

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Rukopis primljen 9. 4. 2019.
Prihvaćen za tisak 1. 12. 2019.
<https://doi.org/10.22210/govor.2019.36.04>

Petra Aczél

petra.aczel@uni-corvinus.hu

Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary

Teaching rhetoric: A proposal to renew rhetorical education in Hungarian and Central European contexts

Summary

Rhetorical education faces significant challenges of the virtual knowledge society. Classroom-teaching in skill-development still seems inevitable, however, the face-to-face experience has to gain more momentum and improve quality. It is especially important in Central European contexts where the history of teaching rhetoric has not been without fractures after World War II. The present paper is an approach that conceptualizes new aims of teaching rhetoric and suggests ways to reform the educational program of rhetoric at the secondary level.

It sets off from the assumption that rhetoric should no longer be conceived and taught of as a toolkit to formulate texts, but rather as a behaviour and sensitivity to human affairs. Thus, rhetorical education should facilitate not so much the production of speeches but the birth of the rhetorical citizen. The education serving this aim does not eliminate the classical roots of rhetorical literacy. On the contrary, it exploits the dynamic capacities of the two-millennia-old faculty.

The paper introduces a detailed, three-phased educational process with which rhetorical sensitivity can be bred in the classroom, while improving rhetoric as a subject matter itself.

Key words: rhetorical sensitivity, rhetorical citizen, critical thinking, creativity, debate

"Yet we seem to have lost faith in our publics' ability to exercise competent judgment. We live at a time when the types of problems confronting a technologically complex and culturally diverse society seem to outstrip the average citizen's capacity to comprehend them, much less to arrive at an informed opinion on their resolution."

Gerard A. Hauser (1999, p. 279)

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the nearly two-and-a-half-millennia history and disciplinary adaptiveness of rhetorical theory and practice does not seem to be an advantage with added value. The faculty is "accused" of being sentimental for the culture of rationality, manipulative for democracy, and trite for creativity (Bender & Wellbery, 1990). Alternatives, such as stylistics, discourse analysis, pragmatics, and communication research utilize rhetorical knowledge in their own jargons, while they criticize the age-old faculty (Aczél, 2015b). Rhetoric has been squeezed in among the practical means of speech production and is awaiting, rather dustily, to be rediscovered somewhere between the teaching of presentation techniques and manipulation. The aim of rhetorical education is the production of speech and the creation of the text artifact, which can be recited and read through appropriate exercises (although the limited time frame of classes often prevents practising them).

According to the currently effective National Core Curriculum of Hungary (2012), the content elements of rhetoric defined for grades 9 to 12 (ages between 16–18 years) are related to text analysis, style, and argumentation. Key content elements include the structural units and genres of speech and types of arguments – students should be able to apply as well as identify these elements. (The first draft of the new National Core Curriculum (August, 2018) that is presently open for public discussion mentions "rhetoric" only two times in contexts of poetics, text, and genre while argumentation and debate is referred to as an overarching communicative skill in the document).

Therefore, the outcome of rhetorical education is mostly a ready-made text that can be (or should be) prepared by following predetermined procedures. In speech preparation emphasis tends to be on construction and expression rather than argumentation – students usually fail to learn the latter (Major, 2011).

Rhetorical education in Hungary reflects the process of reduction that started with Petrus Ramus in the sixteenth century (Genette, 1970), and first bereaved

rhetoric knowledge of invention and arrangement (the very steps that enhance cognitive and critical skills), narrowing its leeway predominantly to the linguistic and aesthetic repository of elocution, then it also condemned the effect of expression as dubious and dangerous, ultimately identifying rhetoric as "ancient stylistics" (Guiraud, 1963, p. 23), or a toolkit of linguistic operations (Dubois, Edeline, Klinkenberg, Minguet, Pire, & Trinon, 1970). The emergence of an artifact- and operation-centred education with a structuralist, belletristic, neo-rhetorical basis was necessary but ineffectual. To put it more sharply, it did not prove to be an indispensable and likeable practice for either the teacher or the student.

While I am drafting this judgment, I have to mention, with unconditional praise, the Hungarian rhetorical revival that took place during the past twenty-five years: the theoretical, historical, and practical revitalization of rhetoric after 1989. Yet, as one of those who could take part in this ground-breaking and important process, I have to acknowledge that we have missed a crucial perspective shift in teaching rhetoric, in the rhetorical part of mother-tongue education at Hungarian secondary schools. This default is discernible in the enthusiasm of our former students when they euphorically confirm the use of two-day corporate training courses in communication a few years after their final exams at school, in the increasing choice of promotional publications, websites, blogs/vlogs, and courses which pop up as novel solutions, claiming that they can "help shed stage-fright," teach persuasive communication in "ten steps," and sum up in "five principles" how we can influence others. Rhetoric as a bunch of marketable and profitable skills, even if it is often bereaved of its "antique" name and called something else, has become an important body of knowledge in the labour market and organizational culture, and a key to success in public life. Beyond the walls of the school, everyone seems to be interested in developing their communication or rhetorical competencies. The emphasis is on *beyond*, as opposed to *within* the school.

Thus, the present article is both an initiative and a proposal: in light of the above, we must see and teach rhetoric in a different way at the secondary level as well.

2. RHETORIC AS SENSITIVITY AND BEHAVIOUR

"What was then has become irrelevant; anyway, all that is capable to persuade should be considered suspicious" – it is a remark about rhetoric we can often hear from contemporary scholars and opinion leaders.

