## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

**University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-11,020

ERICKSON, Keith Vincent, 1943-
ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC: ESSAYS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The University of Michigan, Ed.D., 1972
Speech

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

# ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC: ESSAYS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

by
Keith Vincent Erickson

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
(Speech)
in The University of Michigan
1972

Doctoral Committee:

Assistant Professor Bruce E. Gronbeck, Chairman
Associate Professor C. William Colburn
Professor Gerald Else
Professor L. LaMont Okey

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part

I. A HISTORY OF ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC..... 1

Aristotle
The Early Lectures and Rhetorics
Synagoge technon
Gryllus
Theodectea
The Rhetoric
Dating the Rhetoric
Loss and Recovery of the Rhetoric
The Invention of Printing
Footnotes

II. A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC..... 66

Chronological Index

III. ESSAY HEADNOTES..... 269

Preface
Anton-Hermann Chroust
Anton-Hermann Chroust
Theresa Crem
Robert Price
Brother S. Robert
Whitney Oates
James H. McBurney
Lloyd Bitzer
Gerard Hauser
Joseph T. Lienhard
William S. J. Grimaldi
Donovan Ochs
Robert Sonkowsky
William F. Fortenbaugh
Otto Alvin Loeb Dieter
Friedrich Solmsen

# PART I

## A HISTORY OF ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC

The burst of genius which characterized ancient Greece was to profoundly influence Western civilization. Politics, science, philosophy and the humanities may be seen reflecting the Greek tradition. The classical heritage accepted by Western man encompasses, in fact, nearly every aspect of modern life--from morality to ecology.[1] Isolating Greek contributions to our complex society would be a chore monumental in scope. Such an investigation, however, would necessarily entail an examination of rhetoric. For whatever else may be said of the Greeks, their influence upon rhetoric was staggering; they were to define and shape it like no other culture. No prior civilization held with such esteem or attacked with such vigor the investigation of rhetorical discourse. Those surviving rhetorical fragments written prior to the Hellenic influence, for instance, by comparison are shallow and underdeveloped.

The Greek influence upon rhetorical theory has not gone unnoticed. Greek rhetoric has been studied by some of the foremost classicists and philologists of our time.[2] The uniqueness of the Greek system and the forces which

helped to shape the necessity for suasory discourse also have been investigated. We need not attempt to recapitulate here, therefore, in our brief history of the Rhetoric, the events and state of oratory preceding Aristotle. Suffice it to say rhetoric had far-reaching effects upon the adult life of even the commonest of men. All Athenian citizens, for example, were expected at least once in their life to serve in the branches of an essentially oral government. And, if one were to instigate legal proceedings or discovered oneself a defendant in a suit or charge, the judicial system dictated that he represent himself. Further, in contrast to the paper work surrounding management and government today, relatively few documents were in evidence due to the heavy reliance upon the spoken word. Likewise, literature and festivals were oral as was, indeed, the dissemination of virtually all information.[3] Considered within this context, therefore, it is not surprising that rhetoric should have played such an important role in the history of Greek civilization. A list of early rhetoricians and orators reads like a Who's Who in the literary and philosophic history of antiquity. When we consider that Plato and Aristotle expressed theories of rhetoric and that Pericles, Isocrates, Antiphon, Lysias, Isaeus, Andocides, Demosthenes, and others were orators of this period, an appreciation of the extent and importance of rhetoric becomes clear. Truly no period until or since

then has placed such importance upon or examined with such detail the province of rhetoric.

This is the climate in which a non-Greek, strangely enough, emerged and developed a philosophy of discourse that measurably affected Greek and subsequent rhetorics. We are speaking of Aristotle, born in Macedonia, and his theories as advanced in the Rhetoric. Numerous authorities revere this work as the most important rhetoric to have survived antiquity.[4] Likewise, many consider it the most influential work of its kind ever authored. Many contemporary theorists, in fact, readily admit to an Aristotelian framework. Indeed, after nearly 2,300 years the work continues to effect research: "There can be little doubt that twentieth-century scholarship concerning oral communication refers more to the Rhetoric of Aristotle than to any other source."[5]

The purpose of this book is to trace briefly the history of Aristotle's Rhetoric and to provide a bibliography of virtually all translations, paraphrases, and commentaries related to it. In addition short descriptions of Aristotle's extant and lost works on rhetoric are developed. As these works have received detailed examination elsewhere, outlines, as opposed to critical commentaries, are offered. As the main focus of this book is bibliographic these works will be viewed from an historical as well as a rhetorical viewpoint. We will sketch the development, impact, disappearance and, in the case of the

Rhetoric, recovery of these works. An analysis of those works often associated with the Rhetoric, such as the Poetics and those constituting the Organon, will not be offered except in passing.

Aristotle

If one were to compile a list of men whose influence helped to shape or define philosophy, Aristotle's name assuredly would be near the top. As Werner Jaeger notes: "The name of Aristotle suggests impersonality, timelessness, intellectual sovereignty over the whole world of abstract thought throughout long stretches of history and scholastic idolatry."[6] As widespread as his influence has been, both in ancient and contemporary intellectual circles, it is surprising how little we actually know of Aristotle the man. Marian Plezia states the point succinctly: "The man is almost entirely hidden by the shadow of the philosopher."[7] Ingemar Düring, in an attempt to unravel the myths surrounding Aristotle's life, was frustrated constantly by even the ancients' account.[8] Turning to Aristotle's writings we are even less informed, for there is a definite paucity of personal data exhibited within his works. Aristotle was loath, it seems, to discuss his person in regard to the subject of his analysis; his works, generally speaking, are presented matter-of-factly. Only seldom does he make an expression in the first person. To be sure, biographical accounts of Aristotle's life have been

authored,[9] but nearly all of them fail to account for or explain his motivation for writing his works--including the Rhetoric. Why should Aristotle have wished to write of rhetoric? Is it enough to picture a philosopher who desired merely to construct his own theories concerning rhetoric, or were the more human qualities of jealousy, antagonism, and revolt against authority somehow to impinge? We mention these possibilities for they apparently were to affect his motivation in the teaching and writing of rhetoric, particularly his lost rhetorical works. But whatever his motives, Aristotle was to give birth to a number of rhetorics. It cannot be denied that for him rhetoric was a subject to be taken seriously.

## The Early Lectures and Rhetorics

Aristotle is often conceived of as author and philosopher, less so as a teacher. Aristotle, however, is known to have delivered a series of lectures upon rhetoric. Considerable debate has been generated concerning their probable content as well as the circumstances surrounding Aristotle's opportunity to offer them.[10]

Diogenes Laeritus,[11] an early chronicler of these lectures, reports that Aristotle gathered about him his pupils and lectured upon rhetoric. These pupils, he notes, as if to put theory into practice, were required to discourse upon a set theme. Philodemus,[12] however, is our oldest known source referring to the lectures. He was not

a particularly favorable observer of Aristotle and often disparaged his actions. He attributes these lectures to the early fifties of the fourth century. Significantly, Philodemus chides Aristotle for having turned to rhetoric in preference to philosophy and politics. He felt Aristotle did this solely to antagonize Isocrates. In an often seen phrase Aristotle is reputed to have said that "it is a scandal to remain silent and let Isocrates speak out."[13] Because Philodemus considered rivalry a poor reason for abandoning philosophy and politics he severely criticized Aristotle's reasoning faculties:

> Aristotle did not act the true philosopher when he said that it is a scandal to remain silent and let Isocrates speak out. For, if Isocrates' activities were of no consequence, he should have been ignored. If, on the other hand, the art of speaking is truly important, Aristotle should have engaged in rhetoric and the teaching of rhetoric irrespective of what Isocrates did; and if neither should be the case, Aristotle should not have devoted himself to rhetoric, unless he should run the risk of being regarded as an incompetent man, as acting from sheer envy of Isocrates, as a quarrelsome person, or as having been vanquished by Isocrates. But if in his conduct Aristotle was guided by the popular misconception that it was dishonorable to remain silent and let Isocrates speak out, he certainly did not observe or understand the proper purpose of rhetoric.[14]

He continues his attack upon Aristotle's turn at rhetoric, and, in the course of his remarks, makes a statement few critics have dared to suggest: "As soon as he deserted philosophy and began to collect with the assistance of his disciples, all sorts of information in order to impress people with his erudition; he studied and taught rhetoric,

politics, agriculture, cosmetics, mining, and worse, the several aphrodisiacs. In so doing he was less respectable than the ordinary teachers of rhetoric who merely attempted to impart a certain ability and convey the principles of rhetoric."[15]

At least one ancient, however, held quite another view of Aristotle's interest in rhetoric. Cicero[16] praised Aristotle for his study of rhetoric; he believed that Aristotle had united it with philosophy rather than having abandoned speculation. (Chroust notes, however, that both Philodemus and Cicero were wrong in believing Aristotle to have included rhetoric in the curriculum following the inclusion of philosophical subjects.) Cicero, however, agreed in essence with Philodemus' account of Aristotle's attack upon Isocrates, as did Quintilian and Syrianus.[17] Modern critics likewise have reasoned that the factors behind Aristotle's wish to teach rhetoric resulted from the state of rivalry existing between the Academy and Isocrates.

Contemporary critics have theorized as to the content of these lectures. Some have proposed that Aristotle's rhetorical works contained or made up these lectures. The Rhetoric and Theodectea, for example, are thought to contain passages directly related to them. Blass[18] dates the lectures at 355 B.C. (shortly after the writing of the Gryllus), during Aristotle's first residency in the Academy. Blass also contends that Plato's Phaedrus influenced their

content. Chroust is of a similar opinion: "The platonic Phaedrus and the notions about the proper use of rhetoric and dialectic expressed there probably furnished the general program of how rhetoric ought to be taught."[19]

We do not have, of course, a work attributed to Aristotle entitled Lectures on Rhetoric. Only the Rhetoric survives. But other works on rhetoric were authored by Aristotle. Diogenes'[20] catalogue lists eight works and the 'Anonymus' titles include nine.[21] The lists of the latter, however, are something of a mystery in that we know little of either its authorship or sources of information. Only by cross-referencing to more reliable sources are we able to confirm or deny its entries. Moreover, many of the entries seem spurious leading Cope to conclude: "One thing however at least seems certain: that neither Aristotle nor any other human being could have written all the works that are assigned to him by either of these two lists."[22] It is generally believed three works from these lists (now lost) existed--the Gryllus, Theodectea and Synagoge technon. Each has an interesting history which contributes to our understanding of Aristotelian rhetoric.

Synagôgê technôn

Of the lost rhetorics by Aristotle we know least of the content and thrust of the Synagôgê technôn. Spengel[23] has attempted to reconstruct portions of the work, but much of our evidence is secondary. Cicero is our chief source,

having cited the work and described somewhat its contents in three of his works.[24] Basically, it constituted a history of rhetoric and rhetoricians. The theories of ancient and contemporary teachers of rhetoric were outlined in detail. Such a format would have been entirely in keeping with Aristotle's principle of knowing what has preceded us; for him, human knowledge always benefits from knowing the ideas, successes and failures of others. While we have no evidence to support the claim, the existence of this work does explain the gross lack of references to other rhetoricians and orators exhibited by the Rhetoric.[25] Having once outlined their theories it would hardly have been necessary for Aristotle to repeat them. A. E. Douglas, however, analyzing Cicero's Brutus 46-48, concludes that the Synagôgê technôn's account of history was forced and highly tendentious. Douglas concludes that "our choice is to recognize either that . . . Aristotle's approach was less than fully scientific, or that the work was entrusted to a student who lacked the urbanity and mastery of the head of the school."[26]

Gryllus

The Gryllus, second of the lost works we shall examine, has been given greater examination than the Synagôgê technôn.[27] The few surviving fragments believed to have been passages of the Gryllus, however, offer little in the way of contextual information. Secondary sources

offer us a more clear, if somewhat hazy, view of the work. Significantly, the lists of both Diogenes and the "Anonymus" consider it an authentic work. Modern critics, with the exception of Valentine Rose[28] (who even entertained the possibility of the Rhetoric being a pseudo-Aristotelian work) likewise attribute the work to the Stagirite. Chroust,[29] in fact, believes it was the first major composition or "publication" of Aristotle.

The Gryllus is interesting on several accounts. First, why should Aristotle have given a work on rhetoric such a curious title, and secondly, what prompted Aristotle to author this work (which appears to have been so unlike his other treatises)? The title of the work, it is generally agreed, comes from Gryllus, the son of Xenophon who died at the battle of Mantinea in 362 B.C. It has been suggested Aristotle dedicated this work to Gryllus, supposedly a close friend, and hence the title.[30] No evidence exists, however, to suggest Aristotle was even an acquaintance of Xenophon's son, ruling out the possibility he wished in some way to honor him. Thillet and Solmsen[31] have advanced an alternative solution which seems more plausible. They hypothesize that the work was polemical rather than doctrinal; arguing the Gryllus advanced the position that not all rhetoric constituted art. The key to understanding this work, therefore, lies in determining whom Aristotle was charging with the inartistic employment of rhetoric. Because Diogenes mentions "Aristotle had insisted that a

great many people had composed epitahs and encomia upon Gryllus, largely for the purpose of ingratiating themselves with his father Xenophon,"[32] Thillet and Solmsen believe that he directed his arguments at these orators. There is little doubt that much false praise was heaped upon Gryllus from people only remotely familiar with him. Perhaps what irked Aristotle most was the many prominent rhetoricians who participated in this favor seeking action. Thus the excesses of teachers and rhetoricians in composing false and inartistic eulogies to Gryllus prompted Aristotle's rejoinder aimed at rebuking the substance and manner of their display.

Chroust advances two ideas of interest here. He suggests first that the Gryllus was aimed principally at Isocrates. Chroust hypothesizes that Isocrates might well have written one of these eulogies--reason enough to kindle Aristotle's attack. Secondly, Chroust argues that Plato's Gorgias may have been a source of ideas for his arguments. This is an intriguing issue in that Plato's attack upon the Sophists and the wanting ends of rhetoric would not only have served Aristotle's purposes but have reflected the Master as well: "Hence, it is not surprising that Aristotle, the disciple of Plato, should object to such contemptible practices, as well as to the ultimate philosophic outlook underlying them. In rejecting and denouncing this type of rhetoric, Aristotle acts in full accordance with the spirit and tenets of Plato's basic philosophic teachings."[33]

Quintilian (passages of his work are thought by Thillet and Chroust to be fragments or paraphrases of the Gryllus[34]) dispels any belief, however, that Aristotle merely echoed the sentiments of Plato. Aristotle, he tells us, advanced many arguments of his own making in the Gryllus, and it is obvious by Quintilian's remarks that he was impressed by their strength. Modern critics have thus hypothesized that perhaps a new form of dialogue was tested out by the young writer. Moreover, though, the Gryllus was to launch Aristotle's career as a teacher of rhetoric, because here was the perfect opportunity for him to attack a long standing enemy of the Academy, employ his mentor's work, and simultaneously advance arguments of his own. By so doing he should have secured (if our premises be correct) the support of the enemies of Isocrates, made himself known to Plato, and tested his own powers of intellect. Chroust sees Aristotle's opportunity to teach rhetoric arising directly from the strength of this work: "The Gryllus probably became the occasion for Aristotle's offering (or being permitted to offer) this course in the Academy, especially since in this dialogue he seems to have demonstrated not only his qualifications as a teacher of rhetoric, but also his ability and determination to stand up to Isocrates, a man much disliked by the members of the Academy."[35]

Theodectea

We have now to speak of the Theodectea, a third work on rhetoric. The Theodectea, however, may not have been authored by Aristotle. Rather, he may have commissioned it, or Theodectes the dramatist may have authored or edited the work. Even the ancients were divided on this question. Quintilian and Dionysisus of Halicarnassus believed the work was Aristotle's, while Cicero favored Theodectes. There is mention in the Rhetoric[36] of the Theodectea but no confirmation as to who the author was. The Rhetoricia ad Alexandrum[37] likewise makes reference to the work but is confused as to whether the work was edited by or addressed to Theodectes.

Modern critics have given attention to this problem as well. There seems, however, to be little agreement among the many observers. Rose declares that "it is quite certain that there was no 'art' of Theodectes."[38] Diels,[39] in a position opposite Rose, elaborates the most interesting account of the work. Unfortunately, he draws much of his information from the speculations of Valerius Maximus, whose opinion Cope thinks "admits of no rational explanation and to rest upon no foundation either of history or probability."[40] In essence, it was Diels' belief that upon Plato's death in 348-347 B.C. Aristotle left the Academy, leaving behind him his lecture notes or 'florilegium' on rhetoric. Theodectes, formerly a student of Isocrates but more recently a close friend of Aristotle,

chose to remain in Athens. He assumed the vacated position of instructor in rhetoric and began to teach from, and in the process revise and enlarge, Aristotle's notes. Sometime during these intervening years he or one of his associates published the work. It appeared bearing the name of Theodectes. We can only imagine Aristotle's reaction upon returning to Athens in 335 B.C. and discovering his original florilegium circulated under the name of Theodectes. It is Diels' hypothesis that Aristotle did not move immediately to rectify this situation. Upon Theodectes' death, however, he resumed the lectureship in rhetoric. Finally, sensing perhaps the need for a clearer interpretation of rhetoric he began the arduous task of revision which ultimately, Diels believes, resulted in the Rhetoric.

Friedrich Solmsen[41] presents a more reasonable interpretation of the Theodectea. It is his thesis that Aristotle simply authored a resume of Theodectes' work. Thus, two works were in circulation bearing similar names (which would account or explain the confusion and inconsistency of early catalogers) but having different authors. This would appear to satisfy both the arguments of those insisting Theodectes wrote such a work and those favoring Aristotle's hand. It likewise refutes the arguments of those who assume the Theodectea was written during his stay in Asia Minor.[42]

Aristotle's lost works on rhetoric would surely have given us an additional view of Aristotle's intellectual

development as well as a fascinating glimpse at his earlier theories of rhetoric. There is no ready answer to why some of his works were to survive and others were to disappear. Whether their disappearance can be linked to neglect or purposeful destruction we cannot surmise. We shall shortly take up, however, the question of "publication" in antiquity and the amazing story of the recovery of Aristotle's works. But before we turn to that issue we have still to consider, as it will remain the major focus of this essay, the Rhetoric.

## The Rhetoric

The Rhetoric has never been seriously questioned as an authentic work of Aristotle. Our analysis of the Rhetoric will consist of outlining its contents and demonstrating how it differed from other classical rhetorics. Obviously, the brief examination which follows is not a commentary upon the work. (The reader wishing to explore the work in greater detail is directed to analyses noted in the bibliographic section of this work.) Comparing the Rhetoric with other rhetorics of antiquity, we see Aristotle treating the subject systematically, grounding it upon a philosophical framework, while others tended to favor a handbook format. These rhetorics, often taking diverse stands, constituted essentially practical advice on the art of oratory. Aristotle, on the other hand, saw as his purpose a scientific presentation of the subject.

Crem notes that "Aristotle's treatise on rhetoric is unique, in that it is a properly scientific consideration of the subject."[43]

The Rhetoric is divided into three books. These books roughly outline the stages of preparing a rhetorical address. Many of the rhetorics of antiquity developed their subject matter about the canons or offices of speech building. The divisions of inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, and pronuntiatio embodied respective stages or parts in the process of writing and delivering an oration. The Rhetoric, however, is not organized along these bounds. Book I establishes the speaker and his functions in the persuasion process, while Book II focuses upon the audience, analyzing the relationship among human nature, emotions, and moral considerations. Book III turns to stylistic considerations and matters apropos to the actual writing of an oration. Baldwin summarizes the book's design by noting that "the speech itself, the final utterance . . . has thus been approached as the art of adjusting the subject-matter of a given case through the intelligence and emotion of the speaker to the intelligence and emotion of the audience."[44] Organized in this fashion the Rhetoric also departed from the classical arrangement of partes orationis--the divisions of speech (proem, narration, proofs and epilogue). Aristotle's schema relegated the sections of a speech to his description of disposition. Solmsen concludes that: "This entirely new approach to rhetoric

is . . . obviously based on Aristotle's conception of a thing's organic unity as implying a principle of structure and being different from a mere accumulation of its parts."[45]

The first sentence of Book I establishes philosophically the position of rhetoric to logic: "Rhetoric is the counterpart of dialectic."[46] Aristotle develops this argument by showing the respective provinces of the two arts. We are told neither rhetoric nor dialectic is superior to the other; they lie rather in an antistrophic relationship. The provinces of rhetoric and dialectic are similar in that each treats of subjects belonging to no particular science whose subject matter, as a rule, is known to all men. Likewise, they are similar in that each proceeds in a rational way, yet, unlike the sciences, afford only probable reasons. They differ from one another in that rhetoric often is concerned with moral matters, dialectic with speculative considerations. Dialectic reaches for an audience of logically trained minds, while rhetoric must adjust to the common factor. Rhetorical syllogisms, enthymemes, are the rhetorician's tools while syllogisms and induction the dialectician's. Rhetoric, Aristotle continues, is to be seen as yet another way of establishing truth--"the application of proof to people."[47]

Book I establishes four functions or purposes of rhetoric. First, should the true and just fall prey to their opposites a rhetorician, through effective discourse, can set straight the imbalance. Aristotle argues that rhetoric

is obligated to facilitate learning since science deals with the instruction of matters the multitude cannot grasp. Thirdly, by proving opposites rhetoric enables us to counteract false arguments. Finally, the fourth function of rhetoric he identifies as self-defense: "It would be absurd if it were considered disgraceful not to be able to defend onesef with the help of the body, but not disgraceful as far as speech is concerned, whose use is more characteristic of man than that of the body."[48]

Having generally introduced rhetoric Aristotle defines it formally as the "faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever."[49] No other art can lay claim to this function because others deal with specific subject-matter while rhetoric draws from all. The proofs of rhetoric are either artistic or inartistic. Artistic proofs are basically arguments from probability; they stem from the speaker's ability to "invent" or discover lines of argument from a culture's pool of accepted opinions. Inartistic proof is direct evidence, such as the testimony of slaves, contracts, and witnesses, external to the speaker's art. Both artistic and inartistic proofs, however, are recognized as members of the Aristotelian inventional process, in that both must be molded into an actual discourse. The proofs, pistis, furnished by the speech, he tells us, are those of ethos, pathos, and logos. Ethos persuades when the speaker's

perceived moral character renders him worthy of an audience's confidence. With pathos, arousal of emotion, the source of persuasion lies with the listener, while logos (roughly speaking a "logical" rhetorical argument), lies within the structure and form of the subject matter.

Rhetoric as Aristotle defines it, then, is a faculty for providing arguments of two modes. The first mode of argument is paradeigma or the example. The example is an inductive argument supplying probable conclusions to the subject investigated. The second mode is the enthymeme, a deductive rhetorical syllogism. Aristotle departs here from his contemporaries by linking rhetorical arguments to dialectic and analytics. Heretofore the enthymeme had been thought of by orators as simply a clever stylistic device. Aristotle, however, recognized its logical bases and formulated it as a rhetorical syllogism. While the syllogism is the normal structure of arguments common to dialectic, the enthymeme is common to rhetoric. Concrete presentation, generally speaking, is representative of the enthymeme while abstract deduction denotes the syllogism. Lloyd Bitzer, following an exacting analysis, defines the enthymeme as a "syllogism based on probabilities, signs and examples, whose function is rhetorical persuasion. Its successful construction is accomplished through the joint efforts of speaker and audience, and this is its essential character."[50]

The enthymeme takes its materials from what Aristotle calls the "topics." A discussion of "topics"

("lines of argument") or topoi appears in three sections of the Rhetoric. Topoi according to modern interpreters means seat or place of an argument. Brake believes Aristotle's topoi "may be said to be areas or locales in which ideas are grouped according to their kinds and from which they can be drawn."[51] Topoi have been classified by various schemes, the most comprehensive being that of material and formal (which is not discussed by Aristotle until the end of Book II). Material topoi are of two kinds: (1) common (kinoi) and, (2) special (eidê). Common topics concern general principles of probability which apply equally well to all disciplines. The example used by Aristotle is the topos of "more or less" which, obviously enough can furnish enthymemes as easily for physics as politics. Later in Chapter 18 of Book II, he enumerates the range of the common topics as embracing the possible and impossible, greatness and smallness, what will or will not occur, and what has or has not happened. These topoi were to be especially useful for the three types of oratory (to be discussed shortly). Special or genera topics, however, draw their materials from particular disciplines. Thus, a special topic would involve a proposition habitually associated with specific types of speeches, with the rhetorician relying upon special topoi when topics of a universal (common) nature do not apply or fail to expedite his argument. Moreover, Brake concludes: "The special topoi embrace substantive items or propositions found

largely in the areas of ethics and politics and furnish the premises for enthymemes."[52] Aristotle observes, finally, that speakers as a rule rely more heavily upon specific or particular topics than common topics.

Aristotle, therefore, delineates the types of speaking, and subsumes under each their respective special topoi. He sees rhetorical situations divided into deliberative, forensic and epideictic speaking--the tria genera causarum. Deliberative speaking is that public address occurring in public assemblies and gathering places. The orator speaks of those events and circumstances to come--the future. The topics of deliberative oratory are the expedient and harmful. The speaker may exhort a course of action and in so doing will speak of the good and bad. Deliberative oratory is pragmatic and avoids a scientific investigation and presentation of subject matter. Therefore, suggests Aristotle, the deliberative orator must give his attention to current ideas. Aristotle concludes by developing an analysis of special topoi (discussed as the constituents of "happiness," "goodness," and "utility") applicable to deliberative speaking--offspring, wealth, honor, health, strength, beauty, old age, friendship, fortune, virtue, etc.

The second type of rhetorical situation is ceremonial or epideictic speaking. The epideictic oration, since it deals with praise and/or blame of existing conditions, directs itself to the present. It has as its end

the honorable or disgraceful. The epideictic speaker must of necessity, therefore, address himself to considerations of the ethical and moral: "He will . . . speak of virtue and vice, of the noble and disgraceful, since they constitute the aim of one who praises and of one who blames."[53] From this conclusion he enumerates agents of nobility, virtue, vice, and demonstrates how the rhetorician may make use of these lines of argument.

Aristotle concludes Book I with an analysis of the modes and functions of forensic oratory. Forensic oratory is courtroom speaking, which takes one of two postures--accusatory or defensive speaking. Forensic speaking addresses issues committed or not committed in the past. Here Aristotle examines the motives of unjust acts, the criminal "mind" and finally, the character of those exposed to unjust acts; these aspects of crime provide the lawyer with the special topoi. There are, however, shortcomings to his discussion of forensic oratory, for "his division of 'extrinsic' proofs . . . is for the modern lawyer neither scientific or significant."[54]

Book II of the Rhetoric addresses itself to the audience and its particular dispositions. What emerges is a study of human emotions and attitudes. Aristotle predicts an audience will react positively to a speaker when he possesses the qualities of wisdom, virtue, and goodwill, and an aspiring orator, therefore, should exhibit these qualities. How the rhetorician is perceived, however, depends

upon each member of an audience whose judgment is affected by the emotions. Aristotle develops in Book II, therefore, an extensive analysis of the emotions. He defines emotion as "all those feelings that so change men as to affect their judgments, and that are also attended by pain or pleasure."[55] Aristotle begins with an analysis of anger and outlines three kinds of slighting--contempt, spite, and insolence. He concludes that "clearly the orator will have to speak so as to bring his hearers into a frame of mind that will dispose them to anger, and to represent his adversaries as open to such charges and possessed of such qualities as do make people angry."[56] Similar analyses of the respective emotions and their opposites ensues with their application to rhetorical discourse; with fear, love, envy, shame, kindness, indignation, and emulation analyzed. Aristotle then applies the emotions and moral qualities to human character. He shows how human character corresponds to the various ages and fortunes of men.

Following the divisions of the common topics (discussed earlier) Aristotle turns to those forms of rhetorical arguments common to all oratory--example and enthymeme. The example is divided into fables and the illustrative parallel. Aristotle advises us, however, that "if we can argue by Enthymeme, we should use our Examples as subsequent supplementary evidence. They should not precede the Enthymemes: that will give the argument an inductive air, which only rarely suits the conditions of speech-making."[57]

Turning to the enthymeme again Aristotle developes the maxim--a special form of enthymeme. He notes four varieties of maxims and warns the orator that they are appropriate only to elderly men: "For a young man to use them is like telling stories--unbecoming."[58] The maxim renders the advantage, Aristotle believes, of investing a speech with moral character.

