

OXFORD
ARISTOTLE
STUDIES

Passions & Persuasion in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*



JAMIE DOW

OXFORD

Passions and Persuasion in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

OXFORD ARISTOTLE STUDIES

General Editors

Julia Annas and Lindsay Judson

ALSO PUBLISHED IN THE SERIES

The Powers of Aristotle's Soul

Thomas Kjeller Johansen

Aristotle on the Apparent Good

Perception, Phantasia, Thought, and Desire

Jessica Moss

**Teleology, First Principles, and Scientific
Method in Aristotle's Biology**

Allan Gotthelf

Priority in Aristotle's Metaphysics

Michail Peramatzis

Doing and Being

An Interpretation of Aristotle's Metaphysics Theta

Jonathan Beere

Space, Time, Matter, and Form

Essays on Aristotle's Physics

David Bostock

Aristotle on Meaning and Essence

David Charles

Time for Aristotle

Ursula Coope

Aristotle on Teleology

Monte Ransome Johnson

On Location

Aristotle's Concepts of Place

Benjamin Morison

Order in Multiplicity

Homonymy in the Philosophy of Aristotle

Christopher Shields

Aristotle's Theory of Substance

The Categories and Metaphysics Zeta

Michael V. Wedin

Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*

Contradiction and Dialectic

C. W. A. Whitaker

How Aristotle gets by in *Metaphysics Zeta*

Frank A. Lewis

Passions and Persuasion in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

Jamie Dow

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Jamie Dow 2015

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2015

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014947488

ISBN 978-0-19-871626-6

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

*For Hazel, my lifelong companion in learning
about the emotions.*

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
Introduction	1
Part 1	
1. Rhetoric and the State—Aristotle and His Predecessors	9
2. Proof-reading Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i>	34
3. Rhetoric and the State	64
4. Aristotle against His Rivals	76
5. The Interpretation of Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i>	85
Part 2	
6. How Can Emotion-Arousal Provide Proof?	95
7. A Supposed Contradiction about Emotion-Arousal in Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i>	107
Part 3	
8. The Passions in Aristotle's <i>Rhetoric</i>	131
9. Aristotle's Theory of the Passions—Passions as Pleasures and Pains	145
10. Feeling Fantastic Again—Passions, Appearances, and Beliefs in Aristotle	182
Conclusions	226
<i>Bibliography</i>	229
<i>Index Locorum</i>	237
<i>General Index</i>	244

Acknowledgements

This project has been in gestation for such a long time that it has been improved, challenged, supported, and affected by a very large number of people. I hope it is not invidious, and perhaps it is merely stating the obvious, to say that its greatest debt is to Sarah Broadie. Under her guidance and encouragement, a rather haphazard and disparate doctoral project coalesced into something much more interesting and rich, and this work is a distant descendant of that work. I am extremely grateful to her for her continued encouragement, support, and challenge. She is not alone in having offered warm, vigorous, and sustained encouragement in the project of bringing this book to publication. I would like in that regard to offer particular thanks to Myles Burnyeat, Stephen Halliwell, and Chris Megone. Intellectually, I have benefited hugely from many discussions of the issues tackled in this book and would like to express my thanks for these to those already named, and to George Boys-Stones, Roger Brock, Amber Carpenter, Luca Castagnoli, Victor Caston, Tim Chappell, Peter Goldie, Verity Harte, Antony Hatzistavrou, Malcolm Heath, Phil Horky, Terry Irwin, Rachana Kamtekar, Rob Lawlor, Fiona Leigh, M. M. McCabe, Jessica Moss, Anthony Price, Ed Sanders, David Sedley, Robbie Williams, Adrian Wilson, and to the excellent anonymous referees for Oxford University Press. I would like to record specifically my appreciation of Jessica Moss for the friendly but persistent challenge she has made to my thinking about these issues. Socrates-like, she has been found pursuing me in the marketplace and ‘did not let me go’ (*Ap* 29e4) until she had submitted my views to testing, and irritatingly often rid me of the false pretence to true belief. I am grateful to the AHRC, the Royal Institute of Philosophy, and the University of Leeds for funded research time to develop this project, and to Peter Momtchiloff and the series editors for their patience and perseverance in bringing this through to publication. It has been a long road, and I am grateful to Hazel, Callum, and Rachel, to my parents, Graham and Molly Dow, and to others in my wider family, for their support and encouragement, even when sometimes the great fascination of the

work of long-dead philosophers seems a mystery to them. Above all, I am grateful to the Lord for a life enriched by (but not confined to) spending my working hours in philosophical reflection, research, and teaching.

Some of the material in this book has been published elsewhere. I thank the publishers and editors for their permission to reproduce it here. Parts of Chapters 1–4 reuse material published as ‘Aristotle on the Centrality of Proof to Rhetoric’, *Logique et Analyse*, 53/210 (2010), 101–30. Much of Chapter 2 appeared as ‘Proof-reading Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*’, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 96.1 (2014), 1–37. A version of Chapter 7 appeared as ‘A supposed contradiction about emotion-arousal in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*’, *Phronesis* 52.4 (2007), 382–402. Much of Chapter 9 appeared as ‘Aristotle’s Theory of the Emotions’, in M. Pakaluk and G. Pearson (eds), *Moral Psychology and Human Action in Aristotle*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (2011), 47–74. Various parts of Chapter 10 reuse material from ‘Feeling Fantastic—Emotions and Appearances in Aristotle’, *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, vol. XXXVII (winter 2009), 143–75; and from ‘Feeling Fantastic Again—Passions, Appearances and Beliefs in Aristotle’, *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, vol. XLVI (summer 2014), 213–51.

Introduction

[S]ome interpretations of norms of deliberation privilege speech which is dispassionate and disembodied. Defences of these norms tend to presuppose an opposition between reason and emotion. They tend falsely to identify objectivity with calm and the absence of emotional expression. . . . The privileging of allegedly dispassionate speech styles, . . . often correlates with other differences of social privilege. The speech culture of white, middle-class men tends to be more controlled, without significant gesture and expression or emotion. The speech culture of women, racialized or ethnicized minorities, and working-class people, on the other hand, often is, or is perceived to be, more excited and embodied, values more the expression of emotion, uses figurative language, modulates tones of voice, and gestures widely.

Iris Marion Young, *Inclusion and Democracy*
(OUP, 2000) 39–40.

Principal Claims of the Book

The principal claim defended in this book is that, for Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*, arousing the passions of others can amount to giving them proper grounds for conviction, and hence a skill in doing so is properly part of an expertise in rhetoric.

This claim rests on two principal foundations. First, it involves defending the attribution to Aristotle of a normative view of rhetoric, centred around its role in the state, in which rhetoric is a skill in producing proper grounds for conviction. If the arousal of the passions is part of rhetoric, thus understood, Aristotle must hold, second, a particular view of the passions: he must think they are representational states, in which the subject takes things to be the way they are represented.

Accordingly, the book defends a distinctive fresh interpretation of Aristotle's views on rhetoric (Part 1), sets out some key components of

his understanding of the passions (Part 3), defending these against rival interpretations, and undertakes to resolve an apparent contradiction in Aristotle's views about whether arousing others' emotions could be an exercise of rhetorical expertise (Part 2).

The Significance of the Conclusions

The overall conclusion about the role of emotions in rhetoric carries significance beyond its importance in accurately representing Aristotle's views. The reasoning that lies behind Aristotle's inclusion of emotion-arousal among the methods of rhetoric, if sound, seems to support a similar conclusion for our own day. That is, Aristotle offers a justification for those who consider emotions and their arousal to have a legitimate and important place in public reason, political debate, legal argument, advertising, and public discourse quite generally. And it offers a basis on which to resist the view that public discourse should be kept free from emotion (supposing that were possible). Part of the importance of this issue lies, as feminist thinkers have emphasized,¹ in the way in which the latter point of view can serve to privilege the contributions of men over those of women in public discourse, or those of some cultures over those of others, or indeed those of the educated over those of the working class.

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is the first and most influential treatise on rhetoric in Western civilization. His ideology of it—frequently misunderstood—is therefore worth identifying correctly.

The conclusions on rhetoric are important for some further reasons. First, in Aristotle studies, they highlight that we should not look to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* to give us anything that might be described as an 'ethics of rhetoric'—the endeavour to find such a thing in this work has generally produced disappointing results. However, once it is understood that Aristotle is interested in rhetoric insofar as it is an expertise that is worth valuing in the state, and worth cultivating in ourselves and others, the significance of Aristotle's arguments about the nature of rhetoric comes better into focus. Those interested in questions about what kinds of contribution to public debate and deliberation should be encouraged, or about what kinds of expertise it is important for civic leaders to

¹ E.g. Young (2000), Ahmed (2004), and Zerilli (2005).

cultivate, even about how we should educate the young with a view to their contribution to public life, could profit from attending to Aristotle's arguments about the nature and importance of rhetoric, and its place in the state. Although this cannot amount to a fully developed ethics of public speaking, it does have interesting implications for the use of political 'spin' and propaganda, on the techniques of advocacy, and even on methods of advertising.²

The conclusions about the passions are of interest for two very simple but important reasons. First, identifying correctly Aristotle's understanding of the passions is an issue of considerable interest in ancient philosophy—partly in its own right, and partly for its implications for other aspects of Aristotle's thought, notably his moral psychology. Second, as interpreted here, Aristotle's views on the passions are in most respects highly plausible and deserve serious consideration alongside theories of emotion developed more recently. Some consideration is given to such comparisons in Chapters 9 and 10.

Synopsis

Part 1, then, defends a distinctive interpretation of Aristotle's views on rhetoric. Aristotle's view, I argue, is that rhetoric is exercised solely in the provision of proper grounds for conviction (*pisteis*). This view contrasts as sharply with how rhetoric was understood by his predecessors as it does with what we take 'rhetoric' to refer to today. I show how he defends this surprising and controversial view by appeal to a more widely shared and plausible view of rhetoric's role in the proper functioning of the state. I then explore in more detail what normative standards must be met for something to qualify as 'proper grounds for conviction', applying this to all three of Aristotle's kinds of 'technical proofs' (*entechnoi pisteis*)—proofs using arguments, proofs from the character of the speaker, and proofs involving the passions of the listeners. This interpretation of the *Rhetoric* marks a significant change from the approach adopted by many interpreters since the late Middle Ages, who have seen the treatise either as a kind of guide to virtuous conduct in the arena of public speaking (how to be Cato's '*vir bonus dicendi peritus*'), or as

² I have tried to develop some of these implications in Dow (2013).

offering a view of rhetoric completely free from internal normative constraints—a neutral tool with no tendency to good or ill. By contrast, I champion an interpretation that particularly highlights the logical and epistemological features of rhetoric, the very features that most interested the ancient, Arabic, and early medieval commentators.

Part 2 highlights two challenges that face the inclusion of emotion-arousal within the set of genuine techniques of Aristotelian rhetoric. One is the issue of how arousing audience passions can be a way of producing proper grounds for conviction. This is answered by supposing that passions can constitute the reasonable acceptance of premises in arguments that count in favour of the speaker's conclusion. However, this presents an interesting constraint on Aristotle's understanding of the passions themselves. For it requires that the passions constitute some kind of 'acceptance' of something that can serve as a premise in an argument. Aristotle must, I argue, hold that the passions involve representational content, and that having a passion is a way of taking things to be the way they are represented. The second challenge is a problem of finding a consistent interpretation of the evidence we have in the *Rhetoric*: on the face of things, Aristotle both denies that the arousal of the passions can have any role among the techniques of rhetorical expertise, and also asserts that arousing the passions is one of three kinds of technical proof that collectively make up the expertise. I argue for a resolution of this apparent contradiction, upholding the latter assertion, and offering an alternative explanation of the texts that appear to favour his denial of a role for emotion-arousal within rhetoric.³ Resolving this latter problem clears the way for an interpretation of Aristotle's view of the passions, particularly in the *Rhetoric*, that is consistent with supposing that arousing the passions could be a way to provide proper grounds for conviction.

³ It is not part of this project to argue for or against the unity of the *Rhetoric*, or to try to reach a verdict on the various developmental and redaction hypotheses that have been proposed. I simply assume the unity of the *Rhetoric* as a working hypothesis. However, a significant motivation for denying unity has been the apparent difficulties in finding a consistent treatment of emotion-arousal throughout the treatise, and indeed in finding a consistent treatment of the norms that apply to rhetoric generally. If it can be shown that Aristotle has a coherent position maintained without inconsistency throughout the *Rhetoric*, this motivation for denying its unity is removed.

Part 3 starts from this challenge and defends an interpretation of Aristotle's understanding of the passions. Aristotle accommodates the representational aspect of the passions within a substantive theory of the emotions as pleasures and pains. Such a view constitutes the most plausible understanding of Aristotle's detailed accounts of the passions in *Rhetoric* 2, and is compatible with a new representationalist reading of his account of pleasure (and pain) in *Rhetoric* 1.11. In common with a number of recent interpreters, I argue that for Aristotle the representational aspect of the passions consists in the exercise of a psychological capacity he calls *phantasia*. In contrast to many of these interpreters, however, I reject the view of *Rhetoric* 2.2–11 on which, for Aristotle, the distinctive outlook involved in passionate states is (or can be) how things merely 'appear' to the subject. This is important, because if the passions themselves involve no affirmation of their representational content, it is hard to see how such a state could provide proper grounds for conviction of anything else. That is, it is hard on that view to see how arousing the passions could be a technical proof, part of the expertise of rhetoric. By contrast, I argue that for Aristotle the passions involve an exercise of *phantasia* whose representational contents are (at least to some degree) taken to be the way things actually are.

PART 1

1

Rhetoric and the State— Aristotle and His Predecessors

Not only does the aspiring orator have an *obligation* to be a good man, but unless he is a good man he will not even get to *be* an orator.

(Quintillian, *Institutio Oratoria* XII.1)

MENDACIOUS, adj. Addicted to rhetoric.

(Ambrose Bierce, from *The Devil's Dictionary*)

Sophistications of theory cannot obscure the truth that there are but three ways for language to affect us. It can move us toward what is good; it can move us toward what is evil; or it can, in hypothetical third place, fail to move us at all. . . . [A]ny utterance is a major assumption of responsibility.

(Richard M. Weaver, *The Ethics of Rhetoric*)

This part of the book defends a particular understanding of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. The central claims are that in this work, Aristotle has a consistent view of rhetoric: as an expertise in producing 'proofs' (*pisteis*)—understood as 'proper grounds for conviction'—for the speaker's audience, and that he first states and defends this view, and then sets out in detail the elements of rhetoric thus defined. This normative view of rhetoric derives, I claim, from Aristotle's view that rhetoric was a skill in discharging an important role in the state—namely a role contributing towards good judgements in law courts and political assemblies. Aristotle is here seen as standing in opposition primarily to more mechanical, non-normative views of rhetoric, seen most clearly in Gorgias and Thrasymachus among his near-contemporaries, and characteristic of

the handbooks on rhetoric circulating in Aristotle's day.¹ But equally, he rejects more 'high-minded' accounts of rhetoric, such as the suggestion in Plato's *Phaedrus* that the speaker exercising rhetorical expertise must know the truth about his subject matter so as to be able to ensure that the conviction he brings about in listeners be true (or, if he chooses, false).

Defending the proposed interpretation involves rejecting several rival views of the *Rhetoric*. Aristotle's view of rhetoric is not value-neutral, as some have thought. And yet, the normative element in his account of rhetoric is limited. Thus, on the interpretation defended here, we should not look to the *Rhetoric*—as some have—to provide an 'ethics of rhetoric', that is, an account of how rhetoric ought (virtuously) to be exercised. Nevertheless, the *Rhetoric* does express Aristotle's view of why rhetoric is an expertise valuable to the state and worth cultivating in individuals. Moreover, since his view is that rhetoric is a skill in providing *proper* grounds for conviction, the use of some manipulative speaking techniques (including some championed by, for example, Thrasymachus) will not count as exercising rhetoric at all.

The present chapter sets out some important background to the *Rhetoric*, in the rival views of rhetoric taken on the one hand by Gorgias and Thrasymachus and the handbook writers that followed them, and on the other by the Socrates of Plato's *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*. Then, in Chapters 2 and 3, I set out from the text of the *Rhetoric* an account of Aristotle's position, and how he sought to defend it. Chapter 2 defends the proposed attribution to Aristotle of a normative account of rhetoric, defined in terms of 'proof' and the understanding of this key term (Gk. *pistis*) as '*proper* grounds for conviction'. Chapter 3 further argues that in *Rhetoric* 1.1 Aristotle's understanding of rhetoric is not only asserted (and deployed against rival views), but defended on the basis of rhetoric's role in the state. Chapter 4 explores the merits of Aristotle's view over its rivals. Understanding rhetoric as an expertise in discharging an important role in public life arguably allows Aristotle to account for the value of rhetoric more convincingly than is possible on Thrasymachus's and Gorgias's view, but without being committed to the impossibly idealized picture of rhetoric set out in Plato's *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*. The same chapter canvasses the wider merits of the view of rhetoric being

¹ Cf. *Rhet* 1.1, 1354a11–13, Dow (2007, pp. 391–6), and Chapters 2 and 9.

attributed to Aristotle, and offers some reflections on the significance of his position for understanding speech-making expertise and practice in any era. Chapter 5 considers the merits of this interpretation of the *Rhetoric* over other possible interpretations, broadly vindicating the way in which the treatise was read by ancient commentators, Arab philosophers, and early medieval readers, over the more ‘ethical’ readings of the treatise that have dominated its interpretation since around the time of Aquinas. That is, I defend an interpretation of the work that sees its most important claims as logical and epistemological rather than ethical.

1.1 The Background to Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* on Rhetoric

The remaining sections of the chapter set out first, the non-normative views of rhetoric held by Gorgias, Thrasy Machus, and the writers of handbooks on speaking (*technai logôn*), and second, the criticisms of this kind of view and the more stringent requirements for an art of rhetoric found in Plato’s dialogues *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*.

It is above all in relation to these three thinkers, and those subscribing to their views, that Aristotle seeks to position his own account of rhetoric, in the chapters (particularly sections 1.1–3, 2.1, and 3.1) in which he argues for the key structural elements of that account. Whilst, in the treatise as a whole, Aristotle shows awareness of some other theorists and practitioners of rhetoric, he does not seem to have them in view when he argues for his general position. It is clear from the discussion in Plato’s *Phaedrus*, from Aristotle’s summary of previous writers on rhetoric in *De Sophisticis Elenchis* 34, and from references in the *Rhetoric* itself, that there were a number of thinkers and practitioners regarded in the Academy, and in some cases by Aristotle himself, as having made a significant contribution to rhetoric. But in most cases, he either confines his engagement with their views to certain very specific topics, or he does not (as far as we can tell) engage with their views at all. Prodicus of Ceos, Hippias of Elis, Protagoras, Zeno, and Evenus of Paros, though mentioned in the *Phaedrus* for their contribution to the expertise, are mentioned only in passing or, in Evenus’ case, not at all in the *Rhetoric*. Licymnius of Chios is mentioned only in connection with *lexis* and—as

he is in the *Phaedrus*—for his terminology in designating parts of the speech.² Theodorus of Byzantium is also mentioned, again matching the *Phaedrus*, in connection with terminology for parts of the speech,³ and once in relation to the use of striking linguistic neologisms;⁴ but in a third reference to him, there is the oblique implication that he made a significant wider contribution to the understanding of rhetoric.⁵ This matches the significance attributed to him in *SE* 34, where he is represented as one of the pioneers of rhetoric, alongside Tisias and Thrasyarchus. This said, our evidence of his views on rhetoric hardly extends beyond these references, and we therefore have scant basis for linking him to Aristotle's arguments in, for example, the opening chapters of the *Rhetoric*. Curiously, Tisias is not mentioned in the *Rhetoric* at all, unless Aristotle takes Corax to be Tisias, in which case he is mentioned once in the context of fallacies related to the improper use of 'eikos'.⁶ There are a number of references to Theodectes in the *Rhetoric*, mostly quotations from his plays, but also some examples of arguments he used.⁷ Aristotle refers at 1410b2 to a work called *Theodekteia*, which catalogued ways of composing the opening of periods. The work is often, not implausibly, taken to be Aristotle's own work, though this goes beyond what we have in the text. It may be the same work as the 'Collection of the "Art" by Theodectes' that appears in Diogenes Laertius' catalogue of Aristotle's work.⁸ If Aristotle wrote one or more works about Theodectes, he must have considered his work (on style? on types of argument?) of significant interest, but we do not have enough evidence to support the view that Aristotle was in the *Rhetoric* seeking to position the main features of his account of rhetoric in relation to the views of Theodectes. Similarly, there is no evidence that Aristotle was seeking to position his own views in relation to those of Polus. This is perhaps surprising, since *Phaedrus* 267b10–c3 implies that he wrote a theoretical work on rhetoric, and he has obvious prominence in Plato's *Gorgias*. Still, his name is mentioned only once in the *Rhetoric*, in connection not with his views on rhetoric, but with a pun on his name.⁹ Likewise, Isocrates is mentioned

² 3.2, 1405b6–8, 3.12, 1413b12–14, 3.13, 1414b16–18.

³ 3.13, 1414b12–15. ⁴ 3.11, 1412a25.

⁵ 2.23, 1400b14–16. ⁶ 2.24, 1402a17.

⁷ 2.23, 1397b2–7, 1398b5–9, 1399a7–9, b1–4, 28–30, 1400a27–9; 2.24, 1401a35–b2.

⁸ Diogenes Laertius 5.24.25.

⁹ 2.23, 1400b21. The pun is similar to that made at *Gorgias* 463e2.

by Aristotle a dozen times in the *Rhetoric*,¹⁰ but in these, the focus is clearly on Isocrates' output as an orator or writer, and in no case do we get any hint that Isocrates has what Aristotle would regard as a rival view of rhetoric to offer, or that he put forward views that Aristotle needs to address in setting out his own account of the expertise. This is, of course, strange given that we have what purports to be a systematic account of rhetoric set out in Isocrates' extant works, particularly *Against the Sophists* and *Antidosis* (though, of course, Isocrates himself calls it 'philosophy').¹¹ Nevertheless, Aristotle does not make any attempt to address these in setting out his own account in the *Rhetoric*.¹²

By contrast, I believe a good case can be made that Aristotle engages with the views of Gorgias, Thrasyarchus, and those expressed in the Platonic dialogues *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*. So it is to these that I now turn.

1.2 Gorgias, Thrasyarchus, and the Handbook Writers

Aristotle's view, I claim, is that a speaker exercises an expertise in rhetoric only when he provides his audience with some *good* grounds on which to be convinced. This is, I suggest, rather a surprising view. Whereas, for Aristotle, the person who brings his audience round to his point of view by a series of verbal tricks, body language, tone of voice, and the like, without providing any good grounds for conviction, has not exercised rhetorical skill at all, to us, such a case might seem a paradigmatic exercise of rhetoric.¹³ It is perfectly possible to give an account of

¹⁰ 1.9, 1368a19–21; 2.19, 1392b11–13; 2.23, 1399a1–6, b8–11; 3.7, 1408b15–16; 3.10, 1411a30–1; 3.11, 1412b5–6; 3.14, 1414b26–8, 33–5; 3.17, 1418a29–32, 32–4, b27.

¹¹ It might seem strange also because of the prominence given to Isocrates' ability in rhetoric at the end of the *Phaedrus* (279a). But the latter passage is not unequivocal in this regard: it highlights Isocrates' proficiency as a speaker, not his contribution to rhetorical theory; and it suggests that a more divine impulse will take Isocrates beyond rhetoric towards philosophy.

¹² M. M. McCabe (1994) makes the case for finding Aristotle engaging with Isocrates' views in the opening chapters of the *Rhetoric*, but the evidence cited seems to me far from convincing. The passage one might consider to be the best candidate for an allusion to Isocrates' views is 1.2, 1356a27–30, where Aristotle refers to those who practice rhetoric in place of politics. But again, this is, I think, better taken as a reference to the kind of view held by Thrasyarchus and Gorgias, and championed by the characters Gorgias, Polus, and Callicles in Plato's *Gorgias*.

¹³ See, for instance, OED *v. sub* 'rhetoric' 2.b, *sub* 'rhetorical' 1.b, *sub* 'rhetorician' 2.b.

what rhetoric is without reference to *good* or *proper* grounds for conviction, indeed without using any normative concepts at all. Rhetoric is a skill for using speech to get your listeners to agree with you and do what you want them to do. Defined thus, any use of speech that systematically has the desired effect will be an exercise of the art of rhetoric, a successful rhetorical technique. That Aristotle is not content to define rhetoric in this simple intuitive way is significant. The significance of his view and the ways in which he presents and argues for it will be seen best against the background of Gorgias' and Thrasymachus' views on rhetoric. Both of these seem to have held a non-normative view of rhetoric similar to the one just outlined. They were among the biggest names among theorists of rhetoric in Aristotle's day, and there are good reasons to suppose that they are prominent targets of Aristotle's arguments early on in the *Rhetoric*.

These excerpts from Gorgias's *Encomium of Helen* represent perhaps the most celebrated expression of his position.

But if it was speech which persuaded her and deceived her heart, not even to this is it difficult to make an answer and to banish blame as follows. Speech is a powerful lord, which by means of the finest and most invisible body effects the divinest works: it can stop fear and banish grief and create joy and nurture pity. I shall show how this is the case, since it is necessary to offer proof to the opinion of my hearers: I both deem and define all poetry as speech with meter. Fearful shuddering and tearful pity and grievous longing come upon its hearers, and at the actions and physical sufferings of others in good fortunes and in evil fortunes, through the agency of words, the soul is wont to experience a suffering of its own. But come, I shall turn from one argument to another. Sacred incantations sung with words are bearers of pleasure and banishers of pain, for, merging with opinion in the soul, the power of the incantation is wont to beguile it and persuade it and alter it by witchcraft. . . . What cause then prevents the conclusion that Helen similarly, against her will, might have come under the influence of speech, just as if ravished by the force of the mighty? For it was possible to see how the force of persuasion prevails; persuasion has the form of necessity, but it does not have the same power. For speech constrained the soul, persuading it which it persuaded, both to believe the things said and to approve the things done. The persuader, like a constrainer, does the wrong and the persuaded, like the constrained, in speech is wrongly charged. To understand that persuasion, when added to speech, is wont also to impress the soul as it wishes, one must study: first, the words of astronomers who, substituting opinion for opinion, taking away one but creating another, make what is incredible and unclear seem true to the eyes of opinion; then, second, logically necessary debates in which a single speech, written with art but not spoken with truth, bends a great crowd and

persuades; and, third, the verbal disputes of philosophers in which the swiftness of thought is also shown making the belief in an opinion subject to easy change. The effect of speech upon the condition of the soul is comparable to the power of drugs over the nature of bodies. For just as different drugs dispel different secretions from the body, and some bring an end to disease and others to life, so also in the case of speeches, some distress, others delight, some cause fear, others make the hearers bold, and some drug and bewitch the soul with a kind of evil persuasion.¹⁴

To describe the power of speech, Gorgias uses metaphors involving magic spells and potions, exercises of political power, the use of physical strength to coerce others, and the use of drugs in medicine. Thrasy-machus uses similar images in portraying rhetoric as a powerful force. The physical force image appears in the reported title of one of his works on rhetoric: 'Knockdown Speeches' (*Υπερβάλλοντες Λόγοι*),¹⁵ casting the power of rhetoric in a forensic or political contest as akin to that of a wrestler. Likewise, in Plato's *Phaedrus*, Thrasy-machus is described as a great expert in calming the anger of a crowd, using terminology—'charming them with spells'—that is explicitly attributed to Thrasy-machus himself (*Phaedr.* 267d1). This can be considered alongside the picture of Thrasy-machus from Plato's *Republic* I, where his view of 'justice' is as a tool by which the powerful exercise their power over the weak.¹⁶ It fits nicely with that view to think that rhetoric was another such tool for exercising power. The power of rhetoric (or of speech, *logos*) is comparable to any other force acting powerfully on its objects, whether those objects are listeners (in the spells imagery, you spellbind your audience) or whether they are your opponents whom you overpower when your words rob them of the allegiance of listeners (in the wrestling imagery, you throw your opponent).

There is thus a good *prima facie* case that Gorgias, Thrasy-machus, and others took the view that rhetoric is to be understood simply as a force, with no particular tendency of its own to good or ill, that one can harness to one's own designs.¹⁷ On closer inspection, however, the issue is more complex. Some images, such as the wrestling image, in which one exerts

¹⁴ Gorgias, *Helen*, translation from Sprague (1972).

¹⁵ Thrasy-machus DK 85B7.

¹⁶ Here I follow Chappell (1993, 2000), *pace* Everson (1998).

¹⁷ Gorgias is of course represented by Plato as holding just such a view in the *Gorgias*, e.g. 456a7–457c4.

the power of rhetoric *against those who are arguing for a different point of view*, do not imply a non-normative conception of rhetoric.¹⁸ This is because the image does not even purport to characterize the relationship between orator and listener. Images of this kind characterize the interplay between the disputing parties, and it seems perfectly natural to characterize in the language of physical force or violence the effect on one's opponent of arguments that (even *properly*) count decisively in the eyes of others in favour of your case. An argument can be in that sense devastating, inexorable, irresistible, powerful, or 'knockdown'.

The language of spells and magic, however, is more disturbing. Imagery of this kind purports to characterize the way the orator's speech works in affecting the audience. Part of the point of such imagery, especially as part of Gorgias's display of the power possessed by the skills he offers to convey, is that they operate on people regardless of their resistance. Just as a spell is supposed to bind someone and bring about change irresistibly, perhaps without its object even knowing, so an orator—Gorgias claims—is able to spellbind his audience.¹⁹ The *Helen* concludes with the revelation that although it purportedly aimed at improving the listener's opinion of Helen ('Ελένης μὲν ἐγκώμιον'),²⁰ it has in reality all been an exercise in amusement for Gorgias himself (ἐμὸν δὲ παίγνιον). We are pawns in Gorgias's hand, and rhetorical skill is his means of exercising power over us. I see no reason to suppose, as Robert Wardy does, that Gorgias is here hinting that our enjoyment of this exercise shows our complicity in deception, or our consent to Gorgias's exercise of power over us.²¹ If that were so, Gorgias would have landed us in a strange state indeed—aware that we have been deceived, aware that we have had a hand in our own deception, and yet still persuaded. It is questionable whether such a state is possible,²² and doubtful whether this was part of what Gorgias intended here. On Wardy's suggestion, the

¹⁸ Aristotle himself compares the power of speech to physical strength at *Rhetoric* 1.1, 1355a38–b1.

¹⁹ This, I take it, is part of the implication of the suggestion made in Plato's *Meno* (80b4–7) that Socrates might be mistaken for a sorcerer because of his ability to dislodge others' confidence that they possess knowledge, despite their resistance.

²⁰ Isocrates observed that it was really an *apologia* not an encomium (*Helen* 14). Thanks to Malcolm Heath for this reference.

²¹ Wardy (1998, p. 37).

²² It would come close to the kind of self-deception whose possibility was plausibly denied in Williams (1973).

reader has been foolishly complicit in consenting to Gorgias's deception, and might be expected to reproach himself for this in retrospect. But this reading surely distorts Gorgias's point. The speech is epideictic and the reader assesses it as such—their verdict about Helen is not what principally matters here. It is rather Gorgias himself that the reader is assessing. The reader does this precisely by *refusing* his consent to be deceived, and assessing how well Gorgias can fare in advancing his case. The speech's success then consists in our feeling the force of the case in Helen's favour, being unable to see how to answer it, and yet realizing that something is amiss in the exoneration of Greece's most famous adulteress.²³ The point is that the piece has exercised over us the very kind of power that forms such a theme in the speech itself. And it has done so flagrantly: even when the speech is parading the fact that it is being used to wield power over its listeners, we are powerless to resist. No matter how little consent or complicity we offered, or how forearmed against Gorgias's wiles we were, we were overpowered. In fact, this is a central point of the speech. The very choice of subject matter tells us that what is being defended is indefensible, the emphasis on exercises of power by the use of speech is prominent throughout, and in case it were not obvious, at the end we are told explicitly that Gorgias is not in earnest and is relishing his sway over us. Yet, even with all these reasons for epistemic caution right in the foreground, we still find ourselves beguiled. So almost the reverse of Wardy's claim is true—Gorgias's speech has its way with us even when we consider ourselves to have most reason to resist. Gorgias's skills have the power to make the weaker case appear the stronger, even when the audience knows that this is what is happening. So much, at least, is Gorgias's provocative claim.²⁴

This fits with Gorgias's assimilation (well charted by Wardy) of philosophical argument to political demagoguery, and to witchcraft and magic spells.²⁵ All are ways of using speech to exercise power over

²³ Cf. Griffin (1980): 'the archetype of deceitful wives', 78; 'a legendary figure . . . for her guilt and suffering', 97–8.

²⁴ It would require much more from Gorgias to show that his techniques actually *have* the power to get people to form beliefs against what they consider to be the balance of reasons to believe. All he actually succeeds in showing is that beliefs can be 'compelled' even in circumstances in which a listener takes himself to have some substantial reason(s) not to believe.

²⁵ Cf. also De Romilly (1975).

others, and represent processes in which—if they are executed skilfully—the listener is powerless to resist. Perhaps on their own, these power images might simply be a metaphor for the fact that one-way-or-another speech influences people—something that at that level of generality nobody would deny. Within a larger picture of Gorgias's views, however, it seems these kinds of imagery have a much more specific use, as expressing a view of rhetoric in which the expertise does not in any way depend on whether or not what is communicated in speech represents good reasons for conviction. Indeed even the making of such a distinction by philosophers is cast as merely their device for exercising power over others.

If this is correct about how Thrasyarchus and Gorgias use imagery of spells (and other kinds of power), it is clear how sharply it differs from the view of rhetoric that we are here attributing to Aristotle. For Aristotle, the sense in which rhetorical expertise gives the orator power over listeners is that it gives him an ability to show them that *by their own lights* they do well to be convinced. The power he has is limited by the extent to which he can show them this.

Thus, at one level, Aristotle will have no objection to the use of comparisons with wrestling and physical force. In defending the usefulness of rhetoric at 1355a19–b7, he argues *a fortiori* from the acceptability of being able to 'defend yourself' with bodily force to the acceptability of doing so with argument. But at another, these metaphors are used by Gorgias and Thrasyarchus to express a conception of rhetoric that is very much at odds with Aristotle's. On his view, rhetoric is an ability to influence listeners by producing in speech things that *should*²⁶ bring about conviction in them. On theirs, rhetoric is an ability to influence listeners by producing in speech things—indeed *anything*—that *actually will* bring about conviction in them.

There is good reason to suppose that Gorgias and Thrasyarchus are the major figures in the tradition of writing 'Arts of Rhetoric' (*technai logôn*) that Aristotle is opposing in the programmatic passages of argument at the start of the *Rhetoric*. They were clearly among his most influential predecessors in this field.²⁷ In Aristotle's summary of previous

²⁶ The exact character of this 'should' will be clarified in Chapter 2.

²⁷ This is further confirmed by their prominence in Plato's references to theorists of rhetoric in the *Gorgias* and the *Phaedrus*.

theorists at *De Sophisticis Elenchis* 34.184a, Thrasyarchus is named as a key figure alongside Tisias and Theodorus,²⁸ and Gorgias is mentioned shortly afterwards as someone who *purported* to teach the art of rhetoric but in fact merely imparted the products of the art. Additionally, Aristotle's reference to 'slander, pity and anger' at 1354a16f. in one of his key opening arguments is arguably intended to identify Thrasyarchus as his target.²⁹ Aristotle's opening arguments in the *Rhetoric* may be intended as criticisms of others besides Thrasyarchus and Gorgias,³⁰ but these are certainly the most prominent proponents of the views he is criticizing.

1.3 Plato

The views just described come in for heavy criticism in Plato's dialogues, particularly *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*. This criticism, as well as constituting a rejection of the views on rhetoric of Gorgias, Thrasyarchus, and others, also itself expresses a positive and extremely stringent view of what would be required if something is to count as a genuine expertise (*technê*) of rhetoric. A full account of Plato's treatment of rhetoric cannot be attempted here; it will be enough to indicate the principal lines of argument used against Gorgias and against handbook writers in the tradition of Thrasyarchus. I focus here on the Platonic insistence on knowledge of how the art's methods are applied to achieve its results, the requirement that the expert practitioner know the truth about their subject matter, and the incorporation into the account of the expertise the specification that its deployment be in the pursuit of appropriate goals. These will then provide the basis for a fruitful comparison with Aristotle's views.

In the *Gorgias* (462b–c), Socrates famously suggested that rhetoric was merely a knack (*empeiria*), and not an expertise (*technê*) at all. His central argument in support of this denial was as follows:

²⁸ The latter are unlikely to be Aristotle's principal targets at the start of the *Rhetoric*, Tisias because he could hardly be described as one who 'these days' (*vñv* 1354a11) is putting together an 'art of speaking', Theodorus because he is mentioned by Plato and Aristotle principally in the context of his complex terminology for sections of a speech (cf. Plato *Phaedrus* 266e–267a; *Rhetoric* 3.13, 1414b13–15).

²⁹ The case for this is argued in greater detail in Dow (2007) and Chapter 7.

³⁰ Plato is clearly in view at 1354a1–11, 1355a14–18, and 1356a27–30. As already discussed, there is no obvious evidence of a dialectic with Isocrates, on the nature and core constituents of rhetoric. Cf. Ross (1959, p. 206) (*index auctorum*, sub 'Isocrates'); Haskins (2004).

And I say that it isn't a craft (*technê*), but a knack (*empeiria*), because it has no account of the nature of whatever things it applies (*prospherei*) by which it applies them, so that it's unable to state the cause of each thing. And I refuse to call anything that lacks such an account a craft. (465a2–6)³¹

The objection is based plausibly on the view that having a *technê* includes understanding relevant techniques and how they achieve their results, so that its possessor can achieve non-accidental success in producing some particular result. It may well be an apt criticism of Gorgias and Thrasymachus that they offered little by way of an account of how their techniques worked, and hence of the basis on which one selects one technique rather than another.³² Nevertheless, there seems nothing here to preclude the possibility of their supplying for the array of techniques they called 'rhetoric' an account of how they produced the effects they did, and hence why one might select one or another of these techniques on any given occasion. The addition of such an account would, it seems, be enough to enable Gorgias' and Thrasymachus' approach to speech-making to evade disqualification from being a *technê*, at least on these grounds.³³

It becomes clear what Socrates has in mind, when one considers the accounts sketched in both the *Gorgias* and the *Phaedrus* of a kind of rhetoric that would qualify as a genuine *technê*. Towards the end of the *Gorgias*, Socrates describes what such rhetorical practice would be like.

So this is what that skilled (*technikos*) and good orator will look to when he applies (*prosoisei*) to people's souls whatever speeches he makes as well as all of his actions, and any gift he makes or any confiscation he carries out. He will always give his attention to how justice may come to exist in the souls of his

³¹ Translations of Plato here and below are from Cooper (1997).

³² Both Gorgias and Thrasymachus seem to have taught rhetoric mainly by providing their students with set-pieces to use or adapt. Cf. *De Soph. Elench.* 34, 183b36–185a9; *Phaedr.* 268a–269c; Dow (2007), Chapter 7, and evidence cited there.

³³ It is perhaps for this reason that this point is endorsed with the briefest of arguments in the first few lines of the *Rhetoric* (1354a6–11). Evidently, by Aristotle's time, the point was well worn and not in serious dispute. The further objection that Gorgias' rhetoric does not aim at what is best but at what is pleasant is considered later. But we may note here that the failure of Gorgias' rhetoric to aim at the best is *not* used by Socrates as grounds for concluding that it fails to be a *technê*, but as grounds for concluding that it is *shameful* (464e2–465a2). That Socrates does not here *make* the claim that an improper aim disqualifies a practice from being a *technê* does not, of course, rule out the possibility that he *holds* that claim. Evidence from later in the dialogue that he does hold precisely such a view is presented here.

fellow citizens and injustice be gotten rid of, how self-control may come to exist there and lack of discipline be gotten rid of, and how the rest of excellence may come into being there and badness may depart. (504d–e)

It turns out that rhetoric is an ability to affect people's souls, or, as it will be called in the *Phaedrus*, soul-leading through words (*ψυχαγωγία τις διὰ λόγων*, 261a7–b2, 271c10). What makes this kind of practice a genuine *technê* seems to be the way in which the methods are organized in the service of an identified goal. The kind of understanding of human psychology that this will involve is explained in much greater detail in the *Phaedrus*, where—again—Socrates sets out what would be involved in a genuine *technê* of rhetoric.

SOCRATES: Clearly, therefore, Thrasyarchus and anyone else who teaches the art of rhetoric seriously will, first, describe the soul with absolute precision and enable us to understand what it is: whether it is one and homogeneous by nature or takes many forms, like the shape of bodies, since, as we said, that's what it is to demonstrate the nature of something.

PHAEDRUS: Absolutely.

SOCRATES: Second, he will explain how, in virtue of its nature, it acts and is acted upon by certain things.

PHAEDRUS: Of course.

SOCRATES: Third, he will classify the kinds of speech and of soul there are, as well as the various ways in which they are affected, and explain what causes each. He will then coordinate each kind of soul with the kind of speech appropriate to it. And he will give instructions concerning the reasons why one kind of soul is necessarily convinced by one kind of speech while another necessarily remains unconvinced.

PHAEDRUS: This, I think, would certainly be the best way.

SOCRATES: In fact, my friend, no speech will ever be a product of art, whether it is a model or one actually given, if it is delivered or written in any other way . . . (271a–b)

Understanding of souls and speeches, and of how speeches affect souls, is required for a genuine *technê* of rhetoric because only on this basis can there be a proper account of how its possessor achieves non-accidental success in achieving a particular kind of state in a given soul (or souls) by

using a particular kind of speech. As the use of 'necessarily' (*ex anankê*s, 271b4) shows, Socrates is committed to the view that in at least some cases the state of conviction produced is determined by the kind of speech used and the kind of soul the listener has. To the extent that producing conviction is determined in this way, it is the business of a *technê* of speech-making, i.e. rhetoric, to account for this. It is on the basis of possessing such an account that the expert can be in control of producing their chosen outcome. Thus the understanding involved in rhetoric plays a similar role to that involved in other *technai*. The potter's understanding of clay, of the techniques of working, and of how these affect different types of clay all combine to give them control over the final features of the pot. Likewise, the doctor's understanding of medicines, of the body, and of how various kinds of medicines affect various kinds of bodies combine to give them control over the patient's condition.³⁴ For the orator to possess a similar kind of control over the audience's convictions will, according to Socrates, involve significant knowledge not only of speech-making techniques but also of human psychology.

That a genuine *technê* should involve knowledge that puts its possessor in control of the attainment or non-attainment of particular (valuable) outcomes, and enables them to explain how they are achieved, is thus a prominent aspect of Socrates' position in both the *Gorgias* and the *Phaedrus*. It is also, I shall argue, the best explanation of another distinctive requirement of the kind of rhetoric Socrates is prepared to endorse in the *Phaedrus*. In that dialogue, Socrates distinguishes his position from that of Gorgias, Thrasymachus, and other writers of so-called '*technai*', with regard to whether the expert orator needs to know the truth about their subject matter. Socrates clearly holds that they do, although his arguments for this claim are quite tricky to make out.

One key argument made at 261d–262c, and recapitulated briefly at 273d–e when Socrates considers how to address Tisias, involves accepting—perhaps only for the sake of argument—the premise that the exercise of rhetoric involves the use of similarities. The argument proceeds from this to the conclusion that rhetorical expertise must involve knowing the truth about one's subject matter. The premise

³⁴ Cf. *Gorg.* 503e–504a; *Phaedr.* 268a–269b.

seems acceptable enough: speakers in forensic and deliberative contexts alike frequently invite their audience to see the similarity between one thing and another, and to infer that they should make the same judgment about the one as they do about the other. Socrates proceeds as follows:

SOCRATES: We can therefore find the practice of speaking on opposite sides not only in the lawcourts and in the Assembly. Rather, it seems that one single art—if, of course, it is an art in the first place—governs all speaking. By means of it one can make out as similar anything that can be so assimilated, to everything to which it can be made similar, and expose anyone who tries to hide the fact that that is what he is doing.

PHAEDRUS: What do you mean by that?

SOCRATES: I think it will become clear if we look at it this way. Where is deception most likely to occur—regarding things that differ much or things that differ little from one another?

PHAEDRUS: Regarding those that differ little.

SOCRATES: At any rate, you are more likely to escape detection, as you shift from one thing to its opposite, if you proceed in small steps rather than in large ones.

PHAEDRUS: Without a doubt.

SOCRATES: Therefore, if you are to deceive someone else and to avoid deception yourself, you must know precisely the respects in which things are similar and dissimilar to one another.

PHAEDRUS: Yes, you must.

SOCRATES: And is it really possible for someone who doesn't know what each thing truly is to detect a similarity—whether large or small—between something he doesn't know and anything else?

PHAEDRUS: That is impossible.

SOCRATES: Clearly, therefore, the state of being deceived and holding beliefs contrary to what is the case comes upon people by means of certain similarities.

PHAEDRUS: That is how it happens.

SOCRATES: Could someone, then, who doesn't know what each thing is ever have the art (*technikos*) to lead others little by little through similarities away from what is the case on each occasion to its opposite? Or could he escape this being done to himself?

PHAEDRUS: Never.

SOCRATES: Therefore, my friend, the art (*technê*) of a speaker who doesn't know the truth and chases opinions instead is likely to be a ridiculous thing—not an art (*atechnon*) at all!

PHAEDRUS: So it seems. (261d–262c)

Clearly, if rhetoric requires knowledge of similarities, and knowing similarities in turn requires knowledge of the truth of the things being spoken about, then rhetoric must require this same knowledge of the truth. But for reasons both internal and external to the dialogue, it seems hard to see why one should accept (as Phaedrus does without quibble) the premise that it is impossible to detect similarities between something one does not know and something else. It seems simply implausible as stated: I know little enough about plants, but I can tell similarities and differences between plants even when I do not know what they are. And, even within the dialogue, it seems that only at 260b–d Socrates seemed himself to allow that he might persuade Phaedrus that he should get a horse for fighting enemies despite his (and Phaedrus') being ignorant of what a horse was. Of course, if Socrates is as ignorant as Phaedrus about what a horse is, rhetorical argument may well simply transmit the flaws in Phaedrus' initial understanding onto the conviction Socrates secures. Nevertheless, there is an important sense in which, in this example, despite both parties' ignorance of what a horse is, Socrates' persuasive argument proceeds *successfully* precisely because of the similarity between what Socrates said about 'horses' and what Phaedrus believed about 'horses'. He is successful in the sense that he convinces Phaedrus of what he set out to convince him, namely to get a horse for fighting enemies. It is assumed, we should note, that Socrates knows in the relevant respects what Phaedrus believes about 'horses' (260b2–4). Thus, *even within the dialogue*, it seems that successful persuasive arguments using similarities do not require knowledge of the truth, and Socrates does not seem to offer a good argument to support his claim that they do.

This objection seems to me to be telling if Socrates is viewing rhetoric as a *technê* enabling its possessor to get an audience convinced of a given claim, regardless of whether that claim is true or false. But Socrates' view seems to be that possession of a genuine *technê* of rhetoric ought to put the skilled orator in charge of whether what their audience (and indeed

they themselves) came to be convinced of was true or false. Whether the convictions resulting from the exercise of the *technê* turn out true or false should not be a matter of chance or accident, since an accidental result is the mark precisely of the absence of *technê*. In the previous passage, this may well be what Socrates has in mind, since he repeatedly emphasizes that the result that the orator aims at is for the audience to be deceived but for him to avoid being deceived himself (and the discussion immediately preceding (261c–d) about speaking on opposite sides makes it clear that for the skilled orator, it is simply a matter of choice whether they want the audience to be deceived or to be convinced of the truth: their skill puts them in a position to achieve non-accidentally whichever outcome they choose). If this is the case, then what matters in persuading an audience is not merely the similarity between what they already believe and what, at each stage in the persuasive strategy, they are being invited to believe. Rather the orator will need to know how similar each of these is to what is actually true, so as to be in a position to ensure that where the audience is led, by suitably small steps, tends either towards or away from the truth. This is an important part of the knowledge that enables the genuinely skilled (*technikos*) speaker to be in control of the outcomes that they produce, and to be in a position to offer an explanatory account of how they are produced.

On this interpretation, Socrates insists that the skilled orator must know the truth about their subject matter, even if their aim is to make the audience's convictions false rather than true. His view thus does not rely on the idea that rhetoric aims at true convictions in the audience. It relies instead on the view that rhetoric involves persuasion using similarities (262b6), and that it is the expertise by which a speaker achieves non-accidental success in securing convictions in their audience that are true, if he so chooses, or false. Socrates concludes ultimately that the view of the 'wise',³⁵ namely that the skilled orator need not know the truth but only what their audience believes, makes their supposed *technê* into something ridiculous (*geloian*, 262c2) and not a *technê* at all (*atechnon*, c3). This, on the interpretation proposed here, is because on the account of rhetoric proposed by the 'wise', it is a matter of chance whether the convictions produced in the audience turn out true or false. When

³⁵ 'sophoi' (260a6)—and there is a strong hint that it is Gorgias, Thrasymachus, and Theodorus who held this view (261b6–c3).

Socrates refers back to this argument later at 273d2–6, he claims to have shown that one cannot know what is similar to the truth without knowing the truth of one's subject matter. This lends support to interpretations, such as that proposed here, of the argument of 261d–262c in which the similarities referred to are similarities *to the truth*.³⁶

The position developed by Socrates in the *Phaedrus*, then, is that genuine rhetorical expertise requires knowledge of the speaker's subject matter. The earlier argument to that effect is confirmed by later passages, where the nature of this requirement is further explained. As Socrates at 264e–266c analyses some merits of his two earlier speeches, he highlights the contribution made by collection and division in getting a clear view of the key themes (love, madness) of each speech. At 272d–273e, the role of collection and division is again emphasized for its importance, not just in understanding the soul, but in understanding 'every single thing' (273e2)—where we must take this to include the subject matter of the speech, since it is offered as a reason for resisting Tisias's claim that the expert speaker need only know what is likely—a claim that pertains to the speech's subject matter. The final summary (277b5–c6) of the expertise of speech-making again emphasizes that it requires knowledge of the speech's subject matter as well as of listeners' souls, and confirms that this is to be achieved by collection and division, a skill whose possessors are called 'dialecticians' (266b7–c8), or 'philosophers' (261a3–5, 278c4–d6).³⁷

We have noted in passing Socrates' emphasis in the *Phedrus* on the knowledge of psychology required for possession of a genuine *technê* of rhetoric. It is worth highlighting the prominence it receives. Socrates

³⁶ At 273d, Socrates also repeats (as something 'we were saying before') the claim that 'what is likely is in fact accepted by the many because of a similarity to what is true' (273d3–4). This seems to suggest that in both passages Socrates after all holds the problematic claim that one cannot discern similarities between things unless one knows the truth about them. Interestingly, Socrates here carefully distinguishes between the (problematic) claim that it is similarity to the truth that makes 'the likely' acceptable to the masses, and the claim that knowing what is similar to the truth requires knowing the truth. He perhaps hints that it is the latter that has been the more carefully argued for (*diêlthomen*, d5, cf. *tunchanomen legontes*, d3).

³⁷ The similarity has often been noticed between this claim about the importance of 'dialectic' (and philosophy) to rhetorical expertise and those made by Aristotle (esp. *Rhet* 1.1, 1355a3–18). Here, however, we should note that the aspect of 'dialectic' to which attention is being drawn is the ability to undertake collection and division. See Chapter 3 for Aristotle's very different use within rhetoric of the resources of 'dialectic'.

emphasizes that without detailed knowledge of the soul, the student of rhetoric will have no more than a set of techniques, and will certainly lack a systematic method for how these should be appropriately applied (269a5–c5). The techniques are merely ‘things one must learn as a necessary preliminary to grasping the expertise’ (b7–8), and their limitations are illustrated by comparisons with medicine, tragedy, and music. In medicine, for example, (to paraphrase 268a8–c4) knowing how to raise or lower body temperature, or how to induce vomiting or defecation, without knowing when, to whom, or to what extent one ought to apply such techniques, is not yet to have acquired the expertise of medicine (indeed, 269a2–3 makes the bolder claim that such a person has only the preliminaries to medicine (τὰ πρὸ ἰατρικῆς), and has not even begun to grasp medicine itself). Similarly, the person that has grasped in relation to speaking such things as what the various parts of the speech should contain, techniques for praise, amplification and diminution, the use of images, and how to arouse audience emotions (cf. 266d7–267d9) has only the preliminaries to learning the expertise of rhetoric. What is missing will be analogous to the medical case, including at least³⁸ the following: (1) a clear conception of what the desirable state of the soul is that the speaker should be trying to produce (analogous to the doctor’s understanding of the good functioning of the body that they are aiming to produce), (2) an understanding of how various types of soul are affected by various kinds of speech, and (3) an ability to recognize each type of soul (and perhaps speech) as encountered in real life.³⁹ The point Socrates most emphasizes is the psychological knowledge (2).

Since the nature of speech is in fact to direct the soul (ψυχολογία), whoever intends to be a rhetorician must know how many kinds of soul there are. Their number is so-and-so many; each of such-and-such a sort; hence some people have such-and-such a character and others have such-and-such. Those distinctions established, there are, in turn, so-and-so many kinds of speech, each of such-and-such a sort. People of such-and-such a character are easy to persuade by speeches of such-and-such a sort in connection with such-and-such an issue

³⁸ Some further items are added at 272a4–7.

³⁹ Moss (2012b) offers a nice account of how this is not only explained in the *Phaedrus*, but illustrated (or something approximating to it is illustrated) in Socrates’ interaction with Phaedrus.

for this particular reason, while people of such-and-such another sort are difficult to persuade for those particular reasons. The orator must learn all this well . . .
(271c10–d7)

For Socrates of the *Phaedrus*, a genuine expertise in rhetoric will involve extensive psychological knowledge, as well as knowledge of the truth of their subject matter, in order to put them properly in control of generating beneficial outcomes by the application of their expertise. Attaining this level of knowledge is, as *Phaedrus* observes and Socrates concedes, 'no small task' (272b5–6).

A further significant theme in the criticism in *Phaedrus* and especially *Gorgias* of earlier theorists of rhetoric concerns the goods that rhetoric secures and the goals in the service of which it can and should be deployed. In both dialogues, I shall emphasize, Socrates insists that it is part of the proper practice of any kind of rhetoric that is of genuine value, that it be deployed in the pursuit of what is best, that is justice, temperance, and the whole of virtue (*Gorgias* 504d5–e4).

The question of what rhetoric is good *for*, that is the valuable purpose (if any) that it might be properly deployed to achieve, is one of the structuring questions framing the whole of the *Gorgias*. Socrates, as has already been indicated, gives the fullest statements of his own views towards the end of the dialogue, but the question of what valuable purpose rhetoric serves is central to the interrogation of Gorgias right at the outset. When the orator is compared with the doctor, trainer, and businessman, Socrates makes the comparison in terms of the product or achievement (*ergon*, 452a8, b6) of each, and an assessment of the extent to which each represents a good (*agathon*, 452a5, 8, 9, b3, c5, 7, d1, 3), so as to assess which produces the greatest good. Gorgias is happy to accept that his characteristic activity will be defined by giving an account of its product, the good of which it is the producer (*dèmiourgos*, 452d4). The answer Gorgias gives is that it is persuasion (*to peithein*, or *peithô*, 452e1, 453a2)—his answer is interesting on a number of counts.

Persuasion, I say: the ability to persuade with words the judges in the courtroom, the councillors in the council chamber, the assemblymen in the assembly, and anyone in any other civic debate. In fact, through this power you will make the doctor your slave, and likewise the trainer. And this businessman will turn out to be making money not for himself but for someone else: for you, as a result of your ability to speak and persuade the masses. (*Gorgias* 452e1–8)

We can see in this passage that, although no great emphasis is placed on this point here, Gorgias is made to distinguish between rhetoric's immediate product, persuasion, and the goal that this enables the orator to achieve, power and control over others and enrichment for himself. This is a likely basis for his defence of rhetoric later, at 456c–457c, in which he insists that the possibility of its unjust use (its use in pursuit of unjust ends, presumably) does not impugn the expertise or its teachers.

I think that if someone becomes skilled in rhetoric and then uses this power and expertise to commit injustice, it is not the person that taught him who should be hated and expelled from our cities. The teacher passed it on for just use, but the student is using it in the opposite way. It is the one that uses it incorrectly (*ouk orthôs*) that we should by rights hate, expel and execute, not the one that taught him. (457b5–c3)

Gorgias' defence here is that rhetoric is valuable insofar as it is used justly, and that this is its proper and perhaps its normal use (such that its unjust use is a 'perversion' of it).⁴⁰ The crucial point for our purposes is that this just use of rhetoric will have two central features. First, clearly the just use of rhetoric must be in the service of a genuinely good goal. Second, it requires knowledge of how to attain that goal, including how to do so through the use of rhetorical skills. Without either one of those features, it will remain a chancy matter whether the use of rhetoric will be harmful or beneficial, and hence both are required by Gorgias in order to resist the implied charge that his teaching of rhetoric is irresponsible and dangerous.⁴¹ We have discussed already the requirement that the valuable use of rhetoric requires considerable knowledge on the part of the speaker. Here, we note that the speaker must aim at a good goal.

The defence, as proposed by Socrates and accepted by Gorgias, is doubtless overblown and it leads Gorgias into contradiction. No doubt

⁴⁰ The unjust use of rhetoric is described as 'incorrect' (*οὐκ ὀρθως*) at 457a1–2, 3–4, c2, and as a 'perversion' (*μεταστρέφαντες*) of it at 457a1. Cf. Barney (2010) for an excellent examination of Gorgias' defence along these lines. As she notes, there is a tension between this line of defence and the grounds on which Gorgias boasts of rhetoric's value, that is, as a power to enslave and manipulate others for one's private advantage.

⁴¹ This is, I think, the correct explanation of why Gorgias concedes not only that his pupils will have knowledge of justice and injustice, but also will be motivated justly (459c–460c). These concessions are not required because of Gorgias' particular circumstances as a foreigner (*pace* Kahn, 1983), but because they are required by *any* defence of the value of possessing and teaching an expertise, once it is admitted that it has the potential to be used for inflicting more harm than good.

it would be enough to exonerate the teacher of rhetoric of the charge of irresponsibility if they were merely justified in believing that the skill they conveyed would be used justly: that would then allow for the possibility that it be on occasions used unjustly. It is, however, not this but a rather different strategy for reformulating Gorgias' position that is taken up by Polus. And Polus is surely right in this regard, since the kind of rhetorical practice that depends on extensive knowledge and just goals is very unlike the actual kinds of practice that Polus and Gorgias are represented as standing for in the *Gorgias*. Polus is represented as seeking to retract any robust commitment to just aims or knowledge of justice (461bc). He seeks to defend the value of rhetoric on the basis that it enables a speaker to give pleasure to his audience (462c8–9), and it thereby confers on him the benefit of great power to secure whatever goals he pleases, whatever he *thinks* best (466a9–c2, e6–8). Again, like Gorgias, Polus seems committed to some kind of distinction between rhetoric's proximate goal of pleasure and the ulterior⁴² goal of its practitioner in practising it—typically, for Polus, power and the advancement of his personal goals.

This brief account of how Polus reformulates a defence of Gorgianic rhetoric is enough to highlight some key features of the position Socrates adopts in opposing it. For him, both the proximate goal of pleasure and the ulterior goal of having the power to do whatever seems best are grounds for objection. As a practice aimed at producing pleasure, Gorgianic rhetoric is classified as a kind of 'flattery' (*kolakeia*), and is hence deemed shameful (*aischron*, 464e2) 'because it [namely flattery] guesses at what's pleasant with no consideration for what's best' (465a1–2). Clearly part of what is objectionable about flattery in general, and hence about Gorgianic rhetoric thus conceived, is that it is deceptive. Rhetoric is the 'image of a part of politics' (*πολιτικῆς μορίου εἶδωλον*, 463d2, e4); specifically, it impersonates justice (*δικαιοσύνη*, 465c3) and shares what all flattery has in common:

It masquerades as something else and pretends to be that thing. It gives no thought to what is best, but uses what is most pleasurable at each moment to ensnare folly and deceive it. As a result it is taken to be highly valuable.

(464c7–d3)

⁴² We are not offered any precise account of such a distinction in the text, so it is undetermined whether it is better taken as a distinction between proximate and ulterior ends, or between ends internal and external to the practice of rhetoric.

The metaphors of masks, disguises, and masquerading express the criticism that rhetoric is valued (presumably by listeners, and perhaps at an institutional level—insofar as provision is made in law courts and assemblies for the delivery of speeches) because it is taken to deliver certain benefits, which it pretends to deliver but does not actually do so.⁴³ Just as skill in adornment (*κομμωτική*, 465b3) purports to deliver the authentic, properly held beauty that comes from training, but delivers no more than the illusion of it, so rhetoric purports to contribute to justice, but delivers no more than the illusion of doing so. In short, Socrates is saying that Gorgianic rhetoric, in aiming at pleasure, is fraudulent—pretending to be a valuable contribution that it does not deliver.

As well as contesting the value of pleasure as a goal of rhetoric, Socrates also challenges the worth of power and the capacity to get whatever one thinks best.

SOC: You say that having great power is a good thing for the person who has it?

POL: I do.

SOC: Do you think it is a good thing, then, if someone does the things that seem best to them, when they lack understanding? Do you call that 'having great power'?

POL: I do not.

SOC: So, will you demonstrate that orators do have understanding, and that rhetoric is an expertise (*τέχνη*), not mere flattery, and so refute me? But if you leave me unrefuted, then those orators who do in their cities what seems best to them, and tyrants, will thereby have secured nothing good. Power, as you affirm, is a good thing. But doing what seems best to you when you lack understanding: you also agree that that is an evil. (466e6–467a5)

Polus, as we have seen, does not wish to go back on the Gorgianic insistence that rhetorical skill does not require knowledge. Socrates' argument shows that the good that Polus insists is an (or the) important goal of exercising rhetoric, i.e. power, is at worst an evil, and at best a conditional good. Where the orator lacks knowledge, it will be left a

⁴³ Cf. also *Rhetoric* I.2, 1356a27f.

chancy matter whether the power rhetoric gives them is beneficial or harmful to them. Since the power to advance one's own chosen goals by acting unjustly features so prominently in Polus's account of what rhetoric enables its possessor to do, the conclusion that injustice and unjust action are not goods at all, but the greatest evils, has implications for the worth of rhetoric thus conceived. Socrates returns explicitly to this question at 480a1, 'What is the great benefit of rhetoric?'. Socrates is prepared to concede that it might be of some benefit to an unjust person in ensuring they get punished, but apart from that he concludes that there is no worthwhile goal that can be achieved by rhetoric of the kind Polus has in mind (480b7–d6; 481b1–5). Thus, we see Socrates insisting that if rhetoric is to be of value, there must be some valuable goal that it can be relied upon to secure.

A similar picture emerges clearly from the latter part of Socrates' discussion with Callicles. Socrates distinguishes two kinds of rhetoric according to the aims they countenance. One type is Gorgianic and based on flattery: 'their impulse is towards the gratification of the citizens; they despise the common good and speak with a view to their own private interests' (502e5–7). By contrast, Socrates, towards the end of the dialogue (504d–e), envisages a possible genuine art of rhetoric.

