

## Motyw początku z perspektywy retorycznej

## Rhetoric and the concept of the origin

1(1)2014

FEE-ALEXANDRA HAASE  
UNIVERSITY OF NIZWA, OMAN  
F.HAASE1@GMX.DE

### The Concept of 'Rhetoric' in a Linguistic Perspective: Historical, Systematic, and Theoretical Aspects of Rhetoric as Formal Language Usage

#### Summary

Rhetoric is commonly known as an old discipline for the persuasive usage of language in linguistic communication acts. In this article we examine the concept 'rhetoric' from 1. the diachronic perspective of historical linguistics showing that the concept 'rhetoric' is linguistically present in various Indo-European roots and exists across several language families and 2. the theoretical perspective towards the concept 'rhetoric' with a contemporary definition and model in the tradition of rhetorical theory. The historical and systematic approaches allow us to describe the features of the conceptualization of 'rhetoric' as the process in theory and empirical language history. The aim of this article is a formal description of the concept 'rhetoric' as a result of a theoretical process of this conceptualization, the rhetorization, and the historical documentation of the process of the emergence of the concept 'rhetoric' in natural languages. We present as the concept 'rhetoric' a specific mode of linguistic communication in 'rhetorized' expressions of a natural language. Within linguistic communicative acts 'rhetorized language' is a process of forming structured linguistic expressions. Based on traditional rhetorical theory we will in a case study present 'formalization,' 'structuralization,' and 'symbolization' as the three principle processes, which are parts of this process of rhetorization in rhetorical theory.

#### Key words

Etymology, linguistic concept, Indo-European languages, historical linguistics, conceptualization of rhetoric

#### License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Poland. The content of the license is available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl>

## **The Concept of ‘Rhetoric’ in a Linguistic Perspective: Historical, Systematic, and Theoretical Aspects of Rhetoric as Formal Language Usage**

### **Research on Rhetoric as a Concept: The Concept and Term ‘Rhetoric’ and Definitions for ‘Rhetoric’ in Common Reference Works**

The history of rhetoric is well-documented and the path of this discipline known from the ancient beginnings in Greece to its contemporary presence in departments of rhetoric in universities across the world is long and wide; also intercultural and comparative approaches in non-European sources of rhetoric in other cultures are known. The list of rhetoricians with their contribution to rhetorical handbooks and other writings is long and until now names of rhetorical scholars have been constantly added since the time when classical rhetorical theory was developed by Greek and Roman scholars like Aristotle, Plato, Cicero, Plutarch, and others. In Europe during the Middle Ages the European scholars: Augustine, Boethius, Vinsauf, and Christine de Pizan developed the rhetorical theory and handbooks for the usage of rhetoric based on the ancient system. From the Renaissance to the 18th century scholars like Erasmus of Rotterdam, Castiglione, Ramus, and Bacon re-arranged the system of rhetoric when the systematic classification of rhetorical devices was given up. Rhetoric was also interdisciplinary and scholars from other fields of studies contributed to rhetoric as a field of studies; so during the époque of Enlightenment philosophers like Locke and Hume, Austin, Campbell, and Blair continued to develop this system until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, which is considered in the history of rhetoric already as the century of the ‘decline of rhetoric’; but at this time representative scholars like Whately, Stewart, Douglass, Willard, and Nietzsche still wrote rhetorical works. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century modern and postmodern rhetoricians were also scholars of other fields of the humanities like Bakhtin, Woolf, Burke, Perelman, Toulmin, Foucault, Lausberg, Plett, and Fish. The system of rhetoric was never completely changed, but only altered and modified in scholarly handbooks, which can be traced to the classical ancient rhetoric. So we can

call the ideas associated with rhetoric as representations of a continuous concept in the cultural history of mankind. The concept of ‘rhetoric’ as a linguistic representation extended from the Greek and Latin languages into the vernaculars of Europe. This continuity in the European languages raises questions of our inquiry of the concept ‘rhetoric’ as a linguistic concept and its meanings. This inquiry of theoretical conceptual aspects of rhetoric as a concept with specific linguistic, cognitive and socio-cultural features is an area of rhetoric with relatively few research contributions; rhetoric is usually treated by rhetoricians as a given historical phenomenon ubiquitously present in speech as linguistic communication act or as a field of systematic prescriptive theoretical terms treated in handbooks and lists of rhetorical devices. The contemporary word in English still refers to the ancient meanings of ‘rhetoric.’ So *Brill’s New Pauly* (2013) stated that the Greek term ‘τέχνη ῥητορική’ (‘*téchnē rhētorikḗ*’) for ‘rhetorical technique’ or ‘rhetorical art’ is used “from Plato onwards” besides the simple term ‘ῥητορική’ (‘*rhētorikḗ*’) for ‘rhetoric’. The Latin equivalents for this term are ‘ars oratoria’ and ‘ars dicendi’ for rhetoric as an acquired skill, or ‘eloquentia’ for rhetoric as an ability of the speaker. The performers are in Greek the ‘ῥήτωρ-’ (‘*rhētōr*’) (Homeric ‘ῥήτηρ’ (‘*rhētēr*’) and in Latin ‘*orator*’. The authors of *Religion Past and Present* (2013) stated that “the expression ῥητορικὴ τέχνη / *rhētorikḗ téchnē* was coined by the Sophistic school, which created the theoretical foundation for a form of communication thought of – especially in the Greek world – as an agon: the appearance of one or more communicators before the public, engaging in a linguistic contest.” Rhetoric in a contemporary *Oxford English Dictionary* (2013) is “the art of effective or persuasive speaking or writing, especially the exploitation of figures of speech and other compositional techniques.” The definition of ‘rhetoric’ in the *Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary & Thesaurus* (2013) is “speech or writing intended to be effective and influence people.” The entry of the lexeme ‘rhetoric’ in the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* (2014) has the following definitions in contemporary English:

1. the art of speaking or writing effectively
  - a. the study of principles and rules of composition formulated by critics of ancient times
  - b. the study of writing or speaking as a means of communication or persuasion
2.
  - a. skill in the effective use of speech
  - b. a type or mode of language or speech
3. verbal communication

So the general contemporary language usage of the word ‘rhetoric’ reflects that this word represents still in the tradition of antiquity an art of speaking and writing efficiently, which results in the persuasion of the listener; the art entails rules for

the way how a rhetorical speech is produced. From this standpoint of the present understanding of 'rhetoric' we will in the following section look at the associated meanings of this linguistic concept in various languages.