Aristotle next divides enthymemes into the "elementary classes" of enthymemes--demonstrative and refutative. "The demonstrative enthymeme draws conclusions from admitted premisses, the refutative draws conclusions disputed by the adversary."[59] These enthymemes are built upon lines of argument evolving from twenty-eight valid and nine fallacious topics. These "formal" topics are the third form of topoi alluded to earlier. The formal topoi, derived from Aristotle's Topics, are not dependent upon subject matter but instead serve as lines of argument independent of particular subject-matter and dependent upon abstract analysis--the application of certain arguments to particular subject matter. "The list is a random one of some of the more usual arguments from cause, sign, and example encountered in speaking."[60] A few examples will illustrate our point. The twenty-eight valid formal topoi include arguments of time, opposites, definition, correlation, ambiguity, induction, consequences, antecedents, and past action among others. Generally, then, they serve to reveal characteristics of the thing, idea, or person

being discussed by the orator. The invalid or fallacious formal topoi are those arguments which appear correct but are not. Aristotle by no means was the discoverer of each of these topoi but rather, not uncharacteristically, a cataloger of them. Most had been practiced with proficiency, for instance, by Attic orators. Aristotle concludes Book II with a discussion of how to refute enthymemes. He demonstrates that enthymemes are based upon four types of alleged fact: (1) probabilities, (2) examples, (3) infallible signs, (4) ordinary signs; by diagnosing the weakness of each Aristotle demonstrates how they may be refuted.

Book III of the Rhetoric examines the process of composing a speech. Because this portion of the work differs in focus from Books I and II it has been considered both a spurious work and a separate treatise later appended to the Rhetoric. There are a number of arguments to support these theses. Examining once again the lists of Diogenes Laertus we find no Rhetoric containing three books. Instead a Rhetoric of two books is catalogued as well as a Style in two books. Solmsen[61] has demonstrated, however, that two introductions found in Book III link it to earlier and later drafts of the Rhetoric. This would indicate that during at least one period Aristotle envisioned the three books as comprising one treatise. Seen in this light Book III was not appended to the Rhetoric; it should be considered a genuine work.

The third book opens with a brief analysis of delivery. Aristotle seems to exhibit distaste for the matter, as though he were chagrined at having to acknowledge the importance of delivery. He dismisses the concept quickly by noting that "rightly considered it is thought vulgar,"[62] needing attention because of the sorry nature of an audience. Baldwin, however, concludes that: "Tantalizing in its brevity, this passage is nevertheless suggestive; for it sketches an analytic division of delivery into voice-placing and volume, pitch and rhythm; it points to the value for public speaking of the arts of dramatic recital; and, most important of all, it relates delivery to the whole idea of style as concrete presentation versus abstract formulation."[63]

Then follows the Rhetoric's discussion of style, beginning with word-choice. In any form of written or oral communication, suggests Aristotle, we must give attention to style. There are many virtues of style but chief among them, states Aristotle, is perspicuity or clarity. In order to achieve this virtue one must employ nouns and verbs as they are conventionally found. When ornamentation, the second virtue of style, is necessitated it should be achieved through the judicious use of metaphors: "This will be secured by observing due proportion; otherwise there will be a lack of propriety."[64] Chapter 3 discusses inappropriateness and the vice of excessiveness, while Chapter 4 introduces similes. Having discussed the

individual components of style he moves to an analysis of sentences and clauses. The final virtue of style is appropriateness. Appropriateness, appearing in Chapter 7, is achieved through the expression of emotion and character (ethopoiia). Propriety must be observed, however, in regard to the subject matter: "Style is proportionate to the subject matter when neither weighty matters are treated off-hand, nor trifling matters with dignity. . . ."[65] Appropriateness is an important consideration, he tells us, in that it makes one's case or point appear more credible.

The structure or form of diction next concerns Book III. Rhythm, Aristotle says, is a vital consideration in rhetorical discourse. The orator is warned, however, to avoid meter lest his speech ring of poetry; and, in equal measure, rhythm must not be carried to excess. Of the types of rhythm the heroic is found lacking in prose harmony while the iambic fails at rousing the listener. The trochaic is likewise found wanting as it is a skipping rhythm suggestive of "comic dancing." Aristotle finds the paean most suitable for suasory discourse. The chief virtue of the paean is its non-metrical yet rhythmical structure: "The paean should be retained, because it is the only one of the rhythms mentioned which is not adapted to a metrical system, so that it is most likely to be undetected."[66]

The description of the period in Chapter 9 has often been misinterpreted. Part of the difficulty lies in the differing interpretations we and the ancients have given

the term.[67] Disregarding the period as we know it, at least two types were known to antiquity. The first type is characteristic of Isocrates (the historical period, long sentences made of subordinate clauses), while the second, an earlier form, was favored by Gorgias and Antiphon (the balanced period, parallelism or antithesis composed of two divisions). The latter more closely describes Aristotle's definition: "This is made clear by his comparison of the period to strophe-antistrophe structure of the dithyramb and by his continual reference to the two parts of the period, the beginning and the end he calls them once."[68] There are three additional characteristics concerning the period we must note. First, a period, unlike its modern counterpart, need not consist of an entire sentence. Secondly, Aristotle does not indicate whether the period possesses rhythmical structure. Finally, the two divisions are each called a kolon and make up a group of words. This group need not be grammatically independent, the major requirement being only that it offset equally its sister (i.e., antithetical or parallel) kolon.

Aristotle next discusses the metaphor. He considers that the metaphor consists of more than a single word--often whole phrases, sentences and ideas. In so doing he sees the focus or object of the metaphor given life or action: "They all make the subject moving and living; and actuality is movement."[69] Metaphors, though, should not be too obvious and ought to be drawn from

appropriate subjects. Various forms of metaphor, such as proverbs, hyperboles and similes, then are developed.

A distinction among the various exigencies dictating differentiations in style forms is briefly developed in Chapter 12. Basically, Aristotle reminds the orator of the natural incompatibility of oral and written styles. Obviously that style best suited for prose or poetry would ill-suit the rhetorician. Because compositions are not written with delivery in mind, he tells us, they fall short when spoken aloud. Likewise, "speeches suited for delivery, when delivery is absent, do not fulfill their proper function and appear silly."[70]

Aristotle completes the Rhetoric with a hurried analysis of dispositio. Unlike the rest of the work this section appears shallow, echoing much of what must have existed in rhetorical handbooks of that period. Baldwin dismisses this section by suggesting that "it has little significance [showing] little of Aristotelian discernment and suggestiveness."[71] Aristotle notes there are only two components of a speech (not to be confused with canons)--the proposition and its proof. But what ensues soon seems an analysis of narration. Then, he suggests there are four (the maximum) elements to be analyzed--introduction, proposition, proof, and epilogue. A brief analysis of the appropriate use of each follows. Suddenly, with no epilogue of his own, he ends the Rhetoric. Using an example of a suitable conclusion drawn from Lysias Aristotle seems to

have put double meaning in his last sentence: "I have spoken; you have heard; you know the facts; now give your decision."[72] This concludes our outline of the Rhetoric.

Dating the Rhetoric

We have demonstrated what marked the Rhetoric from other classical rhetorics and viewed its particular contents. A work so unique and complicated took a great deal of time to evolve. It is important, therefore, to fix a date for the Rhetoric's composition. Dating the Rhetoric has been attempted by many classicists with varying degrees of success. We shall consider some of the major arguments advanced and suggest a range within which its authorship may have occurred.

Two early scholars who dated the Rhetoric were Max Schmidt[73] and Christian Brandis.[74] Since then many commentators have lent their expertise to this problem.[75] Few discoveries have been made or hypotheses advanced since these earlier efforts, however. Even the thesis of Solmsen, later refined by Hill, concerning the genetic character of the Rhetoric had been advanced many years before by Niebuhr.[76]

More than 100 years ago Cope despondently outlined our knowledge of the Rhetoric's "publication" date. Unfortunately, his remarks then appear applicable even today: "As is usual in these cases the result is meagre and unsatisfactory: no certainty is attainable; and we have to content

ourselves with sufficiently vague and indefinite conjecture as to the time and mode of the composition of the work."[77] Indeed, Paul D. Brandes, who recently summarized modern research concerning the problem, reluctantly echoed Cope's remarks.[78]

Because our Rhetoric has no recorded "completion" date we must turn to external and internal evidence to deduce an approximate one. Within recent years there has been substantial research indicating the Rhetoric may have developed genetically rather than systematically; that it was not written in one inspired seizure but developed over a period of several years. Although we cannot fully develop the arguments here, the Rhetoric's internal evidence strongly, if not overwhelmingly, supports this thesis. We already have cited the work of Solmsen, Jaeger, and Hill who are of this opinion. It is their belief that careful examination of the Rhetoric reveals it was revised many times (often, strangely enough, without thought to internal consistency). The irregular organization, contradictions, and repetitions of the Rhetoric seem to confirm this thesis. No other explanation would seem to account for these internal faults. If we accept this proposition, however, we face a dilemma. It is safe to assume later students and teachers added to and detracted from the work, thus leaving us with an imperfect statement of Aristotle's analysis. A scholar attempting, therefore, to decipher, event-date, or reconstruct the development of the work based upon its

internal structure or content must determine where Aristotle left off and others began. If, however, we are unable to determine spurious Aristotelian commentary we find ourselves incapable of dating the work by this manner. Likewise, should we be able to detect genuine Aristotelian commentary we are forced to date the work based solely upon historical events whose dates we have determined previously. This, however, is unsatisfactory because we can only date the work to the latest event cited.

Determining a "completion" date for the Rhetoric is, then, obviously difficult. In order to clarify what we mean by "completion" date we must take up the concept of publication in antiquity. Books as we know them, of course, did not exist in ancient Greece. For unlike contemporary scholars blessed with the invention of printing the ancients were limited by the general inavailability of textual materials. To "publish" a book held quite a different meaning for Aristotle and his contemporaries. One of the principal differences lay in the audience to whom scholarly works were addressed. Today the advancement of knowledge, whatever the subject, is assumed to be a commonly held goal by men of learning. And, broadly speaking, scholars address their publications to the whole of the academic community. Students constituting the enrollment of the Academy, Lyceum, Isocrates' and other schools, and of the general circle of enlightened scholars at Athens, however, made up the major audience for scholarly works in ancient Greece. Beyond

these schools, generally speaking, a market for such works did not exist. The great philosophical works emerging from antiquity were intended, therefore, for these few individuals. Many of the philosophers, "perhaps the majority of them, never can be said to have published a philosophical work in any sense other than that in which a lecturer publishes his thoughts to his audience."[79] Shute, for example, makes the case that all of the extant Aristotelian works were in lecture or note-book form during the Stagirite's lifetime, and as such, were never published formally. He concludes by noting that "moreover, . . . those works which have come down to us . . . are clearly neither prepared nor designed for a large circle of readers. I think, then, we safely may conclude that there was no publication in any sense of these works during Aristotle's lifetime."[80] We are attempting to determine, therefore, a completion date "which would permit its being used as a guide to teaching."[81] What, then, is the evidence concerning such a date?

As we have seen, Aristotle's interest in rhetoric was triggered during his first residency in Athens. It was at this time he is thought to have authored the Gryllus as well as to have begun a formative outline of the Theodectea. Whether or not Aristotle's mind had matured to the point of envisioning the Rhetoric is moot. It is safe to assume, however, that parts of the Rhetoric's contents, if nothing more, had been mulled over in his mind. Düring, in perhaps overstating the case, states that "in

these years he wrote the Topics and an important part of his book on rhetoric."[82] Discounting such an early date, Burnet[83] and Jaeger[84] date the Rhetoric's composition during Aristotle's stay in Asia Minor. Both scholars agree that during Aristotle's absence from Athens much of his most productive work was accomplished. Whether or not the Rhetoric was authored there is debatable. By examining Aristotle's use of reference in the Rhetoric a case can be made both for and against its composition occurring in Asia Minor. Sandys notes that Aristotle's use of tense in referring to "the Attic orators" and to "orators at Athens" suggests parts of the work, at least, were not written at Athens.[85] Such aloofness towards politics, though, was characteristic of foreign residents in Athens. Cope, from a position opposite that of Sandys, posits that internal references to events and persons placed the authorship in one of the two periods in Aristotle's Athenian residency. He notes that a great many of Aristotle's references would have been obscure or insignificant to anyone except an Athenian; only Athenians, therefore, would have known to whom and what he was referring. Thus, Cope believes this proves "conclusively the place of composition as that city and no other."[86] He extends his conclusion by suggesting that "it seems equally certain that the final publication of the work did not take place till the second residence of the author at Athens."[87]

The evidence points heavily towards Aristotle's second residency as the period in which he completed the

final draft of the Rhetoric. Spengel[88] identified a passage referring to Phillip's embassy to Thebes in 338 B.C. as well as an alliance with Alexander in 336 B.C. Cope, therefore, reluctantly affixed 336 B.C. as the earliest possible completion date of the Rhetoric. But, in considering the dilemma posed earlier, that should we find the Rhetoric to have been an on-going manuscript--one revised and edited over a number of years--dating by any particular historical references becomes irrelevant. At best, as Cope seems to imply, we can only date the work to the latest historical event cited. Brandes summarizes our point by suggesting:

> The clear thrust of internal evidence and scholarly speculation is toward the view that the Rhetoric is not a "book" in the usual sense but is a set of lecture notes subjected to a series of revisions, not always systematic. It follows, then, that the work cannot be dated by any particular historical reference.[89]

We would do well to think of the Rhetoric, therefore, as having been influenced by all periods of Aristotle's professional life. The final draft of the Rhetoric, if indeed Aristotle even considered it a completed work, can be attributed reasonably to the second residency.

## Loss and Recovery of the Rhetoric

The difficulty of dating the Rhetoric is matched, perhaps, by attempts to reconstruct its history. There are numerous accounts of how the Rhetoric arrived in its present form. Because of the varying accounts the topic must be approached with care. We are ignorant of much of this period and of the men familiar with the work.

The principal ancients who advanced an account of the loss and recovery of Aristotle's works were Strabo[90] and Athenaeus.[91] By analyzing their explanations with those of modern interpreters a probable account of the Rhetoric's history can be reconstructed. Our story begins with the death of Aristotle in 332 B.C. Theophrastus assumed the Lyceum's leadership, previously held by Aristotle. During the later years of his directorship, however, Theophrastus was confronted with dissention within the Lyceum; there arose what seems to have been doctrinal as well as personal in-fighting. As old age approached, Theophrastus wished the conservative Neleus of Scepsis to be his successor. Neleus seemed a plausible choice and Theophrastus envisioned little difficulty in having him appointed as scholarchate. Thus, as was the tradition, he willed the Lyceum's library, containing his own as well as Aristotle's works, to Neleus. Due, perhaps, to the conflict existing within the school, the "elders" elected Stranton of Lampsacus over Neleus--undoubtedly a surprise to Neleus. He decided, perhaps in light of this, to return to Scepsis, taking with him his newly inherited library. It is at this point our story takes some interesting turns.

Strabo's intriguing account relates that Neleus' collection passed to his family upon his death. Said to have been illiterate and generally unaware of the priceless nature of the books, they stored or buried them in a cellar. Strabo suggests they feared that Eumenes II, a neighboring

King of Pergamon (who was a noted collector of manuscripts and books) would attempt to recover the collection by force. As the years passed the books and manuscripts deteriorated badly; nearly one hundred and fifty years passed until the library's value was recognized by one of the descendants. The collection was recovered and sold to Apellicon of Teos for what is reputed to have been a huge sum of money. About 100 B.C. the library was transported to Athens whereupon Apellicon began the incredibly difficult task of correcting and publishing Aristotle's works. He was in no sense of the term a philosopher, however, and was severely handicapped in his attempt to render faithful copies of the works. No trace of his edition remains. Sixteen years later the library of Apellicon was taken as booty by L. C. Sulla, who defeated Athens in 86 B.C., and returned to Rome. In 78 B.C. Faustus Sulla acquired the library and after twenty-three years of disinterest sold it by auction to Tyrannion, a grammarian. One would think Tyrannion suited to edit Aristotle's work. But, like Apellicon before him, he provided an inadequate edition: "Tyrannion apparently not only mishandled the severely damaged texts, but also incorrectly filled in the many and often lacunae."[92] Strabo also laments at certain manuscript copyists or book-sellers who acquired Aristotelian manuscripts from Sulla's auction and later mass-produced copies for lucrative sales. These

copies are said to have been grossly inadequate and riddled with textual inaccuracies.

Strabo's account of the recovery of Aristotle's works, however, cannot be taken at face value. Strabo tells us, for instance, of the elation of the Peripatetics at having acquired through the hand of Apellicon authentic works of Aristotle. He suggests that they had been for many years without the majority of Aristotle's works: "The statement at first blush seems so absurd and impossible that one cannot wonder that many editors have rejected it as utterly false."[93] It seems illogical that Theophrastus would not have allowed his school access to the library's manuscripts and books. The Lyceum was his very life, no less upon his death. Likewise, is it logical that Neleus, irrespective of his disappointment at not having been appointed scholarchate, would have taken the library without allowing his fellows the opportunity to make copies? Moreover, would the members of the Lyceum have so easily given up their tools--the very lifeblood of the institution? "If the books were already in any sense published, there would have been no difficulty about this; if they were not, we must remember that Neleus himself was a Peripatetic, and is hardly likely to have refused his fellow disciples so simple a boon as the right to copy these precious volumes, a boon which involved no loss to himself, but an inestimatable advantage to those to whom it was granted."[94] Chroust agrees in essence with Shute. He considers Strabo's story that upon

the death of Theophrastus no esoteric copies remained (except those possessed by Neleus) to be untrue--a fantastic myth:

> This myth, it might be contended, was probably invented for the purpose of explaining (and incidentally, of excusing) why after the death of Theophrastus the majority of the Peripatetics "deviated" to a considerable degree from the teaching of both Aristotle and Theophrastus. Also, this would explain why apparently during the second century B.C. the philosophical achievements of the Peripatus, on the whole were negligible. Left without any authoritative guides and materials, the post-Theophrastian Peripatetics simply floundered about badly.[95]

Post-Theophrastian authors who cite the supposedly lost works, however, eloquently denies Strabo's story.[96] Also, there is little doubt that the immediate disciples of Aristotle possessed copies of his works and that later Peripatetics relied heavily upon them. These notes and copies were used as the basis for their lectures and various investigations: "It is safe to surmise, therefore, that during the period Aristotle's works were located in Scepsis (or essential parts of them) were still known (and used) through fairly accurate copies that were to be found in the possession of some Peripatetics."[97]

We have yet to address ourselves to Athenaesus' account of the corpus. He tells us that the Ptolemys bought Aristotle's works from both Theophrastus and Neleus in order to enrich the Alexandrian library. There is little question that Alexandria was a great center and storehouse of Aristotelian writings. Ptolemy Philadelphus, for instance, is said to have possessed more than a thousand pieces of

Aristotelica. There was in general, we should add, a great feeling of respect for Aristotle, even to the extent of Aristotelian "clubs" being formed. But Athenaeus' story is marred by a contradiction. For in his description of later Athenian history he relates essentially Strabo's account of Apellicon having secured the Aristotelian library at Scepsis. Shute resolves this conflict by suggesting that Ptolemy Philadelphus could not have bought all the books from Neleus; that very likely Theophrastus sold only those previously published works, such as the historical works and dialogues, and that Neleus may have sold books of assembled notes.

What then can be said of the account of Strabo and Athenaeus concerning the disposition of Aristotle's library? Unlike Shute and Vleeschauwer[98] Chroust suggests Strabo's story to be at best pure fiction. Chroust's reasoning is based upon, in addition to the evidence already cited, Plutarch's[99] mention of Andronicus of Rome and Strabo's indirect reaction to him. Plutarch claimed Andronicus saved the corpus Aristotelicum from becoming a textual catastrophe.

Andronicus was schooled at Rhodes, which for many years had reflected the Peripatetic tradition. Here he was steeped in Aristotelian philosophy and quite likely had occasion to examine many Aristotelica dating to Eudemus. Hence, Andronicus possessed a strong background in Aristotelian studies as preserved at Rhodes and taught by

the Rhodian Peripatus. Chroust argues that it is not unlikely Andronicus traveled to Rome for the express purpose of examining Tyrannion's source materials. Once there, he somehow acquired these materials and soon realized their immense value. He was able to compare his knowledge of Rhodian Aristotelica with Tyrannion's, recognizing as he did, that many unique items were among this collection. This presented a spectacular opportunity for an otherwise undistinguished scholar. Here was his chance to refresh the dwindling intellectual storehouse of the Peripatus through the restoration of Aristotle's works. Such an effort, he believed, would restore the Peripatus to a leading position among schools throughout the Hellenistic-Roman world. Beyond that, however: "If he could successfully convince people that he was in possession of a very large part of Aristotle's writings and that his collection was the only 'authentic' collection in existence of Aristotle's own manuscripts, he would become the undisputed head and lead of the whole revived Peripatetic movement."[100] It is at this point Andronicus submitted his claim to be the new scholarchate.

Strabo must surely have been aware of Andronicus' claims. He does not mention him by name, however, which would suggest ill feeling between the two. Strabo, however, does refer to booksellers of Rome who employed poor copyists--a remark apparently directed at Andronicus. Strabo and other Peripatetics, it would seem, were putting up

strong resistance to Andronicus' claim of possessing the only authentic Aristotelian works. Quite naturally they felt if anyone were heir to the Aristotelian tradition it should be a Greek not a Roman. In the words of Chroust: "In order to discredit Andronicus and especially his claim that he was in the sole possession of the original manuscripts of Aristotle (and of the only authoritative and 'orthodox' materials dating back to the very founders of the school), these antagonists, who were simply competitors of Andronicus, in all likelihood alleged that if he actually did gain possession of Aristotle's own writings--something which in their opinion was by no means certain; and if these writings had been buried in a damp cellar for so many years, they must be severely damaged and hence, for all practical purposes virtually useless."[101] Extending this reasoning they suggested both the works of Tyrannion and Andronicus were inferior to those versions already possessed by the Peripatetics. To support their claim they had only to point to what would have been shoddy editing by Apellicon and Tryannion and indicate, as it was universally recognized, that incompetent Roman copyists and booksellers produced the texts. Chroust summarizes by suggesting that both the Scepsis burial story as well as any preliminary attempts by Apellicon and Tryannion to edit Aristotle's works were highly doubtful. Perhaps, suggests Chroust, Apellicon and Tryannion attempted initial editing but soon found the work exceeding their capabilities. Therefore,

Andronicus, since it cannot be denied that he published an edition of Aristotle's works, at best only consulted these earlier efforts when editing his version. This conclusion in many respects runs counter to that of Shute and Vleeschauwer but would seem the more logical version.

We have sketched a history of the corpus Aristotelicum but have still to speak of the Rhetoric in particular. Apparently, regardless of the authenticity of the Scepsis story, the Rhetoric was never lost. It apparently was preserved by members of the Lyceum either before or upon Aristotle's death. Shute believed the work was "continually extant and continually subject to alteration in the whole period between Aristotle and Andronicus."[102] This suggestion would be in keeping with both Shute's and Chroust's thesis that the lectures continued without interruption. To be sure as the years passed men of lesser abilities assumed teaching positions and what with a changing philosophy in the school the Rhetoric may well have slipped in stature, doomed to gather dust on the shelves of the school. Disuse, therefore, may account for the "disappearance" of the work.

Cicero was familiar with a number of Aristotle's works (all of which, with exception of the Rhetoric, were in dialogue form). Moreover, he makes frequent mention of the Rhetoric, reflecting his familiarity with the work.[103] In comparing his understanding of the Rhetoric with our copy we find them to be remarkably similar: "That

Cicero's Rhetoric of Aristotle is substantially the same as ours no one can doubt, nor I think, can any reasonable person dispute that this book at least he read first hand."[104] In addition, the Synagôgê technôn appears mentioned by Cicero.[105] In De orator he speaks of a history of orators in one book while in the Brutus he relates incidences of Tisias, Theodorus, and Gorgias, which could not have been taken from a source other than this work.

After Cicero we have little evidence as to either the use or study of the Rhetoric for at least a century. It is one of those quirks of fate that while Rome was now the center of Aristotelian study (with scholars the like of Flavius Boethus, Andronicus, Tyrannion and Galen) the Rhetoric enjoyed little popularity. Ciceronian rhetoric, of course, far exceeded what little impression the Rhetoric made. Nor had it an effect upon Greek oratory of this later period. Of this period Dionysius of Halicarnassus is one of our few commentators on the rhetorical influence of Aristotle. He developed the thesis that Demosthenes could not have relied upon Aristotle's Rhetoric in order to write his orations. Rather, he suggested, Aristotle secured many of his ideas by observing Demosthenes and his contemporaries. More important, however, "we notice that his citations from the Rhetoric are not only roughly but actually the same as the text which we now have."[106]

The Rhetoric now appears to have run its course for some years to come. The medieval ages were to overlook the

work generally. Secondary citations (such as Cicero's) provided scholars with their only information concerning the Rhetoric. Lee Hultzén,[107] however, has identified two rhetorics of this period which may have been influenced by or familiar with the Rhetoric. Aquilas Romanus' Aquilae Romani de Figuris sententiarum, authored in the later part of the third century, cites the Rhetoric as its one reference. Also, Victorinus' commentary upon the De inventione makes references to pistis and arrangement which seems Aristotelian; further, these citations are not to be found in Cicero's books. Victorinus, therefore, may have had first-hand knowledge of the Rhetoric. Hultzén, though, summarizes the Rhetoric's influence during this period by noting that "there is in the principal medieval rhetorics no evidence of the use of Aristotle's Rhetoric, nothing later than the fourth century."[108]

There is in our history a gap of nearly six hundred years where little is known of the Rhetoric's fate. Although the Rhetoric was known in early Greece and Rome (while other Aristotelian writings were slipping into obscurity), it was among the last to emerge in the middle ages. During the middle ages the Aristotelian tradition was at its lowest ebb in Western Europe, with only the Organon attracting scholastic interest. Edgar Lobel "assigned on palaeographical evidence"[109] a Greek manuscript of the tenth century. This would be the first

extant manuscript of Aristotle's Rhetoric. Although it is a superior Greek manuscript the copyist is unknown.

Margoliuth[110] believes Arabic translations were in circulation in the tenth century as well. Syrian scholars, who acquired their copies of Aristotle's works from early Syriac versions, are probably to be credited with having saved these works. The Syrian translations were passed on to Arabic copyists. The Arabic books of Aristotle were brought to Spain following its invasion by the Mohammedans and "it was /here/ that the Rhetoric first re-appeared in Western Europe."[111] Aristotelian texts continued to attract Eastern scholars, however, Herrick has pointed out that Eustathius, Bishop of Thessalonica in the last half of the twelfth century, makes mention of the Rhetoric in his extended commentary upon the Illiad.[112] Chief among the early Arabic commentators, however, was the tenth-century scholar, Al-Fārābi.[113] An avid Aristotelian, he is said to have had a special fondness for the Rhetoric, having read it two hundred times and written seventy books on it. His epitome and perhaps a translation (which may have been the work of Averröes) survives. (John Sandys believes Al-Fārābi did not produce a translation, only glosses.) Approximately three hundred years later the German scholar Hermannus Allemanus translated the epitome into Latin. This Declaratio, as edited by Lancilotus Zerlis, was published at Venice in 1841. The Spanish Greek philosopher Averröes also composed

a commentary and a paraphrase of the Rhetoric, similarly translated by Hermannus.

At Toledo in 1256 A.D. Hermannus is said to have translated the Rhetoric into Latin from Arabic. There is some question as to whether the translation was Averröes' or Al-Fārābi's.[114] "Whatever the nature or worth of Hermannus Alemannus' translation, if he did no more than translate Al-Farabius' epitome, it does not appear to have made much of an impression except to draw the censure of Roger Bacon."[115] Bacon severely chided the German scholar for his lack of precision and apparent inability to render Arabic into Latin. He thought Hermannus' translations were next to useless and virtually impossible to understand.

Two translations of the Rhetoric into Latin from Greek occurred in the thirteenth century. Of their existence we have the surest proof--extant copies. The translatio vetus, approximately 1250 A.D., may have ties with the Hermannus Alemannus debate. Its origin and translator, though, are considered unknown. Spengel, however, believed it a translation of Bartholomaeus of Messina while Mandonnet[116] attributes it to Hermannus (which is unlikely). Only three copies of this manuscript exist; it seems to have been little used in schools and less consulted by scholars familiar with its existence. The reason for its lack of popularity is not known. Murphy has suggested

William of Moerbeke's translation, translatio Guillelmi, may simply have overshadowed this work.[117]

Moerbeke, a Flemish Dominican of the thirteenth century, translated many of the works of Aristotle. Ninety-six manuscripts of his translation of the Rhetoric survive, the most frequently consulted being Parisiensus lat. 7695. The work, like Hermannus' translations of Al-Fārābis and/or Averröes glosses, received the attention and censure of Roger Bacon, who termed it unimaginative. Sandys,[118] though, thinks the baldness of Moerbeke's knowledge of Greek lent to the work's literal translation. In any event Moerbeke's translation was well received. Without doubt, Thomas Aquinas, who sponsored the translation, lent heavily to its credibility. The work appears to have been completed about 1270 (a second manuscript, Parisiensus lat. 14696 bears the date 1281) at the height of Aristotelian interest in Paris. Its popularity far exceeded that of any other version. Curiously, we have no knowledge of the Greek manuscript consulted by Moerbeke. Moreover, however, "there is no reason to believe that Moerbeke even consulted previous renditions; in any case his independent version so completely dominates schools and libraries that for all practical purposes it may be regarded as the typical medieval Latin version."[119]

At the close of the thirteenth century at least twenty-two manuscripts of the Rhetoric had been prepared.