But what did invigorate this genre that began to flourish in Attica? The most important impetus was provided by the basic principle of direct democracy that decisions on issues concerning the community should be made by the entire community or a part of the same representing as many members as possible, relying on the power of the word and the public. Thus the political system of institutions in Athens realized an ideal, in a particular form, that had thrived in the culture of ancient Greece for a long time: the superiority of fine words, as opposed to brute force. Its particular character derived from the democratic idea that all free human beings are able to determine truth and define community interests when they either make laws or retaliate the violation of laws. Respect for the superiority of the word was an integral part of Greek identity and their distinction from the barbarians. Opposed parties in conflict resolution and reconciliation of differing interests had the opportunity to elaborate their standpoints coherently under identical conditions. However, persuasion not only offered a humane alternative to the overt or covert use of violence but it also tried to prevent any distinct social stratum from making crucial decisions based on its origin, wealth or, in fact, expertise. (Bolonyai, 2001, pp. 9–10).

This idea and insight should also foster rhetorical knowledge about persuasion today. Because this knowledge can displace and turn violence into a constructive force rather than become its manifestation.

Two and a half millennia after the birth of rhetoric, Jim Corder writes about persuasion as follows:

Rhetoric is love, and it must speak a commodious language, creating a world full of space and time that will hold our diversities. Most failures of communication result from some wilful or inadvertent but unloving violation of the space and time we and others live in, and most of our speaking is tribal talk. But there is more to us than that. We can learn to speak a commodious language, and we can learn to hear a commodious language. (Corder, 1985, pp. 31–32).

Consequently, here we conceive of rhetoric not as a static repository of creating persuasive – often identified as manipulative and thus suspicious – text product but as an instance of social intelligence: sensitivity and behaviour (Aczél, 2015a), which can provide for the individual the skills of adapting to a community and the abilities of self-actualization and empathy towards others. Thus it includes the ethical and cognitive skills or know-how (Booth, 2003; Struever, 1998) necessary in interpreting and influencing social situations.

The environment for rhetorical sensitivity is created by human relations and social situations that have affective as well as cognitive components. As Hart, Carlson, and Eadie (1980, p. 9) put it, "rhetorical sensitivity is a function of three forces: how one views the self during communication, how one views the other, and how willing one is to adapt self to the other." Hence, the important elements of this sensitivity are attention (observation), reflection, and sensitivity to norms and deviations: to whatever is unique, different, disparate, or identical. Rhetorical behaviour is a feature of participative, articulate, resourceful, emphatic, and active citizens who, while they strive to realize their interests, are also social beings capable to define their own goals in accordance with the enhancement of collective values. This behaviour is indispensable in the processes, debates, and cooperation that creatively nurture democracies, co-existence that fosters socialization, and understanding, remembrance, and renewal that ensure cultural continuity.

The lack of rhetorical behaviour may be also reflected, in a specific era, by the individual's lack of self-esteem and sense of being "superfluous," public gloom, and collective distrust. Therefore, learning rhetorical persuasion has a much more profound significance and role than serving momentary individual success.

3. THE SILENT CRISIS

As indicated by research findings, twenty-five years after the democratic transition or regime change, citizens' political participation levels in Central and Eastern Europe remain significantly lower than in Western European countries (Hooghe & Quintelier, 2013).

According to the so-called socialization perspective, the reason for this is the legacy of totalitarian regimes and the behaviour of generations socialized under those regimes, who avoid criticizing prominent public figures and find their security in not speaking up. This communication (or silence) has, as a code, a political "wooden language": the reference-free and empty language of officialdom and disguise (cf. Nowicki, Oustinoff, & Chartier, 2011). This propagandistic pseudo-language is active but it induces passivity, considering the addressees as objects. As Richard Rose (1995, p. 3) sums up, people in post-socialist countries tend to appreciate the freedom not to participate or speak up. According to the socialization perspective, it is only a matter of time and some more generations until these effects begin to fade and participative spirit slowly but steadily increases. Another approach attributes this

phenomenon to experience, that is, to everyday impressions that became internalized as experience that derives from the operation of politics, governance, and the economy, and discourages citizens from participation in public life. Because, as they believe or experience, such engagement is bound to be bad, corrupt, manipulated, and it can benefit few people. If we accept this explanation, then willingness to participate can be expected to improve with economic growth, a decrease in corruption, and conflicts reaching proportionate numbers and reasonable contents. Analysts tend to assume the experience perspective when they interpret the typically Central and Eastern European distrust and passivity in relation to public life, and define an agenda for improvement on that basis.

However, it should be noted that the levels of political activity and public engagement are also low in global terms – it is particularly interesting in light of the optimistic predictions of the 1980s and 1990s that envisioned the coming of a more democratic, participatory culture in the transition generated by the Internet (Kiss & Boda, 2005, p. 13). Decreasing levels of civic participation may lead to the erosion of the social, political, and moral fabric of nation states (Rutten & Soetaert, 2013), and the need for socializing skills which can put an end to these processes. To highlight this problem as simply as possible: people are not keen to participate in public life if they do not have the knowledge to do so. If they lack the competencies needed to represent their own or their communities' opinion, to understand and listen to arguments from others, and to define goals and potential solutions. If they are terrified to express their thoughts to others because they form their beliefs based on unfounded judgments, and are afraid of articulating their opinion but mainly of the reactions of others.

Hence, here we can (also) speak of a language or communication pedagogy that supports participants in not only the communicative management of social situations but also in interpreting those situations and their roles, and the emergence of a meta-discourse too. They can clarify the meanings of (democratic) participative skill, community literacy (Flower, 2008), and rhetorical literacy.