### **Research State for Rhetoric and Linguistics and Research Methodology for 'Rhetoric' as Concept**

The contributions of research to rhetoric from a linguistic scholarly perspective are mainly historical studies of specific époques of rhetoric. So Borkowski (2008) treated the rhetoric of postmodernity as 'new rhetoric' in *The Emergence of a New Rhetoric Since the 1960s. A History of the Linguistic Reformation of American Culture*. Frank (1985: 199-216) discussed the linguistic theory and the doctrine of its usage in George Campbell's 'Philosophy of rhetoric.' Heilmann (1978: 285-300) discussed the modern approach of the so-called 'New Rhetoric' and 'linguistic theory.' Hopper (2007: 236) wrote that

increasingly linguists look to usage for explanations of how patterns of forms come to acquire grammatical status. This search leads linguistics closer to the realm of inquiry traditionally occupied by rhetoric, the study of the effective uses of language. It is proposed here that a view of language as temporal brings these two disciplines closer, and that, in fact, (usage-based) linguistics is nothing other than the "micro" end of rhetoric. As an example of the kind of rethinking of linguistic structure necessary to accommodate this proposal, it is argued that the unfolding of discourse in time proceeds by a progressive delivery of prepackaged formulas that are either juxtaposed or linked by *apo koinou*. Implications of these ideas for the academic organization of linguistics are discussed.

Besides the presence of rhetorical features in linguistic settings, also its classical tradition is related to non-linguistic disciplines like dialectics and philosophy. So Bartoszewicz (2012) in *Linguistics and Rhetoric. Reciprocal Perception* wrote as editor:

In the antiquity rhetoric was defined as the art of convincing argumentation. It was concerned with texts which were applied in their oral form in public language use. Political, legal and occasional speeches were presumed to be the form of expression of ancient Greek democracy. Both rhetoric and linguistics consider language as the means of communication and the focus of interpretative efforts is in both cases the purposeful use of rhetoric as the tool of human beings.

Bartoszewicz (2012) also wrote here that "what can discourage from rhetorical theory is its apparent complexity and alleged interpretative empty spaces, which are left open by rhetorical methodology. Luckily, rhetoric offers no simple, ready-made answers to questions regarding the nature of the analyzed communicative act, which is understood as an autonomous, multi-dimensional, dynamic occurrence." Ile (2014) in *Rhetoric in The International Encyclopedia of Communication* wrote

that rhetoric can be considered the oldest discipline for linguistic studies before the actual emergence of the scholarly discipline linguistics in the 20<sup>th</sup> century:

When exploring rhetoric in relation to language we usually have in mind the nature and functions of the communication systems used by humans in different times and in different parts of the world. Some of the first important theoreticians of language were in fact rhetoricians, as well as philosophers. A major point of departure in exploring rhetoric is the rhetorical role played by language as a conceptualizing and persuasive tool, as a means of communication and as a bearer of values.

Among the rhetorical literature, relatively few contributions exist in rhetorical research regarding the concept 'rhetoric.' Brockriede (1968:1) in *Dimensions of the Concept of Rhetoric* wrote that "Interrelated and interacting rhetorical dimensions which influence the outcome and effectiveness of a communication can be identified. Interpersonal dimensions include (1) the degree of liking among persons involved in the rhetorical act, (2) power in the form of charisma or a power structure, and (3) distance, either interpersonal or social, which separates those involved. Attitudinal dimensions involve those predispositions which affect the response to a rhetorical situation, including attitudes toward the central idea of a communication and the ideological variables evoked by the rhetorical act--(1) unconscious assumptions, (2) the norms and values of listeners or readers, (3) ethical attitudes, and (4) philosophic presuppositions about the nature of man. Finally, the rhetorical act is influenced by such situational dimensions as (1) the format, (2) the channels employed in the communication, (3) the number and types of people involved, and the degree to which they are organized, (4) the functions of the communication, (5) the method of communication employed, and (6) the contexts of time and place." Payne (1986: 187-197) in *Rhetoric, Reality, and Knowledge. A Re-Examination of Protagoras' Concept of Rhetoric* made a study of the concept of rhetoric of one of the first Greek rhetoricians. Murray (1984) in *The True Rhetoric. An Analysis of Plato's Conception of Persuasion* analyzed the concept of 'rhetoric' as used in Plato's conception of persuasion. Paul (1978) in *The Roman Conception of Rhetoric* examined the concept of 'rhetoric' in the time of the Roman Empire.

European rhetorical scholars also described the concept of 'rhetoric.' In the German tradition of conceptual history ('Begriffsgeschichte') Ueding (2005) edited *Rhetorik. Begriff, Geschichte, Internationalität* including the discussion of the concept ('Begriff') of 'rhetoric.' Plett (2010) in *Literary Rhetoric. Concepts, Structures, Analyses* used a pragmatic and prescriptive methodology. Lausberg in *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study* treated the 'concept' in the figures of rhetoric as related to the word *conceptum*, which only in the post-classical European writings occurs. Jasinski (2001:34) wrote that the

‘concept of rhetoric’ entails the ambivalence of language stating that

the Platonic tradition’s negative or pejorative sense of rhetoric is intertwined with a marked ambivalence toward language. Ambivalence toward language, the feeling that it is both beneficial and dangerous, a tool for building human community and a device for tearing it apart, a medium for representing knowledge (or, in more common parlance, “stating the facts”) and a vehicle for distorting or deceiving, is a key element in the thought of most of the major early modern philosophers such as Descartes, Locke, Kant. The concept of rhetoric, what it might possibly mean, is entangled in this persistent ambivalence toward language.

The contemporary conceptualization of rhetoric is ambivalent and a phenomenon of polysemantic meanings associated to the word. *The European Institute of Rhetoric (EIR)* (2014) presents the following concept of ‘rhetoric’ as a prospective view towards the future of rhetoric in Europe based on its various aspects in the European history:

Then, the succession of Vico, Locke, Voltaire and Kant further developed the different schools of thought of practical philosophy and discourse ethics from Schleiermacher to Habermas. The rhetorical values were at risk of being lost by being either legalistically formalized or deconstructed by cultural relativism. It is essential to activate and actualize the traditional pool of methods of thinking and the methods of dialog for European society; it is not necessary to reinvent the philosophical wheel since it is already there in the tradition of ethics and rhetoric. We need only to bring it back for it to continue. For this, it is necessary to retrace and to associate the different tradition lines since antiquity in the different European cultures (speaking Romance, German, English, Slavic languages, etc.) It is of vital importance to conceptualize rhetoric as a European program. The European character of rhetoric should be further developed beyond language boundaries - a process that started with the assimilation of the Greek culture by the Roman world. Because Europe is as well the aim for non-occidental migration, we have to bring the occidental thinking and speaking cultures in line with the immigration and minority cultures.

