thinking of others first.

Proverbs also says that we are to speak appropriately: “A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in settings of silver” (25:11, cf. 15:23). We have all said at one time or another, “Thank you; that is just what I needed to hear.” The perfect words for a given situation can give us great joy, but they do not often come to us by chance. Rather, we must prepare ourselves by storing up wisdom
within ourselves so that we can say just the right thing at just the right time. Thus Solomon says, “The heart of the righteous studies how to answer” (15:28).

Jesus teaches this same truth in Matthew 12:33–35:

Either make the tree good and its fruit good, or else make the tree bad and its fruit bad; for a tree is known by its fruit. Brood of vipers! How can you, being evil, speak good things? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth good things, and an evil man out of the evil treasure brings forth evil things.

Let’s consider this passage verse by verse.

“Either make the tree good and its fruit good, or else make the tree bad and its fruit bad; for a tree is known by its fruit” (v. 33). In order to learn what to say, you cannot prepare every word for every circumstance. Rather, you must strive to become a certain kind of person. As Doug Wilson once taught, “You must prepare the speaker before you prepare the speech.” More will be said about this in Lesson 10.

“You brood of vipers, how can you who are evil say anything good? For out of the overflow of the heart the mouth speaks” (v. 34). You may have heard the cliché that you should always speak from the heart; Jesus teaches here that you cannot speak otherwise. This is an indicative, not an imperative. Jesus does not command you to speak from the heart, He tells you that you already do. Consider what Owen Barfield once said about C. S. Lewis: “Somehow what he thought about everything was secretly present in what he said about anything.” To some extent this is true of us all; our spoken words expose our unspoken thoughts. Thus in order to speak rightly on one subject, you must learn to think rightly about all subjects.

“The good man brings good things out of the good stored up in him, and the evil man brings evil things out of the evil stored up in him” (v. 35). If you truly desire to say what is good—and you should—then you must store up good things within yourself:
good things of the word of God, and the best of what your schooling offers in literature, history, math and science. Read the Bible, especially the King James Version, then read it again in a different translation. Read Homer, Vergil, Dante, and Milton. Read Shakespeare, both his plays and his sonnets. Read the best of modern writers: C. S. Lewis, G. K. Chesterton, J. R. R. Tolkien, and P. G. Wodehouse. If you are studying early church history, read Eusebius; if the science of falling bodies, read Galileo. “He who walks with wise men will be wise” (Prov. 13:20).

1. Quintilian defined an orator as “a good man, skilled in speaking” (*Institutio Oratoria* XII.1.1). According to Quintilian, why must a true orator be a truly good man?

2. In 1 Corinthians 2:1–4, Paul tells the church of Corinth that he did not come to them with “excellence of speech” or “persuasive words.” Does this mean that we should not study rhetoric to improve our speaking? Consider the context, 1 Corinthians 1:17–2:13.

3. Read Psalm 119, and identify those places where the word of God is considered true, good, and beautiful.

Memorize and recite Proverbs 25:11:

*A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in settings of silver.*


NOTES
3 Douglas Wilson, New St. Andrews Lectures on Classical Rhetoric (Moscow, ID, 8 July 2002).
In 465 BC, the people of Syracuse, Sicily, deposed the tyrant Thrasybulus, who had ruled over them for eleven months, following the ten-year tyrannical reign of his brother Hieron. Once the tyrants were expelled, a democracy was established after the pattern of Athens, including government by popular assembly and trial by jury. The Sicilian citizens, who wanted their property restored to them, sought justice through the courts of law, but since there were no professional lawyers to represent them, many of the litigants found themselves unprepared to argue their own cases.

Some enterprising men named Corax and Tisias took advantage of this situation, and taught the citizens of Syracuse rules for speaking in court. These men first taught orally and for a fee, but later their precepts were written into handbooks that could be copied and sold. The handbooks flourished, and over the next few decades they and others like them spread throughout the Greek world. They were eventually compiled by the philosopher Aristotle (384–322 BC). Though none of the handbooks nor Aristotle’s compilation of them has survived to this day, we can discern—from what Plato, Aristotle and others wrote about them—two of their foundational contributions to the art of rhetoric. First, the handbooks taught the people to argue from probability or likelihood of behavior, e.g., “I would not have attacked my neighbor; he is a larger, stronger man than I.” Second, they taught the parts of a judicial speech: exordium, statement of facts, proofs, refutation, and recapitulation.
The discoveries (or developments) of Corax, Tisias, and the early handbook writers are traditionally considered to be the dawning of technical rhetoric. Before this time, of course, people spoke with eloquence and persuasion, but not, it seems, by following specific, prescribed rules that people could learn and use. For example, rhetoric had been practiced in skillful ways for decades in the Athenian assemblies and courts of law, but this practice had not resulted in a written art form; rather, the speakers had learned it by observing and imitating others.

Several excellent examples of older, pre-technical rhetoric can be found in speeches contained in the Homeric epics. We hear smooth-tongued Nestor urging peace between the quarreling leaders, resourceful Odysseus seeking to cajole the angry Achilles to return to the battle, and Aeneas, counselor of the Trojans, declaring his noble lineage to his foes. Many of these speeches, though written hundreds of years before the development of rhetoric as an art, could nonetheless be favorably analyzed according to its methods.

The same could be said for the great orations of the Old Testament: Moses warning Israel to avoid idolatry: “For the LORD your God is a consuming fire” (Deut. 4:1–40); Joshua’s last address at Shechem: “As for me and my house, we will serve the LORD” (Josh. 24:2–15); Ruth pleading with Naomi: “Wherever you go, I will go” (Ruth 1:16–17); David taunting Goliath: “That all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel” (1 Sam. 17:45–47); Abigail interceding for Nabal: “For as his name is, so is he” (1 Sam. 25:24–31); and Job’s complaint against God: “What have I done to You, O watcher of men?” (Job 6–7).

Around the same time as Corax and Tisias, another class of orators arrived in Athens to teach their particular brand of rhetoric. These were the sophists, famous for delivering speeches in a highly-structured, poetic style. Rather than writing handbooks or teaching by rules and methods, the sophists delivered public and private speeches which they expected their students to memorize and imitate. They attracted many followers and started a movement that lasted for centuries. We know some things about them.
from Plato (428–347 BC), who pits Socrates against the early sophists Protagoras and Gorgias in the dialogues named for them, and from Aristotle in his book *On Sophistical Refutations*. Near the end of *Refutations*, Aristotle argues that the sophists, in teaching by example and imitation, “trained people by imparting to them not the art but its products” (ch. 34, p. 253) as if one could teach a man shoemaking simply by presenting him with several kinds of shoes.