Nevertheless, none of the evaluative/investigative perspectives for tendencies of decay in democratic participation touches upon the existence of communicative competencies, skills related to community-awareness, and rhetorical sensitivity. Generally, it can be concluded that, irrespective of the perspective assumed in the study of the unborn or vulnerable participatory culture, researchers fail to include the rhetorical aspect. As Fontana, Nederman, and Remer (2004, p. 2) highlight, it is

striking to see that "Given the emphasis on the discursive and historical dimensions of democracy, it is surprising that commentators have almost universally failed to consider the potential contributions of the history of rhetorical theory and practice to the understanding of democratic processes."

Thus, in the analysis of any event or the dynamics of being democratic, studies revealing the level of rhetorical literacy, the nature of rhetorical practices, the character and effectiveness of rhetorical and communication education should also be represented.

Such studies are also needed because a number of research projects carried out in the spheres of social and business life and in different cultures prove that there is a positive correlation between self-esteem, trust, life satisfaction, and communicative, persuasive, and conflict management skills. Individuals with good communicative and persuasive skills are capable to increase their social capital and act in order to ensure, for themselves and others, fulfilment and well-being. Hence, the link between social/individual mood and rhetorical education/literacy is deeper and more complex as it was formerly held and taught.

As Roderick Hart (1993, p. 102) concludes, teachers of communication and rhetoric "peddle freedom." They educate citizens who keep the space of dialogue open and make responsible, constructive contributions to social discourses. Accordingly, we can link rhetorical education to the key competencies and major development areas of national and local curricula, as an essential element of education for responsibility, family life, and democracy.

However, the role of rhetoric in politics and democracy has long been considered ambiguous. On the one hand, it is obvious that rhetoric provides a system of thinking and expression that is crucial for understanding others, the ability to argue and speak in public. Yet rhetoric, when seen as a tool of political prevarication, disguise, and manipulation, is also interpreted as the opposite of truth, a surface structure or façade that has to be demolished in order to enable rational deliberation (Habermas, 1984). Democratic suspicion (Dryzek, 2010) is still alive despite the fact that good speech has been considered a gift of authenticity since antiquity.

Martha Nussbaum (2012, p. 172) designates the humanities in general as the essential knowledge area for our age. These are the fields of literacy that can provide the opportunity for people living in a culture explained through economic growth within a technological framework to see others as human beings, not simply as objects, to remain curious (critical inquirers) in the age of Big Data, and be able to argue and

assess for common goals. The degradation of this group of knowledge and abilities, of the humanities and the arts is what Nussbaum (2012, p. 1) calls "the silent crisis." In her opinion, the application of Socratic pedagogical principles, the development of self-awareness and sympathy for others, inquiry and argumentation, imagination and creativity, and willingness to debate may offer an escape route from this crisis.

We could dismiss all of the above as idealism. However, there is no pedagogy that could be viable without the ideas and visions concerning humans and humanity. Along these lines, rhetoric is necessary to man, and "is unnecessary only if man is unnecessary" (Johnstone, 2007, p. 25).

4. RHETORICAL CITIZENSHIP

In light of the above, we can conceive rhetoric as an intelligence, a kind of sensitivity and (linguistic) behaviour that enables us to face and manage, in a communicative way, difficult situations. The foundation, source, and medium of rhetorical intelligence are all created in human relations and social situations, in both rational and emotional terms (Darwin, 2003, p. 23). The important elements of this intelligence are attention (observation), reflection, and situational sensitivity to uniqueness, difference, dissimilarity, and identity. In sum, rhetoric can also be called practical sensitivity which is rooted in a given situation and turns that into a fundamentally social world (Burke, 1969, p. 39; Laclau, 2014, p. 438).

The past twenty-five years of Hungarian rhetorical education marked self-assurance (assertiveness) as a criterion for the speaker in rhetorical communication. It is time to replace this concept and related interpretations with the idea of the communicator with confidence in self and others: a critically thinking, community-minded, and participative person who bears herself, articulates her standpoint and eagerly shares the common space of communication with others.

Accordingly, the result of rhetorical practice and education will be personality itself rather than the "fine speech" following structuralist/belletristic principles. It will be the engaged, articulate, resourceful, and compassionate person who considers communication a mode of social existence rather than a tool (Fleming, 1998, pp. 172–73). This individual is a subject or personality who is also a collective creature; thus the output of his or her rhetorical intelligence is never self-actualization only, but a responsible existence within the community. A criterion for all this is that we conceive rhetoric as a form of behaviour rather than a tool. Therefore the education of a rhetorical citizen requires an educational method and vocabulary that help

students (and their teachers) identify, interpret, analyze, and utilize their own rhetorical experiences, events, and situations.