So, it would be with an eye to these things [structure (*τάξις*) and orderliness (*κόσμος*)] that that expert (*τεχνικός*) and good (*ἀγαθός*) orator would proceed, applying to [the citizens'] souls whatever words he spoke, all his actions too, and whatever gift he might give, or if he took anything away. He would always be thinking about how to bring about justice in the souls of the citizens, and drive out injustice, how self-control could be produced and intemperance driven out, how he can bring about the rest of virtue, and get vice to depart. (504d5–e3)

Such an art, in the hands of a good man, would aim at producing justice, self-control, and the rest of virtue in the souls of citizens—that is, it would aim at what is genuinely good. As such, it would be among the genuinely artistic occupations (*pragmateiai . . . technikai*) concerned with the soul, i.e. among those that 'possess forethought about what's best for the soul' (501b3–5).⁴⁴

⁴⁴ The insistence on having the right aim is interestingly less prominent in the *Phaedrus*, but it is not wholly absent. When Socrates compares knowing the various rhetorical techniques catalogued from previous treatises on the 'Art of Speaking' (266d–268a) to knowing how to perform various kinds of medical treatment (268ab), the way he highlights

In the *Gorgias*, then, Socrates seems to insist that a genuine *technê* of rhetoric should aim at the good of listeners, and should proceed on the basis of a knowledge both of this goal and of the means to it (500e–501b). In the *Phaedrus*, this latter requirement is developed further as a requirement that the skilled speaker possess psychological knowledge of how to bring about the envisaged condition in the souls of his listeners. The requirement to aim at the good is perhaps relaxed, with the acknowledgement that a genuine skill in rhetoric could be used for good or ill, and that rhetoric is a skill for speaking effectively on opposite sides. However, the *Phaedrus* adds the new and highly demanding requirement that, in order to argue (as rhetoric does) from likelihoods, the speaker know the truth about their subject matter. I have suggested that this requirement springs from thinking of rhetoric as an expertise that gives its possessor control over whether the listeners' (and his own) convictions turn out true or false.

in which the latter falls short of knowing medicine (τὰ ἰατρικά, 269a3) or of making you an expert medic (ἰατρικός, 268b3) is that it lacks the additional knowledge of when and to whom to apply such treatments. The implication is that it is part of medicine to know what kinds of states of the body are desirable to produce, that is to say, what the appropriate goal of medical intervention is. The implication is that it is part of genuine rhetorical expertise to know when and to whom the various rhetorical techniques should be applied—i.e. what the appropriate goals of rhetorical activity are.

2

Proof-reading Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

2.1 Introduction

Aristotle, I shall claim, saw rhetoric as an expertise in producing ‘proofs’ (*pisteis*), understood as proper grounds for conviction. Such a position is quite distinct from the views of Gorgias, Thrasymachus, and the handbook writers on the one hand, and those put forward in Plato’s works on the other. Gorgias and Thrasymachus saw rhetoric as a collection of techniques for wielding power over an audience by speaking to them, specifically the power to produce conviction in one’s listeners, irrespective of whether they do well to be so convinced. Whereas Aristotle saw rhetoric as an expertise in giving listeners *good* grounds for conviction (‘proofs’, *pisteis*), only techniques that met this criterion would count as rhetoric, in his view. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Plato’s works convey the insistence that to count as a *technê*, rhetoric must have some account of how conviction is successfully brought about, and the suggestion that this is a matter of understanding human psychology so as to know how different kinds of speeches will affect different kinds of souls. Aristotle, as we shall see, partly accepts this requirement, but draws not on a merely descriptive psychology of how conviction can be successfully produced, but on a *normative* psychology of how humans do *well* to be convinced. Accordingly, his theory sets out various kinds of ‘proof’ (*pistis*) that rightly incline humans to be convinced. Aristotle disagrees with the Platonic view of the aim of rhetoric—in Plato, it was the production of virtue in the souls of listeners, for Aristotle, it is well-founded judgements in the listeners. Rhetoric, for Aristotle, aims at an *epistemic* good. Since Aristotle does not agree with the Platonic view that the expert orator should be in a position to control whether the

audience's convictions are true or false, he does not hold that the orator needs to know the truth about his subject matter. For Aristotle, the listeners' judgements will be well-founded through being formed on the basis of good grounds for conviction ('proofs', *pisteis*), and providing these require, in turn, not knowledge of the truth, but rather a grasp of plausible starting points for the listeners' deliberations in the form of 'reputable opinions' (*endoxa*) related to the subject at hand.

2.2 Aristotle's Arguments in *Rhetoric* 1.1

Central to this sketch of Aristotle's distinctive view of rhetoric is the claim that, for him, rhetoric was an expertise in providing *proper grounds for conviction*. I want to set out from *Rhetoric* 1.1 and elsewhere the evidence that this was indeed Aristotle's view of rhetoric (and that this is a correct gloss of his Greek term *πίστις*), and explore how we should characterize his view of how rhetorical methods could provide such proper grounds for conviction. In Chapter 3, I will consider how such a view might be defended, starting from a consideration of how Aristotle actually *does* undertake to defend his view.

The bulk of *Rhetoric* 1.1 is taken up with a polemic by Aristotle against those who had written instruction handbooks for those with ambitions in public life, who needed to be able to succeed both in assembly debates and in the courtroom. I've called them the 'handbook writers'. They typically seem to have called their works 'The Art of (or Expertise in) Making Speeches' (*τέχνη λόγων*).¹ The passage I will start with, from near the start of the *Rhetoric*, is the beginning of Aristotle's polemic against them. Aristotle is setting out his own position, his own instruction manual on rhetoric, affirming (what Plato had once denied)² that there is a genuine expertise of rhetoric, but as a result of this he must immediately insist that this does not constitute an endorsement of the kind of views and techniques peddled by the handbook writers. It's as though he was saying, 'Sure, Socrates was wrong in the *Gorgias*: there is an art of making speeches. But don't think I'm talking about the kind of thing that you find in these handbooks labelled as an "Art of Making Speeches".' In support, he advances a number of *arguments* to show that

¹ Cf. 1354a12.

² *Gorg* 462b8–c3, 465a2–5.

the techniques of the handbook writers do not deserve to be called an expertise in rhetoric.

2.3 *Rhetoric* 1.1, 1354a11–18

Here, then, is a fairly literal translation of how the text is printed in W. D. Ross's Oxford edition:

Now the authors of the current handbooks on the 'Art of Rhetoric' have provided hardly even a part of it.³ (For the proofs are the only thing that belongs to the art, the other things are merely accessories to it.) These people say nothing about enthymemes which is the body of proof, and they busy themselves mainly with what is outside the subject at hand. For slander and pity and anger and suchlike affections of the soul are not concerned with the subject at hand but are directed at the judge. (*Rhetoric*. 1.1, 1354a11–18)

Ross's brackets⁴ and the apparent contradiction between this passage and the rest of the *Rhetoric* over the place of emotion-arousal in rhetoric⁵ have distracted attention from how Aristotle's *argument* works.⁶

This passage, I suggest, could be paraphrased as follows:

These authors claim to have given us a systematic treatment of rhetoric. But in fact they have told us little or nothing about it. Rhetoric consists entirely in providing proofs. They have ignored the main thing that generates proof—that is, arguments / considerations. And they have spent virtually all their time and energy on things that cannot possibly contribute to proof—that is, things that are irrelevant to the issue under consideration.

³ Here there is a variant in the manuscripts. Ross follows some manuscripts and reads 'οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν πεπορίκασιν αὐτῆς μέρος', other manuscripts have 'ὀλίγον πεποιήκασιν αὐτῆς μέρος' (have produced a small part of it), and Kassel conjectures 'ὀλίγον πεπονήκασιν αὐτῆς μέρος' (have laboured over a small part of it). Some, e.g. Cooper (1999, p. 391), in an attempt to soften the apparent contradiction about emotion-arousal, emphasize the possibility of reading 'ὀλίγον . . . μέρος' (a small part). But that what Aristotle has in mind is that their contribution to the expertise itself is negligible is confirmed by the uncontested 'οὐδὲν' (nothing) at 1354b21, in a passage which seems to express the same thought (cf. Dow, 2007, p. 384 and Chapter 7).

⁴ Cf. Burnyeat (1994, p. 10, n.26): 'The parentheses Ross puts around [this sentence] are a disaster'.

⁵ Cf. Chapter 7 for my own view of how the puzzle about this supposed contradiction should be resolved.

⁶ So much so that Kennedy seems to view the passage as a torrent of unsupported accusations rather than as a passage of argument (cf. the 'rhetoric of the *Rhetoric*' (Kennedy, 1985, p. 132)).

We may discern two arguments here. The first is this.

2.3.1 *Argument (i)*

1. In attempting to give an account of the art of rhetoric, the handbook writers say nothing about enthymemes. (a14f.)
2. Enthymemes are the most important part of (literally: the body of) proof. (a15)
3. The only thing that properly belongs to the art of rhetoric is proofs. (a13f.)

We may infer:

4. The handbook writers say nothing about the most important part of the only thing that properly belongs to the art of rhetoric.

Which gives good reason to suppose:

5. In attempting to give an account of the art of rhetoric, the handbook writers have produced scarcely a part of it. (a11–13)

It is clearly important to establish what Aristotle means here by *πίστις*—thus far rendered ‘proof’. LSJ identifies three broad categories of meaning for *πίστις*. First, it can mean a psychological state of trust, confidence, or conviction. Second, it can mean that which *produces* such a state of confidence. And there is a third, later usage to mean that which is entrusted. The relevant category in our texts is clearly the second. But this still leaves open whether or not it is part of the meaning of *πίστις* that what it refers to *properly* produces confidence or conviction. Does the word, as Aristotle uses it, have a normative element to its sense in this way, or not? One might categorize interpreters, and indeed translators, of Aristotle according to the answer they give.⁷ Those who recognize a normative element to the sense of *πίστις* typically favour translating it something like ‘proof’ or, as I prefer, ‘proper grounds for conviction’;⁸ those who do not tend to opt for phrases like ‘means of persuasion’.⁹

⁷ Those recognizing some kind of normative sense to *πίστις* include Barnes (1995), Cooper (1993), and Grimaldi (1972); those who do not include Kennedy (1991), Primavesi (1987), and Rapp (2002a). Those who contend that either the meaning of *πίστις* or the account of rhetoric, or both, changes between 1.1 and the rest of the *Rhetoric* include Barnes (1995), Primavesi (1987), Rapp (2002a), Solmsen (1929), and Wisse (1989).

⁸ Reflected in Freese’s Loeb translation in Freese (1926).

⁹ Reflected in W. Rhys Roberts’ translation in Barnes (1984).

Aristotle says that *πίστεις* are the only thing that belongs to rhetoric, and the previous argument contains a premise (2) that might illuminate what this claim means. If it turns out that enthymemes are a kind of proper grounds for conviction,¹⁰ this might suggest that the presence of proper grounds for conviction is a feature of all *πίστις*. However, the argument will not be decisive on that score. Facts about the 'main part (body) of *πίστις*', though suggestive, will not necessarily entail anything about *πίστις* in general, or about *πίστεις* itself.¹¹ The second argument, however, is decisive.

2.3.2 *Argument (ii)*

1. The handbook writers have spent most of their time on things that are outside the issue (i.e. on speaking irrelevantly to the issue at hand).¹² (a15–18)
2. Only *πίστεις* belong to the expertise of rhetoric. (a13)
3. Therefore, the handbook writers have contributed next-to-nothing to the expertise of rhetoric. (a11–13)

¹⁰ '*Enthymēma*' literally means a consideration, and Aristotle's view seems to be that enthymemes are pieces of reasoning (1355a8) that constitute considerations in favour of the speaker's case. Cf. Burnyeat (1994) and later discussion of 1355a3–12.

¹¹ The interpretation of this argument is further complicated by controversy over what Aristotle means in claiming that enthymeme is 'the body of proof' (a15). None of the arguments here depends on a particular interpretation of this phrase. It comes very early on in the treatise, and the most plausible interpretation seems to me the simple view that this phrase means 'the main part of proof', and that Aristotle is here claiming that, in general, proving something will principally involve advancing 'considerations' in its favour (our interpretation of 'enthymeme' here should be consistent with the more precise account Aristotle gives later in the treatise); cf. Burnyeat (1994). Grimaldi's view that enthymemes underlie all proofs (Grimaldi, 1957, 1972) has little textual warrant, and its inadequacies were exposed long ago (Wikramanayake, 1961; Rapp, 2002a, pp. 2.41–2. Rapp's own view ((Rapp, 2002a, p. 2.41–4) that 'body' is here contrasted with 'accessories' and that the claim is that enthymemes are the essential core of a speaker's proof, to which other things may be added as accessories, has significant weaknesses. First and most significantly, 'body' is *not* here contrasted with 'accessories': the latter is contrasted with 'belonging to the art' (*ἐντεχνον*, a13). Second, it makes Aristotle's point unnecessarily technical, very early on in the treatise. Third, it needlessly saddles Aristotle with an implausibly strong claim, seemingly at odds with the rest of the treatise: that if the speaker has failed to use enthymemes, using only non-technical proofs, *pathos*-proofs, character-proofs, and examples, he has provided only accessories to proof (*pistis*), but not proof itself, cf. 1355b35–1356a4; 1403b9–13.

¹² Cf. correctly Cooper (1999, p. 391), *pace* Cope (1877, p. 4). Cf. also Thür (2005).

As it stands, this second argument is rather elliptical. Its conclusion is that the handbook writers have said little about rhetorical expertise. The justification is that the *πίστεις* alone fall under the expertise, and the handbook writers have spent most of their efforts on what is outside the issue, or irrelevant. The argument requires an unstated premise to the effect that speaking about irrelevancies cannot constitute producing *πίστεις*. But such a premise is only plausible on the normative understanding of *πίστεις*. Indeed, on the normative understanding of *πίστεις*, it is obviously true, and on the non-normative understanding, it is clearly false.

(Unstated premise, normative view of *πίστεις*): if what one says is irrelevant to some issue, saying it cannot provide good grounds for conviction one way or the other on that issue.

(Unstated premise, non-normative view of *πίστεις*): if what one says is irrelevant to some issue, saying it cannot cause someone to be convinced one way or the other on that issue.

It seems clear that argument (ii) should thus be made explicit as follows:

1. The handbook writers have dealt mainly with what is outside the issue (i.e. irrelevant to it). (a15f.)
2. If what one says is irrelevant to an issue, then saying it contributes nothing to giving someone proper grounds for conviction (roughly, a 'proof') of any particular view on that issue. (unstated premise, supplied as obvious)
3. The only thing that properly belongs to the art of rhetoric is giving proper grounds for conviction. (a13)

We may infer:

4. Most of the handbook writers' work dealt with matters that contribute nothing to the only thing that properly belongs to the art of rhetoric.

This gives good reason to suppose:

5. The handbook writers have produced scarcely a part of the art of rhetoric. (a11–13)

If this is right, then the sentence (a13) that Ross puts in parentheses—premise 3 here—is needed to play a key role in connecting the premises

Aristotle gives with the conclusion he takes them to support, in argument (ii), just as it did in argument (i).

The sentence in the text is this.

αἱ γὰρ πίστεις ἔντεχνόν ἐστι μόνον, τὰ δ' ἄλλα προσθήκαι

For it is only the proofs that belong to the art, other things are mere accessories.
1354a13

In my view, this sentence expresses Aristotle's substantive view of rhetorical expertise, and—as suggested by the phrase '*proper* grounds for conviction'—the view he expresses is that exercising the expertise of rhetoric constitutively involves conforming to some normative standards.

As we have seen, in the arguments in which it features, this claim serves to adjudicate what things do and don't constitute exercises of the expertise of rhetoric. It does so by expressing a substantive view of what is essential to rhetorical expertise, such that then various activities or techniques can be assessed against it to see whether they fit. Enthymemes are clear cases of *pistis*. Irrelevancies clearly contribute *nothing*. When we understand *πίστις* as proper grounds for conviction, the arguments at 1354a11–16 can be seen to be fundamentally sound.

If it is correct, the best that can be said for the contribution of these predecessors of Aristotle, the handbook writers, is that they have thought lots about accessory features of rhetorical practice. What they have failed to do is set out the essential features that explain success when the expert rhetorician persuades by deploying his expertise.

However, the effectiveness of these arguments against their targets is subject to an important qualification. The pivotal premise 3 merely *asserts* Aristotle's own position over against the handbook writers' views of rhetorical expertise. If, as we have suggested, it is the views of Gorgias, Thrasymachus, and their followers that Aristotle is criticizing, they surely would not grant this premise. On their view, rhetoric's power is like that of a strong wrestler or a magic spell or a violent enemy: it produces its result without needing to render that result in any sense proper. Whether conviction has been *properly* produced is, on this view, an entirely separate question from whether conviction has been produced by an exercise of rhetorical expertise. At this stage in the treatise, Aristotle has offered no arguments against competing views and in favour of this premise. Nevertheless, if the premise *can* be supported

appropriately, the argument is good. So, in Chapter 3, I will try to show that Aristotle has good reasons for accepting it.

First, however, I wish both to address an important objection against the position canvassed here, and to explain how the view of rhetoric discerned in these opening passages of the treatise is reflected in Aristotle's later statements characterizing the nature, function, and goal of rhetoric.

2.3.3 *The nature of rhetoric and the sense of πίστις between 1.1 and the rest of the Rhetoric*

I hope to have shown that the opening arguments of *Rhetoric* 1.1 present a compelling case for the following claims:¹³

(RHET) Rhetoric, for Aristotle, is an expertise in producing *pisteis*.

(PIST) 'πίστις' means proper grounds for conviction.

However, it has sometimes been doubted that Aristotle adheres to these consistently through the *Rhetoric*. In particular, it is claimed that the meaning of πίστις changes between 1.1 and the rest of the treatise.¹⁴ Against this view, I will attempt to show that it is perfectly plausible to read the treatise preserving throughout a consistent view of the nature of rhetoric and the sense of πίστις.

This ought to come as no surprise, since there are a number of references back from 1.2 to 1.1 (e.g. 1355b33, 1356a31), suggesting that Aristotle at least saw these two chapters as part of a continuous whole, and a number of references back to book 1 from book 3 in passages that exhibit awareness of the contents of both chapters.¹⁵

¹³ Here, as throughout, I use the transliterated *pistis* and *pisteis* to refer to the 'proofs' themselves with which Aristotle says rhetoric is concerned, reserving use of the Greek πίστις and πίστεις for discussion of Aristotle's terms.

¹⁴ Cf. Solmsen (1929); Primavesi (1987); Rapp (2002a). A change in view or an inconsistency between 1.1 and the rest of the treatise has historically been suggested on a variety of grounds, of which this is one. It is sometimes linked with the supposed inconsistency about emotion-arousal addressed in Chapter 7. If these can be explained, the motivation for embarking upon the (hugely problematic) project of assigning different parts of the work to different periods of Aristotle's thought is considerably undermined. The residual issue of whether the use of logical terms is consistent between the chapters cannot be addressed here.

¹⁵ E.g. esp. 3.14, 1415b4–9 and 25–6. But note also how 3.1, 1403b6–13 recapitulates the analysis from 1.2 and 2.1 of technical *pisteis* into three kinds, and how within the same section b18–19 and 1404a5–7 echo the emphasis in 1.1 on relevance and on using the facts

In both the first and second chapters of the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle characterizes rhetoric in terms of the *pisteis*, i.e. as proposed in RHET: that the techniques belonging to the expertise have to do with the *pisteis* (1.1: 1354a13, b21, 1355a3–4; 1.2: 1355b35, 1356a20–33),¹⁶ and also as an expertise that consists in an ability ‘to see the possibly persuasive’ (1.1: 1355b10–17; 1.2: 1355b25–34).¹⁷ Since, on any understanding of what *pisteis* are, they are things that are intended to produce a persuasive effect on the mind of the audience, it is perfectly natural to move from talk of *pisteis* to talk of ‘things that are persuasive’. Aristotle seems in both of the first two chapters to move easily between these two ways of speaking about rhetoric’s core, as though they were simply two closely related ways of speaking about the same thing, one focused more on the content of the speech, the other focused more on its effect on the audience. If so, Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric at 1355b25–6 as a ‘capacity to see the possibly persuasive’ is not a denial of RHET, but simply another perspective on it. And we can see both from the easy transition back to the language of *πίστεις* at b35, and from 1356a20–33, that he still thinks of rhetoric as centrally about producing *pisteis*, i.e. that he is still committed to RHET.

Does the sense of *πίστις* change between 1.1 and the rest of the treatise?¹⁸ The answer, I claim, is that it doesn’t, and that Aristotle uses the word in more or less its ordinary Greek sense throughout, sharpening this up somewhat in one important passage (1355a3–18) to be discussed

to prove one’s case. The sections on *taxis* seem to reflect this same division (e.g. 3.17, 1418a12–21, and a38–40 show awareness of the need for *pathos*- and *êthos*-proofs), but equally strongly echoes the sentiments of 1.1 on *diabolê*, relevance, and the centrality of proving your case with the facts (3.13, 1414a31–7, b7–8; 3.16 *passim*).

¹⁶ Notice that 1355b35’s analysis of *pisteis* follows immediately and naturally (there is no indication of a change of subject) from a definition of rhetoric itself, and that at 1356a20 claims about the nature of the *pisteis* are presented as grounds for conclusions about rhetoric as a whole.

¹⁷ Notice that the distinction at b15–16 between what is really and what is apparently persuasive is incomprehensible in its context, on the view that ‘persuasive’ (*πιθανόν*) means no more than ‘effective in producing conviction’. It must mean something like ‘persuasive by reason’ (cf. DA 3.3, 428a22–3; *Rhet* 1.2, 1356b28–30), such that rhetoric is an expertise in seeing what audiences will take to be reason-based grounds for persuasion (whether or not they are correct to do so).

¹⁸ Rapp (2002a, pp. 34–5) argues convincingly against a range of different interpretations, and defends the view, adopted from Primavesi (1987), that Aristotle in 1.1 uses *πίστις* quotationally (*zittierend*), and then gives the term a different sense in 1.2. My concern here is to reject this in favour of an ordinary Greek sense, though one somewhat different from the ‘unterminological sense’ that Rapp rejects.

later. At no point, I contend, does he use this term in a technical sense, nor does he stipulate a meaning for it.¹⁹

When, thirteen lines into the treatise, Aristotle writes ‘αἱ γὰρ πίστεις ἐντεχνόν εἰσι μόνον’ (only the *pisteis* belong to the expertise), he clearly cannot be using the term *πίστεις* in a way that presupposes his own theory to be unveiled several pages later. He must be using the term in some sense he can expect his readers to be familiar with already. One possibility is that it carries its ordinary, everyday sense. But another is the ingenious suggestion, defended by Primavesi and Rapp, that it is used allusively to mean roughly, ‘the things that previous writers assigned to the section of the speech they called “*πίστεις*”’.²⁰ That ‘αἱ *πίστεις*’ was a familiar term among teachers of rhetoric for a particular part of a speech is corroborated somewhat by its appearance in the *Rhetoric* itself at 3.17, 1417b21²¹ as a way of introducing discussion of the section of the speech devoted to proofs. The employment of such a sense in 1.1, a part of the *Rhetoric* explicitly concerned with previous theorists of rhetoric, is not by itself implausible. Indeed, if one considers 1354a13–14 in isolation, this sense may make for quite a plausible reading. But, in the end, there are decisive objections. The first is that *πίστις* at a15 cannot be read in this way, which saddles the interpretation with an awkward and unheralded shift of the term’s sense within two lines and between its first two uses in the treatise. The second is that this interpretation turns a13–18 into a series of loosely connected *complaints*, rather than (as canvassed earlier) a carefully constructed pair of closely related *arguments* to a single conclusion. The third objection is that this suggestion is needlessly complicated and undermotivated, since the ordinary sense of *πίστις* yields a perfectly satisfactory, indeed superior, understanding not only of this passage, but of uses of the term elsewhere in the treatise. Indeed, *whatever* other possibilities there may be for the meaning of the term in 1.1, if it can be shown that the ordinary sense is plausible both for this

¹⁹ The stipulation of meaning taking place at 1355b35–9 is of *ἄτεχνα* and *ἐντεχνα*. This distinction enables Aristotle to express his position more precisely, clarifying his looser assertion at 1354a13 (‘the *pisteis* alone belong to the expertise’). None of this, however, indicates a change in the *sense* (as opposed to the *reference*) of *πίστις*. Indeed, the unqualified phrase ‘αἱ *πίστεις*’ is used again shortly afterwards at 1356a21 where it clearly refers only to the technical *pisteis*.

²⁰ Primavesi (1987, pp. 36–8); Rapp (2002a, pp. 34–5).

²¹ Theodorus’ list of parts of the speech employs the slightly different terms *πίττωσις* and *ἐπίπιστωσης* (Plato *Phaedr.* 266e3–4).

chapter and for the rest of the treatise, there must be a strong presumption in its favour.

What, then, is the ordinary sense of *πίστις*? Consider the following passage of Aristotle, from a context with no particular connection to the discussion of rhetoric, and in which *πίστις* is clearly not part of a specialist technical vocabulary.

Knowledge (*γνώσις*) of [the soul] is held to contribute greatly to the advance of truth in general, and, above all, to our understanding of nature. For it is something like the principle of animal life. We are seeking to scrutinise and understand (*θεωρῆσαι καὶ γνῶναι*) first its nature and being, and then its contingent properties; . . . To attain any firm evidence (*τινα πίστιν*) about the soul is one of the most difficult things in the world. (*De Anima* 1.1, 402a4–11)

What is the meaning of *πίστις* in the last sentence (here translated as 'firm evidence', in line with the normative interpretation of the term I am urging for its use in the *Rhetoric*)? It is something supremely difficult to obtain in relation to the soul. Aristotle's point here can scarcely be that it is supremely difficult to find anything to say about the soul that could be convincing to people, since people then as now both had and were susceptible to acquiring all kinds of convictions about the soul. His point must be that it is hard to find things that *merit* conviction, things that are a firm (in the sense of proper) basis for pursuing knowledge (*γνώσις*). Hence *πίστις* here must simply *mean* something that merits conviction. And, since the context here provides no indication of a non-standard sense, we ought to conclude that Aristotle is simply relying on the term's ordinary meaning.

Similarly, then, in *Rhetoric* 1.1, Aristotle can rely on *πίστις* having this normative sense quite independently of whether he is engaging dialectically with a tradition of technical writing on rhetoric because this is simply part of the ordinary meaning of the word, when it is used to refer to what produces confidence. This can be seen in both philosophical and non-philosophical usage from around the same period.²² Understanding

²² One interesting philosophical example is from Parmenides fragment B1, 30, where a normative sense is extremely plausible. In Aristotle, see especially *Top* 100b19–21, 103b3–7; *Soph. Elench.* 165b27. In non-philosophical prose, the evidence from the orators is particularly relevant and instructive. Among uses of *πίστις* to refer to what produces conviction, I have yet to find a single instance incompatible with the proposed normative reading, and several that require it: cf. esp. Lysias 1.19.6, 12.10.1, 18.19.5, 19.32.2, 25.17.2; Isocrates *Antidosis* 125.5, *Busiris* 31.5, *Helen* 22.2, *Paneg.* 110.2, *Phil.* 91.8; Lycurgus in *Leocr.* 79.4,

the term in this way makes sense of the connection made frequently in ancient authors between *πίστις*, especially its use in such phrases as '*πίστιν ἔχειν*' (to be convincing), and the cognate adjective *πιστός* (trust-worthy).²³ We have argued that the normative sense proposed in (PIST) was required by the arguments of the opening chapter: the contemporary usage of the term shows this to be simply its everyday meaning.

That this is the meaning of *πίστις* in 1.2 receives some additional support from the following. Following the characterization of rhetoric at the start of 1.2 as a capacity to see the possibly persuasive in each thing (itself entirely consistent with the view of rhetoric in 1.1, as we have shown), Aristotle draws attention to a feature that makes it different from other expertises. That is, that it has no particular subject matter. In making this point, he observes that other expertises are (i.e. make their possessor), in their own domain, 'competent to teach and persuade' (*διδασκαλική καὶ πειστική*, 1355b29), whereas the implication is that rhetoric is, by virtue of its being a capacity to see the possibly persuasive, competent to persuade (*πειστική*) in *any* given domain. If here all that was meant by 'competence to persuade' was *de facto* effectiveness in persuasion, Aristotle's point would be far from compelling—Plato's *Gorgias* calls attention to the fact that in large gatherings experts are less persuasive than non-experts that have expertise in rhetoric.²⁴ And only a page before this passage, Aristotle himself observes that 'before some people, even if we had the most precise knowledge, it would not be easy to persuade them by using it in your speech' (1355a24–5). Presumably the sense in which expertise brings persuasiveness is precisely that it brings an ability to offer genuinely supporting justifications for the expert's claims. Their *de facto* persuasiveness will vary considerably depending on the circumstances of each case. Now if this is right, then even in these opening sentences of 1.2, since Aristotle is suggesting that

80.2, 127.12; Demosthenes 23.116.4, 23.117.2–7, 29.40.8, 30.26.1. In several cases, where it is qualified by an adjective (e.g. *ικανή, μεγίστη, τοσαύτη*), it is clear from the context that the aspect of the meaning of *πίστις* to which the qualifier draws attention is its indicating epistemic merit, not merely persuasive effectiveness. Demosthenes' use of the phrase '*τεκμήριον καὶ πίστις*' (29.40.8, 30.26.1) similarly suggests that it is part of the sense of the term to indicate that what it refers to *merits* conviction.

²³ Aristotle makes this connection explicitly in *Top.* 100b18–23.

²⁴ *Gorgias* 458e6–459c2. This is particularly relevant given that the juxtaposition of 'teaching' and 'persuasion' in connection with the expertises (*technai*) here is surely supposed to recall the discussion of *Gorgias* 453d7–454a5.

the rhetoric's persuasive power across every domain has an important similarity to the persuasive power of each expertise in its own domain, we get a hint that this persuasive power will be about providing *proper* support for the orator's claims, not merely devices that are *de facto* effective in getting people to believe things.

After a brief discussion of rhetoric in terms of what is 'persuasive', Aristotle reverts to talking about the *pisteis* at 1355b35: 'proofs can be divided into technical and non-technical proofs' (b35–6). We should notice two things. The first is that the initial use of 'αἱ πίστεις' cannot mean the section of the speech called 'the proofs', it must mean simply proofs; and since it picks up from the talk of 'the persuasive' (τὸ πιθανόν) in the preceding paragraph, it cannot be a way of referring to a section of the speech by specifying its contents. The second is that this sentence seems to presuppose some previous discussion of 'the proofs': and it seems most natural to suppose that it simply picks up on the discussion of the proofs in Chapter 1. If so, we should expect 'αἱ πίστεις' to mean the same in both places.

Another passage that suggests continuity in the meaning of the term between 1.1 and 1.2 is 1356a20–34. The passage argues that since the *pisteis* are of such-and-such a kind, it turns out that rhetoric is an offshoot of dialectic and politics, and a kind of part of dialectic. Notice first that this inference makes far better sense if *pisteis* are central to rhetorical skill (our claim (RHET)). Second, the inference from the nature of the *pisteis* to a close similarity between rhetoric and dialectic recapitulates what was said in Chapter 1 (as Aristotle himself observes at 1355a31–2), and strongly suggests that the meaning of *πίστις* has not changed between the two chapters.

A final passage to consider in this connection is 1356b26–34. In this section, 'persuasive' (πιθανόν) is unselfconsciously paired with trustworthy (πιστόν) (1356b29) and seems to be some kind of epistemic standing;²⁵ and it is paired also with 'reputable' (ἐνδοξόν) (b34). It is seemingly simply assumed that the kind of persuasiveness Aristotle is

²⁵ Further evidence of this is Aristotle's recognition of a distinction between the 'persuasive' (πιθανόν) and the 'apparently persuasive' (φαινόμενον πιθανόν) at 1355b15–16. This distinction itself makes no sense if *πιθανόν* simply means 'liable to persuade', since here clearly *φαινόμενον* makes reference to the perspective of the speaker's audience. If they take something to be persuasive, then it simply *is* persuasive to them (i.e. liable to persuade them). The distinction is meaningful, however, if *πιθανόν* indicates, as suggested, the

talking about will derive from some kind of trustworthiness or reputability. This is perfectly natural if, as I am claiming, Aristotle is committed throughout to rhetoric's being an expertise in providing proofs (RHET), understood as proper grounds for conviction (PIST).²⁶

Understanding the term *πίστις* as meaning 'proper grounds for conviction', as proposed in (PIST), is thus not only the ordinary meaning of the word in Greek, it is also required by the argument of 1.1, and makes very good sense of its use in 1.2 (indeed, the passages cited can plausibly be taken to offer positive support to this interpretation). This conclusion receives confirmation from book 3. It is clear that book 3 of the *Rhetoric* reaffirms both the classification of proofs into three types from 1.2 (3.1, 1403b9–13; 3.17, 1418a12–17) and the emphasis from 1.1 on the centrality of proof and using the facts to fight one's case (3.1, 1403b18–20, 1404a5–7; 3.13, 1414a30–6). And in this context, it is clear that *πίστις* means, as in 1.1, rhetorical *arguments* that provide some kind of demonstration of the conclusion for which they are offered as support (3.13, 1414a30–6; 3.17, 1417b21–34). For example, at 1414a30–6, Aristotle takes it as obvious that the orator's task of 'demonstrating' (*ἀποδείξαι*) his conclusion will be discharged by providing 'proofs' (*πίστεις*). All of this lends support to the proposal (PIST) that throughout the treatise, by '*πίστις*' Aristotle means proper grounds for conviction.²⁷

2.3.4 Aristotle's overall characterization of rhetoric

I now wish to show that in a number of key passages where Aristotle expresses his understanding of what rhetoric is, its function, goals, and

possession of some kind of positive epistemic standing, that is, something that one *ought* to be persuaded by.

²⁶ These may also explain Aristotle's emphasis on *πίστις* and what might be plausibly seen as his suppression of the term *πειθώ* and cognates until well into the treatise (the first use in reference to rhetoric is at 1355a30). That the delay in the use of these terms is surprising and calls for explanation is suggested by the very close association between rhetoric and cognates of *πειθώ* both in Aristotle, and in the preceding Platonic treatments of rhetoric (e.g. *EN* 3.3, 1112b14; Plato, *Gorgias* 452e–453a; *Phaedrus* 270b8, 271b4–5). The suggestion is that, although Aristotle would not deny that rhetoric was concerned with persuading, he initially uses *πίστις* to the exclusion of *πειθώ* in order to make clear that his view of rhetoric centred on the provision of proofs, not simply on successful persuasion.

²⁷ One might additionally note that where, both in and outside the *Rhetoric*, *πίστις* is used to refer to the state of being convinced, this is closely associated by Aristotle with its being a response to reason and argument, e.g. *Rhet* 1.1, 1355a5–6, *De Anima* 3.3, 428a17–23.

methods, the view he expresses is consistent with, and in many cases confirms, the understanding of rhetoric and the nature of the *pisteis* I am attributing to Aristotle.

Aristotle's first characterization of the nature of rhetoric comes in the first lines of the treatise.

Rhetoric is a counterpart to dialectic. For both are concerned with things that are such as to be, in a way, common to everyone to get to know, and that relate to no specific body of knowledge. This explains why everyone also, in a way, possesses something of both. For, to an extent, everyone engages in criticising and maintaining an argument and in defending and accusing people. Now in the general population, some do these things at random, others because of practice do them from ability. Because both of these are possible, it is clear that there would also be a way of doing these things methodically. For where success is achieved by some because of practice and by others from their own ability, it is possible to study the explanation for this: and just such a thing all would agree is the function of an expertise (τέχνης). (1354a1–11)

Here, he emphasizes that rhetoric, in common with other *technai*, explains its possessor's non-accidental, method-based, success in achieving some goal. Rhetoric's sphere of operation is not precisely specified, but that it is pursued in settings of public deliberation such as law-courts is gestured at in the reference to 'defending and accusing people' (a5–6).

The nature of rhetoric is further indicated in the emphatic alignment of rhetoric with dialectic (a1), and it is clear that the basis for this similarity is the centrality of *arguments* to both.²⁸ The very next sentence in the text has already been discussed at length.

These days, those who put together 'Arts of Speaking' have provided us with scarcely a part of it. For it is only the proofs (πίστεις) that belong to the art, other things are mere accessories. (a11–14)

It confirms that Aristotle sees rhetoric as an expertise to which the proofs are central, and this suggests that it is precisely the role of reasoning and arguments that he sees as the central component both of dialectic and of this closely related expertise used in 'defending and accusing'. Indeed, this impression is specifically confirmed in the next chapter, when he describes rhetoric and dialectic as 'certain capacities for providing arguments' (1356a33–4), and uses the importance of reasoning (τὸ συλλογίσασθαι,

²⁸ Cf. Allen (2007).

1356a22) to rhetoric as a reason for thinking that rhetoric is not merely a kind of offshoot of dialectic (οἶον παραφθές τι, a25), but a kind of part of dialectic and similar to it (μόριόν τι τῆς διαλεκτικῆς καὶ ὁμοί[ωμ]α, a30–1).

It is in this context that we should read Aristotle's explicit statement at the start of 1.2 on the nature of rhetoric.

Let rhetoric be an ability in connection with each thing to see what is possibly persuasive. For this is the function (ἔργον) of no other expertise. (1355b26–8)

Aristotle had just specified the 'function' (ἔργον) of rhetoric in very similar terms (1355b10–11), and although these formulations by themselves leave open what could count as 'persuasive', it is clear from the context just described that he has in mind an ability to see the possibilities for persuasive arguments.

Accordingly, Aristotle's view about the goal of rhetoric (strictly, the goal rhetoric enables its possessor to secure)²⁹ is that it is to secure some particular judgement by offering proof (πίστις) or demonstration (ἀπόδειξις) of it (1354a26–8, b30–1). What type of judgement it is the orator's goal to secure will depend on the type of speech-making in which he is engaged (1.3, 1358a36–1359a6). Thus, forensic speakers are aiming to convince their listeners that an action was just or unjust, deliberative speakers that some course of action is beneficial or harmful, and epideictic speakers that something or someone was fine or base. When Aristotle touches in passing on the goal of rhetoric at the start of each of books 2 and 3, he simply says that it is 'for the sake of a judgement' (ἐνεκα κρίσεως, 1377b20–1), or 'with a view to [the audience's] conviction' (πρὸς δόξαν, 1404a1). One final passage to consider with regard to the goal of rhetoric is Aristotle's introduction in book 3 to his treatment of 'arrangement' (τάξις), i.e. of the parts of a speech.

There are two parts of a speech. For it is necessary both to say what the issue is on which one will speak, and to demonstrate it (ἀποδείξαι). That is why it is

²⁹ Rapp (2009) organizes his discussion of the goals of rhetoric in terms of a modern distinction between 'internal' and 'external' goals. This doesn't match Aristotle's use of terminology, of course. All of Aristotle's remarks about the 'goal' (τέλος) and 'function' (ἔργον) of rhetoric, and hence the discussion here, are concerned with the 'internal' goals of rhetoric. Aristotle's views on the 'external' goals of rhetoric are expressed in terms of how it is 'useful' (χρήσιμος), and emerge in passages where he touches on the role of public speakers in the state. These topics are discussed in Chapter 3.

impossible having said something not to demonstrate it, or to demonstrate it without having first said it. For the one who demonstrates demonstrates something, and the one who introduces something introduces it in order to demonstrate it. And of these, the one is a statement and the other a proof (*πίστις*), just the same as if one had distinguished these as thesis and demonstration.

(3.13, 1414a30–4)

Aristotle is, of course, not literally specifying that a properly constructed speech have only two parts (he discusses six parts in the section of book 3 introduced by this paragraph). He is rather indicating, presumably, that these are the two essential parts that a speech is bound to contain, given the nature and purpose of speech-making. But if so, this confirms that here too Aristotle's view of rhetoric makes proof (*πίστις*) central to the expertise, and characterizes that proof as 'demonstration', a characterization that at the very least suggests the provision of good grounds for the speaker's claim.

The exact significance of Aristotle's use of terms such as 'demonstration' (*ἀπόδειξις*) in characterizing rhetorical proof is the subject of the next section. For now, my concern is to have shown that there are good grounds for supposing that Aristotle's commitment to a view of rhetoric in which it is an expertise in offering proper grounds for conviction is not only required by the initial arguments of the *Rhetoric* 1.1, but also makes good sense of how he characterizes the expertise throughout the treatise.³⁰

2.4 Aristotle's Theory of Proof (1355a3–18)

To claim that rhetoric, for Aristotle, was a skill in producing *pisteis*, and that we should understand these to be 'proper grounds for conviction', is to invite questions about what standards Aristotle thought something had to meet in order to count as '*pistis*'. This section addresses these questions.

³⁰ Arguably, such a view gains support from attention to the things Aristotle lists as *non-technical pisteis* (i.e. proofs that require no technical skill to develop, but are simply available ready to be used by the speaker), in his discussion of these at 1355b35–9. He does not include things of dubious evidential value, such as the family or race of the speakers, even though these might help bring about the desired verdict. He does include things that are good reasons (at least in the view of Aristotle and some of his contemporaries) in favour of some particular verdict: written laws, witness statements, written agreements, evidence obtained under torture (cf. Mirhady, 1996, *Rhet* 1.15, 1376b31–1377a7 and *Rhet. ad Alex.* 16) and statements made under oath.

2.4.1 A theory of *pistis*: what constitutes proper grounds for conviction?

Aristotle, as we have seen, clearly thinks that material irrelevant to some issue cannot qualify as proper grounds for conviction of the orator's proposed view of that issue. Irrelevance is an impropriety that excludes material from being a possible *pistis*. On the other hand, Aristotle seems to allow that there are things that would count as exercises of rhetorical skill despite being sufficiently objectionable that they should not be done.³¹ Thus, not every way of lacking propriety rules something out as a *pistis*. So, what should we think Aristotle supposes is required for something to count as a *pistis*? The answer I propose might be roughly summarized thus: an orator presents listeners with proper grounds for conviction of his conclusion just if what he presents to them is—by their lights—good reason for adopting the conclusion he is recommending.³² A more precise formulation is given in the next section: it can be defended, I believe, on the basis of a close reading of *Rhetoric* 1355a3–14.

2.4.2 Proposed characterization of Aristotelian *pistis*:

1. A *pistis* consists of premises³³ acceptable to the audience that stand in such a relation to the conclusion for which they are offered as a *pistis* that if one accepts (and persists in accepting) the premises, it would be an exercise of good judgement to be inclined towards accepting also that conclusion because of those premises. (Cf. 1355a3–14: *pisteis* require skill in dialectic.)
2. A *pistis* is comprised of things that are reputable, and it is a device by which they confer good standing³⁴ on something else, namely the conclusion. (Cf. 1355a4f. *Pistis* is a demonstration of a kind.)

³¹ Cf. 1355a29–31: Rhetorical expertise involves being *able* to argue both sides of the case, even where actually to do this shouldn't be done because it would be to persuade people of things that are inferior or base 'οὐ γὰρ δεῖ τὰ φαῦλα πείθειν' (a31). Cf. also 1355b2–7: rhetoric can be used wrongly and cause great harm. Notice how on this point Aristotle seems to side with Gorgias against Plato.

³² This rough summary is intended only as an approximation to the view I am recommending.

³³ Since both *logos*-proofs (1359a6–10, 26–9; 1377b16–20) and *pathos*-proofs (1378a26–9) involve premises, it seems reasonable to infer that *êthos*-proofs also do.

³⁴ It is unclear what the correct Aristotelian terminology would be for the epistemic good standing of a conclusion of a sound argument from reputable premises (and we do well to note that not only rhetorical arguments but systematic enquiries in ethics, for

3. A *pistis* aims at inclining the listener to accept the conclusion³⁵ as a result of sensitivity to the reputability of the premises and the relation in which they stand to the conclusion. (Cf. 1355a4f. *Pistis* is a demonstration of a kind.)

My main concern in this characterization is to state more precisely what it is about a *pistis* that makes it *proper* grounds for conviction. Accordingly, in what follows, I will be mainly concerned with parts 1 and 2.

In some key passages in *Rhetoric* 1.1, Aristotle emphasizes that the orator's exercise of his craft should not corrupt the listener; indeed, it should assist him in making good judgements aimed at the truth.³⁶ On this formulation, the orator's presentation of *pisteis* does this by helping the listener to undertake a process of inference that has two important features. One is that the premises are ones that are reputable. The other is that the process of inference itself proceeds correctly such that, given appropriate premises, it serves to increase the good standing of the conclusion.

2.5 Rhetorical, Dialectical Expertise, and the Nature of *Pisteis*: 1355a3–14

The following passage confirms this proposal:

Since it is plain that the expert method is concerned with the proofs (*πίστεις*), and proof is demonstration of a kind (*ἀπόδειξις* τῆς), for we are convinced most of all whenever we think a thing has been demonstrated, and a rhetorical demonstration is an enthymeme, and this is pretty much the most important of the proofs, and the enthymeme is reasoning of a kind (*συλλογισμός* τῆς), and it

example, involve starting from premises that are reputable rather than known). Still, it is clear from both the *Rhetoric* and the *Posterior Analytics* that Aristotle's view is that rhetorical arguments are structurally similar to the (ideal) case of scientific demonstration, where the epistemic merits of the premises of a sound demonstrative argument serve to deliver conclusions that are in sufficiently good epistemic standing to count as understanding (*ἐπιστήμη*). I am grateful to Terry Irwin for highlighting this issue.

³⁵ It is in this sense that Aristotle can allow that the proximate goal of rhetoric is to persuade. Cf. *EN* 3.3, 1112b14.

³⁶ Cf. 1354a24–31, and Chapter 3. Note that although such a view undeniably has significant normative content, it is considerably less high-minded than some competing views of rhetoric attributed to Aristotle. The merits of such views will be considered in Chapter 5.

is the job of dialectic (either dialectic generally, or one of its parts) to consider alike all reasoning, it is clear that the one who is best able to discern this—from what and how a piece of reasoning comes about—would also be best skilled in enthymemes, provided he also grasped the features of the enthymeme and how it is different from cases of logical reasoning. (1355a3–14)

This passage presents many difficulties, not all of which can be discussed here. What I hope to show is that, on any plausible understanding of its argumentative structure and key terms, a number of points emerge about the nature of rhetorical *pisteis*.

First, Aristotle is concerned to show that it is experts in dialectic who are best placed to possess an expertise in rhetoric. This is clearly the conclusion emphatically announced at a10–14.³⁷ (Compare also the treatise's opening slogan, 'Rhetoric is the counterpart to dialectic' 1354a1.) Hence the section serves as a kind of sales pitch for his own teaching, with Aristotle suggesting that one should learn rhetoric from someone like him whose expertise makes him well placed to furnish the necessary foundation in dialectic. The basis for his argument is the nature of rhetoric (as concerned with providing *pisteis*) and hence the nature of the *pisteis*. The crucial point for our purposes is that Aristotle's argument here—however we trace it out in detail—is based upon the nature of *pisteis* (a3–5). A *pistis* is of such a kind, and the most important (component?) of the *pisteis*, enthymeme, is of such a kind that it is experts in dialectic that are best placed to master them. What is it about expertise in dialectic that helps with enthymemes and *pisteis*? Aristotle explicitly says at a11 that it is a matter of being able to discern 'from what and how a piece of reasoning comes about' (*ἐκ τίνων καὶ πῶς γίνεται συλλογισμός*). So, *pisteis* are such that their successful production is a matter of knowing something about how reasoning works, and something about the selection of materials for reasoning.³⁸ My contention is that the crucial aspect of understanding 'how reasoning comes

³⁷ This is confirmed by the clear echoes at a14–18 of Plato's *Phaedrus* 260–73, especially 273d2–6. Aristotle's care at 1355a14–18 (discussed in Chapter 4) to insist against Plato's Socrates that the expert orator need not know the truth about his subject matter is best explained by supposing that his main point in a3–14 was that expertise in dialectic enables expertise in rhetoric. Since Socrates had said something rather similar, Aristotle might easily have been misunderstood as endorsing that position from the *Phaedrus*, hence the need for clarification. Cf. *Phaedrus* 270a–c and 271a–272b in the light of 266b–d, esp. d1–4.

³⁸ Thus, the meaning of this phrase here matches that of the almost identical phrase at *An. Pr.* 1.4, 25b26–7.

about' is understanding the inferential relations that may obtain between the elements of a piece of reasoning: particularly, understanding how these may stand to one another as premises to conclusion such that if one accepts (and persists in accepting) the premises, one is urged towards accepting also the conclusion. This feature is precisely what is needed for skill in producing enthymemes and *pisteis* generally, i.e. for being good at rhetoric. And it is a central skill of dialectic. The other aspect of dialectic that is a key requirement for rhetorical expertise is an ability to select premises for an argument to the desired conclusion—an ability 'to discern . . . *from what* . . . a piece of reasoning comes about'. Obviously part of an ability to discern the right premises is an ability to see their inferential relations to the conclusion. But if this were all that was intended by this phrase, it would make the 'from what' and the 'how' of a11 almost identical. It is more likely that what Aristotle has additionally (and perhaps principally) in mind here is the dialectician's ability to identify premises that not only stand in the right inferential relations to the conclusion, but are *acceptable to the listener*. These two features of dialectical skill mentioned specifically by Aristotle here help to illuminate the nature of the *pisteis* with which the passage starts. They confirm what was proposed in our characterization of *pistis* set out earlier. A *pistis* consists of premises that are acceptable to the listener and that stand in the right kind of relations to the judgement for which they are offered as a *pistis*.

A second feature that sheds light on what a *pistis* is, is the claim that a *pistis* is 'a demonstration of a kind', or 'some sort of demonstration' (a4–5).³⁹ For on any plausible interpretation of this claim,⁴⁰ a demonstration (even one that is strictly speaking defective in certain ways) will be a device by which the reputability of the premises confers good standing on the conclusion. It is for this reason that demonstration is a suitable instrument for teaching, learning, and persuasion (*An Post.* 1.1, 71a1–2, a9–11; cf. *Rhetoric* 1.2, 1355b26–35). This is an important addition to what we have already seen. For in certain kinds of dialectical

³⁹ Cf. Burnyeat (1994, pp. 13–30). For the present point, nothing depends on the interpretation of $\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.

⁴⁰ The original sense of *apodeixis* to mean simply 'show', 'make public', or 'reveal' (e.g. Herodotus 1.1; cf. Barnes (1969, p. 78)) is not a plausible candidate here. However stringent, technical, or otherwise the sense is in this passage, it is clearly a case of 'showing that'.

reasoning, the practitioner's purpose can be merely to undermine a key thesis or set of premises introduced or accepted by their interlocutor, by showing that the premises entailed an unacceptable conclusion, were inconsistent with each other, or were inconsistent with the key thesis.⁴¹ Reasoning can have this limited function, even when it uses acceptable premises. But demonstration aims at something more. Demonstration aims at the acceptance of the conclusion. So, in claiming that *pistis* is some kind of demonstration, Aristotle is saying that it is comprised of things that are reputable, and that it is a device by which they confer good standing on something else, namely the conclusion.

Third, it seems that we can say something stronger about the connection between *pistis* and demonstration. We see this in the way Aristotle supports his claim that *pistis* is *apodeixis tis* (a4–5). The supporting reason given is that we are convinced (*πιστεύομεν*, a5) most of all when we take it that something has been demonstrated. On a very literal interpretation, Aristotle has a rather poor argument here. He would be making an inductive generalization from the cases of greatest or best *pistis* (*πιστεύομεν μάλιστα*, a5) to a conclusion about *pistis* generally. On a more plausible reading, however, Aristotle's argument is about what is essential to *pistis*. What he seems to have in mind is that the most successful cases of *pistis* illuminate what it is about a *pistis* that makes it successful or unsuccessful, i.e. what makes it a *good* example of *pistis*. The view thus illuminated is that a *pistis* is successful to the extent that the conclusion is demonstrated, and this shows us that every *pistis* must involve some degree of demonstrative success on pain of being so bad as a *pistis* that it is not a *pistis* at all.^{42,43} The suggestion is not simply that

⁴¹ Cf. e.g. *Top.* 8.4–5, 159a16–37; *Soph. El.* 2, 165a38–b11, and, for discussion, Allen (2007).

⁴² Aristotle is not here affirming that every case of *pistis* is a *defective* case of demonstration, 'only a sort of *apodeixis*, ... not as it were your full-blooded specimen, not something from which you can expect everything that you would normally expect from an *apodeixis* ...' (Burnyeat, 1994, p. 13). Otherwise, cases of the kind he cites apparently as the most successful kind of *pistis* at a5–6 would risk not only failing to attain that accolade, but failing to be cases of *pistis* at all, making nonsense of the argument. The difficulty is avoided if we take the force of Aristotle's assertion here to be not the negative claim that *pistis* is no more than a defective demonstration, but rather the positive claim that *pistis* is a demonstration of at least that relaxed, less-than-full-blooded kind.

⁴³ Cf. LSJ *v.sub* 'tis' I.A. This interpretation thus accommodates the merits of the *alienans* reading by allowing that the kinds of demonstration over which this expression ranges might include the less-than-full-blooded kinds of demonstration that are central to

being a demonstration is one thing among many that can make a proof a good proof, but that *what it is to be a good proof* is (at least in part) a matter of its credentials as a demonstration. This would constitute a good justification for a conclusion about the nature of proof itself: that it is a demonstration of some kind (a5). What might Aristotle intend by such an assertion? On the most obvious conjecture,⁴⁴ two aspects are central: one relates to the premises, and the other concerns the way the demonstration proceeds from them to the conclusion.⁴⁵ If this is right, then—as in our proposed characterization of Aristotelian *pistis*—Aristotle is committed to the view that the more reputable the premises are to the listeners, and the tighter the inferential relation between premises and conclusion, the better the *pistis*, and to the view that any proof must involve exhibiting these features to at least some degree.

Together these features of Aristotle's argument at 1355a3–14 suggest that the understanding of *pistis* proposed does indeed capture Aristotle's view. They also make clearer the sense in which *pistis* is 'proper grounds for conviction', and suggest that 'proof'—while not perfect—has some merit as an English translation of '*πίστις*'.

We see this account of proper grounds for conviction reflected in what Aristotle says elsewhere in the *Rhetoric* about the kinds of premises needed for rhetorical argument. Premises need to be persuasive or reputable⁴⁶ to the kind of people being addressed (1356b33–4), and this is a matter of their either being intrinsically plausible to them (*πιθανὸν καὶ πιστόν*, b29) or being shown to follow from things that are intrinsically plausible (b29f.). This, typically, is a matter of the premises being recognizable to listeners as the kind of thing they are accustomed to using in sound deliberation (1356b37f.). Seemingly, for

the *alienans* reading: defective demonstration perhaps, but demonstration in some sense nonetheless. Cf. Burnyeat, 1994, pp. 13–39).

⁴⁴ Clearly this is not the point at which to reach for his technical account of demonstration from the *Posterior Analytics*. What is appealed to here is an everyday understanding of what it is to have something demonstrated. Cf. Burnyeat, 1994, esp. pp. 13–14).

⁴⁵ These do, in fact, have their more stringent counterparts in Aristotle's technical account in the *Posterior Analytics* (71b20–4): the self-explanatory character of the axioms, and the necessity with which what is demonstrated follows from them.

⁴⁶ *Endoxon* at 1356b34 appears to be used as simply a synonym for *pithanon*, used immediately before this at b28. It seems to be given a slightly more precise sense at 1357a12–13 where having premises that are 'agreed' seems to be distinct from and correlative to having premises that are 'reputable' (*ex endoxôn*).

premises to be reputable and for them to be agreed are distinct, but both can contribute to making an argument persuasive (1357a12–13). Such premises may consist in likelihoods of various kinds (1357a34–b25) or of examples with a similarity to the case in question (1357a7–21). Interestingly, although premises for rhetorical proofs could be intrinsically plausible or inferred from things that are, Aristotle deems it necessary to clarify that this does not require the orator to go back to first principles in the relevant subject matter. To do so might confuse the listener with an argument too long to follow (1357a3–4, a10–12, a16–23), or involve a departure from exercising *rhetorical* expertise into the exercise of an expertise in some particular subject area (1358a2–26). Premises should be such that listeners are disposed to regard them as reputable, either by their being intrinsically plausible to them already, or because they can be quickly inferred from things that are. Finally, there is the obvious point that Aristotle's phrases 'τὸ (ἐνδεχόμενον) πιθανόν'—the (possibly) persuasive (1355b15f., b26, b33f.; 1356a12f., a20, b28–9; 1403b19) and 'τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πιθανά'—the existing persuasive things (1355b10–11)—typically refer simply to features of the circumstances surrounding the forensic case or political proposal with which the orator is concerned. On our proposed account of *pistis* these are those features (or combinations of features) that the listeners are disposed to regard as true or likely (and hence reputable to believe), and which stand (and can be presented as standing) in the relevant kind of relation to the speaker's conclusion. In this way, Aristotle can insist that 'the things referred to' (τὰ ὑποκείμενα πράγματα) by the speakers have an influence on the effectiveness of their case. Things that are 'true' and 'better' will generally yield the better argued and more persuasive side of a debate (1355a36–8). Indeed, he summarizes his treatment of the *pisteis* as a treatment of 'what things give the facts themselves (αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα) their persuasiveness' (1403b19), and insists that it is right for the speaker to 'fight using the facts themselves' (1404a6; cf. also 1416a37).

There is thus considerable textual support for the characterization of Aristotle's understanding of *pistis* already set out. However, this view faces some difficulties, and it will be important to show how these can be addressed. These relate first, to Aristotle's inclusion of 'apparent enthymemes' among proofs that proceed through the argument itself, and second, to his recommendation that the orator use premises the speaker knows or believes to be untrue.

2.6 Apparent Enthymemes

It is clear that in 1.1, 1.2, 2.24, and elsewhere Aristotle recognizes that genuine 'proofs' sometimes proceed through inferences whose propriety as inferences is merely apparent (hereafter, 'fallacies'), and that mastery of these is part of the expertise of rhetoric.⁴⁷ He devotes a whole chapter to these 'apparent enthymemes' at 2.24. Their inclusion seems to cast doubt on the characterization of Aristotelian *pistis*, since it requires a relationship between the premises and conclusion such that the premises provide *genuine* (and not merely apparent) support to the conclusion.

Of course, there are a number of reasons why one might suppose that the expert orator ought to know about plausible fallacies. This might be in order to recognize and undermine them when an opposing speaker makes use of them.⁴⁸ Equally, if the abilities and knowledge that constitute the expertise of rhetoric involve the ability to distinguish among plausible inferences the good ones from the bad, they will inevitably involve some knowledge of and ability to deploy the latter.⁴⁹

Still, these do not explain how fallacies could constitute 'proper grounds for conviction', which I have argued is the *meaning* of *πίστις*. This is best explained by paying attention to what is meant by 'apparently persuasive' (*φαινόμενον . . . πιθανόν*, 1355a15–16) and 'apparent enthymeme' (*φαινόμενον ἐνθύμημα*, 1356b3–4, 1400b35–6). Since not all things persuasive or all enthymemes are 'apparent' in this way, there must be something that the (merely) apparent cases appear to be. What is this? The most obvious answer is that they appear to be good inferences, i.e. they are taken to be so by the audience. We might next note that Aristotle doesn't seem to recognize 'apparent' cases of every type of proof. It is only proofs through the argument itself (1356a1–4)

⁴⁷ Cf. 'the apparently persuasive' 1.1, 1355b15–16; 'apparent demonstration (*δεικνύναι*)' 1.2, 1356a4, a36; 'the apparently <true>' 1.2, 1356a20; 'apparent enthymeme' 1.2, 1356a35–b4, 2.24, 1400b34–7. That these belong to the expertise of rhetoric is explicit at 1355b15–16, and follows from the fact that proofs by apparent enthymeme are one kind of proof through the argument itself. That Aristotle is recommending their use seems clear from 2.24, 'useful' (1401a8), 'one should do whichever is the more useful' (a26), unless we are somehow to understand these recommendations conditionally.

⁴⁸ Cf. what Aristotle says about knowing how to argue both ways on an issue: 1.1, 1355a29–33.

⁴⁹ Cf. *Metaph.* *Θ*.2, 1046a36–b7.

that include apparent as well as real 'demonstrations' (δεικνύναι, a4). The most natural thing to think here is that when listeners are attending to 'the argument itself' and mistakenly believe the inference from premises to conclusion is good, then in adopting the conclusion, they do something that would be an exercise of good judgement, *were their beliefs true*. The false belief in the correctness of the inference functions as a premise in an argument that *is* then properly inferred from premises some of which are false. Thus, although some set of premises p does not entail or support q , if the subject mistakenly believes that $p \rightarrow q$, the inference from both p and $p \rightarrow q$ to q is correct. The fault in the overall argument lies in the false belief in the truth of $p \rightarrow q$. But this simply makes the use of apparent enthymemes unexceptional within Aristotle's view of rhetoric, according to which expert speakers get audiences to move from premises that are reputable to them, but may not be true, to conclusions that those premises, if true, would support.

Accordingly, there will be a certain kind of use of rhetoric that makes extensive use of fallacies mistakenly believed by audiences to be good inferences. As Aristotle explains, this is to rhetoric what sophistical arguments are to dialectic.

Additionally, [it is clear] that the same expertise covers seeing both the persuasive and the apparently persuasive, just like the syllogism and the apparent syllogism in the case of dialectic too. For the nature of sophistic lies not in the capability deployed, but in how one chooses to deploy it. Except that here one will be a 'rhetorician' on the basis of their knowledge, and another on the basis of their choice. Whereas there one is a 'sophist' on the basis of their choice, and a 'dialectician' on the basis not of their choice but of their capability.

(1.1, 1355b15–21)

Aristotle's point here is about the way in which the term $\rho\acute{\eta}\tau\omega\rho$ (literally: orator, here translated 'rhetorician') does double duty as a term for the person possessing the expertise ($\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\eta$) of rhetoric, and for the person who chooses to deploy this expertise with a particular aim. This is in contrast to dialectic where there are separate terms for the person with the expertise ('dialectician', $\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$) and the person with the distinctively competitive aim ('sophist', $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$). But in both cases, the competitive and less scrupulous manner of deployment is nonetheless a deployment of the same expertise (dialectic, rhetoric). So, just as 'sophistic' is a deployment of dialectical expertise that makes extensive use of merely apparent syllogisms (cf. *Soph. El.* 164a20–165b11), so there is a

kind of deployment of rhetoric that will similarly make extensive use of merely apparent enthymemes that are, as Aristotle puts it, only 'apparently persuasive'.

One might worry, then, about a kind of manipulation where a speaker might take advantage of audience beliefs (whether about the correctness of an inference, or about any other matter) that he *knows* to be false, to get them to assent to his desired conclusion. Can such a technique still count as providing proper grounds for conviction, and thus count as an exercise of the expertise of rhetoric? This is the subject of the second difficulty facing the proposed account of Aristotelian *pistis*.

2.7 The Proposed Characterization of *Pistis* and the Use of Premises Not Believed By the Speaker

It is striking that the proposed account of proof offered here does not exclude the use by the speaker of premises that he *himself* does not take to be true or reputable. All that is required is that proofs consist of material that the *listeners* are disposed to regard as reputable, and that *if true* are good grounds for judging the conclusion true. It might be worried that this leaves open the possibility that besides any good purposes the expertise of rhetoric might serve, it was equally well suited to perverting the course of justice or leading the assembly astray by appealing to popular beliefs that the speaker knows to be misleading misconceptions. The worry is justified, but only up to a point. Aristotle is optimistic about the extent to which popular views track the truth (1355a14–18), and is happy to allow that even if the fallibility of popular beliefs allows the unscrupulous practitioner opportunities for leading the citizens astray, that same set of beliefs will generally be affording *more* and *better* opportunities to the other side of the debate to persuade the citizens of what is true and right (1355b36–8).

However worrying or otherwise this is, it certainly seems to be Aristotle's view. There is a much-discussed example at *Rhetoric* I.9, 1367b22–7 of the kind of unscrupulous practice in question, an example which is sometimes cited as showing that Aristotle's view of rhetoric had

no normative content.⁵⁰ In fact, this passage creates a difficulty only for more idealized accounts of rhetorical expertise sometimes attributed to Aristotle,⁵¹ and fits nicely with the view of *pistis* offered here.