The fourteenth century produced fifty-seven manuscripts, the fifteenth century, seventeen. One would assume extensive scholastic interest accounted for the number; likewise, we would suspect rhetorical training and contemporary rhetorics to reflect this newly available Aristotelian tract. Quite the opposite, however, appears to have been the case. Murphy summarized the Rhetoric's influence during this period and found it wanting. He suggests, based in part upon the commentary of Aegidius Romanus,[120] that the Rhetoric was not thought of as a rhetorical or dialectical work but one allied with political science and ethics. By close examination of manuscript pairings this judgment seems born out. For of the seventy-nine instances where the Rhetoric was paired with one or more works, sixty-nine include the Politica or Ethica: "In any event, the history of Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages indicates quite clearly that even though it did not serve its original purpose directly as a textbook on oral and written discourse, it did find a significant place in European culture, particularly in the areas of ethics, morality and politics."[121]

The Invention of Printing

Our history tracing the whereabouts of the Rhetoric essentially concludes with Gutenberg's assemblage of the printing press. This new found art of book manufacturing was to be a boon to European scholarship. While movable type would arrive too late to affect the Italian Renaissance

(Bolgar concludes the 'novelty' of the printing press contributed little to the rise of Greek letters[122]), it was nonetheless seized upon for its amazing ability to reproduce rare manuscripts in quantity. Both men of learning and finance--who soon recognized the commercial possibilities of printing--established presses in centers of learning. All over Europe presses were built and the task of resurrecting the classics from the hand of scribes begun. The copyists' monumental efforts to reproduce texts by hand, which involved extended periods of time, were almost overnight erased. Venice alone licensed between 200 and 268 printing houses by the end of the fifteenth century.[123] The extent and impact of movable type upon the printing of classical literature were staggering; most of the Latin editionis principes appeared between 1465 and 1475, most of the Greek between 1493 and 1518.[124]

The first published edition of Aristotle's Rhetoric was a translation by George of Trebizond published in Paris by Petrus Caesaris and Johannes Stol. Trapezuntius was an avid, if somewhat lackluster, student of Aristotle. As a professor of Greek and rhetoric at Rome and Venice he was perhaps a suitable choice, however, to bring the Rhetoric to the house of Caesaris and Stol. The books catalogue title runs: "Aristotelis Rhetoricorum liber III, ex interpretatione Georgii Trapezuntii." The book did not carry a publication date and as a result many estimates

have been made of its entrance into print.[125] I accept the Gesamtkatalog Der Wiegendrucke's ascribed date of 1475.

Other incunabula of this genre present only minor problems in comparison with that of George of Trebizond. In 1481 Lancilotus Zerlis published his compendium of Hermannus Alemannus translations. In 1485 Francesco Filelfo's translation was published, three years following his death. This was his only translation of an Aristotelian work. Excerpts or paraphrases, apparently, of the Rhetoric were printed by one T. Ferrariis in 1493. Portions of the Poetics were included as well. Beyond this I have no knowledge either of the compiler or edition. The famed Aristotelian Opera Omnia printed from 1495 to 1498 by the Aldine Press did not include the Rhetoric. It has been suggested that Aldus Manutius was unable to secure an acceptable manuscript of the Rhetoric. This seems strange when we consider that nearly one hundred manuscripts were extant at this time. Manutius[126] was, in addition to a diligent and exacting printer, a scholar. Perhaps he attempted a critical edition but failed owing to the availability of manuscripts. It is possible, although unlikely, that he considered the work to be spurious. And, as he (with the editorial assistance of Demetrius Ducas)[127] included the Rhetoric ten years later in the Rhetores Graeci this hypothesis seems remote. More likely, he may have foreplanned the Rhetores Graeci and perhaps thought that

work a more suitable vehicle for the work's presentation. The Rhetores Graeci, we ought to mention, is an exceptionally important collection of Greek treatises on rhetoric. Included in this work is the first known edition of the Poetics. To conclude our discussion of the fifteenth century we have left only to mention the Georgius Dottanius translation printed by Jakob Thanner at Leipzig in 1499.

Suddenly, like wildfire, paraphrases, commentaries, and translations of the Rhetoric erupted from sixteenth century publishers. Counting reprints and revised editions well over ninety volumes were produced. The twentieth century, by comparison, has less than twenty commentaries or translations in perhaps twice the languages. It is neither our intention or purpose, though, to describe each of these editions or suppose their influence upon Greek letters or rhetorical theory. It is to be noted, however, that a wide range of contemporary scholars turned their attention to the explication and correction of this text. These men included the likes of Piero Vettori (perhaps the greatest of the Italian Greek scholars), Desiderius Erasmus, Alessandro Piccolomini, Antonio Riccoboni, Bernardo Segni, Carlo Signorius, Annibal Caro, Antonio Majoragio and Isaac Casaubon. The Rhetoric was obviously keeping good company. At least twenty-five different scholars attached themselves to the publication of some facet of this work. The works of George of Trebizond, Hermolau Barbarus, Antonio Majorogio, Alessandro Piccolomini, Antonio Riccoboni and Piero Vettori

appear (judging by the variety and number of reprints) to have enjoyed the greatest popularity. Nearly all the major centers of book production included the Rhetoric among their lists; no English translation or commentary had yet been attempted, however.

Scholars of the seventeenth century likewise considered the Rhetoric worthy of commentary and translation. The frenzied publication exhibited by the sixteenth century was not to flow over to the seventeenth, however; still, over twenty scholars thought it worthy of their investigation. This list includes Francois Cassandre, Robert Estienne, Christopher Schraderi and Emmanuel Teasuro. Of interest to the reader of English is Thomas Hobbes' London edition: "A brief art of the rhetorique containing in substance all that Aristotel hath written in his three bookes of that subject, except only what is not applicable to the English tongue." The best evidence suggests it was published in 1637. The first translation of the Rhetoric in England, however, was Theodore Goulston's Greek and Latin translation. It was published under the imprint of Eduard Griffin in 1619.

Just as suddenly the eighteenth century, apparently satiated with an abundance of able editions of the Rhetoric, turned its critical attention elsewhere. We find only three translations published during this time--those of William Battie, J. Holwell and an anonymous edition printed at Padua

in 1786. Beyond these works we have a reprinting of Caro, Du Val and Hobbes' translations from earlier periods and a spattering of essays and abridgements. The nineteenth century, however, was to see a strong revival in the study of Aristotelian rhetoric.

Great interest in classical philology marked European universities (especially German) during the nineteenth century. The whole spectrum of classical literature was investigated with great vigor. Each member of the Aristotelian corpus was studied with careful adherance to establishing critically correct texts. The issuance of periodical journals aided these efforts immeasurably. Now like never before it was possible to share with the whole of the academic community various philological emendations; before such finds would had to have been privately circulated. No less than twenty scholars published either translations or commentaries of the Rhetoric, while authors of essays and monographs well exceed one hundred. Thomas Gaisford published the first modern critical edition by comparing five Parisian manuscripts. Immanuel Bekker, in examining 105 manuscripts, also published a critical edition. Leonardo Spengel, in addition to a translation, devoted (perhaps more than any other man of the nineteenth century) exacting detail to philological and historical considerations; his interest in the work would span his entire lifetime. Likewise, our understanding of the

Rhetoric owes much to the work of Johannes Vahlen and Adolphus Roemer. Theodore Buckly published an English translation and analysis that had the good luck of being imprinted under the popular Bohn series of classical works. It enjoyed an audience for over eighty years. The foremost English translator and commentator of the Rhetoric in this century, however, was Edward Meredith Cope. His commentary, published in 1867, and the three-volume translation and interlinear commentary (posthumously edited by John E. Sandys in 1876) remain today standard reference works. It is difficult, in our brief gloss, to properly access the contributions of the nineteenth century. For in order to linger and illuminate the contributions of one scholar necessitates an examination of another. So much of our knowledge concerning the Rhetoric may be traced to scholars of this period that it is perhaps correct to think of it as the Golden Age of Aristotelian rhetorical studies.

The twentieth century is not without its moments, though. The contributions of Lane Cooper, Rhys Roberts, Sir W. David Ross, Médéric Dufour, Paul Gohlke, Ignacio Granero, Friedrich Solmsen, Wilhelm Kroll, Richard C. Jebb, Antonio Russo and Armando Plebe will long be felt. This century was to usher in a new phenomenon among scholars investigating the Rhetoric. For, as in no previous period, investigators from a wide variety of disciplines paused to gleen from this work wisdom applicable to their respective

fields. The bibliography which follows includes scholars from departments of speech, English, linguistics, history, philosophy, classics, political science, law, physical science, and theatre. Also, the Rhetoric found its way into new languages during the past seventy years. Readers of the Hindi, Japanese, and Polish languages now may benefit from the text's availability.

In conclusion, we have examined by way of a brief introduction the course of Aristotelian rhetoric across 2,300 years. We have tarried just long enough to appreciate what is represented by this bibliography. An examination of Aristotle's lost rhetorics and outline of the extant Rhetoric enabled us to appreciate the activity surrounding this unique work. We traced its history until approximately 400 A.D. when it seemingly "disappeared." Picking up our "recovered" volume in the hands of Arabic philosophers in the ninth century we noted how it soon was reunited with the corpus Aristotelicum. While we noted the Rhetoric's published history we did so briefly. It remains for other studies to explore in detail this fertile area. A study detailing the Rhetoric's influence upon pedagogical matters or its effect upon other rhetorics would add greatly to our store of knowledge. It is, therefore, with the hope of spurring additional investigations of a critical and historical bent that part two of this work, a bibliography of the Rhetoric, is provided.

FOOTNOTES

[1]There are, of course many works which are addressed to the topic of Greece and its influence upon other cultures. Some books of interest to the general reader are: Lane Cooper, The Greek Genius and its Influence (Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1952); R. W. Livingston, The Greek Genius and its Meaning to Us (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912); R. W. Livingston, The Legacy of Greece (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921); Cyril Winn and Maurice Jacks, Aristotle, His Thought and Relevance Today (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1967).

[2]Publications investigating ancient rhetoric must number in the thousands. Those of interest to the modern reader wishing to read general accounts of classical rhetoric may turn to A. E. Chaignet, La rhetorique et son histoire (Paris, 1888); Charles Sears Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic (New York: MacMillan and Co., 1924); Donald L. Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957); M. L. Clarke, Rhetoric at Home (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1953); George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963); Richard C. Jebb, The Attic Orators, 2 vols. (London, 1893); Rhys Roberts, Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism (New York, 1928).

[3]Eric A. Havelock, Preface to Plato (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963), 326p.

[4]Kennedy, 86.

[5]Paul D. Brandes, "The Composition and Preservation of Aristotle's Rhetoric," Speech Monographs, XXXV (1968), 482.

[6]Werner Jaeger, Aristotle, Fundamentals of the History of his Development, trans. by Richard Robinson (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948), 348

[7]Marian Plezia, "The Human Face of Aristotle," Classica et Mediaevalia, XXII (1961), 17.

[8]Ingemar Düring, Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia V. Goteborg, 1957), 490p.

[9]Donald J. Allen, The Philosophy of Aristotle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970); John Burnet, Aristotle (Proceedings of the British Academy, 1924); Abraham Edel, Aristotle (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1967); Sir Alexander Grant, Aristotle (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1963); Geoffrey R. Mure, Aristotle (London, 1931); Alfred E. Taylor, Aristotle (Rev. ed.; New York: Dover Publications, 1955).

[10]For an excellent summary of research on Aristotle's course on rhetoric see Anton-Hermann Chroust, "Aristotle's Earliest 'Course of Lectures on Rhetoric'," L'Antiquité Classique, XXXIII (1964), 58-72. What I outlined in these few pages is indebted to Chroust's analysis.

[11]Diogenes Laertius, Vita hesychii, v. 22.

[12]Philodemus De rhetorica, volumina rhetorica. See H. M. Hubbell, "The Rhetorica of Philodemus," Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, XXIII (1920), 243-382.

[13]Cicero De oratore III. 35. 141.

[14]Chroust, 1964, 60.

[15]Chroust, 1964, 61.

[16]Cicero Orator XIV. 46.

[17]Quintilian Institutio oratoria III. 1.; Syrianus Scholia ad hermogenem IV. 297.

[18]F. Blass, Die Attische Beredsamkeit (Leipzig, 1892), II, 64-65.

[19]Chroust, 1964, 71.

[20]Diogenes Laertius v. i. 22, 24.

[21]See E. M. Cope, An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric With Analysis, Notes and Appendices (London: MacMillan and Co., 1867), 49. Cope describes "Anonymus" as "'an anonymous life of Aristotle, with a list of his works, first published by Menage in his notes on Diogenes Laertius v. 35, and reprinted by Buhle in his edition of Aristotle, Vol. I. p. 60.'"

[22]Cope, 50.

[23]Leonardus Spengel, Artium Scriptores ab initiis usque ad editos Aristotelis de Rhetorica libros (Stuttgart, 1828).

[24]*De inventione* II. 2. 6; *De orator* II. 38. 160; *Brutus* 12.

[25]Stuart W. Hinman, *Literary Quotations and Allusion In the Rhetoric, Poetic and Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle* (Staten Island, New York: Private Edition, 1935), 201p.

[26]A. E. Douglas, "The Aristotelian SYNAGOGE TECHNON After Cicero, *Brutus* 46-8," *Latomus*, XIV (1955), 539.

[27]Anton-Hermann Chroust, "Aristotle's First Literary Effort: The *Gryllus*, A Lost Dialogue on the Nature of Rhetoric," *Revue Des Etudes Greques*, LXXVIII (1965), 576-91; P. Thillet, "A Note sur le *Gryllos*, ouvrage de jeunesse d'Aristote," *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Etranger*, CXLVII (1957), 352-54.

[28]Valentine Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (Leipzig, 1863), 76.

[29]Chroust, 1965, 591.

[30]E. Heitz, *Die Verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles* (Leipzig, 1865), 167.

[31]P. Thillet, 1957; F. Solmsen, *Die Entwicklung der Aristotelischen Logik und Rhetorik* (Berlin, 1929), 200.

[32]Diogenes Laertius II. 55.

[33]Chroust, 1965, 583.

[34]*Institutio oratoria* II. 17.17; II. 17.18; II. 17.22; II. 17.26; II. 17.30.

[35]Chroust, 1965, 591.

[36]Aristotle *Rhetorica* 1410b2.

[37]*Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* 1421a38.

[38]Rose, 1863, 137.

[39]H. Diels, "Über das Dritte Buch der Aristotelischen Rhetorik," *Abhandlungen der Koniglichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philologisch-Historische Klasse* IV (1886), 11-16.

[40]Cope, 1867, 63.

[41]Friedrich Solmsen, "Drei Rekonstrucktionen zur antiken Rhetorik und Poetik, II: Theodektes," Hermes, LXVII (1932), 144-51.

[42]Eduard Zeller, Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, trans. by B. F. C. Costelloe and J. H. Muirhead (New York, 1897), 73.

[43]Theresa Crem, "The Definition of Rhetoric According to Aristotle," Laval Théologique et Philosophique XII (1956), 233.

[44]Baldwin, 1924, 12.

[45]Friedrich Solmsen, "Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric," American Journal of Philology, LXII (1941), 39.

[46]Rhet. 1354a1.

[47]Baldwin, 1924, 9.

[48]Rhet. 1355b1.

[49]Rhet. 1355b25.

[50]Lloyd Bitzer, "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (1959), 408.

[51]Robert J. Brake, "A Reconsideration of Aristotle's Conception of Topics," Central States Speech Journal, XVI (1965), 107.

[52]Brake, 1965, 108.

[53]Rhet. 1366b9.

[54]Baldwin, 1924, 17.

[55]Rhet. 1378a20-21.

[56]Rhet. 1380a1-4.

[57]Rhet. 1394a9-12.

[58]Rhet. 1395a4.

[59]Rhet. 1396b15.

[60]Brake, 1965, 108.

[61]Friedrich Solmsen, Die Entwickelung der Aristotlischen Logik und Rhetorik (Berlin, 1929).

[62]Rhet. 1404a5.

[63]Baldwin, 1924, 22.

[64]Rhet. 1405a9.

[65]Rhet. 1408a2.

[66]Rhet. 1409a5.

[67]George Kennedy, "Aristotle on the Period," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LXIII (1958), 283-288.

[68]George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), 110.

[69]Rhet. 1412a3.

[70]Rhet. 1413b1.

[71]Baldwin, 1924, 34.

[72]Rhet. 1420b6-7.

[73]Max Schmidt, Commentatio de tempore quo ab Aristotle libri de arte rhetorica conscripti et editi sint (Halle, 1837).

[74]Christian A. Brandis, "Uber Aristotele's Rhetoric und die Griechischen ausleger derselben," Philologus, Zeitschrift für das Klassische Alterthum, IV (1849), 1-47.

[75]Paul D. Brandes, "The Composition and Preservation of Aristotle's Rhetoric," Speech Monographs, XXXV (1968), 382-1; Forbes Iverson Hill, "The Genetic Method in Recent Criticism on the Rhetoric of Aristotle" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1963); Solmsen, 1929.

[76]B. G. Niebuhr, Römische Geschicht (London, 1842).

[77]Cope, 1867. 37.

[78]Brandes, 1968.

[79]Richard Schute, On the History of the Process by Which the Aristotelian Writings Arrived at Their Present Form (Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1888), 1.

[80]Shute, 1888, 3.

[81]Brandes, 1968. 483

[82]Ingemar Düring, Aristotle and Plato in the Mid-Fourth Century (Göteborg, 1960), 253.

[83]Burnet, 1925, 117.

[84]Jaeger, 1924. 124.

[85]Richard C. Jebb, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. by John E. Sandys (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1909), xix.

[86]Cope, 1867, 37.

[87]Cope, 1867, 38.

[88]Leonardo Spengel, Specimen Commentariorum in Aristotelis Libros de Arte Rhetorica (Munchen: Libraria Scholarum Regia, 1839).

[89]Brandes, 1968, 487.

[90]Strabo, Geography, trans. by H. L. Hones (New York, 1929), VI.

[91]Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists, trans. by C. B. Galich (New York, 1927), I.

[92]Anton-Hermann Chroust, "The Miraculous Disappearance and Recovery of the corpus Aristotelicum," Classica et Mediaevalia, XXIII (1962), 53.

[93]Shute, 1888,29.

[94]Shute, 1888,30.

[95]Chroust, 1962, 56.

[96]E. Zeller, "Aristotle, Die Rhetorik," Die Philosophie der Greichen in Ihrer Geschichllichen Entwicklung (Leipzig: Fuec Verlag (R. Reisland, 1879), 147.52.

[97]Chroust, 1962, 62.

[98]Herman Jean de Vleeschauwer, L'Odyssee de al Bibliotheque d'Aristote et ses Répercussions Philosophiques (Pretoria, 1957).

[99]Plutarch, "Sulla," Plutarch's Lives, trans. by Bernadotte Perrin (London, 1914-16), 407.

[100]Chroust, 1962, 63.

[101]Chroust, 1962, 64.

[102]Shute, 1888, 100.

[103]Cicero De orator iii. 47. 182-183.

[104]Shute, 1888, 49.

[105]Cicero De orator ii. 38. 160.

[106]Shute, 1888, 67.

[107]Lee S. Hultzén, "Aristotle's Rhetoric in England to 1600" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1932), 21-23.

[108]Hultzén, 1932, 23.

[109]Edgar Lobel, The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 6.

[110]D. S. Margoliouth, The Poetics of Aristotle, Translated from the Greek into English and from Arabic into Latin: With a Revised Text, Introduction, Commentary, Glossary, and Ornamasticon (London, 1911), 77.

[111]Marvin T. Herrick, "The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England," Philological Quarterly, V (1926), 243.

[112]Herick, 1926, 243.

[113]Aimable Jourdain, Rechereches critiques sur l'age et l'origin des commentaires Grecs ou Arabes employés par les docteurs scholastiques (Paris, 1843), 139-41.

[114]Sandys asserts Al-Farabi did not produce a translation but only glosses of the Rhetoric. Martin Grabman in his Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristotelesubersetzungen des XIII (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophies des Mittlelalters, Band 17, Heft 5/6, Munster, 1916), p. 242, favored Al-Farabi's hand. Marvin Herrick (1926) hedges the issue by avoiding to name its author, while Hultzén (1932) leans toward Averroes. James J. Murphy, who makes no mention to this conflict, offers no qualifications as to its commentary/translation status. In any event, the work is said to have been published at Venice in 1481. I have found no basis for that belief. The 1481 Latin edition, which is untitled, is described by the British Museum as: "A Latin translation of the Rhetorica of Hermannus Alemanus preceded

by a Latin version of the Summary of the Poetics of Averroes, both by Hermannus." This work, however, is a translation from Greek, not Arabic, its description ending with: "Explicit rhetorica aristotelis translata a greco in latinum." Comparison with entires to be found in this bibliography under both Al-Fārābi and Averröes gives no indication of an Arabic version translated directly into Latin. In any event, Roger Bacon severely criticized the work. He attacked sharply the Poetics, although he makes no mention of the Rhetoric. It may be inferred, though, from his speaking of "Hermannus' miserable failure with two of the most valuable Aristotelian writings on Logic," (Herrick, p. 244) that he was referring to the Rhetoric. Rhetoric and poetry were for Bacon parts of logic. I, for one, do not rule out the possibility of Hermannus not having translated the Rhetoric. Bacon's attack on the Poetics can be seen as an argument against the Rhetoric's translation. We know, for instance, that the Aristotelis Poetria was a commentary of Averröes. Hermannus, perhaps recognizing his limitations in Arabic, felt content translating only the commentary. Two questions lead from this observation: Why should he have found the Rhetoric (a much longer work) less difficult tc translate, and secondly, why would Bacon have criticized a commentary when obviously a master work, if there had been one, should have drawn his critical attention? These questions, I feel, loom broadly against this whole discussion. Moreover, Bacon records a conversation with Hermannus: "When I questioned him about certain books of Logic, which he had to translate from the Arabic, he roundly told me he knew nothing of Logic, and therefore did not dare to translate them." (John E. Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship, (Vol. I, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896), 569. This supports the thesis that the Rhetoric existed in Greek script from the beginning.

[115]Hultzén, 1932, 39.

[116]Pierre Mandonnet, Siger de Brabant et l'Averroïse Latin au XIIIme Siecle (Louvain, 1911), I, 14.

[117]James J. Murphy, "Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (1966), 110-111.

[118]John E. Sandys, 1896, Vol. I, 564.

[119]Murphy, 1966, 111.

[120]James J. Murphy, The "Scholastic Condemnation of Rhetoric in the Commentary of Giles of Rome on the Rhetoric of Aristotle," Arts libéraux et Philosophie Au Moyen Age (Montreal, 1967), 833-41.

[121]Murphy, 1966, 115.

[122]R. R. Bolgar, The Classical Heritage (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964), 280.

[123]H. Brown, The Venetian Printing Press (London, 1891), 50.

[124]Bolgar, 1964, 281.

[125]In addition to the Rhetoric of Aristotle, Trapezuntius published in 1470 his own Rhetoric based, in part, upon the theories of Hermogenes. Bunker, A Bibliographical Study of the Greek Works and Translations published in France During the Renaissance: The Decade 1540-550 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 3, who I believe confuses these editions, advances 1470 as the first edition date. She speaks, however, of the Sorbonne Press under the guidance of Gaguin, Fichet, and Heynlin. No such work appears to have been produced; I, at least, have no tangible grounds for belief in its existence. Her authority, Gustav Gröber, Geschichte der mittelfranzosischen Literature II (Berlin and Leipzig: Zweite Auflage, Bearbeitet von Stefan Hofer, 1933), pp. 235-37, for example, cites the date 1474. Apparently misreading Gröber, Bunker may have inadvertantly replaced an edition of Cicero's, noted by Gröber, published in 1470, with that of the Rhetoric. Gröber's date of 1474 is in itself puzzling as no catalogue or holding of this edition is cited. Marie Pellechet, Catalogue général des incunables des bibliothèques publiques de France, par M. Pellechet (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1897), no. 1189, cites the work but gives no date. Likewise the Bibliotheque Nationale does not affix a date. The Gesamtkatalog Der Wiegendrucke, which cross-references Pellechet, dates the edition at 1475. A later edition of this catalogue, which saw extensive revision, has an identical entry. The edition is described in much detail suggesting first-hand knowledge of the book. I believe, therefore, this to be the most probable date for the first published translation of Aristotle's Rhetoric.

[126]A. Firmin-Didot, Alde Munce et l'hellenisme a Venise (Paris, 1875); E. Goldsmith, A Biographical Sketch of the Aldine Press at Venice (Edinburgh, 1887); F. J. Norton, Italian Printers 1501-1520 (London, 1958); E. Robertson, "Aldus Manutius, the Scholar-Printer," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXIII (1950).

[127]Deno John Geanakoplos, Greek Scholars in Venice (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), 227.

## PART II

## A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC


1. Adams, E. W. "Metaphor, Simile and Analogy." London Quarterly Review, CLXIV (1939), 378-80

2. Adkinson, H. M. "The Principles of Arrangement as Developed by Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian and Winans." Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Southern California, 1931.

3. Ahrendts, Harold Lee. "A Rhetorical Perspective Arising From a Study of the Speaking of William Jennings Bryan by Means of a Burkeian and Aristotelian Analysis." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1962.

4. Alcyonio, Petro. Aristotelia Opera Varia Latine. Venetiis, 1521.

5. Alemannus, Hermannus. Aristotelis Rhetorica, cum Alpharabii Declaratione, Poetica, cum Ibinrosdin Determinatione, ex arabico latine redditae ad Hermanno Alemanno. Lancillotus de Zerlis recensuit. Venice: per Phillipum Venetum, 1481

6._____. Alfarabius: Declaratio Compendiosa super libris rhetoricorum Aristotillis [sic]. Venetiis, 1484. (See Nicholas Rescher, Al-Fārābi: An Anotated Bibliography. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1962.)

7._____. Opera Omnia quae latina lingua conscripta. Paris, 1638.

8. Alewell, Karl. Über das rhetorische ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ. Inauguaral Dissertation, Liepzig, 1913.

9. Almarini, Gasparis. Artes rhetoricae viridarium ex Aristotle, Cicerone, Quintiliano & aliis rhetoribus. Venice, 1609.

10. Amirante, L. "Nota minima su Quintiliano, Inst. Ora. 5,6." Labeo, VI (1960), 334-348.

11. Ammon, Andreas Gottfried. Elementa rhetoricae ab A. G. Ammone ed., iterum excusa. Helmestadii: J. Miller, 1675. 72p.

12._____. Elementa rhetoricae ab A. G. Ammone ed. & bono iuventutis excusa quoque. Hannoverae:

1681

13._____. Elementa rhetoricae a cl. viro Andr. Goefr. Ammone excerpta. In lucem denuo ed., ac praeter longiorem praefationem De imitationis necessitate, concisam de III Aristotelis librorum De arte rhetorica usu ac praestantia, et summo per 2000 annos in his aestimandis eruditorum consensu dissertationem praemisit Jacobus Burkhard. Boburgi: Pfotenhauer, 1715. 58p.

14. Ammon, George. "Rhetorik, Buch I. u. II vor, Buch III. der Poetik verfasst." Blätter für das Bayerische Gymnasialwesen, (1900), 20-23.

15. Andeltshauser, A. De primordiis eloquentiae apud Graecos. Prague, 1833. 8p.

16. Anderson, Floyd D. "Aristotle's Doctrine of the Mean and its Relationship to Rhetoric." Southern Speech Journal, XXXIV (1968), 100-07.

17. Angeli, R. C. Tabulae rhetoricae, quibus omnia quae Aristotele tribus, de arte dicendis libris, et a Demetrio Phalero suo de elocutione libello tradita sunt. Venice, 1571.

18. Angermann, Otto. De Aristotele rhetorum auctore. Erstveröffentlichung: Dissertation, Leipzig, 1904. 72p.

19. Anonymous. Aristotelis Rhetorica et Poetica. Basileae ex offician Frobeniana per Hieronymum et Ioannem Hervagium, 1520.

20._____. Aristotelis De Arte libri tres. Basileae, 1529. 156p.

21._____. /Another edition./ Parisiis, 1530.

22._____. /Another edition./ Paris, 1539.