Ancient and contemporary rhetoricians seem to agree (cf. Lanham, 1976, pp. 2–3) that rhetorical citizens and their behaviour should meet the following expectations. They should:

- start to learn persuasive speech early. – Children’s resourcefulness may be developed through family discussions and setting high standards for communication too. The exploration of family communication patterns (Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 2006) can be an important foundation for developing an individual style of communication. The "mirrored classroom" represented in teaching methods, the communicative nature of study-based and action-centred classroom activities (storytelling, debate, dramatization) can ensure the continuous socialization of rhetorical behaviour.
 - be good observers of the world. – Rhetoric requires an "absolute hearing" of social situations: sensitivity to and curiosity towards whatever happens or can happen. Thus attention in preparing for persuasion is not routine-like or polite. Instead, it is tireless, analytical and constructive, constantly making meaning.
 - be interested in public life and grasp the facets of an issue or affair what may concern more people, others.
 - love the word: enjoy the potentials offered by language, and learn to "translate" one style to the other, like verbal play, and recognize whenever someone tries to use them as a means of deception.
 - learn to seize the moment, develop their abilities to improvise.
 - stretch their memory to develop their comprehension too. They should also rely on their observations and perceptions – images, moods, and intensity – in evocation. Memory was one of the essential means of oracy in antiquity, authors put great emphasis on mnemonics (Quintilian, 2002, 11.2.11-13). At that time vision and visualization had a much more important role in memory-training than centuries later or have even today. This training in imagination may lead us closer to the acquisition of multimodal-visual skills for rhetoric that are greatly required by digital literacy.
 - recognize that their behaviour is a performance. They should develop and make expressive their gestures and mimics; make their appearance and expression controlled and controllable.
 - familiarize themselves with the sayings, proverbs, and wisdoms of their culture.
 - enjoy the intellectual community of smarter people.
-

As the prominent Hungarian speech therapist Imre Montágh (1996, p. 125) briefly summarized, "The good rhetor is an excellent observer with an advanced ability to grasp the gist, good at inferring, skilled in memorizing, quick to associate, and capable to express in a concise and vivid way that is comprehensible for all." In addition, Montágh emphasized the mastery of language use and rich vocabulary (based on literary erudition), the power of commitment that makes us authentic and uninhibited, control for ourselves, and compassion for others.

5. THE ROAD TO RHETORICA

One of the main challenges of teaching rhetoric is whether we can reconfigure the educational program so that it could assume the process approach rather than remain focused on the product and procedure. In other words, do we accept that the communicative-pragmatic sensitivity and behaviour which manifest in speaking constitute a much better measure of rhetorical proficiency than individual speech artifacts?

If we do, then invention have to be reclaimed for rhetoric from Petrus Ramus, and rhetorical education should be started with the development of critical thinking and rhetorical analysis. Only then we can create and shape the rhetorical space attached to context and situation, to be followed by the instruction and practice of debate as a form of behaviour in dialogical communication.

These three phases can also be grasped through the conceptual triad of (1) thinking, (2) creation, and (3) encounter. Thus first, we teach students open, exploratory inquiry, analysis, and the bold formulation of statements; second, the creative-productive processes of articulation, expression and speaking; and third, we develop the skills required to participate in encounters that emerge in conflicts and disagreement, and can induce changes.

5.1. Rhetorical criticism for critical thinking

The aim of the first phase of the process is to clarify the nature of issues, topics, and stances, and to develop critical thinking (Bowell & Kemp, 2002) and analysis.

The analytical method used in encouraging critical thinking is critical rhetoric, which is also an important procedure in research-centred education. The basic principle of this method is seeing humans as the creators of rhetoric, language as the medium for rhetoric, and communication as the purpose of rhetoric, respectively

(Black, 1965; Foss, 2009). Reasonably, rhetorical analysis can be applied to advertisement reels, video narratives at community sharing sites, and comments to online contents or interviews, news and scientific lectures as well as typical public speeches (tributes, ceremonial speeches, parliamentary contributions, or political campaigns). The procedure of rhetorical analysis can be applied in the following dimensions:

1. Explore the meaning and functions of the situation and speech acts. – Basic questions: What is the situation? Who is the communicator, and what is his intention?
2. Examine the issue, topic or idea: account for perspectives, ideologies and approaches. – Basic questions: What is it all about? What is it that the studied communication does or does not tell us? On what kind of clichés, beliefs, presuppositions, or frames of reference does it rely? What is its basic underlying thought and core idea?
3. Analyse reasoning and proofs. – Basic questions: What does the communicator claim, and what does he uses to justify his claim? What logic or stories does he use to assert his stance?
4. Study the structure of the communication. – Basic questions: What kind of speech elements are included, in what order, and with what effect the text artefact or communication is constructed?
5. Discuss expressive power: observe the code, vocabulary, imagery, and aural elements. – Basic questions: In which individual or group register the communication "sounds"? What kind of rhetorical devices (tropes, figures of speech, repetitions, or omissions) does it apply?
6. Analyse the mode of performance: elaborate the communicator-rhetor's role construction, an array of possible roles, and dramaturgy. – Basic questions: Who does the communicator think his audience consist? What kind of dramaturgical, ritual elements and repetitions are reflected in the communication? What means are applied to maintain roles and situations?
7. Examine the medium. – Basic question: How does the communication relate, in terms of the treatment of time, space, and code, to the mode of mediation?

The process of rhetorical criticism begins with description, continues with analysis, is summarized through interpretation, and ends in evaluation. In each of these study areas, it is essential to raise questions precisely and openly, and to reveal

one's own personal relations (Adamikné Jászó, 2011, 2013; Hart & Daughton, 2005; Stoner & Perkins, 2016). Rhetorical analysis is also a rhetorical act, a specific explorative-assertive and argumentative way of writing. The constant elements of critical analysis are (a) setting the problem, (b) formulating the basic question, (c) describing the selected rhetorical act and artefact, (d) presenting the method and aspects of analysis, (e) summarizing the results of analysis, answering the basic question, and (f) indicating the further challenges of analysis (Foss, 2009, pp. 9–21).