Since praise is made on the basis of actions, and what is distinctive of the good man is what is done from choice, you are to try to show that he acts from choice, and it is useful that he be taken to have done these actions on many occasions. This is why coincidences and things that happen by chance are to be taken as if they were by choice, for if many similar things are produced, they will be thought a sign of virtue and choice. (1.9, 1367b22–7)

This is probably the best example of such underhand practice. It is difficult to deny that Aristotle is endorsing the practices described in this passage: his use of the gerundive 'to be taken' (*ληπτέον*) seems clearly an instruction to the orator to proceed in this way.⁵² But does this violate Aristotle's earlier restrictions on what can count as a *pistis* and hence on what counts as an exercise of rhetorical expertise? It is possible to read this instruction charitably simply as advice to the orator not to be too fussy about whether each action in a series of apparently similar actions was by chance or by choice. Or it may be that the advice concerns cases where it is hard to know the exact motives for a series of similar actions: Aristotle advises the orator to allocate the 'benefit of the doubt' in the way that suits his case. Still, let us adopt a less charitable reading for the sake of testing our proposed account of *pistis*, since this passage has sometimes been read so.⁵³ To take an example, I praise Helen as being compassionate (having the virtue of compassion), and cite her numerous trips to the hospital visiting the sick—despite the fact that I know that in several of these cases the fact that the people she visited were sick and in hospital was a matter of coincidence—she was in fact collecting debts from several of them.

⁵⁰ E.g. Schütrumpf, 1994, pp. 123–7). His list of 'morally questionable tricks' includes also 2.24 and 2.21, 1395a8–10, where Aristotle's point is surely just that it can sometimes be important to state something more crudely or sweepingly than is really the case, presumably in order to convey the force of the point. Note that even here, Aristotle is careful to confine such a strategy to the opening or closing summary, not the proofs section.

⁵¹ E.g. Irwin (1996, esp. pp. 142–6): Irwin even cites this passage at 163 but seems not to see the difficulty for his position; Wörner (1990).

⁵² A gerundive that is undeniably prescriptive occurs three lines earlier, 'you are to try' (*peirateon*), and there are myriad other examples throughout the *Rhetoric*.

⁵³ E.g. as 'direct instructions to lie' (Schütrumpf, 1994, p. 125).

Aristotle here describes this kind of case as a sign-argument (*σημείον*, 1367b27),⁵⁴ where the sign in question is in fact a sign for two related things:

Sign: that Helen went often to the hospital and visited the sick.

Signified 1: that Helen makes fully fledged *prohaireseis* to visit the sick in hospital, i.e. that she chooses these actions because they are cases of visiting the sick in hospital, and chooses them from a character-disposition.

Signified 2: that Helen is compassionate.

For this argument to be a *pistis*, and to be the kind of thing that counts as an exercise of the expertise of rhetoric, it must on our account satisfy two requirements. The first is that the 'persuasive feature' (*to pithanon*) in this case be presented as itself something that the listener will find reputable; the second is that it be something that, if true, makes it an exercise of good judgement to suppose that Helen is compassionate. In this case, absent any special reason to disbelieve it, the listeners are likely to regard the sign that Helen went often to the hospital and visited the sick as believable, simply on the basis of the speaker's testimony. The problem is supposed to arise in the way this fact is related to the beliefs that Helen is compassionate and that she makes *prohaireseis* to visit the sick in hospital. For simplicity, we will refer only to the former of these. The difficulty is that there is a deception here: the implication is that Helen's coincidental visits were caused by her compassion, when in fact they were not, and the speaker knows they were not.⁵⁵ That Aristotle countenances the deceptive use of rhetoric is taken to show that he does not think that exercising rhetoric involves meeting some normative standards. But this is simply a mistake. Aristotle's suggestion in this passage does not (even on the least charitable reading) violate the specific normative conditions that have been proposed for something's being a *pistis* and hence being an exercise of rhetoric. This is because the fact that Helen has visited the sick in hospital many times simply is good grounds for supposing that she is compassionate. The move from believing the sign to believing the signified is wholly proper, even though there is no guaranteed connection at all between sign and signified, and certainly the sign does not guarantee the truth of what it is appropriately taken to

⁵⁴ For a full treatment of this theme, cf. Allen (2001).

⁵⁵ Such deception seems objectionable by Aristotle's lights as well as our own: *NE* 2.7, 1108a19–23; 4.7, 1127a17–26.

signify. It is an exercise of good judgement on the listeners' part if they judge Helen compassionate on the basis of this sign. Aristotle's language here is non-committal about whether this is a genuine case of a sign (*σημείον*)—he says that many similar things 'will be believed to be' (*δόξει*) a sign of virtue and choice. This might imply that he thinks this is not a genuine case of a sign, since the coincidences were not caused by virtue or choice. But equally he may simply be showing that what is important in deploying this kind of proof is what the listener thinks. Either way, this example meets the key criteria for *pisteis* already set out, and specifically that what the audience believes would, if true, make it an exercise of good judgement to believe the speaker's proposed conclusion. Accordingly, it is entirely compatible with producing genuinely rhetorical proofs that these use material that the speaker does not himself believe.⁵⁶

2.8 Conclusion

I have recommended attributing to Aristotle a normative view of rhetoric very different from that of Thrasymachus, Gorgias, and the handbook writers who followed them. We will see in Chapter 4 that his view also has the resources to resist the Platonic demand that the expert orator know the truth about his subject matter. Nevertheless, it is the handbook writers that are the focus of attention in the early arguments of the *Rhetoric*. And in the next chapter it is to these that I return to uncover Aristotle's attempts not merely to assert but to justify his proposed view of rhetoric.

⁵⁶ This holds whether the speaker thereby behaves badly or not. Note that the use of premises one believes to be flawed need not always be deceptive or insincere. An atheist might persuade an audience of Christians by appeal to the authority of Christ or the Bible, without himself recognizing their authority.

3

Rhetoric and the State

3.1 Aristotle's Justification of his Proof-centred View of Rhetoric

Aristotle's proof-centred understanding of rhetoric is expressed succinctly at 1354a13–14, in a claim that, as we saw, plays a pivotal role in his arguments against the handbook writers.

Proper grounds of conviction are the only thing that belong to the expertise of rhetoric.

That is to say, that the techniques or methods in which the expertise consists are methods of identifying proper grounds for conviction and providing them to listeners.

As was noted, this claim is initially unsupported. We would perhaps expect to find that Aristotle returns to offer a defence of this view of rhetoric. I propose that this is exactly what he does. One indication to that effect is that about a page later, Aristotle himself says, 'Since it is evident that the method that belongs to the expertise of rhetoric is concerned with proofs . . .' (1355a3–4). It is not plausible to suppose that this claim was 'evident' all along, so it must be that something in the intervening page or so constituted a basis on which it is *now* evident.

I'm going to sketch how I think he defends his view, and then return to the text of *Rhetoric* 1, where I think we find Aristotle offering an array of arguments against the handbook writers which appeal to just the kind of picture I am about to sketch.

3.2 A Sketch of Aristotle's View of the Relationship between Rhetorical Expertise and the Proper Functioning of the State

States—plausibly all states, but certainly the Greek *poleis* of Aristotle's day—need orators (public speakers). This is because in order to function well it is necessary for citizens to confer, deliberate, and come to decisions. This includes deciding on laws and state policy, and coming to verdicts in the law-courts. For citizens to make judgements about the merits of courses of action, or of each side's case in a lawsuit, the case for each of these has to be made.

Rhetoric, then, is an expertise in discharging public speaking roles in the state—specifically, it is an expertise in helping citizens to arrive at good publicly-deliberated judgements in line with the speaker's proposal,¹ by making the case one way or another in relation to some proposed verdict,² so that a judgement can be made as to its merits (often in comparison with the merits of some rival proposal).

Note that when Aristotle talks of an expertise (Gk. *τέχνη*), what he means is something like what we call 'know-how', that is to say, that having an expertise explains your non-accidental success at something (as indeed Aristotle reminds us in the first ten lines of the treatise). So, having an expertise in cobblery is what explains your non-accidental success in making or repairing shoes. Accordingly, the techniques involved in the expertise of cobblery will be predominantly concerned with working leather. What, then, does rhetoric enable you to succeed in doing? The formulation offered here provides, I believe, Aristotle's answer. Rhetoric enables you to succeed non-accidentally as a public

¹ Reflection on what the *technê* of rhetoric serves to produce is invited right at the start of the *Rhetoric*, when Aristotle says that, 'as all would agree', an expertise should account for non-accidental success (*ἐπιτυγχάνουσιν*, 1354a9). But success in what? What exactly is the product whose successful production will be accounted for by this expertise? Aristotle's answer seems to be that it is good, publicly deliberated judgements by citizens in line with the speaker's proposal. Aristotle eventually identifies rhetoric's goal explicitly at 1358b1–2, with the whole of 1.3 devoted to explaining how this works in each kind of rhetoric. More briefly, at 2.1, 1377b20–1, he says, 'rhetoric is for the sake of a judgement (*ἕνεκα κρίσεως*)'. Cf. also 1.2, 1357a1–2, where rhetoric's function is discharged only in relation to things that are the objects of deliberation.

² 'Demonstrating the matter, that it is or is not the case, that it happened or did not happen' (1354a27–8).

advisor, helping citizens towards particular good, publicly deliberated judgements. Accordingly, the techniques involved in rhetoric will be concerned solely with proper grounds for conviction in relation to whatever the subject under consideration is.

Before examining how this picture emerges from Aristotle's arguments against the handbook writers, I should comment briefly on two concerns that might be raised about this strategy.

First, justifying the view that rhetoric is solely concerned with providing proper grounds for conviction by appeal to a view of rhetoric as an expertise in discharging this kind of public role simply pushes the justificatory question further back. Why should we think that this is the right account of what rhetoric helps its possessor to accomplish? I think that there are some things that can be said to answer this worry, but will postpone addressing it to the final section, where I comment on the overall significance of Aristotle's position.

Second, one might worry that, since all that is required of the premises of *pisteis* is that they be acceptable to listeners, there is nothing to guarantee that good inferences from such premises will improve the judgements of listeners, and hence nothing to guarantee that rhetoric will benefit the state's public deliberations. This will seemingly hold only where the premises are true.³ One might answer this worry by insisting that deliberating using good inferences rather than bad is already to have deliberated better, regardless of the merits of the premises. No doubt Aristotle would have agreed with such a response, though there seems no trace of such a view in the pages of the *Rhetoric*. But such a response is only applicable where the relevant comparison is between good inferences and bad from the premises in question, whereas the comparison relevant to whether the state benefits from the exercise of Aristotelian rhetoric is between making good inferences from premises acceptable to the citizens, and making *no* such inferences. Here it is less obvious that it is better to form further—possibly false—beliefs than to form no additional beliefs. Aristotle's conviction of the beneficial effects of rhetoric seems to rest instead upon an optimistic assessment of the tendencies of humans to believe the truth. In Aristotle's account (1355a21–b7) of why rhetoric is useful or beneficial (*χρήσιμος*), much of the space in the text is

³ I am grateful to Stefan Sienkiewicz, Angela Chew, and David Charles for helpful discussion of this issue.

devoted to how rhetoric enables the judgements of the judges to reflect the natural superiority of what is true and good (a21–4). The latter are ‘generally easier to prove and more likely to convince’ (a38). A few lines earlier he asserted, ‘human beings themselves are naturally inclined towards the truth and usually do attain the truth’ (1355a15–17). Rhetoric, then, involves helping citizens to reason well from premises that are, in Aristotle’s view, likely to be true.⁴ Indeed, they are particularly likely to be true if they are acceptable to many people, not just to some given individual.⁵ And if reasoning well from existing beliefs tends to make one’s overall set of beliefs more coherent, this is likely to improve the proportion of true to false beliefs in the set in the case where the beliefs in the initial set are mostly true.

3.3 Rhetoric’s Purpose and the Justification of Aristotle’s Proof-centred View

I return now to the task of showing that the view previously sketched does indeed match Aristotle’s view of rhetoric’s purpose, and that these are the grounds on which he seeks to justify his account of what rhetorical expertise is an expertise *in*. I think we see him appeal to just such a view in the following sections.

3.3.1 *The Areopagus Argument*

The result is that if all judgements were conducted the way they actually are today in a mere handful of cities—principally those with the best governance—they would have nothing to say.
(1354a18–21)

⁴ It is true that in the *Rhetoric* as a whole, Aristotle’s view of the orator’s typical audience includes disdainful and elitist sentiments, as well as the optimistic and ‘democratic’ sentiments expressed in the passages referred to in the main text here. However, there is nothing in Aristotle’s more disdainful views that undermines the key claim here, that for Aristotle, premises that are commonly held to be reputable will tend to be true. Cf. 1354b8–11 (listeners’ private likes and dislikes cloud their judgement); 1355a24–9 (some listeners can’t be persuaded ‘from the most precise knowledge’, but must be persuaded through the ‘commonplaces’); 1357a3–4, 11–12 (listeners are ‘simple’ and cannot cope with long trains of reasoning); 1403b34–5, 1404a7–8, 1415b4–8 (because of the depravity of the listeners, attention must be given to delivery, to attracting listeners’ attention, and to various other crowd-pleasing devices).

⁵ Cf. 1356b33–4.

How does Aristotle's argument here work?⁶ Could he be arguing that his claim that the handbook writers' techniques were for irrelevant speaking is somehow *confirmed* by the fact that such techniques would be barred if, hypothetically, everywhere prohibited irrelevant speaking? Apart from the question-begging nature of the argument thereby attributed to Aristotle, such an interpretation would neglect his sustained emphasis that it is the *well-regulated* places that prohibit irrelevant speaking, that they are *right* to have such prohibitions, and that everyone agrees about this, even those who don't put this view into practice (a20–b16).

Accordingly, I propose that his argument, as stated, runs as follows:

1. Insofar as using some speaking technique influences the listener irrespective of the merits of their case, good governance should prohibit the use of that technique. ('principally those with the best governance' 1354a20, and a21–4)
2. The speaking techniques of the handbook writers consist entirely of techniques for influencing the listener irrespective of the merits of the speaker's case. (background information about what the handbook writers taught under the title 'rhetoric': 'they busy themselves predominantly with things outside the subject' 1354a15f.)
3. THEREFORE: Good governance should prohibit all of the speaking techniques of the handbook writers. (1354a20–1 '[if judgements were governed as they should be] they would have nothing to say')

Now, while this captures the argument as stated, I don't think that on its own it captures its significance in context. On its own, the argument seems to show that these handbook writers were morally reprehensible—their techniques should ideally be prohibited. This cannot, I think, be quite the criticism that Aristotle is levelling here. For one thing, it is not obvious how damaging a criticism this would be—perhaps ideally these techniques would be barred, but as it is they are not, and they can be deployed to great effect. If you think of moral judgements of this kind, as Thrasymachus seems to have done in relation to justice/legality,⁷ that they are simply a tool used by the powerful to manipulate and control people, you are likely to be unmoved by the criticism that your techniques for public speaking are in conflict with 'good governance'. All that

⁶ The issue is not explicitly addressed by any of the main commentators.

⁷ If we may judge by how his views are represented in *Republic* 1.

shows is that the Thrasymachean politician has more work to do in appropriating these concepts and harnessing them to his own cause. A second reason why this does not capture the significance of this argument is that it does not connect in the right kinds of ways with its context. First, Aristotle has been arguing that the techniques of the handbook writers are not techniques of rhetoric, and—on this interpretation—he here changes tack to argue that their techniques are morally bad and should be prohibited. Second, if his argument were aimed at showing that the handbook writers' techniques for irrelevant speaking should be banned, it is puzzling why, in that case, he does not use the obvious objections to irrelevant speaking in the arguments that follow, since those arguments purport to support the claim that irrelevant speaking should be banned. There are some obvious things he might have pointed out about irrelevant speaking—that it produces miscarriages of justice, vindicating the guilty and condemning the innocent, and that it produces poor political decisions. Instead, he mentions none of these and bases his objections to irrelevant speaking on a careful analysis of the proper roles of speaker and juror/decision-maker in the state.

I propose that this argument is significant because it constitutes another argument in favour of the claim that the handbook writers' techniques were not techniques of *rhetoric*. On my reading, there is no change of focus. And I hope to show that the way in which Aristotle supports this argument (a21ff.) fits nicely with this reading. The argument has, I suggest, an unstated premise and unstated conclusion, as follows:

1. Insofar as something is a way of exercising the expertise of rhetoric, good governance should not prohibit that thing. (Unstated)
2. Insofar as using some speaking technique influences the listener irrespective of the merits of their case, good governance should prohibit the use of that technique. (1354a20, 21–4)
3. The speaking techniques of the handbook writers consist entirely of techniques for influencing the listener irrespective of the merits of the speaker's case. (1354a15ff.)
4. THEREFORE (from 2 and 3): Good governance should prohibit all of the speaking techniques of the handbook writers. (1354a20–1)⁸

⁸ Aristotle is able, in context, to ignore the possibility that their techniques generated a dilemma for legislators—deserving prohibition in virtue of their irrelevance and protection in virtue of other features.

5. THEREFORE (from 1 and 4): The handbook writers have told us next to nothing about rhetoric. (unstated here, but reiterating 1354a11–13)

On this interpretation, the point of the conclusion of the Areopagus' argument, 'these handbook writers would have nothing to say if judgments were governed as they should be,' (a20f.) is that this shows that whatever their techniques were, they were not techniques of *rhetoric*. The interpretation has in its favour that it makes this the third in a series of complementary arguments against the handbook writers, to the effect that they'd said next to nothing about rhetoric.

The unstated premise—that good governance should not rule out the exercise of rhetorical expertise—might seem rather too controversial to be taken for granted. But, if my suggestion is correct, this text shows Aristotle able to appeal to a view of rhetoric's place in the state as an important contributor to its successful functioning. On this view, it is obvious that a well-functioning state should not eliminate the possibility of exercising genuine rhetorical expertise: it would thereby forgo vital contributions to public deliberation. And it is equally obvious, on this view, that it is appropriate to have safeguards against the misuse of opportunities for public speaking in the state, where the purpose of those opportunities is the improvement of publicly deliberated judgments through the exercise of genuine rhetoric.

So, let us see how this line of argument is developed in the rest of the passage, before returning to the question of whether this view of rhetoric and its place in the state can be defended.

3.3.2 *The Carpenter's Rule simile* (1354a24–6)

For one shouldn't warp the juror by bringing him into anger or envy or pity. For that would be like someone warping the ruler he is about to use. (1354a24–6)

The suggestion of the simile is that warping the juror defeats the orator's own proper purposes, just as warping his ruler defeats the carpenter's proper purposes. The simile seems to presuppose in Aristotle and his audience a shared understanding of the orator's proper purpose. On the interpretation proposed here, the orator's purpose is that the jurors form a justified judgement on the matter at hand, and that this judgement be the one he is urging. It will defeat this purpose if his techniques warp the

jurors and prevent them from making a justified judgement at all. Crucially, however, if the jurors' verdict is—as hoped—in the orator's favour, this confirms the correctness of the orator's position in just the same way that a ruler can confirm the straightness of the carpenter's handiwork.

If the cognitive competence of the jurors is needed to achieve the orator's aim, then this illuminates both why 'warping the juror' fails to promote that aim, and also, more widely, why saying *anything* outside the issue will fail to promote that aim.

Accordingly, if a prohibition of irrelevant speaking would serve partly to safeguard the orator's own proper goals, then the fact that the handbook writers' techniques would constantly infringe such a prohibition casts doubt on whether these are truly techniques of rhetoric.

3.3.3 *The brief argument from the speaker's role: 1354a26–31*

Moreover it is obvious that the job of the disputants is nothing beyond demonstrating the matter at hand—that it is the case or that it isn't, that it has happened or that it hasn't. Whether it is important or trivial, or legal or illegal, to the extent that the legislator has not defined these things, surely the juror should find these things out for himself, not learn them from the disputants.

The picture of rhetoric as an expertise in contributing to good public judgements is further underlined in this section, focusing on the role of speakers in the law-courts. Two points are particularly worth highlighting.

The first is that this argument appears to be offered as another reason for supposing that it is right for the state to prohibit irrelevant speaking ('moreover' a26). If that is so, then Aristotle must be understood as saying that it is obvious (a27) that in the law-courts, such prohibitions must respect the legitimate discharge of the speaker's role, but guard against its abuse. This fits well with the picture I am canvassing: Aristotle is reflecting on the valuable role in the state that rhetoric enables its possessor to discharge, and draws on such reflection to show that the handbook writers have told us little about genuine rhetoric.

The second point is that when Aristotle insists (a28–31) that the judges should not learn certain things from the speaker, this is clearly a way of saying that the speaker should not speak about those things. He must suppose that the success of the speaker in his role is constrained by the preservation or promotion of the success of the judges in theirs.

In cricket, the fact that the batsman ought not to play deliveries just outside the off-stump, and that he would be playing poorly if he did, does not mean that it is not part of the bowler's business to bowl deliveries there. The difference between this example and Aristotle's orator is precisely that in cricket the bowler aims at the batsman's failure in his role, whereas Aristotle's orator aims at (or at least he must ensure) the judges' success. This becomes a natural thing to accept only if you suppose, as I am proposing Aristotle did, that the proper functioning of the judge in deliberation and judgement is central to the role and purpose of the speaker.⁹

So, my suggestion is that here again we see Aristotle partly setting out and partly presupposing a view of rhetoric and its place in the state in the light of which it makes sense to claim that the techniques of rhetoric are entirely concerned with proofs or 'proper grounds for conviction'.

3.3.4 Aristotle's conclusion (1354b16–22)

This suggests a way of reading the conclusion of this passage of argument (1354b16–22) that is more integrated than those suggested by previous commentators,¹⁰ and which helps to make sense of how Aristotle has achieved by 1355a2, not just a devastating criticism of the handbook writers, but (as he claims) a justification of his own position. He claims at 1355a3f. that it is now obvious that the expertise of rhetoric is concerned with providing proper grounds for conviction. The extent to which he has argued for this conclusion we will consider later. But we propose here a reading of 1354b16–22 that shows how the passage of argumentation

⁹ Conceivably, one might read a26–8 and a28–31 as two more or less independent reasons for thinking that the state is right to ban irrelevant speaking. Even on this suggestion, the first of these reasons still seems to require the kind of view of rhetoric I am suggesting. But the second might not: that the juror has an important role in the state, and that this might be threatened by speakers addressing topics other than the issue at hand (specifically the legality and severity of the issue), is already good reason for the state to take action to prevent this threat, specifically by prohibiting irrelevant speaking. No view of the positive value of the speaker's role need be presupposed. Still, this does not strike me as a preferable reading of the passage.

¹⁰ Possible exceptions: Kassel's text has parentheses around b19–20 ('since in them.. condition'), which suggests that he reads the following clause ('but set out...') as coordinate with 'give definitions of other matters...' (b17f.), following (Jebb, 1909) *ad loc.*, cf. (Kassel, 1971, 1976), both *ad loc.*. This is consistent with—though does not require—the interpretation I am proposing here.

concerned with the proper role of judges contributes to his basis for the claim at 1355a3f.

If this is correct, then it is obvious that it is an expertise in irrelevance that is the thing discussed by those who give definitions of other matters, such as what the introduction or narrative should contain or each of the other parts of the speech (since in them they busy themselves with nothing except how to put the judge into a certain condition) but set out nothing about the proofs that belong to the expertise, that is to say the means of becoming good at enthymemes.

(1354b16–22)

Exactly what is claimed and on what basis in this passage has sadly not received much scholarly attention.¹¹ This is surely not because it is all luminously clear. In looking at this passage, and how it is connected to its surrounding context, I hope to canvass the merits of the following claim. Aristotle here concludes not just that the handbook writers' techniques were for irrelevant speaking, but also that he was correct in his previous claim¹² that the handbook writers have told us next to nothing about the proper constituents of rhetorical expertise. He has now given us grounds to suppose what he had previously merely asserted, namely that rhetoric is concerned with giving proofs, and turns out to consist, largely or wholly, in a skill in enthymemes.

The argument, I suggest, runs as follows:

Once it is established (b16)

- a. what the role of the orator is (a role in discharging which rhetoric is the relevant expertise), and,
- b. in particular, on what kinds of subject it is appropriate for the speaker to exercise his rhetorical expertise by speaking,

¹¹ The passage is cited twice in the *Symposium Aristotelicum* volume (Furley and Nehamas, 1994), but on both occasions this is little more than a passing mention. Cope (1877) has nothing on this except a misunderstanding mentioned at Chapter 2 n.12. Neither Grimaldi (1980) nor Rapp (2002a) offers help on these points.

¹² This claim is, in my view, announced at 1354a11–13, argued for between that passage and the passage currently under discussion, 1354b16–22, at which point his demolition of their work is complete. They had set out an expertise not in rhetoric but in irrelevance. There is then a brief passage about how all this sheds light on their (otherwise puzzling) preference for forensic over deliberative speaking. Some of these conclusions then reappear in the summary passage 1355a19–20, though it is admittedly disappointing for my interpretation that what I claim is the main conclusion of the chapter up to this point (that the handbook writers have told us little about rhetoric) is not reaffirmed here in this summary.

the following become obvious (b16):

1. that it is an expertise in irrelevance that the handbook writers have offered (b16–17)
2. rather than an expertise in rhetoric (implied by b16–17)
 - (i) the clarification of appropriate topics on which to deploy rhetoric shows the irrelevance of the things that most concerned the handbook writers (b17–20)
 - (ii) the clarification of the role of the orator shows that they have told us virtually nothing about the genuine constituents of rhetorical expertise (b20–1),
 - namely proper grounds for conviction (b21)
 - i.e. nothing about how to become skilled in enthymemes whereby such proper grounds for conviction are presented (b21–2).

On this way of understanding Aristotle's reasoning, he is underlining the progress made not just in negative polemic, but, more positively, in justifying the central tenet of his own view of rhetoric. His claim that rhetoric is an expertise in giving proofs, a claim that played such a pivotal role in Aristotle's opening arguments (and for which no supporting argument was initially offered), has now been given much more substantial support since its original assertion at 1354a13.

3.4 Conclusion: the Implications of Rhetoric's Political Function

Aristotle previously had merely asserted that rhetoric was an expertise in providing proof. He has now shown that if you accept that rhetoric is the expertise that enables a person to be successful as an advisor in public deliberations, you should agree that its exercise consists in providing proofs. During the course of these arguments, he has appealed to a number of assumptions that support the view that rhetoric is indeed an expertise in discharging this advisory role within the state. One such assumption is that the orator's success itself requires the good deliberation of the judge. Another is that orators should properly be barred from irrelevant speaking. Another is that the proper role of the orator is to demonstrate to the listeners that things stand the way they claim. And

yet another is that orators should be confined to the *facts* of the case at hand, that is, to the aspects on which they have a distinctive advisory contribution to make. Once we attend to some of the contours of rhetoric's role in the state, it becomes clear that it is bound to consist in producing proofs, that producing enthymemes will be a characteristic exercise of rhetoric, and that skills for irrelevant speaking are not part of the expertise at all.

4

Aristotle against His Rivals

4.1 Comparing Aristotle, Plato, and Gorgias and Thrasymachus on Rhetoric

We now have the resources to explain more clearly how Aristotle positions himself against the handbook writers, whom I take to represent in Aristotle's day the tradition of Gorgias and Thrasymachus.¹ The difference between his account of what rhetorical expertise consists in and theirs comes down to a difference in their views of the nature and value of rhetoric itself. The handbook writers saw rhetoric as a skill for exercising power over others, whose value consisted principally in its value *to its possessor*. By contrast, Aristotle took a wider view, showing how the expertise possessed by speakers is valued not only by those speakers but by others too. His view involves seeing rhetoric as an expertise for whose exercise states make provision—speeches are invited to be made by protagonists in lawsuits, and by proponents and opponents of political policies. States encourage speech-making, and value the development of skill in this area, because this is seen as contributing to the quality of civic judgements. Audiences listen to speakers similarly with the aim of improving their judgements on the issues addressed. Even Aristotle's view of rhetoric's value to its possessor derives in part from what is valuable about the judgements subsequently formed by listeners. Rhetoric is valuable to the speaker because it enables them to gain the verdict they desire, and in such a way as to constitute an *endorsement* of their own position, because judges deliberating soundly adopted their recommended point of view for the reasons they offered. In this way, Aristotle's view accounts in a unified way for the value of rhetoric to the speaker, to the listener, and to the state as a whole.

¹ Cf. Dow (2007, pp. 391–6), and Chapter 7.

The follower of Thrasymachus or Gorgias may still insist that the expertise they describe is entitled to be called ‘rhetoric’ or ‘the art of speaking’. Aristotle’s position against them can be understood either as the claim that what he describes better captures the concept of the public speaker’s expertise, or as the claim that, even if there are several different skills that might be called ‘rhetoric’, the expertise he describes is the most valuable for the state to foster, for listeners to value in speakers, and for speakers themselves to develop and exercise.²

Aristotle’s arguments, especially in the opening chapter of the *Rhetoric*, are deployed principally against the handbook writers. But in a number of passages, he indicates his awareness of rival Platonic views on rhetoric.

4.2 Aristotle and Plato’s *Gorgias*

Within Plato’s *Gorgias* (462b–c), Socrates denied that rhetoric was a *technê* because it offered no principled account of why and how its techniques worked. Even within that dialogue, that seems to function as an objection to what was proposed as a *technê* by Gorgias and others, rather than ruling out entirely the possibility of a *technê* of speech-making. The *Phaedrus* takes up the task of exploring what such a *technê* might be like. Accordingly, by the time Aristotle is writing the *Rhetoric*, the view that there was a *technê* of rhetoric does not seem to have been very controversial. Thus, at the start of the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle concludes in a mere eleven lines that there must be a *technê* of rhetoric in order to explain the consistent non-accidental success of some orators.

Also in the *Gorgias*, the requirement is expressed that rhetoric have a good aim. Otherwise, rhetoric will either turn out to be something shameful (464e2–465a2) or possibly may fail thereby to be a *technê* at all (501b3–5, 504d–e). Again, this seems a good objection to Gorgias’s rhetoric, seen as a kind of power to achieve whatever seems expedient to its possessor, whether or not this is actually good. The better alternative that Socrates has in mind is that rhetoric aim at justice and self-control in the souls of the citizens (504d–e). The Aristotelian view I have argued for gives rhetoric a good goal, but it is different from that envisaged by

² This latter argument is developed further in section 4.4.

Socrates. It is rather the goal of well-grounded judgements by citizens in contexts such as law-courts and assemblies. Aristotle, not implausibly, supposes that generally the available evidence will provide better grounds for judgements that are true or correct than for judgements that are false or wrong.³ Hence, rhetoric as Aristotle understands it aims at something good (epistemically), because it aims to affect the judgements of listeners in ways that will tend to incline them towards judgements that are true and good. This makes perfect sense if rhetoric aims at well-founded civic judgement, and exercising rhetoric is a matter of providing proofs based on available, evidentially-relevant facts.

We should notice, however, the modest nature of Aristotle's claim about rhetoric's tendency to promote good outcomes. Aristotle insists that the expertise is concerned with proper grounds for conviction (e.g. 1354a13, b21, 35–6), with demonstrating their case (1354a27–8, 1355a3–5, 1417b21), and with leaving the listeners cognitively undistorted (1354a24–6), thus enabling them to form a judgement (*κρίσις*, 1354b29–1355a3; *θεωρός / κρίτης*, 1358b1–6). But while these do amount to the claim that rhetoric is intrinsically such as to confer an epistemic benefit, they leave open the possibility that exercises of rhetoric, even while getting listeners to reason well from reputable premises, may nevertheless on a given occasion be leading them to form false beliefs or morally pernicious intentions. Indeed, Aristotle explicitly recognizes both of these as possible ways in which genuine rhetoric might be used.⁴ Aristotelian rhetoric serves to help audiences make good inferences that they might not otherwise have made, and to help them make good inferences rather than bad ones: these are epistemic benefits, and against a background where (as Aristotle believes) reputable beliefs stand a good chance of being true (1355a21–2, 36–8) they support the view that rhetoric thus understood has a beneficial role in the state (1355a20–1). Still, beliefs formed by good inference from reputable premises can still on occasions turn out false, and a course of action that has *some* merits may yet turn out all-things-considered to be pernicious.

³ *Rhetoric* 1.1, 1355a15–17, a21–b7.

⁴ See 1355a20–3 and especially a29–38 on the use of rhetoric to lead away from the truth, and 1355a29–31, a36–8, and especially b2–7 on its use in the service of injustice.

4.3 Aristotle and Plato's *Phaedrus*

In the *Phaedrus*, Socrates argues that any genuine expertise in rhetoric requires for its exercise the knowledge of the truth about one's subject matter. This may be motivated simply by a worry that otherwise persuasive argument will risk simply transmitting the flaws in the audience's existing beliefs onto any new convictions they are persuaded to form. But, as argued in Chapter 1, it seems more likely to be motivated by the idea that rhetoric should put its possessor in control of whether the audience's beliefs turn out true or false.⁵ Aristotle does not seem to recognize the requirement that the expert orator know the truth. Indeed, two passages in the *Rhetoric* can be plausibly interpreted as a rejection of precisely this Platonic requirement.

At 1355a10–14, Aristotle concludes that it is the person skilled in dialectic who will be best able to master the skills of rhetoric:

[given the preceding argument] it is clear that it is the person who is best able to see how and from what elements reasoning proceeds, that would also be best at enthymemes, provided they grasp additionally the features of enthymemes and how they differ from logical exercises in reasoning.⁶

He supports this with the following argument:

For what is true and what is similar to the truth belong to the same capacity to see, and at the same time human beings themselves are naturally inclined towards

⁵ Note that this requirement is advocated at 261d–262c and recapitulated briefly at 273d–e, in response to the proposal attributed to Tisias that the orator need know not the truth about his subject but what will seem likely to his listeners. The requirement cannot be that unless he knows the truth, an orator will be unable to persuade someone to accept some given claim, since even within the dialogue the example of Socrates persuading Phaedrus that he should get a horse for fighting enemies (260b–d) shows that this is possible despite the ignorance of both parties about what a horse was. Of the two options given above for what motivates the requirement, the view that the orator needs to know the truth in order to be in control of whether the listener's views turn out true or false is suggested by 262b5–c3. There, as elsewhere, it is emphasized that the orator should be able to deceive (if he chooses) but escape deception himself, on pain of not having a genuine *technê* at all. This suggests that rhetoric is here seen as a skill that puts its possessor in control of whether their listeners' beliefs (and their own) turn out true or false.

⁶ The final phrase, '*logikous sullogismous*', is hard to translate, but seems to mean pieces of reasoning where the focus is on the validity of the argument, such as in pure dialectic (or peirastic). Cf. *An. Post.* 93a15 (the only other use of this phrase in Aristotle). The differences Aristotle has in mind in this passage may include that enthymemes aim at the adoption of their conclusion, not merely at showing what follows from what, and that in enthymemes the truth of the premises may recommend the conclusion without necessitating it.

the truth and usually do attain the truth. That is why being good at hunting down what is reputable⁷ is a mark of the same kind of person as being good at hunting down the truth. (1355a14–18)

This seems to be a way of saying that the ability of the philosopher to find the truth (by reasoning inferentially from reputable starting points) and the ability of people to form judgements based on what is likely (by reasoning inferentially from reputable starting points) are the very same ability. And both are essentially reliable, insofar as the starting materials—the plausible or reputable views (*ἐνδοξα*) from which reasoning begins—are grounded in humans' general ability to hit the truth for the most part, and insofar as the reasoning proceeds correctly. So, the ability of the true rhetorician and the ability of the philosopher are the very same thing—not in the way Plato suggested in the *Phaedrus*, by making rhetoric depend on the kind of dialectically derived *knowledge* that is the province of the philosopher, but rather by requiring only plausible starting points from both, plus good (dialectical) *reasoning* onwards from these.

If this is a correct interpretation, then the argument serves to justify the conclusion that preceded it by showing that (apart from the 'additional' things mentioned at a12–14) the understanding of dialectic is *sufficient* for an understanding of rhetoric (or, strictly, of enthymemes). The argument shows specifically that there is no additional requirement that the rhetorician know the truth about an issue to be able to exercise genuine rhetorical expertise in producing enthymematic arguments for some particular view on that issue.

There is a further argument at 1355a24–9 for why rhetoric as Aristotle understands it is more useful than persuasion based on knowledge of one's subject matter.

[Rhetoric is useful because . . .] Additionally, before some people, it would not be not easy, even if we had the most exact knowledge, to be persuasive using it. For knowledge-based argument belongs to teaching, and this is impossible, rather we must develop our proofs and arguments via the commonplaces, as we said also in the *Topics* about encounters with the many.

⁷ The wording here subverts the pejorative use of *στοχαστικός* at *Gorgias* 463a7, where Socrates claims that rhetoric is an untechnical knack of guessing at what will please people.

It is plausible to suppose that Aristotle is here arguing against the view found in Plato's *Phaedrus* (261d–262c, 273d–e), discussed previously, that exercising rhetorical expertise requires knowledge of one's subject matter. If the Platonic view Aristotle opposes here is that, in order to persuade using any argument that proceeded by similarities, one must know the truth of one's subject matter, the argument seems apposite. With some people, a similarity to the truth about the matter in question will not make something persuasive. Rather, with them, one needs to start from very general notions on which everyone agrees (the 'common-places'—τὰ κοινά). Thus, knowledge of the truth does not help, and is less useful in such contexts than what Aristotle takes rhetoric principally to involve, namely the elements of dialectic—the abilities to identify plausible starting points, and to reason well from these.⁸ However, it was suggested earlier in the chapter that the Platonic requirement that the expert orator know the truth was so that the expertise would put them in control of whether the convictions they secured were true or false. Aristotle does nothing to show that it would not have some distinct valuable role within rhetoric along these lines. This argument at 1355a24–9 is confined to showing that such knowledge of the truth would not assist the speaker in *the process of convincing* some popular audiences.

The way Aristotle positions his own view in relation to these Platonic claims about rhetoric can be seen as a way of canvassing the advantages

⁸ Identifying plausible starting points for reasoning on various topics likely to be the subject of deliberation in a courtroom or assembly does, of course, itself require a significant amount of what we call background 'knowledge'. Aristotle recognizes this too, speaking of various things that the speaker 'would need to know' (e.g. δέοι ἄν . . . εἰδέναι, 1359b24, 33–4, 38, 1360a20, 33). However, he prefaces this part of the treatise with comments that make clear that what the speaker needs to possess falls short of what someone with the relevant knowledge or systematic expertise (cf. ἐμπροεστέρως καὶ μᾶλλον ἀληθινῆς [τέχνης], 1359b6–7, ἐπιστήμης, b13) on that particular domain might have. Specifically, it will be less accurate (ἀκριβῶς, b2) and will not be guaranteed to be true (κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, b4–5). We should interpret terms like 'know' in these contexts accordingly. This is further supported by the fact that Aristotle seems in these passages to regard 'the speaker should know' as equivalent to 'he should have looked at' (ἀναγκαῖον . . . τεθεωρηκέναι, 1360a3–4, 18), or 'inquiries [of these persons into such-and-such] are useful' (a33–7). This kind of background 'knowledge' is important because it puts the speaker in a position to propose plausible premises from which to make inferences to his desired conclusion. For our purposes, the key point is that nothing here is at odds with the claim that the Aristotelian expert speaker does not need to abide by the requirement set out in the *Phaedrus* to have knowledge of the truth about his subject matter.

of his own view over those put forward by Socrates in the *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*. He accepts and meets the demand that rhetoric (as a genuine *technê*) involve a principled method for the application of its techniques. But he resists the requirement that exercising rhetorical expertise requires highly demanding levels of knowledge of psychology and of the speaker's subject matter, on the grounds that these are not after all necessary in order for rhetoric to have a genuinely valuable goal. He does so principally on two grounds. One is that he identifies a more modest, but still genuinely valuable, goal for rhetoric, that is, the well-deliberated judgements of citizens. The other is his claim that the reputable starting points for such deliberation are likely to be true. On this basis, his view of rhetoric captures the Platonic intuition that it should be something of real value, whilst maintaining substantial contact with the kind of expertise in speech-making exhibited by real individuals in real cities, and recognized already as 'rhetoric'.

Aristotle in this way distinguishes his understanding of rhetoric, not only from that of the handbook writers, Gorgias and Thrasymachus, on the one hand, but also from Platonic views of rhetoric, on the other. He offers arguments for the superiority of his own preferred view, and I have sought to trace how he intends these arguments to work.

4.4 Is Aristotle's *Rhetoric* about Rhetoric?

How successful, then, has Aristotle been in justifying his own position? There is at least one significant worry that looms large over how Aristotle has defended his view of rhetoric.

Aristotle's view of rhetoric as all about proofs makes sense if rhetoric is an expertise in promoting good public judgements, but why should we think that this is what rhetoric is? Has he merely changed the subject? The handbook writers offered a range of techniques that gave you the ability to get listeners to believe and decide whatever you wanted them to. They considered 'rhetoric' to be an appropriate name for such an ability. Aristotle seems to argue that these techniques are not rhetoric on the grounds that they are not techniques for doing something quite different, namely promoting good public judgements. The handbook writers and Aristotle seem simply to be describing two different things. And it looks like merely a terminological matter which we should call 'rhetoric'. We can allow that Aristotle describes a genuine skill—it is a

skill in producing proper sources of conviction, and enables its user to bring about warranted conviction in listeners. There is another skill, a simpler skill, which is just an ability successfully to get people to believe things, feel things, and do things. And it looks like nothing very significant is at stake in whether (with Aristotle) we think that the term 'rhetoric' should be used for the first of these, or (with Gorgias and our everyday usage) we think that the term should be used for the second.

I think that this objection is correct but trivial. Aristotle does indeed change the subject, and what he calls rhetoric is indeed a different skill or expertise from that set out by the handbook writers (and, for that matter, from what we tend to label 'rhetoric' today).

The more significant issue is which expertise is *valuable*. For Aristotle, the issue of what deserves to be called 'rhetoric' is not so much a question about who owns the 'rhetoric' terminology, as a question of what the skill is, in the area of public discourse, that we think is worth having, worth defending, worth cultivating and promoting in the state. And I think Aristotle's picture can be defended on this score. Why do we want trained and successful people to plead cases in our law-courts? Presumably it is because we think they have an important role in helping the jury or judge see what can best be said for each side, as a means to their making the best judgement they can on the case. Likewise, it is because we think that there ought to be public discussion and deliberation, and that this deliberation ought to be as well informed as possible, that we value political speech-making and campaigning, and think that this is what speech-making should be about if it is done well. From the point of view of the state, we value skilled speech-making because of its epistemic contribution to public deliberation in politics and law. From the point of view of the listener, when anyone sincerely pays attention to a speech, it is not in the hope of being duped or manipulated but in the hope of being informed and helped to a better-deliberated view. Even from the point of view of the speaker, we should recall the point made from Aristotle's Carpenter's Rule simile. In any genuine attempt to persuade, speakers themselves seem to aim not merely at getting people to their point of view (in most cases, speakers would not consider that coercive means would do just as well), but at convincing their listeners in a way that endorses the correctness of their case. The media frequently carries footage of people striding out of court claiming that their position had been vindicated by the jury's verdict. Politicians claim to have won the

argument if they win the vote. This seems to suggest that the good judgement of the listener is often important to the speaker in more or less the way Aristotle suggests.

Thus, although there may be a number of different skills related to public speaking, one such expertise is the expertise Aristotle calls 'rhetoric', an expertise in helping listeners to well-deliberated judgements by making the case for some particular view of the matter. And it is this expertise that is of greatest value, whether considered from the point of view of the state, the listener, or the speaker. If this is correct, then Aristotle's agenda in the *Rhetoric* is well chosen. He sees that an expertise in helping listeners to well-deliberated judgements will be essentially an expertise in providing them with 'proofs', proper grounds for conviction, and he sets out to offer a systematic account of what *that* expertise is, and of how to acquire it.

5

The Interpretation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

If the understanding of Aristotle's view of rhetoric defended in the preceding chapters is correct, then we should notice the implications for the interpretation of the *Rhetoric* as a whole. One might distinguish interpreters along a number of dimensions, and the purpose of this chapter is to situate the interpretation defended here in relation to these, especially as they concern how one should describe Aristotle's dominant concerns in this work, and his views on what normative standards apply essentially to the expertise of rhetoric, its constituents, and its practice.

Some have seen the *Rhetoric* as a development in the field of speech-making of an agenda set out more theoretically in the *Ethics* and *Politics*. This has taken a number of forms. For some theorists, Aristotelian rhetoric is such that its exercise requires or produces character virtue.¹ The position has scant basis in the text of the *Rhetoric*, and it is rejected in the present interpretation, as it is by the majority of recent interpreters. Aristotle's remarks (esp. 1356a5–13; 1378a6–20) on the kind of proof (which he includes within the expertise) that involves the *representation* of the speaker's character, including character virtues, are discussed in the next chapter.

However, there are other kinds of ways in which one might see ethical concerns as among Aristotle's concerns in the *Rhetoric*, or as essential to Aristotelian rhetoric itself. On one such kind of 'moralizing' view, Aristotle is concerned to set out how speeches *ought* to be made, and how the *virtuous* orator should undertake their task.² This view of the *Rhetoric* as

¹ Cf. esp. Wörner (1990), also Garver (1994). The position is criticized by numerous other scholars (Cooper, 1993; Halliwell, 1994; Engberg-Pedersen, 1996; Rapp, 2002a).

² Cf. Wörner (1990), Irwin (1996, pp. 143–6, and Garver (1994).

connected with the ethical discourses seems to have had its origins in the Medieval period. Whereas the Arab commentators (through whom the *Rhetoric* was rediscovered in the West) classified the *Rhetoric* along with the *Organon* as part of Aristotle's work on logic and reasoning,³ from some point possibly as early as the thirteenth century, it became associated with, and indeed often bound in with, the ethical and political works.⁴ The kind of moralizing view of the *Rhetoric* that I have in mind involves attributing to Aristotle the view that using rhetoric to persuade an audience of what is false, or to adopt some morally objectionable course of action, exhibits a defect in the speaker's rhetorical expertise. Rhetoric in the service of what is good and true is not just morally better than its deceptive or corrupting use, it is *better rhetoric*. The interpretation defended here involves rejecting this view. This is on the basis that while Aristotle claims that rhetoric involves advancing *proper* grounds for persuasion, we have seen that the propriety involved is epistemic in nature, and he is much less concerned with whether rhetoric is practised morally virtuously or not. No doubt this is not because he considers orators exempt from the requirements of moral virtue, but rather because his concerns in the *Rhetoric* do not extend much further than setting out what the art of rhetoric includes and how to practise it effectively. Concerns about whether a speaker's methods involve providing proper grounds for conviction are relevant to this; concerns about whether the speaker is, in some wider sense, acting well are not. Indeed, as we saw in Chapter 2, Aristotle explicitly allows that rhetoric is such as to be capable of being used in ways that it should not be used, including its use to oppose what is true or just (1355a29–b7).

A third kind of way in which interpreters have seen ethical concerns as essentially involved in Aristotelian rhetoric is related to rhetoric's purpose. The idea here is that, for Aristotle, rhetoric is an expertise essentially directed to a good goal, such that it is best and most readily practised by those who endorse that goal themselves, and is *misused* by those who do not endorse this goal. One might, by analogy, suppose that the expertise of generalship aims at victory, such that it is best exercised by those who share that aim, and such that its use by those who do not

³ Indeed, in the copies used by the Arab commentators, the *Rhetoric* seems to have been often bound in with the *Organon* in a single volume. Cf. Black (1990).

⁴ Cf. Murphy (1974, p. 100).

aim at victory is a perverse or incorrect use.⁵ A central problem in the use of this kind of argument by Wörner and Engberg-Pedersen, and a significant way in which their approach is at odds with the interpretation canvassed here, concerns what I take to be their misidentification of the goal in question. The aim internal to the practice of rhetoric, analogous to victory for generalship, is not truth (nor is it justice or the good), not least because of the passage just noted in which Aristotle envisages its use for opposing what is true (or just).⁶ So, rhetoric is not (in whole or part) an expertise in *Wahrheitsfindung*. To be sure, it is Aristotle's view that the institutional practices of public speaking, in which rhetoric is the relevant expertise, are conducive to the truthfulness and justice of publicly deliberated decisions. But Aristotle does not refer to this as rhetoric's 'aim' (σκοπός) or 'goal' (τέλος), but rather includes these considerations in his discussion of why rhetoric is 'useful' (χρήσιμος, 1355a20).⁷ Insofar as Aristotle has an explicit position on the goal or aim *internal* to rhetorical practice, it is concerned with securing a particular judgement from the listeners on the basis of the persuasive material offered as proofs (see Chapter 2). On the interpretation canvassed here, Aristotelian rhetoric thereby aims at (to that extent) good judgement, or judgement made on the basis of proper grounds for conviction.

In this way, the interpretation canvassed here is committed to resisting any of these ways in which moral concerns with the character of the speaker or with just or true outcomes to the listeners' deliberations are made an intrinsic feature of Aristotelian rhetoric. It is thereby in line with a number of scholars who have emphasized the moral neutrality of Aristotelian rhetoric.⁸

At the other end of the spectrum, some have taken the view that Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* takes no normative stance on rhetoric's nature at all, recognizing no normative standards that techniques need to meet in order to be possible ways of exercising the expertise of rhetoric.⁹ Clearly, the insistence that it is only *proper* grounds for conviction that fall within the expertise distinguishes the proposed interpretation from

⁵ Wörner (1990, esp. pp. 281–3); Engberg-Pedersen (1996, pp. 125–6).

⁶ Some further reasons are given by Irwin (1996, pp. 143–4).

⁷ Cf. also Rapp (2009, pp. 591–5).

⁸ Oates (1963); Cooper (1993); Halliwell (1994); Rapp (2002a, 2002b, 2009).

⁹ The most prominent exponent of this view is Oates (1963), esp. pp. 335–51. Cf. also Carey (1996).

this wholly non-normative view of rhetoric. But in fact, the latter is a minority view, and most interpreters see that it is part of the distinctive character of Aristotle's view of rhetoric that he placed significant emphasis on reason, arguments, demonstration, enthymemes, and on the connections between rhetoric and dialectic, such that *in some way or another*, he takes a principled stand on how an expert orator should select and deploy persuasive techniques from among those available to him. It will be useful, however, to highlight a number of respects in which the detailed conclusions argued for in the preceding chapters distinguish this interpretation from those of others.

On the interpretation offered here, Aristotelian rhetoric is, in its essence, a skill in offering proper grounds for conviction. Thus, the fact that its exercise contributes some beneficial effect is a consequence of an intrinsic feature of rhetoric itself, not, as Engberg-Pedersen has suggested, an artefact of a particular kind of institutional setting in which rhetoric is contingently practised.¹⁰

Furthermore, the inclusion of proofs through the character of the speaker and the passions of the listeners among the technical proofs is, on the interpretation proposed here, not for their remedial value in correcting cognitive or moral defects in the audience, as has been widely supposed.¹¹ There are techniques, such as those of style (*λέξις*) and delivery (*ὑποκριτική*), to which Aristotle concedes a valuable role in rhetorical practice on precisely this basis; and the recommendation for avoiding a long sequence of inferences is made on similar grounds.¹² But this is not the basis on which he classifies certain ways of portraying the speaker's character and of arousing the audience's emotions as 'proofs' (*πίστεις*). He does so, and *must* do so—given what he thinks *pisteis* are—on the basis of their capacity to provide good grounds for believing the orator's proposed conclusions.

This highlights a further significant way in which the interpretation proposed here may be distinguished from a range of others. The connection

¹⁰ Engberg-Pedersen (1996, pp. 124–6, 130).

¹¹ This is widely held to be the rationale for Aristotle's inclusion of *êthos* and *pathos* proofs alongside those that proceed through the argument itself. See, for example, Cope (1877, *ad* 1356a2, Halliwell (1994), and Engberg-Pedersen (1996, p. 125).

¹² 1357a7–12, 1404a24–8, and 1403b20–1404a8, where the latter passage includes the well-known references to the defects or corruption (*μωχθηρία*) of the constitutions and the hearers.

between rhetoric and dialectic, on the interpretation proposed, covers the whole of rhetoric's core, that is to say, all of the technical proofs, since they all involve a kind of reasoning and a kind of demonstration. If correct, this tells against interpretations according to which the way in which Aristotelian rhetoric is closely connected with dialectic is based more or less entirely on the role of proofs through the argument itself, and holds *despite* the supposed absence of any significant way in which *êthos*- or *pathos*-proofs make use of inferential resources drawn from dialectic. On the latter kind of interpretation, Aristotle's claims that expertise in dialectic is the principal basis for expertise in rhetoric¹³ rest on a *preference* for proofs that are based in the argument itself (and this will be the basis also for the recognized dialectical and argumentative character of Aristotelian rhetoric). Assuming, for the sake of argument, that Aristotle had such a preference, and made a corresponding general recommendation to orators,¹⁴ it is claimed that he did so on the basis that proofs based in the argument were generally more effective than those based on character or emotion-arousal. Rapp, for example, offers this kind of explanation for Aristotle's emphasis on the use of argument.¹⁵ On this view, the reason for the inclusion within rhetoric of methods centred on character and emotion is simply that these methods are persuasively effective, and practically necessary, not—as claimed here—that they are means of providing proper grounds for conviction.

Thus the interpretation canvassed here, whilst upholding the *moral* neutrality of Aristotelian rhetoric, nevertheless insists that Aristotle regarded it as part of the nature of rhetorical expertise that its exercise involves conforming to *epistemic* norms (governing standards of inference, and relevance) in the production of *proper* grounds for conviction. If correct, it supports some contemporary interpreters,¹⁶ and the tradition of

¹³ Cf. 1355a3–18, 1356a20–32.

¹⁴ This is nowhere explicit in the text. But a case could perhaps be made, based on the amount of attention devoted to argument-based proofs within the treatise, or possibly by taking this to be the import of remarks such as the description of the enthymeme at 1354a15 as 'the body of proof' (*σῶμα τῆς πίστεως*), or at 1355a7–8 as 'more-or-less the most important / authoritative of the proofs' (*καὶ ἔστι τοῦτο ὡς εἰπεῖν ἀπλῶς κυριώτατον τῶν πίστειων*); cf. Rapp (2002a, pp. 43–4).

¹⁵ E.g. 'Since people are most strongly convinced when they suppose that something has been proven (*Rhet.* 1.1, 1355a5f.), there is no need for the orator to confuse or distract the audience by the use of emotional appeals etc. In Aristotle's view an orator will be even more successful when he just picks up the convincing aspects of a given issue . . .' (Rapp, 2002b).

¹⁶ Burnyeat (1994), Allen (2001, 2007).

the Arab commentators, in seeing the *Rhetoric* as essentially concerned with the logic of persuasive speech.¹⁷

The conclusions of the preceding chapters also have a bearing on (though they do not fully resolve) the issue of whether the treatise in the form we have it is a single unified work. There are aspects of this question that remain untouched by the present work (such as whether book 3 belongs with the preceding two books, or whether the remarks on *topoi* or on *sylogismos* are internally consistent and assignable coherently to some single period of Aristotle's thinking).¹⁸ But if the position developed here is correct, it provides a way of seeing the work as a whole as expressing a consistent and coherent view of the nature of rhetoric, and of its essential constituents, the proofs. And as such it undermines a significant part of the case against the unity and consistency of the treatise.¹⁹ This is significant because many interpreters have seen the treatise very differently, that is, as setting out incompatible perspectives on rhetoric: an idealized perspective in which the rhetoric's methods should be confined to the production of good arguments, and a more realistic perspective in which Aristotle recognizes that other (more morally and epistemically dubious) methods must in fact be used by speakers, given the actual circumstances in which they are required to persuade. Some interpreters have found in this a virtue, seeing these perspectives as in tension (perhaps, indeed, strictly incompatible) but nevertheless complementary.²⁰ Others have contended that this leaves Aristotle without a single coherent overall view of rhetoric.²¹ In any given work, the case in favour of ascribing to its author a single coherent position (as indeed the case against ascribing different parts to different periods or different authors) is best advanced by developing an interpretation of the work as

¹⁷ This is consistent with recognizing that the interest of the Arab commentators in the logical and epistemic features of Aristotelian rhetoric was dominated by a concern to highlight rhetoric's inferiority in these respects to demonstration (*ἀπόδειξις*, in the technical sense set out in the *Posterior Analytics*). Cf. Black (1990), ch.3, esp. p. 102.

¹⁸ See Rapp (2002a) for discussion of these issues and bibliography. The issue of whether there is an inconsistency between 1.1 and the rest of the treatise over whether emotional arousal can constitute an exercise of rhetorical expertise is addressed in Chapter 7.

¹⁹ The present work is, of course, not unique in this regard, though the details of the unified picture attributed to Aristotle varies, as we have seen. Cf., for example, Cooper (1993), Engberg-Pedersen (1996), and Rapp (2002a, 2009).

²⁰ Cope (1867), Halliwell (1994), Schütrumpf (1994), Sprute (1994); differently Grimaldi (1972), Kennedy (1985).

²¹ Solmsen (1929), Wisse (1989), Barnes (1995).

a whole that is plausible and coherent. It is just such a task in relation to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* that is the principal undertaking of the present work.

Broadly, then, the interpretation defended here tells strongly in favour of unified rather than developmental or multi-perspective interpretations, and in favour of logic-centred views of the treatise, over against both moralizing views and views on which it is not essential to rhetorical expertise that its exercise meet any normative standards. Accordingly, the understanding of rhetorical expertise attributed to Aristotle is not idealized in a way that *rules out* its compatibility with using the speaker's character or the audience's emotions to provide proof. Nevertheless, there is certainly a challenge for this interpretation to show quite *how* presenting the speaker's character and arousing the audience's emotions can constitute providing the listeners with proof in this sense, that is to say, how these can constitute providing *proper grounds for conviction*. The next chapter explores this challenge further.

PART 2

6

How Can Emotion-Arousal Provide Proof?

6.1 Aristotle's Three Kinds of Proof

We saw, in Part I, that for Aristotle exercising rhetoric involved providing proofs or proper grounds for conviction, and Chapter 2 is an attempt to specify precisely how we should understand this claim. Aristotle recognizes that proofs come in three forms.

There are three forms of proofs provided through the speech (*διὰ τοῦ λόγου*): some are in the character of the speaker, others in putting the listener into a particular condition, others in the argument itself (*ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ*) through demonstration or apparent demonstration. (*Rhetoric* 1.2, 1356a1–4)¹

It will already be clear how this is supposed to work for proofs that are ‘in the argument itself’, but it may be less clear how it is that proof is supposed to be provided by the character of the speaker or by putting listeners into a particular (emotional) condition. In what follows, I offer an account first of proofs through the character of the speaker, and then of proofs generated by arousing the passions of the audience. The latter account raises a number of issues: resolving these will be the task of Chapter 6 and a large part of Part III.

6.2 Proofs in the Character of the Speaker

Proofs of the kind Aristotle describes as being ‘in the character of the speaker’ (1356a2), or ‘through his character’ (a4f.), receive rather brief treatment within the *Rhetoric*. Aristotle’s remarks appear in two

¹ Cf. also *Rhet.* 2.1, 1377b20–4; 3.1, 1403b9–13.

passages, reproduced here. The first is the brief account offered as part of the presentation of the three types of proofs in 1.2. The second offers an analysis of how speakers come to be perceived as trustworthy, and hence guidance to orators on how to bring about this result in relation to themselves.

[Proofs] through character [come about] whenever the speech is delivered in such a way as to make the speaker trustworthy (*ἀξιόπιστον*). For we are convinced more, and convinced more quickly, by decent people (*τοῖς ἐπιεικέσι*), quite generally on all topics, but especially so on topics that are controversial and lacking precision. But this too must come about through the speech (*διὰ τοῦ λόγου*), not through the speaker's having an existing reputation for being of a certain character. For it is not like the role some of the handbook-writers assign in their 'Arts' to the decency of the speaker, as contributing nothing to persuasiveness (*ὥς οὐδὲν συμβαλλομένην πρὸς τὸ πιθανόν*). On the contrary, character is almost more convincing than anything else. (*ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ὥς εἰπεῖν κυριωτάτην ἔχει πίστιν τὸ ἦθος*.) (1356a5–13)²

There are three things that make the speakers themselves trustworthy (*πιστοὺς*). For, demonstrations aside, it is these three things that explain why we come to be convinced. And they are understanding (*φρόνησις*), virtue (*ἀρετή*) and goodwill (*εὐνοία*). For it is these, one or all of them, that explain why people speak falsely on the subjects they address, or give false advice. Either they have incorrect beliefs due to a lack of understanding (*δι' ἀφροσύνην*), or although they have correct beliefs they do not say what they believe due to vice (*διὰ μοχθηρίαν*), or they possess understanding and are decent, but do not have goodwill [towards their audience] (*ἢ φρόνιμοι μὲν καὶ ἐπιεικεῖς εἰσιν ἀλλ' ἰοὺκ εὖνοι*), on account of which although they know the best courses of action, they might advise something different. There are no further possibilities. Accordingly, anyone taken to possess all of these is bound to be trustworthy (*πιστόν*) in the eyes of their audience. On what basis people can come to have the appearance of understanding and decency should be taken from the analysis offered in connection with the virtues, for the same things provide the basis for characterising both someone else and oneself in such a way. Goodwill and friendship must be treated within our discussion of the passions. (1378a6–20)

² There is some *prima facie* tension between this final assertion about the pre-eminence of character in relation to *pistis*, and similar claims about enthymemes, especially the claim that it is 'pretty much without qualification the most important (*κυριώτατον*) of the proofs' (1355a7–8). Of course, there is no logical tension—things can be important or pre-eminent in different ways. So, this passage asserts that the use of the speaker's character has the greatest impact on the audience with regard to getting them convinced (or perhaps what it produces is 'most paradigmatically conviction' (*κυριωτάτην πίστιν*)). Whereas 1355a7–8 seems primarily concerned with the importance of enthymemes to the practice of rhetoric, and hence to the expertise itself. For a different solution, cf. Rapp (2002a, p. 144).

Aristotle is explaining here how we come to believe something on the basis of someone's testimony, and against the background that, beyond infancy, humans don't believe everything that anyone tells them, offering an explanation of why we believe those we do when we do. In summary, it is down to the speaker's 'character', and hence it is part of the exercise of rhetorical expertise to be skilled in using the speech to present the right kind of character to listeners. But Aristotle has an analysis of what the relevant kind of character consists in, which he presents in the second passage, from book 2. His analysis is that taking someone to be trustworthy (*πιστός* or *ἀξιόπιστος*) involves a sensitivity to three things about them, understanding (*φρόνησις*), virtue (*ἀρετή*), and goodwill (*εὖνοια*), such that if they were perceived as lacking any one of them, they would not be treated as trustworthy. That the audience perceive the speaker as possessing these three attributes explains (*τὰ αἵτια*, a7) their taking him to be trustworthy,³ and hence it also explains (*δι' αὐτὰ*, a7) their being convinced of what he says.

Character-proofs, then, will have the following key features.

1. The orator presents the audience with evidence that he is trustworthy (or has understanding, decency, and goodwill).
2. The audience regard it as reputable, on this basis, that this particular speaker is trustworthy.
3. The audience comes to believe that the speaker is trustworthy.
4. The audience hears this particular speaker recommend some particular judgement.
5. So the audience believe the following: this speaker is trustworthy, and he recommends judging such-and-such, so probably it is correct to judge such-and-such.
6. The audience recognize this speaker's trustworthiness as proper grounds for making that particular judgement.

³ The fact that the possession of the three attributes explains both the speaker's trustworthiness and the likelihood that he will convince his listeners (rather than there being an explanatory role for the speaker's trustworthiness independently of his perceived possession of these qualities), and Aristotle's insistence that 'necessarily' (a14) the possessor of these qualities will be trustworthy in the eyes of his listeners, suggest that Aristotle thinks that taking someone to be trustworthy simply *consists in* taking them to have these three qualities, and possibly also that he sees the possession of these three qualities as *constituting* (the relevant kind of) trustworthiness.