Gorgias (485–380 BC), perhaps the most famous of the sophists, was, like Corax and Tisias, from Sicily. Gorgias traveled from city to city displaying his oratorical skill, which became wildly popular for its poetic style, a style which included parallelism, antithesis, even rhythm and rhyme. He was also admired for his ability to speak extemporaneously on any subject. In 427 BC Gorgias was sent as an ambassador to Athens, and subsequently settled there to perform and teach. The Gorgianic style of speaking was imitated by many of his contemporaries (though with more restraint than its originator), including Lysias and Isocrates. Gorgias’s most famous speech is his *Encomium of Helen*, a rich illustration of his style that both praises and defends Helen of Troy. Here is a characteristic excerpt:

> In many did she work much desire for her love, and her one body was the cause of bringing together many bodies of men thinking great thoughts for great goals, of whom some had greatness of wealth, some the glory of ancient nobility, some the vigor of personal agility, some the command of acquired knowledge. And all came because of a passion which loved to conquer and a love of honor which was unconquered.

In Plato’s *Gorgias* dialogue, the sophist—under the questioning of Socrates—defines rhetoric as “the art of persuasion in courts of law and other assemblies...about the just and the unjust.” Socrates then corners Gorgias into conceding that a rhetorician, being ignorant of the subject on which he speaks, creates mere belief (rather than knowledge), and *that* only in the ignorant multitude. As the dialogue progresses, Socrates becomes increasingly critical of the rhetoric presented by Gorgias and the other interlocutors in the dialogue, Polus and Callicles.
The technical rhetoricians and the sophists each contributed their own innovations to rhetoric, but according to George Kennedy, “Neither handbook writers nor sophists seem to have discussed rhetoric in abstract terms nor attempted to define it and identify its parts.” This was accomplished by later philosophical rhetoricians (or rhetorical philosophers), including Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian.

In the next lesson we will begin to work through the *Phaedrus*, Plato’s dialogue in which Socrates criticizes rhetoric (as in the *Gorgias*) while also offering many suggestions for understanding and practicing rhetoric as a true art.

---

**THINKING DEEPER**

1. In the *Iliad*, book IX, Agamemnon sends three envoys—Odysseus, Phoinix, and Aias—to Achilles, urging him to give up his anger and rejoin the battle. Find and read these three speeches (they are not too long). How does Achilles respond to each successive speech? Had you been a warrior in Achilles’ situation, which of them would have been persuasive to you, and why?

2. Locate and read the first part of Plato’s *Gorgias* (§447–466). Would Gorgias say that rhetoric is a universal art that applies to all subjects, or would he narrow its scope? How does Socrates define rhetoric? How does he define sophistry? Later in the dialogue (§503), what other type of rhetoric does Socrates admit may exist?

---

**DEVELOPING MEMORY**

Memorize and recite either of these biblical speeches:

```
Entreat me not to leave you,
Or to turn back from following after you;
For wherever you go, I will go;
And wherever you lodge, I will lodge;
Your people shall be my people,
And your God, my God.
Where you die, I will die,
And there will I be buried.
The Lord do so to me, and more also,
If anything but death parts you and me. (Ruth 1:16-17)
```
Then David said to the Philistine, “You come to me with a sword, with a spear, and with a javelin. But I come to you in the name of the LORD of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom you have defied. This day the LORD will deliver you into my hand, and I will strike you and take your head from you. And this day I will give the carcasses of the camp of the Philistines to the birds of the air and the wild beasts of the earth, that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel. Then all this assembly shall know that the Lord does not save with sword and spear; for the battle is the Lord’s, and He will give you into our hands.” (1 Sam. 17:45–47)

- Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* III.1, III.2.

**NOTES**

5 Ibid.
E motions, according to Aristotle, are “those feelings that so change men as to affect their judgments, and that are also attended by pain or pleasure” (Rhetoric 2.1). As we saw in the last lesson, we can more easily generate a particular emotion in our audience when we fully understand that emotion: its definition, situations in which it is felt, and people toward whom it is felt. In this lesson and the next, we will summarize these elements for twelve emotions presented by Aristotle in Rhetoric, Book 2. In Chapters 2–5, he defines and discusses three pairs of contrasting emotions—anger and calmness, friendship and enmity, and fear and calmness—which we will cover first. For each emotion, we will also consider portions of speeches in which the speaker aims to produce that emotion in his hearers.

**ANGER**

As we read in Lesson 11, anger is “an impulse, accompanied by pain, to a conspicuous revenge for a conspicuous slight directed without justification toward what concerns oneself or toward what concerns one’s friends.” Someone slight you when he shows contempt for something or someone you care about, such as insulting your sister, or slandering your church. Thus the craftsmen of Ephesus were enraged in Acts 19:25–28, when Demetrius told them that Paul was turning the people away from the worship of their goddess.

**KEY CONCEPT**

The modes of persuasion
- Ethos
- Pathos
- **Emotions**
- Logos

★ **Emotions:** “those feelings that so change men as to affect their judgments, and that are also attended by pain or pleasure” (Rhetoric 2.1)
He called them together with the workers of similar occupation, and said: ‘Men, you know that we have our prosperity by this trade. Moreover you see and hear that not only at Ephesus, but throughout almost all Asia, this Paul has persuaded and turned away many people, saying that they are not gods which are made with hands. So not only is this trade of ours in danger of falling into disrepute, but also the temple of the great goddess Diana may be despised and her magnificence destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worship.’ Now when they heard this, they were full of wrath and cried out, saying, ‘Great is Diana of the Ephesians!’

The slight is conspicuous when it is made before those whose opinions we care about, such as our rivals, those whom we admire or respect, or those whom we wish to admire or respect us.

Anger is felt toward particular people. We tend to get angry at those we expect to treat us well, such as a friend who mocks us, a family member who ignores us when we are in need, or anyone who fails to show us proper respect. King Ahasuerus was angered when Vashti, his wife and subject, refused to appear at his command before his guests (Esther 1:10–12). We may become angry when someone thwarts our desires, as when a fellow actor lies about you to the drama director so he gets the role that you wanted. We feel angry when our opponent’s bad behavior toward us is unjustified. Thus Jesus was angry at the Pharisees who sought to accuse him for healing a man on the Sabbath (Mark 3:1–6).

Anger is a volatile emotion, especially because when we are in its grip we feel justified in taking revenge. Consequently, we must be slow to anger (James 1:19–20) and quick to let it go (Eph. 4:26–27). As Christians we are to forgive our brothers who slight us (Matt. 6:12–15), imitating our heavenly Father. While anger is not always sinful, we should not be characterized by it (Eph. 4:31, Col. 3:8).

**CALMNESS**

Calmness is “a settling down or quieting of anger” (*Rhetoric* II.3). We feel calm when those who angered us have humbled themselves before us and apologized, or when they respond to our
anger with true patience, kindness, or gentleness. “A soft answer
turns away wrath” (Prov. 15:1).