So the here made conceptualization of ‘rhetoric’ is a programmatic summary of its historical European roots, which we can consider as the dominant cultural elements for our contemporary understanding of the concept ‘rhetoric’ from a European perspective. Methodologically we will approach in the following sections the concept ‘rhetoric’ in a diachronic study as a linguistic concept showing its associated meanings in the hypothetical proto-languages, the emergence of this concept as a lexeme in the Greek language, and the extension of the concept from the linguistic presence in the Greek language in other languages until the contemporary usage of it in contemporary languages of the Indo-European languages. Based on our definition of rhetoric as a mode of formal language usage we will approach in a second part the concept ‘rhetoric’ as a theoretical concept for a linguistic process describing its formalizing processes in the tradition of the rhetorical theory, which explains the emergence of rhetoric with four categorical changes of linguistic material.



## The Concept and Term ‘Rhetoric’: Its Lexical Roots in Proto-Languages and the Emergence of ‘Rhetoric’ in the Greek Language

In this section we examine the aspect of the conceptual linguistic condition of the concept ‘rhetoric,’ which is historically encoded within the roots of the linguistic material of the Indo-European languages and their meanings; as previously shown, the word ‘rhetoric’ emerged first in the ancient Greek language and spread in the form of loanwords across the Indo-European language family and later on again as loanwords in other language families containing the abstract concept of ‘rhetoric.’ The reflexes of this word are until now for ‘rhetoric’ as an abstract concept of linguistic performance present in various language families. According to IGEW (1959-1969) and the *Indo-European Lexicon of PIE Etymon and IE Reflexes of the Linguistics Research Center of the University of Texas* Pokorny’s etymon 6 *uer-* for the associated meanings ‘speak’ and ‘talk formally’ is the origin of the Greek word for ‘rhetoric’ and refers to the semantic field ‘speak’ and ‘talk’. The etymon *uer-* has as Indo-European reflexes the Old English ‘word’, Old High German ‘*rheme*’ for ‘expression of single idea’ and ‘notion’, and Old High German ‘word’ for ‘something that is said’. The West-Germanic Old Frisian word ‘word’, the Old Saxon word ‘word’, Old High German word ‘wort’, the contemporary German word ‘Wort’, and the North-Germanic Icelandic word *orð* for ‘word’ exist as reflexes of the etymon. In the East-Germanic language family the Gothic word ‘*waúrd*’ and in the Italic language family the Latin word ‘*verbum*’ represent also reflexes of this etymon in natural languages. In the Baltic language family the Lithuanian word ‘*vardas*’ has the meaning ‘name’ and the Latvian words ‘*apvārdot*’, ‘*apvārdoju*’, and ‘*apvārdoju*’ have the meaning ‘charm’. In the Hellenic language family the Homeric Greek *εἶπω* for ‘say’ and ‘speak’ and *ρήτήρ* for ‘rhetor’ and ‘speaker’, *ῥῆμα* for ‘rheme’, ‘saying’, and ‘that which is said/spoken’, and *ῥητορικὴ* for ‘rhetoric’ exist as reflexes of the etymon. (*Linguistics Research Center* 2013) The Greek noun *ῥητορεία* refers to the Latin word *oratory* used by Plato (*Politeia* 304a), in the *Rhetoric* of Philodemus (*Rh.* 2.231), and by Plutarchus (*Plu.* 2.975c.); it also refers to ‘piece of oratory’ and ‘set speech’ as used by Isocrates and Aristotle (Isoc. 5.26, 12.2, Arist. *Rh.* 1356b20). (*A Greek-English Lexicon* 2014) The Greek word ‘*ῥητήρ*’ means ‘speaker’ (*A Greek-English Lexicon* 2014) The word ‘*ῥητός*’ has the meanings ‘stated’, ‘specified’, and ‘covenanted’. The specific meanings ‘spoken of’ and ‘famous’ (Hes. *Op.* 4.) and ‘in common use’ (A.D. *Pron.* 113.18) are used in ancient Greek (*A Greek-English Lexicon* 2014). The word *ῥήτρη* means ‘stipulation’ and ‘bargain’ in Homeric poetry (*Od.* 14.393). (*A Greek-English Lexicon* 2014) The word ‘*ῥήτρα*’ has the meanings ‘verbal agreement’, ‘bargain’, and ‘covenant’. (*A Greek-English Lexicon* 2014) The word *ῥητέον* means ‘one must say’ and ‘mention’ (Pl. *Lg.* 730c, *Sph.* 227d). As

derivations from the Proto-Indo-European roots *\*were-* and *\*wrē-* the Greek word *ῥητορεία* means ‘oratory’ (Plato, *Politics* 304a, Philodemos, *Rhetorica* 2.231) or a piece of oratory or set speech, (Isocrates 5.26, 12.2, Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1356b20 (pl.)). The Greek word *ῥητορικός* comprises as meanings oratorical as related to *ῥητορική* (sc. *τέχνη*) (‘*rhetoric*’) (Plato, *Phaedrus* 266d, Philodemos, *Rhetorica* 1.187) or for persons ‘skilled in speaking’ and ‘fit to be an orator’ (‘Isocrates 3.8, Plato, *Phaedrus* 260c, 272d, al.; φύσει ῥ. ib.269d, etc.; σχολαστικὸς ῥ. OGI693 (Egypt)), or seldomly ‘student’ (Lib. Or. 14.62) or ‘belonging to a ῥήτωρ, δοῦλος’ (Stud. Pal. 1.67.289 (i A.D.)) (Liddle; Scott 1940) Aristotle defines rhetoric (‘ῥητορική’) as follows in the beginning of the book as scientific discipline opposed to dialectics:

*ἡ ῥητορική ἐστιν ἀντίστροφος τῇ διαλεκτικῇ: ἀμφοτέραι γὰρ περὶ τοιούτων τινῶν εἰσιν ᾧ κοινὰ τρόπον τινὰ ἀπάντων ἐστὶ γνωρίζειν καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἐπιστήμης ἀφωρισμένης: διὸ καὶ πάντες τρόπον τινὰ μετέχουσιν ἀμφοῖν: πάντες γὰρ μέχρι τινὸς καὶ ἐξετάζειν καὶ ὑπέχειν λόγον καὶ ἀπολογεῖσθαι καὶ κατηγορεῖν ἐγγχειροῦσιν.*