In the terms of my earlier proposal, here is an audience coming to accept a proof (*pistis*) that proceeds from what they accept as reputable to a conclusion that they are thereby led to accept on the basis of that proof. The *pistis* itself is the conjunction of 'this speaker is trustworthy' and 'this speaker recommends judging such-and-such'. The second conjunct is obviously something that it is easy for the audience to find reputable, simply by hearing the speaker recommend such-and-such in his speech. The first conjunct comes from taking the speaker to be of good character. At times, Aristotle presents this as though it were a very intellectual matter (2.1, 1378a6ff.), where the speaker's character is inferred from evidence he presents in his speech for his own wisdom, virtue, and goodwill, and the speaker's trustworthiness (*ἀξιόπιστος* 1356a5f.; *πιστός* 1378a6, a15) is then inferred from these elements of his good character. But I take it that we need not suppose this to be an explicit thought process in the listener's mind. In fact, it is better thought of as the activation of a disposition—evidence of someone's wisdom, virtue, or goodwill is sufficient to activate a (rational) disposition to treat that person as trustworthy. Aristotle more or less says this in his book 1 formulation concerning character-proofs at 1356a6–8, 'we believe / trust / treat-as-reliable good people more, and we do so more readily: this applies generally on all subjects, but applies absolutely where precision is impossible and there are things to be said on either side'. Clearly Aristotle intends this both as a general statement about how humans are disposed to respond to what others say, and as an *explanation* of how the character of the speaker can function as a *pistis*, as a basis for being justified in accepting some further conclusion. So, presenting evidence for the good character of the speaker functions in rhetoric simply to activate this general disposition in these particular circumstances, in relation to *this* speaker, and what he is saying *now*. The listeners' apprehension of the speaker's character need not be an explicit thought process to which they attend, merely something they—one way or another—take to be the case (*φαίνεσθαι* 1377b26, *ὑπολαμβάνειν* b27, *δοκοῦντα* 1378a14, *φανέειν* a16). They believe the things Pericles has said, because they believe Pericles—he himself is what is *pistos*, and if his character is good it provides the strongest of proofs (1356a13). When asked to justify why he thought a particular course of action was best, an assemblyman could reply, 'Because Pericles said it was,' perhaps supplemented with some comment on Pericles' wisdom, virtue, and patriotism.

We should note what is implied by this account of the way character-proofs affect listeners. That is, that whatever the precise psychological processes involved, listeners are making some kind of *inference* from the character of the speaker to the truth of what he says. And, given his analysis of what the relevant kind of trustworthiness involves, it is clear that the inference in question is a reasonable one. That a speaker has understanding, virtue, and goodwill towards one, is—if true—indeed good grounds for believing what he says.

6.3 How Character-Proofs Fit the Proposed Account of *Pistis*

We are now in a position to see how character-proofs fit the account proposed in Chapter 2 of what is required for something to constitute a ‘proof’ (*pistis*), as understood by Aristotle. The components of that account were as follows.

1. A *pistis* consists of premises acceptable to the audience that stand in such a relation to the conclusion for which they are offered as a *pistis* that if one accepts (and persists in accepting) the premises, it would be an exercise of good judgement to be inclined towards accepting also that conclusion because of those premises.
2. A *pistis* is comprised of things that are reputable, and it is a device by which they confer good standing on something else, namely the conclusion.
3. A *pistis* aims at inclining the listener to accept the conclusion as a result of sensitivity to the reputability of the premises and the relation in which they stand to the conclusion.

Proofs through the argument itself involve the listener consciously *believing* the premises, believing that the epistemic good standing of the conclusion is enhanced by the reputability of the premises, and then coming to believe the conclusion on that basis. As we are now in a position to see, character-proofs (and, I will hope to show, emotion-proofs) will simply be variants on this standard case since they will involve mental states that constitute acceptance of one or more premises of such a piece of reasoning, but without those mental states necessarily being ones of consciously believing those premises.

On this understanding, we may distinguish the relevant ways of describing how a proof works, seeking to highlight at each point the contents of the listener's mental states.

6.3.1 *Êthos- (Character-) Proofs*

The effect of an *êthos*-proof may be described as follows.

1. I hear Callias credibly present evidence of his own good character (trustworthiness).
2. I trust Callias (I treat Callias as being trustworthy).
3. I know that Callias asserts such-and-such.
4. I believe such-and-such.

This sequence of mental states features a distinctive sequence in the *contents* of those states.

1. Evidence for: Callias is trustworthy
 - a. And this evidence is reputable.
2. Callias is trustworthy.
3. Callias recommends such-and-such.

Therefore (or 'this is good grounds for judging'),

4. Such-and-such.

What we have here in this latter sequence seems to be a set of premises and a conclusion, where these are so related that if one accepts the premises, it would be an exercise of good judgement to be inclined on that basis to accept the conclusion. The proof starts from premises that are reputable, and is a device by which they confer epistemic good standing on the conclusion. And it aims to convince the listener on the basis of the reputability of the starting points, and sensitivity to the relation in which they stand to the conclusion. We should note that step 2 involves a mental state—trusting Callias—that we can treat as having the intentional contents 'Callias is trustworthy'. It constitutes good judgement to trust someone on the basis of evidence for their trustworthiness, and it is similarly a matter of good judgement to make judgements because they are recommended by someone in whom you have a properly formed trust. This is a case of good judgement precisely because of the propriety of the inference it involves, i.e. because trusting has a kind of intentional content which is about the trusted person's

character, and if this is correct, it is capable of constituting proper grounds for precisely the further judgements that it disposes you to make when you trust somebody.

6.3.2 Pathos- (*emotion-*) *proofs*

Similarly, the suggestion is that the emotions involved in the response to emotion-based proofs constitute affirmations of one or more premises that are part of an underlying inference to a conclusion. So we get a sequence of mental states as follows.

1. I register evidence that Smith is a dangerous character.
2. I feel afraid of Smith (I feel that Smith is a dangerous character).
3. I believe Smith is guilty of assault.

This sequence of mental states features the following sequence in the *contents* of those states.

1. Evidence for: Smith is a dangerous character
 - a. And this evidence is reputable.
2. Smith is a dangerous character.
3. Smith is guilty of assault.

If this is right, then here too we see the key characteristics of Aristotelian *pistis*, as characterized earlier: the proof starts from reputable premises, these premises confer epistemic good standing on the conclusion because of the relation in which they stand to it, and the proof aims at inclining the listener to accept the conclusion because of these features. We will consider here and in subsequent chapters whether this could indeed form the basis of Aristotle's view of *pathos-pisteis*. For the moment, this sketch of a view shows how it could be that *all* of the kinds of technical proofs fall within Aristotle's theory of rhetorical *pistis*, providing the listener with (in the sense specified) proper grounds for conviction.

6.4 How This then Sets a Challenge for *Pathos*-Proofs

I have thus far sketched an account of how in all kinds of *pisteis* including *pathos*-proofs there is an inference underlying the proof that plays an

essential role in enabling the proof to provide proper grounds for believing the conclusion for which it is offered in support. But in that account, I did no more than set out how there could be a sequence of mental states with contents such that certain inferential relations held between those contents. Proof requires more than this. We noted in Chapter 2 that a requirement of Aristotelian *pistis* was that if the listeners were correct to regard the premises as reputable, it would be an exercise of good judgement for them to make the recommended judgement *because of the premises*. That is, what is presented must be such that the listener could believe the conclusion *for that reason*. Indeed, it is precisely when the listener believes (or is inclined to believe) the conclusion *on the basis of the proof* that the proof has been successful.⁴ It is a requirement of rhetorical proofs that, if they are successful and the listeners acquire beliefs on the basis of accepting what is presented, their acceptance of the premises of the proof be a *well-founded* basis for believing the conclusion. In other words, once it is granted that the listener accepts as reputable the premises of the proof they should not be liable to any epistemic criticism for taking these as good grounds for believing the conclusion.

6.4.1 *An apparent problem solved*

An initial puzzle is that this appears at first sight problematic in the case of proofs through the passions of the listeners.

In general, we can see whether something is a good basis for believing a conclusion by reference to two tests.

1. Can this thing be cited by believers themselves as a justification for their believing the conclusion?
2. Can we cite this thing as a third-party explanation for how a believer was justified in believing the conclusion?

In the case of argument proofs, it is obvious that these tests are passed. We justify our beliefs by citing an argument, and even where the

⁴ This is not to say that the proof is necessarily deficient if it is not accepted—unusually stupid people might fail to understand a perfectly good rhetorical proof, for example. Or there may be stronger countervailing reasons against believing the conclusion. Nevertheless, proofs aim at being the basis on which someone believes (or is inclined to believe) their conclusion.

argument turns out to be flawed, we might cite the fact that we believed it at the time to justify rationally our believing the conclusion. Similarly, we explain how someone's belief in a conclusion is well founded by advert-ing to a good argument that they believe supports it; and likewise it constitutes some level of defence of a person's good judgement to advert to an appropriately structured argument whose premises *they* believe, even when those premises are known in fact to be false (or when their believing them is known to lack proper grounds).

A similar story can be told for believing someone on the basis of their character. We support our beliefs by reference to the character of the person on whose authority we believed the conclusion. We explain the epistemic good standing of the beliefs of others by reference to their having received them on trust from someone they reasonably took to be trustworthy, and we do so even when the beliefs have turned out false, or the person has been revealed to have been in fact untrustworthy.

So, I might believe that *p* because I believe an argument to *p*, or because I believe Callias (who says that *p*). These are familiar ways in which we justify our beliefs to ourselves and others—we relay the argument that persuaded us, or we advert to the reliable testimony of the person we believed, 'Callias told me, and he is honest as the day is long.'

I propose that there is a similar story to be told about the passions and the justification of beliefs.

This might not seem immediately obvious for two reasons. First, we do not cite our emotional states directly as justification for our beliefs in the way we do cite an argument or the character of an informant. In answer to the question, 'Why did you think Smith guilty?', it seems a weak kind of justification to say, 'Because I was afraid of him.' Second, we do not cite the emotional states of others directly as part of explanations of their epistemic success. Thus, 'she judged that Smith was guilty because she was afraid of him,' would be more typically understood not as a justification of her judgement at all, but as a way of saying that her judgement was impaired. There is thus some reason to doubt whether emotions can justify beliefs in the ways that facts and beliefs can.

However, the resolution of this apparent problem should already be clear. If we simply use the form of expression 'feel that . . .' to describe emotional states, then they start to seem on a par with beliefs. Thus, we may offer justifications of our beliefs as follows: 'I believe that Smith is

guilty of assault because I feel he is a dangerous character.' This is simply a redescription of my feeling afraid of Smith making explicit the content of the emotion. This also suggests that if my fear of Smith had played an important part in my concluding that Smith was guilty of assault, it would not be misleading to say, 'I believe that Smith is guilty of assault because he is a dangerous character.' That is, once we understand clearly the role played by the contents of emotional states, these contents can be cited directly, in justification of conclusions inferred from them, in just the same way as we do with beliefs.

This, I propose, is exactly how Aristotle is able to see the arousal of the passions as the provision of proof, and is the explanation at work behind his belief that passions affect our judgements (1356a15–16; 1377b31–78a5)—a belief that features in the very definition of the passions offered in the *Rhetoric* (2.1, 1378a19–22).

6.4.2 *A constraint arising from the claim that arousing passions is a way of providing proof*

If this is right, it imposes a constraint on Aristotle's understanding of the passions themselves. For it is essential to the explanation of how proofs in general, and passion proofs in particular, work that they involve the justified acceptance of premises, in such a way as to transmit this justification onto the acceptance of a conclusion, thereby increasing its epistemic good standing. Aristotle's understanding of the passions must be such that they can (i) constitute the acceptance of suitable representational contents as true, (ii) be themselves subject to epistemic assessment for their propriety given the available evidence, and (iii) be capable of conferring such epistemic good standing as they possess onto the acceptance of a conclusion, where the premise set to which the passions' contents belong stands in some appropriate inferential relationship to that conclusion.

This constrains the kind of representational state that Aristotle can suppose is involved in the passions. For instance, it is inconsistent with these constraints to suppose that the passions involve a non-committal attitude to their representational contents.⁵ Only an attitude that involves taking things to be the way they are represented can (i) constitute the kind

⁵ Cf. e.g. Cooper (1993, pp. 191–2); Striker (1996, p. 291); Sihvola (1996, pp. 59–60).

of acceptance required of premises in an argument purporting to offer proper grounds for being convinced of its conclusion, (ii) be an appropriate candidate for assessment for their propriety in the light of available evidence, and (iii) be capable of conferring epistemic good standing onto the acceptance of a conclusion. Where premises are merely entertained (rather than affirmed), they cannot themselves serve to recommend the acceptance of a conclusion, however secure the inferential connection between the two. Such a premise is, by the subject's lights, merely one of infinitely many possible states of affairs, and thus the contents of the premise are not the right kind of thing to entail, or render more probable the truth of the conclusion. There is simply nothing approaching inconsistency involved in entertaining one proposition and denying something else, even if the truth of the one entails the truth of the other.

But this may seem too quick. Most of those who favour the view that for Aristotle the passions need not implicate their subject in taking things to be the way they are represented, would not wish to claim that Aristotelian subjects are *always* non-committal towards the representations involved in the passions. Surely all that is required for the role assigned in rhetoric to the arousal of the passions is that the passions be *capable* of involving the affirmation of their contents, and of having and transmitting epistemic merit? The fact that some passions may lack the features required for their arousal to count as providing proof does not impugn the possibility that other passions may have these features. This much is correct, and this clarifies the constraint.

However, one way in which people have thought that passions sometimes do and sometimes do not involve taking their contents to be the way things are (in this sense, 'affirming' them) is that sometimes the subject's considered beliefs concur with the way things are represented in their passion, and sometimes these conflict with and repudiate the contents of the passionate state. The latter cases (termed cases of 'recalcitrant emotion') are considered in some detail in Chapter 10. But here we need only note that if, in the former type of case, the representational contents of the passion are affirmed in virtue of their being the object of a state of belief, then clearly it is not the passion but the belief that is the mechanism by which the subject accepts these contents as true. The suggestion under consideration seems to be that what makes the difference between passions that do and do not involve taking their contents to be the way things are is a difference in the subject's beliefs about those

contents. But if so, we are given little reason to suppose that in the non-recalcitrant case the passion *itself* involves any affirmation of its content. All the affirming work seems to be done by the subject's beliefs.

In fact, as is argued in Chapter 10, Aristotle's view seems to be that all passions involve taking their representational contents to be the way things are, if not wholeheartedly, then at least to some extent. On such a view, cases of recalcitrant passion also involve some affirmation of their contents, with the result that the subject is conflicted, simultaneously affirming (in some way) conflicting appraisals of how things are.

At this stage, the key point is that the passions *themselves* must involve the subject in an affirmation of the relevant content. This is required if they are to constitute the affirmation of premises in the kind of rhetorical proofs that involve 'putting the listener into a particular condition' (1356a3), such that those proofs can constitute proper grounds for affirming their conclusion. How Aristotle develops his account of the passions in such a way as to meet this requirement is explored in detail in Part III.

Before this challenge is taken up, however, we should address directly a long-standing problem facing any interpretation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in relation to emotion-arousal. The problem is the apparent stark contradiction on whether emotion-arousal has any place at all in rhetorical expertise. The next chapter criticizes previous approaches to this problem, and proposes a new solution.

A Supposed Contradiction about Emotion-Arousal in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

7.1 Introduction

Interpreters since antiquity have been perplexed by Aristotle's attitude to emotion-arousal in the *Rhetoric*.¹ In *Rhetoric* 1.1, he appears to claim that emotion-arousal has no place in the essential core of rhetorical expertise. Yet elsewhere in the treatise he holds that it has an extremely important place as one of the three technical kinds of proof. The first chapter thus seems to stand out as an anomaly. The present chapter is primarily focused on offering a new interpretation of that chapter, and in particular of the precise nature of the criticism of his predecessors that Aristotle offers there.² The interpretation rests on the answers to three questions. What exactly was it that featured so prominently in the rhetorical handbooks of his predecessors, and which Aristotle so firmly excluded from a place in the art of rhetoric? Who were these

¹ Stephanus seems to have this worry in his commentary on the *Rhetoric* (Stephanus 287–8, CAG 21 pp. 297–8).

² The interpretation offered here, and the solution to the problem of apparent contradiction, has—as one might expect—some significant similarities to previous interpretations. Most significantly, the philosophical position attributed to Aristotle and the general thrust of his criticisms of his predecessors in the opening pages of 1.1 is substantially the same as that proposed in Cope (1867, pp. 4–6), Grimaldi (1972, p. 44), Schütrumpf (1994), Wardy (1998, pp. 114–16), and Cooper (1999, pp. 391–3), and has significant similarities with the analysis of Solmsen (1938) and (Rapp (2002a, pp. 2.30–4), though with less emphasis than theirs on the parts of the speech. The identification of Thrasymachus (or his followers) as a central target of Aristotle's criticism is anticipated in Solmsen (1938). But what is proposed here goes beyond these interpreters in addressing the interpretative challenge, highlighted by writers such as Barnes (1995, pp. 259–62) and Wisse (1989, pp. 17–20), to show how the *text* of 1.1 can plausibly be understood as expressing that position and those criticisms.

predecessors that come under Aristotle's criticism in *Rhetoric* 1.1? And how do the criticisms in 1.1 fit with Aristotle's views elsewhere in the *Rhetoric* about the nature of the art and the structure of rhetorical speeches? The proposed answers to these questions provide, I claim, not only a highly plausible view of the argument advanced in *Rhetoric* 1.1, but also a solution to the problem of apparent contradiction between this chapter and the rest of the treatise.

Section 7.2 highlights a notorious problem with the most plausible existing interpretations of *Rhetoric* 1.1. This is the apparent contradiction between 1.1 and the rest of the treatise in relation to emotion-arousal. The remaining sections advance an interpretation of 1.1 in the light of which this problem (here called the 'contradiction problem') is solved. Section 7.3 deals with what key phrases in the chapter—normally taken to refer to emotions—actually refer to. Section 7.4 suggests plausible historical targets for Aristotle's criticisms. Section 7.5 shows how the criticisms of 1.1 fit with Aristotle's view elsewhere of rhetoric and of the structure of rhetorical speeches. Section 7.6 deals with a number of possible objections to this interpretation.

7.2 The Contradiction Problem and the 'Contradiction View'

On the usual interpretations of the opening chapter, it seems as though there is a contradiction over emotion-arousal between 1.1 and the rest of the work. Some interpreters hold that there is indeed a contradiction here: call this the 'Contradiction View'.³ They base it on some difficult passages in the *Rhetoric*, in which Aristotle criticizes his predecessors. These passages are:

Well, as things stand, those who put together Arts of Speaking have provided us with scarcely a part of it.⁴ For it is only the proofs that belong to the art, other things are mere accessories. And they say nothing about enthymemes, which are

³ Barnes (1995, pp. 259–62); Wisse (1989, pp. 17–20); Fortenbaugh (1992, section VII); Kennedy (1985); perhaps Cope (1877, p. 6).

⁴ Or 'have produced only a small part of it', depending on whether one reads 'οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν πεπορίκασιν αὐτῆς μόνιον' or 'ὀλίγον πεποιήκασιν αὐτῆς μόνιον' (or indeed 'ὀλίγον πεπονήκασιν αὐτῆς μόνιον' as Kassel (1976) conjectures). In fact, little hangs on this difference, since there is an uncontested 'οὐδὲν' at 1354b21 in a passage clearly aimed at making the same point.

the body of proof; whereas they devote most of their treatment to things that are outside the subject at hand. For slander, and pity and anger and passions⁵ of the soul of this kind are not about the subject at hand, but aimed at the juror.⁶

One shouldn't warp the juror by leading him on into anger, or resentment or pity, for that would be like someone warping the ruler that they were about to use.

(1354a24–6)

If this is correct, then it is obvious that it is an expertise in irrelevance that is the thing discussed (*φανερὸν ὅτι τὰ ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος τεχνολογοῦσιν*) by those who define other matters, such as what the introduction or narrative should contain or each of the other parts of the speech (since in them they busy themselves with nothing except how to put the judge into a certain condition) but set out nothing about the proofs that belong to the expertise (*περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐντέχνων πίστεων οὐδὲν δεικνύουσιν*), that is to say the means of becoming good at enthymemes.

(1354b16–22)

On the face of it, what is at issue is the arousal of emotions in general. The lists—anger, pity, prejudice⁷—and the general phrases such as ‘passions of the soul of this kind’, ‘put the judge into a particular condition’ certainly suggest this. Aristotle's predecessors saw stirring the emotions as part of rhetoric, and Aristotle criticizes them not merely for their *exclusive* focus on these things, but for including them within rhetoric at all. He is crystal clear—the art of rhetoric is about the technical proofs (*ἐντεχνοὶ πίστεις*), and centres on enthymemes; it does not include things that are outside the subject at hand. Emotions are outside the subject at hand, and so are no part of rhetoric.⁸

⁵ I use ‘passions’ and ‘emotions’ interchangeably throughout simply as English equivalents to Aristotle's *πάθη*.

⁶ *νῦν μὲν οὖν οἱ τὰς τέχνας τῶν λόγων συντιθέντες οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν πεπορίκασιν αὐτῆς μόριον αἱ γὰρ πίστεις ἐντεχνόν εἰσι μόνον, τὰ δ' ἄλλα προσθήκαι, οἱ δὲ περὶ μὲν ἐνθυμημάτων οὐδὲν λέγουσιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα τῆς πίστεως, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος τὰ πλείστα πραγματεύονται: διαβολὴ γὰρ καὶ ἔλεος καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς οὐ περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δικαστήν.* (1354a11–18)

⁷ This is not my preferred translation of *διαβολή*, since it is ambiguous between being a verbal noun and a term for an emotion in a way that the Greek term is not. Its use here exhibits a tendency by translators to obscure the difference between *διαβολή* and the other items on the list: cf. for instance Roberts' ‘the arousal of prejudice, pity, anger and similar emotions’ (Barnes, 1984) *ad loc.*, and nn.16 and 17.

⁸ See Chapter 2, for an analysis of this argument. 1354a11–18 cannot be plausibly interpreted as claiming that ‘slander, pity, etc.’ (whatever the reference of this phrase turns out to be) have no place in the art of rhetoric *to the extent that they are irrelevant to the subject at hand*. They are no part of rhetoric *because* they are irrelevant. Cf. also 1354b21. Otherwise plausible solutions of the contradiction problem founder exegetically on this point. Cope (1867, pp. 4–6); Cooper (1999); Wardy (1998, pp. 114–16); Grimaldi (1972, p. 44); Schütrumpf (1994).

The apparent contradiction is then striking, when Aristotle makes clear at 1.2.1356a1–20 that arousal of listeners' emotions is one of the three kinds of proof that belong to the art. Indeed, in this passage he appears to make the very link that is so problematic. He says the following about the kind of proofs that work through the emotions of the listeners:

[proofs] through the listeners, whenever they are brought into an emotional state by the speech: for we do not make judgements in the same way when upset as when we are glad; or when hostile as when friendly. And this is, as we said, the only thing the current handbook writers attempt to treat. These things will be made clear one by one when we speak about the emotions.

(1356a14–19)

So, in this passage, Aristotle is talking about the second of his own three technical *pisteis*, those that work through the arousal of the passions; he refers forward to his account of the passions in 2.1–11; and he says—referring back to his own remarks at 1.1—that it was this very subject that previous writers spent their labours on; indeed, he says, they dealt with nothing else. On the face of it, it seems that here Aristotle's *pathos*-based type of proof is the very same method⁹ which, in 1.1, he rejects as having no place in rhetorical persuasion. The previous passages, on the intuitively plausible reading just given, seem to provide a strong basis for thinking that Aristotle's views in the *Rhetoric* on emotion-arousal are simply contradictory.

Some, indeed, see no alternative to the contradiction view, and this constitutes for some scholars a significant motivation for hypotheses attributing different parts of the *Rhetoric* to different periods of Aristotle's writing. Nevertheless, even before one gets to any methodologically based reasons to resist attributing inconsistent views to Aristotle, there are several more immediate interpretative reasons for questioning this reading of 1.1. It seems to attribute to Aristotle some rather odd beliefs, such as that the subjects relevantly addressed by orators are not things that people get passionate about,¹⁰ or that any emotion-arousal at all would contravene the rules of the Areopagus.¹¹ Moreover, it is not easy—as this view requires—to detach the criticisms of 1.1 from the rest

⁹ This problem is addressed in section 7.4.

¹⁰ On the conventional reading, this is entailed by Aristotle's claim at 1354a16–18.

¹¹ 1354a18–24.

of the treatise and assign them to a different period of Aristotle's (or someone else's) thought. The same strictures about relevance, the importance of the facts, and the objections to slander, are recapitulated in book 3 in the course of a section that both echoes the language of 1.1 and *also* reaffirms the passions as the source of one of three types of proof that are the core of the art of rhetoric.¹² That is, book 3 contains evidence that the supposedly contradictory views of 1.1 and 2.1–11 (also 1.2) were held *concurrently*. An interpretation of 1.1 that resolved the contradiction problem would have the added benefit of rendering perfectly natural and expected the combination of views we find in the third book. Just such an interpretation is offered here.

7.3 'Slander, Pity, Anger and Similar Passions of the Soul'

My central claim is that where Aristotle's text has 'slander and pity, anger and similar passions of the soul,' (1354a16–17) this is not a list of passions, but a list of activities. He is referring to the activity of *diabolê*, and the activities advocated by handbook writers for using their set-piece 'recipes' for emotion-arousal—recipes used to generate sections in a speech (often in the introduction). These aimed to affect the state of mind of the listener, but were unconnected with the specific subject matter at issue. Such techniques are designed to prejudice the listeners in favour of the speaker, and against his opponent, irrespective of the strength of his case. The kind of thing, I suggest, that Aristotle had in mind was the stirring up of hostility because of how someone dressed, or because of his parentage or racial origins, or the arousal of pity by bringing friends, wife, or children weeping onto the *bêma*.¹³

So, the claim is that this is a list of activities advocated by the handbook writers. What these activities have in common is that adapting them to make them work on any particular occasion does not depend on

¹² 3.14, 1415b4–6 on relevance, 1416a35–7 on slander and the importance of the facts. 1415b4–9 seems to use the same imagery of 'body' as 1.1. These are part of a section on *taxis*, 3.13–19, in which 3.17 on the proofs clearly recognizes argument, character, and passion as providing three kinds of proof. Cf. also 3.1, 1403b10–13.

¹³ Techniques well attested in Athens and noted by philosophers: see e.g. Plato *Apology* 34c; Aristotle *Rhetoric* 3.15, 1416a21–4, b1–3.

the presence of features that have any bearing whatsoever on the truth or falsehood of the orator's claims about 'the issue'.¹⁴

Aristotle's complaint is that these activities are irrelevant (1354a17–18). They therefore contribute nothing to proofs, and so techniques for such activities offered by the handbook writers cannot be constituents of the art of rhetoric. Crucially this does nothing to rule out from the art of rhetoric such things as emotional *proofs*, or emotional *premises* in proofs, where those proofs *do* bear on 'the issue'—but these are entirely different from what the handbook writers had offered (and from what Aristotle criticizes here).

The challenge is to show that this is a viable interpretation of 'slander, pity, anger and similar passions of the soul' at a16–17.¹⁵ For how could there be adequate reason to deny what seems so explicit in the text, namely that this is a list of emotions? We will try to show that there is very good reason to think the proposed new interpretation both viable and preferable to existing readings.

First, we should notice that it is far from straightforward to read this as a list of emotions. The very first item on the list, *diabolê*, is not an emotion,¹⁶ in fact it is not a state of mind¹⁷ at all—it does not fall under 'πάθη τῆς

¹⁴ 'τὸ πᾶγμα'—spelled out by Aristotle in the context of forensic oratory as the matter of 'whether it is or is not the case, whether it happened or did not' (1354a28).

¹⁵ If this can be established, then 1354a24–5 would naturally be read as making a similar point. Cf. Wardy (1998, p. 115).

¹⁶ Cf. Barnes (1995) and Wisse (1989), who both translate *διαβολή* as '[the arousal of] prejudice'. LSJ has both slander and prejudice as meanings of 'διαβολή'—the latter translation is perhaps possible, but none of the passages cited supports a view of *diabolê* as an emotion. In support of the stance taken here, the insistence that *diabolê* is not an emotion, Cope (1877) says, 'It denotes the exciting of suspicion and ill-will in the minds of the judges or audience, in order to prejudice them against the opponent with whom you are in controversy: and is therefore improperly classed with the *πάθη* or emotions such as *ἔλεος* and *ὀργή*. This has already been noticed by Victorius and Muretus: the latter says, "*διαβολή non est πάθος, sed pertinet ad iudicem ponendum ἐν πάθει*", p. 7. Cf. also Rapp (2002a, pp. 44–5). Grimaldi (1980, pp. 10–11) notes, 'In itself *διαβολή* is not an emotion; it produces an emotion.' He also cites the long opening excursus of Demosthenes *On the Crown* (1–9) on the illicit advantages brought by accusation and slander, and draws attention to the phrase 'τοῖς ἐξώθεν λόγοις' (18.9) as a reference to slander, a phrase that clearly refers to the activity of the speaker and not to the mental state of the listener.

¹⁷ Although LSJ has prejudice among the possible meanings of 'διαβολή', this is potentially very misleading in this context. In none of the passages cited does the word refer to the mental state of the listener, nor require or permit any other meaning than slander. The occurrence nearest to requiring the meaning prejudice is in Antiphon *De Caede Herodis*, 71, where the jurors are urged to deliberate *μὴ μετ' ὀργῆς καὶ διαβολῆς*. Yet even here, the translation 'slander' is quite possible—indeed sections 74–80 seem to require it. The English

ψυχῆς'.¹⁸ This suggests that the list at 1354a16–17 is not a list of emotions. *Diabolê* is an activity—slandering or maliciously accusing someone; and there is an associated activity of countering such slander. These activities are strongly associated with the *proemium* section of the speech—not just by Aristotle's predecessors, but by Aristotle himself (3.14–15)—an activity, therefore, that centres on the listeners' states of mind prior to the narrative of events and the argumentation for accepting the speaker's claims. If we take seriously Aristotle's own view of *diabolê*, from 3.14–15, it is an activity which may occupy whole sections of the speech (3.13–19—on *taxis*—is arranged according to the sections of the speech:¹⁹ 14 on *prooimion*; 15 on *diabolê*; 16 on *diêgêsis*; etc., such that there is perhaps even a suggestion that *diabolê* may at times itself be a distinct section of a speech), or which will more usually belong in the conclusion or the proem.²⁰ Crucially this separates it from any claims about the facts of the case, their narration in the *diêgêsis*, or arguments for them in the *pisteis* section. Indeed, it is clear that for Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*, the activity of *diabolê* is something entirely distinct from any kind of argument for the orator's conclusion, even an argument from character. Arguments and their rebuttal are discussed under '*pisteis*', in 3.17, separately from *diabolê* and its rebuttal. And whereas the defending orator is told that he will need to undermine *diabolê* right at the start of his speech, in order to gain the fair-minded attention of the listeners, there is no similar instruction to start one's speech by countering the opponent's *arguments*.²¹ These are dealt with as part of what is covered under *pisteis*, in 3.17. The result of *diabolê* is not a case that needs to be refuted, but the production of κωλύοντα (1415a32), hindrances or obstacles. Removing these is one of the

word 'prejudice' is only apt in connection with διαβολή, if treated as a verbal noun (and as such it would not refer to the mental state of the listener): διαβάλλειν is in this sense perhaps adequately translated as 'to (attempt to) prejudice' someone against someone else.

¹⁸ It does not feature, in fact, in any of the several lists of πάθη from the period: Plato, *Philebus* 47e1; Aristotle, *DA* 1.1.403a16–18; *EN* 2.5.1105b21–3; *EE* 2.2.1220b12–15; *MM* 1.7.1186a11–14; Ps-Aristotle, *Rhet ad Alex* 34.1440a38–b2.

¹⁹ The numbering of the sections of the *Rhetoric* is obviously not Aristotle's own, but the division of sections is clearly signalled in the text.

²⁰ For Aristotle, if you are prosecuting, your *diabolê* should be at the end to make it remain in the listeners' minds; if you are defending, your countering of *diabolê* will need to be at the beginning to secure the listeners' open-minded attention in the first place. (3.14.1415a29–34)

²¹ Socrates, for example, in Plato's *Apology*, right at the start addresses *diabolê* extensively before getting to the actual indictment only at 24b.

ἰατρεύματα—antidotes—that are needed before the orator's case can get under way in the first place. This should alert us to the possibility that in Aristotle's complaint about *diabolê* in 1.1, he is not criticizing the arousal of some *diabolê*-related emotion, but criticizing the very use of *diabolê* itself. Considering *diabolê* on its own for the moment, it is obvious how *diabolê*, slander, can be plausibly charged with being 'not about the issue' (οὐ περὶ τοῦ πράγματός). Indeed it is notable that Aristotle repeats this very point, when he discusses *diabolê* in book 3. When advising how *diabolê* can be undermined, he suggests attacking your opponent's use of *diabolê* on grounds that it shows a lack of faith in the *pragma*, the actual facts of the case at hand (ὅτι οὐ πιστεύει τῷ πράγματι) (3.15.1416a37). Both in book 3 and in book 1, he can take it as simply obvious that *diabolê* is not related to the facts of the case at hand.²² And if this is right, then it suggests that what the items in the list have in common is not that they are all emotions.

This is an important step towards justifying an interpretation in which the objects of Aristotle's criticisms at 1354a16ff. do not include the kind of emotion-arousal that he elsewhere advocates as one of the three kinds of technical proofs.

As we have seen, commentators on the *Rhetoric* have typically looked at the phrase 'slander, pity, anger and passions of the soul of this sort' (διαβολὴ γὰρ καὶ ἔλεος καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς) and worked from the end of the phrase backwards. The thought has been that here is a list of *pathê*, a generalization involving 'passions of the soul', and that even though *diabolê* does not properly fit this category, its effects do, so this must be what is in view, and thus the phrase is a way of picking out the general category of 'passions of the soul'—with three examples at the head. On the reading I am suggesting here, *diabolê* is to be taken at face value, and understood entirely consistently with what Aristotle has to say about it in book 3: it is an activity strongly associated with the opening and ending of a speech.

There are then two possible ways of reading the rest of this key phrase. One is to see the rest of the phrase as an explication of *diabolê* and how

²² Note that it seems that here (1354a16–18) Aristotle thinks it *equally obvious* that pity, anger, and the like are unrelated to the case at hand. This is hard to account for on the view that these terms refer to types of emotion.

such use of *diabolê* is envisaged as working.²³ On this first view, then, the phrase could be paraphrased roughly as ‘slander, and the pity, anger and suchlike passions of the soul *associated with it*’. The whole phrase is, on this view, about *diabolê*.

A second view is that this is a list of coordinate items which all refer to set-pieces that could be composed or selected for use from a collection, along the lines recommended by a ‘master rhetorician’ like Thrasyarchus. On this view, rather than massaging the meaning of ‘slander’ to make it more like pity, anger, and passions of the soul, one instead interprets references to ‘pity, anger and suchlike passions of the soul’ to make them more like the reference to slander. We know from the work of Thrasyarchus, of which Aristotle was specifically aware,²⁴ that these words could be used in this way. Thrasyarchus wrote a work called ‘pities’ (ἐλέοι), where presumably the title referred to what the work contained, that is, set-piece recipes for arousing pity. So, the phrase could, on this second view, be paraphrased roughly as ‘slander, “doing pity”, “doing anger”, and “doing other similar passions”’. It is possible even that this list of terms—slander, pity, anger—would have been recognizable to Aristotle’s readers as a list of chapter headings from such a rhetorical handbook.²⁵

I prefer this second reading. It fits well with the ancient evidence, as we shall see, and avoids a problem with the first reading, which is that pity is not obviously an emotion stirred up by slander. Pity, on the other hand, *is* an emotion strongly associated with set-piece appeals unconnected with the central facts of the case.

We have begun to touch in passing on how the proposed reading fits in with ancient evidence about rhetorical techniques for the arousal of

²³ This view was suggested by a remark of Stephen Halliwell’s that the list is ‘coloured’ by having *diabolê* at the head. The view here is not simply that the pejorative *tone* is inherited by the rest of the list, but—more boldly—that what they *refer to* is made specific to their connection with *diabolê*. Something like this seems to have been the view of Ludwig Radermacher, as appears from a passage quoted by Grimaldi (Radermacher, 1951, p. 216; Grimaldi, 1972, p. 44), although the passage leaves rather unclear both precisely how Radermacher’s view worked, and how Grimaldi understood it.

²⁴ *Rhetoric* 3.1.1404a14–15, also more generally 1409a2 and 1413a8.

²⁵ In case this seems over-speculative, we might note that the section of Plato’s *Phaedrus* (267c–d), quoted here, in which almost exactly these terms can be found associated with Thrasyarchus, belongs in a section of that dialogue where Plato is making extensive (sometimes mocking) use of the ‘technical’ rhetorical terminology of each of the theorists mentioned.

emotions. It will be a merit of our proposed interpretation of *Rhetoric* 1.1 if it combines well with this evidence to yield a plausible picture of Aristotle engaging in fruitful and interesting ways with other rhetorical theorists of the period.

7.4 Who Are the Targets of Aristotle's Criticism?

In this light, we turn to consider who it is that Aristotle is criticizing in *Rhetoric* 1.1.

7.4.1 *Ancient rhetorical set-pieces in general*

One advantage of the reading proposed is that it replaces an interpretation according to which Aristotle makes a wild generalization about emotions with one according to which he is engaging with a well-known feature of how rhetoric was taught in the fifth and fourth centuries BC. From this period we have a collection of set-piece speech openings (the *Exordia*) attributed to Demosthenes, and DK 85B4 suggests that Thrasymachus too had a published collection of his *Prooimia*. Socrates, in the *Apology*,²⁶ says that he is not going to use the familiar tactics for appealing to pity—tears, weeping friends and young family, and the like—and it seems pretty clear that these are well-worn set-piece methods that stand apart from the actual argument of the case. Indeed, Socrates makes that very contrast at 35c. As already noted, Thrasymachus produced a work called '*Eleoi*'²⁷—literally 'Pities', normally rendered 'Appeals to Pity'—which Aristotle highlights for the fact that it touched in part on delivery, but which is most plausibly thought of as having been a collection of 'recipes' or techniques (obviously including such things as sobbing and having a trembling manner of delivery) for arousing pity in a rhetorical audience. Indeed, as we shall see, this is far from Thrasymachus' only work of this nature.

7.4.2 *Thrasymachus*

The figure of Thrasymachus is a particularly interesting case in relation to Aristotle's criticism in 1.1—he seems to be so apt a target for this

²⁶ 34b–35b.

²⁷ Attested in the *Rhetoric* 3.1.1404a14–15.

criticism that it is tempting to think that Aristotle has him specifically in mind. The case for this can get no better than a conjecture—but, I shall argue, it is a highly plausible one. Even if the evidence is not conclusive in showing that Aristotle was here specifically targeting Thrasyarchus, it certainly establishes that he is at least one apt target for Aristotle's criticism construed in the way suggested.²⁸

An important reason for suggesting that 1354a16–24 refers specifically to Thrasyarchus comes from Plato's *Phaedrus*.

As to the art of speeches bewailing [lit. piteous-groaning speeches, οἰκτρογόνων . . . λόγων] the evils of poverty and old age, the prize, in my judgement, goes to the mighty Chalcedonian [i.e. Thrasyarchus]. He it is also who knows best how to inflame [lit. enrage / anger, ὀργίσαι] a crowd and, once they are inflamed, how to hush them again with his words' magic spell, as he says himself. And he is as good at producing slander as he is at refuting it [διαβάλλειν τε καὶ ἀπολύσασθαι διαβολὰς], whatever its source may be.²⁹ (267c7–d2)

Note initially that here in one passage, we have Thrasyarchus connected with pity, anger, and *diabolê*, the very items Aristotle lists in *Rhetoric* 1.1. Plato is summarizing Thrasyarchus' views on the art of rhetoric, and what he mentions is the command of this trio of pity, anger, and slander. If it was in relation to this trio that Thrasyarchus was well known, then when Aristotle says 'slander, pity, anger . . .', there is at least the possibility that he is using this as a way of signalling that he has Thrasyarchus specifically in mind among his targets.

We have seen already that in relation to pity specifically, Aristotle is aware of this connection with Thrasyarchus, as shown by his reference to Thrasyarchus' work 'Pities' (*Eleoi*) at 3.1.1404a14–15.

A further reason to suppose that Aristotle has Thrasyarchus specifically in view in this passage is that in Plato's *Phaedrus*, Thrasyarchus is the principal name associated with the *technê* of rhetoric. At 261c he is named alongside Gorgias and Theodorus, as authors of '*technai*' about speech-making. At 266c, it is 'Thrasyarchus and the others' who claim expertise in the *technê* of speaking; 266–7 contain something of a survey

²⁸ The interpretation here is thus in line with Solmsen (1938), who overturned his previous view that the only serious candidate for being Aristotle's target in 1.1 was Isocrates ((Solmsen, 1929, p. 215), 'Als Gegner aber kommt kein anderer ernstlich in Frage als Isokrates.').

²⁹ Translation is Nehamas and Woodruff (1995), with comments in parentheses mine.

of those, including Thrasymachus, who have contributed to the art of speaking. At 269d, as Socrates signals his disagreement with this tradition about what the art of rhetoric consists in, he names Lysias and Thrasymachus as its representatives—we should note that Lysias is a *practitioner* of rhetoric, rather than a writer of an 'Art of Rhetoric', which leaves Thrasymachus as the figure representative of those who wrote and taught more theoretically about the art.³⁰ Hence, when Socrates comes to stipulate what, on his own view, should be taught by someone trying to educate others in the art of rhetoric, he says the following.

It's clear then that for Thrasymachus and whoever else teaches the art of rhetoric seriously their first task will be to write with utmost precision to enable us to understand the soul . . . (271a4–6)

So, we should note that Thrasymachus stands in the *Phaedrus* as a prominent representative, if not *the* prominent representative, of those who write and teach the art of rhetoric.

Further, out of those listed by Plato in the *Phaedrus* as associated with the art of rhetoric,³¹ there are only a select few that might be apt targets of Aristotle's criticisms at the start of the *Rhetoric*. These are Thrasymachus, Gorgias, Theodorus, and Licymnius. These are the ones mentioned also in the *Rhetoric*, and we might note that in both Plato and Aristotle, Theodorus and Licymnius are mentioned solely in relation to the *taxis* and *lexis* aspects of rhetoric. Of these four names from the *Phaedrus*, the ones more closely connected with emotion-arousal are Thrasymachus and Gorgias. This further reinforces Thrasymachus' prominence in connection with emotion-arousal in the tradition of writers of *technai* as seen through the eyes of Plato's academy—very likely the eyes with which Aristotle would have seen it.

We see this picture further reinforced from Aristotle's own writings. In *De Sophisticis Elenchis* 34, 184b, he names three predecessors in relation to the art of rhetoric, Tisias, Thrasymachus, and Theodorus. Again, we note that of these, it is Thrasymachus who is the best candidate to be the target of Aristotle's critique in relation to slander, pity, anger, and the like in *Rhetoric* 1.1.

³⁰ It is perhaps significant of his greater influence by the time of the *Phaedrus* that it is Thrasymachus not Gorgias that plays this role.

³¹ Thrasymachus, Tisias, Gorgias of Leontini, perhaps Prodicus, Theodorus of Byzantium, Polus, Hippias of Elis, Licymnius of Chios, Protagoras of Abdera, and Zeno of Elea.

The only other figure mentioned in Aristotle as having written an 'Art of Rhetoric' is Licymnius of Chios, at *Rhetoric* 3.13.1414b17. He would perhaps fall within the scope of Aristotle's criticism for preoccupation with different sections of a speech, and such 'accessory' matters. But there is nothing in Aristotle or other ancient evidence available to us that might link him specifically to the criticism related to emotion-arousal, in the way that is so clearly the case with Thrasymachus.

We can see, then, even independently of our interpretation of *Rhetoric* 1.1 that Thrasymachus is an apt target for Aristotle's criticism. He is not only prominently connected with teaching and writing about rhetoric as an art. He is also specifically connected with slander, pity, and anger. However, there is a further strand to Aristotle's criticism, on the view I am recommending. That is, that the use of slander and the arousal of emotion was taught as a matter of using set-piece sections which could be learned and used quite in isolation from consideration of the facts of the case at hand. In Thrasymachus' case, there is good evidence that this was precisely how he taught. We have evidence of various works of his. DK 85A1 lists among his works, 'Playthings' (παίγνια) and 'Rhetorical Resources' (ἀφορμαὶ ῥητορικαί), DK 85B4 has a collection of 'Introductions' (προομῖα), DK 85B5 (=1404a14) has 'Appeals to Pity' (ἐλέους), DK85B7 'Knockdown Arguments' (ὑπερβάλλοντες λόγοι). Even the most substantial fragment of his, DK 85B1, is probably a rhetorical set-piece.³² It is tempting to use what we know of the content of Thrasymachus' *oeuvre* to fill out what we do not know—the nature of the contents of his supposed *Megalê Technê*. If Thrasymachus did write such a work as his definitive handbook on rhetoric, it may not be unreasonable to suppose that a significant part of its contents was such set-pieces, perhaps organized by where they would come in the speech. This would be one way in which a work likely dominated by model speech-sections might define what each section should contain, and show how to affect the listener in particular ways, and so fit Aristotle's description of those he is criticizing.³³

If the interpretation proposed is correct, of Aristotle's criticism of his predecessor writers of Arts of Rhetoric for their views on slander and emotion-arousal, then we find that all of the features criticized come together in Thrasymachus.

³² Yunis (1997). The suggestion of White (1995), that B1 was actually delivered, and the reconstruction of its diplomatic context, are not convincing.

³³ Cf. *Rhet* 1.1.1354b17–20.

7.4.3 Gorgias

The case should not be overstated. It is not that Thrasymachus is necessarily the only person in view. Certainly, it is striking that he matches point by point every aspect of Aristotle's criticism, as reconstructed here. Nevertheless, even if he is the principal target, he is still probably not the only target.

Another likely target for Aristotle's criticism is Gorgias. His *Encomium of Helen* reveals a view of the power of speech to persuade that is strongly associated with its power to excite the emotions. Fear, upset, joy, pity, and yearning are all mentioned as associated with the power of speech. For Gorgias, skill in emotion-arousal is clearly part of the art of rhetoric.

In the passage at the end of the *De Sophisticis Elenchis* cited here, Aristotle goes on to comment on the way in which Gorgias taught rhetoric. He handed out speeches in the form of question and answer. Aristotle's criticism there is that this is not actually to teach a *technê*, but merely to make available the products of a *technê*. It seems natural to infer two things from this criticism. First, Gorgias did not supplement the set-piece examples mentioned with a systematic account—if he had, Aristotle's criticism would have been unfounded. Second, it is most natural to suppose that the force of Aristotle's point is that Gorgias was *purporting* to teach the art of rhetoric, as an art, a *technê*.³⁴ If this is right, then this will be a reason for thinking that Gorgias as well as Thrasymachus are within the scope of Aristotle's criticism at 1.1. He purported, by his writings, to be conveying the art of rhetoric. He saw a key part of this as involving the arousal of emotions. Likewise, it appears that rhetorical set-pieces were a significant part of his *oeuvre*, and that he saw the learning of these set-pieces as a key component of learning the art of rhetoric.

All this said, some cautions should be noted in relation to Gorgias as a target for the criticisms of *Rhetoric* 1.1. It is not clear that Gorgias directly wrote a *technê* in the way that is implied by Aristotle's phrase 'those who put together Arts of Speaking' (οἱ τὰς τέχνας τῶν λόγων συντιθέντες, 1354a12). It also seems rather problematic to see Gorgias as one of

³⁴ This point seems historically very likely, since Plato makes this Gorgias' central claim at the start of the *Gorgias*, 449a–b.

those referred to as ‘those setting out the art nowadays’ (τοὺς νῦν τεχνολογούντας, 1354a17)—even assuming an early date for the *Rhetoric*, Gorgias is scarcely among those who ‘nowadays’ set out the art. Still, Gorgias’ influence was considerable, and it is not implausible to think that rhetorical schools that *were* contemporary with Aristotle saw themselves as successors to his teachings.

Finally, on Gorgias, we should note what is put into his mouth in Plato’s *Gorgias* in the speech 455d–457c. He there claims that the ability his rhetoric gives is a power to influence people on matters such as medicine, or indeed any other craft, regardless of how well or badly qualified the speaker is to know what he is talking about. The claim seems to be that the power of the speech is independent of the strength of the case. Gorgias could deploy his power to get patients to take poison or medicine, or to get the city to appoint himself as their general, chief architect, envoy, or whatever he chose. Rhetoric is like skill in boxing, he says (456d)—it’s an ability to defeat both friends and enemies. Aristotle seems to have reflected on this claim³⁵ and insisted, against Gorgias (or certainly Plato’s Gorgias) and probably against many others too, that rhetoric’s persuasive power is *not* independent of the circumstances of its deployment.³⁶ Rhetoric is no doubt a matter of learning and deploying certain techniques. For Gorgias, if you deploy them skilfully enough, they will enable you to win: learn the speeches, read the handbooks, use their recipes, and you will win. For Aristotle, the skill of rhetoric will enable you to see in a given case what the available features are that tell in favour of your side of the case, and to make the best of those features. But still the eventual strength of your case will remain dependent on what facts there actually are to appeal to! Someone arguing for the truth will generally have a stronger case. The key difference is that for Aristotle, the techniques unleash whatever persuasive power the facts possess, whereas for Gorgias the power is in the techniques themselves. If something like Gorgias’ view was shared by Thrasymachus³⁷ and whoever else may be in

³⁵ *Rhetoric* 1.1.1355a35–b7, including the boxing/wrestling comparison. On this point and the related defence of rhetoric on the grounds that it is taught with a view to its just, not its unjust, use, see now Barney (2010).

³⁶ A similar point is made at *Phaedrus* 268a8–269c5.

³⁷ There is in fact a good case to be made for this from the evidence already cited. *Phaedrus* 267d1 ascribes the language of spells and magic to Thrasymachus, and DK85B7

view in Aristotle's criticism at the start of the *Rhetoric*, their methods would be aptly criticized as 'not about the issue'.

So, my case here is that the most plausible targets of Aristotle's criticism, Gorgias and—more especially—Thrasymachus, give support to my key contention about the nature of that criticism. *Diabolê* need not be reinterpreted as an oblique way of referring to some emotion—it is criticized in its own right. And it is not emotion-arousal per se that Aristotle criticizes, but the inclusion of sections of emotion-arousal deployable independently of the orator's argument—the very kind of emotion-arousal that was so characteristic of Thrasymachus and Gorgias, emotion-arousal using set-pieces that could simply be lifted from a collection and used without reference to the facts of the case, whose rhetorical power would be independent of the underlying strength of the speaker's position.

7.5 'Accessories' and the Elements of Rhetoric

It remains to address our third question and show how Aristotle's criticism of his predecessors fits with his overall view of rhetoric and the structure of rhetorical speeches. We can approach this by looking again at one strand of this criticism. He says that those accused of giving instructions in irrelevant speaking are

those who define other³⁸ things, such as what the introduction or the narrative should contain, as well as each of the other sections of the speech. For in them, they treat of nothing except how to put the judge into a particular frame of mind. (1354b17–20)

What is interesting about this description of those Aristotle is opposing is that it seems that his own work fits this description. After all, in book 3 of this very work, he spends time defining what the different sections of the speech should contain. And, in doing so, he is attentive to how each part of the speech should affect the listener's state of mind. Now this might seem to involve Aristotle in still greater internal contradiction

'Knockdown Arguments' (*ὑπερβάλλοντες λόγοι*) seems to attest his use of the wrestling metaphor for the power of rhetoric.

³⁸ Other, that is, than those related to 'what happened or didn't happen, what will happen or won't, what is the case or isn't.' (1354b13–14)

within the *Rhetoric*, but in fact it shows how attention to Aristotle's overall view of rhetoric can help resolve the apparent inconsistency. Aristotle would readily admit that what he has to say about *taxis* in book 3 is 'outside the issue' (ἐξω τοῦ πράγματος). His consistent view about rhetoric, throughout the *Rhetoric*, is that some things are essential to the art, and other things are merely accessory. So, the proofs, the *pisteis*, are essential, and everything else is accessory. This then forms the principle on which the treatise itself is organized—the first two books set out the essentials—materials for proofs—and once that is done, space is given in book 3 to accessory matters.

This distinction should be understood as follows. Any non-accidental instance of rhetorical persuasion can be fully explained by reference to those things that are essential components of the art itself. Nevertheless, the instance will have lots of other features which do not play a role in explaining why this person was persuaded of that conclusion. The latter are the 'accessories'. It is easy to see why excellent delivery and gaining the audience's attention are accessories. Rhetorical persuasion can take place without them—audiences often pay attention of their own accord, and follow a speaker's argument even if delivered unimpressively. Conversely, without the essential components of rhetorical persuasion, you may have all the attentiveness and excellent delivery you like, but no such persuasion will take place. If all you have are 'accessories', the best you can do is create conditions in which rhetorical persuasion *could* easily take place.³⁹

In the light of this, 1354b16–22 is best understood as a recapitulation of the point made at 1354a11–16: 'Only the proofs belong to the art, everything else is accessory . . . they mainly treat of what is irrelevant to the subject at hand!'. And if that is correct, it suggests that the *target* of

³⁹ Hence, accessory matters like good delivery (1404a5–8) and a good introduction (1415b4–9) can either cause distortion or correct for distortion related to the vice of the listener. But they cannot explain artful rhetorical persuasion itself. Hence, even if we had grounds (in fact we have none) for attributing to Aristotle the view that emotion-arousal is legitimate as a *corrective* against vice in the listener, or against the effects of the opposing speaker's techniques, this could not possibly stand as the explanation for what Aristotle *does* say in 1.2 and 2.1–11, that emotion-arousal is one of the three kinds of technical proof that constitute the essential elements of the art. Hence, such a 'remedial' view of emotion-arousal cannot possibly solve the contradiction problem, *pace* Cope (1867, pp. 5–6), Sprute (1994, pp. 118–22), Engberg-Pedersen (1996, pp. 131–5), and Halliwell (1994, pp. 212–13). Grimaldi (1972, p. 19, n.3) also lists Vater, Spengel, and Russo as advocating this view.

criticism is the same in both passages—those who mistake accessory matters for the essential elements of the art.⁴⁰ Specifically, Aristotle has in mind those whose whole attention is on *diabolê* and set-pieces aimed at manipulating the audience's state of mind, the kinds of activity associated with introductions and conclusions and which have no essential connection to the facts of the case.

7.6 Some Objections

I wish now to deal with some of the difficulties for the interpretation I am recommending.

First, one difficulty for this view is that it is not the most natural way to understand the list at 1354a16–17, 'slander, pity, anger and similar passions of the soul'. The most natural reading of this is as a list precisely of 'passions of the soul'. If it were a list of types of rhetorical set-pieces, then the summarizing phrase 'and similar passions of the soul' perhaps seems out of place. Likewise, it is easier to see 1354a24–5 as a repetition of the same point if the earlier list was a list of *passions*.

One possible explanation is that the phrase 'passions of the soul' does not properly belong in the text at all. This was Kassel's view in 1971 when he wrote his introduction to the text of the *Rhetoric*.⁴¹ It seems his main reason for this was that it is not a good end to a list headed by *diabolê*. Nevertheless, the phrase is attested in most of the main manuscripts and in the Arabic translation (although significantly the Arabic does not have slander but fear (khawf) at the head of the list). Kassel later, unconvinced of his excision, gingerly (*dubitanter*) reinstates the phrase in his 1976 text.⁴²

Assuming that the text is correct as it stands, my suggestion is as follows. In the light of the use of one such term by Thrasymachus, it may have been a perfectly familiar usage to employ emotion terms like 'ἐλεος' to mean a set-piece designed to evoke that particular emotion.⁴³ If the

⁴⁰ Cf. also Burnyeat (1994, p. 10, n.26).

⁴¹ 'πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς mit διαβολῇ sich trotz aller versuchten Interpretationskunststücke schlecht genug verträgt' (Kassel, 1971, p. 118).

⁴² Kassel, 1976, *ad loc.*

⁴³ Against this suggestion, the title of Thrasymachus' work uses 'ἐλεος' in the plural, which perhaps signals that it does not mean simply pity, in a way that is not so obvious with the singular at 1354a17.

combination of slander, pity, and anger was a sufficiently clear signal to readers that Thrasymachus was the target, then it might be perfectly natural to use emotion terms in just the way *he* used them. We have suggested that they may even have been chapter headings in his book. On this reading, the terms are read as meaning something like ‘doing-pity’ and ‘doing-anger’, and there is then no problem in reading the final noun-phrase as meaning ‘doing-similar-passions of the soul’.

Next, one of the passages cited at the outset of this chapter, *Rhetoric* 1.2.1356a14–19, appears precisely to identify the passions for which Aristotle has a central role in his own theory, with the passions treated so obsessively by his predecessors. For convenience, I repeat the passage here, with the translation reflecting the way the passage has usually been understood.

[Proofs] through the listeners, whenever they are brought into an emotional state by the speech: for we do not make judgements in the same way when upset as when we are glad; or when hostile as when friendly. And this is, as we said, the only thing the recent handbook writers attempt to treat systematically (*πρὸς ὃ καὶ μόνον πειρᾶσθαι φάμεν πραγματεύεσθαι*). These things will be made clear one by one when we speak about the emotions. (1356a14–19)

On the face of it, this makes it very hard to resist the contradiction view. Seemingly, there is something that Aristotle criticized in his predecessors to which he now gives a key role in his own theory. The result is that Aristotle’s argument in 1.1 stands in flat contradiction to the view he is starting to develop in this passage, the view that forms the basis for his treatment of the passions in book 2.

Nevertheless, I do not think that we are forced in this direction by this passage, for two reasons.

The first reason focuses on the word ‘πειρᾶσθαι’ at a17: Aristotle is here saying that his predecessors were well aware of the significance of emotions in persuasion, and how powerfully they worked. Nevertheless, they failed in their attempt to give the right kind of explanation of the role of emotion’s persuasive power within the expertise of rhetoric. His contention here in this passage, therefore, is that what he *successfully* explains in 1.2 and 2.1–11, they were *attempting to* treat in their works. Since they did not succeed in connecting their techniques for arousing the passions with the subject matter of the case at hand, they failed to explain how emotion-arousal contributes to genuine rhetorical persuasion.

At best, their techniques contribute to the shady business of *diabolê*, or were successful but illicit, prejudicial rather than rationally persuasive, or were mere 'accessories' of the art of rhetoric. At worst, what they have written about is simply no part of rhetoric at all. This is consistent with what Aristotle says here—they were *trying* to treat systematically the way emotion-arousal contributes to genuine rhetorical persuasion, but ended up treating something quite different, slander and manipulative set-piece emotion plays. Aristotle is here claiming to have succeeded where they had failed.

The second reason corroborates this. In the standard translation, 'πρὸς ὃ καὶ μόνον' is all taken together to mean that it was 'to this feature alone' that previous writers directed their efforts. However, 'καὶ μόνον' may be taken with what follows as an emphatic connective.⁴⁴ Read this way, the sentence means that it was this feature of rhetorical persuasion (namely, the kind of proof that proceeds through the listener's emotions) that the contemporary writers *were merely striving towards*.

I think that these are the two most pressing difficulties for the view I am urging.

7.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, careful attention to the meaning of *διαβολή*, and to the use of emotions and emotion-terminology by Thrasymachus and other technical writers of the period, suggests an interpretation of *Rhetoric* 1.1 that makes good exegetical sense, and gives Aristotle a consistent view of *pistis*, *diabolê*, and the parts of a speech, through the whole of the *Rhetoric*. It is not emotion-arousal per se that Aristotle criticizes, but the inclusion of sections of slander and set-piece emotion-arousal, deployable independently of the strength of the orator's case. In doing so, he criticizes the very kind of emotion-arousal that was so characteristic of Thrasymachus, emotion-arousal using set-pieces that could simply be lifted from a collection and whose use did not require any reference to the facts of the case: emotion-arousing techniques, that is, whose rhetorical power would be entirely independent of the underlying strength of the speaker's position. Contrast this with Aristotle's own

⁴⁴ Denniston (1954, pp. 316–18).

views on the role of emotion-arousal as one of rhetoric's three kinds of technical proof. For him, all proof was a matter of identifying τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον πιθανόν—what, from the available facts, counts in favour of your position. On that basis, if the interpretation of Aristotle's criticisms in *Rhetoric* 1.1 proposed here is accepted, then it is clear that there is no conflict with his own theory. The contradiction is resolved.

PART 3

8

The Passions in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

8.1 Introduction

Aristotle's proof-centred conception of rhetoric, and his view that arousing audience passions can be a way of providing proof, clearly depend in important ways on what the passions themselves are. The aim of Chapters 8 to 10 is to set out, principally from the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle's understanding of what the passions are, particularly in their intentional aspects. It will then be possible to locate within this broader picture an explanation of why for Aristotle arousing their passions could be one way in which the orator gives his audience proper grounds for conviction.

Since I am concerned in the first instance with elucidating Aristotle's views in the *Rhetoric*, the focus here is on the representational aspects of the passions, and the ways in which passions can influence judgements. In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle is not so concerned with issues that are his focus elsewhere, such as the way in which passions involve bodily states (we have no mention of boiling of blood around the heart in the treatment of anger, for example).

The view defended here may be summarized very simply. Aristotle thinks that passions are pleasures and pains, where these are understood as states with representational contents, and where these contents are taken by the subject to be the way things actually are.

Since, as I am inclined to think, Aristotle's views on the passions do not substantially differ across the various works in the corpus, the view that emerges can appropriately be thought of simply as Aristotle's view, and need not be strictly indexed to the *Rhetoric*. That assumption is made in Chapter 10 particularly, where appeal is made to other works in

order to illuminate how Aristotle's views in the *Rhetoric* fit together. And to the extent that this method is successful, it provides, in turn, some support for the assumption of consistency. If all this is correct, the account of Aristotle's understanding of the passions offered here will be of interest for illuminating Aristotle's views not merely in the *Rhetoric* but in the rest of the corpus also.

The present chapter is an extended discussion of Aristotle's definition of the passions, with which he introduces a lengthy treatment of various types of passion, extending through the first eleven chapters of *Rhetoric* 2. In Chapters 9 and 10, I take a more synoptic view of Aristotle's understanding of the passions. In Chapter 9, I defend the view that Aristotle's 'theory' of the passions is that they are pleasures and pains, where these are understood as representational states. I argue that in the rather neglected treatment of pleasure and the pleasant in *Rhetoric* 1.11, Aristotle has just the kind of understanding of pleasure (and, by implication, of pain) that is needed for supposing that the passions are pleasures and pains. In Chapter 10, I focus specifically on the way in which Aristotle understood the attitude taken by the subject of a passion towards the representational content of that passion. This question is related to (but distinct from) the question of what psychological capacity is involved in producing these representational contents. I defend the view that the capacity involved is one Aristotle calls '*phantasia*', and that in having a passion, its subject (to some extent, at least) takes the representational contents to be the way things are. I am particularly concerned in that chapter to resist the suggestion that Aristotelian passions can involve *mere* appearances, where the subject is wholly non-committal towards these. The latter has been made by a number of interpreters in conjunction with their (correct) insistence that the passions involve an exercise of *phantasia*. The positive thesis that the passions involve taking their representational contents to be the way things are clears the way for the passions to be ways of accepting premises in arguments, and hence for their arousal to be a way in which a speaker might give listeners proper grounds for conviction.