We also grow calm when we feel enough time has passed, when
vengeance has been taken, or when we are “enjoying freedom
from pain, or inoffensive pleasure, or justifiable hope” (Rhetoric
II.3). Since anger is caused by being slighted, we grow calm when
we believe that the presumed slight was unintended or the behav-
ior was justified. Thus the town clerk calmed the crowd at Ephesus
in Acts 19:37–40:

For you have brought these men here who are neither rob-
bers of temples nor blasphemers of your goddess. Therefore,
if Demetrius and his fellow craftsmen have a case against
anyone, the courts are open and there are proconsuls. Let
them bring charges against one another. But if you have any
other inquiry to make, it shall be determined in the lawful
assembly. For we are in danger of being called in question
for today’s uproar, there being no reason which we may give
to account for this disorderly gathering.

Calmness also comes to those who trust in God and turn over
all vengeance to Him (Rom. 12:17–21, Ps. 37:7–8).

FRIENDSHIP

Friendship, or friendly feelings toward someone, is “wishing for
him what you believe to be good things, not for your own sake but
for his” (Rhetoric II.4). Thus true friendship is selflessly caring for
another person. And since friendship is always shared, “a friend
is one who feels thus and excites these feeling in return.” Aristotle
adds that “your friend is the sort of man who shares your pleasure
in what is good and your pain in what is unpleasant.” C. S. Lewis
agrees, writing in The Four Loves that friendship “is born at that
moment when one man says to another: ‘What! You too? I thought
that no one but myself...’”

Aristotle’s description of people toward whom we feel friendly
is reminiscent of Paul’s description of love in 1 Corinthians 13:4–7.
He says we feel friendly toward those who are kind to us, who
seek our good over their own, who do not nurse grudges, store up grievances, or speak evil of us, who are ready to fight for us, who are honest with us, and who do not desert us in times of trouble. A familiar biblical example is the friendship between David and Jonathan (see 1 Sam. 20).

Aristotle adds, insightfully, that we also feel friendly toward those who “can stand being made fun of as well as do it prettily themselves.” An amusing example of this in literature is the lighthearted banter between Bertie Wooster and his beloved Aunt Dahlia. Here is one such exchange, from P. G. Wodehouse’s *Code of the Woosters*:

“Hullo, ugly,” she said. “What brings you here?”

“I understood, aged relative, that you wished to confer with me.”

“I didn’t want you to come barging in, interrupting my work. A few words on the telephone would have met the case. But I suppose some instinct told you that this was my busy day.”

“If you were wondering if I could come to lunch, have no anxiety. I shall be delighted, as always. What will Anatole be giving us?”

“He won’t be giving you anything, my gay young tapeworm.”

Of course an interchange like this is more appropriate for those who are confident in their friendship, and as such should rarely be included in a persuasive speech.

Jesus teaches about friendship in John 15:13–17, and in so doing establishes a feeling of friendship in His hearers.

Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one’s life for one’s friends. You are my friends if you do what I command. I no longer call you servants, because a servant does not know his master’s business. Instead, I have called you friends, for everything that I learned from my Father I have made known to you. You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you so that you might go and bear fruit—fruit that will last—and so that whatever you ask in my name the Father will give you. This is my command: Love each other.
As we need to be careful with anger, so should we be with friendship. “The righteous should choose his friends carefully, for the way of the wicked leads them astray” (Prov. 12:26, cf. James 4:4).

**ENMITY**

Enmity is synonymous with hatred, and is the opposite of friendship (cf. Luke 23:12). Enmity, like anger, can be produced by offences against oneself, but it need not be; it may arise simply from disapproval of someone’s character. And whereas anger is always felt against specific persons, hatred may be felt toward whole classes of people. Thus Haman’s hatred, in Esther 3:8–9, is directed not against Mordecai alone but against all Jews, as he tells King Ahasuerus:

> There is a certain people dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of your kingdom who keep themselves separate. Their customs are different from those of all other people, and they do not obey the king’s laws; it is not in the king’s best interest to tolerate them. If it pleases the king, let a decree be issued to destroy them, and I will give ten thousand talents of silver to the king’s administrators for the royal treasury.

Haman’s speech also demonstrates the fact that enmity wishes for the hated to cease to exist—to be either destroyed or banished (cf. Judg. 11:7). Thus, enmity is identified in Scripture as a primary cause of murder (Num. 35:20–21).

Unlike anger, according to Aristotle (*Rhetoric* II.4), enmity is not always accompanied by pain, nor does it fade over time. But like anger, the rightness of the emotion depends on its object. While Christians are not to be characterized by hatred (Gal. 5:19–20), it is right to hate what is evil (Amos 5:15, Heb. 1:9), that is, to hate what God hates (Rev. 2:6). God hates not only evil in the abstract, but evildoers (Ps. 5:5, 11:5). Thus, David, a man after God’s own heart, can rightly say, “Do I not hate them, O Lord, who hate You? And do I not loathe those who rise up against You? I hate them with perfect hatred; I count them my enemies” (Ps. 139:21–22).
But knowing how easily enmity can lead to sin, he follows this up in the next two verses with this prayer: “Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my anxieties; and see if there is any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.”

**FEAR**

Aristotle defines fear as “a pain or disturbance due to a mental picture of some destructive or painful evil in the future” (*Rhetoric* II.5). Fear is forward looking, felt by those who imagine imminent danger coming near; and the more specifically they imagine it—at a particular time, in a particular form, at the hands of a particular person—the more they feel fear. Consequently, in order to produce fear, we should use enargia, vivid language to create a mental picture of some destructive, painful thing. Consider the enargia of the angel from Revelation 14:9–11:

> If anyone worships the beast and his image, and receives his mark on his forehead or on his hand, he himself shall also drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out full strength into the cup of His indignation. He shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb. And the smoke of their torment ascends forever and ever; and they have no rest day or night, who worship the beast and his image, and whoever receives the mark of his name.

Once a specific danger has filled the mind, the smallest hint of it can cause fear. During a scary movie, a viewer can be frightened by the slight movement of a curtain or the unsteady breathing of the protagonist in a dark house. In like manner, fear can be produced in a speech by merely hinting at the enmity or anger of someone who has the power to harm you. On January 30, 1939, Adolf Hitler’s speech to the German parliament included this veiled threat:

> I have often been a prophet in my life and was generally laughed at. During my struggle for power, the Jews primarily received with laughter my prophecies that I would someday
assume the leadership of the state and thereby of the entire nation and then, among many other things, achieve a solution of the Jewish problem. I suppose that meanwhile the laughter of Jewry in Germany that resounded then is probably already choking in their throats.\(^3\)

Five years prior to Hitler’s speech, Winston Churchill warned the English people of the threat of Nazi Germany with some fearful language of his own:

It is but twenty years since these neighbors of ours fought almost the whole world, and almost defeated them. Now they are rearming with the utmost speed, and ready to their hands is the new lamentable weapon of the air, against which our navy is no defense, before which women and children, the weak and frail, the pacifist and the jingo, the warrior and the civilian, the front line trenches and the cottage home, lie in equal and impartial peril.