Rhetorical criticism as the facilitator of analytical skills is complemented by the acquisition of rhetorical invention as a process. In the present conception of teaching rhetoric, argumentation is considered not a part of text construction or expression, but an element of attention and way of thinking whose nature is defined by the dynamics of raising questions and making claims. This view is based on the distinction that argumentation can be interpreted as the construction of arguments, as a product; a rule of constructing arguments, as a procedure; or the counter position of arguments, as a process (Aczél, 2003; Wenzel, 1992).

Depending on the aspect assumed in its description, argumentation can have several definitions. On one hand, when we think of arguments as a set of statements, argumentation can be considered an outcome or product. This approach may be attributed primarily to logic, since it studies the abstract relations between specific statements. On the other hand, if argumentation is described from its practical point of view, then we can see a process where participants pose arguments for their own or against each other's stances. This method is applied in the approach assumed by rhetoric and dialectic. Rhetoric explores how effective the orator is in persuading his audience through his speech. In contrast, dialectic examines the interaction of two participants in the argumentation. Throughout the analysis it focuses on how the debating parties exchange specific arguments, and whether they comply with the rules predetermined by the given situation. (Forgács, 2015, p. 1094).

Therefore, the argument is described, when seen as a result, by logic, as a procedure, by dialectic, and as a process, by rhetoric, respectively. Again, that is why the process-centred approach should replace the product-centred approach, focusing on content description and typology, in rhetorical education.

One of the possible modes of process-like argumentation and education (i.e. the one preparing for interaction) can be grasped through the following steps:

1. Recognize or select the phenomenon or problem/challenge. – In a favourable case, the problem is not fictional, it is not related to imaginary roles or interactions but real collective or individual situations. Problems may belong to the scope of ethical consideration because the potential of their solution always has a stake and responsibility. The problem requires that the "audience," both within and beyond the classroom walls, should be taken into account.
 2. Survey the audience. – It is a fundamental principle of rhetorical invention that the speaker should think of addressees as at least equal human beings with decision-making opportunities, as personalities. It is essential because it enables us to understand and familiarize ourselves with the contingency and rhetorical risk that characterize social situations and interactions, so that the expression of our own thoughts could become an open process rooted in respect for others and fostering self-awareness.
 3. Teach to question. – Students should be able to distinguish general, open/closed, and suggestive types of questions, identify and filter clichés and fallacies that emerge in asking questions.
 4. Articulate the topic. – Here the premise(s) should be constructed, preferably not as a proposed theme (e.g. "the situation of the young") but as a whole sentence or statement (e.g. "The situation of the young has changed by now."), which also reflects pragmatical relations. When articulating statements, the forms of linguistic expression chosen should be as neutral as possible.
 5. Examine topic statements, based on whether they are evaluative or recommendation claims. – Articulate exploratory questions about the evaluative or recommendation claims in order to clarify the scope and significance of communication/argumentation opportunities, their social validity and benefits.
 6. Explore the potential refutations of and alternatives to topic statements, and examine the degree of disputability. – There is no use in working with undisputable claims in rhetorical education.
 7. Define concepts related to the statement, but note that differing opinions may involve conceptual differences.
 8. Articulate the stance related to the statement, based on its function as an evaluation or a recommendation.
 9. Create the logical framework, a system of arguments for the given stance: gather, sort, and arrange arguments and reasons (using statistical data, laws, rules, stories, beliefs, and topoi). – Stephen Toulmin (1958, p. 87) compares the created logical
-

framework to an "organism" that has an anatomical structure and a physiological structure. This is the organism that stems from the initial statement of an unsettled problem and keeps growing until the final presentation of a conclusion.

10. Review the logical framework in terms of the conceptual system and logical-rhetorical relationships.

When finishing these ten steps, students have not yet completed text artefacts either on paper or in their minds. Instead, they can see their own mental maps, the organism of thinking, drafted in the form of claims, relations, concepts, and questions.

5.2. Rhetorical speaking for creation

The second phase of education for rhetorical behaviour consists speaking as a creative act.

In the culture of digital "new media," a number of alternatives to school-based education are available. Hundreds of thousands of people enjoy scientific courses, short and flash talks, and several weeks long online courses of renown training institutions, which all serve as information sources generated through sharing knowledge and experience. These alternative sites combine experiential knowledge acquisition with the characteristics of rhetorical behaviour: resourcefulness, vivid description, simplicity, the use of narratives, palpability, and contrasts. For example, the scientific and informative talks of TED.com are always based on some problem that concerns many people, a particular point of view, insightful descriptions, precise differentiation, disciplined content filtering, time management, and the aim to mobilize (make people think and raise awareness). That is why they seem more comprehensible and colourful, and leave a deeper impression in their audience than school classes do.

Speakers who consider the addressee a subject-like, thinking human being similar to themselves, not as an object, possess the properties of modesty, high-level presence in the situation, attention, and self-reflection. Thus speaking uses genre as a recurrent unit of typical encounters and experiences, and infers it from the mental preparation conducted in the first phase. The dichotomy of evaluation and recommendation gives rise to the classical triad of speech genres: fact speech that evaluates, considers, confirms, and judges; action speech that recommends, initiates, discourages or encourages; and value speech that induces empathy, engages, identifies, or alienates. Actually, these three speech genres are three modes or linguistic-pragmatic-aesthetic

categories of rhetorical behaviour and encounter. The present renaming of these genres does not aim to produce forced neologism. In fact, the classical descriptions translated from Latin, namely, "legal/judicial" (*genus iudiciale*), "deliberative" (*genus deliberativum*), and "demonstrative" (*genus demonstrativum*) do not convey interactional intentions or speech functions, but particular locations which very rarely occur in their pure form in mixed and complex social situations. Moreover, legal speech connotes a courtroom, deliberative speech connotes committee rooms with closed doors, and demonstrative speech connotes ceremonies, respectively: situations that are not only unfamiliar for secondary-school students, but are not necessarily desirable in their future either. In contrast, they can experience praise or blame, orders, consideration and promises, fascinating or animating discoveries, and transformative interactions. Hence, the circumscription of speech genres is significant as an identifier of communicative events, as both analytical and creative knowledge, rather than a genre distinction.

