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 **Tracing the Term Pathos**
 Plato refutes the validity of rhetoric due to being a form of flattery, and, in *Phaedrus*, he describes rhetoric as a knack used to please and persuade the public. Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee (2012) argue how “… early rhetorical theorists like Gorgias and Plato characterized rhetoric as a *psychagogia*, a leader or enchanter of souls” (p. 174- 175). The different views of rhetoric between Gorgias, Plato, and Aristotle influences the role of speaker/orator. Unlike Plato, Aristotle positioned rhetoric as a heuristic tool for the speaker. Aristotle situates rhetoric as not belonging to a specific subject, is dialectic, and “…its function is not to persuade but to see the available means of persuasion in each case, as is true also in all other arts” (p. 35). Aristotle positions rhetoric as both a method and art “derived from ethics and politics on the bases of its conventional uses” (p. 12). This definition is explicated through the theoretical and applicable use of Aristotle’s ethos, pathos, and logos. The conventional use of ethos, pathos, and logos is shaped through the commonplaces and context of the speech. Pathos (pathē) was first coined by Aristotle in *On Rhetoric*, for pisteis, which contributed to the expansion of the portrayal of rhetoric in the 4th century BC. For Aristotle, ethos, pathos, and logos are intertwined, but Quintilian argues that “roman rhetoricians who relied on Greek rhetorical theory sometimes confused ethos with pathos … because there was no satisfactory term for ethos” (Crowley and Hawhee, 2012, p. 174). The use of emotional appeals and a positive ethos allowed for Aristotle’s speaker to establish a “trust” with the audience. Whereas the use of emotional appeals allowed for the orator, according to Cicero, to “lean in the direction” that the orator guided the audience (p. 172). For this trace, I examine how the view and use of emotional appeals, or pathos, shifted with selected texts with the Sophists, Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero.

 The application of emotional appeals was introduced by Aristotle, where he categorized emotional appeals (empathy and sympathy) to pathē (pathos). For Aristotle, pathos classified “…those things through which, by undergoing change, people come to differ in their judgments and which are companied by pain and pleasure, for example, anger, pity, fear, and other such things and their opposites” (p. 35). Prior to Aristotle, the use of emotional appeals was not categorized. Early texts like Homer’s *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and early sophistic manuals addressed or showed the use of emotional appeals (Crowley, 2012 p. 172). The strategic use of pathos (arousing emotion) was not included in the traditional sophistic manuals, but was “part of their general discussion in the introduction and conclusion” (Crowley, 2012, p. 175). Plato found the use of emotional appeals in rhetoric problematic due to its manipulative and deceitful nature. In *Gorgias*, Plato’s depiction of Gorgias’s (the sophist) use of rhetoric is grounded in relativistic epistemology and does not allow for “knowledge of immutable truth” to occur due to Gorgianic rhetoric being unstable, irrational, and solely focused on the pleasures (McComiskey, 2002, p 29). While there is a difference between emotional appeals and pleasures, Plato saw rhetoric as deceitful due to it being able to manipulate audience perception. Positioning Gorgianic and sophistic rhetoric as being irrational signified the circulation of doxa, and, to what Plato refered to, “rhetoric to the soul to what cookery is to the body.” In order to enhance the validity of democratic power structure, Plato then vilified Gorgias and Gorgian rhetoric as being “absurd” (McComiskey, 2002, p. 25). Plato’s view of rhetoric did not dissuade or hinder Aristotle’s argument pertaining to the use of emotional appeals as a persuasive technique, but rather Aristotle provided a counterargument to Plato and Gorgionic rhetoric.
 Gorgianic/sophistic rhetoric devalued the use of emotional appeals. For Gorgias, the sophist, human thought is not rational because it is heavily influenced and distorted through human sensory-perception. Thus, an emotional response can potentially alter the audience’s perception (Crowley, 2012, p. 175). Gorgianic rhetoric then relies on terpsis, “...in which terpsis, a passive, aesthetic, sensory response to a stimulus, leads to and must precede amanke, the active, psyche-based force that motivates the desired physical action in the audience” (p. 28). Similarly, for Plato, appealing to the audience’s emotions enhanced the manipulative and deceitful consequences of rhetoric. When the process of sensory perception is affected, it thus deconstructs Plato’s “knowledge-versus opinion binary” and renders it as being “.. unacceptable for Gorgias the sophist” (McComiskey, 2002, p. 23). Influenced by Plato and Gorgias, Aristotle sought to expand the view and application of rhetoric in civic discourse by advocating for the opposite: using emotional appeals contextualizes the speech, thus establishing a more effective outcome. *On Rhetoric* is not a manual on how to appeal to an audience, but rather detailed a theoretical framework on how rhetoric can be a heuristic strategy for the speaker.