Here Churchill follows the suggestion of Aristotle: “Consequently, when it is advisable that the audience should be frightened, the orator must make them feel that they really are in danger of something, pointing out that it has happened to others who were stronger than they are, and is happening, or has happened, to people like themselves” (Rhetoric II.5).

Christians should live free of fear (1 John 4:18, Heb. 2:15). But the way out of a life of fear is through a proper fear of God: “And I say to you, My friends, do not be afraid of those who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will show you whom you should fear: Fear Him who, after He has killed, has power to cast into hell; yes, I say to you, fear Him!” (Luke 12:4–5). This will carry over to a proper fear of authorities (Rom. 13:5–7).

**CONFIDENCE**

Confidence is the opposite of fear. It is “the expectation associated with a mental picture of the nearness of what keeps us safe and the absence or remoteness of what is terrible” (Rhetoric II.5). Thus, we are confident when surrounded by strong friends or
when we have skills, training, or experience to deal with a dangerous situation. If we have often succeeded or if we have faced peril and escaped it before, we picture ourselves doing so again. Since we fear those who are angry with us or hate us, we are confident when we believe that we have wronged no one, and are on good terms with all.

An actor will feel confident if he has performed on stage many times and has never forgotten his lines or if he has taken steps to make sure he will remember them in the future. A sports team will feel confident if they have faced the same opponent before and defeated them soundly. A nation will feel confident if it has wealth, resources, and an industrious workforce, if its military is powerful and well-equipped and its allies are strong, and if its enemies are weak or far-removed or they have no enemies. Thus we see Winston Churchill argue in the conclusion of his famous Iron Curtain speech,

> If the population of the English-speaking Commonwealth be added to that of the United States, with all that such cooperation implies in the air, on the sea, all over the globe, and in science and in industry, and in moral force, there will be no quivering, precarious balance of power to offer its temptation to ambition or adventure. On the contrary there will be an overwhelming assurance of security.

As Christians, we must remember to put our full trust in God: “It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man. It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in princes” (Ps. 118:8–9). Proverbs 3:5–26 tells us further how to find confidence in God (cf. Luke 12:22–34):

> Trust in the Lord with all your heart, and lean not on your own understanding. In all your ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct your paths. Do not be wise in your own eyes. Fear the Lord and depart from evil. It will be health to your flesh, and strength to your bones. Honor the Lord with your possessions, and with the firstfruits of all your increase, so your barns will be filled with plenty, and your vats will overflow with new wine…. Keep sound wisdom and
discretion, so they will be life to your soul and grace to your neck. Then you will walk safely in your way, and your foot will not stumble. When you lie down, you will not be afraid; yes, you will lie down and your sleep will be sweet. Do not be afraid of sudden terror, nor of trouble from the wicked when it comes. For the Lord will be your confidence, and will keep your foot from being caught.

In the next lesson, we will learn about six more emotions described in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*.

1. When would it be right to produce anger in an audience? When would it be wrong? See Ephesians 4:26–27. Discuss this for the other emotions identified in this lesson.

2. The *Iliad* opens with “Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus’ son Achilleus.” Achilleus’s anger is his flaw, and it drives much of the story. Find characters in stories who exhibit, properly or improperly, the other emotions from this lesson and the next.

3. How does confidence differ from courage?

4. It is well known that music affects emotions (consider musical scores used in television and film). What different emotions might be associated with fast versus slow tempo? major versus minor chords? loud versus soft volume? complementary versus clashing melodies? regular versus irregular rhythm? How can an understanding of music and emotion help the rhetorician?

Memorize and recite “King Alfred’s War Song”:

When the enemy comes in a’roarin’ like a flood,  
Coveting the kingdom and hungering for blood,  
The Lord will raise a standard up and lead His people on,  
The Lord of Hosts will go before, defeating every foe;  
Defeating every foe.

For the Lord is our defense, Jesus defend us,  
For the Lord is our defense, Jesu defend

Some men trust in chariots, some trust in the horse,  
But we will depend upon the name of Christ our Lord,
The Lord has made my hands to war and my fingers to fight.  
The Lord lays low our enemies, but he raises us upright;  
He raises us upright.

For the Lord is our defense, Jesus defend us,  
For the Lord is our defense, Jesu defend.

A thousand fall on my left hand, ten thousand to the right,  
But He will defend us from the arrow in the night.  
Protect us from the terrors of the teeth of the devourer,  
Imbue us with your Spirit, Lord, encompass us with power;  
Encompass us with power.

For the Lord is our defense, Jesus defend us,  
For the Lord is our defense, Jesu defend.

**Reading Further**

- Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* VI.2.

**Notes**

3. Quoted in Mark Dery *I Must Not Think Bad Thoughts* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2012), 110.
4. Traditional. Attributed to Alfred the Great.
Recall that there are five faculties of oratory—five skills that we must possess in order to speak effectively. These skills are invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Invention was defined in the *Ad Herennium* as “the devising of matter, true or plausible, that would make the case convincing,” and has been the faculty on which the majority of this text has focused. The concept of invention was introduced in Unit 2, Lesson 5, which included the method of stasis theory. Unit 4 then covered invention under the special lines of argument, and Unit 5 under the general lines of argument.

The *Ad Herennium* defined arrangement, the second faculty of oratory, as “the ordering and distribution of the matter, making clear the place to which each thing is to be assigned.” Arrangement was taught in Unit 2, Lessons 6–9, under the six parts of a discourse.

Style is defined as “the adaptation of suitable words and sentences to the matter devised” (*Ad Herennium* I.2). This definition assumes that as you work on style, the matter has already been devised—that is, you know your arguments and have arranged them. Now you must find suitable words adapted to those arguments. Your words will be suitable when they help to make your arguments clear and elegant, leading your hearers to truth that is easy to understand and delightful to receive. In this lesson we
will consider some ways to do this. In the next lesson, we will look at how to adorn the truth using figures of speech.

**CLARITY**

Your speech will be clear if your words completely and correctly convey your intended meaning into the minds and hearts of the audience. This simply means that you should speak in a way that your hearers will be able to follow.

You will have a good start toward clarity by remembering the rules of proper grammar that you have probably learned in English. Make sure that the subjects of your sentences agree with the verbs, that the pronouns have clear antecedents, and that verb tenses are used consistently. Avoid clichés like the plague. When speaking, dangling modifiers should also be shunned. Do not fail to be wary of overly compound negatives. Rather, use words that are clear and straightforward, and define your key terms. These and other basic grammar rules should be dusted off and put into practice.