*Rhetoric is a counterpart of Dialectic; for both have to do with matters that are in a manner within the cognizance of all men and not confined to any special science. Hence all men in a manner have a share of both; for all, up to a certain point, endeavor to criticize or uphold an argument, to defend themselves or to accuse.*

No other natural language has developed the concept of ‘rhetoric’ and related concepts to the amount and quality of the ancient Greek language, even though the historical linguistic presence of the same root is obvious among the Indo-European languages. Among the hypothetical linguistic reconstructions of existing languages besides Pokorny’s etymon 6 *uer-* for ‘speak’ and ‘talk formally’ the Proto-Indo-European roots *\*were-* and *\*wrē-* are the sources for the morphological material, which in the natural language Greek developed to the word and concept ‘rhetoric’. According to IGEW (1959-1969), the Proto-Indo-European roots *\*were-* and *\*wrē-* with the meanings ‘tell’ and ‘speak’ refer to natural dead and living languages; also the dead languages Hittite with the word *werija-* for ‘call’, ‘name’, and ‘mention’ and Tokharian A *wram* and B *wreme* (PT *\*wreme*) for ‘object’ refer to this etymon. Old Greek *ἐῖρō* and *rhēthēsoma* mean ‘say’; the participle *rhētō-* means ‘appointed’, ‘destined’, and ‘sayable’. *Rhētēr* means ‘speaker’, *rhētōr* and Aeolic *wrētōr* was used for a speechmaster; *rhēma* means ‘sentence’, ‘word’, and ‘narration’; *rhēsi-s* means ‘speech’ and ‘pronunciation’; *rhētrā* has as meanings ‘appointment’, ‘treaty’, ‘law’, and ‘sentence’; related to this Proto-Indo-European roots are also the Slavic roots *\*vbrāti*, *\*vbrō*, *\*vbrāčb*, *\*vbrākā*, and *\*vorz* and the Germanic roots *\*wrō-x-i-* c, *\*wrō-g-ā-* m, *\*wrō-x-ia-*, and *\*wrō-g-iā-*. The Proto-Germanic roots *\*wrōxi-z* and *\*wrōgá-m* and *\*wrōxian-* and *\*wrōgián-* have the meanings ‘tell’, ‘speak’, and ‘shout’. In the Germanic language family the extinct Gothic word *wrōh-s* means ‘complaint’ and ‘accusation’; *wrōhjan* means



‘accuse’. The Old Norse word *rōgja* means ‘accuse’ and ‘slander’; *rōg* means ‘argument’ and ‘slander’. In contemporary Norwegian *rōgja* means ‘accuse’ and ‘ghossip’. Swedish *rōja* means ‘tell a secret’. In the Germanic language family the Old Danish word *rōghä* is related. Also among the Germanic languages the Old English words *wrēgan* and *wrōht* and the modern English word *bewray*, the Old Frisian words *wrēia*, *wrōgia*, and *ruogia*, Old Saxon *wrōgian* for ‘accuse’ and *wrōht* for ‘argument and ‘riot’, the Middle Dutch words *wroeghen* and *wroughen* for ‘accuse’ and Dutch *wroegen*, Middle Low German *wrōge* and *wrōch* for ‘legal accusation’, ‘accusation’, ‘warning’, ‘financial penalty’, and ‘penalty’, *wrōgen* and *wrūgen* for ‘accuse’, and Old High German *ruogen* (8<sup>th</sup> century) for ‘accuse’, ‘accuse legally’, and ‘report’ are related words in Germanic languages. The Middle High German word *rüege* means ‘legal accusation’, ‘announcement’, and ‘punishment’; the verbs *rüegen* and *ruogen* means ‘report’, ‘say’, and ‘accuse’. In contemporary German the verb *rügen* and the noun *Rüge* exist for a verbal accusation. So even taking into account the reflexes of the etymon in the Indo-European languages, we must state that the concept of ‘rhetoric’ was exclusively developed in the ancient Greek language.

### **The ‘First Wave’ of Loanword Production between Modernity and Pre-Postmodernity: The Establishment of ‘Rhetoric’ as Loanword in Western European Languages**

The Germanic languages developed terms equivalent to the ancient Greek terms, but they were based on the linguistic material of Germanic roots for ‘speak.’ The early language states of the Old High German language and the Old English do not entail the loanword ‘rhetoric,’ but rely on words from the Germanic root for ‘speak.’ In later stages of these two languages the implementation of the concept of ‘rhetoric’ occurs by loanwords, which are derivations from the ancient Greek word and the Latin loanword ‘rhetorica’ transmitted via the scholarly writings of ancient authors and the late ancient culture in Europe in the Byzantine Empire. This spreading extension of loanwords made the concept ‘rhetoric’ a popular concept across Europe in the conceptual framework of the Greek term. So in the earliest stage of the historically known German language, according to NAW (2006), in Old High German for ‘rhetor’ the generic historical term ‘*sprōhman*’, for ‘rhetoric’ ‘*rehtsprōhhÆ\**’, and for ‘rhetorical’ the terms ‘*wōhsprōhhal\**’, ‘*wōhsprōhlÆh\**’, and ‘*wōhsprehhÆg\**’ existed. While in the Old English no derivation from the ancient Greek root as a loanword existed, in the Middle English language ‘rethorik’ as a derivation from Old French ‘*rethorique*’ is documented. (*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* 2014) In the following Middle English

language of the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century, according to the *Middle English Dictionary* of the University of Michigan (2014), the words ‘rethoricien’, ‘rethorien’, ‘rthork(e)’, ‘rhetoryk’, ‘rhetoricalle’, ‘rethorik’, ‘rethorike’, and ‘retorik’ existed in the written works referencing the ancient rhetoricians and their writings:

‘rethoricien’:

‘He happed to fynde a book þat Tullius Cicero mad, þe grete rhetorician of Rome’  
(c1450 Capgr. St. Aug. (Add 36704): 9/13)

‘rethorien’:

‘Com now forth, therefore, the suasyoun of swetnesse rethorien’  
(a1425 (c1380) Chaucer Bo. (Benson-Robinson) 2.pr.1.46)

‘rthork(e)’:

‘Of Sophestrie she was also witty, Of Rhetoric, and of other clergye’  
(c1475 Guy(1) (Cai 107/176): 90)

‘rhetoryk’:

‘With quakyng penne my consceyt to expresse, ffor lak of Rhethoryk feerful to vnffoolde, To your noblesse to wryten as I wolde’  
(c1450(a1449) Lydg. S Secr. (Sln 2464): 334)