23._____. Aristotelous technes rhetorikes biblia tria. Parisiis, 1538.

24._____. Rhetorica. Chr. Wechel, Paris, 1541.

25._____. Aristotelis De arte dicendi libri 3. Argentorati: Rihelius, 1547.

26._____. Tradottione antica de la Rettorica d'Aristotile, nuovamente trovata. Padova, stamp. per G. Fabriano, 1548.

27. _____. Ἀριστοτέλους Τέχνης Ῥητορικῆς Βιβλία 3. Parisiis, Morelius, 1559. 153p.

28. _____. /Another edition./ Parisiis, 1562. 153p.

29. _____. Td. Liber I Deiprosophislorum Athenaei et Aristoteles Oratio. 1559.

30. _____. /Another edition./ 1562.

31. _____. "Rhetoricorum, artisque poeticae libri omnes," in Opera omnia in partes 7 divisa; nuper ex optimis exemplaribus, cùm Graecis, tùm Lat. recogn.: oc scholiis annotationibus, varietatibusque lectionum recèns illustr.: Tandem libri omnes in rectum scientiarum ordinem redacti. Vol. II Venetiis: ad signum Seminantis, 1572.

32. _____. /Another edition./ Lugduni, 1580.

33. _____. /Another edition./ Coloniae Allobr.: Stoer, 1608.

34. _____. Aristotelis De arte dicendi libri 3. Parisiis: J. Benenatus, 1575.

35._____. Aristotelis libri tres de arte rhetorica. Brixiae, apud Pet. Mariam Marchettum, 1584.

36._____. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum libri 3. Eiusdem De poetica liber 1. Nuperrime recensitis, & summa cura pristino nitori restituti. Parisiis: Libert, 1625.

37._____. /Another edition./ Parisiis: Libert, 1629.

38._____. /Another edition./ 1675.

39._____. /Another edition./ 1685.

40._____. /Another edition./ 1698.

41._____. /Another edition./ 1702.

42._____. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum Liber I. (-III.) 3 tom. I. Libert: Parisiis, 1630.

43._____. De Rhetoricorum Aristotelis sententia et usu. Helmstadii, 1673.

44._____. Aristotelis Stagirite et philosophi oĩm pspica- et oratoris eloquẽtissimi tria rhetori cor volum- ĩa incredibili suaui tate et rhetorice arte vber-

tate insignia; quib pluria splendidissime facultati rhetorice adiumenta atque ornamẽta sub ministrasse cognoscitur (Lat.). Leipzig: J. Thanner, 1679.

45._____. L'Espirit de la Rhetorique d'Aristote, ou methode de l'eloquence expliquee en trois parties. Paris, 1685. 221p.

46._____. Aristotle's Rhetoric; or The True Grounds and Principles of Pleading and Speaking in full Assemblies and Courts of Judicature. Made English by the Translators of the Art of Thinking. London, 1686.

47._____. /Another edition./ London, Reimp, 1693.

48._____. /Another edition./ Oxford, 1816.

49._____. Aristotelis De arte rhetorica libri 3. Cum Lat. versione, & exacta librorum, & capitum divisione. Acc. ind. Ad usum Seminarii Patavini. Patavii, Typographi Seminarii, 1689.

50._____. Ex Aristotelis II. 21 Rhetoricor fabulas Stesichart et Aesopi recepit IO. VPTON in Suam chrestomathiam, inscriptam: ΠΟΙΚΙΑΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ, siue

nouus historiarum fabellorumque delectus cum notis et versione. Londoni, 1701.

51._____. Rhetorica. (Gr. et Lat.) Cambridge, 1726. (See Lee Hultzen, "Aristotle's Rhetoric in England to 1600." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1932. p. 173).

52._____. Rhetoric; or the Principles of Oratory delineated: in which all the branches of that art are considered, and supported by large quotations ... Together with Figura Metrica, or the principal figures of grammar and rhetorik in eighty-four Latin verses ... Being a collection from ... Aristotle, Cicero, etc. London, 1736.

53._____. A new analysis of Aristotle's Rhetoric, arranged under the heads and divisions of the most approved authors. Oxford, n.d. (Between 1759 and 1772?)

54._____. De arte rhetorica libri. (Graece et Latine). Padua, 1786.

55._____. Aristotle, Rhetoric and Poetic; a new translation, by a member of the University. Oxford, 1819.

56._____. /Another edition./ London, 1825.

57._____. /Another edition./ Oxford, 1847.

58._____. Aristotle's Treatise on Rhetoric Literally Translated from the Greek; with Notes by a Graduate of the University; Two which is added, an Analysis of Aristotle's Rhetoric by Thomas Hobbes of Malmsbury. Oxford, 1823.

59._____. /Another edition./ 1833.

60._____. /Another edition./ London, 1847. 384p.

61._____. "de Arte rhetorica, libri III," in Opera optimorum (Ad optimorum librorum) fidem accurate edita. Lipsiae, 1831-32.

62._____. /Another edition./ 1869.

63._____. /Another edition./ Editionis stereotypae C. Tauchnitionae. Nov. impressio. Lipsiae, Sumptibus Ottonis Holtze, 1873.

64._____. /Another edition./ Lipsiae, 1881.

65._____. The Rhetoric of Aristotle, Book I., Chapter I. Whitchurch, Salop, 1840 (?)

66._____. Analysis of Aristotle's Rhetoric, With Questions. Oxford, Vincent. 1832.

67._____. Questions on the Rhetoric of Aristoteles. Oxford, Talboys. 1832. (This entry is not to be confused with No. 66)

68._____. Treatise on rhetoric. A new and literal translation, with notes and analysis. By a graduate in honours. Oxford, C. Richards; London, Whittaker, 1849. 288p.

69._____. El arte de la retorica (Col. Los Fundamentales). Buenos Aires, Eudeba, 1966. 488p.

70. Anton, Hugo Saintaine. "Über die Rhetorik bei Aristoteles in ihrem Verhaltniss zu Platon's Gorgias." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XIV (1859), 570-98.

71. Aphrodisaei, Alexandri. Idem praeclarus Vir Conradus Gesnerus in partitionibus Rhetoricis titulo 2. Aphrodiseao tribuit Commentarium five Scholia Graeca in libros tres Rhetorices Aristotelis, quae initio mutila sine auctoris nomine prodierint Graece. Paris, per Conradum Neoburium, 1538.

72._____. Aristotelis ... Physicorum libri VIII quibus adiecimus omnia illius opera, quae ad naturalem philosophiam spectare videbantur ... Pars secunda. (Libri omnes, quibus tota cunita. -Rhetoricorum, Artisque poeticae libri, atque etiam Problematum sectiones omnes, quibus Alexandri Aphrodisaei omnia Problemata adiucta fuere ... pars sexts.) Lugduni: Junta, 1561.

73._____. /Another edition./ Venetiis, 1572.

74._____. /Another edition./ Venetiis, 1576.

75._____. /Another edition./ Junta, 1579.

76._____. /Another edition./ Junta, 1580.

77._____. /Another edition./ Geneva: I. Berjon, 1580.

78._____. /Another edition./ Venetiis, 1584-96.

79._____. Aristotelis, ... Rhetoricorum Artisque poeticae libri omnes ... -Aristotelis Problematum duodequadraginata sectiones, quibus Alexandri Aphrodisaei Problematum libri adjecti fuere. Lugduni, sumptibus H. Cardon, 1608-1614.

80. Arcoleo, S. "Nota alla Retorica di Aristotele." Paideia, XIX (1964), 173-77.

81. Arndt, E. De ridiculi doctrina rhetorica. Dissertation, Bonn. 1904.

82. Arrighetti, Filippo. La Rettorica & c. tradotta in Lingua Italiana da Filippo Arrighetti, e dal medesimo ipiegata in LVI. Lezioni nell' Accademia Fiorentina, di cui era membro. n.d. (See Biblioteaca degli Volgarizzatori, Edited by Filippo Argelati, Milano: 1767, p. 89.)

83. Atkins, John W. H. "The Development of Rhetorical Theory: Isocrates, Aristotle, and Theophrastus." Literary Criticism in Antiquity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934. 120-163.

84. Aubenque, P. "La definition aristotelicienne de la còlere." Revue Philosophique, CXLVII (1957), 300-17.

85._____. "Aristote et le langage." AFLA, XLIII (1967), 85-105.

86. Averroes. Declaratio compendiosa per viam divisionis

Alpharabii super libris Rhetoricorum Aristotelis, etc. Explicit rhetorica Aristotelis, cu ... Egidii de Roma ... Cōmētariis ... nec nō ejusdē ... poetica cū ... Averroys ad ēade suma novissime recognite .... G. Arrivabenum: Venetiis, 1515.

87._____. Index illorum que in hoc volumine continentur. Libri posteriorum analiticorum, cum magnis commentariis Averroys. Libri thopicorum paraphrases Averroys. Libri elenchorum paraphrases Averroys. Libri rethoricorum paraphrases Averroys. Libri poetice paraphrases Averroys. Quesita logica Averroys & alionum. Liber de demonstratione Abrami de Balmes. Epithoma Averroys omnium librorum logice. Venetiis: de Sabio, 1523.

88._____. Rhetorica Aristotele cum Egidii Romanii commentariis nec no ejusde Ar. poetica cu magni Averroys ad eude suma novissime recognite. Venetiis, 1525.

89._____. De rhetorica, et poetica libri, cum Averrois Cordubensis in eosdem paraphrasibus. in Omnia quae extant opera, nunc primum selectis translationibus collatisque cum graecis emendatissimis exemplaribus, margineis scholiis illustra., &

in novum ordinem digesta. Graecorum, Arabum, & Latinorum monumenta quaedam ad hoc opus spectantia. M. Antonii Zimaral in Aristotelis & Averrois dicta contradictionum solutiones. Jo. Baptistae Baolini labore, ac diligentia. Haec autem omnia tum ex praefatione, tume ex ind. librorum clarius innotescunt. Vol II Venetiis: Juntae, 1550.

90._____. Qui rhetoricorum libros ad artem dicendi attinentes, atque poeticam affect. Etiam eos quos ethicorum vel Nicomachios vocant, cum commen. Averrois paraphrasi. in Omnia Opera Omnia, quae extant, opera, nunc primum selectis translationibus, emendationisbus ex collatione graecorum exemplarium scholiis in margine illustr., novo etiam ordine digesta: Add. praeterea non nullis libris nonquam antea latinitate donatis. Averrois cordubensis in ea opera omnes, qui ad nos pervenere, commentarii. Graecorum, Arabum, et Latinorum monumenta quaedam, ad hoc opus spectantia. Venetiis: Cominus de Tridino, 1560.

91._____. De rhetorica, et poetica libri, cum Averrois in eosdem paraphrasibus. Omnia Quae extant opera. Selectis translationibus, collatisque

cum graecis emendatissimis exemplaribus, illust., prestantissimorumque aetatis nostre philosophorum industria diligentissime recogn. Venetiis: Junctae, 1562.

92._____. /Another edtion./ Venetiis: Junctae, 1574.

93._____. /Another edition./ Frankfurt am Main, Minerva, 1962.

94. Azcárate, D. Patrico, ed. Obras completas de Aristóteles. Puestas en linqua castellana por D. Patricio de Azcárate. Buenos Aires, 1947.

95. Backes, James G. "Aristotle's Theory of Stasis in Forensic and Deliberative Speech in the Rhetoric." Central States Speech Journal, XII (1960), 6-8.

96. Badawī, Abdurrahmān. Aristotelis Rhetorica, in verione Arabica Vetusta. Cahirae, 1959.

97. Balcer, Charles. "The Vocal Aspect of Delivery Traced through Representative Works in Rhetoric and Public Speaking - Aristotle to Rush." Central States Speech Journal, XI (1959), 27-34.

98. Baldwin, Charles Sears. "The Rhetoric of Aristotle." Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic. New York: The

MacMillan Company, 1924. 6-36.

99._____. Reprinted by Peter Smith, Gloucester, Massachusettes. 1959.

100. Barbaro, Hermolao. Rhetoricorum libri 3, interprete Hermolao Barbaro. Commentario in eosdem Danielis Barbari. Pauli Gerardi opera. Venetiis: Cominus de Tridino, 1544. 202p.

101._____. Danielis Barbari in tres libros Rhetoricorum Aristotelis commentaria. Trans. by Ermolao Barbaro. Lyons, Sebastian Gryphius, 1544.

102._____. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum libri tres, Hermolao Barbaro patricio Veneto interprete. Danielis Barbari in eosdem libros commentarij. Basileae, 1545. 679p.

103._____. /Another edition./ Venetiis, 1558.

104._____. Rhetoricorum Aristotelis libri tres, interprete Hermolao Barbaro p.v. Quae deprauata plerisq; in locis errant, adhibita nuperrimè non mediocri diligentia in gratiam studiosorum castigationa reddita sunt. Lugduni, apud Theobaldum Paganum, 1548. 391p.

105. _____. Aristotelis de arte dicendi libri tres ... a P. Victorio correcti ... Iidem Latinitate donati per H. Barbarũ. Parisiis, apud Vascosanum, 1549. 131p.

106. _____. De arte dicendi ... (libri tres). Hermolai Barbari eorundem versio, cum graeco textu, capitibus suis distincto et figuris Aristotelicam methodum indicantibus illustrato. Voir Borrhau (Martin). In tres Aristotelis de Arte dicendi libros commentaria. Basileae, 1551.

107. _____. /Another edition./ 1555.

108. _____. /Another edition./ 1559.

109. _____. De arte dicendi libri 3. Hermolao Barbaro interprete. Observationes quibus in locis interpres a Graecis euariaveit. Parisiis: Morelius, 1559. 147p.

110. _____. /Another edition./ 1565.

111. _____. /Another edition./ Rostock, 1577.

112. _____. /Another edition./ Venetiis, 1624.

113._____. /Another edition./ Rostock, 1634.

114. Barner Wilfried. Barockrhetorik, untersuchungen zu ihren geschuhtliches Grundlagen. Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1970.

115. Barthelemy-Saint-Hilaire, J. Rhétorique, traduite en Francais et accompognée de notes pérpetuelles avec la Rhétorique à Alexandre (apocryphe) et un appendica sur l'enthyméme. Paris, 1870.

116._____. "Rhetorique." Œuvres d'Aristote. Paris; Ladrange, 1870. xvii - xviii.

117. Barthes, Roland. "L'ancienne Rhétorique." Communications, XVI (1970), 172-229.

118. Barwick, Karl. "Die Gliederung der Rhetorischen TEXNH und die Horazische Epistuala ad Pisones." Hermes, LVII (1922), 1-62.

119._____. "Probleme der stoischen Sprachlehre und Rhetorik." Abhandlungen der Sächischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, XLIX (1957, iii.

120._____. "Die 'Rhetorik ad Alexandrum' und Anaxmenes, Alkidama, Isokrates, Aristoteles und Theodek-

teia." Philologus, CX (1966), 212-45; CXI (1967), 47-55.

121. Battie, William. Aristotelis de Rhetorica seu arte dicendi libri tres, Graeco - Latine. Contextu graeco ad exemplaria selectiora emendato; latino paraphrasi, vbi opus intertexto: vtroque in sectiones distincto. Appositis locis auctoris, ex ipso citatis vel ἐκ παραλλήλου fimilibus, cum methodo analytica. Huic editioni accessere notae quaedam e VICTORII, MAIORAGII ac FABII PAVLININI commentariis selectae: (singulis libris suiectae) variae lectiones; (ex edit. Morel et Basil.) indexque rerum memorabilium. (editore GVL. BATTIE, COLL. Regal. Cantab. Soc.) Cantabrigiae typis academicis, sumptibus Gul. Thurlbourn Bibliopol. Cantabr. Prostant apud Iac. et Ioh. Knapton, R. Knaplock, I. Groenewegen et N. Prevost Bibliopolas Londinenses, 1728. 585p.

122. Bauduyn, Andre de la Neufville. La Rhétorique Royal d'Aristote, traduite de Grec en Francois. Paris, 1669. 144p.

123. Baumhauer, M M. v. Disquisitio critica de Aristotelis vi in Ciceronis scriptis. Traiecti ad Rhenum, 1841.

124. Beard, Raymond Standish. "A Survey of the Theories and Trends in Cross Examination from Ancient Times to Modern." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1954.

125. Bekker, Immanuel and C. Brandis, eds. Aristotelis Opera. Edidit Academia Regia Borussica, 5 Vols. Berlin, 1831-70.

126._____. Rhetorica et poetica, ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri iterum seorsim editae. Berolini: G. Reimer, 1831. 206p.

127._____. /Another edition./ Berolini: Reimeri, 1843.

128._____. /Another edition./ Berolini, typis et impensis G. Reimeri, 1859. 206p.

129._____. /Another edition./ Rhetorica et poetica, ab Immanuele Bekkero a 1859 tertium editae, nunc iterartae. Berolini, 1873. 206p.

130._____. Aristotelis de Rhetorica libri III; de Rhetorica ad Alexandrum; de Poetica. in Opera Omnia ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri. Oxonii, e typographeo academico, 1837.

131._____. Opera, ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri, eddit Academia Regia Borussica Accedurt fragmenta, scholia, index Aristotelicus. Ed. altera, addendis instruxit fragmentorum collectionem retractavit Olof Gigon. Berolini, W. de Gruyter, 1960.

132. Bellin, A. G. Exposition des idées de Platon et d'Aristote, sur la nature et l'origine du langage, etc. 1842.

133. Bénard, Charles. "Les Rhéteurs." L'esthétique d'Aristote. Extrâct du Compte rendu des séance et travaux de l'Académie des Sciences morales et Politiques. CXXIX (1888), 422-450.

134. Bennett, Owen. "The Nature of Demonstrative Proof According to the Principles of Aristotle." Catholic University of America, Philosophical Studies. Vol. 75, 1943.

135. Benoit, Ch. "La grade Rhétor, d'Aristote les caracteres généraux." Essai historique sur les premiers manuels d'invention oratoire jusqu'à Aristote. Parigi, 1846.

136. Benson, Frank Thomas. "A Comparitive Analysis of George

Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1962. 413p.

137._____. and Michael H. Prosser. Readings in Classical Rhetoric. Boston, 1969.

138. Benvoglienti, Fabio. Discorso di Fabio Benvoglienti sopra la materia degli Affetti per dichiarazione del libro III della Rettorica d'Aristotile. Siena pel Bonetti, 1579. (See Biblioteca Italiana, N. F. H. Romano, Milano, 1773, p.488)

139. Bernardi, Ant. Mirandulani Casertae episcopi, etc., in librum Rhet. Aristoteles explicatio. Cui additum est in Aristoteles Rhetoricam prooemium universale, nec non in Cap. 1 et 2. lib I. Rhet. Aristoteles expositio. Bononiae, apud Mich. Berniam, 1590.

140._____. Antonii Bernardi ... In tertium librum Rhet. Aristotelis egregia explicatio. Cui additum est in Arist. Rhetoricam Prooemium universale, necnon in Cap. I. & II. lib. I. Rhet. Arist. expositio. Apud V. Benalium, Bononiae, 1595.

141. Bernhardt, E. Begriff und Grundform der griech. Periode. Wiesbad, 1854.

142. Bevan, Edwyn. "Rhetoric in the Ancient World." Essays in Honour of Gilbert Murray. London, 1936. 186-213.

143. Bigone, E. L'Aristotele Perduto e la Formazione Filosofica di Epicuro. Vol. II, 1936.

144. Bird, Otto. "The Tradition of the Logical Topics: From Aristotle to Ockham." Journal of the History of Ideas, XXIII (1962), 307-323.

145. Bitzer, Lloyd. "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (1959), 399-408.

146. Black, Edwin Benjamin. "Method in Rhetorical Criticism." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1962.

147._____. "Aristotle and Rhetorical Criticism." Rhetorical Criticism, A Study in Method. New York, 1965. 91-131.

148. Blass, F. W. Die Attische Beredsamkeit I-III. Leipzig, 1887 (-98).

149. Blóm, S. "Concerning a Controversy on the Meaning of Probability." Theoria, XXI (1955), 65-98.

150. Bock, F. "Aristotelis rhetoricam observationes criticae." Philologisch-historische Beiträge. Geburtstage überreicht. Leipzig, (1897), 199-207.

151. Boggess, William F. "Hermannus Alemannus' Rhetorical Translations." Viator, 2 (1970).

152._____. "Alfarabi and the Rhetoric: The Cave Revisited." Phronesis, XV (1970), 86-90.

153. Boissier, G. L'introduction de la rhetorique grecque à Rome. Mélanges Perrot, Paris, 1903.

154. Bonafous, Norbert-Alexandre. La Rhétorique d'Aristote trad. en francais avec le texte en regard et suivie de notes philologiques et litteraires, par Norbert-Alexandre Bonafous. Paris, 1856.

155. Bonitz, H. Index Aristotelicus. Berlin, 1870.

156. Bontoux, M. Aristotelis el Ciceronis principia rhetorica inter sese invicem comparata. Paris, 1840.

157. Bossuet, Jacque B. "Rhetorica I." Platon et Aristote. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck. 178-89.

158. Bounel. De partitione generum eloquentiae apud antiquos, prasertim apud Aristote et Ciceronem. Paris, 1850.

159. Bourgey, L. Observatione et experience chez Aristote. Paris, 1955. 10-33.

160. Boyancé, P. "la Rhétorique dans L'humanisme Latin." L'Information litteraire, II (1950), 19-24.

161. Brake, Robert J. "Classical Conceptions of Places: A Study in Invention." Unpublished dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964.

162._____. "The Substance of Rhetoric: Good Reasons: Aristotle Re-examined." Quarterly Journal of Speech, L (1964), 184-85.

163._____. "A Reconsideration of Aristotle's Conception of Topics." Central States Speech Journal, XVI (1965), 106-112.

164._____. "Aristotle on Pleasure." The Southern Speech Journal, XXXVI (1971), 324-332.

165. Branca, Vittore, ed. Ermolao Barbaro, Epistolae, Orationes et Carmina. Liberia Editrice, Vol. 1 (1943), 101-09.

166. Brandes, Paul. "Aristotle for the Undergraduate." Southern Speech Journal, XIV (1949), 264-69.

167._____. "The Composition and Preservation of Aristotle's Rhetoric." Speech Monographs, XXXV (1968), 482-91.

168._____. "Evidence in Aristotle's Rhetoric." Speech Monographs, XXVIII (1961),21-28.

169. Brandis, Chsti. "Ueber Aristoteles' Rhetorik u. die griech. Ausleger derselben," Philologus, 4 (1849), 1-47.

170._____. Handbuch der Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Philosophie. Berlin: Reimer, 1860.

171. Brandt, William J. "The Theory of Classical Rhetoric According to Aristotle." The Rhetoric of Argumentation. Indianapolis, Indiana: The Bobbs-Merril Company, Inc. 1970.

172. Braun, Edmund. Zur Einheit der aristotelischen Topik.

Dissertation, University of Köln, 1959.

173. Bredow, G. G. "Proben einer Deutschen Ubersetzung der Rhetorik Des Aristoteles." Berliner Monatschrift, (April, 1796), 363-385.

174. Breen, Quirinus. "The Correspondence of G. Pico della Mirandola on the Conflict of Philosophy and Rhetoric." Journal of the History of Ideas, XIII (1952), 348-412.

175. Breitenbach, H. P. "The De Compositione of Dionysius of Hallicarnassus Considered With Reference to the Rhetoric of Aristotle." Classical Philology, VI (1911), 163-179.

176._____. The De Compositione of Dionysius of Hallicarnassus Considered With Reference to the Rhetoric of Arisotle. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1911. 179p.

177. Brentlinger, Browck W. "The Aristotelian Conception of Truth in Rhetorical Discourse." Unpublished Ph.D. disseration, University of Illinois, 1959.

178. Brenton, N. De la rhétorique selon les préceptes

d'Aristote, de Cicéron et de Quintilien. Paris, 1703. (See Hugh Davidson, Audience, Words, and Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century French Rhetoric. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1965. p. 179.)

179. Brisca-Menapace, L. "La Rettorica di Francesco Patrizio o del Platonismo Anti-Aristotelico." Siculorum Gymnasium, V (1952), 434-61.

180. Brittin, Marie. "Concepts of Evidence in Rhetoric." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1949.

181. Brocardus, Jacobus. Partitiones oratoriae, quibus rhetorica Omnia Aristotelis praecepta breviter et dilucide explicantur. Venice, 1558.

182._____. Paraphrasis in libros Aristote de arte dicendi. Parisiis, 1558.

183._____. In libros Aristotelis de arte rhetorica paraphrasis, a Jac. Brocardo. Parisiis, apud Jacobum Dupuys, 1560 (?) 376p.

184. Brockreide, Wayne. "Toward a Contemporary Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (1966), 33-40.

185. Brooks, George Edward. "A Rhetorical Comparison of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt Based Upon Aristotelian Criteria." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1945.

186. Brown, Hazel Louise. "Aristotle's Rhetoric." Extemporary Speech in Antiquity. Collegiate Press, University of Chicago, 1914. 42-45.

187. Bruni, Gerardo. "De differentia rhetoricae ethicae, et politicae." The New Scholasticism, VI (1932), 1-18.

188. Brunschwig, J. Aristote, Topiques. Paris: Société d'Édition "les Belles Lettres," (1967), xcvi-ciii.

189. Brunton, M. E. "Invention, as Developed by Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian." Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Southern California, 1931.

190. Bryant, Donald C. "Aspects of the Rhetorical Tradition: The Intellectual Foundation." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVI (1950), 169-76.

191. Bucheit, Vinzenz. Untersuchungen zur Theories des

'Genos epideiktikon' von Gorgias bis Aristoteles. München, 1960. 260p.

192. Buckley, Theodore. Aristotle's Treatise on Rhetoric literally translated from the Greek, with copious notes. An analysis of Aristotle's Aristotle's Rhetoric ( A Brief of the art of rhetorick), by Thomas Hobbes. Analytical Questions on Aristotle's Rhetoric. Throughly corrected with additions and improvements. Oxford: Talboys, 1833. 373p.

193._____. /Another edition./ London: H. G. Bohn, 1847.

194._____. Aristotle's treatise on rhetoric literally translated from the Greek. With an analysis by Thomas Hobbes, and a series of Questions. New edition, to which is added a supplementary analysis of Greek definitions. London: H. G. Bohn, 1850. 500p.

195._____. /Reprinted./ 1851.

196._____. /Another edition./ London, 1853.

197._____. /Reprinted./ 1857

198._____. /Another edition./ London, Bell and Daldy. 1869.

199._____. /Reprinted./ 1872.

200._____. /Reprinted./ 1878.

201._____. /Reprinted./ 1880.

202._____. /Reprinted./ 1883.

203._____. /Reprinted./ 1888.

204._____. /Reprinted./ 1890.

205._____. /Another edition./ London, 1894.

206._____. /Reprinted./ 1900.

207._____. /Reprinted./ 1903.

208._____. /Reprinted./ 1906.

209._____. /Reprinted./ 1910.

210._____. /Reprinted./ 1914.

211. Buhle, J. G. Organon, la Rhétorique et la Poétique. in

Opera omnia graece ad optimorum exemplarium fidem recensuit, annotationem criticam, librorum argumenta et novam versionem latinam adiecit Io. Biponti. Ex typographia societatis, 1791.

212._____. Rhetorica, gr. et lat. ex editione Theod. Goulston, cum variantibus lectionibus editionis Buhle. Oxonii, typographia Clarendae, 1805.

213._____. /Another edition./ 1809.

214._____. Aristotelis De rhetorica libri tres, etc. (Praefatio I. T. Buhli. -I.T. Buhlii Argumentum librorum Aristotelis de rhetorica.) 1820.

215._____. I. T. Buhlii Argumentum librorum Aristotelis de rhetorica. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1826.

216._____. /Another eidtion./ E Typographeo Academico: Oxonii, 1833.

217. Burgess, Parke Gillette. "A Concept of Social Responsibility in Rhetoric." Unpublished Ph.D.

dissertation, Northwestern University, 1956.

218. Burgess, Theodore. Epideictic Literature. University of Chicago, 1902.

219._____. "Epideictic Literature." Studies in Classical Philology, III (1902), 89-261.

220. Burke, Richard J. "Aristotle on the Limits of Argument." Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, XXVII (1967), 386-400.

221. Burke, Kenneth. "Rhetoric Old and New." The Journal of General Education, V (April, 1951), 203-05.

222._____. "Rhetoric and Poetics." Language as Symbolic Action. Berkeley, Calfifornia: University of California Press, 1966. 295-307.

223. Burkes, Don. "Psychological Egoism and the Rhetorical Tradition." Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1961), 400-418.

224. Burrell, David B. "Analogy and Philosophical Language." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1965.

225. Byars, William Vincent. "Aristotle." The Handbook of Oratory. Chicago: F. P. Kaiser, 1901. 25-46.

226. Bywater, Ingram. "Aristotelia III V." Journal of Philology, XVIII (1889), 53-74; XXVIII (1903), 241-53; XXXII (1913), 137-65.