We will now consider three other rules to help keep your speech clear.¹

**Avoid unhelpful nominalizations**

A nominalization is a verb, adjective or adverb that has been turned into a noun: *explanation*, rather than explain; *uncertainty*, rather than uncertain; *with quickness* rather than quickly. Consider this highly nominalized sentence (the nominalizations have been italicized):

> The unwillingness of students to demonstrate submission to the school uniform policy was a cause of the increase of strictness on the part of the administration.

Such sentences can be unclear because they force the hearer to think abstractly rather than concretely. We generally expect concrete subjects to do things. If we take some of those nominalizations and turn them into their corresponding verbs or adjectives, we create this clearer sentence:

> The students were unwilling to submit to the school uniform policy, causing the administrators to grow increasingly strict.
This sentence is shorter and easier to follow because it has people (students and administrators) doing things (submitting and growing strict). It also eliminates the strings of abstract nouns.

Note that the rule says to avoid *unhelpful* nominalizations. Not all nominalizations are improper or unclear. In fact, a well-written nominalization can actually help clarify a sentence. Rather than this sentence:

*The students would not submit to what the administration was demanding.*

We could use this nominalized (and clearer) sentence:

*The students would not submit to the administration’s demands.*

Nominalizations can also eliminate awkward phrases like “the fact that.” Consider this clunky sentence:

*The fact that they refused to submit to the new policy angered the principal.*

We can simplify it by using a nominalization:

*Their refusal to submit to the new policy angered the principal.*

**Use active and passive voice wisely**

Passive sentences can sound dull for the same reason as nominalized sentences: our hearers generally expect the subject of the sentence to be doing the action. But in a passive sentence, the subject expresses the goal of the action. This can result in an awkward sentence with a complex subject.

For example, consider this passive sentence:

*A committee to express concerns about the school uniform policy to the principal was formed by the students.*

This sentence is clunky, confusing, and uninspiring. But made grammatically active, we get a much clearer sentence:

*The students formed a committee to express their concerns about the school uniform policy to the principal.*
As with nominalizations, you can use the passive voice in certain circumstances to clarify your sentences. If your audience does not need to know who is doing the action, feel free to use the passive, as in this example:

New school policies should be put into the parent-student handbook.

A judicial use of the passive can also help to maintain a consistent point of view. Consider this excerpt from Franklin D. Roosevelt's January 1941 speech, “The Four Freedoms”:

It is true that prior to 1914 the United States often has been disturbed by events in other continents. We have even engaged in two wars with European nations and in a number of un-declared wars in the West Indies, in the Mediterranean and in the Pacific, for the maintenance of American rights and for the principles of peaceful commerce. But in no case had a serious threat been raised against our national safety or our continued independence.

The first and third sentences are passive, and the second active. This allows the point of view of the whole to remain on the United States, as you can see through the italicized words.

Sometimes a careful use of the passive voice can help to support the argument of the speech. Consider this excerpt from Lincoln's Gettysburg Address:

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us....

Lincoln's switch from the active “we cannot dedicate” to the passive “it is for us to be dedicated” supports the main point he is making in this paragraph.
Make your flow of thought clear

You can achieve clarity not only by choosing the form of your words carefully and considering the grammatical structure of your sentences, but also by crafting your sentences to show the connections between your thoughts.

One helpful but subtle method for connecting thoughts is to continue the next sentence with a subject that connects it to the previous sentence, like overlapping links in a chain. For example, consider these closing lines to Jonathan Edward’s sermon “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God”:

Therefore let everyone that is out of Christ now awake and fly from the wrath to come. The wrath of almighty God is now undoubtedly hanging over great part of this congregation. Let everyone fly out of Sodom: Haste and escape for your lives, look not behind you, escape to the mountain, lest you be consumed.

The concept of wrath ends the first sentence and begins the second. The congregation that ends the second sentence links to the subject everyone at the beginning of the third. Finally, the mention of Sodom connects to the command to escape from that city.

A second method for making our flow of thought clear is to enumerate the key sentences in the argument to clearly display the sequence of ideas. Words like first, second, next, and finally—as long as they are not overused—can help the audience to follow our arguments. Jonathan Edwards uses this method throughout “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God.”

A third way to clarify the flow of our thoughts is to use words and phrases that indicate transitions. Transitional words can show a flow of time, such as now, at first, meanwhile, eventually, and later. They can show comparison, such as likewise and similarly, or contrast, such as however, but, yet, rather, and on the contrary. Transitional words also include premise and conclusion identifiers such as since, because, therefore and so. We can even use whole sentences and paragraphs to help our audience follow where we have come from and where we are going. This was, in fact, the purpose of the opening three paragraphs of this lesson.
A fourth way is to order the argument with successive sentences or sections of the speech starting with the same word or phrase (using anaphora, which we will learn about in the next lesson). The order can be chronological, climactic, or some other fitting arrangement. John F. Kennedy uses this technique twice in his inaugural address to clarify his flow of thought. First, following the introductory phrase, “This much we pledge—and more,” Kennedy presents successive pledges to six different groups: allies of the United States, newly freed states, third-world peoples, southern republics, the United Nations, and potential adversaries. Then, expanding on this last group, he presents them with five successive challenges, each challenge starting with the phrase, “Let both sides…” This helps his hearers to follow his thoughts.

**ELEGANCE**

We should speak in order to bless our hearers, to benefit them in some way. Consequently, we must present the truth not only with clarity but also with elegance. While clarity and elegance are related, elegance has more to do with how the words sound within their sentences: not merely making them sound pretty, though at times that is an appropriate goal, but also by investing them with interest and giving them gusto.

We will present four means of producing elegant sentences: using rhythm, employing parallel construction, varying sentence length, and ending the speech in a long coordinated sentence with a climactic thump.

**Rhythm**

Rhythm is the first element of style that we learn from the poet. Meter within a sentence is inescapable—the rhythm of prose is as present as the rhythm of poetry. We want our words to have a proper rhythm without being overly rhythmical. Longinus the rhetorician warns us in his work *On the Sublime* (XLI) that “over-rhythmical style does not communicate the feeling of the words but simply the feeling of the rhythm.”
A detailed discourse of the elements of rhythm—meter, syllable, accent, stress—is beyond the scope of this text. Here I will simply say with Quintilian that the best judge of rhythm is the ear (Institutio Oratoria IX.4). When you are writing a speech, read it aloud and ask yourself, “Does this sentence flow smoothly in terms of its sound? Would this sentence sound better by adjusting the words, or by replacing a word with a synonym?”

Part of the answer to these questions relates to the purpose of the speech. A ceremonial oration delivered in a grand manner can be more overtly rhythmical than a more ordinary political or forensic speech, in which the rhythm should be more subdued (notice: not absent). Sometimes, such as when you are confident that your audience is with you, the meter can be pleasant and smooth, rising and falling like a gentle wave. Other times you will want to grab their attention by varying the rhythm, bringing the hearer up short.