‘rhetoricalle’:

‘Ioyne them also in Rhethoricalle gyse with naturis ornate in purifiede wyse’  
(a1500(c1477) Norton O Alch. (Add 10302) 1648)

‘rethorik’:

‘So seiþ Prosper the rethorik [L rhetor] in his vers’  
((a1387) Trev. Higd.(StJ-C H.1) 5.215)

‘rethorike’:

‘Þe rethorike [L rhetoricus] wiþ his faire speche brekeþ out ofte tyme in þat manere’  
((a1387) Trev. Higd. (StJ-C H.1) 7.211)

‘retorik’:

‘I holde my pees of gramariens and of medeleris of retorik’  
(a1450(c1395) WBible(2) Pref.Jer.(NC 66) p.66)

In Latin literature the Greek term was used as the loanword ‘rhetorica.’ Similar to the implementation of the Middle English loanwords for rhetoric from the French and Latin language, also the Middle High German word ‘rhetorick’ entered as a loanword a translation from the Latin (*ars*) *rhetorica* the Thesaurus of Middle German. (*Duden Online*) Around 1500 *Formulare vnd teütsch Rethoric* (1519) and *Nuw practiciert rethorik und brieff formulary* (1493) written by Heinrich Geßler in Straßburg appeared. At that stage, the concept ‘rhetoric’ was used for the scholarly tradition of the ruled speech performance according to the traditional system. But also a more simplified understanding of rhetoric as persuasion often

in a negatively considered attitude arose since the age of the ‘decline of rhetoric’ in the 19th century; the scholarly tradition of rhetoric as one of the arts in the educational system of the liberal arts in the academic European landscape ended and the simplified understanding of rhetoric as persuasion was now considered the meaning of rhetoric. But rhetoric as a concept and also as a systematic discipline is still present in the scholarly and academic institutions like *Departments of Rhetoric and Writing Centers* of universities following the U.S. American system and European universities; also courses for writing with an emphasis on the process of composition often named as ‘rhetoric and composition’ are common in curricula of various disciplines at a university.

### **The ‘Second Wave’ of Loanword Production from Modernity to Postmodernity: The Transfer of Rhetoric’ as Loanword in the Western European Languages**

The Greek historical terms ‘*ῥητορική (τέχνη)*’ and the Latin loanword ‘*rhetorica(e techne)*’ were the basis for loanwords not only in the contemporary Greek language. The contemporary Greek language still uses the terms ‘*ῥητορικός*’, ‘*ῥητορεία*’, and ‘*ῥητορική*’. Contemporary Italian employs the term *retorica* with the same meaning. Among the Germanic languages the contemporary German language uses the term ‘*Rhetorik*’ and in the thesaurus of contemporary English the term ‘rhetoric’ is still present. Contemporary Dutch has the words ‘*retorisch*’, ‘*redekunst*’, ‘*retoriek*’, ‘*retorica*’, and ‘*rederijkerskunst*’. The contemporary Swedish language has in its thesaurus the native words and loanwords ‘*retorisk*’ and ‘*retorik*’ and ‘*talarkonst*’. In the Indo-European language continuum of the Romanic language varieties the language Spanish has the loanwords ‘*retórico*’ and ‘*retórico*’ and ‘*retórica*’ in its thesaurus. In the contemporary French language the loanwords ‘*rhétorique*’ and ‘*rhétoricien*’ are present. Portuguese has as loanwords ‘*retórico*’, ‘*retórica*’, and ‘*linguagem retórica*’ in its thesaurus. Romanian has the loanwords ‘*oratorie*’, ‘*retorică*’, ‘*elocință*’, and ‘*discurs pompos*’, which derived from Latin and Greek. In the Eastern European languages in contemporary Bulgarian ‘*опамопcmbo*’ and ‘*пumopuka*’, in Czech ‘*řečnický*’, ‘*rétorika*’, and ‘*řečnictví*’, and in Estonian ‘*ilukõne*’ and ‘*retoorika*’ exist as lexemes. Hungarian has the loanword ‘*retorika*’ and Latvian has the native word and loanword ‘*retorika*’ and ‘*daiļrunība*’ in their thesauri. In contemporary Polish ‘*retoryka*’ and ‘*retoryczność*’ is used. Russian has the words ‘*пumopuka*’, ‘*опамопcкое уккyccmbo*’, and ‘*кpаснобайцmbo*’ in its thesaurus. Contemporary Serbian has the native word and loanword ‘*besedništvo*’ and ‘*retorika*’. The thesaurus of the Slovak language has the native word and loanwords ‘*rečnický*’, ‘*rétorický*’ and ‘*rétorika*’. In the

Albanian thesaurus the word ‘*retorikë*’ is present. We can mark the topographical border for the commonly shared concept of ‘rhetoric’ of the Indo-European languages in Europe as the border between the Greek and Turkish language, which belongs to the Altaic language family. In contemporary Arabic *balagha*, ‘*lm al-balagha*, *fann al-khatābah*, *biān*, *biān balagha*, *fann al-nathr*, *faṣāḥa* exist. Contemporary Turkish has ‘*etkili konuşma sanatı*’, ‘*güzel konuşma*’, ‘*sözbilim*’, the contemporary Arabic loanword ‘*belâgat*’, ‘*etkili yazma*’, and ‘*hitabet sanatı*’ in its thesaurus. On the contrary, the Altaic language Korean has just the native contemporary words ‘수사학의’ and ‘사학’ and ‘문법’ in its thesaurus. In non-Indo-European languages in Asia the loanword ‘rhetoric’ entered via language contact with the English language. The English term ‘*rhetoric*’ is one example for the emergence of the concept of ‘rhetoric’ as loanword from the Greek language; but the English language is also a tool and carrier of the concept to languages, which are spoken far away from the areas of Indo-European languages, via language contacts in the course of the internationalization of the English language. Usually the usage of a loanword occurs when the natural language is not able to cover the meaning of the concept with its own thesaurus of the natural language, or an older native word is replaced. Obviously, also the languages related closely to the Greek language within the group of the Indo-European languages did not built out the linguistic concept of ‘rhetoric’ and its various derivations to such an extensive vocabulary like it was done in the ancient Greek language. Among all the languages, which shared the common Proto-Indo-European roots *\*were-* and *\*wrē-* only the Greek language developed the linguistic and mental concept of ‘rhetoric’ with the specific meaning for a technical term; we have seen other languages later implemented the concept as a loanword in later stages of their linguistic development. Also this fact speaks for the existence of a need to implement lacking concepts into a natural language, when these languages lack the concept in the thesaurus of the natural language itself. Based on these historical studies of the concept of ‘rhetoric’ in linguistic materials we now look at the conceptualization of rhetoric from a theoretical perspective onto the concept of ‘rhetoric’ according to the contemporary understanding of the concept.