In Chapters 9 and 10 especially, I am concerned not only to defend a particular interpretation of Aristotle, but to show the philosophical attractions that his view—thus explicated—has.

8.2 The Definition of the Passions in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

The rest of this chapter offers a discussion of Aristotle's generalized remarks about the passions in *Rhetoric* 2.1, particularly 1378a19–22. This is an obvious starting point for a careful examination of Aristotle's understanding of the nature of the passions.

The passions are those [things?] on account of which we change and differ in relation to our judgements (*πρὸς τὰς κρίσεις*),¹ and that are accompanied by pain and pleasure, for example, anger, pity, fear and any other similar passions and their opposites. (2.1, 1378a19–22)

With this sentence, Aristotle introduces an extended section (running through to *Rhetoric* 2.11) dealing with the passions. Aristotle, it seems, is offering here a definition of the passions, not merely characterizing them so that his audience can identify what he is talking about.² He defines the passions by their connection to two things, the distinctive outlook they bring to the passionate person and the experience of pleasure and pain. Both of these will be discussed in more detail later. That he is thereby identifying the essential features of a passion is suggested by the following line of argument. One of the connections mentioned, that involving pain and pleasure, is pretty clearly regarded by Aristotle as an essential feature of the passions. This is clear from how centrally pleasure and pain feature when Aristotle, elsewhere in the corpus, attempts to characterize the passions in general, as opposed to listing particular types of passion.³ Equally, it is suggested by the centrality afforded to pain and pleasure in Aristotle's definitions of most of the types of passions in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11: anger, for example, is defined as a desire-cum-pain, fear as a pain or disturbance.⁴ This rather suggests that in the part of the sentence (1378a19–22) in which Aristotle asserts a connection between passions and distinctive judgements, he is likewise identifying an essential feature

¹ 'Judgements' here means instances of judging, not faculties of judgement.

² I find the language here, although—as we shall see—imprecise in some ways, more technical in character than one would expect if Aristotle were simply highlighting some characteristic features of passions in order to indicate his subject matter.

³ E.g. *EN* 2.5, 1105b21–3; 2.6, 1106b18–20; *EE* 2.2, 1220b12–14; *Phys* 7.3, 247a3–9.

⁴ In Chapter 9, I claim that for Aristotle all passions involve pleasure or pain or both, and discuss the apparent exceptions found in *Rhetoric* 2.

of the passions.⁵ And if so, then the sentence as a whole must surely be construed as an attempt to define the passions by giving their essential characteristics.

8.3 Context and Structure

We should pay attention to how Aristotle introduces and structures the definition. Here, there seem to me a number of ways to interpret the relevant sentence. The previous sentence ends with a promise to discuss goodwill and friendliness 'in the account of the passions'. The Greek then reads as follows.

ἔστι δὲ τὰ πάθη δι' ὅσα μεταβάλλοντες διαφέρουσι πρὸς τὰς κρίσεις οἷς ἔπεται λύπη καὶ ἡδονή, οἷον ὀργή ἔλεος φόβος καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα, καὶ τὰ τούτοις ἐναντία. (1378a19–21)⁶

The start of this sentence is normally understood thus: 'the passions are those things on account of which people change and differ . . .'. This may be a reasonable understanding of Aristotle's claim, but only if we grant some background assumptions (that he is only considering a restricted class of things in the first place, such as states of the soul), since otherwise the definition will be manifestly inadequate.⁷ However, the sentence can also be understood as claiming, 'The passions are those [i.e. those passions] on account of which people change and differ . . .'.⁸ Or it could be read, 'They [i.e. the passions] are those passions on account of which people change and differ . . .'.⁹ Aristotle's intention, on either of these latter suggestions, would be to identify the passions (in the everyday use of *τὰ πάθη*, similar to our 'emotions') as a sub-set of the 'passions' or 'affections' of the soul (in the technical sense which includes perceiving

⁵ Price (2009, p. 136) argues more strongly still that to read the first part of the sentence as merely a contingent generalization would make it bizarrely mismatched with the part about pain and pleasure.

⁶ Ross (1959).

⁷ Without such assumptions, the definition implausibly classes some mind-affecting substances like alcohol and bodily states like hunger or tiredness as passions, since they explain a change and difference in judgements and are accompanied by pain and pleasure.

⁸ On this suggestion, there is an implied repetition of *τὰ πάθη* before *δι' ὅσα*, or a repetition of *πάθη* after it.

⁹ On this suggestion, the subject of *ἔστι*, i.e. *τὰ πάθη*, is understood from the previous sentence.

and thinking¹⁰). The view that Aristotle is distinguishing the passions from the wider class of affections of the soul finds some support from the fact that Aristotle uses the same construction, $\delta\iota'$ ὅσα, at 1390b14 to identify a sub-set of goods of fortune, those that affect character.

However we understand the grammatical structure of the sentence, the *definiendum* is 'τὰ πάθη' (a19): here this clearly means the passions. This is clear from the list of examples immediately after the definition.¹¹ That this definition introduces a discussion of the passions is similarly clear from the references forward to this section earlier in the treatise, and from the way in which the section is announced in its immediate context.¹² This meaning for 'πάθη' is a regular non-technical meaning of the word, used as shorthand for the longer phrase 'τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς'—the passions or affections of the soul.¹³

Arguably this definition marks out a coherent category of conditions of the soul, not dissimilar to our own category of passion or emotion.¹⁴ Indeed, arguably we have here an adequate definition of emotion. To see this, let us consider the various elements of the definition.

8.4 Pain and Pleasure

The requirement that emotions be accompanied by pain and pleasure requires some clarification. The next chapter will take up the connection with pleasure and pain in more detail. For present purposes, we will confine our attention to 1378a19–21 itself. We will also consider how this part of the definition will need to be understood if the definition of the passions is to be successful. First, although Dorothea Frede is no doubt correct to see Aristotle here as engaging with the Platonic position expressed at *Philebus* 46b–c and 47d–50c, namely that the passions are mixtures of pleasure and pain,¹⁵ it does not follow that he

¹⁰ Cf. *De Anima* 1.1, 403a3–8, Rorty (1984) and LSJ *v.sub* πάθος, III.

¹¹ 1378a21: 'anger, pity, fear, and all others like these'.

¹² Forward references: 1356a14, 19, 1369b15; immediate context: 1377b30–78a5, 1378a18f.

¹³ Cf. Leighton (1982, pp. 220–31); LSJ *v.sub* πάθος, II; Gill (1984). Note also several examples of this non-technical meaning in earlier uses of 'πάθος' phrases in the *Rhetoric* itself, e.g. 1354a16 (the longer phrase), 1356a14, 19, 1369b15.

¹⁴ For a discussion and defence of the view that Aristotle's πάθη are roughly equivalent to our passions/emotions, cf. Konstan (2006, ch.1).

¹⁵ Frede (1996, pp. 258–60).

is straightforwardly endorsing the Platonic position. Certainly a20–1 alone cannot be taken as confirming such a view. In fact (and especially in the light of the accounts of individual emotion-types that follow), it is better to read Aristotle's requirement here as that each passion be accompanied by pleasure *or* pain (or both). Second, we should note that within the definition, the specification of passions as states that are accompanied by pleasure and pain serves to distinguish passions from other conditions of the soul that explain a difference in judgements. Obvious examples are thoughts, sensations, opinions, and beliefs, perhaps also some or all desires. If this is correct about the function of this part of the definition, it is very illuminating about how it should be interpreted. The kinds of state just mentioned are all clearly distinct from passions, and yet it is possible for any of these to occur concurrently with pleasure or pain, without this combination amounting to a passion. It must be more than simple concurrence that is meant at a20–1. Indeed, it will not even be adequate to insist that the connection be necessary rather than contingent. Perhaps there are some thoughts that are so long and complicated and require so much concentration that for humans thinking them necessarily results in headaches. This would not make thinking those thoughts amount to a passion.¹⁶ In fact, what seems to be needed is for Aristotle to be insisting that passions have as an essential feature pain and pleasure *that is connected in the right kind of way* to the other features of that passion.¹⁷ In fear, it is not just any pain that is involved, but pain that is connected to the apparent advent of something bad. The way in which the pain or pleasure *follows* the passion's other features must involve a very close connection. The first part of the definition indicates that Aristotle thought that passions involve a distinctive outlook on the world. It is tempting to think that what Aristotle has in mind here is that the kind of pain and pleasure that will distinguish passions from other judgement-affecting mental states is pain or pleasure *at those things*' being that particular way.¹⁸ This of course goes beyond the text we are considering here. For now, we note

¹⁶ Nor even is it simply a matter of passions having the presence of pain or pleasure as an essential characteristic. For this could just be a conceptual matter—and a concept whose essential features included the conjunction of thoughts about Plato and pain in the lower abdomen would not thereby be the concept of a passion.

¹⁷ Cf. Leighton (1982, pp. 217–20).

¹⁸ This is the position to be defended in Chapter 9.

that if the definition of emotion is to be adequate, it requires that *οἷς ἔπεται* (are accompanied by) indicates the kind of very close connection just described between the pleasure and pain involved in a passion and its other aspects.

8.5 Difference in Relation to Judgements

In Aristotle's definition of the passions, then, one condition relates to pain and pleasure. The other is that passions be states of the soul on account of which we change and differ in judgements (*κρίσεις*). This part of the definition warrants careful scrutiny.

First, Aristotle refers here to a change (*μεταβάλλοντες*, a20) as well as a difference in judgements among the things accounted for by emotions. What kind of change is he referring to? It is hard to tell. He may be referring to the bodily changes that he regards as part of having an emotion (cf. *DA* 1.1, 403a16–18). The participle ('changing') may refer to changes in judgements, and might conceivably be read with 'differ' (*διαφέρουσι*) as *hendiadys*, meaning 'change so as to be different', i.e. just a stylistic way of talking about change.¹⁹ Or Aristotle may simply be leaving this open—it is clear simply that in the arousal of the passions, people change in one way or another.²⁰ My speculation is that this expression is prompted by Aristotle's awareness of the role of bodily changes in the passions, but because this is largely irrelevant in the context of rhetoric, we get no more than this unspecific hint.

A second philological point relates to the word we have translated 'judgements', in Greek *κρίσεις*. Sihvola has suggested that Aristotle's choice of this word is motivated in part by a desire to be unspecific about the nature of the cognitions involved in emotions. As he explains,

In Aristotle, *κρίσις* is a very general cognitive term covering [a] wide range [of] selective and discriminating activities. It can refer to any case where something like assent to something's being the case is involved. It apparently covers both

¹⁹ That said, this seems a surprising stylistic device to find in the context of a *definition*. Price (2009, p. 135) seems to interpret the participle this way, taking it to emphasize the passivity of the cognitive changes involved in the passions.

²⁰ In *Physics* 7.3, 246b20–247a19, Aristotle is at pains to emphasize that, in undergoing passions (and therein bodily pains and pleasures), the states (*hexeis*) of the soul do not change. Rather it is the affections (*pathē*) that constitute changes, and these involve changes to the perceptual part and to the body.

perception and belief and is applicable to both human beings and other animals. The use of this term hints that when defining at a general level the *πάθη* which we would call emotions Aristotle did not want to commit himself to either a belief- or appearance-based interpretation.²¹

This seems to me to be a mistake. The choice of the word *κρίσις* here has nothing to do with a cautious openness to various kinds of discriminating activities that might be involved in the passions, still less to leave open the possibility of animals experiencing passions. Such concerns are not in view here.

Aristotle opens his discussion of proofs using the speaker's character and the audience's passions by emphasizing the importance of such character and passions in influencing people's judgement (*κρίσις*).

Since rhetoric is for the sake of a judgement (*κρίσις*) (people make a judgement on their deliberations [in the assembly] and the lawsuit is a judgement) it is necessary not only to look to the argument, that it be demonstrative and convincing, but also to getting oneself and the listener in the right condition. For it makes a great deal of difference to how convincing one is (*πρὸς πίστιν*) . . . (*Rhetoric* 2.1, 1377b20–5)²²

It is clear in this passage that the kind of 'judgement' Aristotle has in mind is the judgement by an assembly of citizens on a course of action, or by a jury in a lawsuit. This makes sense if his view is (as has been argued in Part I) that rhetoric is an expertise in discharging civic advisory roles in such contexts as assemblies and law-courts.

Aristotle then illustrates with a number of examples the kind of effect the passions have on judgement.

Affecting the listener's condition is more useful for lawsuits. For things do not appear (*φαίνεται*) the same to people when friendly as when hostile, nor when angry as when calm: they appear either completely different or different in magnitude. For the listener who is friendly towards the person about whom they are forming a verdict believes (*δοκεῖ*) that they have committed either no

²¹ Sihvola (1996, p. 74). The phrase amended is actually printed ' . . . covering wide range or selective . . . ', which doesn't make sense. Accordingly, we assume this is a printing error, with the version here restoring the intended sense.

²² It is unclear whether, in the phrase *πρὸς πίστιν*, Aristotle's claim here is that the use of *êthos* and *pathos* makes a difference to the proof, or to the conviction in the listener. *Pistis* here could mean either proof or convincingness. But whether directly or indirectly, Aristotle's concern is with the speaker's effectiveness in bringing about his persuasive aims, as the following lines make clear.

wrong or trivial wrongs. Whereas the hostile listener believes the opposite. And to the person who is full of desire and hope, if the prospect is pleasant, it appears (*φαίνεται*) that it will happen and will be good. Whereas to the person indifferent and pessimistic, the opposite.²³ 1377b31–78a5

These examples suggest that the kind of 'judgement' (*krisis*) that Aristotle sees as subject to influence by the passions is not just those formal verdicts of civic settings like the courts and the assemblies, but also the everyday judgements that are elements of a person's outlook on such things as what to expect in the future. The passage has some similarities with *De Insomniis* 2.460b1–11, in which Aristotle describes how fear makes the coward more likely to think he sees the enemy, love makes lovers more likely to think they see their beloved, and cases of anger and appetite make their subjects liable to deception in unspecified ways. These similarities suggest that this passage expresses the more general view that passions affect their subject's outlook. Here, as in the *De Insomniis* passage, Aristotle seems to switch indifferently between expressing this point in terms of an influence on how things appear (*φαίνεται*) and on how the subject believes (*δοκεῖ*) them to be.

The examples also invite speculation about the way in which the passions influence judgements. Friendship influences judgement towards belief in the friend's innocence, enmity towards their guilt, and not vice versa. Likewise, hopefulness about something makes you tend to think it will happen, appetite that it will be good, whereas pessimism and indifference have the opposite effect. Aristotle's view in the *De Anima* and elsewhere is that appetite itself involves the appearance (*φαίνεται*) that the pleasant object is good.²⁴ Similarly, it would be very natural to think that hopefulness about something itself involved the appearance or the belief that that thing would happen. So, in these two cases at least, it seems as though for Aristotle passions might influence the subject in favour of judging that p by themselves involving some kind of psychic attitude towards p, in which p is presented as the way things are.²⁵ The friendliness and enmity examples, though, caution against such a simple

²³ I am sympathetic to Freese's suggestion here that we should translate '*duscherainonti*' (literally: in bad humour; here: pessimistic) as the opposite of '*euelpidi*' (full of hope), cf. Freese (1926) *ad loc.*

²⁴ E.g. *DA* 3.10, 433b5–10 esp. 8–9, and cf. now Moss (2012a) *passim*.

²⁵ Appearance (*phantasia*) is an important candidate for the psychic state involved in the passions, and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 12.

construal of Aristotle's view. It is not plausibly *part* of feeling friendly towards someone that they appear to you (or are believed) to be innocent, nor of enmity that they appear guilty. Rather, it seems more likely that friendship involves some cognition which in turn disposes the subject to the judgement that their friend is innocent or their enemy guilty.²⁶

All of this immediate context should inform our understanding of what Aristotle has in mind when he says (1378a12–20) that the passions are those on account of which people change and differ in relation to their judgements (*κρίσεις*). The choice of this word has to do with the contexts in which rhetoric is exercised, law-courts and assemblies. In assemblies and courts, listeners form verdicts (*κρίσεις*). Aristotle here is highlighting the rhetorical usefulness of emotion-arousal. It is not that here '*κρίσις*' needs to mean the dropping of a voting pebble into an urn. And the examples involving appetite and hopefulness show that Aristotle is well aware that the 'verdicts' over which passions exert an influence extend much more widely than formal civic settings. Nevertheless, Aristotle is, by the use of the word '*κρίσεις*', drawing attention here to the relevance of the passions to the judgements, the mental 'verdicts', about civic issues that dicasts and ecclesiasts express when they cast their votes.

This is a very different view from Sihvola's about Aristotle's reasons for using the word '*κρίσις*'. We should not discern here a cautious openness to the possibility of passions in non-human animals, nor a studied neutrality about the exact type of discriminating state involved in the passions. That said, there is a certain absence of precision in the wording of Aristotle's definition.²⁷ Passions, according to Aristotle, explain why people differ 'in relation to their judgements' (Greek: *πρὸς*

²⁶ Friendly feelings towards someone seem, for Aristotle, to involve representing that person as one who both wants goods for you for your sake and is inclined to bring them about, as far as they are able to do so, and as the object of such desires and inclinations from you (1380b36–1381a3). Perhaps the thought is that we may infer from these things that the person is likely to be a decent individual and unlikely to be guilty of any very serious offence. Much of *Rhetoric* 2.4 is spent charting how the nature of friendship explains why we are friendly towards certain kinds of people. That is, it charts inferences made in the opposite direction, i.e. we infer that this person wants our good for our own sake, etc. from the fact that they share our view of good and bad, or have the same friends and enemies, or are benefactors, generous, brave, just, and so on.

²⁷ Perhaps this reflects a desire to avoid technical controversies about psychology in a work on rhetoric.

τὰς κρίσεις). Aristotle does not here assert, nor does he deny, that the passions themselves include the 'difference in judgements' referred to. Nor does he specify in what respect the passionate person is different—perhaps it is with respect to their judgements (κρίσεις), but Aristotle's wording does not quite say this.²⁸ He simply asserts that passions explain a difference *in relation to* the subject's verdicts—most plausibly, his point is simply that passions affect a person's overall outlook (sometimes, specifically, their view of an issue of public or judicial concern).²⁹

Though Aristotle's wording here is unspecific in these ways, the view he expresses here is nevertheless best interpreted as the view that the passions themselves involve distinctive 'verdicts', that is, they involve the passionate person representing the world as being a certain way corresponding to their passion (e.g. in pity, that such-and-such a person is suffering undeservedly).³⁰ We have seen that there are significant reasons in favour of understanding the pain and/or pleasure that are involved in a passion as closely connected with the other aspects of that passion, particularly those aspects in which the subject is taken to be responding to the relevant circumstances in the world. If this is right, then one might naturally expect the first part of Aristotle's definition to specify the other aspects of a passion to which the pain and/or pleasure are connected. On the proposed interpretation of 1378a19–20, what Aristotle actually says is that passions are 'those conditions of the soul that affect a person's overall outlook'. It is not implausible to suppose that these words express, albeit indirectly, a view in which the passions *are* representational states of the soul and themselves constitute *part of* their subject's overall outlook. This in turn enables the 'pain and/or pleasure' to be understood as pain or pleasure *at* the circumstances thus represented. The definition as a whole would then be understood as expressing the

²⁸ As the examples in LSJ (v.sub διαφέρω) show, the locution used here with διαφέρω, i.e. πρὸς + accusative, would not be the normal way of saying that things differed *in respect of* some feature. Rather it seems to indicate more vaguely some connection between the difference and the judgements—a person's passions explain a difference in them that is connected (in some way) to their judgements.

²⁹ Cf. also LSJ v.sub κρίσις A.I.1, 2; II.1. Interestingly, Aristotle does not repeat his use of 'κρίσις' in his detailed treatment of the passions (*Rhetoric* 2.2–11). Our interpretation of this term here, in a definition of the passions *generally*, should therefore be informed by a wider consideration of how Aristotle characterizes *in detail* the cognitions involved in different types of passions. On this, see Chapters 9–10.

³⁰ Cf. *Rhetoric* 2.8, 1385b13–16.

following view: passions are representational states of the soul, constituting part of the subject's overall outlook, to which attach pain and/or pleasure. This goes a little beyond what Aristotle literally says, but offers a nicely unified understanding of the definition he offers.

8.6 The Adequacy of Aristotle's Definition of the Passions

How successful is Aristotle's formulation as a definition of the passions? This section discusses a number of concerns that might be raised. Of these, I shall argue, some are successfully answered by the interpretation of Aristotle's definition canvassed in the preceding section. And if so, principles of charitable interpretation count strongly in its favour.

One concern is that several of the types of state listed in *Rhetoric* 2 as types of passion fail to fit his definition because they do not involve pleasure or pain. The clearest examples are friendship and enmity: in the latter case, Aristotle explicitly says that it does not involve pain (1382a12–13). But the same worry can be raised about some of the kinds of state Aristotle identifies as opposites of kinds of state that are clearly types of passion, such as calmness (*πράοτης*), anger's opposite, and confidence (*θάρασος*), fear's opposite—seemingly with the implication that these also are passions. If these examples are indeed passions, then one part of Aristotle's definition is not a necessary condition of being a passion. The worry will be discussed in the next chapter, as part of a detailed defence of the claim that for Aristotle passions are pleasures and pains.

A second concern runs along similar lines but relates to the first part of the definition. Surely there are states that are passions but which do not affect the subject's verdicts. One can feel afraid of a spider without this affecting one's judgements or verdicts about it, perhaps if one knows that it is harmless. And quite generally, whether or not we come to have a passion on a given occasion seems often to make no difference to our judgements. This again suggests that an element of Aristotle's definition is not necessary for being a passion.

The validity of this objection turns on what count as 'judgements' or 'verdicts' (Gk. *κρίσεις*) in the definition. If Aristotle intends this term to refer only to a person's considered judgements, then the objection holds.

But it seems much more likely that Aristotle is referring to a person's overall outlook, including how things seem to them (cf. *φαίνεται* 1378a4), and where this is not restricted to matters they have explicitly deliberated. If so, Aristotle is entitled to insist that even where a person's considered view remains unchanged by their passions, their outlook as a whole is always affected. The person who both thinks, in their considered view, that the impending war is a terrible thing and also fears it has a wholeheartedness to their outlook on it that is different from that of the person who shares their considered view but lacks their passion (or has some conflicting passion). Certainly, if passions themselves are representational and involve some kind of 'verdict' on the perceived circumstances, Aristotle may insist that they will always affect their subject's outlook, and in that sense, their verdicts.

A third worry about Aristotle's definition was mentioned earlier on in the chapter. It was that some states of the soul seem to meet his definition but are clearly not passions (e.g. thinking thoughts so complex that they are bound to give rise to a headache).

We might consider this concern alongside a fourth. There are clearly cases of pain and pleasure that give rise to a difference in judgements, but which equally clearly are not passions. While strolling around Paris mid-morning, I judge that it is vital to find for lunch a restaurant with the perfect balance of ambience, value, good food, and attractive locality, but then I start to feel hungry and come to judge that all that is needed is to find the nearest restaurant with a table for two. Or this process might be more subtle: I retain all my previous criteria but under the influence of hunger, I come to judge that a restaurant previously rejected for poor ambience is after all more attractive than I had previously thought. My hunger causes my judgements to be more sympathetic, in ways that conduce to eating sooner!³¹

These concerns show, I think, not that the definition is inadequate but that it requires careful interpretation. Interpreted in a fragmented way as requiring separately that to be a passion a state of the soul must affect judgements and involve pain and pleasure, the definition is clearly

³¹ I see no reason to deny, with Leighton (1982, p. 225), that the desire alters judgement. Even on his account, supposing a desire gives rise to anger, irritation, despair, or reflection on these, and that it is these that are the immediate cause of an alteration in judgement, it remains the case that the desire has accounted for a difference in judgements.

inadequate. But I have canvassed the merits of a more integrated reading of Aristotle's view in which he sees the passions as states in which the subject feels pain or pleasure or both *at* some perceived circumstance, and where this pain and pleasure itself forms part of the subject's overall cognitive outlook.³² If Aristotle's definition is interpreted as requiring that passions be representational states of the soul, constituting part of the subject's overall outlook, where these very states amount to cases of pain and/or pleasure, then it is clear that supposed counter-examples such as the hunger and complex thoughts cases do not, after all, fit the definition.

Interpreted as specifying two separate criteria for being a passion, Aristotle's definition seems hopelessly vulnerable to counter-examples. Charity in interpretation seems to tell strongly in favour of a more integrated interpretation such as that canvassed in this chapter, despite the fact that such interpretations stray beyond what is explicit in the text.

We have confined ourselves in this chapter to considering Aristotle's definition of the passions at *Rhetoric* 2.1 and the introductory remarks about the passions in the immediate context. Any interpretation of this definition and of Aristotle's views on the passions must be supported also from Aristotle's more detailed remarks on the passions in the subsequent chapters of *Rhetoric* 2, and elsewhere in the corpus. Accordingly, the following chapters are devoted to setting out in greater detail Aristotle's views on the passions.

³² This implies that for Aristotle the relevant kinds of pain and pleasure are representational: this claim is defended in the next chapter.

9

Aristotle's Theory of the Passions—Passions as Pleasures and Pains

9.1 Introduction

Does what Aristotle has to say about the emotions in *Rhetoric* 2.1–11 amount to a fully fledged theory of the emotions? If he does have a theory of the emotions, is it still credible?

Some have insisted that in the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle offers no theory of the emotions, merely 'a preliminary, purely dialectical investigation that clarifies [some of] the phenomena in question'.¹ Others detect here no quest by Aristotle for a theory of the emotions of his own.² Instead, he simply presents a set of definitions that are the results of the best available substitute: theories developed in the Academy,³ perhaps specifically the view developed in Plato's *Philebus* of the emotions as mixed pleasures and pains.⁴

The view defended here is that *Rhetoric* 2.1–11 expresses Aristotle's *own* theory of the emotions, not merely an endorsement of Plato's or anyone else's theory. His account of course has limitations, and his theory is in certain respects, as one might say, not 'fully fledged':⁵

¹ Cooper (1996, pp. 238–9, 251–2).

² Indeed, (pace Cooper) there is little in *Rhetoric* 2.1–11 that might be properly described as a 'dialectical' investigation: there is very little mention of alternative views or puzzles to be resolved (though cf. 1386b16–24 for an exception), little evidence indeed of anything like the early or 'preliminary' stages of the method of inquiry set out at *EN* 7.1, 1145b2–7.

³ Striker (1996, pp. 287–8).

⁴ Frede (1996, pp. 258–60).

⁵ The treatment of the emotions in the *Rhetoric* is aptly contrasted by Cooper (1996, p. 239) with the ethical works and the *De Anima*, and by Striker (1996, p. 287) with the *Topics* and the *Analytics*.

Aristotle's aims are confined to what is required for a treatise on rhetoric. Nevertheless, Aristotle's remarks in *Rhetoric* 2.1–11 do present a theory of the emotions.⁶ Not only that, I argue that his theory has some substantial philosophical advantages lacked by many modern theories of emotion. That is, his philosophy of the emotions is still credible.

His theory, I propose, is as follows. Passions simply *are* states of pain or pleasure (or both). This can be understood in terms of two key claims.

Claim 1:

To have an emotion is to experience (some kind of) pain, pleasure or both.

Claim 2:

The pain and pleasure involved in having an emotion is pain/pleasure that is intentional and representational: it is pain/pleasure at the emotion's object or 'target' and involves that target being represented in ways that give 'grounds' for the particular emotion experienced.

Thus, being afraid of the bear is to experience pain, and this is pain at the bear, at the bear's being a source of future harm (i.e. fearsome).

In section 9.2 below, I defend the view that these claims represent Aristotle's understanding of emotion in *Rhetoric* 2.1–11. This includes consideration of some kinds of Aristotelian emotion that appear to involve no pleasure or pain. Section 9.3 focuses particularly on claim 2, and the kinds of pleasure and pain involved in emotions, according to *Rhetoric* 2.1–11. This generates a question about whether Aristotle has an account of pleasure and pain that can accommodate pleasures and pains of the required kind. In section 9.4 this question is considered briefly in relation to the accounts of pleasure (and pain) in the ethical works, and in section 9.5 in relation to the account of pleasure in *Rhetoric* 1.11. Section 9.6 turns from exegesis of the *Rhetoric* to canvassing the philosophical merits of the theory of emotions that has emerged from Aristotle's texts.

9.2 Claim 1: Emotions as Pleasures and Pains

Pleasure and pain are regularly connected in Aristotle's writings with the passions.⁷ It is no surprise, therefore, that a prominent part of his

⁶ I shall use 'emotions' and 'passions' interchangeably. The assumption that our talk of emotions and Aristotle's discussion in *Rhetoric* 2 of '*ta pathē*' are about the same thing cannot be defended here. Cf. Striker (1996, p. 299 n.1); Konstan (2006, esp. ch.1).

⁷ Cf. *EN* 2.5, 1105b21–3; *EE* 1220b12–14; *MM* 1.8, 1186a33–6.

definition of the passions at 1378a19–21 is that the passions are ‘accompanied by (Gk: *ἔπεται*) pain and pleasure’. One obvious thing Aristotle may have in mind here is to recognize the distinctive phenomenology of the passions. But beyond this, questions remain. In particular, how does he conceive of the relationship between emotions and pain and pleasure,⁸ which he regularly characterizes by the use of ‘*ἔπεται*’ (literally: follow upon)?⁹ The picture can then be filled out by attention to Aristotle’s references to pain and pleasure in his accounts of the various types of emotion in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11.

9.2.1 *ἘΠΕΤΑΙ* (‘Accompanies’) in Aristotle

Within Aristotle, there seems to be a variety of usage of *ἔπεσθαι* (to accompany/follow). Occasionally this verb is used (like the English ‘to follow’) simply to indicate that one thing comes after another.¹⁰ But by far its most common usage in Aristotle is of the following kind. To say that A *ἔπεται* B is to say that wherever you find B you also find A. This is obviously important in Aristotelian logic in warranting inference (accordingly, *ἔπεται* is one of the standard words used in premises in the *Prior Analytics*). But it also indicates, for example, to the orator what to expect from, say, wealthy people, ‘The kinds of character that *go with* (*ἔπεται*) wealth are obvious for all to see . . .’ (*Rhetoric* 2.16, 1390b32). The inference Aristotle encourages the orator to make here from someone’s wealth to their character would be reasonable in virtue of the fact that some contingent generalization holds. More commonly, however, when Aristotle asserts that wherever you find B you find A (A *ἔπεται* B), the connection to which he is drawing attention is that B *by its very nature implies* A. Unsurprisingly this latter usage is typical in logical contexts (e.g. ‘in every case where you get man or footed thing generally you get animal’, *An. Pr.* 56a28–9). But it is also easily the most common usage elsewhere too (e.g. *De Anima* 3.3, ‘wherever you get belief you get

⁸ Aristotle’s position here is importantly related to that of Socrates at *Philebus* 46b–c and 47d–50c, but it need not be taken as endorsing the view that each emotion involves *both* pain and pleasure (pace Frede, 1996, pp. 258–60).

⁹ Cf. also refs. at n.7.

¹⁰ Mostly this usage in Aristotle indicates simply a transition to the next subject of discussion, e.g. *EN* 1111b5, 1172a19. *ἔπεται* at 1168a21 may indicate merely temporal sequence (perhaps hinting also at a causal connection), but seems equally plausibly interpreted as marking implication.

conviction'), and accordingly in several places in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Terence Irwin even translates *ἐπεται* with 'implies' (e.g. '[the right sort of] giving implies doing good' 1120a14, where it is clear that the former implies the latter *in virtue of what it is* to give correctly).¹¹

Since there is such a strong statistical presumption in favour of this latter use of *ἐπεται*, we should look at Aristotle's own careful distinctions within this kind of usage. These come in a couple of passages, one of which is in the *Rhetoric* itself, at 1.7.1363b28ff.¹²

[We say that that is a greater good than this] also whenever this goes with (*ἐπεται*) that, but that doesn't go with this. And one thing goes with something else simultaneously or subsequently or potentially: the use of the former is present in the use of the latter. Being alive goes with being healthy simultaneously, but not *vice versa*; understanding goes with learning subsequently; and stealing goes with temple-robbery potentially (anyone who has committed temple-robbery has it in them to steal).

The last case (temple-robbery and stealing) does not seem a good candidate for elucidating Aristotle's usage of *ἐπεται* to indicate the connection between pleasure and pain and the passions, such as at 1378a21, but in the first two examples, the connection signalled by *ἐπεται* is between two things one of which is part of the essence of the other. Being alive is part of the essence of being healthy, since being healthy is *a way of* being alive. Likewise, one has not learned unless one subsequently understands (or 'knows')—it is essential to learning that it is the achieving of a state of *having learned*, indeed, of understanding.

This passage cannot mandate a particular interpretation of 1378a21: what is *directly asserted* by the use of *ἐπεται* at 1378a21 is nothing stronger than concurrence. However, it highlights the fact that when Aristotle says that pleasure and pain 'follow' the passions, although he may have in mind as loose a connection as that pleasure and pain states tend to occur in conjunction with states of passion distinct from them, nevertheless he is more likely to have in mind a tighter connection such as that pain or pleasure is essential to being a passion.¹³ Usage elsewhere

¹¹ Cf. *EN* 1120a14, a26, b32 (Irwin, 1985).

¹² Cf. also *Topics* 117a5–15.

¹³ Aristotle does not seem to hold that pleasure or pain is the *genus* of the passions, nor, when he writes, 'x is a pain at . . .' need he be interpreted as making a claim about x's *genus* (pace Cooper, 1996, p. 245 and Frede, 1996, p. 259). By analogy, suppose nausea is a dull pain at the surging of the sea, this is still compatible with its *genus* being sensation. The *genus* of the passions was clearly a matter of discussion in the Academy, at least in relation

in Aristotle, as exemplified in the earlier passage, certainly suggests this. I shall argue that Aristotle's view is the stronger connection proposed in claim 1, that emotions *are* (kinds of) pleasures or pains or both—that is to say, that this is what being a passion consists in. This can be best seen in how strongly Aristotle associates pleasure and, more especially, pain with the individual passions that he goes on to discuss.

However, let us pause briefly to consider the plausibility to Aristotle of this view of emotions as pleasures and pains. It is easy to be misled into thinking that its plausibility to Aristotle would have been low by the fact that it has not been widely advocated in the contemporary debates about the nature of emotions.¹⁴ One reason for this might be that pains and pleasures have sometimes been thought to have phenomenal but not representational qualities.¹⁵ However, it is clear that for both Plato and Aristotle, pain and pleasure were indeed both intentional and representational. In the *Philebus*, Socrates' position is that pain and pleasure represent their objects as being a certain way, and can be false.¹⁶ Likewise, the view of emotions advocated in the *Philebus* is that they are mixed pleasures and pains. Hence, if Aristotle thought that emotions were pleasures and pains, and that the latter were representational states, he was adopting a recognizable and plausible position within his

to anger (*Topics* 127b26–32, 150b27–151a19, 156a32–3; cf. *Rhet* 1378a30–2), and after Aristotle, it continued to be a matter of dispute. Aspasius defends the view that pleasure and pain are the 'most generic passions' (γενικώτατα πάθη), and in doing so takes himself to be championing an Aristotelian position (CAG 19.1, 42.27–47.2) against Stoic rivals. Whatever the merits of his view, it is doubtful that it is Aristotle's (cf. Sorabji, 1999). The fact that Aspasius presents his position as a needed clarification of Aristotle's claim that pleasure and pain 'follow' (ἐπεσθαι 42.27–8) every passion, may itself invite the suspicion that his own position here goes beyond that of Aristotle. It is at any rate clear from Aristotle's definition of anger in the *Rhetoric* ('Let anger be a desire . . . ' 1378a30), read against the background of such debates in the Academy, that he was not concerned to defend the view that the *genus* of anger, still less that of all emotions, is pain or pleasure. A further reason why that is unlikely to have been Aristotle's position is that he seems to have seen anger as essentially involving *both* pleasure *and* pain (1378a31–b2): since each thing can only have one genus, he would be forced to say that at least one of pleasure and pain was not anger's genus. But if in the case of anger it is possible for a passion to be *essentially* (say) a pleasure without that's being its *genus*, it is unclear why there is any motivation for making the stronger claim about pain's being its *genus*. The same seems to apply to the passions in general. See section 9.6 for a philosophical merit of pleasure and pain's not being the *genus* of emotions.

¹⁴ Though see Goldstein (2002) and Helm (2001) for two exceptions.

¹⁵ E.g. McGinn (1982, p. 8). Note, however, several recent defenders of representational views of pain and pleasure: Bain (2003), Tye (2006), Prosser (2007); cf. also Crane (1998).

¹⁶ Cf. on this issue Harte (2004).

philosophical tradition. We will later consider how plausible this view is to *us*; the point here is that there is nothing *prima facie* implausible about attributing such a view to *him*.

9.2.2 *Pleasure and pain in the individual accounts of types of passion*

In *Rhetoric* 2.2–11, six types of emotion are defined by Aristotle specifically as pains. Fear is defined as ‘a kind of pain or disturbance from the appearance of approaching damaging or painful harm’ (1382a21f.). Likewise, shame is ‘a kind of pain or disturbance at bad things that will apparently bring disgrace’ (1383b12–14), and pity is ‘a kind of pain at’ undeserved suffering (1385b13f.). Indignation is pain at the success of the undeserving (1386b9–11); envy and ‘emulation’ are kinds of pain felt in response to the success of one’s equal, the difference between them being whether the pain is felt at the other person’s success or at one’s own non-attainment of that success (1386b18–21, 1387b23–5; 1388a31–8). Correspondingly, Aristotle clearly recognizes certain emotions as pleasures. The person disposed to pity will feel two other (unnamed) emotions—pleasure at deserved suffering, and pleasure at deserved success. Similarly, the person prone to envy will also be prone to an emotion that is pleasure at the misfortune of their equals, for which English has no name but Aristotle calls *epichairekakia* and German speakers call *Schadenfreude*.

9.2.3 *Aristotle’s general position on emotions and pleasure and pain*

On the most generous count, Aristotle identifies seventeen types of emotion types in *Rhetoric* 2. Of these, as we have seen, six are explicitly defined as pains—pains at something. Three are described as pleasures. So, over half are described explicitly as pleasures or pains. The number rises still further, possibly as high as eleven, if one can count as pleasures any of *praotês* (calmness/satisfaction),¹⁷ *tharsos* (confidence/boldness)¹⁸, and *anaischuntia* (shamelessness), the opposites of three other emotions described explicitly in terms of pain. On *tharsos* and *anaischuntia*, sadly,

¹⁷ Cf. Konstan (2006, ch.3) for the view that *praotês* is a positive emotion (‘satisfaction’) in its own right.

¹⁸ Cf. Cooper (1996, p. 245), and *Nicomachean Ethics* 3.9.

Aristotle has little enough to say of relevance to our purposes about these 'opposites', but indicates, perhaps less than perspicuously, that we should be able to work the details out from the accounts of fear and shame, both of which he describes in terms of pain.¹⁹ This evidence collectively amounts to a strong basis for investigating whether claim 1 might represent Aristotle's general view of the connection between emotions and pain and pleasure: that emotions simply are pains or pleasures (or perhaps both).²⁰ The investigation will need to cover whether attributing such a view to Aristotle can accommodate what he actually says about the other emotion types such as gratitude and ingratitude, anger and calmness, and friendship and hatred, where his description lacks phrases like 'x is pain and distress at y', and indeed—in the case of hatred—specifically excludes pain. What should be said generally about the 'opposites' to some types of passion, especially where the opposite is most plausibly construed as involving not some opposite pleasure or pain, but the absence of the original passion's pleasure or pain?

Anger, first, is not said to be a pain, but a desire with pain. Aristotle was aware of the (evidently) lively debate within the Academy about the *genus* to which anger belonged.²¹ His saying that anger is a desire may express his decisive verdict in favour of desire as the *genus* of anger.²² Still this is compatible with his thinking that anger is a pain—within the *genus* of desires, there are some desires that are also pains, and anger is one of these. Being a pain would thus be the *differentia* that marks out the desires that are pains from those that are not. And the contents of the pain, namely 'at what one takes to be an unwarranted slight of oneself or one's associates' plus the type of object of the desire, namely 'for what one takes to be revenge', are the *differentiae* that mark out cases of anger from other states that are both desires and pains. In support of this

¹⁹ 1383a13–16; 1385a14–15. On balance, I think it more likely that Aristotle considered *anaischuntia* not a pleasure but a privation of shame. I discuss such privations later in this chapter.

²⁰ Arguably anger is both a pleasure and a pain, though support for this in *Rhetoric* 2.2 is at best equivocal.

²¹ *Topics* 127b26–32, 150b27–151a19, 156a32–3.

²² It may not. The definition need not be interpreted as stating anger's *genus*. Aristotle's having written the definition thus, even if he did not think that anger's *genus* was desire, might be best understood alongside his use elsewhere of Platonic-sounding tripartite psychology. Cf. *Rhetoric* 1.10, 1.11, Striker (1996, p. 289), and especially Rowe (2003).

reading of Aristotle's definition, we should note that his phrase, 'on account of what one takes to be a slight' (1378a31) seems to apply to the state as a whole. Thus it has been somewhat misleading to assign this as the content of the pain, while 'what one takes to be revenge' (a30) was assigned as the object of the desire. Aristotle's formulation suggests that both apply to the state as a whole: thus anger is a desire-cum-pain for purported revenge, on account of a purported slight.²³

The next passions to consider are *charin echein* (gratitude) and *acharistia* (ingratitude).²⁴ There is no mention of their involving pleasure or pain in the chapter (2.7) devoted to them.²⁵ By anyone's lights, the chapter is puzzling—it appears to be wholly devoted to an analysis of what it is to do someone a 'favour', and it is supposed to be obvious (*dêlon*, 1385a16) how this amounts to an elucidation of a kind of *emotion*. There is in fact no explicit material here on the emotion itself. Commentators even divide over what Aristotle's term is (or would be) for whatever emotion is under discussion here!²⁶ I shall assume that the case is decisive in favour of the emotion's being '*charin echein*', and its being gratitude. Even so, the same difficulty recurs—the focus is so much on the act of kindness that justifies the feelings of gratitude (of course, this is precisely the material the orator needs for stirring up these feelings) that we can only guess at the involvement or absence of pleasure or pain in the feelings that result. Perhaps there might be an interesting interplay between the two in this case—one feels pleasure at the kindness, but pain at the sense of obligation, especially if it involves a considerable or insuperable burden to discharge. Still, this remains speculation and goes beyond Aristotle's text. It is interesting that

²³ Following Homer, Plato, and several others, Aristotle recognizes that anger also has its pleasures: 'associated (*ἐνεσθαι*) with every case of anger there is a certain pleasure from the expectation of getting revenge' (1378b1–2). This seems to be Aristotle's way of insisting that pleasure as well as pain is essential to anger without saying, 'anger is a pleasure', which might be taken as a claim about anger's *genus*.

²⁴ The translation of these terms is controversial. Cf. n.26.

²⁵ Pain is mentioned only as part of elucidating needs, which are in turn used to elucidate what a favour (*charis*) is.

²⁶ For Cooper (1996, pp. 242–3), it is *charis*, understood either as the motivation behind kindly acts (cf. Cope (1877) and Kennedy (1991, *ad loc.*) or as a kindly feeling that listeners might feel towards one who has treated them well. For Striker (1996, p. 301, n.15), Rapp (2002a, *ad loc.*) and Konstan (2006, ch.7), the emotion is *charin echein*, and is feeling grateful (possibly with a connotation of obligation, cf. Konstan (2006, pp. 164–8).

Aristotle's discussion of this pair of emotions focuses *entirely* on the conceptual detail of how the emotion's potential subjects take things to be, i.e. on whether they understand some person's actions to have been a 'favour' or not. But it does not seem that this pair of passions can count strongly either for or against claims about the involvement of pleasure and pain in the passions.

Love/friendship and hostility (*Rhetoric* 2.4) probably pose the greatest problems for the suggestion that all Aristotelian emotions involve pleasure and/or pain. Indeed, Aristotle explicitly says that hostility does not involve pain (1382a12–13). As he describes it, *philia* seems to be not a *pathos* at all, but a disposition to *pathê*, namely towards pleasure in relation to the friend, to the activities involved in friendship, but (more relevantly for rhetorical scenarios) also pleasure in relation to the friend's success and well-being.²⁷ The same disposition is a disposition to distress at any harm to the friend's interests or to his person. From a rhetorical point of view, one can see that knowing how to produce this *disposition* in a listener is a much more useful skill than knowing how to produce particular episodes of friendly emotion, episodes of friendly pleasure or friendly distress. In the courts and the assembly, the speaker wants the listeners to feel a particular way about (e.g.) Aristides not just now but at the end of the debate, or at the vote, and this might be next week, or after some opposing speeches. This might account for why here Aristotle's focus shifts from passions themselves to dispositions to passions. Still, it is disappointing that Aristotle does not distinguish more carefully between passions themselves and passionate dispositions. My suggestion, then, is that strictly speaking, as Aristotle defines them, *philia* and *echthra* are not passions.²⁸ But they are dispositions to passions—and Aristotle *does* explicitly point out that *philia* involves a disposition to feel pleasure along with a friend at good things, and pain at distressing or painful things (1381a3–6). (And this comes so early on in his account, that it may be Aristotle's hint at how *philia* fits into his general picture of the passions.) With hostility, there are two possible ways to integrate it

²⁷ *Rhetoric* 2.4, 1381a3–6, cf. Striker (1996, p. 301 n.13); Cooper (1996, p. 244).

²⁸ Of course, one might suppose that if Aristotelian desires essentially involve a pleasant or painful representation of their objects, the characterization of friendliness as a kind of desire (*τὸ βούλεσθαι*, wishing, 1380b35–6) implies that it is also a pleasure and/or a pain. Cf. Moss (2012a).

into the proposed picture of the passions as pleasures and pains.²⁹ One is to insist that Aristotle is merely insisting (correctly) that hostility—considered as a disposition—is without pain, and that this is consistent with his agreeing that the episodes to which it disposes its possessor do involve pain. Admittedly, this is awkward as an interpretation of 1382a12–13 because hostility is contrasted with anger—and it is clearly *episodes* of anger that are in view.³⁰ Still, I am inclined to think that this is what Aristotle *should have said* here.

The other strategy for reconciling hostility with what I am suggesting is Aristotle's general view of emotions involves treating hostility simply as the privation of love/friendship. This strategy is important, in that it may well also be the right way to explain why 'calmness', 'shamelessness', and 'ingratitude' appear in Aristotle's list of passions, when they do not seem (even by Aristotle's own lights) to qualify as passions, being rather *privations* of some particular kind of passion.³¹ For it seems plausible to think that Aristotle's accounts of the 'opposite' passions do not stand on their own, but should be taken as part of the pair in which they are presented. Thus, these 'opposites' are not themselves passions but are privations of their opposite, which in each case *is* a passion. A clear indication in this direction is his description of *anaischuntia* as 'some kind of disdain and emotionlessness (*apatheia*) in relation to these same things [viz. the objects of shame]' (1383b14–15).³² To the extent that each of these states involves no pleasure or pain (as merely the privation of another kind of state), strictly speaking, it does not belong in a list of the *pathê*. But there is equally clearly an important sense in which these states do belong exactly where we find them. The aspiring orator needs to

²⁹ Fortenbaugh's suggestion (2002, p. 107, n.2) that Aristotle has two distinct conceptions of hostility does not solve the problem of how to make sense of hostility's apparent classification as a *pathos* in the *Rhetoric*.

³⁰ Cf. Leighton (1996, p. 232f., n.14) and Fortenbaugh (2002, p. 107, n.1).

³¹ How pressing this worry is may vary among the types of states listed. See, for example, the section on *praotês*.

³² Konstan (2006, ch.3) argues that *praotês* is an emotion in its own right, and is satisfaction. Grimaldi (1988, *ad loc.*) agrees, as does Cooper (1996, p. 242 and n.4). Cope (1877) disagrees. Whatever one's view on the disputed cases, clearly some 'opposites' are emotions in their own right (e.g. indignation) and equally clearly some are merely privations (e.g. shamelessness). Confidence (*tharsos*) is described as being 'without emotion' (*apatheis*) at 1383a28, but cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* 3.9.

know both how to arouse and to dispel each type of emotion, and—insofar as Aristotle has things to say about what we might call the ‘privations’—this is exactly the kind of thing he says about them, and the kind of explanation he offers of why it is useful to understand how to bring someone into such a state.³³ In short, Aristotle’s goal in this section of giving a good account of the passions is subordinate to his larger goal of setting out the expertise of rhetoric. Thus, it is, I suggest, no serious objection to the proposal about how Aristotle sees the connection between emotions and pleasure and pain that it entails that some of the states named in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11 are not strictly emotions.

9.2.4 *Summary of how the proposed view fits the evidence of Rhetoric 2.2–11*

The proposed view, then, is that Aristotle thinks that all emotions are states of pleasure, pain, or both. His treatment of the passions in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11 reflects this explicitly in many cases, with emotions described as ‘a pain’ or ‘desire-cum-pain’ in the case of anger. Apparent exceptions are explained simply as Aristotle’s attention shifting from the emotion type to the associated disposition (in the case of *φιλία*, possibly also *τὸ μισεῖν*), or as Aristotle’s having included in his list some non-emotions because of their rhetorical importance in blocking or calming other states that are emotions.

9.3 The Representational Pain and Pleasure Involved in the Passions

I turn now to the second claim, that the pains and pleasures involved in emotional experience are intentional and representational—that is, they are pain at X, at X’s being F. Let us first review how pleasures and (mostly) pains feature in the accounts of individual emotion types in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11.

³³ That this is his purpose in including ‘opposites’ is suggested by his comments on *praotēs* 1380b31–4, on the opposites to pity (1387b16–21; 1388a24–30; 1387a3–5) and on the passions generally (1388b29).

9.3.1 Rhetoric 2 *on the pains and pleasures involved in emotions*

Emotion Type	Phrases Involving Pleasure and Pain
anger	<p>desire-cum-pain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - of what one takes to be³⁴ revenge (gen) - because of (<i>dia</i> + acc) what one takes to be contempt (1378a30–2) <p>pleasure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - from the hope of being avenged (<i>apo</i> + gen) (1378b1–2)
friendly feelings	<p>sharing a friend's pleasure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at good things (dat) <p>sharing a friend's pain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at painful things (dat) <p>not with anything else in view, but for their sake (1381a3–5)</p>
fear	<p>pain from (<i>ek</i> + gen) the appearance of future harm that is destructive or painful (1382a21–2)</p> <p>pain and distress on account of (<i>dia</i> + acc) this: that something bad might befall him from the other's success (1386b22–4, part of a contrast with <i>phthonos</i>)</p>
shame	<p>pain in connection with (<i>peri</i> + acc) bad things that we take it will involve us in disgrace (1383b12–14)</p>
pity	<p>pain at (<i>epi</i> + dat) what is taken to be destructive or painful harm to someone who is undeserving (1385b13–14)</p> <p>being pained at (<i>epi</i> + dat) undeserved farings-ill (1386b9)</p> <p>sharing distress at (<i>epi</i> + dat) those who undeservedly fare ill (1386b12–13)</p>
indignation	<p>being pained at (<i>epi</i> + dat) undeserved farings-well (1386b10–11)</p> <p>being pained at (<i>epi</i> + dat) the one taken to be faring well undeservedly (1387a8–9)</p>
envy	<p>disturbing pain at (<i>epi</i> + dat) the faring well of an equal, clarified as pain on account of (<i>dia</i> + acc) that person (1386b18–21)</p> <p>pain at (<i>epi</i> + dat) what is taken to be faring well (enjoying) those benefits just mentioned, in connection with (<i>peri</i> + acc) those who are similar . . . on account of them (<i>dia</i> + acc) (1387b23–5)</p>

³⁴ The exact attitude referred to when Aristotle speaks of how things 'appear' (*phantasia*, *phainesthai*—here taken to indicate how the subject 'takes things to be') in experiencing an emotion is a matter of some controversy that would take us too far afield. These translations reflect my view, defended in Chapter 10 and see references there.

emulation	pain at (<i>epi</i> + dat) what is taken to be the presence of goods which you could get, and in connection with (<i>peri</i> + acc) those similar in nature, not because (<i>hoti</i>) the other has them but because you do not (1388a32–4)
righteous satisfaction	being pleased or without pain at (<i>epi</i> + dat) those who suffer deservedly, when they get their comeuppance (1386b27–9)
happy for	being glad at (<i>epi</i> + dat) those who do well deservedly (1386b30–1)
<i>Schadenfreude</i>	being glad at (<i>epi</i> + dat) the loss and destruction of that which to the same kind of person is an object of pain (<i>phthonos</i>) when it comes about and is present [i.e. success for an equal] (1387a1–3)

This evidence enables us to elaborate on the earlier formulation in which, for Aristotle, the pain and pleasure involved in emotions are pain *at* the emotion's 'target', and pain *at* things being the way that gives 'grounds' for the emotion. In distinguishing target and grounds, I am simply following Aristotle's own directions at 1378a22–4 in the schema he sets out for his accounts of individual emotion types (distinguishing three questions illustrated using the example of anger, 'what kind of condition disposes people to anger, who typically are targets of people's anger, and on what grounds?'). But when it comes to the accounts themselves, although he usually keeps to this schema in structuring each section, it seems clear that there is substantial overlap between the accounts of each emotion's targets and grounds. Anger, for example, involves pain at a supposed slight, its grounds are a supposed slight, and its objects are those that we suppose to have slighted us.³⁵ Thus typically, the emotion's targets are simply those people or things that instantiate its grounds. So,

³⁵ All of this is said to be obvious (*phaneron*) from an understanding of what anger is (2.2, 1379a10f.). The section (1379a30ff.) on anger's objects frequently refers back to the section on slighting (1378b10ff.). For example, someone who ridicules you is an object of anger 'because they are insulting (or committing an outrage against—"hubrizontes") you' (1379a31f.). Arguably, the section on slighting isn't a separate section on grounds for anger, it merely elucidates the terms of the definition of anger, and Aristotle treats the objects and grounds of anger together. (He appears to say at 1379a10f. that treatment of grounds and objects lies ahead, and to consider this task accomplished by 1380a1ff. If so, then it must be that grounds are considered covered in the long list of anger's objects at 1379a30ff.) If this is correct, it reinforces my claim that passions simply involve representing facts or circumstances about their object. Passions' objects and grounds will not easily come apart.

if the emotion's grounds have been specified, it is a short step to see what kind of people or things will be its targets. Similarly, an adequate specification of the class of some emotion's targets is bound to highlight the features in virtue of which they instantiate its grounds.

This overlap is reflected in the evidence summarized for the particular pains and pleasures involved in Aristotelian emotions. The most commonly used construction to specify the objects of pain or pleasure is *epi* with the dative. This is used both in specifying the targets of the emotion³⁶ and their grounds.³⁷ The cases of pity and indignation are particularly suggestive, since for each, the definition is stated more than once, in different places, but where the formulations vary as to whether it is the grounds or the target that is specified.³⁸ It seems likely that Aristotle simply considered these formulations interchangeable. A number of other constructions are used, each of which appears to have its own nuance. I will discuss the single usage of each of *ek* and *apo* below. *Peri* and the accusative are used to identify the principle target at which pain is felt,³⁹ and the dative on its own is used to specify the objects of shared pleasure and pain in friendship. *Dia* and the accusative, and likewise a *hoti* construction, are most often used to offer further clarification within the explanation of the objects of pain.⁴⁰ Thus fear is carefully distinguished from envy in that the pain is felt 'because something bad might befall' the subject (1386b22–4), envy involves pain at the success of others 'because of them' (1387b23–5 and implied 1388a32–4), whereas emulation's pain is 'because you do not' have the goods in question (1388a32–4). The point of these clarifications seems to be to identify what precisely in the pained person's outlook is found painful, so as to classify the state as fear, envy, or emulation.

When Aristotle specifies the pains and pleasures involved in various types of emotion, he seems to be mainly concerned with setting out the circumstances (as the subject takes them to be) at which pain or pleasure is taken. Within this, for some emotions, the relevant situation may

³⁶ E.g. pity 1386b12f.; indignation 1387a8f.; righteous satisfaction 1386b27–9; happy for 1386b30f.

³⁷ E.g. pity 1385b13f., 1386b9; indignation 1386b10f.; envy 1386b18–21, 1387b23f.; emulation 1388a32f.; *schadenfreude* 1387a2f.

³⁸ Cf. references in the table.

³⁹ E.g. shame 1383b12f.; envy 1387b24; emulation 1388a33f.

⁴⁰ 1378a31 is an exception.

centre upon some particular person or thing—the evil feared, the person pitied, the shameful act, the equal envied, and so on—and this is his way of making sense of the way in which emotions can have a specific object (i.e. we can pity someone, be ashamed at something, envy someone, be happy for someone). That the pain and pleasure of emotions is primarily to be understood as taken at a set of circumstances is illustrated by Aristotle's approach to anger and fear. In both of these cases, it seems natural to think that an adequate account of what is involved ought to make sense of how we can be angry *at* someone, and afraid *of* someone (or something). In both of these cases, Aristotle's definition is given in terms of pain (or desire-cum-pain) at a kind of state of affairs, apparent slight and future harm. With anger, Aristotle is quick to point out that it always has a particular object, and of course is concerned to make sense of how we can be angry *at someone* (1378a32–b1). But it is interesting that the definition offered specifies the type of *situation* at which pain is felt, and the fact that anger is felt at some *particular* thing (usually a person) is *inferred from* the fact that anger involves pain because of a slight (you can't be slighted by a *type* of thing). In the case of fear, Aristotle seems much less concerned to offer an account of how we can fear particular things or people. It seems as though the pain of fear is felt at situations and circumstances, rather than at particular objects.

The pain and pleasure of emotion are thus for Aristotle felt at situations or circumstances as the subject represents them. Sometimes there will be some central person or object involved, sometimes not. This account thus requires an account of pain and pleasure which involves representational content, such that the pleasure or pain is felt at that content. The content in question needs to allow for the kind of nuance we have seen, where there can be such subtle differences as exist between the pain of envy and the pain of emulation—where in both the pain involves the representation of the success of an equal, but in one the pain is *because of* the other person's success, and in the other the pain is *because of* the subject's own lack.

The view set out here is at odds with the view taken by William Fortenbaugh in *Aristotle on Emotion*.⁴¹ He denies that the pain and pleasure involved in emotion is representational, and suggests that

⁴¹ (Fortenbaugh, 2002) 12–13, 110–12.

Aristotle's position is that emotions are or involve pain and pleasure *caused by* thoughts with the relevant content. Aristotle's view of emotions, on his view, is structurally similar to his view of eclipses as 'deprivation of light from the moon *caused by* the obstruction of the earth'. Thus it is only the thoughts that are intentional and are properly called cognitions, the pains and pleasures are only intentional 'in a derivative way, i.e., through the judgment that is its cause'.⁴² The view finds its best textual support in Aristotle's remarks on the pleasures of anger and in his definition of fear. Anger's pleasure is 'from (*ἀπὸ*) the hope of being avenged' (1378b1–2), and fear is defined as 'a pain from (*ἐκ*) the appearance of future harm' (1382a21–2). These two remarks undoubtedly assert a causal connection between hope and pleasure in the one case and appearance and pain in the other. Perhaps if they were typical of Aristotle's remarks about the pain and pleasure of emotions, Fortenbaugh would have a strong case. But they are not. These are the only examples of constructions using *ek* and *apo* in connection with emotional pleasure or pain. We should set against this the evidence set out previously of Aristotle's more usual formulations which are much more naturally interpreted as specifying the representational contents of the pain state itself.⁴³ While Fortenbaugh's view has difficulty with quite a bit of the relevant material on emotional pleasures and pains, the view that these pains and pleasures are representational has no difficulty with Aristotle's causal remarks about anger and fear. After all, it is natural to suppose that causal relations would hold between thinking that something fearsome is the case and the state of feeling pain *at that same thing*. Likewise, thoughts about getting vengeance are very likely to cause a state of pleasure *at getting vengeance*. Thus the best evidence cited in favour of Fortenbaugh's claim is in fact equally compatible with my claim that Aristotelian emotions involve representational pain and pleasure, and much of the relevant evidence fits my proposal much more naturally.

⁴² Fortenbaugh (2002, p. 13).

⁴³ Fortenbaugh's suggestion that language involving *dia* and *epi* may be similarly read as purely causal is not convincing. It is possible in some cases (e.g. 1378a30–2, 1386b22–4), but very implausible in others (e.g. 1381a3–5, 1387b23–5, cf. 1388a32–4). It does not seem a natural way of reading *epi* clauses when, as often happens, these are elaborated and explained by further clauses introduced by *peri* and *dia*. Finally, shame's pain is said to be 'in relation to' (*peri* with accusative) bad things leading to disgrace—a formulation not easily read in Fortenbaugh's causal mould.

This view of the kinds of pleasure and pain involved in emotions is, however, not compatible with every view of pleasure and pain. It requires a view of pleasures and pains on which they are representational, and can be felt 'at' the kinds of states of affairs that constitute grounds for emotions. We must now, therefore, investigate whether Aristotle has a suitable account of pleasure and pain, of the kind required by the accounts of the emotions in *Rhetoric* 2.1–11.

9.4 Aristotle on Pleasure and Pain

The fact that Aristotle considers several (even if not all) passions to involve pain and/or pleasure has not gone unnoticed by commentators. It is therefore surprising that the question of how these views fit with his understanding of pleasure and pain themselves has received such scant attention.⁴⁴ The question seems to arise whether or not one accepts the position argued for here that for Aristotle, emotional pains and pleasures are representational pains and pleasures at (what the subject takes to be) the emotion-relevant circumstances.⁴⁵ The focus here will be on whether Aristotelian accounts of pleasure and pain are compatible with the view of emotional pains and pleasures defended as Aristotle's.

A general problem in answering this question is that his remarks on the emotions touch much more on pain than on pleasure, whereas his accounts of pleasure and pain are almost entirely focused on pleasure. Aristotle seems to suppose that a detailed account of pain can be inferred from what is said in his accounts of pleasure, pleasure and pain being understood presumably as opposites.⁴⁶ This is most clearly stated in the account of pleasure at *Rhetoric* 1.11, but seems also intended in the accounts in the *Nicomachean Ethics*.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Cf. Frede (1996, pp. 275–6) for the one exception of which I am aware.

⁴⁵ For example, on Fortenbaugh's account, why the thought of a friend's success should cause (say) an unimpeded exercise of a faculty is not so obvious as not to require any explanation.

⁴⁶ Cf. e.g. Ryle (1949, p. ch.4) for worries about whether such a view could be correct.

⁴⁷ Cf. 'and pain is the opposite' *Rhetoric* 1.11, 1369b35. *EN* 7.11, 1152b1 announces an account concerned with 'pleasure and pain', but what follows contains very little directly about pain; interestingly the account in *EN* 10 does not announce itself as an account of both pleasure and pain, but simply of pleasure (1172a16; although cf. *EN* 9.9, 1170a24f. for a possible forward reference to it as an account 'about pain'). Still, pain is discussed briefly at various points in ways that are taken to illuminate the nature of pleasure.