Perhaps no modern orator mastered rhythm as well as Martin Luther King, Jr. Consider the rhythm of these sentences, taken from his powerful speech “I Have a Dream”:

In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds.

And so, we’ve come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

These beautifully framed words are memorable not only for what they say, but for how they were said. Listen for the rhythm by reading them aloud or, better yet, find a recording of Dr. King’s original delivery of the speech.

**Parallel construction**

We employ parallel construction in a sentence when we give similar ideas a similar pattern. We can use this device to compare or contrast two items, and to connect several items in a series.
As an example of contrasting items, consider this section from “I Have a Dream” that continues the sentence discussed above. You should discern three pairs of concepts contrasted through parallel construction:

In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred....We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence.

Consider also the parallel that ends another sentence, from that same speech:

We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities.

Imagine he had instead used this more awkward sentence:

We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and in hotels.

Here is an example of connecting items in a series, from later in the speech:

With this faith, we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

Had he not made those items parallel, with parallel elements being grammatically similar, the sentence would be clunky and disjointed:

With this faith, we will be able to work together, pray with one another, have mutual struggles, be jailed together, and we stand up for freedom, knowing that we will be free one day.

**Sentence length**

You can help retain your hearers’ interest by varying your sentence length mixing long and short sentences. Remember to make
your longer sentences clear and your shorter sentences punchy, as Dr. King does in this section:

The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. And they have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone. And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back.

Here is that same paragraph rewritten in sentences of eight words each:

A new militancy has engulfed the Negro community. It must not lead us to distrust whites. Many of our white brothers are here today. They know their destiny is connected with ours. They realize their freedom is bound to ours. We cannot walk alone, but make this pledge: We shall march ahead and not turn back.

Reread these sets of sentences aloud, and you should hear a striking difference.

Coordinated sentences

A study of the most powerful speeches will reveal that many of them end with a longer, highly-coordinated sentence, a sentence that climaxes in a short, powerful word. A few examples will help to show what we mean:

In short they have no refuge, nothing to take hold of; all that preserves them every moment is the mere arbitrary will, and un-covenanted, unobliged forbearance of an incensed God. (Jonathan Edwards, “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God.”)

If we adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength, seeking no one’s land or treasure, seeking to lay no arbitrary control upon the thoughts of men, if all British moral and material
forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the high roads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time but for a century to come. (Winston Churchill, “The Iron Curtain.”)

And when this happens, and when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old negro spiritual, 'Free at last, free at last; Thank God Almighty, we are free at last. (Martin Luther King, Jr., “I Have a Dream.”)

Consider this structural analysis of the second of these closing sentences:

If we

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations} \\
\text{and} \\
\text{walk forward in} \\
\text{and} \\
\text{strength}, \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{sedate} \\
\text{and} \\
\text{sober} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{land} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{treasure} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{seeking no one’s} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{treasure} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{seeking to lay no arbitrary control upon the thoughts of men,} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{treasure} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{moral} \\
\text{and} \\
\text{material} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{forces} \\
\text{and} \\
\text{convictions} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{are joined with} \\
\text{your own in fraternal association,} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{treasure} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{the high roads of the future will be clear,} \\
\text{or} \\
\text{treasure} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{not only} \\
\text{for us} \\
\text{but} \\
\text{for all} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{not only} \\
\text{for our time} \\
\text{but} \\
\text{for a century to come} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\right. 
\]
Long and highly structured sentences like these have a way of holding our thoughts and stirring our emotions, and should thus be reserved for speeches delivered in a grand manner. The next lesson will discuss more what this means.

1. How can a study of poetry improve our rhetorical style?
2. Read through the St. Crispin’s Day speech from Shakespeare’s *Henry V*. Where is the rhythm (iambic pentameter) most evident? Why?
3. Why does a well-written, highly coordinated sentence at the conclusion of a grand speech so powerfully affect us?

Memorize and recite this quote from Arthur Quiller-Couch, *On the Art of Writing*:

This then is Style. As technically manifested in Literature it is the power to touch with ease, grace, precision, any note in the gamut of human thought or emotion. But essentially it resembles good manners. It comes of endeavoring to understand others, of thinking for them rather than for yourself—of thinking, that is, with the heart as well as the head. It gives rather than receives.²
• Joseph M. Williams, *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace*.
• Matt Whitling, *Grammar of Poetry*.
• Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* IX.4.45–147.

NOTES
1 Many of the concepts in this lesson—including nominalizations, a wise use of active and passive voice, and using a clear flow of thought—I first learned from Joseph M. Williams’s helpful book *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace* (New York: Longman, 1997).
FUNERAL ORATION

Pericles, 431 BC, Athens (translated by Benjamin Jowett)

Most of those who have spoken here before me have commended the lawgiver who added this oration to our other funeral customs. It seemed to them a worthy thing that such an honor should be given at their burial to the dead who have fallen on the field of battle. But I should have preferred that, when men’s deeds have been brave, they should be honored in deed only, and with such an honor as this public funeral, which you are now witnessing. Then the reputation of many would not have been imperiled on the eloquence or want of eloquence of one, and their virtues believed or not as he spoke well or ill. For it is difficult to say neither too little nor too much; and even moderation is apt not to give the impression of truthfulness. The friend of the dead who knows the facts is likely to think that the words of the speaker fall short of his knowledge and of his wishes; another who is not so well informed, when he hears of anything which surpasses his own powers, will be envious and will suspect exaggeration. Mankind are tolerant of the praises of others so long as each hearer thinks that he can do as well or nearly as well himself, but, when the speaker rises above him, jealousy is aroused and he begins to be incredulous. However, since our ancestors have set the seal of their approval upon the practice, I must obey, and to the utmost of my power shall endeavor to satisfy the wishes and beliefs of all who hear me.

I will speak first of our ancestors, for it is right and seemly that now, when we are lamenting the dead, a tribute should be paid to their memory. There has never been a time when they did not inhabit this land, which by their valor they will have handed down from generation to generation, and we have received from them a free state. But if they were worthy of praise, still more were our fathers, who added to their inheritance, and after many a struggle transmitted to us their sons this great empire. And we ourselves assembled here today, who are still most of us in the vigor of life, have carried the work of improvement further, and have richly endowed our city with all things, so that she is sufficient for herself both in peace and war. Of the military exploits by which our various possessions were acquired, or of the energy with which we or our fathers drove back
the tide of war, Hellenic or Barbarian, I will not speak; for the tale would be long and is familiar to you. But before I praise the dead, I should like to point out by what principles of action we rose to power, and under what institutions and through what manner of life our empire became great. For I conceive that such thoughts are not unsuited to the occasion, and that this numerous assembly of citizens and strangers may profitably listen to them.