### **A Contemporary Definition and Model of the Concept ‘Rhetoric’ and ‘Rhetorization’ as Process of Establishing Relations between Things (‘*res*’) and Words (‘*verba*’)**

In this section we present a contemporary definition of ‘rhetoric’ in the convention of the traditional concept of ‘rhetoric.’ The contemporary definitions of ‘rhetoric’ found in contemporary dictionaries, which had already been quoted in

the introductory part of this study, still entail as the features of rhetoric its quality as an art, the persuasive function of rhetoric, and the usage of the stylistics is still considered an important field of rhetoric. Based on these aspects of 'rhetoric' as lexeme still present in the contemporary dictionaries, the contemporary definition can be formulated as:

The art of intentional change of linguistic communication and related semiotic systems from standardized linguistic communication in a formal way as formal language usage with active approaches aiming at the persuasive change of the receivers regarding an issue.

In detail this definition means:

1. Rhetoric is an art, since it requires skills above the level of standard usage of language.
2. Rhetoric is an intentional change, since the 'rhetor' uses the art intentionally for the persuasion in his / her favor.
3. Rhetoric can be applied to linguistic communication and related semiotic systems, since also other semiotic systems can be the carriers of persuasive contents, e.g. the image.
4. Rhetoric is a change from standardized linguistic communication; rhetoric entails the formal structures not in standardized linguistic communication present.
5. Rhetoric uses active approaches, since the persuasion is realized in the activation of thereceivers. (E.g. the traditional functions 'move' (*movere*), 'teach' (*docere*), and 'delight' (*delectare*) in classical Latin rhetoric and its modern reception.
6. Rhetoric aims at persuasive change of the receivers, since it is a strategic change addressed to them as targeted audience regarding their opinion about an issues.

Based on this definition, in a theoretical part we examine the conceptualization of 'rhetoric' as a process, which takes place as a generic process of the production of linguistic communication. Since rhetoric from the perspective of the rhetorician is a ubiquitous phenomenon, we can also describe the process of the conceptualization of 'rhetoric' not as a successive process from a default-language-level to a level of 'rhetorized language,' but as the process of an alteration of linguistic materials. The traditional rhetorical theory therefore uses the four categories of change for the generic development of rhetorical phenomena. To the rhetorization of linguistic communication any element and tools of rhetoric can contribute; in this regard, the rhetorical theory traditionally describes these elements in handbooks and rhetorical treaties, which list the rhetorical devices in a systematic way. The process of the generation of rhetorized linguistic communicative acts can be differentiated into three types of principle processes; the traditional rhetorical theory has reduced all processes, which generate rhetorical linguistic communication, to processes depending on four categories of change. We will use in the following section these four categories of change in order to describe rhetorization in a model of the three

processes of rhetorization ('formalization,' 'structuralization,' 'symbolization').

## The Conceptualization of 'Rhetoric' and the Process of Rhetorization of Linguistic Communication: A Model of the Process of Rhetorization of Linguistic Communication

In this section we describe the three processes of the rhetorization of linguistic communication, which result in the rhetorical appearance of any unit of linguistic communication ('formalization,' 'structuralization,' 'symbolization'). These three processes describe the qualities of the rhetoricized written or spoken linguistic communicative acts. The process of the rhetorization of the linguistic communication entails as aspects:

1. the 'formalization', which can be understood as the formal artificial design of a unit of linguistic communication,
2. the 'structuralization', which can be understood as the complex structure of the major unit of linguistic communication entailing several text unit parts with modifications of formalization, and
3. the 'symbolization' as the decoding process of the linguistic communication used.

The process of rhetorization is traditionally explained within the science of rhetoric as the process of the change of linguistic material according to the four principles or categories: 'addition,' 'removal,' 'replacement,' and 'transposition.' (Table 1) These categories serve for the classification of the rhetorical elements in linguistic communication since antiquity and they are also in contemporary setting useful as the classification of a macro-framework for rhetorization of linguistic communication. A rhetoricized language is produced via the following processes or basic concepts according to traditional rhetorical theory:

'Adjectio'	Adjection	Addition
'Detractio'	Detraction	Removal
'Transmutatio'	Transmutation	Replacement
'Immutatio'	Immutation	Transposition
Historical Term	Contemporary Term	Alternative Contemporary Term

**Table 1.** Categories of Change in Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* and Contemporary Terms

In the *Institutio Oratoria* (I, 5, 6) Quintilian listed the four categories of change:

Interim vitium quod fit in singulis verbis sit barbarismus. Occurrat mihi forsitan aliquis: quid hic promisso tanti operis dignum? aut quis hoc nescit, alios barbarismos scribendo fieri, alios loquendo (quia quod male scribitur male etiam dici necesse est, quae vitiose dixeris non utique



et scripto peccant), illud prius adiectione detractioe immutatione transmutatione, hoc secundum divisione complexione adspiratione sono contineri?

The formalization of a natural language can take place at several levels of it with the processes of ‘adjection,’ ‘detractio,’ ‘transmutation,’ and ‘immutatio.’ Textual units like the word, the sentence, and the paragraph (in the sense of a unit-building group of sentences) belong to it. Another approach is the approach from the thing, the ‘res,’ to the formalization of a person, thing, issue or event, time or place. The following table describes the application of the four categories of change to the level of the linguistic phenomenon (‘*verba*’-level) and the level of objects represented by the language (‘*res*’-level):

	Adjection	Detraction	Transmutation	Immutation
Level of the Linguistic Phenomena (‘ <i>Verba</i> ’-Level)				
Word	‘Figures of Words’ via adjection	‘Figures of Words’ via detractio	‘Figures of Words’ via transmutation	‘Figures of Words’ via immutatio
Sentence	‘Figures of Sentences’ via adjection	‘Figures of Sentences’ via detractio	‘Figures of Sentences’ via transmutation	‘Figures of Sentences’ via immutatio
Paragraph	‘Figures of Sentences’ via adjection	‘Figures of Sentences’ via detractio	‘Figures of Sentences’ via transmutation	‘Figures of Sentences’ via immutatio
Level of the Represented Phenomena (‘ <i>Res</i> ’-Level)				
Thing	‘Topoi’ of the Thing	‘Topoi’ of the Thing	‘Topoi’ of the Thing	‘Topoi’ of the Thing
Person	‘Topoi’ of the Person	‘Topoi’ of the Person	‘Topoi’ of the Person	‘Topoi’ of the Person
Issue, Event	‘Topoi’ of the Issue, Event	‘Topoi’ of the Issue, Event	‘Topoi’ of the Issue, Event	‘Topoi’ of the Issue, Event
Time	‘Topoi’ of the Time	‘Topoi’ of the Time	‘Topoi’ of the Time	‘Topoi’ of the Time
Place	‘Topoi’ of the Place	‘Topoi’ of the Place	‘Topoi’ of the Place	‘Topoi’ of the Place