 Aristotle addresses the relationship between ethos and pathos, but provides distinctive qualities for each. For Aristotle, “good sense, good moral character, and goodwill” create a positive ethos and a receptive emotional state of mind from the audience. The creation of a positive ethos is then attributed to virtue. In *De Oratore*. Cicero argues that “employing thoughts of a certain kind and words of a certain kind, and adopting besides a delivery that is gently and shows signs of flexibility, makes appear as decent, as good in character…” (p. 171). For Cicero, the use of emotional appeals is of equal importance to the topic and is a crucial trait for the character of the orator and the delivery of a speech. Through the creation of a positive ethos, Aristotle places the speaker as having “virtuous moral intent and understanding of the good” (p. 83). Therefore, the moral capacity and understanding of the good should then, in theory, enhance knowledge and establish “trust” between the speaker and the audience. Aristotle describes virtue as being associated with “justice, manly courage, self-control, magnificence,  magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence and wisdom” (p. 80). A virtuous man does not signify honor, but rather the greatest virtue is when it can be used to help others. In order to help others, then the speaker must understand his audience. This approach differs from his predecessor, Plato, because he perceived virtue, or a positive ethos, to solely be associated with knowledge. For Aristotle, the “trust” established between a speaker and the audience is the foundation for the application of pathos in Aristotle’s *On Rhetoric* and Cicero’s *De Oratore*.

 Crowley and Hawhee (2012) state: “Aristotle’s picture of the rhetorical situation as ethos meeting (and creating) pathos, layers of dispositions. If rhetoric wants to evoke an emotion, it is best to display that emotion as well” (p. 181). Aristotle claims there are levels to emotions and is dependent on the speaker’s relationship with audience (state of mind, against whom, and reasons for the emotion) (p. 121). For Aristotle, “emotions are all those feelings that so change men as to affect their judgements, and that are also attended by pain or pleasure.” By establishing trust and understanding the context of the emotions, the speaker is able to be more persuasive and procure a more effective outcome from his speech. The role of emotions is further discussed by Cicero in *De Oratore*, where, according to Cicero, “for oratory that aims at stirring the hearts of others, will, by its very nature, stir the orator himself even more strongly than it will any member of his audience” (p. 173). Both Cicero and Aristotle saw value in the emotional appeals, unlike their predecessors Plato and Gorgias.
 Aristotle’s influence on Cicero is evident in the stylistic choices (pitch, tone, etc.) advocated by Cicero. Similar to Aristotle’s contextualization of commonplaces, Cicero’s orator “… carefully concentrate all of [his] thoughts on considering, on scenting out as keenly [he] can, what their feelings, their opinions, their hopes, and their wishes are, and in what direction my speech may most easily lead them” (p. 172). The awareness of the relationship between audience and the speaker is critical for the delivery of speech for both Aristotle’s speaker and Cicero’s orator. Aristotle’s intensity of emotions is similar to Cicero’s “vigorous oratory,” in which the state of mind of the speaker and the audience influence the intensity (or levels) of emotions. For Cicero, it is an easier feat to embellish an emotion than to fabricate an emotion (p. 171). Both Aristotle and Cicero in their respective texts pair opposing emotions and address the state of mind of the speaker/orator and the audience, reason for using emotion, and intensity received/given. According to Cicero, the important emotions to arouse in a speech and “…. In the hearts of jurors, or of any other audiences [orators] address: affection, hate, anger, envy, pity, hope, joy, fear, and grief” (p. 198). Similarly, Aristotle sought to arouse similar emotions, but Cicero’s attention to emotions focused more on hostile appeals than Aristotle.
 Pathē, or pathos, was first introduced by Aristotle; however, the use of emotional appeals was a contested debate amongst practitioners and theorists of rhetoric. Gorgias argued the use of emotional appeals was subjective, thus being a hindrance to the effectiveness of a speech. The negative view of emotions did not shift until Aristotle’s introduction of ethos, pathos, and logos, and it is Aristotle’s definition and application of emotional appeals that is widely circulated and applied to this day.Aristotle is revered as one of the most prolific and influential thinkers of the 4th Century BC. His works influenced Cicero and Quintilian, as well as post-enlightenment thinkers. Coupled with ethos, pathos, and logos, Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric is the most circulated definition and application of rhetoric in composition courses. Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric and use of emotional appeals, pathos, is grounded in rhetorical theory, but, as a heuristic skill, continues to be debated within composition courses. It is the norm within composition courses to advice, from a Gorgianic rhetorical standpoint, that an argument based solely on emotion is not effective. Yet, students are taught to contextualize their role, audience, and speech in order to seek and apply the most effective rhetorical strategies within their argument. The use of emotional appeals within the classroom continues to be a concept worthy of inquiry because of its application within and outside the academia, since it contextualizes the role as a speaker and as an audience member.
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