The most crucial requirement from Aristotelian passions on a theory of pleasure and pain is that they accommodate pains (and pleasures) where what is found painful or pleasant is an object with certain attributes (e.g. pain at one who suffers undeservedly, 1386b12–13), or a putative state of affairs (e.g. pain at undeserved suffering, 1386b9). It seems to me that the theories of pleasure from the ethical works struggle to meet this requirement.⁴⁸ In the ethical works, pleasure completes an activity, and arises from (or is identical with)⁴⁹ the unimpeded activity of a faculty in relation to its objects. What is thereby enjoyed is exercising that faculty on those objects. Pleasure seems always to be strictly speaking pleasure in an activity, e.g. eating/tasting the cream cake, even in those cases where it seems more natural to speak simply of enjoying the object—the cake. This view does not then seem able to accommodate the examples of emotional pleasures and pains without distorting them. Pleasure at another's suffering (*ho epichairekakos* 1386b34–87a3) is not the same as enjoying *knowing* about his suffering. Pain at the success of an equal (*phthonos* 1387b23f.) is not the same as loathing *knowing* about the success of an equal.⁵⁰ It seems difficult even to make this distinction on the accounts in the *Ethics*. They thus risk misidentifying what it is that is found pleasant or painful. Even though in the *Rhetoric*'s account of many types of emotion, the thing at which pain is incurred is qualified by 'apparent' or some cognate expression, this cannot be plausibly taken to mean that pain is incurred at the mental *state* (i.e. at the state itself of having something appear to you) rather than at the putative *fact* (i.e. at that which is apparently the case).⁵¹ It does not seem to me that the accounts of pleasure and pain from the ethical treatises can be easily reinterpreted so as to accommodate the kinds of pain under discussion here. Rather, it seems best to understand those accounts as being accounts, appropriate to their role in the ethical treatises, of enjoyment and loathing of *activities*, that is, in a sub-set of things in which pleasure and pain can be taken. Their purpose, I take it, is primarily to show that

⁴⁸ Whether the arguments in *EN* 10 and in the common books (*EN* 7) are wholly consistent need not detain us here. For in both, pleasure is a matter of enjoying some activity, and pain some correlate *mutatis mutandis* of pleasure.

⁴⁹ Cf. Gosling and Taylor (1982, ch.11); Owen (1971).

⁵⁰ Cf. Frede (1996, pp. 275–6).

⁵¹ This holds even on a different view from that adopted here about the precise force of 'apparent' in these expressions, cf. n.4, and Chapter 10.

genuine happiness does after all involve pleasure,⁵² to make clear how character virtue and vice are connected with pleasure and pain,⁵³ and to shed light on the use of pleasure and pain in educating the young to act correctly.⁵⁴ It does not necessarily impugn these accounts to observe that they are not complete accounts of all pleasure and pain.

9.5 Pleasure and Pain in *Rhetoric* 1.11

The account of pleasure in the *Rhetoric* itself may fare better at providing an account of pleasure and pain at (what in the subject's view are) emotion-relevant circumstances. The account has not been widely discussed.⁵⁵ This is partly because it is often taken to have major deficiencies—Gosling and Taylor identify it as a process theory and a restoration theory, both heavily criticized by Aristotle in the ethical works with arguments widely taken to be successful against their targets. Accordingly, another reason for its neglect has been that it does not thus reflect, indeed is taken to be inconsistent with, Aristotle's mature views (it is classed by Gosling and Taylor as 'early Aristotle').⁵⁶ Furthermore, since it occurs within a section of the *Rhetoric* which provides the materials for enthymemes, materials which purport only to be 'reputable', it need not be taken even to reflect Aristotle's views at the time of writing.

It is far from obvious that the *caveat* offered by Aristotle at 1369b31–2 (immediately before 1.11, the chapter on pleasure and the pleasant) should lead us to conclude that the materials of *Rhetoric* 1.11 do not represent his own views. He is there concerned merely that readers do not expect from his definitions a greater degree of exactness than is possible in a work of

⁵² EN 1152b4–8, 1176a15–29.

⁵³ EN 1152b4–6.

⁵⁴ EN 1172a16–26.

⁵⁵ It gets a very brief treatment in Gosling and Taylor (1982, pp. 196–9), of which barely half a page is given to exegesis of the relevant chapter of the *Rhetoric*, cf. now Rapp (2002a, *ad loc.*).

⁵⁶ One of the reasons why this section is often taken this way is because of its relation to the views on pleasure found within Plato's *Philebus* and *Timaeus*. It seems correct to take the latter views as Aristotle's targets in his criticisms in the ethical works of previous accounts of pleasure. As will be seen later, I think the *Rhetoric* account is importantly different from these Platonic accounts, although it seems as though Aristotle is keen here (as in a number of other places in the *Rhetoric*, such as 1.10 where he comes close to endorsing something like *Republic*-style tripartition in the theory of motivation) to make his account *sound* amenable to the Platonist. Passages of this kind are suggestive of an interesting dialectic with Platonists. They certainly suggest that adherents to Platonic thought must have been an important section of the readership for the work.

this character. But still, his account will not be completely vague—the definitions offered will be ‘neither unilluminating nor yet meticulous’ (μητε ἀσαφείς μητε ἀκριβείς). Surely it is over-cautious on this basis to deny that it is generally Aristotle’s own views that are expressed in the ‘materials for enthymemes’ sections of the first book of the *Rhetoric*, and of the account of pleasure (and pain) in particular? Indeed, arguably a *caveat* of this kind only makes sense if he is giving his own view: it would be odd to strike such a cautionary note if Aristotle were merely recording the views of others.⁵⁷

Still, even if *Rhetoric* 1.11 did not represent Aristotle’s own views, this would not mean that it is not an interesting and important account of pleasure and pain. Neither would this make it untrue. So, I propose to look in detail at *Rhetoric* 1.11, tentatively assuming that it was genuinely proposed by Aristotle as the outline of a theory of pleasure and pain.

9.5.1 *The account of pleasure (and pain) in Rhetoric 1.11*

Let us take it that pleasure is some motion of the soul, a massive and perceptible settling down into its proper nature, and pain the opposite. If that is what pleasure is like, it is evident that what produces the aforementioned condition is pleasant, what destroys it or produces the contrary settling down is painful. Necessarily, therefore, it is pleasant . . .

1. in general, to come into the natural state (especially whenever things coming about in accordance with it have regained their own nature).
2. Likewise, habits. For that which has become habitual is already becoming as though it were natural; in fact, habit is something like nature, for the distance between ‘often’ and ‘always’ is not great, and nature belongs to what is always, habit to what is often.
3. That which is not forced is also pleasant, for force is contrary to nature. That is why what is necessary is painful, and it has been rightly said,

⁵⁷ Pace Gosling and Taylor (1982, pp. 197–8). The point has been widely made that *some* views set out in the *Rhetoric* must be taken by Aristotle to be correct and not merely plausible. In particular, this must apply to his accounts of the emotions since the orator is intended to use them not merely for speaking convincingly about the emotions but for actually arousing them in his audience. Cf. Cooper (1996, pp. 240–1), Frede (1996, pp. 259–60), Striker (1996, p. 286), and Sihvola (1996, pp. 53–4). Still, this argument does not apply to the treatment of pleasure and the pleasant in *Rhetoric* 1.11. They are intended not to enable the orator to produce pleasure or pain in anyone else, but primarily to enable the orator to speak convincingly about the motives of others (1369b15–31).

'For every necessitated act is bitter.'

Application, effort, and strain are also painful, for these involve necessity and force, unless they are habituated; for then habit makes them pleasant. Their opposites are pleasant. Hence relaxation, idleness, freedom from care, amusements, leisure and sleep are among pleasant things, because none of these is done out of necessity.

4. Whatever is an object of appetite is pleasant; for appetite is a desire for the pleasant. (1369b33–70a18)

On the face of it, the opening definition itself has clear scope for accommodating pleasures that are taken *at* something, and involve representing that thing in a particular way—i.e. just what is required for Aristotelian emotions. For one part of the definition has it that pleasure is a 'motion of the soul', or an 'event in the soul' (b33f.)⁵⁸, and this seems immediately to offer the possibility that representational states directed upon pleasure's objects could be among such 'motions' or 'events'.

9.5.2 *The restoration of nature view*

Still, this may be too quick. There is an interpretation of these lines on which this possibility does not exist. On this interpretation, all pleasure is simply the restoration of a thing's nature, and things that are pleasant are simply those that bring about a process of this kind. 1369b33–4 is taken, on this view, more or less as a recapitulation of part of the account of pleasures set out in Plato's *Philebus* 31b–36c. Thus, the motion of the soul at b33–4 is nothing more than the perception implied by '*athroan kai aisthêtên*' at b34. Pleasure is a veridically perceived restoration of the subject's naturally harmonious condition,⁵⁹ where this is sufficiently massive ('*athroan*') to be perceptible ('*aisthêtên*'), i.e. to cause the relevant perceptual motion of the soul.

Undeniably some elements in 1.11 seem to fit this view. What is pleasant is defined (1370a1–3) apparently without any reference to how the pleasant object is viewed, but simply in terms of its causal

⁵⁸ How we should understand *kinêsis* here will be discussed later.

⁵⁹ It seems unavoidable to use some such locution to make clear that the 'proper nature' is being used to convey some sense in which the resulting condition is evaluated as 'naturally good' or 'good for the subject in respect of their nature'. There is otherwise a difficulty over squaring the phrase with 1370a8, where 'nature' is said to belong to 'what is constant' (*tou aei*). If someone's nature is constant, they cannot possibly settle into it because they cannot *fail to be in it* in the first place.

relations (*'poiêtikon'*, *'phthartikon'*) to the states and processes that constitute pleasure. And what Aristotle labels as his best examples (*'malista'* a4) of pleasant things seems to bear this out:

especially whenever things coming about in accordance with it have regained their own nature (1370a4–5)

These are most plausibly understood as cases of the restoration of something's naturally best condition after a naturally occurring depletion—i.e. things like drinking when thirsty and eating when hungry.⁶⁰ The pleasure involved seems to arise regardless of how the subject conceives of what is happening.

However, this cannot, I think, be Aristotle's whole understanding of pleasure. Thus, despite the fact that he does appear to start from pleasures related to a human's natural functions, and an account that seems completely focused on pleasure of this kind, he quickly branches out towards recognizing as pleasant things that do not produce a restoration of the subject's nature at all. On closer examination, we will see that the possibility of pleasure in this wider set of cases seems to be built into the definition of pleasure itself.

9.5.3 Problems with a 'restoration of nature' view

The definition itself would be an odd construction if all pleasure were natural restoration perceived in the soul, for the first part ('some kind of motion of the soul' b33–4) would be almost superfluous if it simply referred to the perception that is more or less implied by 'massive and perceptible' at b34. More probably, Aristotle intends to suggest that there is something else going on in the soul beyond an awareness of the restoration.

In fact, we see just this almost immediately in Aristotle's examples of pleasant things. He presents three categories of pleasant things as though their pleasantness simply followed as a matter of necessity from the definitions of pleasure and the pleasant.⁶¹ In fact, only the pleasantness

⁶⁰ *'ta kat'autên gignomena'* (a5) is here understood to refer to depletions of the body, such as hunger and thirst, that are themselves the product of the body's natural activity.

⁶¹ 'Necessarily, therefore, it is pleasant...' 1370a3. It is not clear how much of what follows is within the scope of this inference. The way the translation is set out here records my view, based on two chief considerations. First, *'te'* (a3) is most plausibly picked up by the *'kai'* at a5 (and also at a9) not the one at a4. Second, if what was being inferred were only that going into the natural condition is pleasant, this would add nothing to what had just

of the first can be inferred from the preceding definitions—understood exactly as they stand.⁶² Indeed, by the definitions of pleasure and the pleasant he has just offered, habits and habitual activities are not pleasant. They perhaps bring about the restoration of a habitual condition. And this habitual condition may be ‘just like’, ‘similar to’, or ‘close to’ a thing’s proper nature,⁶³ but notwithstanding all that, Aristotle seems to understand here that habit is not the same as nature. So, habits bring about the restoration of *something like* a thing’s proper nature. Thus, the best we can conclude would be that they bring about *something like pleasure*, not pleasure itself, and that they are *something like pleasant*, not actually pleasant. However, this then seems to highlight that the precise respect in which such states might most plausibly be thought to be like the real thing (restorations of one’s proper nature) is presumably that they are *pleasant* or *enjoyable*. And if so, this suggests that what it takes to be a case of pleasure is not ‘being a restoration of a thing’s proper nature’ (since the results of habitual activities lack that feature) but something that the latter and their habit-based counterparts have *in common*. Likewise, even if one allowed (implausibly) that when someone or something is forced against its will to do something, this goes against their nature, it does not follow that all cases in which such compulsion is absent must involve ‘the restoration of a thing’s proper nature’, as their pleasantness would require. The second and third categories in Aristotle’s trio of pleasant things are better understood not as inferences from the initial definitions—strictly understood (as in the ‘restoration of nature’ view), but as his way of showing how his opening definitions need to be understood more flexibly, of indicating how they are to be extended eventually to cover the full range of pleasant things that lies ahead in the rest of *Rhetoric* 1.11. What I believe Aristotle thinks about habits and about things that are unforced is that they put us in a condition in which we *take ourselves*, sometimes mistakenly, to be experiencing a restoration of our proper nature.⁶⁴ The habitual and the

been asserted. Indeed, so close is it to the preceding formulation that it scarcely makes sense to see it as an *inference* from what preceded at all.

⁶² Even here, what follows, strictly speaking, is that coming into the natural state is a case of *pleasure*, not of something *pleasant*.

⁶³ ‘hōsper’ (a6), ‘homoion’ (a7), ‘engus’ (a7).

⁶⁴ This might seem to presuppose that pleasures involve a rather over-intellectual kind of content, deploying concepts such as ‘restoration’ and ‘proper nature’. This would be

unforced give rise to pleasure because they give rise to an experience which shares the relevant features with the veridical experience of a restoration of the subject's proper nature. The relevant features have to do with the *contents* of the experience.

This might seem a contorted reading of this passage until one reads it against its Platonic background. As has already been noted, the passage very strongly echoes the accounts of pleasure and pain from the *Philebus* and the *Timaeus*. The latter is particularly helpful in shedding light on how we should understand the present passage of the *Rhetoric*. The *Timaeus* passage comes from an extended section (61c–68d) detailing various perceptual affections.

Pleasure and pain, then, we must think of as follows. Any forceful (*βίαιον*) and massive (*ἄθρόον*) disruption coming about in us of our natural state (*παρὰ φύσιν*) is painful, and a massive (*ἄθρόον*) return to that natural state (*εἰς φύσιν*) is pleasant: what is gentle (*ἡρόεμα*) and gradual is imperceptible (*ἀναίσθητον*), what is the opposite to these is perceptible. (*Timaeus* 64c7–d3)

The language of our passage of the *Rhetoric* clearly alludes to this view of pain and pleasure, sharing its key elements of disruptions of or returns to the subject's natural state, and the requirement that these be massive (*ἄθρόος*) and perceptible (*αἰσθητός*), and indeed the terms used to describe them. This picture of pleasure and pain, in the *Timaeus*, is to be found within a section devoted to perception, such that it is clearly to be understood as an analysis of pleasure and pain as perceptual events of some kind. As such, it should be no surprise to find that, on this view, pleasure and pain involve representation. Interestingly, the *Timaeus* passage represents pleasure and pain as having, as it were, a double object. The processes involved in pleasures and pains have in common with other perceptions that they involve a process in which the various parts set in motion by each other, 'reach the intelligent part and announce to it the power of the agent' (64b5–7). That is to say, that the external cause (and its 'power') is among the objects of such an experience. Likewise, in the pleasure-less and painless cases, the

objectionable, since it would seem implausibly to make pleasure and pain impossible for those such as infants and animals who lacked those concepts. But in fact, the relevant cognitions might be better expressed as the simple thought that 'this is the way things should be!' And further, we should note that making and expressing such an evaluation need not involve language at all.

perceptions that come about are, 'in accordance with whatever [vision itself] undergoes, and of whatever it hits and comes into contact with' (64e2–3); and although these are distinctive in being the 'greatest and clearest' perceptions, there is every reason to suppose that pleasurable and painful perceptions too will similarly have among their objects the external cause of the experience, including the nature of its impact upon the subject. On this picture, in at least the veridical case, pleasures and pains are a kind of perception *of* the thing that caused them and of some of its qualities. But the passage also goes on to highlight how, in pleasurable and painful perceptions, the disruption or restoration in the subject is itself among the objects perceived in the experience.

Bodies that are subject to gradual loss and depletion but massive (*ἰθρόας*) and sudden replenishment, are insensible of (*ἀναισθητά*) the depletion but sensible of (*αἰσθητικά*) the replenishment, and they produce no pains in the mortal part of the soul, but the greatest pleasures. (65a1–6)

Within the short section 64b–65a of the *Timaeus*, containing this account of pleasures and pains, we have seen that it clearly portrays these states as perceptual, and portrays their contents as including both the external object (the source of the pain or pleasure) and the disintegration or restoration caused by that object, where this disintegration and restoration are themselves constituents of the states of pain and pleasure.

This is important for understanding *Rhetoric* 1.11. The detailed allusion to the kind of account offered in the *Timaeus* suggests to the reader that a similar account of pleasure (and pain) is being offered—that is to say, one that is perceptual in character, and includes among pleasure's (and pain's) intentional contents both the pleasant (and painful) objects *and* their effects on the subject.

The *Timaeus* passage does not extend its account beyond the veridical case, but it is clear from the discussion of false pleasures in the *Philebus* that Plato was aware of the need for any adequate account of pleasure and pain to accommodate cases in which the pleasure or pain is based on false representations of their objects by the subject. The most obvious way to do this in an account such as that set out previously is to suppose that a sensory experience would also count as a pleasure (or pain) whose contents included the *false* representation of its external object's effects as causing restoration into (or disintegration from) the subject's natural

state. On such a view, what makes a sensory experience a case of pleasure (or pain) is the way the effects of the external object on the subject are *represented*. Although this extension beyond the veridical case is not explicit in the *Timaeus* passage, its account of the veridical case provides the resources for extending the account in this way, and it seems a natural way to interpret the *Timaeus* account such that it applies generally to veridical and non-veridical cases alike. It is just such an account that I am suggesting Aristotle offers in *Rhetoric* 1.11, using words and phrases that allude to late Platonic accounts of pleasure and pain, and particularly to this passage of the *Timaeus*.

That this is how we should understand the account of pleasure in *Rhetoric* 1.11 is reinforced by some of Aristotle's other examples of pleasant things. As Aristotle's account of pleasant things progresses, his account leans more and more towards things that are pleasant because of the way that they relate to the way people *represent* those things and their effects on the subject. We might recall that his purpose in setting out what people find pleasant is as part of helping the forensic orator to make (or refute) claims about a defendant's motives for wrongdoing.⁶⁵ So, it is no surprise to find among Aristotle's list of what is pleasant things that are only pleasant because we believe them to be so, or because we come to view them in a certain way. His examples include winning (1370b32–4), honour and good reputation (1371a8–10), being loved (1371a18–21), being admired (1371a21–2), and even flattery (1371a22–4)! In two of these cases, winning and flattery, an inference is explicitly made that is hard to account for without supposing that Aristotle understood his account of pleasure to have a representational component (i.e. without supposing that the settling into one's proper nature mentioned in the definition of pleasure specifies *how things are represented to be* by the subject, whether or not this is how things actually are). The inference is clearest in the case of flattery.

Also being flattered and the flatterer are pleasant things. For the flatterer is a seeming admirer and a seeming friend. (1371a22–4)

The inference is from the pleasantness of something to the pleasantness of an apparent case of that thing. The fact that the same kind of inference

⁶⁵ This is clear both from how 1.11 is introduced beforehand, and how it is summarized afterwards: *Rhetoric* 1.10, 1368b1–5; b25–32; 1369b15–31; 1.12, 1372a4–5.

had been made at 1370b32–4 indicates that Aristotle takes it to be legitimate for pleasant things generally. This, it seems to me, is deeply problematic on 'straight' non-representational readings of his definition of pleasure here in *Rhetoric* 1.11, and the corresponding definition of the pleasant. For, on these readings, Aristotle thinks that pleasure is simply some process in the subject (attaining their proper nature), and pleasantness is being productive of this. But if that is so, then it is simply a fallacy to infer from something's being pleasant that an apparent case of that thing will be productive of the same result, especially when (as with flattery) there is a strong possibility that appearances are misleading. There is nothing in the nature of pleasure or the pleasant, on a non-representational view of these, that helps explain why such inferences are acceptable (as clearly Aristotle takes them to be).

By contrast, on a 'representational' understanding of either pleasure or pleasantness, the grounds for the inference are much easier to supply. On a representational view of pleasantness, a thing's being pleasant will be a matter of its being *represented* as having certain pleasure-producing features. If cases of pleasure from being flattered involve their being (mistakenly or otherwise) taken for cases of being loved, and being loved is understood to have the relevant pleasure-producing features (i.e. it is taken to be pleasant, 1371a17–21), then it is obvious how flattery comes to be pleasant. It is rational to conclude in each case that here is something with the relevant pleasure-producing features, i.e. here is something pleasant.

Likewise, a representational view of pleasure would be the view that pleasure itself involves, perhaps amongst other things, representational contents as of experiencing the effects of something pleasant. It is easy to see how a state or process with those representational characteristics would be likely to be brought about by the subject's believing that he is on the receiving end of something pleasant. So, the flattered person takes himself to be loved or befriended (1371a24) and presumably takes this to be a pleasant thing for him. He thus sees himself as enjoying the beneficial effects of something pleasant. This is of course not the same as feeling pleasure at that thing, but on the representational view, it is already to have in place precisely the kind of basis on which one might expect to come to have an experience involving representations as of experiencing the effects of something pleasant. That is, to see something as pleasant is already to be on the path to feeling pleasure at it. The

contents of the former ('that is pleasant') implies or suggests the contents of the latter ('this—its effect—is pleasure').

Representational views of pleasure thus make it natural to suppose that a belief in something's pleasantness will give rise to pleasure at it. Hence, there will be cases where it is sufficient for something's being pleasant that it is believed to be pleasant. But this does not either imply or suggest that belief in something's pleasantness is *necessary* in order for pleasure to be taken in it. There may be things whose pleasantness is derived from their being believed to be pleasant. But this will not be true of all pleasant things. There are things that are pleasant to infants and beasts, and things that are pleasant in ways that do not seem to depend in any important way on their being believed to be any particular way by the subject. The pleasantness of a gentle massage or a warm bed might be good examples.⁶⁶ Such pleasures may not be *belief*-dependent, but on the account proposed, they will involve the subject's having an experience whose representational contents include their being restored to their natural condition—more simply, they experience some kind of feeling that this is how things should be.

The suggestion, then, is that Aristotle's initial definition of pleasure and pleasantness at 1369b33–5 characterizes pleasure experiences as involving the representation of the subject as undergoing a restoration of their nature. I have argued that the definition itself, read against its Platonic background, can be understood as offering or at least implying such an account. Certainly, it is clear that through most of *Rhetoric* 1.11, as he catalogues the things that are pleasant, he must have in mind a view of pleasure as involving representational contents of this kind.

It is now important to show that, on Aristotle's view, the representational contents of pleasure experiences should also be understood as including the thing in which pleasure is taken. If this can be shown, his view of pleasure will turn out to be precisely what is required for his view of emotions in book 2. That Aristotle sees pleasures in just this way, as involving representations of the object of pleasure, may be seen from the occurrence in 1.11 of some of the key locutions used in characterizing

⁶⁶ Even here, however, we might note that in the case of the massage, the very same sensations could be experienced as affectionate intimacy or a creepy violation or an impersonal therapeutic treatment, depending on who one took to be delivering the massage; and hence the same sensations could vary hugely in pleasantness on that basis.

the pleasures and pains involved in emotions in 2.2–11. Thus, 'lovers are constantly glad about ($\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ + genitive) the beloved' (1370b20) and at the onset of love 'pain arises at (dative) the [lover's] absence' (b24), and while grief involves a mixture of pain and pleasure, 'the pain is at ($\epsilon\pi\iota$ + dative) the fact that they are not there' (1370b26). There is no reason to think these are special cases. It seems reasonable to think that Aristotle would have recognized that in many cases for something to be pleasant in a particular way is just for it to be such as to give rise to pleasure *at that thing characterized that way*. This view of at least some pleasures has again much in common with the position set out in the *Philebus*, where the 'opinions' associated with pleasures or pains 'fill up' the pleasures and pains with their own condition.⁶⁷

9.5.4 Aristotle's 'contents of experience' view of pleasure in Rhetoric 1.11

The evidence surveyed suggests the rejection of the simple 'restoration of nature' interpretation in favour of an interpretation in which Aristotle understands pleasure as depending upon the contents of pleasure experiences. On this interpretation, 1369b33–5 might be paraphrased as follows.

Let us take it that pleasure is some motion of the soul [i.e. some representational state] as of a massive and perceptible settling into one's proper nature.⁶⁸

Some such understanding seems to be necessary to accommodate even some of these very first items in Aristotle's list of pleasant things—the

⁶⁷ *Philebus* 42a7–9.

⁶⁸ The need for a paraphrase might seem to raise a puzzle about why—if this was Aristotle's view—he did not express it more clearly. Of course, any interpretation of his definition faces the challenge of making it consistent with the rest of the chapter. The most obvious interpretation of each part of 1.11 renders Aristotle's definitions of pleasure and pleasant inconsistent with his list of things recognized as pleasant. The inclarity, on our interpretation, of his initial definition is excused somewhat by Aristotle's warning at 1369b31–2 against expecting these definitions to be too exact, and by his practical purpose in this chapter (Cf. n.1 of this chapter). He may also have seen the complexity involved in providing an adequate account of pleasure (cf. Frede, 1993, p. xlv), and thought it easier to provide a definition that only really applies straightforwardly to bodily pleasures, together with some gestures towards how it might be expanded to cover the wider range of pleasures that he recognizes. But the strongest answer to this challenge is to insist that, read against the Platonic background to which it so clearly alludes, the definition *does* include representational elements that indicate how it is to be applied to non-bodily and indeed non-veridical cases.

pleasantness of habits, for example. The same will apply, as we have seen, to many more items listed as pleasant in *Rhetoric* 1.11.⁶⁹

The key interpretative point is that 'motion of the soul' at 1369b33–4 is unlikely merely to express essentially the same point as '*aisthêtên*' at b34: the requirement that the restoration of the natural condition be sufficiently massive to be perceived. It is more likely to indicate something more complex. I have speculated that the pleasantness of habits and what is unforced could be accommodated by supposing that the motion of the soul had representational content *as of* a settling into the natural condition. But merely for pleasure (and, by implication, pain) to be representational in *this* way is insufficient to accommodate the kind of representational pleasure and pain required for emotions. These require the representational content to be not just of the state of the subject himself, but of the object or circumstances found pleasant. We saw earlier that Aristotelian emotions involve representational pleasure and pain *at the grounds for the emotion*, which might focus centrally on *some object* that is the emotion's *target*. However, it becomes clear shortly after the initial definition of pleasure that Aristotle does indeed see the representational content involved in pleasure as including pleasure's objects. Whereas in the initial definition of pleasure, what was 'perceptible' (1369b34) was the settling into the subject's proper nature, by 1370a27–32, it is clear that Aristotle takes the kind of perception (or quasi-perception) involved in pleasure to include perception of pleasure's object—the point in this passage being to establish that this can happen through memory and anticipation because of the involvement of *phantasia* in these states. The crucial point for our purposes is to notice that Aristotle is content to allow that the representational states involved in pleasure can have not just the state of the subject as their contents, but the pleasant objects too.

I have argued that in *Rhetoric* 1.11 Aristotle sees pleasure and pain as representational states, with representational contents of a kind compatible with what is required by his account, in *Rhetoric* 2.1–11, of the emotions as pleasures and pains. Still, important questions remain about

⁶⁹ We need not, however, attribute to Aristotle the view that pleasure consists *solely* in the representational contents of experience having certain features. (Nor, indeed, is Aristotle committed to such a view by the range of things he recognizes as pleasant.) For example, the possibility is left open that Aristotle might have thought, as some others have, that the representational contents of a motion of the soul could not alone properly account for the pleasurable 'feel' of pleasure.

the kind of 'motion of the soul' that pleasure or pain involves: specifically, what kind of stance is taken towards its representational content?

We start in seemingly unpromising territory, the indefinite adjective 'some' (Gk. *τινα*) from the first part of his definition of pleasure: 'some motion of the soul' (*κίνησιν τινα τῆς ψυχῆς*, b33–4). Disambiguating this expression touches on an important issue for Aristotle's understanding both of pleasure and pain, and—if the principal claims of this chapter are upheld—of emotions. Here are four possible ways to understand this phrase.

- (1) (reading *τινα* (b33) as 'some [particular] kind or other') Aristotle recognizes that there will be some particular kind of motion of the soul that all pleasure involves, but he here maintains his neutrality over which of various competing accounts might be correct. We might paraphrase as follows, '[whatever precise theory of pleasure is correct,] it is *some kind of* motion of the soul'.
- (2) (reading *τινα* (b33) as 'a certain [particular kind of]') Aristotle recognizes that all pleasure involves some particular kind of motion of the soul, but he refrains in this context from offering a more detailed characterization.
- (3) (reading *τινα* (b33) as *alienans*, and *κίνησιν* as meaning change—thus: 'a change of a kind') On this reading, Aristotle is here characterizing (or beginning to characterize), albeit rather sketchily, the kind of motion of the soul that pleasure involves. He characterizes it as 'a change—sort of' in the soul, i.e. a *pseudo*-change or a *quasi*-change. Perhaps he has in mind that pleasure is the *energeia* of some part in its best condition. Accordingly, *τινα* signals that the state of pleasure is not strictly speaking a *κίνησις* in the sense discussed in, for example, *De Anima* 2.5.⁷⁰
- (4) 'Some motion' is deliberately an indefinite phrase, since, even on the most precise understanding of them, pleasures can involve various kinds of motion. On this view, a correct definition of pleasure *could not* be more precise than this. Although the motions of the soul that are involved in pleasure must meet certain conditions (e.g. that they have certain kinds of representational content), still pleasure is, on this view, not a matter of being *some particular*

⁷⁰ Cf. Burnyeat (2002) and Heinaman (2007). The point that pleasure is strictly speaking not a *κίνησις* need not be denied on the other readings. There is nothing in the context to indicate that *κίνησιν* bears any particularly technical sense.

kind of motion of the soul. Rather *any* kind of motion of the soul (or any of a number of different kinds of motion) can constitute a pleasure, so long as those other conditions are met.

Each of these seems a plausible option as a reading of Aristotle's intended meaning here.

9.5.5 *The 'activity view' and the 'features view'*

The most significant difference between these interpretations concerns whether pleasure (or being pleased) is a kind of thing that we do, or whether it is a feature that may be possessed by our doing of something else. All of (1), (2), and (3) attribute to Aristotle the view that pleasure is some kind of thing the soul does (or something the animal does in virtue of being ensouled), correlative with believing and perceiving. On this view, it would be a proper task for the student of nature to establish what exactly this activity is, the nature of its objects, and perhaps also the part of the body with which it is done. Call this the 'activity view'. By contrast, (4) attributes to Aristotle the view that pleasure happens when the soul does something *else* in such a way as to constitute pleasure. On this view, sensations, thoughts, beliefs, desires, and perceptions might all constitute pleasures if their occurrence has certain features. Call this the 'features view'. The most obvious feature would be that their represented contents in some way include the effects of some pleasant object, and perhaps the pleasant object itself.

9.5.6 *Exegetical reasons (from elsewhere in Aristotle) for preferring the features view*

There does not seem to be any obvious evidence in the immediate context in the *Rhetoric* on the basis of which to adjudicate between these readings. I briefly suggest two considerations that tell somewhat in favour of the 'features view'.

First, the features view seems more easily compatible with views in the ethical treatises. In particular, it seems easier to accommodate on this view the insight that enjoying doing something is not something over and beyond doing that thing.⁷¹ It is an attribute of one's doing it, or some feature of the manner in which it is done.

⁷¹ Cf. *EN* 1153a7–17.

Second, the features view sits well with the brief discussion of pleasure and pain in *De Anima* 3.7, 431a8–14. There it seems clear that there is no separate faculty of pleasure or pain, they are exercises of the perceptual faculty. Conceivably in this passage from the *DA*, Aristotle is only concerned with bodily pleasure and pain, and it will be true of all such cases that they involve perception—bodily sensation, in fact. The bodily sensations that are pains are those where the perceptual system is activated by a painful object. Such an activation of sensory capacity has some key features—features, it seems, of its objects and how they are represented—that make it a case of pain. It looks as though the features view is how Aristotle is thinking of pain in this passage in the *De Anima*, and this lends support to attributing to him a similar view in the *Rhetoric*.

Tentatively, then, the features view will be adopted in considering the philosophical merits of what I have proposed is Aristotle's view: that emotions are pleasures and pains.

In summary, making sense of the definitions of pleasure at the start of *Rhetoric* 1.11 is tricky. Doubtless, what Aristotle provides is adequate for the purpose of the treatise, but it is frustrating to have little more than gestures towards how the whole account could be understood consistently. Nevertheless, a combination of reading the definitions against the Platonic background to which they allude, and careful attention to the remainder of the chapter, gives a basis for affirming reasonably confidently that Aristotle did here understand pleasure as involving the kind of representational contents required for his account of the emotions in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11, that is, it provides enough support for upholding both our claim 1 and claim 2.

9.6 Philosophical Advantages of Understanding the Emotions as Pleasures and Pains

It is beyond the scope of the present project to evaluate fully the merits of the view of the emotions that emerges from my treatment of Aristotle's text. Nevertheless, it is worth indicating some important merits possessed by an account of emotions in which they are understood as pleasures and pains.

Three principal advantages possessed by an understanding of emotions as pleasures and pains are (1) a kind of parsimony in our

explanation of mental phenomena, (2) a unity between various aspects of emotional experience, and (3) that (at least on the features view of pleasure and pain) his theory will be compatible with whatever turns out to be the correct explanation of recalcitrant emotions.

The parsimony advantage can be initially canvassed as follows. The following seem to be three kinds of mental phenomena.

1. Pleasant and painful bodily sensations.
2. Pain and pleasure at things being thus and so.
3. Emotions.

It obviously simplifies the task of explaining what these things are if the things in (3) are all or part of what falls within (2). Likewise, the task is simplified still further if the resources for the explanation of the things in (2) are wholly or largely available from the explanation of the things in (1). Seeing emotions as pains and pleasures thus immediately simplifies an explanatory task in psychology. On the 'features view' of pleasure and pain one might go further and suggest that the explanation of both emotions and (if distinct from emotions) of pains/pleasures at things being thus and so will require no more than the various attitudes (belief, desire, judgement, etc.) towards represented content that an account of the mind is likely to require *anyway*, plus an account of what makes such attitudes painful or pleasant. This gives this view an explanatory advantage over views of emotions as *sui generis* states.⁷² For on such views, emotions represent an addition to the tally of explanatory tools required for an adequate psychology.

The unity issue may be illustrated as follows.

- | | |
|-------|--|
| | Judging that something bad will happen |
| + | Having an unpleasant sensation |
| + | Having a desire to run away |
| + | Having a certain body temperature |
| <hr/> | |
| ≠ | Having the emotion of fear. |

And this lack of unity does not seem to be alleviated by supposing that the unpleasant sensation was *caused* by judging that something bad will

⁷² E.g. Goldie (2000) and Whiting (2006).

happen. In general, the requirement is that the various elements of an emotion—the cognitions and consequent rational and inferential relations, the phenomenology, associated motivations, and the physiological changes involved—should possess the right kind of unity. If emotions are pleasures and pains, and if the latter are best understood as features possessed by other kinds of mental phenomena (i.e. they are painful sensations, or pleasurable thoughts, painful imaginings, pleasurable memories), then the unity is easy to explain.

Pitying Jessica, on this account, might be the painful judgement that she is suffering undeservedly (where what is painful about the judgement is its object: that she is suffering undeservedly).

The fact that this is a judgement implies that it is rational if the subject has good evidence that Jessica is suffering undeservedly, and that pity for her should cease if they knew that her suffering had ceased, or was deserved.⁷³ The fact that the judgement is painful accounts for its phenomenal character. But additionally, for the judgement to be genuinely painful probably requires the deployment of some specific bodily apparatus in the way the judgement is instantiated.⁷⁴ The fact that Jessica's undeserved suffering is found painful readily explains why pity of this kind constitutes a motivation to bring it about that she not suffer undeservedly, i.e. to alleviate her suffering. A view of emotions as pleasures and pains thus seems to offer considerable strengths in terms of parsimony in psychology, and in meeting a unity requirement for emotional states that rival accounts may find harder to meet.

One thing that an account of emotions in terms of pain and pleasure does not do is answer the question, 'what kind of stance towards their represented content is involved in emotions?'. For, on this account, pains

⁷³ In the next chapter, I defend the view that for Aristotle, the passions involve not judgements but exercises of *phantasia*. Nevertheless, the possibility that emotions might involve judgements illustrates most clearly the ways in which feelings, motivations, and epistemic credentials can be explained in a unified way on the view that emotions are pleasures and pains at objects represented in particular ways.

⁷⁴ Sensing (visually) that my foot is painful is not the same as feeling pain in my foot, even though both are sensory perceptions as of a painful object. Apprehending the object in a pain-involving way may typically implicate particular parts of the body in the apprehension. This is so even on an entirely representational account of pain: having a sensation with *exactly that* content might involve the proprio-perceptual system, or the eyes and visual system, or the nose and olfactory system.

and pleasures may come in various shapes and sizes involving a variety of different stances towards the content represented. As a consequence, they may vary as to the logical and inferential relations in which they stand to other mental states. Feeling pain at the breakdown of a friendship whilst denying that this friendship has broken down is irrational. Feeling pain in my foot whilst denying that I have a foot—so-called ‘phantom limb pain’ felt by some amputees—is not irrational. The difference between these two cases seems best explained as the former being a painful belief or judgement and the latter being a painful sensation. There are puzzles that arise with some emotions when they persist in the face of conflicting better knowledge. Thus, feeling afraid of the spider I know not to be fearsome is irrational; but it is not as irrational as simultaneously affirming and denying that the spider is fearsome. The puzzle over how to characterize the stance involved in such emotions towards the content represented is not solved by supposing fear to involve pain. But it is clear that this view of emotions will be compatible with whatever the correct characterization of that stance turns out to be.

9.7 Conclusion

Aristotle insists on two key features in his account of the passions. One is that they play a role (or are capable of playing a role) in verdict formation. The other is that they involve pleasure and pain. I have focused in this chapter on the latter and argued for the view that the involvement of pleasure or pain is essential to Aristotelian emotions, and that this view does not involve him in strong or implausible claims about pleasure or pain being the *genus* of any or all passions. With these qualifications, his position is that the emotions are pleasures and pains at certain supposed states of affairs, typically focused on some object. This claim puts pressure on his understanding of pleasure and pain, since it must be the case that there *are* genuine pleasures and pains of the right kind to be involved in the passions. This requires a representational theory of pleasure and pain, not merely one specified in terms of physiological process. The representational contents of the state should include the object at which pleasure or pain is experienced, as well as how the subject is affected by the pleasantness or painfulness of the object.

I have recorded a number of reservations about Aristotle's account. It is not completely clear how every one of the individual emotion types fits his overall account, and we have seen that perhaps, in the end, some cannot be made to fit it. Perhaps the greatest frustration with his account is that he does not specify, at least not to the level of precision we might hope for, the stance towards their represented content that emotions involve.

As such, his account in *Rhetoric* 2.1–11 is imperfect. Nevertheless, these reservations should not blind us to the considerable merits and interest of what may not improperly be called Aristotle's theory of the emotions.

10

Feeling Fantastic Again— Passions, Appearances, and Beliefs in Aristotle

10.1 Introduction

At the end of Chapter 6, we saw that Aristotle saw passion-based proofs, like other kinds of rhetorical proof, as involving the justified acceptance of premises, in such a way as to transmit this justification onto the conclusion, thereby increasing its epistemic good standing. If audience passions can constitute the justified acceptance of premises in this way, they must (among other things) constitute the acceptance of suitable representational contents as true. But it has been doubted whether the passions themselves, for Aristotle, implicate their subject in this kind of ‘acceptance’. The issue is connected with the psychological mechanisms involved in Aristotelian passions, and specifically, with how Aristotle characterized the representational aspect of those passions.

Consider, for example, the following remarks about pity (*eleos*):

Let pity be a pain at apparent harm that is destructive or painful befalling one who does not deserve it, and which one could foresee being suffered by oneself or one of one’s own, and where this appears near. (Rhetoric 2.8, 1385b13–16)

In thinking about the representational aspect of Aristotelian passions, we might distinguish a number of distinct questions that arise.

1. In virtue of the exercise of what psychological faculty do passions have their representational contents?
2. What type of attitude towards their representational contents do passions themselves involve (for the subject herself, for a part of her soul)?

3. If the passions involve *phantasia*, how do they fit within Aristotle's views on the role of (evaluative and non-evaluative) *phantasia* in the psychology of humans and other animals?
4. What kinds of conflict does Aristotle recognize as occurring between passions and beliefs, and what resources does he have for explaining these?

Addressing these questions involves engaging with a recent debate about whether for Aristotle the representational state involved in human passions is belief (*doxa*) or appearance (*phantasia*).¹ Distinguishing these questions, however, already represents significant progress towards resolving this disagreement.²

I have changed my mind on the role of *phantasia* in Aristotelian passions, and now defend the following view. According to Aristotle, being in a passionate state constitutes an affirmation by the subject herself (not only by a part of her soul) of the way things are represented as being the way things are, where the representations involved are the result of exercising a capacity he calls *phantasia* (roughly, 'appearances').³ Thus, it is part of feeling pity that the subject affirm that the

¹ For the view that Aristotelian passions involve *phantasia*, see e.g. Cooper (1996); Sihvola (1996); Striker (1996); Nieuwenburg (2002); Price (2009); Moss (2012a, ch.4). For arguments against the view that such passions can involve merely uncommitted appearance, see e.g. Dow (2009); and for the view that they must involve *doxa*, see e.g. Nussbaum (1994) and Fortenbaugh (2002). Fortenbaugh's view is unusual in that he insists that it is not the passions themselves but their causes that have representational content; cf. Dow (2011, pp. 58–9) for criticism of this view.

² They were not adequately distinguished in the conclusion of Dow (2009). Many of those who canvass the involvement of appearances and *phantasia* are principally concerned with identifying the psychological capacity involved, e.g. Nieuwenburg (2002), Price (2009), and Moss (2012a), whereas those who canvass the view that passions involve belief are concerned to stress that the subject takes things to be as they are represented, e.g. Nussbaum (1994) and Dow (2009)—thus these concerns need not conflict. The issue is complicated, however, by arguments that link the two questions. Cooper (1993, pp. 191–2), 1996, pp. 246–7, 1999, pp. 416–17, Striker (1996, p. 291), and Sihvola (1996, pp. 59–60) all suggest that a central reason why Aristotle saw passions as involving *phantasia* was that he wanted to allow for the possibility of passions completely unendorsed by their subject (the suggestion is resisted in Dow (2009)). In general, the distinction highlighted here is obscured by too close an association between the psychological faculty of *phantasia* and cases of mere appearance to which the subject gives no endorsement, such as the sun's appearing about a foot across when it is known to be huge. These issues and the relevant passages in Aristotle are discussed in greater detail later.

³ I defended a somewhat different view in Dow (2009). The kind of 'affirmation' intended in this claim will be specified further later in the chapter.

object of their pity is suffering undeservedly: it is this suffering that makes them an object of their distress,⁴ and pity typically gives the subject some inclination to behave in ways that are appropriate only if these representations are true (perhaps to alleviate the suffering).

I also contend that the *phantasmata* involved in the passions fall within the scope of what Aristotle says should happen when *phantasia* conflicts with another psychological faculty. For Aristotle, the animal as a whole should affirm (or 'act according to') the way things are represented by the more authoritative faculty. The kind of *phantasia* relevant to the passions, where things are represented as pleasant and painful, also falls within the purview of Aristotle's insistence that the non-reasoning parts of the soul should listen to reason, as to one's father or friend (*EN* 1.13, 1102b25–33). That is, *phantasmata* of this kind should have their content regulated by what correct reason affirms. Aristotle's explanations of how passions can conflict with reasoned beliefs can thus draw on his resources for explaining how in general appearances can diverge from beliefs, and specifically how pleasures and pains can persist in conflict with what the subject believes is truly pleasant or painful.

Aristotle seems to think that—except in highly unusual cases—adult humans simply do not have persisting passions whose contents they *wholly* repudiate. Aristotle thinks that in general human passions are aroused either where the subject's beliefs afford them some support or where the subject's reasoning is disabled (for example, through sleep or drunkenness). Of course, Aristotle's view that the passions involve an exercise of *phantasia* opens up the possibility of conflict with *doxa* (belief), but the kind of conflict he seems to recognize as actually occurring is largely confined to cases where reason endorses the passion as warranted, while rejecting it as an *overall* response to the situation, i.e. cases like Odysseus's anger against the servant girls in *Odyssey* 20 (cf. *EN* 7.6, 1149a25–34),⁵ or like pleasure-*akrasia*, where reason endorses *phantasia*'s appraisal of the object as pleasant, but repudiates its overall verdict on the object's goodness and pleasantness (cf. *DA* 3.10, 433b5–10). Where a person believes that (say) fear is *wholly* unwarranted, i.e. that there is *nothing* genuinely fearsome present, Aristotle

⁴ Cf. e.g. 1385b13–16, and Chapter 9, for the view that pity just *is* this distress.

⁵ This is distinct from the additional role for reason in *thumos-akrasia* that Aristotle recognizes at 1149a25–6, 33.

seems to think they will not feel fear, despite the presence of *phantasmata* representing fearsome things: those appearances will leave them unmoved (*DA* 3.3, 427b21–4).

10.2 What Is the Significance of These Claims?

This account of the representational aspects of Aristotelian passions, I contend, not only fits best with Aristotle's views on biology, ethics, and rhetoric, but also gives him a philosophically attractive position.

First, the claim that the passions involve an exercise of the capacity *phantasia* makes possible for Aristotle a view in which the passions of human adults, children, and non-human animals all deploy the same kinds of processes. For children and most non-human animals, certainly all of those Aristotle mentions as experiencing passions,⁶ have representational capacities that are, in his view, limited to *aisthêsis* (sensation) and *phantasia* (sensory impressions), and certainly do not include the capacities for belief (*doxa*), supposition (*hypolêpsis*), or conviction (*pistis*).⁷ If human and non-human passions involve the same kinds of capacities, not merely *analogous* capacities, then the former are continuous with the latter (differing from them 'by the more and the less'), as seems to be Aristotle's view in *History of Animals* 8.⁸ It is also plausible in its own right. Passions very much like anger, fear, jealousy, and so on seem to be experienced by creatures cognitively less complex than adult humans, so it is a merit of one's biological and psychological views to have an account of such passions that is largely common across adult humans, children, and non-human animals.

A second merit of the claim that passionate representations are provided by *phantasia* is that it is consistent with the ethical works about how the passions are independent from reason, are capable of agreeing with reason (in virtuous cases) or disagreeing (in cases of *akrasia* or *enkrateia*), and belong to the non-reasoning part of the soul.⁹ Aristotle emphasizes that the part to which the passions belong 'heeds' reason (*ἐπιπείθεις λόγῳ*, *EN* 1.7, 1098a4), is 'in a way persuaded by reason' (*EN*

⁶ The evidence for Aristotle's attribution of passions to non-human animals is presented and discussed in Fortenbaugh (1971), Sorabji (1993, ch.4), and Sihvola (1996).

⁷ Cf. e.g. *De Anima* 3.3, 427b7–8, b11–14, 428a21–4.

⁸ *HA* 8.1, 588a18–30.

⁹ Cf. Moss (2009); Moss (2012a); Price (2009).

1.13, 1102b33), by nature 'is persuaded by', 'listens to', and 'follows' reason (*EE* 2.1, 1219b30–1, 1220a10–11). Thus the passionate part is independent from the reasoning part, does not itself undertake reasoning, but is representational and can and should conform its evaluative representational content to that endorsed by the reasoning part, though in reality it does not always do so. This is confirmed by a comparison between the behaviour of this part of the soul in the self-controlled person and its behaviour in the virtuous: in the self-controlled, it submits to (*πειθαρχεῖ*, *EN* 1.13, 1102b26) reason, whereas in the virtuous, it is 'more heedful still' (*ἔτι ἐνῆκοώτερόν*, b27), for 'it agrees with reason in everything' (*πάντα γὰρ ὁμοφωνεῖ τῷ λόγῳ*, b28).¹⁰

A third merit of the proposed interpretation is that it is consistent with what Aristotle says about the use of emotion-arousal in rhetoric. On this view, Aristotelian passions can be felt precisely *because* they are epistemically reasonable to feel in the light of the agent's beliefs. If the agent then draws conclusions based on the way things seem to him in his passionate state, it seems plausible to suppose that those conclusions will inherit the epistemic credentials of the passionate state that gave rise to them.¹¹ For example, if I am justified in envying someone's undeserved prosperity, my consequent disinclination to believe that they are the undeserving victim of serious harm will also be justified.¹² In this way, arousing the passions of an audience can be a way of giving them proper grounds for conviction.¹³

¹⁰ This last phrase confirms that we should think of the passionate part here as exercising a *representational* capacity that can agree in content with the reasoning part, and not merely as exercising a *motivational* capacity in ways that coincide with the prescriptions of the rational part. Such a view is also suggested by the allusion to *akrasia* in *DA* 3.10, 433b7–10, where it is suggested that *nous* and *epithumia* each makes assertions, which differ in the akratic case (because of *epithumia*'s inability to consider the future as *nous* can). Cf. D'Arms and Jacobson (2000, pp. 65–900, and Salmela (2006) on standards of appropriateness and correctness for emotions.

¹¹ This seems to me implied in the claim that the passionate part of the soul 'has reason' in a way that is derived from the successful reasoning of the rational part (*EN* 1.13, 1102b30–2).

¹² Cf. *Rhet* 2.9, 1387a3–5, b16–21; 2.10, 1388a27–30. The move from envying someone (as enjoying prosperity) to being unable to pity them (as not suffering undeservedly) seems to be made inferentially.

¹³ Cf. e.g. *Rhet* 1.1, 1355a3–6; 1.2, 1356a1–4; 2.1, 1377b20–4, 1378a19–20. See Chapter 2 for a defence of 'proper grounds for conviction' as a gloss of Aristotle's term *πίστις* in the *Rhetoric*.

By contrast, if passions do not involve any endorsement of their representational contents, and the subject remains uncommitted to them, then it is hard to see how they can provide a source of epistemic justification for any conclusion inferred from them, just as a premise that is merely hypothesized can contribute no epistemic merit to a conclusion inferred from it.

Thus, the proposed account fits well with Aristotle's views on biology, ethics, and rhetoric.

It also has considerable philosophical merits. Some of these can be seen by focusing on the question, 'what kind of attitude towards their representational contents does Aristotle think is involved in the passions?'. In contemporary philosophy and psychology, an important test of the merits of answers to this question is how well they account for 'recalcitrant emotions',¹⁴ i.e. cases where the subject's emotion arises or persists despite being in recognized conflict with their better beliefs or knowledge.¹⁵ Recalcitrant emotions present an interesting set of *desiderata* for any account of the type of attitude towards their representational content that emotions involve.¹⁶

1. It should not render such cases impossible or exceptional.
2. It should explain why emotions usually *are* responsive to the subject's better beliefs.
3. It should account for the conflict/inconsistency in which they implicate the subject.
4. It should account for the failing involved in having recalcitrant emotional responses.
5. It should not overstate the failing involved in having recalcitrant emotional responses.

¹⁴ The terminology is from Brady (2007, 2008). In psychology, one might consider the debate between Robert Zajonc (1984) and Richard Lazarus (1984). In philosophy, examples include Greenspan (1988), Gordon (1990), Helm (2001), Nussbaum (2001), and Prinz (2004). A similar strategy is also evident in Gendler (2008), in defending a thesis that ranges considerably beyond the emotions.

¹⁵ Some have argued that Aristotle saw the passions as involving *phantasia* because of how this enabled him to explain recalcitrant emotions on the model of visual illusions. E.g. Cooper (1996), Sihvola (1996), and Striker (1996); criticized in Dow (2009).

¹⁶ Dow (2009) discusses the problems these present for judgement- or perceptual appearance-based theories of emotion.

The first and second *desiderata* require that the psychological system that generates emotions be distinct from and (at least to some extent) independent of the reasoning processes for forming and regulating beliefs. The third *desideratum* goes beyond the observation that the representational content of a recalcitrant emotion is inconsistent with what the subject believes. For there can be 'inconsistency' of that kind between imaginings and beliefs without any sense that the subject is conflicted or holds inconsistent attitudes.¹⁷ A theory of emotion must provide (or allow for) an explanation of the fact that the subject of recalcitrant emotions is in some sense 'pulled in different directions'.¹⁸ The fourth and fifth *desiderata* together present the requirement *both* to explain how the subject of recalcitrant emotions fails to comply with some norm of rationality that is successfully met by (say) the person whose fear of the spider is extinguished by better knowledge,¹⁹ *and* to avoid assimilating their irrationality to that exhibited by someone who simultaneously judges both something and that thing's negation.²⁰

In the final section (section 10.7), I argue that, with respect to the full range of these *desiderata*, the view I am attributing to Aristotle has considerable merit as an account of the emotions. But we may immediately here make the straightforward observation that if the passions involve an exercise of *phantasia*, this obviously allows for the possibility of conflict with the subject's considered beliefs (which are an exercise of *doxa*). That is, it meets *desideratum* 1.

First, however, I attempt to show that the proposed view is indeed Aristotle's.

¹⁷ Helm (2001, pp. 41–6). Cf. also Pitcher (1965, pp. 324–46). Prinz (2004, pp. 237–40) attempts to address such concerns, in response to Pitcher, but fails to do so satisfactorily. See also Döring (2003) and Salmela (2006).

¹⁸ This can, but need not, be understood as having conflicting practical motivations. Cf. Elster (1999, 2004); Sripada and Stich (2004). This approach seems to me unpromising, since it is obviously possible to experience emotions that are clearly recalcitrant but where the motivations they generate happen to be congruent with the agent's goals.

¹⁹ Cf. Brady (2007, 2008); in line with a tradition going back to Pascal (*Pensées*, 2.82); Hume (*Treatise*, ch.26). Others affirm these *desiderata*, but restrict their scope to those passions over which the subject has control, e.g. Döring (2003, p. 223), Prinz (2004, pp. 236–9), and Salmela (2006, p. 396); enlisting (implausibly, to my mind) Hume to their cause.

²⁰ Cf. Greenspan (1988, pp. 17–20); Helm (2001, pp. 41–2); Döring (2003, p. 223).

10.3 Aristotelian Passions Involve Exercising *Phantasia*

Although it is the *Rhetoric* that contains Aristotle's most developed treatment of the passions, his concerns there are primarily those relevant to an orator wishing to arouse them. So, we do not find careful and explicit answers to questions about how the passions fit into Aristotle's wider views about the psychological capacities of humans (and non-human animals). So we must look wider—mostly to the *De Anima*, and the ethical works—for evidence of his views, and then check the picture developed from this wider set of texts for consistency with his remarks in the *Rhetoric*.²¹ My principal concern in this section, then, is to argue that for Aristotle, the representational aspect of the passions is an exercise of *phantasia*—a capacity to store and use sensory representations.²²

For some interpreters, notably John Cooper, the evidence is staring us in the face, from the text of the *Rhetoric* itself. Aristotle, throughout *Rhetoric* 2.2–11, uses the terms *phantasia* (appearance) and *phainomenos* (apparent) in his explanations of the distinctive outlook, and hence the distinctive representational contents, involved in each type of passion that he discusses. One example is the definition of pity given previously. Another is his account of anger.²³

Let anger be a desire-cum-pain for apparent (*φαινομένης*) revenge on account of an apparent (*φαινομένην*) slight against oneself or one of one's own, from someone with no business doing so. (*Rhetoric* 2.2, 1378a30–2)

These interpreters take this as Aristotle indicating that the psychological faculty involved in such passions is *phantasia*, or at least that these texts create a presumption in favour of this view.²⁴ This seems to

²¹ One cannot, of course, simply *presuppose* that Aristotle's views are consistent across all his works. But it is appropriately charitable to seek a single consistent interpretation; and, if one can be found, it seems reasonable, then, to use one work to elucidate another.

²² Cf. esp. Everson (1999), Caston (1996, 1998), and Moss (2012a) and bibliography there.

²³ Similar terminology is used in the definitions of calmness (1380a10–12), fear (1382a21–5), confidence (1383a16–19), shame and shamelessness (1383b12–15), indignation (1387a8–9), envy (1387b22–5), and emulation (1388a32–5), as well as elsewhere in the detailed treatment of the various types of passion.

²⁴ E.g. Cooper (1996, pp. 246–7, 1999, pp. 416–17) and Nieuwenburg (2002); more cautiously, Price (2009, pp. 133–5) and now Moss (2012a, p. 70); I argue against this view in Dow (2009, pp. 151–5).

me mistaken, stemming from a failure to take seriously the context (an explanation of rhetorical techniques) in which these texts are found. I will give my preferred interpretation of these texts later, but mention them now to set them aside: I do not think they constitute *any* evidence for the view that passions involve *phantasia*. The most one should say is that the use of the words *phantasia* and *phainesthai* as technical terms in the psychological works does not present an obstacle to their use here, since Aristotle does in fact think that the passions involve the capacity of *phantasia*.

Instead, I present two arguments—each convincing alone, but together certainly decisive—for the claim that the representational aspect of the passions is, for Aristotle, an exercise of *phantasia*.²⁵

10.3.1 *Passions and parts of the soul*

The first argument is that for Aristotle the passions belong to a 'part' of the soul whose representational capacities include sensation and *phantasia*, but not reason or intellect. Since the representational content of most passions is not given by a current sensory experience, in at least these cases (and arguably in all cases), the representational element of the passions must be an exercise of *phantasia*.

Aristotle is often cautious about speaking of 'parts' of the soul. His preferred approach involves identifying and distinguishing psychological capacities.²⁶ In *De Anima* 1, he identifies some capacities as clearly involving the body, and others as candidates for involving the soul alone (1.1, 403a3–10). Anger, confidence, appetite, and perception are among the former (a7), to which shortly afterwards he adds 'all the passions' (a16), whereas thinking is an example of the latter (a8), though

²⁵ My understanding here owes a considerable debt to Price (2009) and Moss (2012a), and to exchanges with their authors. I leave aside here some other arguments from Nieuwenburg (2002) and Moss (2012a). The fact that the pleasures of anger are signalled as exercises of *phantasia* (*Rhetoric* 2.2, 1378b9–10) can be readily agreed by someone who denies that *phantasia* is involved in the way the objects of the passions are represented. There is no inconsistency involved in supposing that anger requires *believing* one has been slighted, even if it requires no more than *imagining* getting revenge. More promising is *Rhetoric* 2.8, 1386a29–b1, in which Aristotle advocates various kinds of acting in order to make misfortunes seem 'near' (pity's objects are represented as near, 1385b15), but one might still insist that these techniques work because they influence the audience's *beliefs*.

²⁶ Cf. *DA* 2.2, 413b13–32; 3.9, 432a22–b7; 3.10, 433b1–4; *EN* 1.13, 1102a26–32; *EE* 2.1, 1219b32–6.

even thinking will require the body if it turns out (as Aristotle thinks it does) that thinking involves *phantasia* (a8–10). It is evident from this that he considers *phantasia* a capacity whose exercise clearly involves the body. Aristotle, then, thinks that passions involve the body, but in addition, his account of anger at 403a26–7 suggests that he thinks specifically that the representational aspects of the passions are themselves instantiated in the bodily processes associated with each passion. Thus, anger is the boiling of blood and hot stuff around the heart, because of such-and-such, for the sake of such-and-such.²⁷ The representation of revenge as an object of desire, and probably also of the slight that occasioned the angry response, are also here seen as bodily processes. If so, it is clear that these aspects of the passions cannot be an exercise of thinking processes that, at this stage in the *De Anima*, Aristotle allows are possible candidates for separation from the body. Of the body-involving capacities listed in *De Anima* 1.1, there are two that are clearly representational: sensation (*aisthêsis*) and *phantasia*. If the passions involve an exercise of one of these, it must be *phantasia*, since the objects of passions are frequently not objects of current sensory experience.²⁸

The same view is evident in the ethical treatises. There he recognizes a wholly non-reasoning part—the nutritive part, and two other parts that ‘have reason’—one that itself exercises reason, i.e. engages in reasoning, and one that does not itself engage in reasoning, but ‘has reason’ in the sense that it is able to be guided by reason.²⁹ Aristotle clearly locates the passions³⁰ (and related excellences)³¹ in this latter ‘part’ of the soul. But now the representational resources of this part of the soul do not extend

²⁷ The general form of Aristotle’s preferred account is given in a26–7, and the specific details for anger are fleshed out somewhat in a30–b1; cf. Charles (2011).

²⁸ Aristotle’s *prima facie* puzzling implication at 403a7 that anger, confidence, and appetite are species of perception can be read as confirming this conclusion. For Aristotle thinks that *phantasia* is a particular type of exercise of the perceptual capacity (cf. *De Insomn.* 459a16–17; *DA* 3.3, 428b11–17; and note how at *DA* 3.3, 428a9 he is careful to reject only the possibility that *phantasia* and *aisthêsis* are identical ‘in actuality’, which leaves open the possibility that the potentiality for *phantasia* is identical with the potentiality for *aisthêsis*); cf. discussion in Everson (1999, pp. 157–8) and Whiting (2002, pp. 154–63). The claim that such an exercise of *phantasia* is not merely a part but the whole of a passion is a stronger claim, but seems required by the most natural reading of 403a7.

²⁹ *EN* 1.13, 1102a27–1103a3; *EE* 2.1, 1219b26–1220a4.

³⁰ *EE* 2.1, 1220a8–12; 2.4, 1221b27–34; *EN* 1.13, 1103a3–8.

³¹ *EN* 2.6, 1106b16–23; *EE* 2.2, 1220b5–14; 2.3, 1220b34–1221b17; 2.5, 1222b4–14; *Pol* 1.5, 1254b2–9, noting ‘the passionate part’ (τῷ παθητικῷ μορίῳ, b8).

to capacities (such as *doxa*, or *pistis*) that involve reasoning,³² and seem to be limited once again to *aisthêsis* and *phantasia*, of which the latter is the suitable candidate for involvement in the passions.³³

Likewise, when Aristotle, in *Rhetoric* 1.10, distinguishes kinds of motivation for human action, he identifies anger (*ὀργή*) and appetite (*ἐπιθυμία*) as kinds of non-reasoning desire (*ἄλογοι ὀρέξεις*, 1369a4). If Aristotle endorses this classification,³⁴ he cannot think that these states essentially involve the exercise of reasoning-based representational capacities, which seems once again to reduce the possible candidates for the capacity involved to sensation and *phantasia*.

10.3.2 *Passions, pleasure, and pain*

The second argument proceeds from the view that for Aristotle passions essentially involve pleasure and pain.³⁵ This seems clear from a number of passages about the passions in general.

The passions are those on account of which we change and differ in our judgements, and which are accompanied by pleasure and pain, for example, anger, pity, fear, and others of this kind, and their opposites.

(*Rhetoric* 2.1, 1378a19–22)

³² Cf. *DA* 3.3, 428a18–24.

³³ If when Aristotle refers to the 'desiderative' part (*τὸ ὀρεκτικόν*), his terminology indicates (perhaps among other things) that this part is the seat of the passions (as Moss (2012a, p. 72) suggests, plausibly, on the basis of *EE* 1221b31 and *EN* 1102b30), then the conclusion receives some confirmation from the apparent reference to one and the same faculty as 'perceptive and desiderative' (*EE* 2.1, 1219b23), and from his assertion at *DA* 3.7, 431a12–14 that the bearer of the capacities of desire and aversion is not a different thing (*οὐχ ἕτερον*) from the bearer of perceptual capacities, though its being is different (*ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶναι ἄλλο*). Cf. also, relatedly, *Phys* 7.3, 246b20–247a19, discussed later. The proposal in Whiting (2002), that practical *νοῦς* (e.g. *DA* 433a9, 14) also stands in the same relationship—sameness in number, difference in being—to this perceptive/imaginative/appetitive/passionate part would not undermine the argument, at least insofar as it rests on texts that make use of a contrast between reasoning and non-reasoning 'parts' of the soul, and locates belief (*δόξα*) in the former and perception, *phantasia*, and the passions in the latter.