Our form of government does not enter into rivalry with the institutions of others. Our government does not copy our neighbors’, but is an example to them. It is true that we are called a democracy, for the administration in the hands of the many and not of the few. But while there exists equal justice to all and alike in their private disputes, the claim of excellence is also recognized; and when a citizen is in any way distinguished, he is preferred to the public service, not as a matter of privilege, but as the reward of merit. Neither is poverty an obstacle, but a man may benefit his country whatever the obscurity of his condition. There is no exclusiveness in our public life, and in our private business we are not suspicious of one another, nor angry with our neighbor if he does what he likes; we do not put on sour looks at him which, though harmless, are not pleasant. While we are thus unconstrained in our private business, a spirit of reverence pervades our public acts; we are prevented from doing wrong by respect for the authorities and for the laws, having a particular regard to those which are ordained for the protection of the injured as well as those unwritten laws which bring upon the transgressor of them the reprobation of the general sentiment.

And we have not forgotten to provide for our weary spirits many relaxations from toil; we have regular games and sacrifices throughout the year; our homes are beautiful and elegant; and the delight which we daily feel in all these things helps to banish sorrow. Because of the greatness of our city the fruits of the whole earth flow in upon us; so that we enjoy the goods of other countries as freely as our own.

Then, again, our military training is in many respects superior to that of our adversaries. Our city is thrown open to the world, though we never expel a foreigner and prevent him from seeing or learning anything of which the secret if revealed to an enemy might profit him. We rely not upon management or trickery, but upon our own hearts and hands. And in the matter of education, whereas they from early youth are always undergoing laborious exercises which are to make them brave, we live at ease, and yet are equally ready to face the perils which they face. And here is the proof: The Lacedaemonians come into Athenian territory not by themselves, but with their whole confederacy following; we go alone into a neighbor’s country; and although our opponents are fighting for their homes and we on a foreign soil, we have seldom any difficulty in overcoming them. Our enemies have never yet felt our united strength, the care of a navy divides our attention, and on land we are obliged to send our own citizens everywhere. But they, if they meet and defeat a part of our army, are as proud as if they had routed us all, and when defeated they pretend to have been vanquished by us all.

If then we prefer to meet danger with a light heart but without laborious training, and with a courage which is gained by habit and not enforced by law, are we not greatly the better for it? Since we do not anticipate the pain, although, when the hour comes, we can be as brave as those
who never allow themselves to rest; thus our city is equally admirable in peace and in war. For we are lovers of the beautiful in our tastes and our strength lies, in our opinion, not in deliberation and discussion, but that knowledge which is gained by discussion preparatory to action. For we have a peculiar power of thinking before we act, and of acting, too, whereas other men are courageous from ignorance but hesitate upon reflection. And they are surely to be esteemed the bravest spirits who, having the clearest sense both of the pains and pleasures of life, do not on that account shrink from danger. In doing good, again, we are unlike others; we make our friends by conferring, not by receiving favors. Now he who confers a favor is the firmer friend, because he would rather by kindness keep alive the memory of an obligation; but the recipient is colder in his feelings, because he knows that in requiting another's generosity he will not be winning gratitude but only paying a debt. We alone do good to our neighbors not upon a calculation of interest, but in the confidence of freedom and in a frank and fearless spirit. To sum up: I say that Athens is the school of Hellas, and that the individual Athenian in his own person seems to have the power of adapting himself to the most varied forms of action with the utmost versatility and grace. This is no passing and idle word, but truth and fact; and the assertion is verified by the position to which these qualities have raised the state. For in the hour of trial Athens alone among her contemporaries is superior to the report of her. No enemy who comes against her is indignant at the reverses which he sustains at the hands of such a city; no subject complains that his masters are unworthy of him. And we shall assuredly not be without witnesses; there are mighty monuments of our power which will make us the wonder of this and of succeeding ages; we shall not need the praises of Homer or of any other panegyrist whose poetry may please for the moment, although his representation of the facts will not bear the light of day. For we have compelled every land and every sea to open a path for our valor, and have everywhere planted eternal memorials of our friendship and of our enmity. Such is the city for whose sake these men nobly fought and died; they could not bear the thought that she might be taken from them; and every one of us who survive should gladly toil on her behalf.

I have dwelt upon the greatness of Athens because I want to show you that we are contending for a higher prize than those who enjoy none of these privileges, and to establish by manifest proof the merit of these men whom I am now commemorating. Their loftiest praise has been already spoken. For in magnifying the city I have magnified them, and men like them whose virtues made her glorious. And of how few Hellenes can it be said as of them, that their deeds when weighed in the balance have been found equal to their fame! Methinks that a death such as theirs has been the true measure of a man's worth; it may be the first revelation of his virtues, but is at any rate their final seal. For even those who come short in other ways may justly plead the valor with which they have fought for their country; they have blotted out the evil with the good, and have benefited the state more by their public services than they have injured her by their private actions. None of these men were enervated by wealth or hesitated to resign the pleasures of life; none of them put off the evil day in the hope, natural to poverty, that a man, though poor, may one day become rich. But, deeming that the punishment of their enemies was sweeter than any
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- Spoken before an audience (or written with that intention), e.g., not a song without a direct audience
- Spoken from man to man or angel to man; not a prayer, nor from God (except for the speeches of Jesus), nor a prophet saying “Thus says the Lord”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Intended audience</th>
<th>Title or quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:23–24</td>
<td>Lamech</td>
<td>His wives</td>
<td>Seventy-sevenfold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:8–9</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>No strife between us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:34–49</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>Laban's family</td>
<td>A wife for Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:27–29</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Be master over your brethren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:39–40</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Esau</td>
<td>You shall break his yoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:5–13</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Rachel and Leah</td>
<td>Flee from Laban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:14–16</td>
<td>Rachel and Leah</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Response to Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:26–30</td>
<td>Laban</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Why did you steal my gods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:36–42</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Laban</td>
<td>What is my trespass?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:8–10</td>
<td>Hamor</td>
<td>Sons of Jacob</td>
<td>Make marriages with us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:14–17</td>
<td>Sons of Jacob</td>
<td>Shechem &amp; Hamor</td>
<td>On one condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:21–23</td>
<td>Hamor</td>
<td>Men of the city</td>
<td>Will not their property be ours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:25–36</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Pharaoh</td>
<td>Let Pharaoh select a wise man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Intended audience</td>
<td>Title or quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:18–34</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Interceding for Benjamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:4–13</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>His brothers</td>
<td>It was not you who sent me here, but God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:18–19</td>
<td>Egyptians</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Why should we die before your eyes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:23–24</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Egyptians</td>
<td>I have bought you and your land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:3–7</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Your two sons shall be mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:1–27</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>His sons</td>
<td>Jacob blesses his sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:21–27</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Elders of Israel</td>
<td>Instituting the Passover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:3–16</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>You shall tell your sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:13–14</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Stand and see the salvation of the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:17–23</td>
<td>Jethro</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Jethro’s advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:4–19</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Children of Israel</td>
<td>Offerings for the tabernacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:30—36:1</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Children of Israel</td>
<td>The LORD has called Bezaleel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:7–9</td>
<td>Joshua &amp; Caleb</td>
<td>Congregation</td>
<td>The LORD is with us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:41–43</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Congregation</td>
<td>Do not go up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:5–11</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Korah and Levites</td>
<td>You take too much upon yourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12–14</td>
<td>Dathan</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>We will not come up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:28–30</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Congregation</td>
<td>If the earth opens its mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:14–17</td>
<td>Messengers</td>
<td>King of Edom</td>
<td>Please let us pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:5–6</td>
<td>Balak</td>
<td>Balaam</td>
<td>Curse this people for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:7–10</td>
<td>Balaam</td>
<td>Balak</td>
<td>First oracle: How shall I curse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:18–24</td>
<td>Balaam</td>
<td>Balak</td>
<td>Second oracle: God is not a man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:3–9</td>
<td>Balaam</td>
<td>Balak</td>
<td>Third oracle: How lovely are your tents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:15–24</td>
<td>Balaam</td>
<td>Balak</td>
<td>Fourth oracle: A star shall rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:15–20</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Officers of the army</td>
<td>Purify yourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:6–15, 20–24</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Trans-Jordan tribes</td>
<td>Be sure your sin will find you out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6—3:29</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Moses reviews their journeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1–40</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>This great nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1—26:19</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>The Ten Commandments expounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:1–8</td>
<td>Moses &amp; elders</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Write on stones the words of this law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:12–26</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Curses from Mt. Ebal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:1–68</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Blessings and curses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:2—30:20</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>This commandment is not far off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:2–6</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>I am 120 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:7–8, 23</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Joshua, Levites</td>
<td>Be strong and courageous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:26–29</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Levites</td>
<td>A witness against you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:1–43</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>The Song of Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:2–29</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Blessing the tribes of Israel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**abusive ad hominem**—the verbal attack of a man’s character as a means of invalidating his argument | 245

