Read and highlight the “Ethos, Logos, and Pathos” handout (it’s a tad challenging, but you can do it).

**All of this is important as it is a requirement for your summative.**

Rhetoric, Logos, Pathos, and Ethos 

**Ethos**

Persuasion from ethos establishes the speaker's or writer's good character. The appeal from a person's acknowledged life contributions within a community has moved from the stability of the family hearth to the mobility of the shiny car. Without the ethos of the good name and handshake, current forms of cultural ethos often fall to puffed-up resumes and other papers. The use of ethos in the form of earned titles within the community—Coach Albert, Deacon Jones, Professor Miller—are diminishing as "truthful" signifiers, while commercial-name signifiers or icons appear on clothing—Ralph Lauren, Louis Vuitton, Tommy Hilfiger—disclosing a person's cultural ethos not in terms of a contributor to the community, but in terms of identity-through purchase. Aristotle warns us away from such decoys, telling us that the appeal from ethos comes not from appearances, but from a person's use of language. In a culture where outward appearances have virtually subsumed or taken over the appeal from inner (moral and intellectual) character, the appeal from ethos becomes both problematic and important. Aristotle tells us that three things "Inspire confidence in the rhetor's [speaker's/writer's] own character: good sense, good moral character, and goodwill. False statements and bad advice come from the lack of any of these elements. Exhibiting these three aspects of character in your discourse can play a large part in gaining credibility for your ideas.

**Pathos**

Persuasion from pathos involves engaging the readers' or listeners' emotions. Appealing to pathos does not mean that you just emote or "go off' through your writing. Not that simple. Appealing to pathos in your readers (or listeners), you establish in them a state of reception for your ideas. You can attempt to fill your readers with pity for somebody or contempt for some wrong. You can create a sense of envy or of indignation. Naturally, in order for you to establish at will any desired state of emotion in your readers, you will have to know everything you can about psychology. Maybe that's why Aristotle wrote so many books about the philosophy of human nature. In the *Rhetoric* itself, Aristotle advises writers at length how to create anger toward some ideal circumstance and how also to create a sense of calm in readers. He also explains principles of friendship and enmity as shared pleasure and pain. He discusses how to create in readers a sense of fear and shame and shamelessness and kindness and unkindness and pity and indignation and envy and indignation and emulation. Then he starts all over and shows how to create such feelings toward ideas in various types of human character' of "people" of virtue and vice; those of youth, prime of life, and old age; and those of good fortune and those of bad fortune." Aristotle warns us, however: knowing (as a good willed writer) how to get your readers to receive your ideas by making readers "pleased and friendly" or "pained and hostile" is one thing; playing on readers' emotions in ways that make them mindless of concepts and consequences can corrupt the judgment of both individuals and the community.

**Logos**

Finally, a writer appeals to readers through the appeal to the readers' sense of logos. This is commonly called the logical appeal, and you can use two different types of logic. You can use inductive logic by giving your readers a bunch of similar examples and then drawing from them a general proposition (suggestion); this logic is pretty simple; or you can use the deductive reasoning by giving your readers a few general propositions and then drawing from them a specific truth.

Source: Henning, Martha L. Friendly Persuasion: Classical Rhetoric--Now! Draft Manuscript. August, 1998.

In Mark Antony's funeral oration for Caesar, we have not only one of Shakespeare's most recognizable opening lines but one of his finest examples of rhetorical irony at work. Perhaps more than any other of Shakespeare's works, *Julius Caesar* is a play that hinges upon rhetoric—both as the art of persuasion and an artifice used to veil intent.

To be sure, Antony does not have it easy. He is already a man distrusted by the conspirators for his friendship with Caesar. Brutus lets him speak at Caesar's funeral, but only after Brutus, a great orator in his own right, has spoken first to "show the reason of our Caesar's death." Brutus makes it clear that Antony may speak whatever good he wishes of Caesar so long as he speaks no ill of the conspirators. But Antony has two advantages over Brutus: his subterfuge and his chance to have the last word. It's safe to say that Antony makes the most of his opportunity.

In the speech that follows, Antony merely sets the table for dissent. He progressively hits upon the notes of *ambition* and *honourable* in a cadence that soon calls both terms into question. Antony's prime weapons at the beginning are his conspicuous ambiguity regarding Caesar ("If it were so, it was a grievous fault") and Brutus ("Yet Brutus says he was ambitious"), rhetorical questions ("Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?") and feigned intent ("I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke"). More chilling, however, is Antony's cynical epilogue to the funeral speech as the mob departs: "Now let it work: mischief, thou art afoot/Take thou what course thou wilt!" As Antony exemplifies, the art of persuasion is not far removed in *Julius Caesar* from the craft of manipulation.

Mark Antony, in *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar*, is a brave, intelligent, pleasure-loving, and cunning man. He was loyal to his friend, Caesar, whom he considered a true friend. Antony was devoted and preferred to be dependent upon Julius Caesar since he rather have enjoyed life than to claim the highest position in the government. He wanted the crown to be given to Caesar so that all conflicts could be avoided. However, this additional power contributed to the conspirator's motive to assassinate him. Antony was distraught with Caesar's death and sought revenge first by speaking to the crowd in his speech.

YOU TASK:

For the Marc Antony speech (printed on GOOS paper) you are to:

1. Identify ethos, logos, and pathos, and explain why it is ethos, logos, and pathos.
2. Identify as many rhetorical devises and explain how they support Antoni’s purpose. His purpose is to turn the pacified mod against Brutus and his conspirators.

Context for the speech

The speech is taken from Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar.* In the play, Caesar is killed by conspiring Senators; Brutus, Caesar’s, friend is among the traitors. When Brutus speaks to the angry Roman mob he says that he killed Caesar for Rome and not for personal gain (this is true). He claims that Caesar was becoming too powerful and would turn Rome into a dictatorship. At this point, the Roman mob is pacified and supports Brutus. Marc Antony, also a friend of Caesar, is disliked by the conspirators and is under threat of death; he wants to avenge his friend. The conspirators allow Antony to speak so long as he says nothing ill about them. Marc Antony makes the most of his opportunity and by the end of his speech *persuades* the mob to turn on Brutus and the conspirators.