**Table 2.** Processes of the Rhetorization of Linguistic Communication: The Categories of ‘Adjection’, ‘Detraction’, ‘Transmutation’, and ‘Immutation’ at the Levels of Words (‘*verba*’) and Things (‘*res*’)

Rhetoric is traditionally understood as the discipline which serves as a bridge between the ‘things’ around us and the ‘words’ we use. The table above (Table 2) classifies areas of ‘words’ (‘*verba*’) and ‘things’ (‘*res*’). The column on the left side entails the text-sequences: ‘words,’ ‘sentences,’ and ‘paragraphs’ as the classifying units of ‘words’ (‘*verba*’) in linguistic communication and as the classifying

units of the things ('res') the categories: 'thing,' 'person,' 'issue' and 'event,' 'time' and place.' A second table (Table 3) shows how the here introduced aspects of the rhetorization refer to classical aspects of the system of rhetoric. Language in linguistic communication acts has the quality of rhetorical features, which in the following table we distinguish as the processes of 'formalization,' 'structuralization,' and 'symbolization,' which rhetorize a text; the process of rhetorization is a process, which entails processes of the 'formalization,' 'structuralization,' and 'symbolization' of a text. The table presents examples for each of the processes:

Rhetorization as Process by		
'Formalization'	'Structuralization'	'Symbolization'
Process of the creation of formal units of the rhetorized text	Process of the creation of Macro-structural units of the rhetorized text	Process of the creation of symbolified formal units of the rhetorized text
'Figures of speech' 'Figures of words' 'Figures of sentences'	'Introduction' 'Middle part' 'Conclusion'	'tropes'
Example: 'the power of food'	Example: An essay with 5-paragraph structure	Example: 'the spirit of a flower'

**Table 3.** 'Formalization', 'Structuralization', and 'Symbolization': Aspects of the Rhetorized Language in Linguistic Communication Acts

'Formalization' refers here to the rhetoricized language, which entails specific forms traditionally described in stylistics as the 'figures'; the 'structuralization' is the quality of the rhetoricized language, which determines the whole unit of a text; 'symbolization' is the quality of the rhetoricized text, which refers to the alternative description of an issue connoted with the persuasive aim of its producer.

### **'Formalization', 'Structuralization', and 'Symbolization': A Case Study of Aspects of the Process of Rhetorization of Linguistic Communication**

The formalization of language in a formal pattern is the main feature of the concept 'rhetoric,' which is also the oldest feature of rhetoric already present in the meanings of the Proto-Indo-European roots. The formalization of language in written or spoken linguistic communication acts is already in the conceptual meanings of the Proto-Indo-European roots *\*were-* and *\*wrē-* in the realizations of the ancient Greek vocabulary present. The root semantically describes a formal language. Also in the theoretical perspective this stylistic form is one aspect of the formalization of a natural language to a 'rhetoricized language.' The formalization is an essential aspect and quality of the rhetoricized usage of a natural language.

The formalized rhetorical language entails forms, which are describable, like the figures of speech. Structuralization is a feature of the 'rhetorized language,' which is a consequence of the formalization of the natural language. So here the formal patterns of the 'rhetorized languages' have the ability to form a structure of the text. Whereas the formalization of the language can concern only several separated aspects of the natural language, e.g. the metaphors, the resulting comprehensive formation is the rhetorical structure of the whole textual unit of a text. The structuralization concerns the whole unit of the rhetorized text (e.g. a poem, a letter, a book as the macro-unit), whereas the formalization refers to the single part, which has been the subject of the formalization. 'Symbolization' refers to an effect of the process of rhetorization; the rhetorized text entails parts, which are semantically encoded and allow a simple reference structure between 'word' and 'thing.' The rhetorized text does no longer describe the 'things' with the semantically common 'words,' but with alternative 'words,' which are usually no longer a unique feature of the 'thing'; so the statement 'my love is a rose' entails the symbolic codification of the love as a 'rose,' which is an element of formalization of a part of the texts and so also a contribution to the rhetorical structuralization. The semantic sphere is here opened, when the word 'rose' as a figure of words is a contribution to the metaphorical meaning and needs to be understood as a decodable word, which cannot be understood literally. The process of rhetorization is an omnipresent process; we can also use it to describe these aspects as the different layers of the rhetorized text. We take the example of the following sentence:

The flower of the sun reached out to the moon and embraced him.

In this sentence the three aspects of the rhetorization can be distinguished as follows: The formalization entails the various figures of words and sentences in this sentence like the metaphors "*flower of the sun*," "*moon*," and "*embrace*" as well as the whole sentence as an allegory. So we have a specific structure of the sentence, which – in this case – entails a complete rhetorized structure with no words referring to a simplified 'word'- 'thing' relation; In the case the sentence was structured like the following one by a comparison and the partial existence of a clear 'things' to 'words' relationship, it would have a structure of both rhetorical and non-rhetorical symbolizing elements:

The lover was like a flower of the sun, which reached out to the moon and embraced him.

The symbolization of the rhetorical linguistic communication is here clearly present in the tropes, which stand as words for something different and leave the reader/ listener alone with the need to decode the symbolized expressions in this language.

So all three aspects of the rhetorization of a unit of linguistic communication, the formalization, the structuralization, and the symbolization, are present in this example. The usual and traditional description of the process of the ‘formalization’ is the description of a unit of linguistic communication as a ‘figure’ (Latin: *figura*) of speech. The ‘structuralization’ is usually in the traditional rhetoric described as the ‘parts of speech,’ whereas the ‘parts of speech’ in rhetoric are usually limited to the structural parts of a speech as units of the text of a speech; the aspect of the ‘symbolization’ refers not only to the creation of the level of multiple meanings of a e.g. metaphorical text, but also the general persuasive effect of a rhetoricized language, which structures the ‘things’ of its discourse in an intended way with *topoi* (‘places’) for the organization of the argumentation and the stylistics of the presented speech, and so classifies as rhetorical speech.