³⁴ One might doubt this, on the basis that *Rhet* 1.4–15 provides merely reputable materials for rhetorical arguments (cf. 1.2, 1356b28–1357a1; 1359a26–9). But that this particular section (1368b28–1369b29) represents (also) Aristotle's own views is strongly suggested by a use of the first-person singular (1369b23), and a forward reference to *Rhetoric* 2.2 for an account of anger—since he must think the latter not merely reputable but true, given its purpose of facilitating anger-arousal (cf. 1378a22–6).

³⁵ Cf. Dow (2011) for the stronger claim that Aristotelian passions *are* pleasures and pains.

By passions I mean appetite, anger, fear, confidence, envy, joy, love, hatred, yearning, emulation, pity, and in general the things that are accompanied by pleasure or pain. (*EN* 2.5, 1105b21–3)

By passions I mean such things as anger/spirit (*θυμὸν*), fear, shame, appetite, and in general the things that in themselves are accompanied for the most part by sensory pleasure or pain. (*EE* 2.2, 1220b12–14)

It is also clear from how Aristotle describes the particular kinds of passions. His definition of pity has been given; equally typical is his definition of fear.³⁶

Let fear be a certain pain or disturbance from the appearance of destructive or painful harm in the future. (*Rhetoric* 2.5, 1382a21–2)

In the *Rhetoric* and elsewhere Aristotle takes pleasures and pains to require, and perhaps simply to be, exercises of perception and *phantasia*.³⁷

Since feeling pleasure is in the perceiving of some condition, and *phantasia* is a kind of weak perception, there would always be in the person remembering or looking forward some *phantasia* of the thing he is remembering or looking forward to. And if so, it is clear that as people remember and look forward they will simultaneously also have pleasures, since perception too is present.

(*Rhetoric* 1.11, 1370a27–32)

So, Aristotle sees the passions as involving sensory pleasure and pain, which itself involves an exercise of *phantasia*, itself a particular kind of exercise of the capacity for sensation (*aisthêsis*).

That this reasoning is Aristotelian is confirmed by its appearance at *Physics* 7.3. He is defending the claim that virtues are not alterations, but allows that their acquisition is accompanied by alterations of the sensitive part. He explains that the virtues of the soul³⁸ involve being in a good condition with regard to its proper affections (*πάθη*, *Phys.* 247a4), and acquiring them (therefore?) results from alterations of the sensitive part (*τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ μέρους*, a6–7).

³⁶ In Aristotle's list of types of passion in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11, there are some that seem to be exceptions to the claim that all passions involve pleasure or pain. These are discussed in some detail in Chapter 9, and I leave them aside here.

³⁷ E.g. *DA* 3.7, 431a10–11. Notice that in *EE* 2.2, 1220b14, Aristotle specifies that it is sensory (*αἰσθητική*) pleasure and pain that is involved in the passions. In the relevant texts, Aristotle ignores the pleasures of thought that he mentions in *EN* 10.5, 1175a21–8.

³⁸ He has in mind character virtues here, and moves on to intellectual virtues at 247b1.

For all character virtue is concerned with bodily pleasures and pains, which again depend either upon acting or upon remembering or upon anticipating. Now those that depend upon action are determined by sense-perception, and are moved by something sensible; and those that depend upon memory or anticipation are likewise to be traced to sense-perception. Thus all pleasure of this kind must be produced by sensible things; and since the presence of defect or excellence involves the presence of pleasure or pain . . . , and pleasures and pains are alterations of the sensitive part, it is evident that the loss and acquisition of these states too [viz. character virtues] must be the result of the alteration of something. (*Physics* 7.3, 247a7–18)

Since Aristotle sees the passions as involving (sensory) pain and pleasure, he sees them as involving an exercise of the sensitive part of the soul in either *aisthêsis* or *phantasia*.³⁹

10.3.3 Arguments appealing to visual illusions

The view that, for Aristotle, the passions involve an exercise of *phantasia* has been defended by appeal to a comparison between recalcitrant passions and visual illusions.⁴⁰ For example, John Cooper comments as follows on Aristotle's use of '*phantasia*' in the definitions of the types of passion in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11.

It seems likely that Aristotle is using *phantasia* here to indicate the sort of nonepistemic appearance to which he draws attention once in *De Anima* 3.3 (428b2–4), according to which something may appear to, or strike one, in some way (say, as being insulting or belittling) even if one knows there is no good reason for one to take it so. If so, Aristotle is alert to the crucial fact about the emotions, that one can experience them simply on the basis of how, despite what one knows or believes to be the case, things strike one—how things look to one when, for one reason or another, one is disposed to feel the emotion. Being unable to control an emotion is, partly, taking as a ground of it something that you know was not one at all.⁴¹

³⁹ One might reasonably suppose that what is said about the pleasures and pains that accompany the *acquisition* of virtues in the *Physics* passage applies equally to the pleasures and pains involved in the *exercise* of virtues. Cf. *EN* 2.1, 1103b13–21; 2.3, 1105a13–16.

⁴⁰ The similarity between recalcitrant passions and perceptual illusions is endorsed by Moss, but doesn't form part of her argument for the involvement of *phantasia* in the passions (Moss, 2012a, p. 65 and ch.5 *passim*).

⁴¹ Cooper (1999, p. 417). Similar lines of argument are presented in Cooper (1993, pp. 191–2), Striker (1996, p. 291), and Sihvola (1996, pp. 59–60). These arguments, and particularly the appeal to *DA* 3.3, is resisted in Dow (2009).

Cooper invokes the comparison between recalcitrant passions and visual illusions in a way that raises a number of other issues. He here clearly claims or implies all of the following.

- i. That the term '*phantasia*' carries in *Rhetoric* 2 the same meaning as it does in *De Anima* 3.3.
- ii. That Aristotelian passions involve 'non-epistemic' appearances.
- iii. That Aristotelian emotions can be wholly repudiated by their subject.
- iv. That Aristotle's view that passions involve *phantasia* was developed partly in order to account for recalcitrant emotions of this kind, analogously to visual illusions.

All except the second of these claims seem to me misguided in one way or another. Against i, I discuss in section 10.4.2 the sense of '*phantasia*' as it is used in *Rhetoric* 2.⁴² Against claims iii and iv, I consider in sections 10.4.4 and 10.6 the kinds of conflict between passions and reasoned beliefs that Aristotle recognizes, and which one might reasonably take to have shaped his views on the passions. However, the second claim is our immediate concern, in which Cooper characterizes the appearances involved in the passions as 'non-epistemic', since it is this that is central to the comparison with visual illusions. How should we understand this claim?

- i. 'Non-epistemic' may here be simply a synonym for 'non-doxastic', such that Cooper's claim is just that passionate appearances do not involve beliefs.
- ii. Claiming that passionate appearances are 'non-epistemic' may be a claim that they are not apt targets of epistemic evaluation, or that the subject is not liable to epistemic evaluation as a result of this kind of passionate experience. This kind of exemption from epistemic evaluation is typical of states in which the subject is uncommitted to the truth of their representational contents (e.g. supposing, imagining, and—crucially—having a perceptual appearance).

If the latter is what Cooper intended, the issues raised are those discussed in sections 10.4 and 10.5. I set aside that possibility here, and will take Cooper to be proposing that Aristotle's view of the role of

⁴² This builds on the earlier discussion in Dow (2009, pp. 151–5).

phantasia (rather than *doxa*) in the passions arose from a comparison between recalcitrant passions and visual illusions.

If Aristotle thought about such a comparison,⁴³ then he might have considered it good grounds for supposing that passions and beliefs involve different faculties of the soul. Consider the following passage from the *De Insomniis*.

And these [viz. appearances as of animals on the walls, experienced by fevered persons] sometimes combine with their condition in such a way that, if they are not excessively ill, it does not escape their notice that here is something false, but if their condition is more severe, they even move towards them. The explanation for these things' coming about is that the cognitions (τὸ κρίνειν) of the controlling part and the one that produces the appearances (τὰ φαντάσματα) do not involve the same faculty (δύναμιν). (460b13–18)

Aristotle's view seems to be that certain kinds of psychological conflict demand explanation in terms of distinct psychological capacities or faculties. In the moderately fevered person, neither the appearances nor their considered beliefs are incoherent, as they would be if just one capacity were being exercised. Rather, the appearances are of animals on the wall, and their beliefs are that there are no animals, merely patterns (cracks, blemishes, or shapes?). Furthermore, the pattern of conflict may provide additional grounds for concluding that two capacities are involved. For Aristotle observes that in the more severe case, where presumably the reason-involving capacity for forming or using considered beliefs is disabled, the appearances are not thereby disabled. It is just so with the passions when they conflict with considered beliefs: fear involves representing the spider as threatening some harm, but the subject has a coherent belief to the contrary. And the fact that a person's reason-involving capacity for exercising (and acting in accordance with) knowledge can be disabled, in ways akin to sleep, does not thereby disable their passions.⁴⁴ It looks as though the reasoning that led

⁴³ Jessica Moss argues that he saw weakness of will as analogous to being taken in by what one knows is a visual illusion in Moss (2009). That weakness of will involves the kind of conflict we are considering here, i.e. between, on the one hand, the representation involved in the appetitive or spirited state and, on the other, the agent's considered belief, is strongly suggested by passages such as *De Anima* 3.10, 433b5–10 and *EN* 7.6, 1149a29–34.

⁴⁴ Cf. *EN* 7.3, 1147a10–18, b6–9. Moss (2009) plausibly argues for the view that in these passages it is the passions and appetites themselves that play a role in disabling reason, a possibility that Aristotle himself clearly recognizes in *DA* 3.3, 429a7.

Aristotle to suppose that the possibility of conflicts between sensory appearances and considered beliefs should be explained by reference to distinct psychological capacities could have led him to conclude that the passions involve the exercise of a capacity distinct from those involved in considered beliefs.

Immediately after the passage quoted, Aristotle presents the example of the sun's appearing a foot across, when we know it is much larger (*De Insomn.* 460b18–20), as further evidence for (σημείον, b18) the claim that appearances result from the exercise of a capacity distinct from that responsible for our considered judgements. He uses this example here simply to argue from the conflicting representations to the distinctness of the capacities involved.

These passages suggest that Aristotle would have explained the possibility of conflict between a person's passions and their considered beliefs by reference to the fact that beliefs and passions involve distinct psychological capacities. We should also agree that *phantasia* is responsible both for the appearance of the sun as about a foot across and for the representational contents of the passions. However, there are important differences between the exercises of *phantasia* involved in the small visual appearance of the sun, and those involved in the passions. For when the latter persist in the face of conflicting beliefs, Aristotle will want to say the subject *is* implicated in inconsistency in the case of recalcitrant passions in a way that he supposes does not occur in the case of recognized visual illusions.⁴⁵ This is most evident in his treatments of *akrasia* and *enkrateia*, where it is clear (whatever else may not be) that he sees their subject as having passions that persist directly *in conflict* with the deliverances of their reasoning.⁴⁶ And it is equally clear that this

⁴⁵ See section 10.4.4 for the suggestion that the argument of *DA* 3.3, 428a2–9 turns on Aristotle's plausible observation that the subject of a recognized visual illusion is *not* thereby implicated in inconsistency. There is a difficulty faced by perceptual theories of emotion generally in accounting for the inconsistency involved in having recalcitrant emotions; cf. section 10.2 and n.17 of this chapter.

⁴⁶ Cf. for appetitive *akrasia*: *EN* 7.3, 1147a31–b3, noting *ἐναντίας* (b1) and *ἐναντία* (b3); for *akrasia* from spirit/anger: 7.6, 1149a29–34, noting that the conclusion of *θυμός* that 'δεῖ τῷ τοιούτῳ πολεμεῖν' (a33–4) is clearly supposed to be in conflict with reason's 'ἐπίταγμα' (a31); for conflict between reason and the appetites: *DA* 3.10, 433b5–6, b7–10, noting 'ἐναντία' (b5, 6), and 433a10–11, 22–9, where the conflict is attributed to the production of conflicting evaluative representations. That the accounts of *akrasia* in *DA* 3.10 and *EN* 7.3 are consistent, and indeed complementary, is defended in Moss (2009). For evidence that *epithumia* is for Aristotle a type of passion, see *DA* 1.1, 403a7; *Rhet* 2.1, 1378a3–5.

renders the subjects *themselves* conflicted.⁴⁷ This is in significant measure why virtue is better than *enkrateia*.

The inconsistency in which the subject of recalcitrant passions is implicated is, I claim, the result of a quite general feature of Aristotelian passions. That is, that having a passion constitutes a kind of affirmation by the subject that things are the way they are represented in their passionate experience. It is this feature of the passions that means that where the contents of a person's passions are inconsistent with the contents of their beliefs, that person holds (to that extent) inconsistent attitudes about how things are in the world. In the following section, I defend the attribution of this view to Aristotle.

10.4 What Kind of Attitude Do Aristotelian Passions Involve towards their Representational Contents?

We should suppose, then, that the representational aspect of the passions involved, for Aristotle, 'appearances' presented by *phantasia*. Several scholars have suggested that Aristotle saw similarities between visual illusions and conflicts between passion and reason, and this might be taken to imply that Aristotelian passions need involve no inclination to take their contents as being the way things are (recall that this was one possible meaning of Cooper's characterization of the passions as involving 'non-epistemic appearances'). In this section, I claim that the exercises of *phantasia* involved in Aristotelian passions constitute a kind of affirmation by their subject of their representational contents.

10.4.1 Affirming the representational contents of *phantasia*

It is important to clarify what is meant in this context by 'affirming' these representational contents. This is best elucidated by considering two passages. One is the end of *De Anima* 3.3.

Because they [viz. exercises of *phantasia*] remain within, and are similar to sensations, animals perform many actions in accordance with them, in some cases, such as brutes, because they do not have thinking (*voûs*), and in others,

⁴⁷ EN 7.2, 1146a9–16; 7.9, 1151b32–1152a3.

such as humans, because their thinking is sometimes covered over by passion or by diseases or by sleep. (429a4–8)

Aristotle here thinks of brutes and some humans as ‘acting according to *phantasia*’, by which he presumably means that they treat *phantasia* as representing the way things actually are. The implied contrast is with fully functioning human adults, who do not act according to *phantasia*, but presumably act according to *nous*. Such humans may often have states of *phantasia* whose contents differ from the contents of their *nous*-derived beliefs, but it is the contents of their beliefs, not their *phantasmata*, that guides both how they act, and also what further beliefs they might be inclined to form by making inferences. I shall say that such fully functioning humans ‘affirm’ the contents of their beliefs, but do not ‘affirm’ the contents of their *phantasmata*, whereas the brutes and the diseased or sleepy (or drunk, or immature) humans do ‘affirm’ the contents of their *phantasmata*. I do not intend this use of ‘affirm’ to imply that there is some further psychological activity (the activity of affirming) over and above the exercises of *phantasia* and *nous* taking place in any of the animals Aristotle is considering. Rather, animals are simply disposed to treat the representational contents of *phantasia* as giving the way things are, unless *nous* is operating effectively, in which case it is the beliefs generated by *nous* that are taken to give the way things are. Whether the contents of *phantasia* are affirmed is thus a relational matter—a matter of whether something else within the animal’s psychology takes on the role they would otherwise play.⁴⁸

The second passage brings to light two possible ways in which the contents of sensation or *phantasia* might be ‘affirmed’. They are, in a sense, ‘affirmed’ by the capacity (or part of the soul) that presents them. But they may also be ‘affirmed’ by the person as a whole. The claim defended here is that, in virtue of being in a passionate state, the *subject* of the passions affirms the representational contents of their passions in this latter way. The issue is thus not about whether these contents are

⁴⁸ Moss (2012a, 92–3) similarly highlights what is in common between beliefs in normally functioning adult humans and exercises of *phantasia* in those that lack the functioning of *νοῦς*—her preferred term is ‘acceptance’. Her account and mine differ in that hers addresses only the question of what should be said about sub-personal parts (rational or non-rational), whereas I address, and take there to be Aristotelian material relevant to, the further question of what should be said about the subject as a whole.

affirmed *by the capacity for phantasia itself*, but whether they are affirmed by the *person* whose capacity it is. For Aristotle sometimes writes as though there is a kind of conversation going on internally between the various capacities.

... it is due to touch announcing (*εἰσαγγέλλειν*) two movements that we believe one thing is two. For, in general, the origin affirms (*φησιν*) what comes from each sense, unless another more authoritative [sense] (*κυριωτέρα*) contradicts (*ἀντιφῆν*). (*De Insomn.* 3, 461b2–5)

Aristotle is discussing how a single object touched with crossed fingers feels like two objects (460b20–2).⁴⁹ He is happy to say that the senses themselves can ‘announce’ and ‘contradict’, and to that extent there is something within the agent that affirms the content of the illusion. But he takes it as obvious that if we are aware of the illusion, we are not tempted actually to believe there are two objects. Indeed, he is explicit at 460b21 that ‘we do not affirm two’, and he offers the explanation recapitulated in the earlier passage that ‘sight is more authoritative (*κυριωτέρα*) than touch’ (b21–2). So, the *subject* of these sensory experiences is—I suggest—completely uncommitted to the sensory representations provided by touch⁵⁰ in this example, indeed the subject explicitly rejects them as false. The crossed-fingers case from the *De Insomniis* thus clarifies the precise sense in which subjects (as contrasted with their sub-personal capacities) can affirm or be uncommitted to the contents of *phantasia*.

Two qualifications should be noted. The claim that the subject of a passionate state thereby affirms its representational contents should not be understood to preclude that same subject’s affirming, perhaps by having a reasoned belief, something else simultaneously. If the contents of the belief and the representations involved in the passion are inconsistent, the subject in such a case would be conflicted. Recalcitrant passions will be of this kind—the subject is conflicted because she simultaneously affirms (albeit with different psychological capacities)

⁴⁹ He describes a similar case later in the same work, where a single object appears visually to be two if the observer presses under their eyeball with their finger (461b30–462a2).

⁵⁰ Aristotle clearly takes this to generalize to *phantasia*, since in this part of the *De Insomniis* he is explaining using these sensory examples why typically dreams—for Aristotle, exercises of *phantasia*—are convincing to us when asleep, but not when we are aware that they are mere dreams.

inconsistent assessments of (say) the danger posed by the spider. Second, in such a case, the influence of passions and reasoned beliefs on the subject's behaviour and thinking may not be equal. I discuss in section 10.5 evidence that Aristotle thought a person's reason could be inhibited to varying degrees. If so, the extent to which their behaviour was determined by what was affirmed by the non-reasoning part of the soul would also vary.

The remainder of this section is concerned with showing that for Aristotle, the subject of the passions affirms, in the sense just identified, the representational contents of their passions.

10.4.2 Aristotle's use of *phantasia* and *phainesthai* in the *Rhetoric*

The most important evidence for this claim is the use of cognates of *phainesthai* ('to appear', esp. *phainomenos* and *phantasia*) in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11.⁵¹ In context, these do not—as Cooper and others have supposed⁵²—signal that the psychological capacity involved in the passions is *phantasia*; rather they indicate that this is how—in having a passion of the type under discussion—the subject of the passion *takes things to be*.⁵³ *Phantasia* and cognates are important words in the *Rhetoric* as a whole, and are used to indicate how the listener takes things to be, which—of course—may be incorrect. A good illustrative example is Aristotle's phrase '*phainomenon enthymêma*' (1356b2–3), which means something that a listener *thinks* is a piece of good rhetorical reasoning (lit. 'apparent enthymeme'), even if it is not.

This view of terms like *phantasia* in *Rhetoric* 2.2–11 receives confirmation from their context. They occur within a set of instructions about how a speaker might arouse passions of various types as part of convincing an audience. Against this background, the directions Aristotle gives for how to arouse each type of passion can only plausibly be understood

⁵¹ We may ignore the suggestion that these mean 'conspicuous' or 'manifest'. Cf. Fortenbaugh (2002, pp. 97–100); *pace* Cope (1877) on *Rhetoric* 2.2, 1378a30–1, who is followed by translators W. R. Roberts (in Barnes, 1984) and Kennedy, 1991.

⁵² Cooper (1999, pp. 416–17); Sihvola (1996, pp. 59–68, 70–1); Striker (1996, p. 291); Nieuwenburg (2002, esp. pp. 89–94). Moss (2012a, ch.4) is more cautious.

⁵³ The argument is made in more detail at Dow (2009, pp. 151–5), and is broadly in line with Fortenbaugh (2002, pp. 95–100), Nussbaum (1994, ch.3), and Nussbaum (1996) on this point.

on the view that passions involve their subject affirming that things are the way they are represented.

Aristotle indicates his approach as follows.

For each passion, we should make a division into three, I mean, for example, with anger how we are disposed when we get angry, at whom we tend to get angry, and on what grounds. If we were to have one or two of these, and not all three, it would be impossible to arouse anger. (*Rhetoric* 2.1, 1378a12–14)

This sets the context for the accounts of the various types of passion that follow.

Let anger be a desire-cum-pain for *apparent* revenge on account of an *apparent* insult to oneself or one of one's own from one who should not have insulted.

(*Rhetoric* 2.2, 1378a30–2)

Let calmness be the settling and abating of anger. If people are angry at those who insult them, and insulting is voluntary, it is clear that they are calm towards those who do none of these things or do them involuntarily or *appear* to be of this kind.

(*Rhetoric* 2.3, 1380a8–12)

What things we fear, and whom and in what condition will be clear as follows. Let fear be some kind of pain or disturbance from the *appearance* of future harm that is damaging or painful. (*Rhetoric* 2.5, 1382a20–2)

It seems obvious that the representational state involved in these passions (signalled by *phantasia* and cognates, translated 'apparent' or 'appearance') must be one in which the way things are represented is affirmed as the way things are. For it is extremely implausible to suppose that Aristotle intends here to allow for the possibility that you could produce anger in your audience merely by bringing about the (potentially uncommitted) *appearance* of insult, or by getting your audience to *entertain the thought* of someone's insulting them. An uncommitted *phantasia* is clearly inadequate for the job that Aristotle is recommending to the orator. The case is even clearer with calmness, where Aristotle describes how to soothe the anger of an audience. He says that people calm down from anger towards those who didn't do what they were originally thought to have done, or towards those who did involuntarily what they had been thought to have done deliberately, or (crucially) people who *appear* thus (1380a10–12). Can Aristotle really be supposing that people's anger can abate merely by entertaining the thought of someone's innocence, without endorsing that? Surely not. Anger abates precisely by the subject's *affirming* that the original accusation was either

false, or the deed done involuntarily. What is the force of ‘apparent’ in such cases? It is to emphasize that when a person calms down because the object of their anger appears now to be innocent after all, they may not be correct.⁵⁴ A false belief in someone’s innocence is as effective as a true belief in causing anger to abate. But an unendorsed thought or appearance is obviously not, and it is outlandish to suppose that Aristotle would have thought so.

Correctly interpreted, then, Aristotle’s ‘appearances’ terminology in the *Rhetoric* constitutes a powerful reason for thinking that Aristotelian passions involve the subject’s affirming their representational content. Paradoxically perhaps,⁵⁵ by using *phantasia* and cognates in his accounts of the passions, Aristotle explicitly asserts that having a given passion involves things appearing to be (i.e. being affirmed to be) a certain way.

10.4.3 *Phantasia, passions, and paintings in De Anima 3.3*

Further support for this claim may be found in *De Anima* 3.3.

That it (*phantasia*) is not the same [type of thinking] as judgement (*hypolêpsis*) is obvious. For this condition is up to us whenever we wish (it is possible to put something before the eyes, as do those who use images as an *aide-memoire*), whereas believing (*doxazein*) is not up to us, of necessity we either do so falsely or truly. Furthermore, whenever we believe something terrible or fearsome, we immediately experience a passion, and likewise if it is something encouraging. Whereas with *phantasia* we are as if we were looking at terrible or encouraging things in a painting. (DA 3.3, 427b16–24)

This passage does not rule out the possibility that passions themselves involve *phantasia*. Its purpose is to establish that *phantasia* and *hypolêpsis* are not identical. All Aristotle needs to show is that some cases of *phantasia* are not cases of *hypolêpsis*: he invites the comparison between uncommitted exercises of *phantasia* (what we call ‘imagination’) and believing to show this.

⁵⁴ Cf. Nussbaum (1994, pp. 83–6); *pace* e.g. Cooper (1996, p. 247); Striker (1996, p. 291).

⁵⁵ Of course, this is only paradoxical to *us*. Since, as has been argued, Aristotle thinks that these representations involve an exercise of a capacity for which his technical term is *φαντασία*, the fact that the word might have carried this connotation to some of his audience merely means that this presented no obstacle to its use to signify that passions involve taking things (whether truly or falsely) to be a certain way.

His claims in this passage are that (a) believing, *doxazein*, is sufficient to cause passions, but (b) uncommitted *phantasia* is not. These claims suggest the view that passions are responses to certain supposed features of the world (things that are pitiful, fearsome, etc.), and hence lend support to the claim that the subject affirms the representational contents of their passions as the way things are. This is because supposing that passions involve affirming their representational contents provides a ready explanation of Aristotle's claims, whereas supposing that passions can be entirely uncommitted leaves unexplained and rather puzzling the facts to which Aristotle adverts, i.e. that passions are reliably caused by beliefs but are not by mere imaginings. To *believe* that there is (say) something terrible or fearful (b21–2) is to be in a state in which, from that person's perspective, there *is* something terrible or fearful. It is obvious why such a situation would tend to bring about a further, passionate, response from the subject of a kind that involves recognizing that here is something terrible or fearful. However, merely to entertain the thought of something terrible or fearful (in a way that is uncommitted as to whether it is actually the case) is not thereby to be in a state in which, from the subject's perspective, there is some object or state of affairs that calls for passionate response. Clearly, if the passions involve affirming their contents, they are responses that the subject makes to (supposed) objects or states of affairs actually obtaining. And this readily explains why beliefs but not imaginings would typically give rise to passions. Whereas if passions can involve merely uncommitted representations of objects or states of affairs, it is unclear why beliefs should be any more potent to bring them about than imaginings, since both involve presenting the subject with relevant representational content.

This passage, thus, provides a second argument in support of the view that Aristotelian passions involve their subject taking things to be the way they are represented.

10.4.4 Limitations to the use of visual illusions in De Anima 3.3 as a model for Aristotle's understanding of the passions

If the earlier arguments are correct, however, they combine with a careful reading of Aristotle's views on visual illusions in *De Anima* 3.3 to highlight a number of limitations to the use of the latter as a model for how Aristotle understood the passions, and for how he understood

conflicts between passions and reasoned beliefs.⁵⁶ It is important to notice these limitations, given that comparisons between passions and sensory appearances will seem attractive once it is recognized that the capacity for appearances (*phantasia*) is involved in Aristotelian passions.

DE ANIMA 3.3: PHANTASIA, DOXA AND THE SIZE OF THE SUN

Let us investigate in detail how Aristotle's account of *phantasia* is supposed to explain the sun's 'appearing' to be a foot across when we know it is larger than the inhabited part of the earth (428b2–9). Aristotle presents this as a problematic case for accounts of appearances (*phantasia*) that involve belief. These problems he takes to be among a whole series of reasons⁵⁷ why such views should be rejected. Obviously, his own view must then offer a coherent explanation of such cases.⁵⁸

Let us examine the text with two questions in mind. First, might Aristotle have come to the view that the passions involved the perception-based capacity of *phantasia* because of a realization that his negative arguments in *De Anima* 3.3 against a view of *phantasia* as involving belief, based on occasions where *phantasia* and belief can be in conflict, would also carry weight against views of emotions as involving beliefs? The second question is whether his remarks in this passage about recognized visual illusions could provide a model for understanding his view of conflicts between passions and reasoned beliefs.

THE SUN EXAMPLE AND THE PROBLEM OF BELIEF

λείπεται ἄρα ἰδεῖν εἰ δόξα... [argument against supposing that *phantasia* is *doxa*]... φανερόν τοίνυν ὅτι οὐδὲ δόξα μετ' αἰσθήσεως, οὐδὲ δι' αἰσθήσεως, οὐδὲ συμπλοκὴ δόξης καὶ αἰσθήσεως, φαντασία ἂν εἴη, διὰ τε ταῦτα καὶ διότι οὐκ ἄλλου τινὸς ἔσται ἢ δόξα, ἀλλ' ἐκείνου, εἴπερ ἔστιν, οὐ καὶ ἡ αἰσθησις· λέγω δ', ἐκ τῆς τοῦ λευκοῦ δόξης καὶ αἰσθήσεως ἢ συμπλοκὴ φαντασία ἔσται· οὐ γὰρ δι' ἐκ τῆς δόξης μὲν τῆς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, αἰσθήσεως δὲ τῆς τοῦ λευκοῦ. τὸ οὐδὲ φαίνεσθαι ἔσται τὸ δοξάζειν ὅπερ αἰσθάνεται, μὴ κατὰ συμβεβηκός. φαίνεται δὲ γε καὶ ψευδῇ, περὶ ὧν ἅμα ὑπόληψιν ἀληθῆ ἔχει, οἷον φαίνεται μὲν ὁ ἥλιος ποδιαῖος, πιστεύεται δ' εἶναι μείζων τῆς

⁵⁶ Cf. Cooper (1999, p. 417) and Moss (2009, 2012a) for examples of scholars who advocate such use.

⁵⁷ As is clear from 428a24–8.

⁵⁸ Indeed, the need to explain perceptual error generally (whether or not recognized as such) is prominent throughout *De Anima* 3.3, 428a12, a18, b2–9, b17–30.

οἰκουμένης· συμβαίνει οὖν ἥτοι ἀποβεβληκέναι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀληθῆ
δόξαν, ἣν εἶχε, σωζομένου τοῦ πράγματος, μὴ ἐπιλαθόμενον μηδὲ
μεταπεισθέντα, ἧ εἰ ἔτι ἔχει, ἀνάγκη τὴν αὐτὴν ἀληθῆ εἶναι καὶ
ψευδῆ. ἀλλὰ ψευδὴς ἐγένετο ὅτε λάθοι μεταπεσὼν τὸ πρᾶγμα. οὐτ'
ἄρα ἐν τι τούτων ἐστὶν οὐτ' ἐκ τούτων ἡ φαντασία.⁵⁹

So it remains to see if it [appearance] is belief... It is clear then that appearance could not be either belief with sensation or by means of sensation, nor a mixture of belief and sensation, both for these reasons and because the object of the belief will be the very same thing that is (if it exists) the object also of the sensation. What I mean is that appearance will be the mixture formed from the belief that it is white and the sensation of white, certainly not from the belief that it is good and the sensation of white. Therefore things appearing is a matter of believing the thing that one senses, non-accidentally. And yet there can be also false appearances, about which the subject simultaneously has a true judgement. For example, the sun appears to someone to be a foot across, and yet he is convinced it is larger than the inhabited part of the earth. Thus what happens is either that he has lost his previously-held true belief, with no change in the facts, and though he has not forgotten it nor been persuaded to change his mind; or else, if he still retains it, necessarily the same [belief] is true and false. But [a belief] becomes false when the facts change without one's noticing. So, appearance is neither any one of these [viz. sensation, belief, knowledge, etc.] nor formed out of them. (*De Anima* 428a18–19, a24–b9)

The sun example features as part of a section (428a18–b9) where Aristotle, having argued that *phantasia* cannot be *aisthêsis* (sensation), *epistêmê* (knowledge), or *nous* (understanding), argues that it cannot be either belief (*doxa*) or a combination of belief and sensation (*aisthêsis*). Aristotle reserves most space for the latter, where his target appears to be what we shall call the 'mixture view' of appearances advanced in Plato's *Sophist*.⁶⁰ This view is that appearances are a combination of belief and sensation, and it is the involvement specifically of belief that accounts for how appearances can sometimes be false. Aristotle's use of the sun example as an objection to this view centres around the role of belief in the Platonic view. I propose to look in detail at Aristotle's arguments with a view to determining whether they would count against a view of the passions as involving beliefs, and hence might have motivated the development of Aristotle's view of the passions.

By 428b2, Aristotle has already clarified that this mixture theory would need *phantasia* to be a combination of a sensation and a belief

⁵⁹ Text from Ross (1956).

⁶⁰ *Sophist* 263d–264b.

(*doxa*) with the same object (428a27–b2).⁶¹ His argument is that this will give the Platonic mixture theorist insuperable difficulties over a particular range of cases. There are cases where what ‘appears’ to us is false (e.g. the sun appears about a foot across) and at the same time seemingly we have only correct beliefs about the very same matter. In such cases, the mixture theorist about appearances faces a dilemma. The first option is that the correct belief that the sun is huge is ‘lost’ (428b5). It is lost presumably because, in having the *phantasia*, the person has (on the proposal under consideration) a sensation and a belief that the sun is quite small. The belief that the sun is small causes the belief that the sun is huge to be lost (*ἀποβεβληκέναι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀληθῆ δόξαν*, b5). Aristotle draws attention to how problematic this option would be. The loss of the correct belief that the sun is huge would have happened without the occurrence of any of the usual processes by which our beliefs are changed: there is no change of the facts, no forgetting, and he has not been persuaded to change his mind.

So, Aristotle seems to view this first option as unattractive. The second option is that the person retains their belief that the sun is huge. Aristotle’s argument is quite difficult to make out. He says, ‘if he still retains it, necessarily the same [belief] is true and false. But [a belief] becomes false when the facts change without one’s noticing.’ (428b7–9).

On a widely held interpretation,⁶² Aristotle’s objection is that the same *belief* cannot be both true and false, where the belief he is referring to is the belief that the sun is larger than the inhabited part of the earth.⁶³ This is a natural reading of the Greek text; and yet it seems to face three overwhelming difficulties. The first is that it is hard to see any sense in which *that* belief is false. Hamlyn suggests that it is false *ex hypothesi* as the belief involved in the appearance.⁶⁴ That is to say, that since it must (somehow) be the belief involved in the appearance that the sun is about

⁶¹ The exact nature of this constraint is tricky: ‘with the same object’ may mean ‘about the same thing’, e.g. something white (or ‘the white’); or ‘about the same proposition’, e.g. that it is white.

⁶² Hamlyn (1993, *ad loc.*); Lycos (1964, pp. 501–2).

⁶³ The view that the feminine noun to be understood at b7 is ‘φαντασίαν’ (Ross, 1961, *ad loc.*) is implausible on both textual and philosophical grounds. The view thereby attributed to the mixture theorist is neither coherent nor Plato’s: that a state composed of the belief that the sun is huge plus some sensation both (somehow) constitutes the appearance as of the sun’s being about a foot across, and (somehow) is both true and false.

⁶⁴ Hamlyn (1993, *ad loc.*)

a foot across, it must be false, since that appearance is false. Of course, this would be a paradoxical result,⁶⁵ that a true belief could—without changing its content, without ceasing to be true—become false through being incorporated into a mental state which was false. But if this is Aristotle's argument, it simply fails. If the true belief (that the sun is huge) is part of the false *phantasia* (that the sun is a foot across), then *if anything is true and false* it is the state of *phantasia* (true in virtue of one of its parts, false in virtue of the whole) not the belief that is one constituent of it. Strictly speaking, there will be no single thing that is both true and false: the belief will be true and the *phantasia* false.

The second difficulty, on this interpretation, concerns the view Aristotle attributes to the mixture theorist.⁶⁶ Can Aristotle really be attributing to the mixture theorist the view that the belief *that the sun is huge* is a constituent of the appearance *that the sun is a foot across*? Not only is the position scarcely coherent, it also seems to involve abandoning the very core of the mixture theory: that appearances inherit their content from the beliefs involved in them (and the fact that these beliefs can be false explains how appearances can be false).⁶⁷ Now let us recall that Aristotle is presenting a problem faced by the mixture theorist in finding a response to the second horn of his dilemma (i.e. the supposition that the subject *retains* their belief that the sun is huge). On this interpretation, Aristotle imagines that the mixture theorist's response would be as we have just described—with all the incoherence and explanatory impotence we have highlighted. But then he presents the difficulty of this horn of the dilemma simply by saying 'the same [belief] would be bound to be true and false'. It seems unlikely that if this is how Aristotle understood the mixture theorist's position, he would present, as his objection to it, not its most blatant weaknesses, but the fact that it would make the same belief true and false.

The third difficulty is that, on this interpretation, Aristotle's criticism is too easily evaded by the mixture theorist who need only insist that while the belief that the sun is huge is retained, it is not *this* belief, but

⁶⁵ And apparently at odds with what Aristotle says at 428b8–9, '[a belief] becomes false when the facts change without one's noticing.'

⁶⁶ The same worry as faces Ross; cf. n.59.

⁶⁷ This said, it is possible that Aristotle knowingly adopted a deeply implausible and uncharitable interpretation of Plato's view for dialectical reasons. Cf. Annas (1982).

rather the belief that the sun is about a foot across, that is a constituent of the *phantasia*.

Each of these difficulties alone would put this interpretation in serious doubt. Collectively they seem to count overwhelmingly against it. However, it seems that in connection with this view we have also encountered a more general puzzle. If, as seems plausible, 'the same [belief]' at b7 refers to the belief that the sun is larger than the inhabited part of the world, how can *this* belief possibly be said to be false?

Two further interpretative options suggest a more fruitful approach. One possibility is that 'the same [belief] must be true and false' at 428b7–8 records a verdict that the subject himself is committed to. The idea is that firstly the belief that the sun is huge is retained (b7). But this is now alongside the *phantasia*, which (*ex hypothesi*) includes the belief that the sun is quite small (b3–4). Each of these beliefs entails both its own truth and the falsity of the other. Thus these two beliefs commit the subject to—what is an absurd inconsistency—two different verdicts on the same belief.⁶⁸ He must (*ἀνάγκη*, b7) think that the 'same belief'⁶⁹ is at once true and false. Now this interpretation requires supposing that there is an unstated 'in his (the subject's) view' to be understood in lines b7–8. Admittedly, this is speculative. Still, if it is possible, this interpretation has Aristotle drawing out the conclusion for the mixture view of appearances that it casts the 'sun example' as an example of someone having inconsistent beliefs. How, though, would this constitute an *objection* to the mixture view—which is what b7–8 clearly is? After all, the mixture view is Plato's, and he would have been happy to grant that human beings often hold inconsistent beliefs.⁷⁰ It is the business of philosophy, and famously of Socrates, to face people with this uncomfortable fact. There is a challenge for this interpretation to identify Aristotle's objection.⁷¹

⁶⁸ The unstated noun at b7 is indeed surely *δόξαν* rather than *φαντασίαν*.

⁶⁹ This may refer specifically to the belief under discussion throughout the dilemma (b4–9), namely 'that the sun is larger than the inhabited part of the earth', or may refer in a general way to whichever of the two beliefs one is considering.

⁷⁰ This is distinct from allowing that people might *consciously* hold beliefs that they *recognize* to be inconsistent. Cf. *Metaph. Γ.3*, 1005b19–34.

⁷¹ A related possibility is to suppose from the context that the believing subject is presumed *correct* with regard both to his retained belief (that the sun is huge) and to how things appear (which *ex hypothesi* includes a belief that the sun is quite small). Their being correct about both of these, however, entails that 'the same belief' (on which cf. n.58) actually *is* both true and false.

A final interpretative option⁷² is to take 'the same' (τὴν αὐτὴν, b7) as referring to the same type of attitude—i.e. *doxa*, that the subject adopts in relation to the size of the sun. So, it is not a token instance of believing that is both true and false, but rather 'what the subject believes'. What is 'necessary' therefore here is that the answer to the question, 'What does the subject believe about the size of the sun?' be both, 'that it is a foot across', and, 'that it is huge'. Hence, when considering the subject's belief about the size of the sun, we must admit that it is both true and false. If this is somehow a possible reading of the Greek text,⁷³ Aristotle would be pointing out that on the mixture view of appearances, in cases like the sun case, the subject adopts two attitudes towards the size of the sun, attitudes of exactly the same kind, exercises of the same faculty, such that one is true, the other false. But it is again unclear how this would constitute a point against the mixture view.

On the last two interpretative suggestions, we have yet to identify Aristotle's objection. For Aristotle, like everybody else, knew that people can sometimes have (albeit unrecognized) inconsistent beliefs. I think this challenge can be met. It can be met first in terms of Aristotle's dialectic. His criticisms are of Plato. On the Platonic account, I cannot (in the same way, with the same part of the soul) believe that the sun is huge and believe that it is a foot across.⁷⁴ And yet, if—on Plato's account of appearance—appearance that things are a certain way involves belief that they are that way, this is precisely what is entailed.⁷⁵ Furthermore, even without the dialectic with Plato, there is something plausible about this account of Aristotle's criticism. When I knowingly both believe something and believe the negation of that same thing (i.e. by implication, that each is both true and false), I am in an important way irrational. Finding oneself in such a situation

⁷² Hicks (1907, pp. 466–7). The reading of this and related passages in Everson (1999, pp. 212–13) seems to have much in common with his interpretation.

⁷³ It is certainly awkward to suppose that 'τὴν αὐτὴν [δόξαν]' (b7) could mean the same *faculty of belief*, or the same *kind of attitude*, i.e. belief.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Rep.* 4, 439b5–6 and esp. 10, 602e8–9.

⁷⁵ We might still wonder how great a difficulty this would be for Plato. *Protagoras* 356c–e and *Rep.* 10, 602e4–6 show awareness of the possibility of divergence between perceptual appearances and knowing by, say, the art of measurement (I am grateful to Sarah Broadie for drawing attention to this point). Could he not simply say that the two beliefs are held with different parts of the soul, as he clearly does at *Rep.* 10, 602a1–2? Still, on the basis of what we actually have in the *Sophist*, this difficulty stands.

brings doubt and puzzlement. Thus if the mixture theory were correct, it would be irrational and puzzling for the sun to appear about a foot across when I know it is huge. But there is nothing irrational or puzzling about this. So the mixture theory must be false. The difficulty stems from the mixture theorist's claim that I take the same kind of stance (i.e. belief) to the sun's being a foot across as I do to its being huge. But a little reflection tells us that it is precisely *not* the same kind of stance. In fact, as Aristotle wants to insist, the whole of my believing about the size of the sun is true. For my believing to become false, there would need to be some change in the world that had escaped my notice (b8–9). That has not happened in this case, even by my own lights. How the sun appears does not compromise my wholehearted endorsement of my existing belief about the sun's size (namely, that it is huge) as being true.

This account of the nature of Aristotle's objection at b7–8 is compatible with either of the latter two options for interpreting his argument. Neither is without some difficulty as a reading of the text, but despite this, they seem the most attractive accounts of how this part of the 'sun example' works as an argument. My preference is for the former.

APPLYING THE *DE ANIMA* 3.3 ARGUMENTS ABOUT *PHANTASIA* TO THE PASSIONS

These, then, are the options for how to understand Aristotle's objection to a view of appearances in which they are partly constituted by beliefs. Do these arguments show that there will be something similarly problematic about an account of the *passions* in which they are partly constituted by beliefs, such that arguments of this kind could be part of the explanation for the development of Aristotle's views of the passions? An account of perceptual *phantasia* in which one constituent is belief will struggle to explain cases where one concurrently has a false *phantasia* in conflict with a true belief about the very same object. Similarly, it is suggested, an account of the emotions in which one constituent is belief will struggle to explain cases of recalcitrant passions, such as those discussed in section 10.2, where one concurrently has a 'false emotion' in conflict with a true belief, both about the same object.

If Hamlyn's interpretation, set out previously, were correct, the sun argument from *De Anima* 3.3 would still present no deep difficulty for supposing the passions to involve beliefs. Simply distinguishing the (false) belief involved in the passion from the (true) belief with which

it is in conflict is enough to avoid the paradoxical result of there being some one belief that is at once true and false.⁷⁶ Thus the suggestion that applying this kind of argument to the passions played a role in Aristotle's avoidance of a view of the passions in which they essentially involved beliefs turns out to rest on a very flimsy foundation. The suggestion would turn out to be that *if* Aristotle understood his argument in the way Hamlyn suggests, *and if* he did not realize how easily evaded such an objection would be in the case of passions (if not of appearances too), then he might have thought (incorrectly) that it counted against the view that the passions involved beliefs.

If, on the other hand, either of the latter two proposals for interpreting the sun argument is correct, that argument would apply to the passions as follows. The sun example showed that if belief is involved in *phantasia*, then first, it would be irrational for the sun to look a foot across when we believe it is huge, and second, the subject's endorsement of this latter belief as true would be compromised by the sun's foot-wide appearance. But obviously neither of these is the case. So the theory that belief is involved in *phantasia* must be false. However, these last steps come out very different in relation to the involvement of belief in *passions*. If belief is involved in the passions, then it will be *irrational* to feel afraid of the spider when believing that it is harmless. And of course, this is irrational! In fact, it is in precisely such cases that we talk about irrational fears. So, whereas it is a bad theory that makes the sun case irrational, it is a *good* theory that makes the spider case irrational. Likewise, in recalcitrant emotions, the subject *is* conflicted, his endorsement of his previous belief *is* compromised. Again, it is a bad theory that says otherwise. So, if the earlier understanding is correct, Aristotle's arguments in rejection of Plato's 'mixture view' of perceptual *phantasia* not only present *no* obstacle to his supposing that the passions involve beliefs, but they seem instead to present a serious obstacle to his supposing that the emotions involve (potentially wholly unendorsed) appearances of the kind Aristotle has in view in this passage from *De Anima* 3.3. Such a view cannot account for the conflict and irrationality involved in recalcitrant

⁷⁶ In addition, the worry noted that the argument fails even on its own terms (because the belief incorporated into the state of *phantasia* will not itself be both true and false) would apply equally to the argument's deployment against a view of emotions as involving beliefs.

emotions.⁷⁷ Thus, a careful understanding of *De Anima* 3.3, 428a18–b9 so far from supporting, actually *presents obstacles* for the suggestion that Aristotle was motivated by the kinds of argument it presents to avoid a view of the passions in which beliefs are essentially involved in their representational aspects, and to adopt instead one involving perception-based appearances (*phantasia*).

I have argued that for Aristotle the representational aspect of the passions involves the exercise of *phantasia*, and that the passions involve the subject in some level of affirmation of the content thus represented. The next section aims to explain how these claims can be accommodated within Aristotle's view of *phantasia* more generally.

10.5 *Phantasia* and the Regulation of the Passions

I start by seeking to trace some implications for the regulation of the passions of Aristotle's view that they involve an exercise of *phantasia*. I briefly highlight two features of *phantasia*, before applying them to the passions. One is the way in which the proper role of *phantasmata* within the organism depends on the presence or absence of more authoritative information from other psychological faculties. The other is the way in which evaluative *phantasia*, where things appear good or bad in some way, involves pleasure and pain, and has motivational consequences.

10.5.1 *Two features of phantasia*

The first feature concerns the role of the representations presented by *phantasia*. On almost any view of the role of *phantasia* in an Aristotelian subject,⁷⁸ there are exercises of *phantasia* whose contents are affirmed, others towards whose contents the subject is entirely uncommitted, and still others where the subject is conflicted in relation to them.

The crossed-fingers case from the *De Insomniis* provides a clear example of uncommitted *phantasia*. An even clearer example is the following.

⁷⁷ Indeed, note the difficulty faced by perceptual theories generally in accounting for this irrationality. Cf. n.58.

⁷⁸ E.g. Nussbaum (1978); Schofield (1978); Wedin (1988); Everson (1999); Lorenz (2006); and Moss (2012a).

For this condition [*phantasia*] is up to us whenever we wish (it is possible to put something before the eyes, as do those who use images as an *aide-memoire*) . . .
(*De Anima* 3.3, 427b17–20)

Conversely, there are clearly some exercises of *phantasia* that are affirmed by the subject. At the end of *De Anima*'s chapter on *phantasia*, Aristotle says:

Animals perform many actions in accordance with *phantasia*, in some cases because they do not possess thinking, e.g. in brutes, and in others because thinking is covered over sometimes by passion or disease or sleep, e.g. in humans.
(*DA* 3.3, 429a5–8)

Aristotle thinks that in animals, and in some human behaviour, action is guided by *phantasia*.⁷⁹ This passage also highlights what I take to be, in Aristotle's view, the correct and normal functioning of animals, such that the role of *phantasia* (i.e. whether what it represents is 'affirmed' by the subject such that they 'perform actions in accordance with' it) is determined by whether some more authoritative faculty is present and active.⁸⁰ In properly functioning adult humans, where their reasoned thinking (*voûs*) is active, it is the deliverances of the latter, rather than of *phantasia*, that are 'affirmed' and guide action.

The second feature of *phantasia* to highlight is that evaluative appearances have motivational consequences. This appears to hold regardless of any conflict with reasoned beliefs.

Now the origin of motion is, as we have said, the object of pursuit or avoidance in the sphere of action. Of necessity the thought and *phantasia* of these are accompanied by heating and chilling. For the painful is avoided and the pleasant pursued, and the painful and the pleasant are nearly always accompanied by

⁷⁹ *Phantasia* can seemingly do so by providing (to put the point in terms of Aristotle's distinction from *De Motu* 7, 701b23–5) the premise of the possible, e.g. *De Motu* 7, 701a32–3 and cf. Schofield (2011); or the premise of the good, e.g. *DA* 3.10, 433a26–9, and arguably *De Motu* 8, 702a18–19, cf. Moss (2012a, ch. 3).

⁸⁰ The explanation of why the contents of some *phantasmata* are affirmed and others not is much more difficult on Lorenz's view (2006, esp. ch.9) that *phantasia* can present an animal with 'prospects' to be realized. On this view, non-rational animals regularly have *phantasmata* whose contents are not affirmed, as well as *phantasmata* whose contents are affirmed. The explanation for why some are not affirmed, that makes reference to more authoritative capacities, is not applicable to the 'prospects' cases, and so leaves puzzlingly unexplained why the contents of some *phantasmata* are affirmed and others not.

chilling and heating (although we do not notice this when it happens in a small part). (*De Motu* 8, 701b33–702a2)⁸¹

Since Aristotle has already explained (7, 701b2–17) that it is by internal heating and chilling that locomotion is initiated, this passage effectively indicates that evaluative *phantasmata* of the pleasant and the painful are ‘necessarily’ accompanied by the kind of (motivational) states that give rise to locomotion.⁸² The intriguing implication is that the activity of a more authoritative psychological capacity is insufficient to prevent some level of influence on the subject’s behaviour in the case where *phantasia* is of the pleasant and the painful. The *phantasmata* involved in the passions are of course of just this kind.

10.5.2 The ‘covering-over’ of reason

These observations about *phantasia* have implications for the regulation of the passions. In the *properly functioning* adult human, reasoning capacities (*voûs*) should be active and determine the subject’s actions. This might include endorsing certain passionate responses. But where reasoned beliefs are in conflict with how things are represented by passionate *phantasia*, it should be the former that determine how the subject behaves. We see this normative picture expressed in Aristotle’s explanation of various ways in which humans may *fail* to function correctly.

We might recall that reason can be ‘covered over’ or disabled (*DA* 3.3, 429a7), allowing passionate *phantasia* to exert greater influence over the subject’s behaviour than it should, if it is at odds with their reasoned beliefs. However this comes about (e.g. through sleep, drink, or disease), this constitutes a disabling of the proper functioning of the person.

However, we should also notice that the passions themselves can disable reason from performing its proper role. Aristotle describes in the *De Insomniis* how reason can be disabled by fevers. The lines preceding this passage, in which he describes some (related) ways in

⁸¹ Text and translation are from Nussbaum (1978), omitting from the translation Nussbaum’s explanatory interpolation.

⁸² This conclusion may need to be tempered in the light of the *caveat* ‘nearly always’ (a1), although Moraux’s transposition of the parentheses to where they appear, if correct, has Aristotle backpedalling on this *caveat*, reinstating the necessity claim of b34. Cf. Nussbaum (1978, *ad loc.*) and Moss (2012a, pp. 24–5).

which passions can distort cognition, suggest that he thinks strong passions too can have this effect.

This is why sometimes also to those with a fever animals appear on the walls, from a slight similarity of the markings combined together. And these sometimes combine with their condition (*τοῖς πάθεσιν*) in such a way that, if they are not excessively ill, it does not escape their notice that it is something false, but if their condition is more severe, they even move towards them.

(*De Insomn.* 2, 460b11–16)

De Anima 3.3, 429a5–8 (discussed previously) confirms explicitly that passions are among the things that can ‘cover over’ reason in this way.⁸³ When reason is thus disabled, appearances (*phantasmata*) that would normally be treated in an uncommitted way, because of the more authoritative deliverances of reason, are now affirmed by the subject. And they act accordingly.

Of course, we need not suppose the covering-over of reason is an all-or-nothing affair, such that Aristotle would hold implausibly that individuals experiencing passions were either uncommitted to the way their passionate *phantasia* represented things or wholly unable to exercise their capacities of reason. The *De Insomniis* passage clearly presents the disabling of reason by disease as a matter of degree (‘if they are not excessively ill . . . if their condition is more severe . . .’ 460b14–15), and it is natural to think that Aristotle would have seen the effects of passions similarly.⁸⁴ Depending on their strength, Aristotelian passions can impede reason’s proper functioning to different degrees, and so persist when they should be extinguished, and generate motivational conflict where there should be none, despite the subject’s recognition that they involve a misrepresentation of how things are.

10.5.3 *Phantasia and ‘listening to reason’*

The second feature of passion-related *phantasia* highlighted, that it has motivational effects, even when the subject has reasoned beliefs in conflict with it, may explain a further feature of Aristotle’s views about the proper regulation of the passions. As noted in section 10.2, Aristotle thinks that, when it comes to the kind of *phantasia* that is pleasurable or

⁸³ Cf. also *De Sensu* 447a14–17, and for a defence of the view that this is what accounts for *akrasia* in *EN* 7.3, cf. Moss (2009).

⁸⁴ Cf. Moss (2012a, pp. 126–7) and references there.

painful, i.e. to the kind of appearances involved in the passions, *phantasia* can and should represent things as being the way that correct reason says they are, though in reality it may sometimes fail to do so. It is a mark of virtue that these evaluative appearances ‘completely concur with reason’ (EN 1.13, 1102b28), at least in the case when reason is getting things right. It is noteworthy that Aristotle recognizes no corresponding requirement for non-evaluative *phantasia* (e.g. that involved in memory, imagining, dreams, sensory appearances) to be conformed to what correct reason says. The explanation for why evaluative *phantasmata* are subject to this kind of regulation is, I suggest, that unlike their non-evaluative counterparts they will exert a degree of motivational influence on the subject regardless of the presence of more authoritative reasoned beliefs.⁸⁵

The way evaluative *phantasia* should listen to reason seems to me nicely illustrated by the passage from *De Anima* 3.3 (427b21–4) about how imagining terrible or frightening things leaves us unmoved, as we would be if we had seen such things in a painting. The passage has puzzled interpreters, on two grounds.⁸⁶ First, it has seemed puzzling that Aristotle would suppose we are left unmoved by the arts, especially given how central he thinks the arousal of pity and fear is to tragedy. Second, it seems puzzling how one could represent things as terrible or frightening with the non-reasoning part of the soul and not *ipso facto* be distressed—surely for Aristotle no more is needed for the non-reasoning part to be distressed than for it to represent something as terrible or frightening? Both puzzles are dispelled if we see this as a case where evaluative *phantasia* concurs (as Aristotle thinks it should) with reason. The result is very specific.

We are in the same condition as we would be if we were looking at terrible or encouraging things in a painting. (427b23–4)

The comparison with a painting is, I suggest, not making some implausible point about how we are left emotionally unmoved by the arts in general. Rather it draws on a point made specifically about painters in *Republic* 10, 596d–e.⁸⁷ *In a way*, the painter makes the objects he depicts,

⁸⁵ See further section 10.6.

⁸⁶ E.g. Belfiore (1992, pp. 242–5); Polansky (2007, p.412); Moss (2012a, pp. 90–1).

⁸⁷ This does not acquit Aristotle of claiming that we are (sometimes) left emotionally unmoved by paintings. Presumably he has in mind vase paintings. If—charitably—he may be taken not to be denying that we can *ever* be moved by paintings, but to be asserting that

but strictly speaking, he only makes the appearances of them. Aristotle's claim here, I suggest, is that when we know that these representations are merely imagined, we do not mistake them for the real thing. In a way what *phantasia* represents is terrible or encouraging things, but strictly what is represented is 'what terrible or encouraging things look like'. There is a subtle change in the representational contents of *phantasia*, akin to recognizing the images in a painting as *images*. As such, I suggest, this is a case where *phantasia* has successfully concurred with reason.⁸⁸

10.6 Resources for Explaining Conflict between Passions and Reason

I have claimed that an Aristotelian passion involves an exercise of *phantasia* whose representational contents are affirmed by its subject. I have also claimed that in correctly functioning humans, first, evaluative *phantasmata* will have representational contents that concur with what their reason concludes, but second,—if any evaluative *phantasmata* did persist that are at odds with reason's verdicts—although their contents would be affirmed by the subject, the person would act in accordance with what correct reason says, affirming reason's verdicts, reflecting the greater authority of reason in comparison to *phantasia*.

Correspondingly, Aristotle thinks that, in adult humans, recalcitrant passions, i.e. passions that persist in recognized conflict with the subject's considered beliefs, involve some *defect* or *failure* of correct functioning. And this, I argued in section 10.2, is a strength not a weakness of a view of the passions—it meets one of the *desiderata* for a theory of emotions that emerged from reflection on recalcitrant emotions.

Specifically, on an Aristotelian view, there are two malfunctions involved in recalcitrant passions. First, the way these passions represent their objects as pleasant and painful is not determined by what reason

sometimes (often, perhaps) the recognition that this is a painting and not the real thing so distances us from what is depicted that we do not respond to it emotionally, then his point seems to me not at all implausible.

⁸⁸ Conversely, it seems Aristotle's view is that passionate responses to the right kind of tragic plot and to certain kinds of music *can* be endorsed by reason—as though reason's verdict is that here is something worthy of fear, pity, anger, and so on. Cf. *Poetics* 13 and 14, esp. 1352b30–1353a5; *Politics* 8.5, esp. 1340a14–b7. The issues involved are complex and cannot be explored here.

correctly prescribes. Second, if that fails and the subject has passionate appearances persisting in conflict with their reasoned beliefs, the subject's actions and inclinations should be wholly determined by their reasoned beliefs, and they should be comparatively uncommitted to the contents of *phantasia* (reflecting belief's proper status as the more 'authoritative' psychological faculty), just as usually subjects are uncommitted to sensory appearances they know to be false (the appearance of the sun as about a foot across, or of one object as two in the finger and eyeball experiments described earlier). The second failure in the recalcitrant case, then, is that the *phantasma* involved in the passion, despite its being less 'authoritative' than the reasoned beliefs with which it is in conflict, nevertheless remains affirmed by the subject as representing the way things are, and continues to exert motivational pressure on the subject to act accordingly. This is a failure of proper psychological functioning according to which reason should determine the content of the subject's evaluative *phantasmata*, and the deliverances of more authoritative faculties should trump those of other, less authoritative faculties.

If we think that recalcitrant passions are a reasonably commonplace occurrence, we might be puzzled at the implication of this view that humans so frequently suffer the malfunctions just described, and suppose that this requires some explanation. This should start from the kinds of conflict between passions and reasoned beliefs that Aristotle himself recognizes.

In some ways the clearest cases are those discussed in *Nicomachean Ethics* 7.6, 1149a21–b26 involving conflict between anger/spirit (*θυμός*) and reason. On Aristotle's diagnosis, the conflict arises not from any disagreement about whether a slight (*ὀλιγωρία*) has occurred, but over whether one should fight for vengeance. Aristotle may have in mind Odysseus's anger against the servant girls in *Odyssey* 20, where reason does not repudiate the anger itself, nor denies the correctness of having some impulse towards vengeance.⁸⁹ Reason simply disagrees with anger's verdict that 'one should fight such a thing' (a33–4), on the grounds that—all things considered—it is better to do something else. The kind of *akrasia* from anger that Aristotle considers here is where the

⁸⁹ Homer, *Od.* 20.9–24, an incident that Plato had used to illustrate the motivational conflict between spirit and reason (*Rep.* 4, 440e–441b).

person *acts* from anger, against his reasoned judgement: the conflict is not over whether anger represents its objects correctly.

Similar is the type of case analysed in *DA* 3.10, of conflict between appetite and reason, where appetite's verdict on its object, that it is 'unqualifiedly pleasant and unqualifiedly good' (433b9), conflicts with reason's verdict. Aristotle is talking here about cases where immediate pleasure should be sacrificed because of greater longer-term benefits (b5–10): so, reason does not wholly repudiate the representation (by *phantasia*) of appetite's object as pleasant and good, in the ways to which appetite is sensitive. Rather, reason sets these against competing longer-term goods, and judges that all-things-considered it is better to forgo the immediate pleasure. Because appetite's verdict does not distinguish between *pro tanto* and all-things-considered pleasantness or goodness, it is opposed by reason to the extent that it motivates its subject to act as though its object were not merely *pro tanto* pleasant and good, but unqualifiedly so.⁹⁰

The key point for us is that, in both of these cases, the way the passions in question represent their objects is not contradicted directly by reason. Rather, reason recognizes the passionate response as a correct but partial response to features of the subject's circumstances.

In *De Memoria* 2, 453a26–8, Aristotle recognizes that anger and fear do not subside (or 'settle down', *καθίστανται*), despite the subject's efforts to extinguish them. The passage is not altogether clear—perhaps he envisages that the angry or fearful person continues to represent their object as meriting anger or fear despite being convinced that there are no grounds for these passions. But I think it more likely, given the context, that he is simply highlighting that the bodily processes involved in the passions are not immediately halted when one comes to see that the passions are not called for.

A final passage⁹¹ to consider in this context is *De Anima* 1.1, 403a19–25, in a series of arguments to the conclusion that the affections (*τὰ πάθη*) of the soul are enmattered accounts (*λόγοι ἐνυλοὶ*).

⁹⁰ Understanding the conflict between reason and appetite in *EN* 7.3 is complicated by Aristotle's diagnosis of ignorance, but for a defence of the view that the conflict is similar to that in *DA* 3.10, followed by a disabling of reason by the passions, see the justly celebrated Moss (2009).

⁹¹ I set aside *De Motu* 11, 703b5–8, and *De Anima* 3.9, 432b29–433a3. As examples of the accidental arousal of the passions by activities of reason, they show the passions' independence from reason. Still, they are not examples of passions in *conflict* with beliefs.

This is suggested by the fact that sometimes when serious and conspicuous sufferings are taking place people feel no distress or fear, whereas at other times they are stirred by small and feeble stimulations, whenever the body is angry, i.e. is in the condition it is in when a person is angry. And here is an even clearer case: when nothing fearsome is happening people find themselves with the feelings of the person who is frightened.

Aristotle's principal aim is to establish that the passions involve the body. His examples are best understood as cases where the subject's passions are at odds with how they take things to be, as a result of some bodily condition. In some of these cases, we can speculate plausibly about what might produce this result: the person who is physically exhausted may be unable to feel pity or fear at what they recognize as meriting such responses. The person whose body is in the aftermath of one frightening experience may be prone to a stronger fearful reaction to some subsequent stimulus than even their own assessment of how much fear that stimulus merits. It is less easy to guess what Aristotle has in mind in his last 'still clearer' case!⁹² But in all cases, there seems no obstacle to supposing that he is describing divergences from the proper functioning of a human adult. Aristotle takes such cases to be familiar but unusual cases that demand an explanation such as the one he provides. On the view defended here, these are unusual because they are deviations from the normal successful functioning of adult humans in which passions occur and persist only in the absence of conflict with the more authoritative psychological capacity for reasoned beliefs.