227. Cairns, H. Legal Philosophy from Plato to Hegel. Baltimore, 1949.

228. Calhoun, G. Introduction to Greek Legal Science. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1944.

229. Camotius, J. Battista, ed. Ἀριστοτέλους Πασαν λογικην ῥητορικην και ποιητικην πραγματειαν περιεχων τομος α΄. Aristotelis omnem logicam, rhetoricam et poeticam disciplinam continens. Aristotelis Opera Omnia graece (ed. Io. Baptista Camotius). Venetiis, 1551-53.

230. Cantor, Norman F., and Peter L. Klein. Ancient Thought: Plato and Aristotle. Waltham, Massachusettes, 1969. 194p.

231. Caplan, Harry. Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Medieval Rhetoric. Cornell University Press, 1966.

232. Caro, Giovannia Battista, ed. Rettorica d'Aristotile fatta in lingua Toscana dal Commendatore Annibal Caro. Venetia: Al segno della salamandra, 1570. 270p.

233._____. /Another edition./ 1643.

234._____. /Another edition./ Operum graecorum, latinorum & italorum rhetorum tomus primus. 1644

235._____. Rettorica d'Aristotile fatta in lingua Toscana dal Commendatore A. Caro; accresciuta d'una prefazione dottor B. Schiavo. Venezia, 1732.

236._____. /Another edition./ Rettorica d'Aristotile fatta in lingua Toscana dal commendatore Annibal Caro. Ed. noviisima con somma diligenza emendata. Venezia, Nella stamperia Remondini, 1757. 218p.

237._____. La rettorica d'Aristotile, fatta in lingua Toscana dal Commendatore Annibal Caro, libri 3. Ed. rivedutta e corr. sui migliori esemplari cul s'aggiunge l'Introduzione allo studio della medesima (Intraduttione ridotta poi in Alcune tavole sopra i tre libri della Rhetorica di Aristotile) di Giason de Nores. Milano: Rusconi, 1826. 334p.

238._____. La rettorica d'Aristotile, trad. dal Commendatore Annibal Caro, libri 3. Milano: Bettoni, 1827.

239._____. La rettorica d'Aristotile, fatta in lingua Toscana dal Commendatore Annibal Caro, libri 3. Ed. riveduta e corr. sui migliori esemplari, cui s'aggiunge l'Introduzione allo studio della medesima (Introduttione ridotta poi in Alcune tavole sopra i tre libri della Rhetorica di Aristotile) di Giason de Nores. Milano: Silvestri, 1831. 334p.

240._____. Della Rettorica di Aristotile fatta Italiana dal Annibal Caro. Testo di lingua. Commento di Francesco Mastelloni. Firenze, 1898.

241. Carpentarium, Jacobum. Aristotelis Ars Disserendi ex comparatione omnium interpretum et accurata observatione sententiae de integro Latina facta per Ja. Capentarium. Paris, ex typ. Th. Brumennii, 1567.

242._____. /Another edition./ 1572.

243._____. /Another edition./ 1578.

244. Carpenter, Ronald H. "The Essential Schemes of Syntax: An Analysis of Rhetorical Theory's Recommendations for Uncommon Word Orders." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LV (1969), 161-68.

245. Carrino, Elnora M. "Conceptions of Dispositio in Ancient Rhetoric." Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, 1959.

246. Cartwright, George W. "Modern Homiletics and the Aristotelian Tradition of Rhetoric." Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Illinois, 1948.

247. Casaubon, Issac. De arte rhetorica. Lugduni, 1590.

248._____. /Another edition./ 1619.

249._____. Ethica Nicomachea. Magna Moralia. Ethica Eudemia. De virtutibus. De republica. Vita K. Strazae. Strazae de republica. De cura rei familiaris. Ars rhetorica. Rhetorica ad Alexandrum. De poetica. Problematum sectiones. Metaphysica. De platis. in Operum Aristotelis ... nova editio graece et latine. Lyons, 1590.

250._____. /Another edition./ Geneva, 1605.

251._____. /Another edition./ Geneva, 1646.

252._____. Aristotelis Opera; nova editio, graece et latine; latinae ... interpretationes graeco contentu convenientiores. Geneva, 1597.

253._____. /Another edition./ 1602.

254._____. /Another edition./ 1606-07.

255. Caselii, Joannis. Rhetoricorum liber primus. Cum prooemio Joannis Caselii. Vitebergae: Crato, 1564.

256._____. Explanatio hoci rhetoricorum Aristoteles. Rostocchii, 1571.

257._____. Aristotelis De arte dicendi libri 3, Opera & Studio Joannis Caselii, quam emendatissime ed., & quam diligentissimè corr., iuxta eam, quae una omnibus ceteris praestat, editionem Petri Victorii, qui exemplaribus & pluribus, et vetustissimus, & optimis usus fuit. Rostochii: Lucius, 1577. 256p.

258. Cassandre, Francois. La Rhetorique d'Aristote en Francois, nouvelle par F. Cassandre. Paris, 1654.

259._____. /Another edition./ Amsterdam, 1675.

260._____. /Another edition./ Amsterdam, 1698.

261._____. /Another edition./ La Haye, 1718.

262._____. /Another edition./ Amsterdam, J. Covens & C. Mortier, 1733.

263._____. La Rhetorique d'Aristote fidelement traduite en Francois, par Cassandre. Paris, E. Loyson, 1672.

264._____. La Rhétorique d'Aristote en Francois. Traduction nouvelle. (Übers.: F. Cassandre.) Paris: Chez D. Thierry, 1675.

265._____. /Another edition./ Lyon: Molin, 1691.

266._____. La Rhétorique d'Aristote trad. en francois avec le texte regard, accomp. de not. phil. et litt. Paris, 1856.

267. Castellani, Giorgio. "Giorgio da Trebisonda Maestro di Eloquenza a Vicenza e a Venezia." Nuovo Archivio Veneto, XI (1896), 123-42.

268. Catanio, Roco. La Rettorica d'Aristotile tradotta dal Brucioli con la Sposizione di Roco Catanio. Venezia pel Trojano, 1545.

269. Champier, S. Libri VII de Dialectica, Rhetorica, Geometria, Arithmetic, Astronomica, Musica, Philosophia naturalis, Medicina et theologia, ... Haec omnia sunt tractata ex Aristotelis et Platonis sententia. Basileae, 1537.

270. Chase, Richard. "The Classical Conception of Epideictic." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVII (1961), 293-300.

271. Charpin, F. "Coniunctiones Causales et rationales." Revue des Études Latines, XLIII (1965), 396-405.

272. Cherniss, Harold. Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1944.

273._____. Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1935.

274. Christ, W. v. Griechische Litteraturgeschichte. Leipzig, 1866.

275. Chroust, Anton-Hermann. "Aristotle's Earliest Course of Lectures on Rhetoric." L'Antiquité Classique, XXXIII (1964), 58-72.

276._____. "Aristotle's First Literary Effort: The Gryllus, A Lost Dialogue on the Nature of Rhetoric." Revue des Études Grecques, LXXVIII (1965), 576-91.

277._____. "The Probable Dates of Some of Aristotle's Lost Works." Rivista Critica di Storia della Filosofia, XXII (1967), 3-23.

278. Chrytaeus, Nathan. ἠθη καὶ πάθη seu de affectibus mouendis, Aristotelis ex II, Rhetoricorum doctrina, accuratè & perspicuè explicata in Academia Rostochiana. Herbonnae, 1586. 152p.

279. Church, David A., and Robert S. Cathcart. "Some Concepts of the Epicheireme in Greek and Roman Rhetoric." Western Speech, XXIX (1965), 140-47.

280. Cima, Antonio. "Un passo di Aristotele (Rhet. I, 13)." Bolletino di Filologia Classica, III (1896-97), 211.

281. Clark, Donald L. Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance. New York: Columbia University Press, 1922.

282._____. /Another edition./ Russell & Russell, 1963.

283._____. "Ancient Rhetoric and English Renaissance Literature." Shakespeare Quarterly, XI (1951), 195-205.

284._____. Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

285. Clavel, V. De M. T. Cícerone Graecorum interprete. Paris, 1868.

286. Cohoon, J. W. "Aristotle's Rhetorical Theory." Rhetorical Studies in the Arbitration Scene of M's Epitrepontes. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1915. 145-54.

287. Cole, T., and H. K. Chinoy, eds. "Management of the Voice; Excerpts from the Rhetoric." Actors on Acting. New York: Crown Publishers, 1954.

288. Cooper, Bernarr. "Radio Broadcasting to Chinese and Korean POW's: A Rhetorical Analysis." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1957.

289. Cooper, Lane. "Aristotle: from the Rhetoric." Theories of Style. New York: MacMillan Company, 1907. 52-96.

290._____. /Another edition./ 1912.

291._____. "A Pun in the Rhetoric of Aristotle." American Journal of Philology, XLI (1920), 48-56.

292._____. "The Climax (Rhet. 1.7 1365a 16-19)." The Sewanee Review, XXXII (1924), 32-43.

293._____. "Ross on Aristotle." Classical Weekly, XVIII (1925), 180.

294._____. "The Oxford Translation of Aristotle." American Journal of Philology, XLVI (1925), 190-02.

295._____. "Haemon and Jocasta Advising (Rhet. 3.16 1417b 16-20)." American Journal of Philology, L (1929), 170-80.

296._____. The Rhetoric of Aristotle, An Expanded Translation with Supplementary Examples for Students of Composition and Public Speaking. New York: Appleton-Centruy-Crofts, 1932.

(passages reprinted in: Keith V. Erickson, ed. Communicative Rhetoric: A Workbook. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1968; Howard H. Martin and Kenneth E. Andersen, eds. Speech Communication: Analysis and Readings. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1968; Haig A. Bosmajian, ed. Readings in Speech. New York: Harper & Row, 1965; Dudley Bailey, ed. Essays on Rhetoric. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965; Jerry M. Anderson and Paul J. Dovre, eds. Readings in Argumentation. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1968.)

297._____. /Another edition./ 1957.

298._____. /Another edition./ 1960.

299._____. "The Rhetoric of Aristotle." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXI (1935), 10-19.

300._____. "The Verbal Ornament." Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard. Edited by Leslie Webber Jones. New York, 1938. 61-77.

301._____. Aristotelian Papers, Revised and Reprinted

by Lane Cooper. Cornell University Press, 1939. 235p.

302._____. "Rhetoric, Book III, Ch. I-XII." Art of the Writer. Cornell University Press, 1952. 45-82.

303._____. "An Aristotelian Analysis of the Gettysburg Address." The Problem of Style. Edited by J. V. Cunningham. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publications, 1966. 241-43.

304._____. "What Rhetoric is." Rhetoric. Edited by Richard Larson. Indianapolis, Indiana: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1968. 14-17; 32-34.

305. Cope, Edward M. "The Sophists." The Journal of Classi- and Sacred Philology, I (1854), 145-88; II (1885), 129-69; III (1856), 34-81; 253-89.

306._____. An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric With Analysis, Notes and Appendices. London: MacMillan and Co., 1867. 464p.

307._____. /Another edition./ Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co. Reprint Library, 1966.

308._____. Rhetoric (Gr.) with a Commentary by the Late Edward Meredith Cope. Revised and ed. for the Syndics of the University Press. Edited by John E. Sandys. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1877. 3 Vols.

309._____. /Another edition./ Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co. Reprint Library, 1966.

310._____. An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric. Edited by Ray Nadeau. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press. (In press)

311. Corbett, Edward P. J. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

312._____. Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969. 272p.

313. Cornford, F. M. "Hermes, Pan Logos (Rhet. II, 24, 1401a12)." Classical Quarterly, III (1909), 281-84.

314. Corder, Jim W. Uses of Rhetoric. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1971.

315. Coulter, James A. "Περὶ ὕψους 3.3-4 and Aristotle's Theory of the Mean." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, V (1964), 197-214.

316. Cousin, Jean. Études sur Quintilien. Amsterdam, 1967.

317. Crabalza, Cio. "Origine delia critica classica, La rettorica umanistica." Storia dei Gereri Letterari Italiana, II (1915), 1-38.

318. Craig, Hardin. The Enchanted Glass, The Elizabethan Mind in Literature. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960. 170-74.

319. Crane, William G. Wit & Rhetoric in the Renaissance: The Formal Basis of Elizabethan Prose Style. New York, 1937.

320. Cranmer, J. A. Σχόλια τοῦ Κυρίου Σεκιάνου εἰς Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνη ὁητορική. in Anecdota Graeca e codd. Mss. Bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis. Edidit J. A. Cranmer. Oxonii, 1839. 245-312.

321. Crem, Theresa M. "The Definition of Rhetoric According to Aristotle." Laval Théologique et Philosophique, XII (1956), 233-50.

322. Crimmin, Daniel Michael. A dissertation upon rhetoric, tr. from the Greek of Aristotle. London: Printed for J. J. Stockdale, 1811. 476p.

323._____. /Another edition./ 1812.

324._____. /Another edition./ 1816.

325._____. /Another edition./ A dissertation on rhetoric, tr. from the Greek of Aristotle: with notes. 3rd ed., corr. and greatly extended to which is prefixed, A compendium of Logic by the Rev. Julius Picquot. London: J. J. Stockdale, 1818.

326. Croce, Benedetto. "Rhetoric: or the Theory of Ornate Forms." Aesthetic: As Science of Expression and General Linguistic. Translated by Douglas Ainslie. New York: Noonday Press, 1960. (1909). 422-36.

327._____. "I trattatisti Italiani del concettismo e Baltasar Gracián." Problema di estetica e contributi alla storia dell' estetica Italiana. Bari, 1923. 313-48.

328. Croissant-Goedert, J. "La Classification des Sciences

et las Place de las Rhetorique dans L'oeuvre d'Aristote." Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Philosophy, XIV (1953), 269-75.

329. Cronkite, Gary L. "The Enthymeme as Deductive Rhetorical Argument." Western Speech, XXXII (1966), 129-34.

330. Crusius, O. Die Anagnostikoi: (Rhet. III, 12) Festschrift. 381-87.

331. Cunningham, J. V., ed. "On Prose Style, from the Rhetoric." The Problem of Style. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, 1966. 67-91.

332. Curtius, E. R. "Antike Rhetorik und vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft." Comparative Literature, I (1949), 24-43.

333. Cyllenius, R. A. Tabulae rhetoricae, seu Aristotelicarum partitionum, libri tres. Venice, 1571.

334. Dale, A. M. "Ethos and Dianoia in the Poetics." Proceedings of the London Classical Society, No. 1 (October, 1947 - May, 1952).

335._____. "Ethos and Dianoia: In the Poetics." Jour-

nal of Australian Universities Language and Literature Association, IV (1959), 3-16.

336. D'Aostino, V. "Leggendo: A Reply," Rivista di Studi Classici, VII (1959), 79-81.

337. Daneau, G. O. M. I. Les Passions dans la Rhétorique d'Aristote. Ottawa, 1948. 381p.

338. Dannhauer, Johann Conrad. "De ΠΛΘΟΛΓΙΛ Affectum Doctina." Epitome Rhetorica. 1651. 62-69.

339. Daube, D. "A Rhetorical Principle in the Gospels." Expository Times, LIV (1942-43), 305-06.

340. Davidson, Hugh M. Audience, Words and Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Rhetoric. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1965.

341. Dearin, Ray. "Aristotle on Psychology and Rhetoric." Central States Speech Journal, 17 (1966), 277-82.

342. Decolonia, D. De Arte rhetorica libri quinque. Martriti, 1867.

343. Dehlen, A. Die Theories des Aristotles und die

tragödie der antiken, Christlichen; naturwissenschaftlichen Weltanschauung. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1885. 124p.

344. Deinhardt, J. H. Beiträge zur Dispositionslehre. 1858. 52p.

345. Delaney, Howard. "The Doctrine of Four Term Analogy in Aristotle." Unpublished dissertation, St. Louis University, 1958-59. 222p.

346. Deman, Th. Témoignage D'Aristote sur Socrate. Paris: Societé D'Édition, "Les Belles Lettres," 1942.

347. Denniston, John Dewar. "Notes on the Rhetoric." Greek Litterary Criticism. London: Dent & Co., 1924. 136-44.

348. Denores, Jason. Introduttion ridotta poi in ... sopra itra libri Della Rhetorica di Aristotelis. Venetia, 1578.

349. De Quincey, Thomas. "Aristotle's View of Rhetoric." and "Rhetoric." Blackwoods Magazine, (April, 1829); reprinted in Essays on Style, Rhetoric, and Language. Edited by Fred N. Scott. Boston, 1893. 140-46.

350. Devogel, C. J. "The Rhetoric of Aristotle." Greek Philosophy. 3rd ed., Vol. II. Leiden, Netherlands, 1953 (1967). 217-224.

351. Dick, Robert. "Topoi - An Approach to Inventing Arguments." Speech Teacher, XIII (1964), 313-19.

352. Di Cnido, Eudosso. "Aristotele e la nascita della logica formale." Filosofia, XVIII (1967), 393-406.

353. Diels, Herman. "Ueber das dritte Buch der aristotelischen Rhetorik." Abhandlungen der Akademie Wissenschaft, IV (1886), 1-37.

354. Dieter, Otto Alvin Loeb. "Stasis." Speech Monographs, XVII (1950), 345-69.

355. Dirlmeier, Franz. "Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Aristoteles-Forschung." Wiener Studien, LXXVI (1963), 52-67.

356. Dittmeyer, A. L. "Neue Beiträge zur lateinischen Übersetzung der pseudo-aristotelischen Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum." Bayerische Blätter für das Gymnasialschulwesen, LXX (1934), 166-72.

357._____. Quae ratio inter vetustam Aristotelis Rhetor-

icorum translationem et Graecos codices intercedat. Dissertation, Monachii. 1883.

358. Dobree, Peter Paul. "Notae ad Aristotelis artem poeticam et rhetoricam." Aversaria et Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense, and Miscellaneous Notes on Inscriptions. Edited by Joacobo Scholefield. Londini: Cantabrigiae, 1832.

359._____. /Another edition./ 1837.

360._____. /Another edition./ 1875.

361. Dodd, Mary C. "Rhetorics in Molesworth's Edition of Hobbes Abstract of Aristotle's Rhetoric." Modern Philology, L (1952), 36-52.

362. Donnelly, Francis P., S. J. "Ancient Rhetoric and Modern Practice." Eastern Public Speaking Conference. Edited by Harold F. Harding. New York, 1940. 183-90.

363. Dorolle, Maurice. "L'Analogie chez Aristote." Le Raisonnement par Analogie. Presses Universtaires De France, Paris. 1949. 1-17.

364. Douglas, A. E. "The Aristotelian Συναγωγὴ Τεχνῶν After Cicero, Brutus 46-8," Latomus, XIV

(1955), 536-539.

365. Dottanius, Georgius. Tria rhetoricorum volumina. Übers Guilelmus de Morbeca. Mit Beigaben von Georgius Dottanius. Leipzig: Jakob Thanner, 1499.

366. Downs, Robert Bingham. "Rhetoric." Famous Books Ancient and Medieval. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1964. 125-27.

367. Dransfield, J. A. Epistolographia, seu ratio epistolas Latinas accurate scribendi a ... Erasmo Roterodamo, J. Lipsic et C. Shradero diversis operibus olim descripta. Item Rhetorica Aristotelis ad Epistolographiam accomodata studio et cura J. A. Dransfield. Osterod, 1692.

368. Düebner, Friedrich. Organon, rhetoricen, poeticen, politica. in Aristotelis Opera Omnia. Graece et Lat. cum ind. nominum et rerum absolutissimo. Parisiis: Firmin Didot, 1848. 656.

369._____. /Another edition./ 1862.

370._____. /Another edition./ 1878.

371._____. /Another edition./ 1883.

372._____. /Another edition./ 1927.

373. Dufour, Médéric. Rhétorique. 2 Vols. Collection des Universités de France. Published for the Association Guillaume Budé. 1932. 217p.

374._____. /Another edition./ 1934.

375._____. /Another edition./ 1960.

376._____. /Another edition./ 1969.

377._____. "Aristote, Rhétorique I-II." 'Les Belles Lettres. Paris, 1932.

378. Düring, Ingemar. Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia V. Göteborg. Elanders, 1957. 490p.

379._____. "Die Schriften, Rhetorik I-II." & "Die Rhetorik, Buch I-II." Aristoteles, Darstellung und interpretation seines Denkens. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1966. 126-59.

380. Du Sin, Jean. Les trois livres de la Rhétorique d'Aristote, traduits de grec en francois (par Jean Du Sin). Parisiis: D. Douceur, 1608. 377p.

381._____. La Rhétorique d'Aristote, traduite du grec en francois par L.F.G.D.R. Parisiis: D. D. Doucer, 1613. 378p.

382. Du Val, Guillaume, ed. Aristotelis Opera Omnia Quae Extant, Graece & Latine. 1619.

383._____. /Another edition./ Bilhaine, 1654.

384._____. /Another edition./ M. Gayot, 1770.

385._____. /Another edition./ M. les Duc de la Vallière, 1784.

386._____. /Another edition./ M. Gayot, 1789.

387. Dwivedi, Ramowadh and Vikramaditya Rai. "Aristotle and Rhetoric." Literary Criticism. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi. 1964. 59-64.

388. Edel, Abraham. "The Rhetoric." Aristotle. Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1967. 472-83.

389. Egger, Émile. "Transmission de la Rhétorique D'Aristote." Essai sur L'Histoire de la Critique chez les Grecs. Paris: G. Pedone-Louriel, 1887. 561p.

390. Ehninger, Douglas. "The Classical Doctrine of Invention." Gavel, XXXIX (1957), 59, 62, 70.

391. Eichstädt, H. C. A. Quaedam de veterum arte rhetorica. 1827. 6p.

392. Ēliou, Ēlias Philippou. Rētorikē. 1940.

393. Engdahl, Lynn. "induction in Classical Rhetoric." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1966.

394. Erasmus, Desiderius. de Arte dicendi libri III. Aristotelis svmmi semper viri, et in qvem vnvm uim suam universam contulisse natura rerum videtur, opera, quaecung; impressa hactenus extiterunt Omnia, summa cum viqilantia excussa. Basileae, Apvd Jo. Beb. Anno, 1531.

395._____. /Another edition./ 1539.

396._____. /Another edition./ Basel, 1550/

397. Erickson, Keith V. Communicative Rhetoric: A Workbook. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1968.

398._____. Dimensions of Oral Communication Insturction: Readings in Speech Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co. Publishers, 1970. 15-16.

399._____. Aristotle: The Classical Heritage of Rhetoric. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1972.

400. Ernesti, Johann. Lexicon technologiae graecorvm rhetoricae. 1795.

401. Escobar, F. de. Rhetorica. n. d. (middle 16th. Century?) (See D. Rubio, Classical Scholarship in Spain. Washington, D. C., 1934; Also R. R. Bolgar, The Classical Heritage. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964. p. 511.)

402. Estienne, Robert. Aristotelis Rhetorica. Gallice, 1529.

403._____. La Rhétorique d'Aristote, traducte en francois par le sieur Rob. Estienne .... Paris, 1624.

404._____. La Rhétorique d'Aristote: les deux premiers livres traduits du grec en francois par le Robert Estienne, son nepueu. Paris, 1630.

405. Etiemble, René and Jeannine Etiemble. "Aristote." L'art d'écrire. Seghers, Paris, 1970. 26-33.

406. Eucken, R. De ar. Dicendi ratione. Pars I. Oberservationes de particularum usu. Dissert. Göttingen, 1866. 81p.

407._____. Über den Sprackgebrauch Des Aristoteles. Beobaktungen über Die Dräpositionen. Berlin, 1868. 75p.

408. Eucken, Rudolf. "Über Bilder und Vergleichungen bei Aristoteles." Neues Jahrbuch für Philologie und Pädagogik, XCIX (1969), part 1, 248.

409. Eugubini, F. Pauli Benii. f. Pauli Benii Eugubini, Philosophiae et sacrae theologiae doctoris, qui guatuor ac viginiti annos in Patauino Gymnasio professus est eloquentiam e prima sede, in Aristotelis libros rhetoricam commentarii: in quibus Aristotelea de arte dicendi praecepta non solum copiose declarantur, verum etiam centum oratoriis controversiis interpositis illustrantur: cum Platone, etiam in decretis multis, cum M. Tullio in toto dicendi artificio conferuntur. Accessit Platonis rhetorica ex eius monumentis excerpta Ad. illustriss et reuerendiss. Venetiis, Guerilium. 1624.

410. Fabriano, M. G. Tradottione Antica de la Rettorica d'Aristotile. Padova, 1548.

411. Fabrici, J. Alberti. "Rhetorica Expositio." Bibliothecae Graece. Vol XIII, 1740. 651-747.

412. Facciolati, Jacobi. "De Enthymemata." Jacobi Facciolati Orationes XII. Patavii, 1729.

413. Feezel, Jerry D. "The Mystery of the Epicheireme." Western Speech, XXXI (1967), 109-115.

414. Feltenstein, Harry D., (T. Lira, pseudonym). "The Metaphor Roots of the Symbol." Unpublished Bowdain Prize Essay, 1941.

415. Ferrariis, T. Propositiones ex omnibus Aristotelis libros philosophie. Moralis, Naturalís et prime nec non dialectice. Rhetorique et poetiae . . . excerpte; et ad certa rerum capita per tabellam additam redacte. Venetiis, Gregor de Gregoriis, 1493.

416. Feudenthal, J. Über den Begriff des Wortes Φαντασία bei Aristoteles. Gottingen, 1863.

417. Figliucci, Felice. Tradottione antica de la Rettorica d'Aristotile nuouamente trovata. 1548. 184p.

418. Filelfo, Franciso. F. Philelfi praeceptorum Rhetorice Aristotelis de causis civilibus . . . e graeco in latinu traductio. 1485?

419._____. Poetica, interprete Georgio Valla Placentino: Rhetorica, interprete Fr. Philelfo; Ethica Nicomachea, interprete Io. Byzantino; Oeconomica et Politca, interprete Leonardo Aretino; Moralia magna, interprete Georgio Valla. Venetiis, 1504.

420._____. Utilissima preclarissimi philosoporū Aristotelis Rhetorica. Gilles de Gourmont: Paris, 1509?

421. Fisher, Walter R. "Uses of the Enthymeme." Speech Teacher, XIII (1964), 197-204.

422. Fitzhugh, Thomas. "Aristotle's Theory of Rhyth." Transactions of the American Philolgical Association, XLIV (1913).

423. Flemming, E. G. "A Comparison of Cicero and Aristotle on Style." Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, IV (1918), 61-71.

424. Fleschenberg, O. Schissel von. "Zum Anonymus Neobarii in Aristotelis Rhetorica." Commentaria

in Aristotelia graeca. XXI, 2 Berlin, 1896.

425._____. αὔξησις im 1. und 2. Buch der aristotelischen Rhetorik. Aus der Wekstatt des Hörsaals. Innsbruck, 1914.

426. Fleshler, Helen. "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Dialectic." Pennsylvania Speech Annual, XX (1963), 11-17. Reprinted in: Communicative Rhetoric: A Workbook. Edited by Keith V. Erickson. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1968. 8-12.

427. Florentinus, Laurentiauns. In librum Aristotelis De elocutione. Venetiis, per Sim. De Luere, 1500.

428. Flynn, Larry. "Aristotle: Art and Faculty of Rhetoric." Southern Speech Journal, XXI (1965), 244-54.

429._____. "The Aristotelian Basis for the Ethics of Speaking." Speech Teacher, VI (1957), 179-87.

430. Fogarty, Daniel John. "Emerging Conceptions of Rhetoric." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1959.

431._____. Roots for a New Rhetoric. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

432. Fortenbaugh, William W. "Recent Scholarship of the Psychology of Aristotle." Classical World, LX (1967), 316-27.

433._____. "Aristotle and the Questionable Mean-Dispositions." Transactions of the American Philological Association, XCIX (1968), 203-32.

434._____. "Aristotle's Rhetoric on Emotions." Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie, LII (1970), 40-70.

435._____. "Aristotle: Emotions and Moral Virtue." Arethusa, II (1968), 163-185.

436._____. "Aristotle: Animals, Emotion and Moral Virtue." Arethusa, IV (1971), 137-65.

437. Fortoul, Hippolyte Nícolas Honoré. Aristotelis Logice, Rhetorice, Poetice, quibus utantur communibus principiis. Lugduni, A. Perisse, 1840. 35p.

438. Fortunatiani, Chirii. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum libri tres, ex vers. Consulti Chirii Fortunatiani, Castigatiore iom redditi Opera Petri Nannii Alemariani. Lovanii, 1550.

439. Foster, George M. "Development of Rhetorical Stasis

for Deliberative Speaking." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1970.