The instruction of structuring principles for speaking is suited to the social situation, goals, and the intended effect to be generated in and in cooperation with the addressee. It depends on the imaginability of collective discovery and the potential processes of an attitudinal change. In this sense, parts of the speech are not content-related but, for both the communicator and the addressee, stimulating units that draw and maintain attention, engage the audience (introduction, narrative), enable emotional attachment (digression), encourage causal and analytical thinking (proof and refutation), demand participation (enthymeme), generate the joy of structure (conclusion), foster imagination (tropes), record what has been heard (figures of speech), and elevate the situation to an event. The good speech is a building where you can easily find your way around, which makes you feel at home, and can be visited from time to time – because it is based on the holistic logic of oral cultures (Ong, 1982). Thus rhetorical communication also makes use of visual-spatial intelligence (Gardner, 1983).

In light of the above, the cognitive framework created in the critical preparation should be embedded into the dynamic and interactive process of speaking. It should be easy to communicate, follow, and receive – these requirements do not really (if at all) match the virtues of rationality and logical closure. As Jorge Luis Borges (2000, p. 31) wrote in his essay *The Metaphor*:

Because, as I understand it, anything suggested is far more effective than anything laid down. Perhaps the human mind has the tendency to deny a statement. Remember what Emerson said: arguments convince nobody. They convince nobody because they are presented as arguments. Then we look at them, we weigh them, we turn them over, and we decide against them. But when something is merely said or – better still – hinted at, there is a kind of hospitality in our imagination. We are ready to accept it. (Borges, 2000, p. 31).

The doctrinaire imposition of rationality and objectivity is alien to rhetoric: not because it aims to manipulate, but because it concerns specific human relations rather than universal principles.

5.3. Rhetorical debate for encounter

The third phase in rhetorical education is teaching debate as an encounter. In accordance with the suggestion by Ankersmit (2003, p. 20), disagreement is a creative source for all human relations and communication. There can be a strong sense of security in a relationship or community where parties are governed by identical opinions or the fear of debate, but their ability to change is bound to be weak. Although they may seem to be ideal, debate-free relations and societies are more vulnerable and exposed than communities that are ready for debate.

Debate generates knowledge, shapes experience, facilitates inquiring, critical thinking and attention techniques, and may foster a participatory culture of engagement. Debate is a communication genre which allows the parties to match, counter pose, and (in the agreement phase) reconcile their stances in order to reach a decision. Debate is a conflict by nature, but as such it is never threatening, coercive, or destructive. Disagreement in debate is not impoliteness or harshness, but an opportunity to seek new perspectives – it is the most efficient way of making decisions. Thus it can be considered an intellectual struggle that has a stake but enables preparation through an all-round approach, allows us to prepare thoughtfully, gaining experience in argumentation, and having a responsible attitude towards the other.

The parties to a debate represent disparate stances. Therefore, on the one hand, both parties are forced – by the very presence of the other – to scrutinize their own stances in order to filter inconsistencies. So they encourage each other to behave in a self-controlled and attentive way. On the other hand, a debate between these parties does not mean that they disagree. Accepting the other's point may also lead to the

extension of our own beliefs, without giving up our conviction. Thus debaters are not petty squabblers, but observant, restrained, and responsible communicators. A decision made during the debate usually derives from the community which provides the context for the debate. Consideration in good decision-making is based on the effectiveness of the parties in:

- exploring and analyzing the subject matter,
- reasoning, recounting proofs,
- constructing their argument, and
- refuting the points proposed by the other party.

There are several models for debating competitions which are fruitfully applicable in secondary school classroom-based instruction with appropriate preparation, among them the US Public Forum Debate or the widespread and enjoyable British Parliamentary Debate. Both formats have clearly defined methods, concepts, and rules that can be easily adapted to specific linguistic and cultural features. Hence, there is no point in further elaborating them here. A point that should be emphasized, however, is that debate can also foster growth in skills needed for cooperation and consensus.

Maxine Hairston (1974, pp. 210–211) describes the process of dialogical debate, based on Carl Rogers's insights, as follows. The debater should:

- give a brief, objective statement of the issue under discussion.
- summarize, in impartial, precise language and emphasizing values, the differing opinions of the opponent/audience and his own opinion on that issue. This summary demonstrates that he respects the opinion of the other(s), and did his best to understand the case, intents, and reasons for the opposition.
- present his own side of the issue, listing its foundational values and motives.
- compare the two (or more) positions and highlight their common ground, outlining how his position could alter or complement that/those of his opponent(s).
- propose, based on all of the above, a solution to the debated issue, the initial problem.

The prevalence of this model does not depend on practising only. It depends on developing an attitude to debate that focuses on curiosity, open-mindedness, the

opportunity to learn, and a friendly as well as forthcoming attitude. It does not imply some kind of a false sense of security but, much more, commitment and confidence.