Having surveyed the kinds of conflict that Aristotle recognizes between reasoned beliefs and the passions, let us return with these in mind to the question of why humans seem prone to reasonably frequent failures of proper psychological functioning in these ways. Many of these cases involve a significant endorsement by reason of the contents of *phantasia*: that is to say, that experiencing some passion of that kind, e.g. experiencing *some* anger, does not represent a failure. Where there is a failure, it may consist in an inability, familiar from the ethical works, of non-virtuous people to take pleasure (and pain) in all and only the things

Indeed, in the former case, there is some doubt whether they are passions at all; cf. Nussbaum (1978, *ad loc.*).

⁹² Could it be that he is thinking of the emotional effects of music? If so, perhaps the suggestion is that the effect on the soul of music and poetry is such as to mimic standard cases of fear? Cf. *Politics* 8.5–7, esp. 1340a14–28.

that reason correctly affirms as good (or bad), and to the degree that reason so affirms them. Proneness to such failures is partially explained in *De Anima* 3.10 as stemming from the cognitive limitations of *phantasia*, and an inability to 'see the future'. But it will also be explained in significant measure by defects in upbringing and moral education.⁹³ The failure might also result from the disabling or 'covering-over' of reason as a side effect of the subject's passions.

Some challenges for the view canvassed here remain. There is a puzzle about why for Aristotle human *phantasia* ought to 'agree with'⁹⁴ correct reason when those contents are *evaluative* (and the *phantasma* would be pleasurable or painful), whereas—as with the apparent size of the sun—he clearly does not think that it is *generally* true of *phantasia* that its contents ought to follow what reason says, where the two conflict. I have speculated that this is best explained by the fact that evaluative *phantasia* has necessary motivational consequences, whereas non-evaluative *phantasia* does not. But to be fully satisfying within Aristotle's framework, we would wish this explanation to be accompanied by some story about why (it is good that) evaluative and non-evaluative *phantasia* are different in this way. Relatedly, the account presented here raises a challenge to explain why seemingly humans more reliably withhold affirmation from non-evaluative than from evaluative *phantasmata* when they conflict with better-grounded beliefs. Why, one might justifiably wonder, does a structural feature of human psychology (preferring more authoritative rational beliefs over non-rational appearances, when the two conflict) operate more successfully if the content is non-evaluative, despite the fact that the conflict is between *phantasia* and *doxa* in both cases? Perhaps Aristotle's recognition of the power of passionate states to disable reason goes some way to explaining this. But here again, there remains a substantial challenge to turn this into a convincing explanation of how phobic responses to dogs or heights, so prevalent in the contemporary literature on the philosophy of emotions, can arise or persist in the face of conflicting better beliefs.⁹⁵ For, on the face of things, the reasoning faculties of such phobics seem unimpaired.

⁹³ EN 2.3, 1104b3–1105a16; 2.6, 1106b36–1107a2, and cf. still Burnyeat (1980).

⁹⁴ See section 10.2 for discussion of the passages in which Aristotle expresses this view.

⁹⁵ Cf. Moss (2012a, pp. 112–18 and 126–7) for some intriguing suggestions about how such an explanation might work.

Of course, the fact that challenges remain in understanding fully the contours of Aristotle's evaluative psychology need not impugn the progress that it is possible to make. If the proposed account is correct, Aristotle has powerful resources for explaining human passions, including the conflicts he recognizes between passions and beliefs.

10.7 Some Philosophical Merits of Aristotle's View

The view of the passions that I have ascribed to Aristotle here seems to me to have considerable merits as a view of the emotions. In particular, it has some interesting strengths in how it accounts for recalcitrant emotions.

On Aristotle's view, recalcitrant emotions are possible because the representational capacity involved in the emotions is distinct from that involved in considered beliefs.

Assuming that there is more reason for affirming the way things are represented in the subject's considered beliefs than the way they are represented in their passion, there will be a failing involved in persisting in having the passion once the conflict between these is recognized.

We have focused on Aristotle's treatment of (typical?) cases where reasoned beliefs are epistemically better than mere appearances, but of course this need not always be so. Our emotional responses may, on some occasions, be more sensitive to the balance of relevant evidence than our reasoned beliefs. Consider the kind of situation in which one might correctly feel suspicious of a plausible-sounding stranger, on the basis of subtle behavioural cues that betray his fraudulent intentions, without one's being aware that one is responding to those cues, and without one's being able reflectively to identify adequate grounds for such suspicion. Aristotle's view of course is that the passions should be conformed to what *correct* reason prescribes (EN 1107a1–2). Recalcitrant passions will thus *normally* involve a failing, since normally the subject's reasoned beliefs will be a better response to the balance of evidence available. But Aristotle seems aware (EN 1151b17–22) that sometimes the representations involved in the passions may constitute a better response to the available evidence than that person's reasoned beliefs, and if so, it is a merit that they persist in spite of their conflict with those beliefs.

Aristotle thus has a plausible account of the failing involved in recalcitrant emotions, and also avoids *overstating* this failing.⁹⁶ When a person's considered judgement and their passions are in conflict, the person endorses conflicting appraisals of their situation. If it is the reasoning part that is responding correctly to the balance of considerations available, Aristotle's diagnosis is that the passionate part has failed to discharge its function properly, and listen properly to the reasoning part. The subject's reason has also failed to exercise its *authority*. For the subject experiences motivational conflict, and is in other ways inclined to affirm representational contents that have been contradicted by a more authoritative faculty. But these failings are less significant than the fact that their reasoning has reached the correct judgement on whether emotion is warranted, and if it is this considered judgement that determines the subject's further inferences, judgements, and actions, the reasoning part has *largely* succeeded in functioning as it should. Certainly, the failing involved in having recalcitrant emotions is not as serious as persisting with beliefs or judgements that are inconsistent with one's better beliefs or knowledge. This is because the reasoning part has a supervisory or 'ruling' role in the person, such that it is more important for exercises of this part to be regulated by the person's assessment of the balance of evidential considerations than it is for subordinate parts to be so regulated. The subordination Aristotle recognizes of the non-reasoning to the reasoning part gives him resources for an account of the passions which meets the *desiderata* of making recalcitrant emotions a failing but one that is not too severe.

The explanation of why the passions of adult humans generally are successfully regulated by beliefs is provided in part by supposing (as Aristotle seems to have done) simply that adult humans in general function tolerably well. Having located the passions in the non-reasoning part of the soul, he can appeal to the cognitive limitations of this part to account for the particular kinds of conflict between passions and beliefs (those involved in weak-willed behaviour) to which humans are particularly prone.

⁹⁶ We here leave aside the case where passions completely disable the subject's ability to reason, and to control their beliefs and actions in the light of their beliefs. Aristotle would presumably see such a loss of control by reason as a serious failure of psychological functioning.

10.8 Conclusion

Aristotle's position, I think, is this. The passions involve exercises of the capacity *phantasia* with evaluative representational contents that constitute an affirmation by the subject that things are the way they are represented as being. This explains why the passions can be used, and legitimately used, in rhetoric. It also explains why it is important for fully virtuous agents to have the right passions—they are thereby able to make an unconflicted affirmation of the correct view of what the situation demands. Virtue is better than self-control on precisely this point, since the self-controlled person—as well as having a correct appraisal in virtue of the activity of their reasoning part—also has an incorrect appraisal in virtue of their passionate responses. Although their reasoning part exercises, in the end, the control it should over action, they also have a dissenting voice that does not construe the situation as it should. And that is a failing.

Conclusions

I have sought to defend the claim that, for Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*, arousing the passions of others can amount to giving them proper grounds for conviction, and hence a skill in doing so is properly part of an expertise in rhetoric.

This has involved first defending the attribution to Aristotle of a normative view of rhetoric, centred around its role in the state, in which rhetoric is a skill in producing proper grounds for conviction. It has also involved, second, defending the ascription to Aristotle of a particular view of the passions: that they are representational states, in which their contents are not merely how things ‘appear’ to the subject, but how the subject takes things to be.

This view has some nice implications for Aristotle’s understanding of passions in non-human animals. There is no reason, in principle, why non-humans cannot experience very similar passions to those experienced by humans. But there will be important differences between human and non-human passions arising from the availability of reason to the former but not to the latter, and to other differences in psychological complexity. Thus, to the extent that some human passions involve deploying rather complex notions such as ‘undeserving’, ‘slight’, ‘revenge’, ‘deliverance’, and ‘disrepute’, we should suppose that less sophisticated animals will have—at most—simpler versions deploying simpler notions commensurate with their psychological abilities. This would be, I take it, a difference of degree (or of ‘the more and the less’), and would match nicely the view expressed by Aristotle (*HA* 8.1, 588a18–30) that human and non-human animal passions differ in precisely this way. Tracing this view in detail would involve a careful consideration of the various kinds of animal passion mentioned in various places throughout the corpus, and particularly in the biological works. As such it lies beyond our scope here.

The view of the passions here ascribed to Aristotle leaves unresolved a difficult issue in Aristotle studies, as in contemporary philosophy, that is, of how to understand passionate responses to things known to the subject to be fictional. If the position defended here is correct, Aristotle faces the choice between supposing that experiencing pity and fear in response to tragedy either involves some kind of psychological malfunction or involves the subject's in some way supposing the objects of their passions to be real, since to pity someone is to take them (really) to be suffering undeservedly, and to fear something is to take it that something destructive or grievous (really) is going to happen. Again, the issue cannot be resolved here, but some of the ways this issue is connected to the assertions made here are interesting. For there are wider questions about what one should say about the reference and correctness conditions of assertions about fictional characters. Passionate responses to fictional characters can be appropriate or inappropriate to what is happening in the fiction, just as assertions about fictional entities can be judged for truth and falsity in relation to the fictions in which they are found. So, it is possible that this could yield some sense in which the subject takes things to be a certain way (in the fiction), so as to retain the view that passions involve taking things to be as they are represented, and avoid the unacceptable conclusion that passionate responses to fiction exhibit a psychological malfunction. Equally suggestive are the ways in which Aristotle, in the *Poetics* (e.g. 1451a36–b10), connects the action on the stage to universal truths about people and their affairs. So, perhaps part of what is happening when we experience pity and fear in response to tragedy is that we are really pitying and fearing features of our own condition, or that of humans in general. If so, these would be things that the subject could, without any psychological malfunction, take to be a certain way without in any way compromising their grasp of the fictional nature of the individual characters and particular events represented on the stage.

A full resolution of these issues cannot be developed here. I have presented here a new reading, or rather the revival of an old reading, of Aristotle's understanding of rhetoric in the *Rhetoric*. In doing so, I hope to have shown how richly rewarding for many areas, but particularly for the study of Aristotle's views on the passions, is the close study of the context in which these views are principally presented: that is, the close study of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, S. (2004) *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Allen, J. (2001) *Inference from Signs: Ancient Debates About the Nature of Evidence*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Allen, J. (2007) 'Aristotle on the Disciplines of Argument: Rhetoric, Dialectic, Analytic', *Rhetorica*, 25(1), pp. 87–108.
- Annas, J. (1982) 'Aristotle on Inefficient Causes', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 32(129), pp. 311–26.
- Bain, D. (2003) 'Intentionalism and Pain', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 53(213), pp. 502–23.
- Barnes, J. (1969) 'Aristotle's Theory of Demonstration', *Phronesis*, 14(2), pp. 123–52.
- Barnes, J. (ed.) (1984) *The Complete Works of Aristotle—The Revised Oxford Translation*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Barnes, Jonathan (1995) 'Rhetoric and Poetics', in J. Barnes (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 259–86.
- Belfiore, E. S. (1992) *Tragic Pleasures: Aristotle on Plot and Emotion*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Bierce, A. (1993) *The Devil's Dictionary*, Courier Dover Publications, [online] Available from: <http://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=FmquL5XIxbMC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=bierce+the+devil%27s+dictionary&ots=MrA6yqLzPd&sig=u7HjcEEeTG-n58j84eTLT_YHijw> (accessed 9 September 2014).
- Black, D. L. (1990) *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*, Islamic Philosophy and Theology, Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Brady, M. S. (2007) 'Recalcitrant Emotions and Visual Illusions', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 44(3), pp. 273–84.
- Brady, M. S. (2008) 'The Irrationality of Recalcitrant Emotions', *Philosophical Studies*.
- Burnyeat, M. F. (1980) 'Aristotle on Learning to be Good', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*, Berkeley, University of California Press, pp. 69–92.
- Burnyeat, M. F. (1994) 'Enthymeme: The Logic of Persuasion', in D. J. Furley and A. Nehamas (eds), *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, pp. 3–56.
- Burnyeat, M. F. (2002) 'De Anima II 5', *Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy*, 47(1), pp. 28–90.

- Carey, C. (1996) 'Rhetorical Means of Persuasion', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, pp. 399–415.
- Caston, V. (1996) 'Why Aristotle Needs Imagination', *Phronesis*, 41, pp. 20–55.
- Caston, V. (1998) 'Aristotle and the Problem of Intentionality', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 58(2), pp. 249–98.
- Chappell, T. D. (1993) 'The Virtues of Thrasymachus', *Journal of Ancient Philosophy*, 38(1), pp. 1–17.
- Chappell, T. D. (2000) 'Thrasymachus and Definition', in D. J. Sedley (ed.), *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, XVIII, pp. 101–7.
- Charles, D. (2011) 'Desire in Action: Aristotle's Move', in M. Pakaluk and G. Pearson (eds), *Moral Psychology and Human Action in Aristotle*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 75–93.
- Cooper, J. M. (1993) 'Rhetoric, Dialectic, and the Passions', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 11, pp. 175–98.
- Cooper, J. M. (1996) 'An Aristotelian Theory of the Emotions', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, pp. 238–57.
- Cooper, J. M. (ed.) (1997) *Plato: Complete Works—Edited with Introduction and Notes*, Indianapolis, Ind., Hackett Publishing Company.
- Cooper, J. M. (1999) *Reason and Emotion: Essays on Ancient Moral Psychology and Ethical Theory*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.
- Cope, E. M. (1867) *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric, with Analysis, Notes and Appendices*, S.I., s.n.
- Cope, E. M. (1877) *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Crane, T. (1998) 'Intentionality as the Mark of the Mental', in A. O'Hear (ed.), *Contemporary Issues in the Philosophy of Mind*, Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement, pp. 229–51.
- D'Arms, J. and Jacobson, D. (2000) 'The Moralistic Fallacy: On the "Appropriateness" of Emotions', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, LXI(1), pp. 65–90.
- Denniston, J. D. (1954) *The Greek Particles (revised by K. J. Dover)*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- De Romilly, J. (1975) *Magic and Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*, The Carl Newell Jackson lectures, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Döring, S. (2003) 'Explaining Action by Emotion', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, LIII(211), pp. 214–30.
- Dow, J. (2007) 'A Supposed Contradiction about Emotion-Arousal in Aristotle's Rhetoric', *Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy*, 52, pp. 382–402.
- Dow, J. (2009) 'Feeling Fantastic?—Emotions and Appearances in Aristotle', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 37.

- Dow, Jamie (2011) 'Aristotle's Theory of the Emotions—Emotions as Pleasures and Pains', in M. Pakaluk and G. Pearson (eds), *Moral Psychology and Human Action in Aristotle*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 47–74.
- Dow, J. (2013) 'Advertising, Ethics of', in H. LaFollette (ed.), *International Encyclopaedia of Ethics*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Elster, J. (1999) *Alchemies of the Mind*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Elster, J. (2004) 'Emotions and Rationality', in A. S. R. Manstead, N. Frijda, and A. Fischer (eds), *Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium (Studies in Emotion and Social Interaction)*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 30–48.
- Engberg-Pedersen, T. (1996) 'Is There an Ethical Dimension to Aristotelian Rhetoric?', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, pp. 116–41.
- Everson, S. (1998) 'The Incoherence of Thrasymachus', in C. C. W. Taylor (ed.), *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, XVI, pp. 99–131.
- Everson, S. (1999) *Aristotle on Perception*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. (1971) 'Aristotle: Animals, Emotion and Moral Virtue', *Arethusa*, 4, pp. 137–65.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. (1992) 'Aristotle on Persuasion through Character', *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 10(3), pp. 207–44.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. (2002) *Aristotle on Emotion*, 2nd edn. London, Duckworth.
- Frede, D. (1993) *Plato: Philebus (Translated, with Introduction and Notes)*, Indianapolis, Ind., Hackett Publishing Company.
- Frede, D. (1996) 'Mixed Feelings in Aristotle's Rhetoric', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, p. 258.
- Freese, J. H. (1926) *Aristotle: Art of Rhetoric, Volume XXII*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Furley, D. J. and Nehamas, A. (eds) (1994) *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.
- Garver, E. (1994) *Aristotle's Rhetoric: An Art of Character*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.
- Gendler, T. S. (2008) 'Alief and Belief', *Journal of Philosophy*, 105(10), pp. 634–63.
- Gill, C. (1984) 'The Êthos/Pathos Distinction in Rhetorical and Literary Criticism', *The Classical Quarterly*, 34(01), pp. 149–66.
- Goldie, P. (2000) *The Emotions—a Philosophical Exploration*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Goldstein, I. (2002) 'Are Emotions Feelings?: A Further Look at Hedonic Theories of Emotions', *Consciousness and Emotion*, 3(1), pp. 21–33.
- Gordon, R. M. (1990) *The Structure of Emotions: Investigations in Cognitive Philosophy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Gosling, J. C. B. and Taylor, C. C. W. (1982) *The Greeks on Pleasure*, USA, Oxford University Press.
- Greenspan, P. (1988) *Emotions and Reasons*, New York, Routledge.
- Griffin, J. (1980) *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Grimaldi, W. M. A. (1957) 'A Note on the *Pisteis* in Aristotle's Rhetoric, 1354–1356', *American Journal of Philology*, pp. 188–92.
- Grimaldi, W. M. A. (1972) *Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Hermes. Einzelschriften. Hft. 25., Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Grimaldi, W. M. A. (1980) *Aristotle, Rhetoric I: A Commentary*, New York, Fordham University Press.
- Grimaldi, W. M. A. (1988) *Aristotle, Rhetoric II: A Commentary*, New York, Fordham University Press.
- Halliwell, S. (1994) 'Popular Morality, Philosophical Ethics and the Rhetoric', in D. J. Furley and A. Nehamas (eds), *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, pp. 211–30.
- Hamlyn, D. W. (1993) *Aristotle: De Anima Books II and III*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Harte, V. (2004) 'The "Philebus" on Pleasure: The Good, the Bad and the False', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 104(2), pp. 111–28.
- Haskins, E. V. (2004) *Logos and Power in Isocrates and Aristotle*, Columbia, SC, University of South Carolina Press.
- Heinaman, R. (2007) 'Actuality, Potentiality and *De Anima* II. 5', *Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy*, 52(2), pp. 139–87.
- Helm, B. W. (2001) *Emotional Reason—Deliberation, Motivation and the Nature of Value*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hicks, R. D. (1907) *Aristotle: De Anima*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Irwin, T. H. (1985) *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*, Indianapolis, Ind., Hackett Publishing Company.
- Irwin, T. H. (1996) 'Ethics in the Rhetoric and in the Ethics', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- Jebb, R. C. (1909) *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* (tr. R. C. Jebb)—*Edited with an Introduction and with Supplementary Notes by J. E. Sandys*, J. E. Sandys (ed.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kahn, C. H. (1983) 'Drama and Dialectic in Plato's *Gorgias*', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 1, pp. 75–121.
- Kassel, R. (1971) *Der Text der Aristotelischen Rhetorik: Prolegomena zu einer Kritischen Ausgabe*, Berlin, New York, W. de Gruyter.
- Kassel, R. (1976) *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica*, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1985) 'Review of William A. Grimaldi, *Aristotle, Rhetoric I. A Commentary*', *American Journal of Philology*, 106(1), pp. 131–3.

- Kennedy, G. A. (1991) *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Konstan, D. (2006) *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1984) 'On the Primacy of Cognition', *The American Psychologist*, 39(2), pp. 124–9.
- Leighton, S. R. (1982) 'Aristotle and the Emotions', *Phronesis*, 27(2), pp. 144–74.
- Leighton, S. R. (1996) 'Aristotle and the Emotions', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, pp. 206–37.
- Lorenz, H. (2006) *The Brute Within: Appetitive Desire in Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Lycos, K. (1964) 'Plato and Aristotle on Appearing', *Mind*, LXXIII, pp. 496–514.
- McCabe, M. M. (1994) 'Arguments in Context: Aristotle's Defense of Rhetoric', in D. J. Furley and A. Nehamas (eds), *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, pp. 129–65.
- McGinn, C. (1982) *The Character of Mind*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Mirhady, D. C. (1996) 'Torture and Rhetoric in Athens', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 116, pp. 119–31.
- Moss, J. (2009) 'Akrasia and Perceptual Illusion', *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 91(2), pp. 119–56.
- Moss, J. (2012a) *Aristotle on the Apparent Good: Perception, Phantasia, Thought, and Desire*, Oxford Aristotle Studies, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Moss, J. (2012b) 'Soul-leading: The Unity of the *Phaedrus*, Again', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 43, pp. 1–23.
- Murphy, J. J. (1974) *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Nehamas, A. and Woodruff, P. (1995) *Phaedrus*, Indianapolis, Hackett Publishing Company.
- Nieuwenburg, P. (2002) 'Emotion and Perception in Aristotle's Rhetoric', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 80(1), pp. 86–100.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1978) *Aristotle's De Motu Animalium*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1994) *The Therapy of Desire—Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1996) 'Aristotle on Emotions and Rational Persuasion', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Berkeley, University of California Press, pp. 303–23.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2001) *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Oates, W. J. (1963) 'Excursus: Evidence from the Rhetoric', in W. J. Oates, *Aristotle and the Problem of Value*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, pp. 335–51.
- Owen, G. E. L. (1971) 'Aristotelian Pleasures', in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, pp. 135–52.
- Pitcher, G. (1965) 'Emotion', *Mind*, 74, pp. 324–46.
- Polansky, R. (2007) *Aristotle's De Anima: A Critical Commentary*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Price, A. (2009) 'Emotions in Plato and Aristotle', in P. Goldie (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotion*, Oxford Handbooks in Philosophy, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 121–42.
- Primavesi, O. (1987) 'Der Terminus "Pistis" in den Einleitungskapiteln der Aristotelischen Rhetoric', Lehramt am Gymnasium, Heidelberg, Universität Heidelberg.
- Prinz, J. (2004) *Gut Reactions—a Perceptual Theory of Emotion*, New York, NY, Oxford University Press.
- Prosser, S. (2007) 'The Two-Dimensional Content of Consciousness', *Philosophical Studies*, 136(3), pp. 319–49.
- Radermacher, L. (1951) *Artium Scriptores (Reste der Voraristotelischen Rhetorik)*, Österreichs Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, Vienna.
- Rapp, C. (2002a) *Aristoteles: Rhetorik*, Werke in deutscher Übersetzung, Berlin, Akademie Verlag.
- Rapp, C. (2002b) 'Aristotle's Rhetoric', Winter 2008, in E. N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, [online] Available from: <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-rhetoric/>> (accessed 19 August 2009).
- Rapp, C. (2009) 'The Nature and Goals of Rhetoric', in G. Anagnostopoulos (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Aristotle*, Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 577–96.
- Rorty, A. O. (1984) 'Aristotle on the Metaphysical Status of "Pathé"', *The Review of Metaphysics*, 37(3), pp. 521–46.
- Ross, W. D. (ed.) (1956) *Aristotelis: De Anima (Oxford Classical Texts)*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ross, W. D. (ed.) (1959) *Aristotelis: Ars Rhetorica (Oxford Classical Texts)*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Ross, D. W. (1961) *Aristotle: De Anima*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Rowe, C. (2003) 'The Treatment of Anger in Aristotle's Rhetoric and Ethics', in D. N. Koutras (ed.), *On Aristotle's Poetics and the Art of Rhetoric*, Athens, Society for Aristotelian Studies, pp. 366–76.
- Ryle, G. (1949) *The Concept of Mind*, London, Hutchinson.
- Salmela, M. (2006) 'True Emotions', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 56(224), pp. 382–405.

- Schofield, M. (1978) 'Aristotle on the Imagination', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's De Anima*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Schofield, M. (2011) 'Phantasia in De Motu Animalium', in M. Pakaluk and G. Pearson (eds), *Moral Psychology and Human Action in Aristotle*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 119–34.
- Schütrumpf, E. (1994) 'Some Observations on the Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric', in D. J. Furley and A. Nehamas (eds), *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, pp. 99–116.
- Sihvola, J. (1996) 'Emotional Animals: Do Aristotelian Emotions Require Beliefs?', *Apeiron*, 29(2), pp. 105–44.
- Solmsen, F. (1929) *Die Entwicklung Der Aristotelischen Logik Und Rhetorik*, Neue Philologische Untersuchungen. Heft 4., Berlin, Georg Olms Verlag.
- Solmsen, F. (1938) 'Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings', *Classical Philology*, 33(4), pp. 390–404.
- Sorabji, R. (1993) *Animal Minds and Human Morals—the Origins of the Western Debate*, London, Duckworth.
- Sorabji, R. (1999) 'Aspasius on Emotion', in A. Alberti and R. W. Sharples (eds), *Aspasius: The Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter and Co, pp. 96–106.
- Sprague, R. K. (1972) *The Older Sophists: A Complete Translation by Several Hands of the Fragments in Die Fragmente Der Vorsokratiker*, edited by Diels-Kranz. With a New Edition of Antiphon and of Euthydemus, Indianapolis, Hackett Publishing Company.
- Sprute, J. (1994) 'Aristotle and the Legitimacy of Rhetoric', in D. J. Furley and A. Nehamas (eds), *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, pp. 117–28.
- Sripada, C. S. and Stich, S. (2004) 'Evolution, Culture and the Irrationality of the Emotions', in D. Evans and P. Cruse (eds), *Emotion, Evolution and Rationality*, New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 133–58.
- Striker, G. (1996) 'Emotions in Context: Aristotle's Treatment of the Passions in the Rhetoric and His Moral Psychology', in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Berkeley, University of California Press, pp. 286–302.
- Thür, G. (2005) 'The Role of the Witness in Athenian Law', in M. Gagarin and D. J. Cohen (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*, New York, NY, Cambridge University Press, pp. 146–69.
- Tye, M. (2006) 'Another Look at Representationalism about Pain', in M. Aydede (ed.), *Pain: New Essays on its Nature and the Methodology of its Study*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Wardy, R. (1998) *The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato and their Successors*, London, Routledge.
- Weaver, R. M. (1953) *The Ethics of Rhetoric*, Chicago, IL, H. Regnery Company.

- Wedin, M. V. (1988) *Mind and Imagination in Aristotle*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- White, S. A. (1995) 'Thrasymachus the Diplomat', *Classical Philology*, 90(4), pp. 307–27.
- Whiting, D. (2006) 'Standing Up For an Affective Account of Emotion', *Philosophical Explorations*, 9(3), pp. 261–76.
- Wikramanayake, G. H. (1961) 'A Note on the *Pisteis* in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*', *The American Journal of Philology*, 82(2), pp. 193–6.
- Williams, B. A. O. (1973) 'Deciding to Believe', in B. A. O. Williams, *Problems of the Self*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 136–51.
- Wisse, J. (1989) *Ethos and Pathos, from Aristotle to Cicero*, Amsterdam, Hakkert.
- Wörner, M. H. (1990) *Das Ethische in der Rhetorik des Aristoteles*, Freiburg/Munich, K. Alber.
- Young, I. M. (2000) *Inclusion and Democracy*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Yunis, H. (1997) 'Thrasymachus B1: Discord, Not Diplomacy', *Classical Philology*, 92(1), pp. 58–66.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1984) 'On the Primacy of Affect', *American Psychologist*, 39(2), pp. 117–23.
- Zerilli, L. M. G. (2005) *Feminism and the Abyss of Freedom*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

Index Locorum

Antiphon

De Caede Herodis

71, 74–80 112 n.17

Aristotle

De Anima

402a4–11 44

403a3–10 135 n.10, 190–1,
197 n.46

403a16–8 113 n.16, 137, 190

403a19–25 220–1

403a26–7 191

403a30–b1 191 n.27

413b13–32 190 n.26

427b7–8 185 n.7

427b11–14 185 n.7

427b16–24 203–4

427b17–20 214

427b21–4 185, 185 n.7, 217

428a2–9 197 n.45

428a9 191 n.28

428a12 205 n.58

428a17–24 47 n.27, 192 n.32

428a18 205 n.58

428a18–9 205–13

428a20 147–8

428a22–3 42 n.17

428a24–8 205 n.57

428a24–b9 205–13

428b2–9 205

428b11–7 191 n.28

428b17–30 205 n.58

429a4–8 198–9

429a5–8 214, 216

429a7 196 n.44, 215

431a8–14 177, 192 n.33, 193 n.37

432a22–b7 190 n.26

432b29–433a3 220 n.91

433a9–14 192 n.33, 197 n.46

433a22–9 197 n.46

433a26–9 214 n.79

433b1–4 190 n.26

433b5–10 139 n.24, 184, 186 n.10, 196
n.43, 197 n.46, 220

De Insomniis

459a16–7 191 n.28

460b1–11 139

460b11–16 215–16

460b13–8 196–7

460b18–20 197

460b20–2 200

461b2–5 200

461b30–462a2 200 n.49

De Memoria

453a26–8 220

De Motu Animalium

701a32–3 214 n.79

701b2–17 215

701b23–5 214 n.79

701b33–702a2 214–15

702a18–9 214 n.79

703b5–8 220 n.91

De Sensu

447a14–7 216 n.83

De Sophisticis Elenchis

34 11–12, 120

164a20–165b11 59

165a38–b11 55 n.41

165b27 44 n.22

183b36–185a9 20 n.32

184a 19

184b 118

Eudemian Ethics

1219b23 192 n.33

1219b26–1220a4 191 n.29

1219b30–1 186

1219b32–6 190 n.26

1220a8–12 191 n.30

1220a10–1 186

1220b5–14 191 n.31, 193

1220b12–5 113 n.16, 133 n.3, 146 n.7

1220b34–1221b17 191 n.31

1221b27–34 191 n.30, 192 n.33

1222b4–14 191 n.31

History of Animals

8.1, 588a18–30 185, 226

Aristotle (*cont.*)*Magna Moralia*

- 1186a11–4 113 n.16
- 1186a33–6 146 n.7

Metaphysics

- 1005b19–34 209 n.70
- 1046a36–b7 58 n.49

Nicomachean Ethics

- 1098a4 185
- 1102a26–32 190 n.26
- 1102a27–1103a3 191 n.29
- 1102b25–33 184
- 1102b26–8 186
- 1102b28 217
- 1102b30–2 186 n.11, 192 n.33
- 1102b33 185–6
- 1103a3–8 191 n.30
- 1103b13–21 194 n.39
- 1104b3–1105a16 222 n.93
- 1105a13–6 194 n.39
- 1105b21–3 113 n.16, 133 n.3, 146 n.7, 193
- 1106b16–23 191 n.31
- 1106b18–20 113 n.3
- 1106b36–1107a2 222 n.93
- 1107a1–2 223
- 1108a19–23 62 n.55
- 1111b5 147 n.10
- 1112b14 52 n.35
- 1117a29–b22 150 n.18, 154 n.32
- 1120a14 148
- 1120a26 148 n.11
- 1120b32 148 n.11
- 1127a17–26 62 n.55
- 1145b2–7 145 n.2
- 1146a9–16 198 n.47
- 1147a10–18 196 n.44
- 1147a31–b3 197 n.46
- 1147b6–9 196 n.44
- 1149a21–b26 219
- 1149a25–34 184, 196 n.43, 197 n.46
- 1151b17–22 223
- 1151b32–1152a3 197 n.46
- 1152b1 161 n.47
- 1152b4–8 163 nn.52–3
- 1153a7–17 176 n.71
- 1168a21 147 n.10
- 1170a24–5 161 n.47
- 1172a16 161 n.47
- 1172a16–26 163 n.54
- 1172a19 147 n.10

1175a1–8 193 n.37

1176a15–29 163 n.52

Physics

- 246b20–247a19 137 n.20, 192 n.33
- 247a3–9 133 n.3, 193
- 247a7–18 194

Poetics

- 1451a36–b10 227
- 1452b30–1453a5 218 n.88

Politics

- 1254b2–9 191 n.31
- 1340a14–b7 218 n.88, 221 n.92

Prior Analytics

- 25b26–7 53 n.38
- 56a28–9 147

Posterior Analytics

- 71a1–2 54
- 71a9–11 54
- 71b20–4 56 n.45
- 93a15 79 n.6

Rhetoric

- Book 1
- 1.1 10
- 1.1–3 11
- 1354a1 53
- 1354a1–11 19 n.30, 48, 77
- 1354a5–6 48
- 1354a6–11 20 n.33
- 1354a9 65 n.1
- 1354a11 19 n.28
- 1354a12 35 n.1, 120 n.34
- 1354a11–14 10 n.1, 48, 73 n.12
- 1354a11–18 35–41, 108–9, 123
- 1354a13 42, 43 n.19, 74, 78
- 1354a13–14 43, 64
- 1354a13–18 43
- 1354a15 43, 89 n.14
- 1354a16–7 19, 111–13, 124, 135 n.13
- 1354a16–18 110 n.10, 114, 121
- 1354a16–24 117, 122
- 1354a18–21 67–70
- 1354a18–24 110 n.11
- 1354a21–4 69
- 1354a24–6 70–1, 78, 109, 112 n.15, 124
- 1354a24–31 52 n.36
- 1354a26–8 49, 65 n.2, 78
- 1354a26–31 71–2
- 1354a28 112 n.14
- 1354b8–11 67 n.4

- 1354b13-4 122 n.38
1354b16-22 72-4, 109, 119 n.32, 123
1354b21 42, 78, 108 n.4
1354b29-1355a3 78
1354b30-1 49
1354b35-6 78
1355a2 72
1355a3-4 42, 64, 72-3, 78
1355a3-6 186 n.13
1355a3-18 42, 50-6, 89 n.13
1355a5-6 47 n.27, 78, 89 n.15
1355a7-8 89 n.14, 96 n.2
1355a10-4 79-80
1355a14-8 19 n.30, 53 n.37, 60, 79-80
1355a15-6 58
1355a15-7 67, 78 n.3
1355a19-20 73 n.12
1355a19-b7 18, 66, 78 n.3
1355a20-1 78, 87
1355a20-3 78 n.4
1355a21-2 78
1355a21-4 67
1355a24-5 45
1355a24-9 67 n.4, 80-2
1355a29-31 51 n.31, 78 n.4
1355a29-33 58 n.48
1355a29-38 78 n.4
1355a29-b7 86
1355a31-2 46
1355a35-b7 121 n.35
1355a36-8 57, 78, 78 n.4
1355a38 67
1355a38-b1 16 n.18
1355b2-7 51 n.31, 78 n.4
1355b10-11 49, 57
1355b10-17 42
1355b15-16 46 n.25, 57, 58 n.47
1355b15-21 59-60
1355b25-6 42
1355b25-34 42
1355b26 57
1355b26-8 49
1355b26-35 54
1355b29 45
1355b33 41
1355b33-4 57
1355b35 42, 46
1355b35-9 43 n.19, 50 n.30
1355b35-1356a4 38 n.11
1355b36-8 60
1356a1-4 58-9, 95, 186 n.13
1356a1-20 110
1356a3 106
1356a4 58 n.47
1356a4-5 95
1356a5-6 98
1356a5-13 96-101
1356a6-8 98
1356a12-3 57
1356a13 98
1356a14-19 110, 125-6, 135 nn.12-13
1356a15-6 104
1356a20 57, 58 n.47
1356a20-33 42, 46, 89 n.13
1356a21 43 n.19
1356a22 48-9
1356a25 49
1356a27-30 13 n.12, 19 n.30
1356a30-31 49
1356a31 41
1356a33-4 48
1356a35-b4 58 n.47
1356a36 58 n.47
1356b2-3 201
1356b3-4 58
1356b26-34 46-7
1356b28 56 n.46
1356b28-30 42 n.17, 56, 57
1356b28-1357a1 192 n.34
1356b33-4 56, 67 n.5
1356b37-8 56
1357a1-2 65 n.1
1357a3-4 57, 67 n.4
1357a7-12 88 n.12
1357a7-21 57
1357a10-12 57, 67 n.4
1357a12-3 56 n.46, 57
1357a16-23 57
1357a34-b25 57
1358a2-26 57
1358a36-1359a6 49
1358b1-2 65 n.1
1358b1-6 78
1359a6-10 51 n.33
1359a26-9 51 n.33, 192 n.34
1359b2-1360a37 81 n.8
1363b28-32 148
1367b22-7 60-1
1367b27 61
1368a19-21 13 n.10
1368b1-5 170 n.65
1368b25-32 170 n.65

Aristotle (*cont.*)

1368b28–1369b29 192 n.34
 1369a4 192
 1369b15 135 nn.12–13
 1369b15–31 164 n.57, 170 n.65
 1369b31–2 163–4, 173 n.68
 1369b33–1370a18 164–77
 1369b33–5 173–7
 1369b35 161 n.47
 1370a8 165 n.59
 1370a27–32 174, 193
 1370b20–6 173
 1370b32–4 170–1
 1371a8–10 170
 1371a17–21 170–1
 1371a21–2 170
 1371a22–4 170–1
 1372a4–5 170 n.65
 1376b31–1377a7 50 n.30

Book 2

2.1 11
 1377b16–20 51 n.33
 1377b20–1 49, 65 n.1
 1377b20–5 95 n.1, 138, 186 n.13
 1377b26–7 98
 1377b31–1378a5 104, 135 n.12, 138–9
 1378a3–5 197 n.46
 1378a4 143
 1378a6–16 98
 1378a6–20 96–101
 1378a12–4 202
 1378a18–9 135 n.12
 1378a19–22 104, 133–44, 147,
 186 n.13, 192
 1378a21 135 n.11, 148
 1378a22–6 157, 192 n.34
 1378a26–9 51 n.33
 1378a30–2 149 n.13, 152, 156, 158
 n.40, 160 n.43, 189, 202
 1378a31–b2 149 n.13, 152 n.23, 156,
 159–60
 1378b9–10 190 n.25
 1378b10–1379a9 157 n.35
 1379a10–1 157 n.35
 1379a30–b37 157 n.35
 1380a1–5 157 n.35
 1380a8–12 189 n.23, 202
 1380b25–6 153 n.28
 1380b31–4 155 n.33
 1380b36–1381a3 140 n.26
 1381a3–6 153, 156, 160 n.43
 1382a12–13 142, 153–4

1382a20–2 150, 156, 160,
 193, 202
 1382a21–5 189 n.23
 1383a13–6 151 n.19
 1383a16–9 189 n.23
 1383a28 154 n.32
 1383b12–4 150, 156, 158 n.39, 189
 n.23
 1383b14–5 154
 1385a14–5 151 n.19
 1385a16 152
 1385b13–16 141 n.30, 150, 156, 158
 n.37, 182, 184 n.4, 190 n.25
 1386a29–b1 190 n.25
 1386b9–11 150, 156, 158
 n.37, 162
 1386b12–3 156, 158 n.36, 162
 1386b16–24 145 n.2, 150, 156, 158,
 160 n.43
 1386b27–9 157, 158 n.36
 1386b30–1 157, 158 n.36
 1386b34–1387a3 162
 1387a1–3 157, 158 n.37
 1387a3–5 155 n.33, 186 n.12
 1387a8–9 156, 158 n.36,
 189 n.23
 1387b16–21 155 n.33, 186 n.12
 1387b22–5 150, 156, 158, 160 n.43,
 162, 189 n.23
 1388a24–30 155 n.33, 186 n.12
 1388a31–8 150, 157–8, 160 n.43,
 189 n.23
 1388b29 155 n.33
 1390b14 135
 1390b32 147
 1392b11–3 13 n.10
 1395a8–10 61 n.50
 1397b2–7 12 n.7
 1398b5–9 12 n.7
 1399a1–6 13 n.10
 1399a7–9 12 n.7
 1399b1–4 12 n.7
 1399b8–11 13 n.10
 1399b28–30 12 n.7
 1400a27–29 12 n.7
 1400b14–16 12 n.5
 1400b21 12 n.9
 1400b34–7 58 n.47
 1400b35–6 58
 1401a8 58 n.47
 1401a26 58 n.47
 1401a35–b2 12 n.7
 1402a17 12 n.6

- Book 3
 3.1 11
 1403b6–13 41 n.15
 1403b9–13 38 n.11, 47, 95 n.1, 111 n.12
 1403b18–19 41 n.15, 47
 1403b19 57
 1403b20–1404a8 88 n.12
 1403b34–5 67 n.4
 1404a1 49
 1404a5–7 41 n.15, 47, 123 n.39
 1404a6 57
 1404a7–8 67 n.4
 1404a14–5 115 n.24, 116 n.27, 117, 119
 1404a24–8 88 n.12
 1405b6–8 12 n.2
 1408b15–16 13 n.10
 1409a2 115 n.24
 1410b2 12
 1411a30–1 13 n.10
 1412a25 12 n.4
 1412b5–6 13 n.10
 1413a8 115 n.24
 1414a30–6 47, 49–50
 1414a31–7 42 n.15
 1414b7–8 42 n.15
 1414b12–15 12 n.2, 12 n.3, 19 n.28
 1414b16–18 12 n.2, 119
 3.14 (1414b19–1416a3) 113
 1414b26–8 13 n.10
 1414b33–5 13 n.10
 1415a29–34 113 n.20
 1415a32 113
 1415b4–9 41 n.15, 67 n.4, 111
 n.12, 123 n.39
 1415b25–6 41 n.15
 3.15 (1416a4–b15) 113
 1416a21–4 111 n.13
 1416a35–7 111 n.12
 1416a37 57, 114
 1416b1–3 111 n.13
 3.16 (1416b16–1417b20) 42 n.15, 113
 3.17 (1416b21–1418b380) 113
 1417b21 43, 78
 1417b21–34 47
 1418a12–21 42 n.15, 47
 1418a29–32 13 n.10
 1418a38–40 42 n.15
 1418b32–4 13 n.10
 1418b27 13 n.10

Rhetorica ad Alexandrum
 16 50 n.30
 1440a38–b2 113 n.16

Topics
 100b18–23 45 n.23
 100b19–21 44 n.22
 103b3–7 44 n.22
 117a5–15 148 n.12
 127b26–32 149 n.13, 151 n.21
 150b27–151a19 149 n.13, 151 n.21
 156a32–3 149 n.13, 151 n.21
 159a16–37 55 n.41
 Aspasius (Commentaria in Aristotelem
 Graeca vol. 19.1)
Commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics
 (ed. G. Heylbut, 1889)
 CAG 19.1, 42.27–47.2 149 n.13

 Demosthenes
Exordia 116
On the Crown (18)
 1–9 112 n.16
In Aristocratem (23)
 116.4 45 n.22
 117.2–7 45 n.22
In Aphobum de falso testimonio (29)
 40.8 45 n.22
In Onetorem i (30)
 26.1 45 n.22
 Diogenes Laertius
 5.24.25 12 n.8

 Gorgias
Encomium of Helen (DK 82B11)
 8–10, 12–14 14–15

 Herodotus
 1.1 54 n.40

 Homer
Odyssey
 20.9–24 219

 Isocrates
Antidosis (15)
 125.5 44 n.22
Busiris (11)
 31.5 42 n.22
Helen (10)
 14 16 n.20
 22.2 44 n.22
Panegyricus (4)
 110.2 44 n.22

- Isocrates (*cont.*) 465a2–6 20, 35 n.2
Philippus (5) 465c3 30
 91.8 44 n.22 466a–e 30
 466e6–467a5 31
 Lycurgus 480b7–d6 32
 481b1–5 32
In Leocratem 500e–501b 33
 79.4 44 n.22 501b3–5 32, 77
 80.2 44 n.22 502e5–7 32
 127.12 44 n.22 503e–504a 22 n.34
 504d–e 20–1, 28, 32, 77
 Lysias
On the murder of Eratosthenes (1) *Meno*
 19.6 44 n.22 80b4–7 16 n.19
Against Eratosthenes (12) *Phaedrus*
 10.1 44 n.22 260–73 53 n.37
On the confiscation of the property of the 260a6 25 n.35
brother of Nicias (18) 260b–d 24, 79 n.5
 19.5 44 n.22 261a3–5 26
On the property of Aristophanes (19) 261a7–b2 21
 32.2 44 n.22 261b6–c3 25 n.35
Defence against a charge of subverting the 261c–d 25, 117
democracy (25) 261d–262c 22–6,
 79 n.5, 81
 17.2 44 n.22 262b5–c3 79 n.5
 Parmenides 266b–d 53 n.37
 B1, 30 44 n.22 266b7–c8 26, 117
 Plato 266d1–4 53 n.37
Apology 266d7–267d9 27
 17a–24b 113 n.21 266d–268a 32 n.44
 34b–35b 116 266e3–4 43 n.21
 34c 111 n.13 267b10–c3 12
 35c 116 267c–d 115 n.25, 117
 267d1 15, 121 n.37
Gorgias 268a–b 32 n.44
 449a–b 120 n.34 268a–269b 22 n.34
 452a–453a 28 268a–269c 20 n.32, 121 n.36
 453d7–454a5 45 n.24 268a8–c4 27
 455d–457c 121 269a2–3 27, 33 n.44
 456a7–457c4 15 n.17 269a5–c5 27
 456d 121 269d 118
 456c–457c 29 270a–c 53 n.37
 458e6–459c2 45 n.24 271a–b 21–2
 459c–460c 29 n.41 271a–272b 53 n.37
 461b–c 30 271a4–6 118
 462b–c 19, 35 n.2, 77 271c10 21
 462c8–9 30 271c10–d7 27–8
 463a7 80 n.7 272a4–7 27 n.38
 463d2 30 272b5–6 28
 463e2 12 n.9 272d–273e 26
 463e4 30 273d–e 22–6, 79 n.5, 81
 464c7–d3 30–1 273d2–6 53 n.37
 464e2–465a2 20 n.33, 30, 77 277b5–c6 26

- 278c4–d6 26
 279a 13 n.11
- Philebus*
 31b–36c 165
 42a7–9 173
 46b–c 135, 147 n.8
 47d–50c 135, 147 n.8
 47e1 113 n.18
- Protagoras*
 356c–e 210 n.75
- Republic*
 Book 1 15
 439b5–6 210 n.74
 440e–441b 219 n.89
 596d–e 217
 602a1–2 210 n.75
 602e4–6 210 n.75
 602e8–9 210 n.74
- Sophist*
 263d–264b 206 n.60
- Timaeus*
 61c–68d 168
 64b5–7 168
 64c7–d3 168
 64e2–3 169
 65a1–6 169
- Quintilian
Instituto Oratoria
 XII.1 9
- Stephanus (Commentaria in Aristotelem
 Graeca vol. 21.2)
- Commentaries on the Art of Rhetoric*
 (ed. H. Rabe, 1896)
- CAG 21.2, 287–8 (pp. 297–8) 107 n.1
- Thrasymachus
 DK 85A1 119
 DK 85B1 119
 DK 85B4 116, 119
 DK 85B5 119
 DK 85B7 15, 119, 121 n.37

General Index

- Academy (Plato's) 11
 accessories 122–4
 Ahmed, Sara 2 n.1
akrasia 184–6, 196 n.43, 197, 219–20, 224
 Allen, James V. 48 n.28, 55 n.41, 62 n.54, 89 n.16
 anger 15, 19, 36, 70, 109, 111–12, 114–15, 117–19, 124–5, 131, 133, 135 n.11, 139, 142–3, 149, 151, 154–7, 159–60, 184–5, 189–91, 194, 202, 219–21
 animals 137–8, 140, 213–15
 Annas, Julia 208 n.67
 Arab interpreters of the *Rhetoric* 11, 86, 89–90
 Areopagus 67–70, 110
 'art' (e.g. of rhetoric) *see technê*
 apparent enthymemes 58–60
 appearances 132, 162, 194–8, 201–13, 217–19 *see also phantasia*
 appetite 139, 191
 arrangement *see taxis*
 Aspasius 149 n.13
- Bain, David 149 n.15
 Barnes, Jonathan 37 n.7, 54 n.40, 90 n.21, 107 n.2, 108 n.3, 112 n.16
 Barney, Rachel 29 n.40, 121 n.35
 Belfiore, Elizabeth 217 n.86
 belief 105, 136, 139, 182–3, 185–7, 192, 194–6, 200–1, 203–13, 218–25
 Bierce, Ambrose 9
 Black, Deborah L. 86 n.3, 90 n.17
 body of proof 38 n.11, 89 n.14, 111 n.12
 Brady, Michael 187 n.14, 188 n.19
 Broadie, Sarah 210 n.75
 Burnyeat, Myles F. 36 n.4, 38 n.10, 38 n.11, 54 n.39, 55 n.42, 56 n.44, 89 n.16, 124 n.40, 175 n.70, 222 n.93
- Callicles 13 n.12, 32
 calmness 10, 15, 138, 142, 150–1, 154–5, 189 n.23, 202–3
- Carey, Christopher 87 n.9
 Caston, Victor 189 n.22
 Cato the Elder 3
 Chappell, Timothy D. J. 15 n.16
 character *see êthos*
 Charles, David 66 n.3, 191 n.27
 Chew, Angela 66 n.3
 coherence 67
 commonplaces 81
 confidence 142, 150–1, 154 n.32, 189 n.23, 190, 191 n.28, 203–4
 conviction, proper grounds for *see pistis*
 Cooper, John M. 36 n.3, 37 n.7, 38 n.12, 85 n.1, 87 n.8, 90 n.19, 104 n.5, 107 n.2, 109 n.8, 145 nn.1–2 and 5, 148 n.13, 150 n.18, 152 n.26, 153 n.27, 154 n.32, 164 n.57, 183 nn.1–2, 187 n.15, 189, 194–8, 201, 203 n.54, 205 n.56
 Cope, Edward M. 38 n.12, 73 n.11, 88 n.11, 90 n.20, 107 n.2, 108 n.3, 109 n.8, 112 n.16, 123 n.39, 152 n.26, 154 n.32
 Corax 12
 corruption (of the audience) 88, 123 n.39
 craft *see technê*
 Crane, Tim 149 n.15
- D'Arms, Justin and Jacobsen, Daniel 186 n.10
 deception 60–3
 deliberation 56
 delivery 88, 116, 123
 demonstration 47, 49–50, 51–2, 54–6, 59, 65 n.2, 78, 89, 90
 Denniston, J. D. 126 n.44
 De Romilly, Jacqueline 17 n.25
diabolê 42 n.15, 109–19, 122, 124, 126
 dialectic 26, 46, 48–9, 51–5, 59–60, 79–82, 89
 Diogenes Laertius 12
 Döring, Sabine 188 nn. 17 and 19–20
doxa see belief

- Elster, Jon 188 n.18
 emotion *see passion*
empeiria 19–20
 emulation 150, 158, 189 n.23
endoxa 35, 46, 51–2, 54–6, 56 n.46, 57, 62, 78–80, 163
 Engberg-Pedersen, Troels 85 n.1, 87–8, 88 n.11, 90 n.19, 123 n.39
 enthymemes 36–8, 40, 52–3, 73–5, 79–80, 88–9, 163–4
 envy 70, 150, 156, 158–9, 162, 185, 189 n.23
 epistemic goods 34, 88–90
 ‘ethics of rhetoric’ 2, 10,
êthos 42 n.15, 51 n.33, 95–101
 Evenus of Paros 11
 Everson, Stephen 15 n.16, 189 n.22, 191 n.28, 210 n.72, 213 n.78
 examples 57
 expertise *see technê*

 fallacies 58–60
 fear 14–15, 101, 103–4, 120, 124, 133, 135–6, 139, 142–3, 146, 150–1, 156, 158–60, 184–5, 188, 189 n.23, 193, 196, 202–4, 217–18, 220–1
 flattery 30–1, 170–1
 Fortenbaugh, William W. 108 n.3, 154 nn.29–30, 159–60, 161 n.45, 183 n.1, 185 n.6, 201 nn.51 and 53
 friendship 151, 153–6, 158
 Frede, Dorothea 135, 145 n.4, 147 n.8, 148 n.13, 161 n.44, 162 n.50, 164 n.57, 173 n.68
 Freese, J. H. 37 n.8, 139 n.23

 Garver, Eugene 85 n.1 and n.2
 gender 1
 Gendler, Tamar 187 n.14
 Gill, Christopher 135 n.13
 Goldie, Peter 178 n.72
 Goldstein, I. 149 n.14
 Gordon, Robert 187 n.14
 Gorgias 9–11, 13–19, 20, 22, 34, 40, 51 n.31, 76–7, 81, 118, 120–2
 Gosling, J. C. B. and Taylor, Christopher C. W. 162 n.49, 163, 164 n.57
 governance, good 68–70
 gratitude 151–4
 Greenspan, Patricia 187 n.14, 188 n.20
 Griffin, Jasper 17 n.23

 Grimaldi, William M. A. 37 n.7, 38 n.11, 73 n.11, 90 n.20, 107 n.2, 109 n.8, 112 n.16, 115 n.23, 123 n.39, 154 n.32

 Halliwell, Stephen 85 n.1, 87 n.8, 88 n.11, 90 n.20, 115 n.23, 123 n.39
 Hamlyn, David W. 207, 211
 handbook writers 13–19, 34–41, 64, 66, 68, 72–5, 76–7, 81, 96, 107, 111–12
 Harte, Verity 149 n.16
 Haskins, Ekaterina V. 19 n.30
 hatred 29, 110–11, 125, 138–9, 151, 153–5, 193
 Heinaman, Robert 175 n.70
 Helm, Bennett W. 149 n.14, 187 n.14, 188 nn.17 and 20
 Hicks, R.D. 210 n.72
 Hippias of Elis 11, 118 n.31
 Homer 152 n.23
 Hume, David 188 n.19

 indignation 150, 154 n.32, 156, 158, 189 n.23
 Irwin, Terence H. 51 n.34, 61 n.51, 85 n.2, 87 n.6, 148
 Isocrates 12–13, 19 n.30

 Jacobsen, Daniel *see* D’Arms and Jacobsen
 jealousy *see* envy
 Jebb, R. C. 72 n.10
 judgement 49, 51–2, 59, 62–3, 65–6, 70–1, 76, 78, 87, 99–102, 131, 133, 137–43, 178–80, 187 n.16, 203–4, 205–13, 219–20, 223–5
 justification 102–4, 186–7

 Kahn, Charles H. 29 n.41
 Kassel, Rudolf 36 n.3, 72 n.10, 108 n.4, 124
 Kennedy, George A. 36 n.6, 37 n.7, 90 n.20, 108 n.3, 152 n.26, 201 n.51
kolakeia see flattery
 Konstan, David 135 n.14, 146 n.6, 150 n.17, 152 n.26, 154 n.32
 knack *see empeiria*
 knowledge 19–28, 31–3, 79–82

 Lazarus, Richard 187 n.14
 Leighton, Stephen R. 135 n.13, 136 n.17, 154 n.30

- lexis* *see* style
 Licymnius of Chios 11–12, 118–29
 likelihoods 22–6, 33, 57, 79–80
 Lorenz, Hendrik 213 n.78, 214 n.80
 Lycos, Kimon 207 n.62
 lying 60–3
 Lysias 118
- magic 15–18, 121 n.37
 manipulation 58–63
 McCabe, M. M. 13 n.12
 McGinn, Colin 149 n.15
 medicine 27, 32 n.44
 Mirhady, David C. 50 n.30
 Moss, Jessica 27 n.39, 139 n.24, 153
 n.28, 183 nn.1–2, 185 n.9, 189 nn.22
 and 24, 190 n.25, 192 n.33, 194 n.40,
 196 nn.43–4, 197 n.46, 199 n.48,
 201 n.52, 205 n.56, 213 n.78, 214
 n.79, 215 n.82, 216 nn.83–4, 217
 n.86, 220 n.90, 222 n.95
 Muretus 112 n.16
 Murphy, James Jerome 86 n.4
 music 27
- Nieuwenburg, Paul 183 nn.1–2, 189
 n.24, 190 n.25, 201 n.52
 Nussbaum, Martha C. 183 n.1, 187 n.14,
 201 n.53, 203 n.54, 213 n.78, 215
 nn.81–2, 221 n.91
- Oates, Whitney J. 87 nn.8–9
 Owen, G. E. L. 162 n.49
- pain 132–3, 135–7, 141–4, 145–81,
 192–4 *see also* pleasure
 paintings 203–4
 passion 42 n.15, 51 n.33, 101–6,
 107–227
 ‘affirmation’ of contents 105, 132,
 183–4, 198–213
 and the arts 217–18, 227
 attitude involved in 104–5, 132, 139,
 175–7, 179–80, 182–225
 bodily changes involve in 131, 137,
 190–1, 220–1
 of children and animals 185, 189, 199
 cognitions involved in 137, 139–42,
 144, 149, 160, 179–80,
 182–225
 definition of 104, 132–44
 desiderata of an account of 187–8,
 223–5
 dispositions to 153–4
 essential features of 133–4
 genus of 148 n.13, 151, 152 n.23, 180
 merits of Aristotle’s view of 142–4,
 187–8, 223–5
 phenomenology of 147, 149, 179
 privations of 151 n.19, 154–5
 and psychological conflict 143,
 183–4, 187–8, 200–1, 215, 218–25
 and reason 184–8, 191–2, 194–201,
 204–13, 213–25
 recalcitrant emotions 187–8, 194–8,
 211–13, 218–25
 representational contents of 103–4,
 131–2, 139, 141–2, 146, 156–60,
 182–225
 target and grounds of 156–8, 174
 unified account of 178–9
 and visual illusions 187 n.15, 194–8,
 204–13
 Pascal, Blaise 188 n.19
pathos *see* passion
 perception 136, 137 n.20, 165, 168–70,
 174, 176–7, 179, 185, 187 n.16,
 191–8, 205–11
 persuasion, means of *see pistis*
phantasia 132, 139, 162, 174, 179 n.73,
 182–225
pistis 9–11, 34–63, 64, 66, 84, 86, 88, 98,
 107–11, 123, 126–7, 131, 182, 186
 function of 49
 goal of 49–50
 normative view of 34–47, 61–3, 87–9
 ordinary Greek meaning of 44–5, 47
 technical vs. untechnical 43 n.19, 46,
 50 n.30
 types of 38 n.11, 41 n.15, 51 n.33,
 88–9, 95–101, 111 n.12
 Pitcher, George 188 n.17
 pity 150, 156, 158–9, 162, 182–4, 189,
 193, 217, 221
 Plato 9–11, 19–33, 34–6, 45, 51 n.31,
 77–82, 135–6, 145, 151 n.22, 152
 n.23, 163 n.56, 168–73, 205–12,
 217–18
 pleasure 132–3, 135–7, 139, 141–4,
 145–81, 192–4
 in activities vs. states of
 affairs 162–3, 176

- activity vs. features view of 176–7
 attitude involved in 175–7
 representational view of 144, 146,
 149, 155–81
 restoration of nature view of 165–73
 Polansky, Ronald 217 n.86
 Polus 12, 13 n.12, 30–1, 118 n.31
 power 29–32, 121
 pretence 31
 Price, Anthony 134 n.5, 137 n.19, 183
 nn.1–2, 185 n.9, 189 n.24, 190 n.25
 Primavesi, Oliver 37 n.7, 41 n.14, 42
 n.18, 43
 Prinz, Jesse 187 n.14, 188 nn.17 and 19
 Prodicus of Ceos 11, 118 n.31
 proof *see pistis*
 proper grounds for conviction *see pistis*
 Prosser, Simon 149 n.15
 Protagoras 11, 118 n.31
 psychology 26–8, 34
 public reason 1–3
- race 1
 Radermacher, Ludwig 115 n.23
 Rapp, Christof 37 n.7, 38 n.11, 41 n.14,
 42 n.18, 43, 49 n.29, 73 n.11, 85 n.1,
 87 n.7 and n.8, 89, 90 nn.18–19,
 96 n.2, 107 n.2, 112 n.16, 152 n.26,
 163 n.55
 rationality 210
 relevance 38–41, 51, 68–70, 72–5,
 112–14, 121–2, 124–5
 reputable opinions *see endoxa*
 rhetoric
 accessory features of 36–40
 and the state 10, 76–84, 138–41
 dangers of 29
 fraudulent kinds of 31
 goals of 28–33, 65–6, 77–8, 86–7
 kinds of 49
 moralizing view of 85–6
 normative view of 34–47, 88–90
 powerful force of 15, 34, 40, 76–7, 121
 value of 82–4, 87
 Roberts, W. Rhys 37 n.8, 109 n.7,
 201 n.51
 Rorty, Amelie O. 135 n.10
 Ross, W. David 19 n.30, 36, 39–40, 134
 n.6, 206 n.59, 207 n.63, 208 n.66
 Rowe, Christopher 151 n.22
 Ryle, Gilbert 161 n.46
 Salmela, Mikko 186 n.10, 188 nn. 17
 and 19
Schadenfreude 150, 156, 158 n.37, 162
 Schofield, Malcolm 213 n.78, 214 n.79
 Schütrumpf, Eckart 61 n.50 and n.53,
 90 n.20, 107 n.2, 109 n.8
 sensation *see* perception
 shame 150–1, 154–6, 158 n.39, 159, 160
 n.43, 189 n.23
 Sienkiewicz, Stefan 66 n.3
 signs 62–3
 Sihvola, Juha 104 n.5, 137–8, 140, 164
 n.57, 183 nn.1–2, 185 n.6, 187 n.15,
 194 n.41, 201 n.52
 similarities (arguments based on) 22–6
 slander *see diabolê*
 Solmsen, Friedrich 37 n.7, 41 n.14, 90
 n.21, 107 n.2, 117 n.28
 sophistical arguments 59–60
 Sorabji, Richard 149 n.13, 185 n.6
 soul-leading 21–2
 Sprute, Jürgen 90 n.20, 123 n.39
 Sripada, Chandra S. and Stich,
 Stephen 188 n.18
 state, rhetoric's role in the 64–75
 Stich, Stephen *see* Sripada and Stich
 Striker, Gisela 104 n.5, 145 nn.3 and 5,
 146 n.6, 151 n.22, 152 n.26, 153
 n.27, 164 n.57, 183 nn.1–2, 187
 n.15, 194 n.41, 201 n.52, 203 n.54
 style 88, 118
- taxis* 42 n.15, 111 n.12, 118, 123
 Taylor, Christopher C. W. *see* Gosling
 and Taylor
technê 19–20, 21–8, 31–3, 34–41, 47–8,
 58–61, 65, 67–70, 72–5, 77, 79 n.5,
 107–11, 120
 Theodectes 12
 Theodorus of Byzantium 12, 19, 43
 n.21, 118
 thinking 190, 199, 214–15
 Thrasymachus 9–11, 12, 13–19, 20, 22,
 34, 40, 68–9, 76–7, 81, 107 n.1,
 115–19, 121–2, 124–7
 Thür, Gerhard 38 n.12
 Tisias 12, 19, 22–3, 79 n.5, 118
 trustworthiness 96–101
 truth 22–8, 34–5, 57, 66–7,
 79–82, 87
 Tye, Michael 149 n.15

- unity of the *Rhetoric* 4 n.3, 41 n.14, 90, 110
- Victorius 112 n.16
- virtue 85–6, 95, 98–9, 163, 193, 198,
217–18, 225
- Wardy, Robert 16–18, 107 n.2, 109 n.8,
112 n.15
- weakness of will *see akrasia*
- Weaver, Richard M. 9
- Wedin, Michael V. 213 n.78
- White, S. A. 119 n.32
- Whiting, Demian 178 n.72
- Whiting, Jennifer 191 n.28, 192 n.33
- Wikramanayake, G. H. 38 n.11
- Williams, Bernard A. O. 16 n.22
- Wisse, Jakob 37 n.7, 90 n.21, 107 n.2,
108 n.3, 112 n.16
- Wörner, Markus H. 61 n.51, 85 n.1, 85
n.2, 87
- wrestling 15
- Young, Iris Marion 1, 2 n.1
- Yunis, H. 119 n.32
- Zajonc, Robert 187 n.14
- Zeno 11, 118 n.31
- Zerilli, Linda M. G. 2 n.1