440. Freese, Joh Henry. Aristotle, with an English Translation: The "Art" of Rhetoric. London, 1926.

441. _____. /Another edtion./ Harvard University Press, 1939.

442. _____. /Another edition./ 1947.

443. _____. /Another edition./ 1967.

444. Freidenberg, O., ed. Le Théories antiques sur la langue et le style. Moscou & Léningrad Ed. de l'État. 1936. 341p.

445. Frenkian, Aram M. "Emendationen zu den 'Commentaria in Aristotelem Graecá'." Philologus, CVIII (1964), 301-03.

446. Freund, Wilhelm. "Rhetorik des Griechen und Römer." Triennium Philologicum oder Grundzüge der Philologischen Wissenschaften. Leipzig, 1876. 224-300.

447. Frobenius, Joannes. Aristotelis Rhetorica et Poetica,

graece; ex officina Frobeniana per Hieronymum et Ioannen Hervagium. Basel, 1520.

448. Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957.

449. Fuhrman, Manfred. "Die aristotelische Rhetorik und das Lehrbuch des Anaximenes." Das Systematische Lehrbuch. Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1960. 138-42.

450._____. Ars rhetorica, quae vulgo fertur Aristotelis ad Alexandrum. Bibl. script. Graece et Roma Teubneriana, Leipzig Teubner. 1966. 114p.

451._____. Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte der pseudo-Aristotelischen Alexander-Rhetorik. Akad. d. Wissenschaft und d. Lit., Wiesbaden. 1965.

452. Gaisford, Thomas, ed. Aristotelis De Rhetorica libri tres, ad fidem manuscriptorum recogniti cum versione Latina. Atero volumine continentur animadversiones variorum. In usum academicae juvenutis. Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano 1805. 2 Vols.

453. Gandin, William R. "Speech and the Enterpreise of

Learning." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXVII (1942), 401-07.

454. Garin, Eugenio. "Le Traduzione Umanistiche di Aristotele nel Secolo." Atti dell' Accademi Florentina di Scienze Morali, XVI Florence, 1951.

455._____. "Logic, Rhetoric and Poetics." Italian Humanism. Translated by Peter Munz. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

456. Garve, Christian, and Friedrich Wolfgang Reiz. Aristotelis De arte rhetorica libri 3. Ex aliquot editionum collatione. Lipsiae: Svikertus, 1772.

457. Gasparavich, Eleanor. "A Study of the Treatment of Pronuntiatio by the Ancients." Unpublished Masters thesis, Louisiana State University, 1945.

458. George of Trebizond. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum liber III, ex interetatione Georgii Trapezuntii. Parisiis, apud J. Stoll et P. Caesaris. 1475.

459._____. /Another edition./ Venedig, 1478.

460._____. Aristotelis Varia Opera novissime traducta:

& Rhetorices Hermogenis compendium Poetica Aristotelis, interprete Georgio Valla. Rhetoricorum ad Alexandrum Regem libri 2. Franciscus Filelphus e graeco in lat. convertit. Rhetoricorum ad Theodectem libri 3: Georgius Tabezuntio e graeco in lat. convertit. Ethicorum ad Nicomachum filium libri 10. 1500. (?)

461._____. Georgij Trapesumcij (I) in rhetori carum aristotelis traductionis prefatio. Parisiis: apud Egidium gourmont, 1519. (?)

462._____. /Another edition./ (With Valla Lorenzo . . . De elegantijs linque latine.) 1519.

463._____. Ad reuerendissimum in Christo patrem . . . dominũ Fratrem de Padua . . . Georgij Trapesumaij in Rhetoricarum Aristotelis libros traductionis prefatio . . . . (Paris) Venales reperiuntur in vico Sancti Ioannis Lateranensis e regione Cameracensis collegij apud Egidium Gourmont. 1515 (?)

464._____. Continentur hoc volumine: Georgii Trapezuntii Rhetoricorum libri V. Consulti C. Fortunationi liber III. Aquilae Romani de figuris sententiarum & elocutionis liber. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum ad Theodecten e Georgio Trapezuntio in-

terprete libri III. Ejusdem Rhetorices Alexandrum a F. Philelpho in latinum versae liber. Paraphrasis Rhetoricae Hermogenis ex Hilarionis Monachi veronensis traductione, Priscianus de Rhetoricae praeexercitamentis ex Hermogene. Aphthorii declamatoniis rhetorica progymnasmata J. M. Catanaeo tralatire. In aedibus Aldi et Anreae Asulani: Venetiis, 1523.

465._____. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum ad Theodecten libri tres, Latinè, Georgio Trapezuntio interprete; et Rhetorices ad Alexandrum liber unus, a Francisco Philelpho in Latinum versus. Paris, apud Sim. Colinaeum, 1530.

466._____. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum ad Theodecten, Georgio Trapezuntio interprete, libri III. Eiusdem Rhetorices ad Alexandrum, à Francisco Philelpho in latinū versae liber I. Nunc recens ad graecam veritatem recogniti. Parisiis, 1540.

467._____. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum ad Theodecten, Georgio Trapezuntio interprete, libri III. Basilease, in officina Frobeniana, 1534. 205p.

468._____. /Another edition./ Basiliae, 1538.

469._____. Rhetorica Aristotelis ad Theodecten libri tres,

Latini, Georgio Trapezuntio interprete. Lugduni, Apud Sebastianum Gryphium, 1541.

470._____. Rhetoricorum Aristotelis ad Theodecten libri tres, Georgio Trapezuntio interprete; eiusdem ad Alexandrum rhetorices liber I. à Francisco Philelpho in latinum versus. Lugduni, 1545. 248p.

471._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae De Rhetorica, et Poetica libri, cum Averroir cordubensis in eosdem paraphrasibus. Georgio Trapezuntio trans. Venice, Junta, 1550. 94p.

472. Ghiano, Juan Carlos. "Las Retorica." Los Generos Literarios. Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1961. 79-84.

473. Gigond, Ed. de. Art rhétorique, inclus dans: Art poétique, Dan le même ouvrage: Topiques. Paris, 1969.

474. Giles, B. "Mediaeval Latin Translations of Aristotle's Art of Rhetoric." Transactions of the American Philological Association, LXV (1934), 37-38.

475. Gillies, John. A New translation of Aristotle's rhetoric; with an introduction and appendix; explaining

its relation to his exact philosophy, and vindicating that philosophy, by proofs that all departures from it have been deviations into error. London: Cadell, 1823. 493p.

476. Gloeckner, St. Quaestiones rhetoricae. Historiae artis rhetoricae qualis fuerit aevo imperatorio capita selecta. Diss., 1901. 44p.

478. Gohlke, Paul. "Überlick über die Literatur zu Aristoteles (bis 1925). Teil II: Ethik, Politik, Rhetorik, Poetik." Bursians Jahresbericht der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, CCXX (1929), 265-328.

479._____. "Die Enstehung der Aristotlischen Ethik, Politik, Rhetorik." Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, CCXXIII (1944), Fasc. 2. 11-141.

480._____. Aristotles, Die Lebrschriften, Rhetorik. Paderborn, 1959.

481. Goldenthal, Jo. Averrois commentarius in Aristotelis arte rhetorica libros tres hebraice versies a Todroso Todosi Arelatensis. Nunc primum ex codice Bibliothecae senatoriae lipsiensis cum prolegomensis copiosissimis edidit Jo. Golden-

thal. Lipsiae, Frank, 1842.

482._____. /Another edition./ Réannoncé, Lipsiae, Werlagsbureau, 1847.

483. Gomperz, Th. Sophistik und Rhetorik. Leipzig, 1918.

484._____. "Aristotle and Rhetoric." Greek Thinkers: A History of Ancient Philosophy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912. Vol. IV, 420-59; 562-66.

485._____. Beitrage zur Kritik und Erklorung griech. Schrifsteller. Vol. VIII, 1924. 1-14.

486. Goodell, Thomas. "Aristotle on the Public Arbitrators." American Journal of Philology, XII (1891), 319-26.

487. Göttling, C. Commentariolum de soloecismo logico rhetorico grammatico eiusque veriloquio. 1886. 8p.

488. Goulding, Daniel. "Aristotle's Concept of the Enthymeme." Journal of the American Forensic Association, II (1965), 104-08.

489. Goulston, Theodore. Aristotelis de Rhetorica seu arte

Dicendi Libri tres. Graecolet. Contextu Graeco, ad exemplaria selectiona emendato; Latino, paraphrasi, ubi opus, intertexto; Utroque, etiam in Particulas distincto. Londini, typis Eduardi Griffini, 1619.

490._____. Versio Latina et Paraphrasis in Aristotle's Rhetoricam. Londini, 1619. (The difference between this and the above edition is in board size.)

491._____. Rhetorica ex recens. Th. Goulston 1619 - De Poetica Latina redditus opera Th. Goulston. London, T. Snodhami, 1623.

492._____. Aristotelis de Rhetorica seu arte Dicendi Libri Tres, Graecolat. Contextu Graeco, ad exemplaria selectiora emendato; Latino, Paraphrasi, ubi opus, intertexto; utroque etiam in Particulas distincto. Margini interiori, adscriptis locis Authoris, ex ipso citatis, vel ἐκ παραλλήλου similibus; exteriori, adposita Analytica Methodo: cuius Tabulae Synopticae, in sua loca distributae. (Studio Theodori Goulston.) Londini typis Eduardi Griffini. Rec. Londini, typis Ben Griffini, impensis Edvard. Hall. Biblio. Cantabrigiae, 1696.

493._____. /Another edition./ Cantabrigiae, 1728.

494._____. /Another edition./ 1805. (See No. 212)

495._____. /Another edition./ 1809. (See No. 213)

496. Grabmann, Martin. "Forschungen Über Die Lateinischen Aristotelesübersetzungen Des XIII Jahrhunderts." Beiträge zur Geschichte Der Philosophie Des Des Mittelalters, Band XVII, No. 5-6 (1916), 270p.

497._____. "Eine lateinische Übersetzung der pseudo-Aristotelischen 'Rhetoric ad Alexandrum' aus dem 13." Jahrhundert, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klassch. IV (1931-32), 4-5.

498. Gräfenhan, A. "Syntax-Rhetorik." Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie im Alterthum. Bonn, 1843. 491-510.

499. Granero, Ignacio. El arte de la rétorica. Texto griego, y comentarios de E. Ignacio Granero. Mendoza, Universidad Nacional de Cuzo, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Instituto de Lenguas y Literaturas Clásicas, 1951. 208p.

500._____. "Dos pasajes del libro II de la Rétorica de Aristoteles." Revista de Estudios Classicos, VII (1960), 162-64.

501. Grant, Mary A. "Aristotle." The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 21, 1924. 24-32.

502. Grant, Sir Alexander. "The 'Greek' School of Rhetoric." The Ethics of Aristotle. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1874. 122-29.

503. Graux, Charles. "Aristote, Rhétorique, 11, 2, 1379b lig. 2-4 (Bekker)," & "Aristote Rhétorique 11, 3, 1380a, lig. 31-33." Les Articles Originaux. Edited by Ch. Emile Ruelle. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1892.

504. Grayeff, Felix. "The Problem of the Genesis of Aristotle's Text." Phronesis, 1 (1956),

505. Greene, W. "Aristotle on Metaphor." Classical World, XXXIX (1945), 94-95.

506. Grierson, Herbert J. C. "Rhetoric in the Ancient World: Aristotle." Rhetoric and English Composition. London: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1944. 1-15.

507._____. /Another edition./ Edinburgh, 1945.

508. Grimaldi, W. M. A. "The Enthymeme in Aristotle." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1953.

509._____. "A Note on the Pistis in Aristotle's Rhetoric." American Journal of Philology, LXXVIII (1957), 188-92.

510._____. "Rhetoric and the Philosophy of Aristotle." Classical Journal, LIII (1958), 371-75.

511._____. "The Aristotelian Topics." Traditio, XIV (1958), 1-16.

512._____. "Aristotle: Rhetoric." Classical Philology, LVI (1961), 38-43.

513. Grion, Dottore Giusto. "La rettorica d'Aristotile, voltata in volgare nel dugento per uno da Pisa." Ora pubbl. a cura del Dottore Giusto Grion. Bologna: Fava & Garagnavi, 1868.

514. Gros, Etienne. La rhétorique d'Aristote, grec-francais; avec des notes et un ind. des morceaux parallèles dans Cicéro et Quintilien. Paris, 1822.

515._____. Etude sur l'etat de la rhétorique chez les Grecs, depuis sa naissance jusqua'à a la prise de Constantinople. Paris, Didot frères, 1835. 14-16.

516. Grube, G. M. A. "Platonist and Aristotelian." Phoenix, II (1947), 15-28.

517._____. "Rhetoric, Book 3, Chapters I-XII." Aristotle on Poetry and Style. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1958. 65-100.

518._____. "Aristotle's Rhetoric." Greek and Roman Critics. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965. 92-102.

519. Grumach, Ernst, ed. Aristotles. Werke in deutscher Übersetzung. Darmstadt, Wissenchaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.

520. Guengerich, R. "Rhetorik." Der Hellenismus in der deutschen 1938-1948. Edited by E. Kiessling. Wiesbaden Harrassowitz, 1956. 142-48.

521. Gueroult, Martial. "Logique, Argumentation et Histoire de la Philosophie chez Aristote." Lá Theories De L'Argumentation. Perspectives et Applications. Lovain, 1963. 431-49.

522. Gugolstetter, T. Isagoge in Rhetoricam Aristotele b. e. praecepta eloquentia methodica ex ar. excerpta. Lipsiae, 1602.

523. Guide, M. and R. Walzer. "Uno scritto introduttivo allo studio di Aristotele." Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, Memorie, Ser. Vol. VI (1937-40), 375-419.

524. Guillemin, A. M. "Ethos." Humanités R. E. S., Classe de Lettres, IX (1933), 377-82.

525._____. "Les survivances de la rhétorique." Les Études Classiques, VI (1937), 497-504.

526. Guy, Alain. Ortega y Gasset, critique d'Aristote: L'ambiüité du mode de pensée péripatéticien juge par le ratiovitalisme. Toulouse. Private edition. 207p.

527. Hahne, Oberlehrer Franz, II. Die Lehre von den Stilarten. Wissenschaftliche Beilage zu den Programm des Heryoglichen Neuen Gymnasiums zu Brourschweig. 1896. 38p.

528. Hamblin, Charles L. "Aristotle's List." Fallacies. London: Methuen and Co., 1970. 50-88.

529. Hamburger, Max. "Excursus: Aristotle's Contribution to Criminology as set Forth in His Rhetoric." Morals and Law, The Growth of Aristotle's Legal Theory. New York: Biblo & Thanner, 1965. 73-108.

530. Hamelin, O. Le Système d'Aristote, Collection Littéraire der Grands Philosophes. Paris, 1931.

531. Hammer, C. Rhetores graeci. Vol I. Lipsiae, 1894.

532. Hangard, Johan. Monetaire en daarmee verwonte Metaforen: studiën over het metaforisch gebruick van de terminologie van muntwezen in de Griekse literatuur tot Aristoteles. Groningen: Wolters, 1963.

534. Harrington, Elbert. Rhetoric and the Scientific Method of Inquiry. University of Colorado Studies. Series in Langauge and Literature, No. 1. Boulder, 1948. 64p.

535. Hauser, Gerard A. "The Example in Aristotle's Rhetoric: Bifurcation or Contradiction." Philosophy and Rhetoric, I (1968), 78-90.

536. Havet, E. De la rhétorique d'Aristote. 1843.

Filmed as received

without page(s) 144.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

Graece et Latine. Parisiis, 1848.

546._____. Die Verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles. 1865.

547. Heller, John L. "Ancient Rhetoric in the Modern College Course in Speech." The Classical Weekly, XXIX (1936), 57-59.

548. Henderson, G. L. "The Peripatetic Mean of Style and Three Stylistic Characters." American Journal of Philology, XXV (1904), 125-46.

549._____. "The Origin and Meaning of the Ancient Characters of S$^{T}$yle." American Journal of Philology, XXVI (1905), 249-90.

550. Hendrix, J. A. "In Defense of Neo-Aristotelian Rhetorical Criticism." Western Speech, XXXII (1968), 246-52.

551. Henry, L'Abbé. "Aristote." Histoire de L'Éloquence. Paris: Libraire Adrien LeClere et cie. Vol. II, 1846. 138-42.

552. Herbesti, Bened. Tractatio uberrima de periodis, ex sententia Aristotelis, Demetrii Phalerei, Ciceronis, Quinctiliani. Lipzig, 1566.

553. Herrick, Marvin T. "The Early History of Aristotle's Rhetoric in England." Philological Quarterly, V (1926), 242-57.

554._____. "Some neglected Sources of Admirato." Modern Language Notes, LXII (1947), 222-26.

555._____. "The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism." Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XXXII (1946), No. 1.

556. Hessey, James A. Schemata Rhetorica; or tables explanatory of the nature of the Enthymeme, and the various modes of classification adopted by Aristotle in his Rhetoric and Prior Analytics. With notes and an introduction. To which is added, the Commentary on Analyt. Prior II. XXIX by Pacius. Oxford, 1845.

557. Hewlett, Marilyn Nesper. "An Analysis of Theories of Speech Arrangement as Developed by Selected Ancient Rhetoricians." Unpublished Masters thesis, State University of Iowa, 1947.

558. Hicks, E. L. "Emendations (Rhet. 1416a21; III, 15.5)." Journal of Philology, XIII (1885), 99.

559. Hilderbrant-Günther, R. Antike Rhetorik und deutsche literarische Theories. Marburg, 1966.

560. Hill, Forbes Iverson. "The Genetic Method in Recent Criticism on the Rhetoric of Aristotle." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell Universtiy, 1963.

561. Hinks, D. A. G. "Tria Genera Causarum." Classical Quarterly, XXX (1936), 170-76.

562._____. "Tsias and Corax and the Invention of Rhetoric." Classical Quarterly, XXXIV (1940), 61-69.

563. Hinman, W. Stuart. Literary Quotations and Allusion in the Rhetoric, Poetic and Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle. Staten Island, New York: Private Edition. 1935. 201p.

564. Hobbes, Thomas. A Briefe of the art of rhetorique containing in substance all that Aristotel hath written in his three bookes of that subject, except onely what is not apllicable to the English tongue. London, Printed by T. Cotes for A. Crooke, 1637 (?)

565._____. A Compendium of the Art of Logick and Rhetorick in the English Tongue. Containing all that Peter Ramus, Aristotle have writ thereon, with plaine Directions for the more easie understanding and practice of the same. London,

Printed by Thomas Macen, 1651. (Some debate exists over whether Hobbes is the author of this work--see Dodd, No. 361)

566._____. The art of Rhetoric with a Discourse of the Laws of England. London, Printed for William Crooke at the Greene Dragon without Temple--Bar. 1681.

567._____. Hobbes's translation of Aristotle's art of rhetorick. A new edition, with alterations and a new preface by a Gentleman. London, Thrush, 1759.

568._____. The Whole Art of Rhetoric and the Art of Rhetoric. The English Works of Thomas Hobbes. Edited by Sir William Molesworth. John Bohn, London, 1840.

569._____. "Aristotle's Rhetoric. A Digest by Thomas Hobbes." Aristoteles, De Poetica, English. Aristotle's Poetics. London, 1934. 77-195.

570._____. Abstract of Aristotle's Rhetoric. New York: Everyman's Library, 1934. Vol. CMI.

571. Hoffmann, Samuel F. W. "Aristoteles." Bibliographisches Lexicon der gesammten Litteratur der

Griechen. Leipzig, bei A. F. Böhme, 1838. 271-375.

572. Holland, Laura Virginia. "Aristotelianism in the Rhetorical Theory of Kenneth Burke." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1954.

573._____. Counterpoint: Kenneth Burke and Aristotle's Theories of Rhetoric. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.

574. Hollingsworth, John Emory. Antithesis in the Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus. The Collegiate Press, The University of Chicago, 1915. 2-14.

575. Holmes, Joh. "Aristotle." The Art of Rhetoric Made Easy: or, the Elements of Oratory Briefly stated, and fitted for the practice of the studious youth of Great-Britain and Ireland: In Two Books. London: A. Parker, 1739.

576. Holwell, J. Ἀριστοτέλους Τέχνης Ῥητορικῆς βιβλια 3. 1759. 199p.

578. Holwerda, D. Commentarius de vocis quae est φύσις vi atque usu praesertim in Graecitate Aristotele anteriore. Gröningen, 1955.

579. Holyday, Barten. "Oratio habita cum Aristotelis rhetoricorum librum secundum aspicarer." Philosophiae polito-barbarae specimen. Oxford, 1633.

580. Hook, L. Van. The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism. Chicago, 1905.

581. Horna, Knonstantine. "Beiträge zur Überlieferung der aristotelischen Rhetorik." Wiener Studien, LI (1933), 31-56.

582._____. "Die Zeilenlängen in den Stammhandschriften der Aristotelischen Rhetorik and Poetik." Wiener Studien, LII (1934), 140-42.

583. Hoshor, John Payton. "A Study of the Principles of Ethical Proof in the Works of Certain Ancient and Modern Rhetoricians." Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Washington, 1940.

584. Hostettler, Gordon F. "Trends in the History of Rhetoric." The Communicative Arts and Sciences of Speech. Edited by Keith Brooks. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967. 17-35.

585. Howell, Wilbur Samuel. The Rhetoric of Alcuin and

Charlemagne. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1941. 46-58.

586._____. "DeQuincey on Science, Rhetoric, and Poetry." Speech Monographs, XIII (1946), 1-13.

587._____. "Classical and European Traditions of Rhetoric and Speech Training." Southern Speech Journal, XXIII (1957), 73-78.

588._____. "Aristotle and Horace on Rhetoric and Poetics." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIV (1968), 325-339.

589. Howes, Raymond F., ed. Historical Studies of Rhetoric and Rhetoricians. Itica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1961.

590. Hubbell, H. M. "The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysisus and Aristides." Unpublished Masters thesis, Yale University, 1913.

591. Huemer, Kamillo.,ed. Chrestomathie aus Platon nebst Proben au Aristoteles. Wien und Leipzig, Verlagsbuchhandlung Carl Fromme, 1930.

592. Hughes, C. "Contemporaneity of Classical Rhetoric." College Composition and Communication, XVI

(1965), 157-59.

593. Hultzén, Lee S. "Aristotle's Rhetoric in England to 1600." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1932.

594._____. "Status in Deliberative Analysis." The Rhetorical Idiom. Edited by Donald C. Bryant. Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958. 97-123.

595. Hunt, Everett Lee. "Plato and Aristotle on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians." Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans. Edited by A. M. Drummond. 2nd ed. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962. 3-60. (cf. with No. 589)

596. Huseman, Richard Carl. "The Concept of Appropriateness as an Element of Style in Classical Rhetoric." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1963.

597._____. "Aristotle's System of Topics." Southern Speech Journal, XXX (1965), 243-252.

598._____. "Modern Approaches to the Aristotelian Concept of the Special Topic." Central States

Speech Journal, XV (1964), 21-26.

599._____. "Aristotle's Doctrine of the Mean: Implications for Rhetorical Style." Western Speech, XXXIV (1970), 115-21.

600. Ioannou, Iakobos. "On Scripture Metaphors." Biblical Review, V (1846-50), 55-69.

601. Ipfelkofer, Adalbert. Die Rhetorik des Anaximenes unter den Weken des Aristoteles. Inaug Diss. Von Erlangen u. Progr. des neun Gymn. Würzburg, 1889.

602. Isaacson, Carl. "Aristotle's Concepts of Emotional Proof Applied to an Analysis of Modern Speeches." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1954.

603. Jackson, F. M. "An Application of the Principles of Aristotelean (sic) Rhetoric to Certain Early New England Prose." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1967.

604. Jaeger, Werner. Aristotile. Ital. Edn. Florence, 1935.

605._____. Aristotle, Fundamentals of the History of His Development. Translated by R. Robinson, Oxford:

Oxford University Press, 1934.

606. Jaeneke, Walther. De Statuum Doctrina ab Hermogene Tradita. Leipzig, 1904. (See G. Lehnerts review: Berliner Philologische Wachenschrift, 16 September, 1905. 1173-1176.)

607. James, Herbert Lee. "A Comparative Analysis of the Major Rhetorical Treatises of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, Together with Tabular Outlines and Diagrams of their Theories." Unpublished Masters thesis, Ohio State University, 1951.

608. Janssens, Emile. "The Concept of Dialectic in the Ancient World." Philosophy and Rhetoric, I (1968), 174-81.

609. Jebb, Richard Claverhouse. The Rhetoric of Aristotle. Translated by Rev. John E. Sandys. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

610._____. /Another edition./ 1916.

611._____. "Aristotle on the Three Instruments of Rhetorical Proof." The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus. 2nd ed. London, 1893. lxxix.

612. Jentsch, Hugo. Aristotelis ex arte rhetorica quaeritur quid habeat Cicero. Diss. Berolini, 1886.

613._____. De Aristotele Ciceronis in Rhetorica auctore questionum pars I. (-II.). Ex programmate Gymnasii Gubenensis. Gubenae, 1874. 1-25; 1875, 1-26.

614. Johannesen, Richard L. "The Greek Rhetoricians on Deistic Reference." Central States Speech Journal, XIII (1962), 100-05.

615. Johnson, Samuel. "The Non-Aristotelian Nature of Samoan Ceremonial Oratory." Western Speech, XXXIV (1970), 262-73.

616. Jones, Elbert Winston. "A Study of 'Interest Factors' and 'Motive Appeals' in Rhetorical Theory with Special Reference to Invention, Style, and Arrangement." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1950.

617. Josserand, Ch. "Formes d'argumentation dans l'éloquence grecque." Mélanges de linquistique, de philologie et de méthodologie de l'enseignement des langues anciennes offerts à Rene Fohallé. Gembloux Dueulot, 1969. 325-332.

618. Jourdain, Aimable. "Sharh kitāb al-khatābah bi-Aristū (Declaratio compendiosa super libris rhetoricorum Aristotelis)." Recherches Critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote et sur des commentaires Grecs ou Arabes employes par les docteurs scolastiques. Nouvelle edtion par C. Jourdain, Paris. 1843.

619._____. /Another edition./ New York, 1960.

620. Kalischer, Salomon. De Aristotelis Rhetoricis et Ethick Nicomaecis et in quo . . . inter se quum congruant turh differant. Diss. Halae, 1868.

621. Kantelhardt. A. De Aristote rhetoricis. Dissertation. Goettingen, 1911.

622. Kappelmacher, A. "Die Aristotelszitate in der Schrift des pseudo-Demetrius Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας ." Wiener Studien, XIV (1902), 452.

623._____. "Zu Aristoteles RhetorikIII 9." Wiener Studien, XXXIV (1912), 67-73.

624. Karakulakov, B. B. "Sur la question de la Classification de parties du discours chez Aristote." Studii Clasice, II (1960), 77-84.

625. Karuna, Hārīśa. Grīka sāhitya-śastra. 1964. 170.

626. Kayser, L. "Review of 'Gd. cum adnotatione Leonardi Spengel Accedit vetusta translatio latina'." Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie, LI (1868), 1-17.

627. Keil, Burno. "Ad orationem quae inscribebatur Ἀλέξανδρος." Hermes, XIX (1884), 649.

628. Kennedy, George. "Aristotle on the Period." Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LXIII (1958), 283-288.

629._____. "The Earliest Rhetorical Handbooks." American Journal of Philology, LXXX (1959), 169-78.

630._____. "Review of W. D. Ross' Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica." American Journal of Philology, LXXXII (1961), 201-05.

631._____. "The Development of Aristotle's Rhetoric." The Art of Persuasion in Greece. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1964. 82-113.

632. Kennedy, Verne R. "Auxesis: A Concept of Rhetorical Amplification." Southern Speech Communication

Journal, XXXVIII (1971), 60-72.

633. Killeen, J. F. "Aristotle Rhet. 1413b3." Classical Philology, LXVI (1971), 186-87.

634. King, D. B. "The Apeeal to Religion in Greek Rhetoric." Classical Journal, L (1955), 363-71; 376.

635. King, H. R. "Aristotle's Theory of Topos." Classical Quarterly, XLIV (1950), 79-96.

636. Kirchner, P. "Gryllos 3." R. E. Supplementband. 1912.

637. Knebel, Heinrich. "Aristoteles Rhetorik, übersetzt erläutert von Heinrich Knebel." Werke. Uebers u. erl. von Karl Hoffmeister u. Heinrich Knebel. Stuttgart: Balz, 1838. 380p.

638. Kocín, Jan. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum libri III. Strassburg, Theodsius Rihelius. 1570.

639. Koffka, G. Aristoteles. München, 1922.

640. Kowlski, G. De Arte Rhetorica I. Poloniae, 1937.

641. Krauss, J. J. F. De Conjunctivo rhetorico s. pathetico. 1857. 26p.

642. Krauss, O. Die Lehre von Lob, Lohn, Tadel and Strafe bei Aristoteles. Halle, 1905.

643._____. Über eine altüberlieferte Missdeutung der epideiktischen Redegattung bei Aristoteles. Halle, 1905.