6. CONCLUSION

The three-tiered objective of inculcating thinking, creation, and encounter also describes the process of rhetorical education. If we take this road, the result of teaching rhetoric will not be the text artefact but sensitivity, intelligence, and interaction skill that ensure the foundations for the rhetorical citizen – it will be a complex competence that opens up the opportunity to participate in community and social life or public affairs, to adopt the form of behaviour based on "confidence in self and others," critical thinking, and creative presence.

Understanding rhetoric as a process requires innovative pedagogical methods, tasks, textbooks – and the opportunity that exist specifically in public education only: an ongoing integration and sustenance of this process, its application in our everyday life, and testing within a protective sphere.

Rhetorical education and the construction of the rhetorical space together with students, the birth of thoughts and the discovery of interactions through language and communication offers an elevating experience for the teacher too. As Jay Heinrichs wittily remarks, "Besides all these practical tools, rhetoric offers a grander, metaphysical payoff: it jolts you into a fresh new perspective on the human condition. After it awakens you to the argument all around, the world will never seem the same." (Heinrichs, 2007, p. 6)

REFERENCES

- Aczél, P.** (2003). Erős szavak. A bizonyítás mint a szöveg tulajdonsága [Strong words: Proof as a text property]. *Világosság*, 2003(11–12), 171–178. Retrieved from <http://www.vilagosság.hu/pdf/20040419120505.pdf>
- Aczél, P.** (2015a). Ancient novelty – The significance of rhetoric in teacher training and education: Keys and principles. In A. Horváth, K. Pálvölgyi, É. Bodnár, & J. Sass (Eds.), *Cross-curricular connections* (pp. 21–36). Budapest: Hungarian Institute for Educational Research and Development. Retrieved from http://ofi.hu/sites/default/files/attachments/tankepzes_2_kotet-en.pdf
-

-
- Aczél, P.** (2015b). Retorika és kommunikációkutatás. A régi tudomány új nézőpontjai [Rhetoric and communication research: New perspectives for an old discipline]. *Magyar Nyelv*, 111(3), 311–319.
- Adamikné Jászó, A.** (2011). A szövegértő olvasás fejlesztésének új lehetősége: a retorikai elemzés [Rhetorical analysis as a new opportunity to develop reading comprehension]. *Könyv és Nevelés*, 2011(4). Retrieved from http://olvasas.opkm.hu/portal/felso_menusor/konyv_es_neveles/a_szovegerto_olvasas_fejlesztesenek_uj_lehetosege_a_retorikai_elemzes
- Adamikné Jászó, A.** (2013). *Klasszikus magyar retorika [Classical Hungarian rhetoric]*. Budapest: Holnap Kiadó.
- Ankersmit, F.** (2003). Democracy's inner voice: Political style as unintended consequence of political action. In J. Corner, & D. Pels (Eds.), *Media and the restyling of politics: Consumerism, celebrity and cynicism* (pp. 19–41). London: Sage.
- Bender, J., & Wellbery, D. E.** (1990). Rhetoricity: On the modernist return of rhetoric. In J. Bender, & D. Wellbery (Eds.), *The ends of rhetoric. History, theory, practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Black, E.** (1965). *Rhetorical criticism: A study in method*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bolonyai, G.** (2001). Az attikai szónoklás és rétorika [Attic oratory and rhetoric]. In G. Bolonyai (Ed.), *Antik szónoki gyakorlatok [Antique oratorical practice]* (pp. 8–18). Budapest: Typotex.
- Booth, W. C.** (2003). Foreword: Seriously considering rhetoric education. In J. Petraglia, & D. Bahri (Eds.), *The realms of rhetoric: The prospects for rhetoric education* (pp. vii–ix). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Borges, J. L.** (2000). The metaphor. In J. L. Borges, & M. Călin-Andrei (Ed.), *This craft of verse* (pp. 21–42). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bowell, T., & Kemp, G.** (2002). *Critical thinking: A concise guide*. London: Routledge.
- Burke, K. D.** (1969). *The rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Corder, J. W.** (1985). Argument as emergence, rhetoric as love. *Rhetoric Review*, 4(1), 16–32.
- Darwin, T. J.** (2003). Pathos, pedagogy, and the familiar: Cultivating rhetorical intelligence. In J. Petraglia, & D. Bahri (Eds.), *The realms of rhetoric: The prospects*
-

- for rhetoric education* (pp. 23–37). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dryzek, J. S.** (2010). Rhetoric in democracy: A systemic appreciation. *Political Theory*, 38(3), 319–339.
- Dubois, J., Edeline, F., Klinkenberg, J.-M., Minguet, P., Pire, F., & Trinon, H.** (1970). *Rhétorique générale*. Paris: Larousse.
- Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Ritchie, D. L.** (2006). Communication schemata within the family: Multiple perspectives on family interactions. *Human Communication Research*, 20(3), 275–301.
- Fleming, D.** (1998). Rhetoric as a course of study. *College English*, 61(2), 169–91.
- Flower, L.** (2008). *Community literacy and the rhetoric of public engagement*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Fontana, B., Nederman, C. J., & Remer, G.** (2004). Introduction: Deliberative democracy and the rhetorical turn. In B. Fontana, C. J. Nederman, & G. Remer (Eds.), *Talking democracy: Historical perspectives on rhetoric and democracy* (pp. 1–26). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Forgács, G.** (2015). Az érvelés mint lehetséges tudomány: Az integrálás nehézségei [Argumentation as a potential science: The difficulties of integration]. *Élet és Tudomány*, 2015(35), 1094–1096. Retrieved from http://www.eletestudomany.hu/az_erveles_mint_lehetseges_tudomany
- Foss, S. K.** (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Gardner, H.** (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Genette, G.** (1970). La rhétorique restreinte. *Communications*, 16(1), 158–171.
- Guiraud, P.** (1963). *La stylistique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (P.U.F).
- Habermas, J.** (1984). *The theory of communicative action* (Vols. 1–2). Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Hairston, M.** (1974). *A contemporary rhetoric*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hart, R. P.** (1993). Why communication? Why education? Toward a politics of teaching. *Communication Education*, 42(2), 97–105.
- Hart, R. P., Carlson, R. E., & Eadie, W. F.** (1980). Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity. *Communication Monographs*, 47(1), 1–22.
-

