

## RHETORIC

1<sup>st</sup> CANON: Invention = finding something to say.

- 3 aspects to make invention easier:

ETHOS / PATHOS / LOGOS ← The arguments can be  
(character) (emotion) (reason) related to: author (ETHOS),

objections = possible obj. by audience address (PATHOS),  
Think about it not to be embarrassed **Negative facts (LOGOS)**.

wishes = what the audience is expecting for. Think about it too.

2<sup>nd</sup> CANON: Arrangement = how one orders speech or writing.

- context: oral/writing; interrupted or not;

attention begin → end or not.

- Schemes: organisation of arguments

↳ Nestorian, Ascending, Descending.

- beginning: "Captatio Benevolentiae"

= show you are like audience, understand...

3<sup>rd</sup> CANON: Style = how to dress ideas in words.

3 ways:

1) Praise audience

2) Show understanding

3) Be humble/  
self ironic.

• Figurative language = non-literal language.  
• Ornament: based on rhetorical figures.  
- Metaphor ; - Analogy: comparison to help  
the audience connect to our idea; Amphora.

4<sup>th</sup> CANON: memory: mnemonics to assist orator in  
returning his speech; "preface": improvisations (topics, rhythm);  
help the audience memorize ideas (by fig. of speech e.g.).

5<sup>th</sup> CANON: Delivery = aspects that concern the public presentation.

## ARGUMENTATION

DEF: verbal activity, social & rational, aimed at convincing a reasonable critic of the acceptability of a standpoint by putting forward a constellation of 1 or >1 propositions to justify the standpoint (or refute it).

⚠ Always IDENTIFY THE ASSUMPTIONS WHEN ARGUING.

- Premise (claim) vs Standpoint (conclusion)

SCIENTIFIC SYLLOGISM → to demonstrate: major & minor premises always valid. Therefore conclusion always valid.

⚠ DISCOVERY OF AN EXCEPTION RUINS THE MAJOR PREMISE.

→ NO LESS RATIONAL THAN SCIENTIFIC SYLLOGISM.

ENTHYMEME (rhetorical syllogism) → to convince: based on a "generally valid proposition". counter-facts don't invalidate the major premise.

↳ USUALLY: major premise &/or conclusion are IMPLICIT.

"Incompt." ↳ can cover weaknesses of an argument;  
"negative" ↳ implicit premises more acceptable;  
"negative" ↳ implicit conclusions distract audience from validity.

↳ HOW TO CHALLENGE THEM?: reach an absurd conclusion just by accepting the major premise: "hardly driving a car".

→ OR "sophism"

FALLACY: = common error in reasoning that undermines the logic of your argument (like a common belief).

DIFFERENT TYPES OF FALLACIES: arguments appear correct in form, but actually invalid.

"borrow the car"

→ X true bc you cannot prove X false // in law.

- **ARGUMENT FROM IGNORANCE**: the assumption of a conclusion based primarily on a lack of evidence of the contrary.
- **ARGUMENT FROM BEST EXPLANATION**: non-existence of an entity = best explanation for the lack of evidence.
- **ARGUMENT FROM AUTHORITY**: - FALSE: appeal to the testimony of an authority outside his special field (ad. campaigns...);  
→ "son/father about smoking" - TRUE: insisting a claim is true bc. a valid authority on the issue said it was true.
- **ARGUMENT TO THE PERSON**: avoid discussion on the topic by instead attacking the person making the argument.
- **APPEAL TO COMMON BELIEF**: fallacious bc. the mere fact that a belief is widely held is NOT a guarantee it is correct.
- **ARGUMENT FROM PIETY**: irrelevant appeal to emotions to get a conclusion accepted.
- **THE COMPLEX QUESTION**: Taking for granted smthg that might deserve to be discussed.  
↳ school shootings: fallacy in which the answer to a given question presupposes a prior answer to a prior question → to trap the respondent in accepting smthg.
- **FALSE CAUSE**: when an argument mistakenly attempts to establish a causal connection:  
"after this, therefore because of this"
- **STRAW MAN FALLACY**: deliberately modifying the interlocutor's thesis turning it A → B and then answering to B instead of A.
- **"IRREPARABLE DIRECTION" FALLACY**: if you choose smthg → consequences you don't want & won't be able to repair. Fallacy bc.: the best option is not necessarily good.

[Here we displayed 10 different types of fallacies.]

↳ Always be careful because there may exist other types of fallacies.]

methods for developing arguments.

## TOPOI:

→ Nuclear/fossil fuels

- **Contradiction**: a position may be refuted by showing the opposite is false.
- **Analogy**: validity of a position is proven by means of an irrefutable d "ASIF" showing similarity. → Radiation/drugs.
- **TOPOS of the + & - likely**: if the most likely doesn't happen, the less likely will not happen. → greatest mathematicians.
- **TOPOS from the contrary**: based on the principle of non-contradiction: since A and  $\bar{A}$  cannot co-exist. → self control is good since a lack of self-control is bad.
- **Reductio ad absurdum**: form of arg. that attempts to establish a claim by showing that the opposite tenet would lead to absurdity of contradiction. → Earth cannot be flat.
- **The lesser evil principle**: it is the principle that when faced

After selecting from two immoral options, the least immoral one should be chosen → Tithanic scenario.

- EXAMPLES: arguments by analogy.

↳ To support a specific claim, you introduce another claim, which in some way is similar to the first. An implicit generalization: what applies to one applies to the other & vice versa. They persuade due to the striking evidence of the 2nd claim being called upon to support the 1st.  
→ nuclear radiations + medicines.

- QUASI-LOGIC ARGUMENTS: arguments that derive their strength

from the resemblance to a logical/mathematical demonstration.

Their persuasiveness derives from their resemblance to formal logic.

- **argument of reciprocity:** assumption of an existing symmetry between two situations, so what applies to one must necessarily apply to the other as well. → Greece/Germany; Bully/Bully back.

↳ ! only way to respond: to show that the 2 situations are actually ≠.

- Rule of justice: (similar to reciprocity) 2 beings/situations falling under the same essential genre or category should be dealt in the same manner.

→ siblings. ↳ This type of arg. used when we claim ∃ gap in literature.

- Argument of transitivity: based on Euclid's geometry: things equal to the same thing are = to each other. → friends' friends.

↳ ! to respond: to point out that human relations are ≠ from geometry.

- Argument of sacrifice: in the absence of an objective standard, things are judged only by the value people attach to them: "If smth costs a lot, it must be valuable". → sheep whose witnesses are willing to be slaughtered for (Pascal).

- Argument of q'ty: A lot means good → high number of publications..