644._____. Neue Studien zur Aristotelischen Rhetorik. Halle, 1907.

645._____. "Die Auffassung des Aristotelischen γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν in Italien." Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, (1909), 1551-152.

646. Kreczmar, Jerzy. "O przenósni u Arystotelesa." Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Woycickiemu, VI (1937), 321-336.

647. Kristeller, J. "Renaissance Aristotelianism." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, VI (1965), 157-174.

648. Kroll, Wilhelm. "Randbemerkungen," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, LXII (1907), 90.

649._____. "Da Epicheirema." Sitzungsbericht der Akademie der Wissenschaften, CCXVI (1936), No. 2.

650._____. "Rhetorica." Philologus, LXXXVIII (1933), 457-466; LXXXIX (1934), 334-348; XC (1935), 205-215; XLI (1936), 197-205.

651._____. Rhetorik. Stuttgart, 1937.

652._____. "Aristoteles Rhetorik." Real-Encylopadie Der Classicher Altertums Wissenschaft. Supp. 7, 1057-1064.

653. Lacombe, George, ed. Aristoteles Latinus. Corpus Philosophorum Medii aevi. Union academique internationale. 2 vols. 1939-53.

654. Lajard, F. "Guillaume de Moerbecke, dominican." Historie litt. de la France. Vol. XXI Paris, 1847. 143-50.

655. Lamb, John Hall. "An Analysis of the Aristotelian Concept of Ethical Proof in Representative Contemporary Speech Literature. Unpublished Masters thesis, State University of Iowa, 1949.

656. Larkin, M. T., C. S. J. "A Study of Language in the Philosophy of Aristotle." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1965.

657. Larsen, Robert E. "The Aristotelianism of Bacon's

Novum Organum." Journal of the History of Ideas, XXIII (1962), 435-50.

658. Lasino. F. Il Commento medio di Averroe alla Retorica di Aristotile. Florence, 1877.

659._____. Il Commento medio alla Rettorica di Aristotele publicato per la prima volta nel testo arabo. Fasc. I. e 2 del testo arabo. Maxnier, Firenze, 1878.

660. Latini, Brunetto. La Rettorica d'Aristotile tradotta da Ser Brunetto Latini in Volgar Fiorentino. Roma pel Dorice, 1541.

661. Laurentii, Gasparis. Ἑρμογένους τέχνη ῥητορική τελειοτάτη Hermogenius ars oratoria absolutissima. Cum nova versíone latína e rigione contextus graeci, et commentariis Gasparis Laurentii. Coloniae, 1614.

662. Lausberg, Heinrich. "Die drei aristotelischen genera." Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik. München, Max Hueber, 1960. 52-65.

663._____. "Los tres 'genera' aristotelicos." Manuel de Retorica Literoria. Biblioteca Románica Hispánica, Madrid. 1966. 106-117.

664. Lavency, M. "La Preparation du Discours Dans La Rhétorique Primitive." Les Études Classiques, XXVII (1959), 353-61.

665. Lawson, John. "Abstract of Aristotles Rhetorick, of Cicero's treatise concerning the orator, Comparison of these two tracts by J. Lawson." Lectures Concerning Oratory. Dublin, George Faulkner, 1758.

666._____. /Another edition./ Dublin, 1759.

667._____. /Another edition./ London, 1759.

668._____. /Another edition./ Menston, England: The Scolar Press Limited, 1969.

669. LeBlond, J. M. "Aristote et Théophraste, Un renouvellement radical de la question Aristotélicienne." Critique, VIII (1952), 858-69.

670._____. Logique et Méthode chez Aristote. Paris, 1939.

671. Lechner, Sister Joan, O.S.U. Renaissance Concepts of the Commonplaces. New York: Pageant Press, 1962. 268p.

672. Lee, Irving J. "A Study of Emotional Appeal in Rhetor-

ical Theory with Special Reference to Invention, Arrangement and Style." Unpublished dissertation, Northwestern University, 1939.

673._____. "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory." Speech Monographs, VI (1939), 66-86.

674._____. "General Semantics and Public Speaking." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXVI (1940), 594-601.

675._____. "General Semantics and Public Speaking: Perspectives on Rhetoric Compared: Aristotle, Hitler and Korzybski." Papers From the Second American Congress on General Semantics. Edited by M. Kendig. Chicago: Institute of General Semantics, 1943. 329-34.

676. Leeman, A. D. Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practices of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1963.

677. Legouëz, A. Rhétorique d'Aristote, livre XI, Chap. 1-17. Traduction littérale, suive d'un commentaire, par A. Legouëz. Paris, imp. de Lahure, 1876. 56p.

678. Lehman, Ernst Ludwig. "Ars rhetorica." Aristotele. Analytiker der Wirkliehkeit. Berlin, 1962.

679. Lehnert, Georges. "Aristotelis doctrinam de arte rhetorica a scholiastis non usurpatam esse." De Scholiis ad Homerum rhetoricis. Lipsiase, 1896.

680._____. "Bericht über Aristoteles (als Rhetoriker) aus den Jahren." Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, CCXLVII, 51-55.

681. Lentz, F. L. "Review of Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica cum adnotatione Leondrid Spengel." Jahrbucher für Classiche philologie, (1870), 1-17.

682. Lersch, L. Die Sprachphilosophie der Alten . . . . (Anhängen über Aristoteles Poetik und Rhetorik, etc.). 1838.

683._____. "Aristotles' Rhetorik." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, I (1842),17p.

684. Lesky, Albin. A History of Greek Literature. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966. 572-73.

685. LeTronne. "La Rhétorique D'Aristote, grec-francais avec des notes et un index des Morceux paralèles dans Cíceron et Quintilian; traduction novelle, par M. E. Gros, Paris, 1822." Journal Des Savans, (Février, 1824), 67-76.

686. Leyden, W. von. "Aristotle and the Concept of Law." Philosophy, XLII (1967), 1-19.

687. Lieberg, G. Die Lehre von der Lust in den Ethiken des Aristoteles. München: Beck, 1958.

688. Lienhard, J. T. "A Note on the Meaning of Pistis in Aristotle's Rhetoric." American Journal of Philology, LXXXVII (1966), 446-54.

689. Liers, Hugo. Rhetoren und Philosophen im Kampfe um die Staatsweisheit. 1888.

690. Lionardi, Alessandro. Dialogi . . . della inventione poetica et insieme di quanto alla storia et alla arte oratoria s'appartiene, et del modo de finger la favola. Venice, 1554.

691. Lipourlis, D. D. "Autour d'Aristote, I: Notes Critiques et Corrections." Hellencia, XX (1967), 297-310.

692. Lloyd, G. E. R. Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

693. Lonicer, Johann. Rhetoricae artis compendium maiori ex parte ex Aristotelicis libris, et alijs precipue estimationis apud Latinos uiris decerptum. Apud Bartholomaeum Westhemerum: Baileae, 1538. (Colophon date of 1536.)

694. Loukas, Christ. "The Psychology of Aristotle: A Logical Arrangement of his De Anima and Allied Treatises." Journal of General Psychology, 6 (1932), 157-89.

695. Mackey, Louis A. "Aristotle, Rhetoric III, III, 16, 11 (1417b 12-20)." American Journal of Philology, LXXIV (1953), 281-86.

696._____. "Aristotle and Feidelson on Metaphor: Toward a Reconciliation of Ancient and Modern." Arion, IV (1965), 272-85.

697. Mackin, John H. Classical Rhetoric for Modern Discourse. New York: Free Press, 1969.

698. Madden, Edward H. "The Enthymeme: Crossroads of Logic, Rhetoric, and Metaphysics." Philosophical

Review, LXI (1952), 368-76.

699. Madden, Frank. "Aristotle's Treatment of Probability and Signs." Philosophy of Science, XXIV (1957), 167-72.

700. Madwig, Jo. "Rhetorique." Adversaria critica ad scriptores graecos et latinos. Hauniae, 1871.

701. Madyda, Wladyslaw. "De arte poetica post Aristotelem exculta quaestiones selectae." Polska Akad. um Archiwum Filol., XXII (1948), 164p.

702._____. "Retoryka. Ksiega III." Trzy stylistyki greckie. Wroclaw, Zakland Narodowy im. Ossolínskich. 1953. 3-80.

703. Maercker, F. A. Zur Wiederherstellung der Kunst der Beredsamkeit als Philosophische Wissenschaft zu den Vorlesungen über des Aristoteles Rhetorik. 1843.

704. Magill, Frank N., and Ian P. McGreal. "Rhetoric." Masterpieces of World Philosophy in Summary Form. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1961. 169-74.

705. Magno, Alessandro. La Rettorica d'Aristotile ad Ales-

sandro Magno fatta in Italiano. Venezia, per Giacomo Leoncini, 1547.

706._____. /Another edition./ 1574.

707. Mairoragii, M. Antonii. Interprete M. Antonio Mairagio, cum einsdem explanationibus. Venetiis, apud F. Franciseum. 1545.

708._____. /Another edition./ 1547.

709._____. Rhetoricorum libri III. Tr. M. A. Maioragius. Per. J. Parauimure: Venetiis, 1552. 221p.

710._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae, Rhetoricorum libri III. Quos M. Antonius Maioroqius vertebat. Apud Valerium & Hieronymum Metios, fratres: Mediolaui, 1550. 240p.

711._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae, Rhetoricorum liber III. Quos M. Antonius Maigoragius vertebate. Venetiis, 1552.

712._____. M. Antonii Mairoragii in tres Aristotelis libros, De arte rhetorica, quos ipse latinos fecit, explanationes. Nunc primum a primo comite auctoris amitino in lucem prolatae . . . . Venetiis, 1571.

713._____. Aristotelis rhetorica, Graece et Latine, cum M. Ant. Maioragii commentariis. Venetiis, apud de Franciscis, Senensem, 1572.

714._____. Rhet. Aristotelis ad Theodect. libri 3. Quos M. Antonii Maioragus vertebat. Eiusdem Liber ad Alexandrum, Francisco Philelpho interprete cum Expositione Joannis Marinelli (In Rhetoricam Aristotelis bravis Expositio.). Venetiis: Vaigrisius, 1575. 479p.

715._____. Aristotelis Stagyritae De arte rhetorica libri 3. cum M. Antonii Maioragii commentariis. Additis nuper Graeco textu ad ipsius Maioragii versionem, & Petri Victorii sententiam emendato: Nova capitum divisione . . . per Fabium Paulinum. Cum duplici ind. locupletissimo. Venetiis: de Frnaciscis, 1591.

716._____. /Another edition./ Mylius: Birckmann. 1607.

717._____. M. A. Majoragii in tres Aristotelis libros de Arte Rhetorica, quos, ipse Latinos fecit, explanationes. Typis Seminariii Patavini: Patavii, 1689.

718. Mansion, S. Aristote et les Probleme de Methode. Paris, 1961.

sandro Magno fatta in Italiano. Venezia, per Giacomo Leoncini, 1547.

706._____. /Another edition./ 1574.

707. Mairoragii, M. Antonii. Interprete M. Antonio Mairagio, cum einsdem explanationibus. Venetiis, apud F. Franciseum. 1545.

708._____. /Another edition./ 1547.

709._____. Rhetoricorum libri III. Tr. M. A. Maioragius. Per. J. Parauimure: Venetiis, 1552. 221p.

710._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae, Rhetoricorum libri III. Quos M. Antonius Maiorogius vertebat. Apud Valerium & Hieronymum Metios, fratres: Mediolani, 1550. 240p.

711._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae, Rhetoricorum liber III. Quos M. Antonius Maigoragius vertebate. Venetiis, 1552.

712._____. M. Antonii Mairoragii in tres Aristotelis libros, De arte rhetorica, quos ipse latinos fecit, explanationes. Nunc primum a primo comite auctoris amitino in lucem prolatae . . . . Venetiis, 1571.

722._____. /Another edition./ 1523.

723. Marcou, F. L. Aristote, Extraits de la Rhétorique, avec une introduction et des notes, par F. L. Marcou, . . . . Paris, Garnier. 1897. 84p.

724. Margoliouth, D. S. "On the Arabic Version of Aristotle's Rhetoric." Semitic Studies. Edited by George Alexander Kohurt. Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1897. 376-87.

725. Maria, Jo. Isagoge ad tres Aristoteles libros De arte rhetorica. Pataviim, 1619.

726. Mariotii, Italo. Marii Victorini Ars grammatica. Introduzione critico e commento. Florence, F. Le Monnier. 1967.

728. Mariotti, S. "Cicerone e una fonte Stoica dipendente da Aristotele." SIFC, XVII (1940.

729. Marsh, Robert. "Aristotle and the Modern Rhapsode." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIII (1953), 481-89.

730. Marsh, Thomas H. "Aristotle versus Plato on Public Speaking." Southern Speech Journal, XVIII (1953), 136-46.

731. Martin, Josef. Grillius, Ein Beitrag zur Geschiechicte der Rhetorik. Paderborn, 1927.

732._____. "Symposion Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form." Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XVII (1931), 204-211.

733. Martino, E. "Ser y valor de la Metáfora." Humanidades, XIII (1961), 167-92.

734. Marx, Friedrich. "Aristoteles' Rhetorik." Aus: Berichte Über die Verhandlungen der Kgl. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, LII (1900), 241-328.

735. Massa, E. "Ruggero Bacone e la Poetica di Aristotele." Giornale critico della Filosofia italiana, XXXII (1953), 457-73.

736. Maurò, S. "Philosophiam rationalem, hoc est logicam, rhetoricam, et poeticam." Opera, quae extant omnia, brevi paraphrasi, ac litterae perpetuò inhaerente exploratione illustr. a Sylvestro Mauro. Romae: Franzini, 1668.

737._____. "Logicam, rhetoricam, poeticam." Opera omnia quae extant brevi paraphrasi et litterae perpetuo inhaerente expositione illustr. a Silves-

tro Mauro. E. iuxta Romanam a. 1658 (2-4: 1668) denuo typ. descripta opera Francisci Ehrle, adiunantibus Bonif Felchlin et Fr. Beringer (2: opera Francisci Beringer; 3.4: opera Augustini Bringmann). Parisiis: Lethielleux, 1885.

738. Mazzacurati, Giancarlo. "Retorica umanistica e Razionalismo Aristotelico." La Crisi Della Retorica Umanistica nel Cinquecento (Antonio Riccobono). Libreria Scientifica Editrice, Napoli, 1961.

739. McBurney, James A. "The Place of the Enthymeme in Rhetorical Theory." Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, 1935.

740._____. "Some Recent Interpretations of the Aristotelian Enthymeme." Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science Arts and Letters, XXI (1936), 489-500.

741._____. "The Place of the Enthymeme in Rhetorical Theory." Speech Monographs, III (1936), 49-74.

742. McCall, Marsh. "Ancient Rhetorical Concepts of Simile and Comparison." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1965.

743._____. "Aristotle, Rhetoric III. 4. 1407a 15 and 11. 1413a5[1]." Rheinishces Museum für Philologie, III 2 (1968), 159-65.

744._____. "Aristotle." Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969. 24-56.

745. McKeon, Richard. The Basic Works of Aristotle, edited with an introduction by Richard McKeon. New York: Random House Publishers, 1941.

746._____. /Another edition./ 1947.

747._____. "Aristotle's Conception of Language and the Arts of Language." Classical Philology, XLI (1946), 193-206; XLII (1947), 21-50. Reprinted in Critics and Criticism, Ancient and Modern. Edited by R. S. Crane. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952. 176-232.

748._____. "The Methods of Rhetoric and Philosophy: Invention and Judgement." The Classical Tradition. Edited by Luitpold Wollach. Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966. 365-73.

749._____. "Rhetoric and Poetic in the Philosophy of Aristotle." Aristotle's Poetics and English Literature. Edited by Elder Olson. Chicago:

750. McLaughlin, Ted John. "Modern Social Psychology and the Aristotelian Concept of Ethical Proof." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, n.d.

751. McNally, James Richard. "Characteristics of Art in the Test of Aristotle." The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XXIX (1971), 507-514.

752. Meador, Prentice. "The Classical 'Epicheireme': A Re-examination." Western Speech, XXX (1966), 151-55.

753. Measell, James Scott. "Development of the Concept of Analogy in Philosophy, Logic and Rhetoric to 1850." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Chapaign, 1970.

754. Méautis, G. "L'orphisme dans L'Eudeme d'Aristote." Revue des Études Anciennes, LVII (1955), 254-66.

755. Medesimo, D. La Politica, la Rettorica, la Poetica, ed i Libri dell' Anima di Aristotile. Firenze, per Giorgio Marescotti, 1583.

756. Meerwaldt.(H ?). "De Aristotelis erga Demosthenem an-

757. Mekler, Siegfried. "Aristoteles rhetorik A. 11, 1371a 10, frg. 660R.." Lucubrationum criticarum capita quinque. Progr. des Communal-Obergymn. im 19. Bezirke Wien, 1895.

758. Melanchthonis, Philippi. Operum Aristotelis tomvs Iertivs Moralem Philosophiam continens, una cum Rhetoricis ac Poëtica . . . . Apposita quoque hic sunt Metaphysica lib. XIIII. Adiecta insuper est de hoc ipso autore Commentatio Philippi Melancthonis. Basileae, apud J. oporinum, 1542.

759. Mestre, Perè. Préceptes de Rhetorique: Histoire de l'Eloquence Grecque, Latine, et Francaise. 7th ed. Lyon: Delhomme et Brignel, 1893.

760. Metzler, J. B. "Schriften zur Rhetorik und Poetik." Aristoteles Werke. Vol. II Stuttgart, 1833-40.

761._____. Schriften zur rhetorik und Poetik. Stuttgart, 1851.

762. Meyer, Hans. "Das Universlsystem des Aristoteles-Rhetorik." Geschichte Der Alten Philosophie. Verlag Josef Kosel & Friedrich Pustel. München, 1925. 252-55.

763. Michel, Alain. "Le Conflit d'Aristote et d'Isocrates." Rhetorique et Philosophie Cicéron. Presses Universtaires De France, 1960. 107-08.

764. Michelakis, E. Platons Lehre von der Anwendung des Gesetzes und der Begriff der Billigkeit bei Aristoteles. Munich,

765. Mioni, Elpidus. "De arte rhetorica (Bekker 1343-1353)." Aristotelis Codices Graeci Qui in Bibliothecis Venetis Adservantur. 1958.

766. Mizow, E. Questionum Aristotelearum specimen. Wands. Beck, gymnasial-Progyanium. 1881.

767. Mocenigo, Alovigi. La Rettorica d'Aristotile, tradotta dal Greco in Italiano da Alovigia Mocenigo. Bologna, 1605.

768._____. /Another edition./ Venezia, 1744.

769. Molette, Carlton. "Aristotle's Union of Rhetoric and Dramatic Theory." Southern Speech Journal, XXXIV (1968), 47-54.

770. Moraux, Paul. À la recherche de l'Aristote perdue: le dialogue Sur la justice. Louvain-Paris, 1957. 183p.

771._____. "Rhétorique et Poétique." Les Listes Anciennes des Ouvrages D'Aristote. Louvain. Editions Universitaires, 1951. 96-104.

772. Moreau, Joseph. "Rhétorique et Poétique." Aristote et son ecole. Paris. Presses Universitaires de France, 1962. 248-58.

773. Morpurgo-Tagliabue, Guido. "Aristotelismo E Barocco." Retorica e Barocco. Edited by Enrico Castelli. Rome, 1955. 119-97.

774._____. "La Stilistica di Aristotele e lo strutturalismo." Lingua e Stile, II (1967), 1-18.

775._____. Linguistica e stilistica in Aristotele. Roma: Ed. dell' Ateneo (Collana Filologia e Critica, n. 4), 1967. 398p. (See Review by Gianfranco Fioravanti, Filosofia, XXII (1971), 383-86.)

776. Morrhii, Girardi. Aristotelis De Arte rhetorica libri tres. Parisiis, Apud Collegiumi Sobonae, 1530.

777. Moxon, Thomas A. Aristotle's Poetic, Demetrius on Style and Selections From Aristotle's Rhetoric Together With Hobbes' Digest and Horace's Ars Poetica. London and Toronto: Dent & Sons, 1934.

778._____. /Another edition./ 1953. 337p.

779. Mras, Karl. "Plato's Phaedrus und die Rhetorik I.." Wiener Studien, XXXVI (1914), 295-319.

780. Mudd, Charles. "The Enthymeme and Logical Validity." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (1959), 409-414.

781. Müller, Karl O. "Rhetoric and Criticism." A History of the Literature of Ancient Greece. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1842. 288-94.

782. Munro, Hugh P. "The Function and Measurement of Rhetorical Energia." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1963. 176p.

783. Munteano, B. "Humanisme et Rhétorique: la survie littéraire de rhéteurs anciens." Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France, LVIII (1958), 145-56.

784. Mure, G. R. G. "The Arts of Persuasion and Poetry." Aristotle. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1932. 223-233.

785. Muret, Marc Antonine. Aristotelis De arte dicendi liber secundis, M. Antonio Mureto interprete. Romae,

Apud heredes A. Bladij, 1577. 48p.

786._____. /Another edition./ Parisiis, 1577.

787._____. /Another edition./ Venetiis, 1583.

788._____. Aristotelis Rhetoricorum libri duo, M. Antonio Mureto interprete. Romae, apud Bartholomaeum Grassum, 1585. 180p.

789._____. /Another edition./ Romae, 1595.

790._____. /Another edition./ 1600.

791._____. /Another edition./ 1683.

792._____. M. Antonii Mureti, presbyteri et civis Romani commentarius in primum et secundum librum Rhetoricorum Aristotelis, et ejusdem interpretatio ex graeco. In primum questionem Tusculanom M. Tulli Ciceronis liber singularis. Notae in tres libros de Officiis et in quinque de Finibus. In orationem pro Dejotaro. Accessit ejusdem Mureti commentarius in Catilinarias Ciceronis. Ingolstadii, 1602.

793._____. Rhetoricorum libri 3: Priores 2, M. Antonio Mureto: Tertius M. Antonio Maioragio inter-

pretibus. Mylius: Birckmann, 1594.

794._____. /Another edition./ 1607. 234p.

795._____. Mureti Opera Omnia, 1789.

796._____. Paraphrasis in Rhetoricam Aristotelis interjecta rerum difficiliorum explicatione, et collata ipsius Riccoboni multis in locis conversione, cum Majoragii, Sigonii, Victorii, Mureti conversionibus Ad editionem hanc accesserunt librorum primi secundique, M. A. Mureti summae breviores. Londini, 1822.

797. Murphy, James J. "Aristotelian Rhetoric." Chaucer, Gower, and the English Rhetorical Tradition. Stanford University Press, 1956. 4-9.

798._____. "Aristotle's Rhetoric in the Middle Ages." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (1966), 109-115.

799._____. "The Scholastic Condemnation of Rhetoric in the Commentary of Giles of Rome on the Rhetoric of Aristotle." Arts libéraux et Philosophie Au Moyen Âge. Montreal, 1967. 833-41; Paris, 1969.

800. Mutschmann, Ernest Hermann. Divisiones quae vulgo dicuntur Aristotelae. Praefatus edidit testimoniisque instruxit Hermannus Mutschman. Lipsiae, in aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1906. 76p.

801._____. /Another edition./ Keil, 1906. 42p.

802. Mynas, Minoïde. L'art de la rhétorique, par Aristote. Texte collationné sur les éd. Précédentes et sur les manuscripts de la Bibliotheque du Roi: préc. d'une préf. sur l'art oratoire des anciens, et des tables analytiques; suivi de notes et d'ind. Paris, 1837. 453p.

803. Nadeau, Ray. "An Analysis of the Commonplaces." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIX (1963), 328-31.

804._____. "Some Aristotelian and Stoic Influences of the Theory of Stases." Speech Monographs, XXVI (1959), 248-54.

805. Nagy, Albino. "Notizie intorno alla retorica d'Al-Fārābi," Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei (Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche, e Filologiche), Serie 5, Vol. II, Rome, 1893. 684-91.

806. Navarre, O. Essai sur la rhétorique grecque avant

Aristote. Paris, Hachette. 1900.

807. Neale, John V. "An Essay on the Rhetoric of Aristotle." Unpublished Masters thesis, Cornell University, 1939.

808. Nelson, William F. "An Historical, Critical and Experimental Study of the Function of Topoi in Human Information Retrieval." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1969.

809. Neobar, Conrad. Εἰς τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους Ῥητορικὴν Προάγγελμα ἀνώνυμον. Nunc primùm in lucem editur cum Regio privilegio in quinquennium. Paris, 1539. 80p.

810. Nestle, von Wilhelm. "Ars Rhetorica." Aristotele Hauptiverke. Leipzig: Kröner, 1934

811._____. /Reprinted./ 1938.

812._____. /Reprinted./ 1942.

813._____. /Another edition./ Stuttgart: Kröner, 1953.

814._____. /Reprinted./ 1958.

815._____. /Reprinted./ 1963.

816. Neufville, Andre Bauduyn de la. La Rhétorique Royal d'Aristote, traduite de Grec en Francois. Paris, 1669. 144p.

817._____. /Another edition./ Paris, J. B. Loyson, 1673.

818. Nickau, Klaus. "Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica W. D. Ross Oxonii 1959." Gymnasium, LXXI (1964), 460-64.

819. Niphi, A. Magni philosophi A. Niphi exposition interpretatio in libros Artis Rhetorice Aristotelis. Venetiis, 1537.

820._____. Aristotelis topica inventio in octo secta libros. A. Magno A. Nipho interpretata atque exposita. Paris, 1540.

821. Norden, Eduard. "Aristoteles u. Theophrast." Die Antike Kunstprosa. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1958. 125-26.

822. Nores, Giason di. Breve Trattato dell 'Oratore di M. J. Denores. . . Discorso del medesimo intorno alla distinctione, deffinitione, et, divisione della Rhetorica in piu tavole . . . compartitio. Pavoa, 1574.

823._____. Breve Institutione dell' Ottima Republica di J. de Nores, ...raccolta in gran parte da tutta la Philosophia humana di Aristotile... Introdutione del medesimo ridotta poi in alcune tavole sopra i tre libri della Rhetorica d'Aristotile. 2pt. Venetia, 1578.

824._____. Della Rhetorica...libri tre; ne quali, oltra i precetti dell' arte, si contengono vinti orationi, tradotte de' piu famosi philosophi' ed oratori, etc. Venetia, 1584.

825._____. /Another edition./ Milano: Rusconi, 1826. 334p. (cf. No. 237).

826._____. /Another edition./ Milano: Silvestri, 1831. (cf. No. 239)

827._____. /Another edition./ 1868.

828. Oates, Whitney. Aristotle and the Problem of Value. Princeton University Press, 1963. 335-351.

829. Ochs, Donovan Joseph. "The Tradition of the Classical Doctrines of Rhetorical Topoi." Unpublished dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1966.

830._____. "Aristotle's Concept of Formal Topics." Speech Monographs, XXXVI (1969), 417-25.

831. O'Donnell, E. P. "The Influence of Greek Rhetoric on the Development of Roman Oratory in the Last Century of the Republic." Unpublished thesis, University of London, 1954.

832. Olian, Robert. "Ancient Rhetoric and Moral Theory." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1965.

833._____. "The Intended Uses of Aristotle's Rhetoric." Speech Monographs, XXXV (1968), 137-48.

834. Omont, H. "Un nouveau manuscrit de la 'Rhétorique' d'Aristote et la bibliotheque grècque de Francesco Filelfo." La Bibliofilia, II (1900-01), 136-40.

835. O'Neil, Marion Rose. "The Opinions of Ancient Rhetoricians Concerning the Audience." Unpublished Masters thesis, Cornell University, 1940.

836. Ong, Walter J., S.J. "Hobbes' and Talon's Ramist Rhetoric in English." Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, L (1949-53), 260-69.

837. Oporinus, Johannes. De Arte Rhetorica libri tres. Basel, 1549.

838. Orban, M. "Rehabilitation de la parole dans le De Oratore de Cicéron." L'Antiquité Classique, XIX (1950), 27-44.

839. Organ, Troy Wilson. Index to Aristotle. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949.

840. Oroz, J. "La retórica antiqua." Helmantica, V (1954), 95-114.

841. Orth, E. "Varia Critica: Rhet. III, 1, 1403b, 15-17." Helamntica, VI (1955), 69-79.

842. Osborne, Michael. "The Function and Significance of Metaphor in Rhetorical Discourse." Unpublished dissertation, University of Florida, 1965 ?

843._____. "Evolution of the Thoayr of Metaphor." Western Speech, XXXI (1967), 121-31.