**accent**—drawing a fallacious conclusion caused by emphasizing words in a sentence to change the meaning from the original intent | 254, 279

**accident** or **sweeping generalization**—a fallacy committed when a general rule is applied to an exceptional case to which the rule does not apply | 256

**ad baculum**—threatening one’s hearers in order to gain their consent to some position | 246

**ad ignorantiam**—fallaciously arguing that a claim is false because it has not been proven false | 252

**ad populum**—an appeal to the emotions of the masses to win them over to one’s point of view | 244

**ad verecundiam** or **ipse dixit**—an illegitimate appeal to authority, arguing that a claim is true merely because an authority has declared it to be true | 250

**affirmative statement**—a statement that affirms the predicate of the subject | 182, 192

**affirming the consequent**—an invalid mixed hypothetical syllogism of the form if \( p \) then \( q, q, \) therefore \( p \) | 236, 238

**alliteration**—figure of speech that repeats the initial consonant sounds of related or adjacent words | 291

**allusion**—an indirect reference, often a near quote, bringing something familiar to the mind of the audience | 79, 287, 303

**amphiboly**—a fallacious misunderstanding of a sentence due to its unclear grammar | 253

**anadiplosis**—figure of speech that repeats the last word from the end of one clause at the beginning of the next | 294

**anaphora**—figure of speech that repeats a word or group of words at the beginning of successive clauses | 278, 292, 293

**anger**—“an impulse, accompanied by pain, to a conspicuous revenge for a conspicuous slight
directed without justification toward what concerns oneself or toward what concerns one’s friends” | 68, 75, 95, 98, 103, 104, 107, 108, 113, 117, 119, 265, 327

antimetabole—figure of speech that repeats words in reverse grammatical order in successive clauses | 292

antithesis—figure of speech in which contrasting ideas are placed together, often in parallel structure | 17, 289

apostrophe—figure of thought that addresses an absent person or personification | 300

appeal to pity or ad misericordiam—a type of ad populum that provokes pity from one’s hearers to gain consent | 244

argument—a set of statements in which a conclusion either is or appears to be implied by the premise or premises | 2, 46, 51, 59, 67, 86, 125, 144, 163, 169, 178, 181, 186, 191, 196, 201, 209, 217, 229, 243, 261, 273, 285, 301, 324

argument by example—“rhetorical induction” | 209

arrangement—“the ordering and distribution of the matter [of a speech], making clear the place to which each thing is to be assigned” | 2, 31, 45, 51, 59, 67, 73, 261, 273, 278, 309

artificial modes of persuasion—persuasion invented and achieved by the spoken word | 85, 125, 133

assonance—figure of speech that repeats similar vowel sounds in the stressed syllables of adjacent words | 291

asynedeton—figure of speech that deliberately omits conjunctions between clauses | 290

axiom—a self-evident truth that is the starting point of proof | 144, 190

bandwagon fallacy or appeal to the masses—a type of ad populum that appeals to the popularity of a claim as a reason for accepting it, arguing that many people believe something, so it must be true | 145, 244

begging the question or circular reasoning—a fallacy in which the conclusion of an argument is stated or presumed in the premises | 255

biconditional—an “if and only if” statement, which is true when both component parts have the same truth value | 177, 183, 184, 186, 195

Bulverism—a circumstantial ad hominem of the form you are making this claim because you are a… | 245

calmness—“the settling down or quieting of anger” | 103, 104, 113

categorical syllogism—a deductive argument with a conclusion and two premises in categorical form | 217, 219, 222, 226, 235

categorical statement—a statement that connects a subject term with a predicate term, both of which are nouns or noun phrases, by means of a to-be verb | 181, 186, 192, 217, 219

ceremonial oratory or epideictic speech—a speech of praise or censure based upon honor or dishonor | 126, 143, 155, 169

cherry-picking—a fallacy of improper induction which generalizes based on unrepresentative instances | 234, 249

chiasmus—figure of speech that reverses the grammatical structure in successive phrases, clauses, or larger units, but without the repetition of the words | 292

chronological snobbery—a fallacy in which one argues that the ideas of an earlier time are inferior to those of the present time simply because of their age | 247

circumstantial ad hominem—the attempt to invalidate an adversary’s argument by appealing to special circumstances that affect him | 245

clear at a glance—a type of maxim whose truth is immediately evident when stated | 201, 203

climax—figure of speech that arranges successive sets of words in increasing importance | 293, 324

complement of a term—everything not included in the term; ie, the complement of p is non-p | 193

complete proof—an enthymeme based on a valid syllogism | 221
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