## Literature

- Aristotle.** *Ars Rhetorica*. Ed. W. D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. Perseus Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2014, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.01.0059>.
- Aristotle.** *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*. Vol. 22. Tr. J. H. Freese. Aristotle. Cambridge and London. Harvard University Press; William Heinemann Ltd. 1926. Perseus Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2014, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.01.0060%3abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D1>.
- Bartoszewicz, I.** (2012). *Linguistics and Rhetoric – Reciprocal Perception*. “Forum Artis Rhetoricae” 2.December 12, 2013, [http://www.retoryka.edu.pl/files/far3\\_2012\\_ed\\_ang.pdf](http://www.retoryka.edu.pl/files/far3_2012_ed_ang.pdf)
- Borkowski, D.** (2008). *The Emergence of a New Rhetoric Since the 1960s: A History of the Linguistic Reformation of American Culture*. Lewiston: Mellen.
- Brockriede, W. E.** (1968) *Dimensions of the Concept of Rhetoric*. “The Quarterly Journal of Speech” 54.1, pp.: 1-12.
- The European Institute of Rhetoric* (EIR). University of the Saarland. January 23, 2014, <http://www.uni-saarland.de/en/institut/the-european-institute-of-rhetoric-eir.html>
- Frank, T.** (1985) *Linguistic Theory and the Doctrine of Usage in George Campbell’s „Philosophy of Rhetoric”*. “Lingua e Stile” 20.2, pp.: 199-216.
- Heilmann, L.** (1978) *Rhetoric, New Rhetoric and Linguistic Theory*. “Folia Linguistica” 12.3-4, pp. 285-300.
- Hopper, P. J.** (2007) *Linguistics and Micro-Rhetoric. A Twenty-First Century Encounter*. “Journal of English Linguistics”, 35.3, pp.: 236-252.
- Ilie, C.** (2014) *Rhetoric* In: *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. Ed. Wolfgang Donsbach. January 23, 2014, [http://www.communicationencyclopedia.com/public/tocnode?query=rhetoric&widen=1&result\\_number=15&from=search&id=g9781405131995\\_yr2013\\_chunk\\_g978140513199523\\_ss55-1&type=std&fuzzy=0&slop=1](http://www.communicationencyclopedia.com/public/tocnode?query=rhetoric&widen=1&result_number=15&from=search&id=g9781405131995_yr2013_chunk_g978140513199523_ss55-1&type=std&fuzzy=0&slop=1)
- Indo-European Lexicon. PIE Etymon and IE Reflexes*. “Linguistics Research Center.” University of Texas. January 12, 2014, <http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/ielex/X/P2167.html>
- Jasinski, J.** (2001). *Sourcebook on Rhetoric. Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Köbler, G.** (2006). *Neuhochdeutsch-althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. Homepage Gerhard Köbler. January 12, 2014, <http://www.koeblergerhard.de/germanistischewoerterbuecher/althochdeutscheswoerterbuch/nhd-ahd.pdf>
- Lausberg, H.** (1998). *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Foreword by George A. Kennedy. Transl. by Matthew T. Bliss. Ed. by David E. Orton & R. Dean Anderson. Leiden: Brill.
- Liddell, H. G.; Scott, R.** (1940). *A Greek-English Lexicon Revised and Augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the Assistance of Roderick McKenzie*. Oxford. Clarendon Press. Persues Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2014, [http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr\(hto%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr(hto%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric)
- Murray, J. S.** (1984) *The True Rhetoric. An Analysis of Plato's Conception of Persuasion*. Ann Arbor, Mich.; Univ. Microfilms International.
- Paul, D.** (1978). *The Roman Conception of Rhetoric*. Coleraine, New Univ. of Ulster, Diss..
- Payne, D.** (1986). *Rhetoric, Reality, and Knowledge: A Re-Examination of Protagoras*. "Concept of Rhetoric". "Rhetoric Society Quarterly" 16., pp. 187-197.
- Plett, H.F.** (2010). *Literary Rhetoric. Concepts, Structures, Analyses*. Leiden: Brill.
- Quintilian, Marcus Fabius.** *Institutio Oratoria*. The Latin Library. January 23, 2014, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/quintilian/quintilian.institutio1.shtml#5>
- "Rhetor."** In: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ed. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Perseus Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2014, [http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr\(hth%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr(hth%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric)
- "ῥητορ."** In: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ed. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Perseus Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2014, [http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr\(hth%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr(hth%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric)
- "ῥητορική."** In: *A Homeric Dictionary for Schools and Colleges*. Ed. Georg Autenrieth. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1891. Perseus Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2013, [http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0073%3Aentry%3Dr\(h%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0073%3Aentry%3Dr(h%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric)
- "ῥήτρα."** In: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ed. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Persues Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2014, [http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr\(h%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr(h%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric)
- "ῥητέον."** In: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ed. Henry George Liddell. Robert Scott. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Persues Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2013, [http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr\(h%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr(h%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric)
- "Rhetoric."** In: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ed. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Perseus Project. Tufts University. January 23, 2014, [http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr\(hto%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dr(hto%2F%26%26highlight=rhetoric)
- "Rhetoric"**. In: *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. 2014. Fourth Edition. Houghton Mifflin Company. The Free Dictionary. January 23, 2014, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/rhetoric>
- "Rhetoric"**. In: *Brill's New Pauly*. Ed. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. Brill Online. November 29, 2013, <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-pauly/rhetoric-e1022090>
- "Rhetoric"**. In: *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus*. Cambridge Dictionaries. December 23, 2013, <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/rhetoric>
- "Rhetorik"**. In: *Duden Online*. January 23, 2014, <http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Rhetorik>
- "Rhetoric"**. In: *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Merriam-Webster. January 24, 2014, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/rhetoric>
- "Rhetoric"**. In: *Middle English Dictionary*. University of Michigan. January 23, 2014, <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/middle-english/dictionary/rhetoric>

lib.umich.edu/m/med/med\_quot\_search.html

**“Rhetoric”**. In: *Oxford English Dictionary. Online Edition 2013*. December 23, 2013, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/rhetoric>

**“Rhetoric”**. In: *Religion Past and Present*. Brill Online. November 29, 2013, [http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/religion-past-and-present/rhetoric-COM\\_024625](http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/religion-past-and-present/rhetoric-COM_024625)

*Rhetorik. Begriff - Geschichte – Internationalität*. Edited by Gert Ueding. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005.