-
- Hart, R. P., & Daughton, S. M.** (2005). *Modern rhetorical criticism*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Hauser, G. A.** (1999). *Vernacular voices: The rhetoric of publics and public spheres*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Heinrichs, J.** (2007). *Thank you for arguing: What Aristotle, Lincoln and Homer Simpson can teach us about the art of persuasion*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Hooghe, M., & Quintelier, E.** (2013). Political participation in European countries: The effect of authoritarian rule, corruption, lack of good governance and economic downturn. *Comparative European Politics*, 12(2), 209–232.
- Johnstone, H. W. Jr.** (2007). The philosophical basis of rhetoric. In G. Hauser (Ed.), *Philosophy and rhetoric in dialogue: Redrawing their philosophical landscape* (pp. 15–26). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Kiss, B., & Boda, Z.** (2005). *Politika az interneten [Politics on the Internet]*. Budapest: Századvég Kiadó.
- Laclau, E.** (2014). *The rhetorical foundations of society*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.
- Lanham, R. A.** (1976). *The motives of eloquence: Literary rhetoric in the renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Major, H.** (2011). Reflektálás egy jelenségre – retorikai szempontból. Az emelt szintű magyar nyelvi és irodalmi érettségi érvelési feladatának vizsgálata [Reflections on a phenomenon – from a rhetorical point of view: A study of the argumentation task for the advanced secondary-level final examination in Hungarian language and literature]. *Anyanyelv-pedagógia*, 2011(4). Retrieved from <http://www.anyanyelv-pedagogia.hu/cikkek.php?id=344>
- Montágh, I.** (1996). *Figyelem vagy fegyelem?! [Compassion or control?!]*. Budapest: Holnap Kiadó.
- National Core Curriculum of Hungary. (2012). Retrieved from <http://ofi.hu/nemzeti-alaptanterv>
- National Core Curriculum of Hungary, first draft. (2018). Retrieved from https://www.oktatas2030.hu/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/a-nemzeti-alaptanterv-tervezete_2018.08.31.pdf
- Nowicki, J., Oustinoff, M., & Chartier, A.-M.** (Eds.) (2011). *Les langues de bois. Hermès, 58* [a thematic issue].
- Nussbaum, M. C.** (2012). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
-

- Ong, W.** (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word (New accents)*. New York: Methuen.
- Quintilian, M. F.** (2002). *The Orator's education* (Vols. I–V). Edited and translated by Donald A. Russell. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rose, R.** (1995). Mobilizing demobilized voters in post-communist societies. *Studies in Public Policy*, 246. Glasgow: Centre for the Study of Public Policy, University of Strathclyde.
- Rutten, K., & Soetaert, R.** (2013). Rhetoric, citizenship, and cultural literacy. In K. Rutten, & G. Vandermeersche (Eds.), *Literacy and society, culture, media and education*, a thematic issue of *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2242>
- Stoner, M., & Perkins, S.** (2016). *Making sense of messages: A critical apprenticeship in rhetorical criticism*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Struever, N. S.** (1998). The rhetoric of familiarity: A pedagogy of ethics. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 31(2), 91–106.
- Toulmin, S. E.** (1958). *The uses of argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenzel, J. W.** (1992). Perspectives on argument. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 121–143). New York: Foris (Walter de Gruyter).
-

Petra Aczél

petra.aczel@uni-corvinus.hu

Sveučilište Matije Korvina, Budimpešta, Mađarska

Poučavanje retorike: prijedlog za osuvremenjivanje retoričkog obrazovanja u mađarskom i srednjoeuropskom okruženju

Sažetak

Retoričko obrazovanje suočava se s izazovima društva virtualnog znanja. Nastava koja uključuje razvoj vještina je neizbježna, no trebalo bi učiniti kvalitetnijim i osnažiti izravno poučavanje licem u lice. To je posebno važno u srednjoeuropskom kontekstu unutar kojeg je povijest poučavanja retorike narušena poslije Drugoga svjetskog rata. Ovaj rad ocrtava nove ciljeve u poučavanju retorike i predlaže reformu obrazovnog programa retorike na srednjoškolskoj razini.

Temelji se na pretpostavci da retoriku ne treba doživljavati i poučavati kao alat kojim se služimo pri oblikovanju teksta, već kao ponašanje osjetljivo za ljudsko djelovanje. Stoga retoričko obrazovanje ne treba biti usmjereno isključivo na proizvodnju govora, već na stvaranje retoričkoga građanstva. Obrazovanje s takvim ciljem ne odbacuje klasične retoričke temelje. Dapače, ono crpi dinamične kapacitete mentalne sposobnosti stare dvije tisuće godina.

U radu se iznosi detaljan obrazovni proces u tri faze pomoću kojeg se može istovremeno razvijati retorička osjetljivost u učionici i unaprjeđivati sama retorika.

Ključne riječi: retorička osjetljivost, retoričko građanstvo, kritičko mišljenje, kreativnost, debata