844. Owen, G. E. L. "The Platonism of Aristotle." Proceedings of the British Academy, LI (1967), 125-50.

845. Pack, R. A. "Errors as Subjects of Comic Mirth." Classical Philology, XXXIII (1938), 405-10.

846. Paëpp, Ioannes. Artificiosae memoriae fundamenta ex Aristotle, Cicerone, Thoma Aquinate, Aliisque praestantissimis doctoribus petita, figuris, interrogationibus, ac res ponsionibus clarius quam unquam antehac demonstrata. Lugduni: sumptibus auctores et venundantur apud Bartholemaeum Vincentium, 1619.

847. Pagliaro, A. "La dottrina dell' analogia e i suoi precedenti." Ricerche Linguistiche, IV (1958), 1-18.

848. Palmer, Georgiana P. The TOPOI of Aristotle's Rhetoric as Exemplified in the Orators. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1934.

849. Parson, Don W., and David M. Berg. "The Relationship of Rhetoric and Education: An Aristotelian View." Southern Speech Journal, XXXIII (1968), 328-32.

850. Parson, Frederic J. The Rhetoric of Aristotle with Notes and Illustrated Passages. Oxford: Parker, 1836. 34p.

851. Pater, W. A. de. "Espèces Rhétoriques Instruments et Lieux." Les Topiques D'Aristote et La Dialectique Platonicienne. Editions St. Paul Fribourg Suisse, 1965. 92-148.

852. Patterson, Robert E. "Chinese Rhetoric Compared with that of Aristotle and Other Western Rhetoricians." Ohio Speech Journal, II (1963), 15-23.

853. Paul, Robert Bateman. An Analysis of Aristotle's Rhetoric, with questions. By . . . R. B. Paul . . . Oxford: Printed for the author, Published by J. Vincent, 1830. 66p.

854. _____. /Another edition./ Oxford: Vincent, 1837. 88p.

855. Paulinus, Fabius. /Venetis, 1591. Cf. No. 715/

856. Pavlovskis, Zoja. "Aristotle, Horace and the Ironic Man." Classical Philology, LXIII (1968), 22-41.

857. Payne, Robert O. "The Boundaries of Language and Rhetoric: Some Historical Considerations." College Composition and Communication, CCCXIX (1968), 109-116

858. Pazzi, Alessandro de'. Aristotelis de Arte rhetorica libri tres; ad alexandrum de Rhetorica liber unus; de poetica liber unus. Ioan. Gryphius exudebat. Venice, 1546.

859._____. /Another edition./ Lyons, 1580.

860. Pearson, Lionel. "Characterization in Drama and Oratory." Classical Quarterly, XVIII (1968), 76-83.

861. Pence, Orville Leon. "A Study of the Principles of Pathetic Appeal in the Works of Certain Classical Rhetoricians." Unpublished Masters thesis, Washington University, 1939.

862. Pépin, Jean. "La philosophie d'Aristote, se premieres expressions et sa postérité." Les Etudes Philosophiques, No. 4 (1969), 429-38.

863. Perelman, Chaim. "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning." The Great Ideas Today. Edited by Robert M. Hutchins. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1970. 272-313.

864._____. "The New Rhetoric." The Prospect of Rhetoric. Edited by Lloyd Bitzer and Edwin Black. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentic-Hall, Inc.,

1971. 115-122.

865. Perrot, G. L'Eloquence politique et judiciaire à Athenes. Paris, 1873.

866. Peter, H. "Rhetorik und Poesie im Klassischen Altertum." Neu Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik, V (1898), 637.

867. Peters, F. E. "Rhetorica." Aristotles Arabus, The Oriental Translations and Commentaries on The Aristotelian Corpus. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1968. 26-28.

868. _____. Aristotle and the Arabs: The Aristotelian Tradition in Islam. New York University Press, 1969 ?

869. Philosophicus, Rhetoricus (pseudo). "Art of Rhetoric. Aristotle of Macedon." Philosophy and Rhetoric, I (1968), 51-53.

870. Piccolomini, M. Alessandro. Copiosissima parafrase, di M. Alessandro Piccolomini: nel primo libro della Retorica d'Aristotele. Con la tauola de i capi in quella contenuti: dalli argumenti de i quali potra il lettore ageuolmente conoscere quanto utile, & necessaria lettione se

gli appresenti. Venetia, per G. Varisco, e compagni, 1565.

871._____. Pienna, et larga parafrase . . . nel secondon libro della Retorica d'Aristotele a Theodette. appresso Gio Francesco Camotio, Venice, 1569.

872._____. I tre libri della Retorica d'Aristotele a Theodette; tradotti in lingua volgare, de M. Alessandro Piccolomini, Nuouamente dati in luce. F. de' Franceschi: Venetia, 1571.

873._____. Piena et larga parafrase di M. Alesandro Piccolomini nel terzo libro della Retorica d'Aristotele à Theodette. Venetiz, Per G. Varisco & Compagni, 1572.

874._____. Piena et larga parafrase: di M. Alessandro Piccolomini: nel secondo libro della Retorica d'Aristotile . . . Nuoumente stampato & . . . ricorreto. Heredi di G. Varisco: Venetia, 1592.

875._____. Retorica d'Aristotile amplissimanente tradotta, & illustrate con dotte, & vtilissime digressioni da Alessandro Piccolomini. Opera non meno utile che necessaria a tutti quelli, che si dilettano dell' arte oratoria. Venetia, Appresso

Giorgio Argelieri, 1597. 507p.

876. Pidppidi, D. M. "Aristote et Tucydid. En Mange du chapitre IX de la Poetique." Mélanges de Philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau par ses collegues et élèves étrangers. Paris, 1948. 483-90.

877. Patonow, J. "Rhetorica, russich übersetzt von J. Platonow." Journal des kais. russ. Ministeriums der Volksaufklärung, (1893), 10-82.

878. Plebe, Armando. La Teoria del Comico, da Aristotele à Plutarco. Torino Universita, 1952. 132p.

879._____. "Retorica aristotelica e logica stoica." Filosofia (torino), X (1959), 391-424.

880._____. Retorica. Bari, Laterza. 1961.

881._____. "La Retorica Aristotelica." Breve Storia Della Retorica Antica. Milano, 1961. 67-99.

882._____. "Che cos' è la retorica (Retorica, I, 1-2); L'elocuzione poetica e retorica (Retorica, III, 1-12)." Estetica/Storia Antologica Dei Problemi Filosofici. Firenze, 1965. 87-119.

883. Pohlenz, M. "Zu den attischen Reden auf die Gefallenen." Symbolae Osloensis, auspiciis Societatis Graeco-Latine, XXVI (1948), 46-74.

884. Pomeroy, Ralph. "Aristotle and Cicero: Rhetorical Style." Western Speech, XXV (1961), 25-32.

885. Portello, Luigi dal. Trattato de' costumi de' giovani, de' giovani, de' vecchi, e dell' èta virile; de' nobili, de' ricchi, de' potenti, e de' fortunati, di Aristotele. Nuovamente trad. Venetia, 1561.

886. Portus, Aemilio. Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνης ῥητορικῆς βιβλία τρία. Aristotelis artes rhetoricae, sive de arte dicendi, libri 3, A M. A. Porto . . . nova interpretatione illustrati, item F. Porti . . . in eosdem libros perpetui Latini commentarii. Spirae, Albinus, 1598.

887._____. /Another edition./ Bibliopolio Commeliniano. 1606.

888. Price, Robert. "Some Antistrophes to the Rhetoric." Philosophy and Rhetoric, I (1968), 145-64.

889. Primmer, Adolf. "Schlichter Stil und eingliedrige Periode in Aristoteles 'Rhetorik' III, 9."

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 109 (1966), 73-77.

890. Pross, E. Practical Implications of the Aristotelian Concept of Ethos." Southern Speech Journal, XVII (1952), 257-64.

891. Quacquarelli, A. La retorica antica al bivio. Roma, 1956. 215p.

892. Rabe, H., ed. "In Artem rhetoricam commentaria." Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita Consilio et auctoritate Accademiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Berolini, typ. et impensis G. Reimeri, 1896.

893. Radermacher, L. " οὐσίωσις (Rhet. 1420a)." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XLIV (1889), 638.

894._____. "Ein Nachhall des Aristoteles in römischer Kaiserzeit." Weiner Studien, XXXVIII (1916), 72-80.

895._____. "Phidias in einem übersehenen Zitat au Dionys ?." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, LXXXIX (1940), 78-80.

896._____. "Artium scriptores (Reste der voaristotelischen Rhetorik)." Oesterreisches Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsbericht, CCXXVII, Band 3, Vienna, 1951.

897. Rainold, John "Joh. Rainoldi Lectiones in Aristotelis Rhetoricam, praevia praefatione." (Queens College, Oxford, listed in part 1 of H. O. Coxe, Catalogus Codicum MSS. in Collegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus Hodie Adservantur, 2 parts, Oxford, 1852.)

898. Rapin, René. Réflexions sur l'éloquence, la poétique, L'histoire et la philosophie, avec le jugement qui on doit fail faire des auteurs qui se sont signalis dans ces quarte parties des belles lettre. Paris, 1671.

899._____. /Another edition./ Paris, 1684.

900._____. /Another edition./ Amsterdam, 1709.

901._____. /Another edition./ 1725.

902. Rassow, H. "Zu Aristoteles Rhetorik und Poetik." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XLIII (1888), 583-96.

903. Rauchenstein, R. "Zu Aristoteles Rhetorik und Poetik." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XVIII (1863), 468-70.

904. Reinach, Th. "Note sur un passage de la Rhétorique d'Aristote." Académie des inscriptions, 8 April. (Revue Critique No. 16), 1892.

905. Renehan, Robert. "Aristotle's Definition of Anger." Philologus, XVII (1963), 61-74.

906. Rescher, Nicholas. Al-Fārābi's Short Commentary on Aristotle's 'Prior Analytics'. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963. 11-21.

907. Reyes, A. La antigua rétorica. México. Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1942.

908. Reynolds, John. "Commentarii de Rhetoric, Aristotle." London, 1607. (MS., British Museum)

909. Riccoboni, Antonio. Aristotelis Artis rhetoricae libri tres; ab Antonio Riccobono Latine conversi. Eusdem rhetoricae paraphrasis, interiecta rerum explicatione, & collata Riccoboni multis in locis conversione cum Maioragii, Sigonii, Victorii & Mureti conversionibus, separatim est edita. Hanoviae, 1556. 354p.

910._____. Ars rhetorica ab Antonio Riccobono lat. conversa. Ejusdem Riccoboni Explicationum liber, quo Aristotelis loca obscuriora. . . Aristotelis Ars Poetica ab eodem in lat. linguam versa. Cum euisdem De re comica disputatione. Venetiis: Meiettus, 1579. 457p.

911._____. Aristotelis Artis rhetoricae libri tres, ab Antonio Riccobono latine conversi. Ejusdem Rhetoricae paraphrasis, interiecta rerum explicatione . . . . Hanoviae, apud heredes A. Wecheli, C. Marnium et J. Aubrium, 1588.

912._____. /Another edition,/ 1606.

913._____. Praxis rhetorica, seu de usu artis rhetoricae in tribus generibus causarum, et in orationibus eccelesiasticis commentariorum libri XVI. Coloniae, 1588.

914._____. A. Riccoboni paraphrasis in Rhetoricam Aristotelis, interjecta rerum difficiliorum explicatione, & collata ipsius Riccoboni . . . conversione, cum Jarjorgii, Sigonii, Victorii, Mureti conversionibus. Francocofurti, 1588. 288p.

915._____. /Another edition./ Oxonii, 1819.

916._____. /Another edition./ Londoni, 1822.

917._____. "Cum inciperent explicare artem rhetoricam Aristotelis." Orationes. Vol. II, Patavii, apud L. Pasquatum, 1591.

918._____. "In quo: rhetori ces ad Theodecten, libri 3." Operum, quotquot extant, Latina editio: Ex optimorum quorumque numero Graecae ed. Sylburgianae respondens, itidemque ut illa peculiorem cuique tomo ind. attexens. Francofurti: Marnius & Aubrius, 1593.

919._____. Artis rhetoricae libri 3. Cum observatione eiusdem Riccoboni loco indicis de usu artis rhetoricae Aristotelis, seu ratione conficiendarum orationum. Venetiae: Meiettus, 1594. 128p.

920._____. De usu Artis rhetoricae. Aristotelis commentarii viginti quinque . . . quibus accessit ejusdem Antonii Riccoboni a Jo. Mario Matio Brixiano dissensio de quibusdam locis Quintiliani probantibus rhetorica ad Herennium esse cornificiii. Frankfurt, 1595.

921._____. Commentarius in universam doctinam oratoriam Ciceronis . . . Simulque libri rhetoricae Aristotelis perstringunter. Addito compendio totius rhetoricae ex Aristotele et Cicerone junioribus ediscendo. Frankfurt, 1596.

922._____. Rhetoricorum artisque poeticae libri omnes. Operum, quotquot extant, Latina editio: Ex Optimorum quorumque interpretum versione, concinnata. Coloniae, Allobr.: Stoer, 1608.

923._____. Aristotelis Artis rhetoricae libri tres, quibus subjungitur ejusdem de Arte poetica liber, latina versione e regione graeci sermonis posita. Editio postrema . . . (ab Antonio Riccobono). Lugdini, sumptibus P. Rigaurd, 1618.

924._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae Rhetoricorum libri tres. Ejusdem de poetica liber unus. Nuperrimè recensiti et summa cura pristino nitori restituti (graece et latine). Parisiis, J. Libert, 1620.

925._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae Rhetoricorum libri tres (Antonio Riccobono interprete.) Ejusdem De poetica liber unus (Daniele Heinsio

interprete). Nuperrimè recensitis, & summa cura pristino nitori restituti. Parisiis, Apud I. Libert, 1625.

926._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae Rhetoricorum libri tres. Eiusdem De poetica liber unus. Nuperrimè recensiti & summa cura pristino nitori restituti. Parisiis, Apud I Libert, 1629.

927._____. /Another edition./ 1645.

928._____. Aristotelis Artis rhetoricae libri tres; ab Antonio Riccobono latine conversi. Eiusdem rhetoricae paraphrasis, interiectarum explicatione, & collata Riccoboni multis in locis conversione cum Maioragii, Sigonii, Victorii, & Mureti conversionibus, separatim est edita. Hanoviae, 1630. 354p.

929._____. Aristotelis Artis rhetoricae libri tres. Latinâ versione è regione graeci semonis posita . . . Antonio Riccobono interprete. Parisiis, 1648. 259p.

930._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae De arte rhetorica libri tres. Cum Latina versione . . . Accessit index . . . Ad usum Seminarii Pata-

vini. Patavii, Ex typographica Seminarii, 1689. 463p.

931._____. Aristotelis Stagiritae De Arte Rhetorica libri tres. Cum Latina versione, & exacta librorum, & capitum divisione. Accessit index rerum omnium, & verborum, quae universo opere continentur. Patavii, ex typographia Seminarii, 1786.

932._____. "Oratio Pro Studiis Hamanitatis." La Crisi Della Retorica umanistica nel Cinquencento (Antonio Riccobono). Libreria Scientifica Editrice, Napoli, 1961. 163-179.

933. Rice, George P. "Aristotle's Rhetoric and Introductory Public Address." Western Speech, VII (1943), 2-5.

934._____. "Aristotle's Rhetoric as an Undergraduate Textbook." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIII (1947), 217-19/

935. Richards, H. "Ad Aristotle's Rhetorica 1416-21." Journal of Philology, XIII (1885), 98-100.

936._____. "Notes on the Rhetoric of Aristotle." Journal of Philology, XXXIII (1914), 172-81.

937._____. "Aristotle's Rhet. 3, 6." Classical Review, I (1898), 28.

938._____. "Aristotle Rhet. 1377a20." Classical Review," VIII (1902), 395.

939. Riemann, Othon. "Aristote, Rhétorique 3.7.," Revue de Philologie, VI (1882), 154.

940. Riondato, E. La Teoria aristotelica dell' Enunciazione. Padova, 1597.

941. Riposati, Benedetto. Studi sui Topica di Cicerone. Milan, 1947.

942._____. "Problemi di retorica antica." Introduzione alla Filologia Classica. Edited by Carlo Marzorati. Milano, 1951. 657-789.

943. Robert, Brother, S. F. S. C. "Rhetoric and Dialectic According to the First Latin Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle." The New Scholasticism, XXXI (1957), 484-498.

944. Roberts, Rhys. "The New Rhetorical Fragment (Ox. Pap. III, p. 27-30) in Relation to the Sicilian Rhetoric of Corax and Tisias." Classical Review, XVIII (1904), 18-21.

945._____. "Aristotle on Public Speaking." Fortnightly Review, XCVI (1924), 201-210.

946._____. "References to Plato in Aristotle's Rhetoric." Classical Philology, XIX (1924), 342-46.

947._____. "Notes on Aristotle's Rhetoric." American Journal of Philology, XLV (1924), 353-57.

948._____. Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism. New York, 1928.

949._____. Rhetorica. The Works of Aristotle. Translated into English under the editorship of W. David Ross. Vol. XI Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. (Selected passages reprinted in: Selected Readings in Public Speaking. Edited by Jane Blankenship and Robert Wilhoit. Belmont, California, 1967; The Speakers Reader: Concepts in Communication. Edited by Robert L. Scott. 1969)

950._____. /Another edition./ The Rhetoric and The Poetics of Aristotle, with an Introduction and Notes by Friedrich Solmsen. W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater, trans. New York: Modern Library, 1954.

951._____. "Rhetoric." Great Books of the Western World. Edited by Robert Maynard Hutchins. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britanica, Inc. 1952. 593-675.

952._____. Rhetorica (W. Rhys Roberts). De Rhetorica ad Alexandrum (E. S. Forster). De Poetica (Ingram Bywater). Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.

953. Robin, Léon. "Rhétorique et dialectique; les 'lieux' les genres Oratores." Aristote. Paris: Presses Universitaires De France, 1944. 288-90.

954. Robinson, Kenneth Walter. "Some Classical Discussions of Style." Unpublished Masters thesis, Cornell University, 1929.

955. Rochefort, M. de. "Sur L'object de la Tragédie chez les Grecs." Mémoires De Littérature Tires Des Registres De L'Academie Royale, XXXIX (1777), 125-58.

956. Roemer, Adolphus. "Zur Kritik der Rhetorik des Aristote." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XXXIX (1884), 491-510.

957._____. Aristotelis Ars rhetorica cum nova codicis $A^c$ et vetustae translationis collatione, edidit Adolphus Roemer. Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubner, 1885.

958._____. "Zur Rhetorik des Aristoteles II, 2, 1379a15." Blätter für das Bayer Gymnasialschulwesen, XXII (1886), 39.

959._____. Aristotelis Ars rhetorica; iterum edidit dr. Adolphus Roemer. Lipsiae, in aedibus B. G. Teubner, 1898. 245p.

960._____. /Another edition./ 1914.

961._____. /Another edition./ 1923.

962._____. /Another edition./ 1936.

963._____. "Zur Rhetorik des Aristoteles." Blätter für das Bayerische Gymnasialschulwesen, (1900), 209-220.

964. Rohatyn, Dennis A. "A Double Anticipation in Aristotle's Rhetoric." Philosophy and Rhetoric, II (1969), 235.

965. Romeyer-Dherbey, G. "Les Discours el le Contraire."

Les Études Philosophiques, IV (1970), 475-98.

966. Rondelet, A. De modalibus apud Aristote. Paris, 1847.

967. Rose, H. J. "Metaphor, Ancient and Modern." Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952. 239-47.

968. Rose, V. De Aristotelis Librorum Ordine et Auctoritate. 1854.

969._____. Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus. 1863.

970. Rosenfield, Lawrence. "Aristotle and Information Theory: A Comparision of the Influence of Causal Assumptions on Two Theories of Communication." Unpublsihed Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1963.

971._____. "The Doctrine of the Mean in Aristotle's Rhetoric." Theoria, XXXI (1965), 191-98.

972._____. "Rhetorical Criticism and an Aristotelian Notion of Process." Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 1-16.

973._____. "An Autopsy of the Rhetorical Tradition." The Prospect of Rhetoric. Edited by Lloyd Bitzer and Edwin Black. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971. 64-77.

974._____. Aristotle & Information Theory: A Comparison of the Influence of Causal Assumptions on Two Theories of Communication. New York: Humanities Press, 1971 (In press).

975. Rosenmeyer, T. G. "Gorgias, Aeschylus and Apate (Rhet. 1406b 14-19)." American Journal of Philology, LXXVI (1955), 255-60.

976. Rosenthal, L. "The Concept of Ethos in Ancient Rhetoric." Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 114-26.

978. Ross, Sir W. D. "Rhetoric and Poetics." Aristotle. London: Methuen & Co., 1923. 270-90.

979._____. /Another edition./ 1949.

980._____. "The Three Ages of Man, Rhet. 1389a2-1390b11." Aristotle Selections. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927. 323-28.

981._____. /Reprinted./ 1938.

982._____. Ars rhetorica. Recognavit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit W. D. Ross. E Typographeo Clarendoniano: Oxonii, 1959. 206p.

983._____. /Another edition./ 1964.

984. Rossignal, J. P. "L'Art de la Rhétorique par Aristote C. Minoïdes Mynas." Journal Des Savants, (October, 1840), 615-34.

985._____. /Above review expanded./ (Septembre, 1842), 554-68.

986._____. /Above review expanded./ (Février, 1843), 102-119.

987. Rössler, W. Rhetorum antiquorum de dispositione doctrina. Gymn.-Progr. 4. Budissin, 1886.

988. Rostagni, A. "Aristotele e l'aristotelismo nella storia dell' estetica antica." Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica, II (1922), 1-147.

989._____. "Un nuovo capitolo della retorica e della sofistica." Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica, II (1922), 148-201.

990. Roth, Karl Ludwig. Schriften zur Rhetorik und Poetik. Werke. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1833. 304p.

991._____. Schriften zur Rhetorik und Poetik. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1836. 512p.

992. Rowell, Edward Z. "Prolegomena to Argumentation." Quarterly Journal of Speech, Part II, XVIII (1932), 224-48; Part Iv, XVIII (1932), 585-606.

993._____. "The Conviction-Persuasion Duality." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XX (1934), 469-82.

994. Ruelle, Charles-Émile. Aristote, Poétique et Rhétorque; traduction entièrement nouvelle d'après les dernieres recensions du texte par Ch-Émile Ruelle. Paris, 1883. 371p.

995._____. /Another edition./ Paris, Garnier Freres, 1922. 371p.

996. Ruhnken, David. "Ratio de Graecia Artium ac Doctrinarum Inventrice." Opuscula-Oratoria, Philologica, Critica. Lugduni Batavorum, apud Sam. et Joh. Luchtmans, 1807. 78-104.

997. Russel, D. A. "Rhetoric and Criticsm." Greece & Rome, XIV (1967), 130-144.

998. Russo, Antonio. La filosofia della retorica in Aristotele. Naples. Societa Arte Editoriale Libraria. 1962. 172p.

999. Rutherford, Lewis Roland. "An Interpretation of Aristotle's Theory of the Modes and Forms of Proof." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1970.

1000. Ryan, Pat M., Jr. Aristotle: Rhetoric, an Abstract of Principles of Public Speaking. Golden, Colorado: Colorado School of Mines. n.d. 17p.

1001. Saintsbury, George. Loci critici. Passages Illustrative of Critical Theory and Practice from Aristotle Downwards. London ,1903.

1002._____. "The Rhetoric." A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe. London: William Blackwood & Sons, Ltd. 2nd ed., 1949. 39-56.

1003. Salim, Muhammad Salim, ed. Talkhīs al-khātabah. United Arab Republic, 1967.

1004. Sallam, A. "Averroes' Commentary on the Third Book of Aristotle's Rhetoric." Unpublished thesis, Oxford University, 1952.

1005. Salomon, Max. "Der Begriff des Tauschgeschäftes bei Aristoteles." Der Begriff Der Gerechtigkeit Bei Aristoteles. Leiden, 1937. 145-67.

1006. Samaranch, Francisco de P. Retorica. Traducción del griego y notas par Francisco de P. Samaranch. Madrid: Agiular, 1964. 311p.

1007. Sandford, William P. "English Rhetoric Reverts to Classicism." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XV (1929), 503-25.

1008. Sandys, John E., ed. The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary. E. M. Cope. Cambridge University Press, 1877. (See no.308)

1009._____. "Aristotle." M. Tulli Ciceronis Ad M. Brutum Orator. Cambridge University Press, 1885.

1010._____. "Aristotle's Rhetoric." A History of Classical Scholarship. Cambridge University Press, 1896. 81-97.

1011._____. /Another edition./ 1906.

1012. Sattler, W. "Conceptions of Ethos in Rhetoric." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1941.

1013._____. "Concepts of Ethos in Ancient Rhetoric." Speech Monographs, XIV (1947), 55-65.

1014. Saupe, W. De Aristotele rhetorum auctore. Diss. Leipzig, 1904.

1015. Sauppe, Hermann. Epistola critica G. Hermannum. Lipsize, 1840.

1016._____. "Bedeutung der Anführungen au Aristoteles Rhetorik bei Dionysios von Halikarnass für die Kritik des Aristoteles." Ebenda, (1863), 336-356.

1017._____. Dionysios und Aristoteles. 1863.

1018. Schaep, Willem von. De Spreek-kunst van Aristoteles aen Alexander de Groote . . . uyt het griecks in het nederlants vertaelt, door Mr. Willem van Schaep . . . . Leyden, D. Von Gaesreck, 1677.

1019. Schendler, W. "An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1954. 234p.

1020. Schirach, von. "Ein Abschnitt, der von den Leidenschaften und Sitten handelt, von Schirach," Ueber die Harmonie des Stils, aus dem Marmontel. Bremen u. Leipzig, 1768.

1021. Schlechta, Karl. Goethe in seinem Verhältnis zu Aristoteles. Frankfut, 1938.

1022. Schmid, Walter. Ueber die Klassische Theories und Praxis des Antiken Prosarththmus. Hermes Einzelschriften 12. Wiesbaden, Steiner. 203p.

1023. Schmidt, A. Aus des griech. Rhetorik. Mannheim, 1858. 48p.

1024. Schmidt. Maximilan. T. G. Voigtelio . . . muneribus publicis per quinquoquinta annos . . . functo . . .gratulatur D. M. Schmidt. Inest commentatio de tempore, quo ab Aristotele libri de Arte Rhetorica conscripti et editi sint. Halis Saxonum, 1837. 21p.

1025._____. On the Date of the Rhetorik! Halle, 1839.

1026. Schoell, Maximilian Samson. "Aristote Rhétorique." Histoire de la Littérature Grecque Profane. Vol. III Paris: Libraire de Gide Fils, 1824.

1027. Schoepsdau, K. Antike Vorstellungen von der Geschichte der griechischen Rhetorik. Diss. Univ. des Saarlandes Saarbrücken, 1969.

1028. Schott and Wenck. Commentario Ciceronis de fine eloquentiae sententia examinature et c. Aristotelis, Quinctiliani etc., comparatur. Leipzig, 1801.

1029. Schraderi, Christophori. Aristotelis De arte rhetorica libri tres, Graece et Latine editi cura Christophori Schraderi. Helmaestadi, Typis & sumptibus H. Mulleri, 1648. 253p.

1030. _____. /Another edition./ 1660.

1031. _____. /Another edition./ 1661.

1032. _____. /Another edition./ 1672.

1033. _____. Dispositiones oratoriae ad ductum Rhetoricae conciunatae. Helmstadii, 1663.

1034._____. /Another edition./ 1673.

1035._____. /Another edition./ 1674.

1036._____. De Rhetoricorum Aristotelis sententia et usu commentarius. Helmestadi, 1674.

1037. Schuhle, Peirre-Maxime. Aristote. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968.

1038. Schupp, F. "Zur Geschichte der Beweistopik in der älten griechischen Gerichtsrede." Wiener Studien, XLV (1926-27), 17-28; 173-85.

1039. Schütz, Hermann. "Kritische Bemerkungen zu Aristoteles Rhetorik." Jahrbücher für classiche Philologies, CXXXVII (1888), 681-95.

1040. Schwaab, Franz Joseph. Über die Bedeutung des γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν in der aristotelischen Rhetorik. Diss. Würzburg, 1923. 46p.

1041. Schwab, Moïse. "Rhetoric and Poetic." Bibliographie d'Aristote. 1896. 285-98.

1042. Schwartz, Joesph, and John Rycenga, eds. The Province of Rhetoric. New York: Ronald Press, 1965.

1043. Schwartz, Joseph. "Kenneth Burke, Aristotle, and The Future of Rhetoric." College Composition and Communication, XVII (1966), 210-16.

1044. Sears, Lorenzo. "Aristotle, The Rhetorician." The History of Oratory. Chicago: S. C. Griggs and Company, 1896. 78-90.

1045. Seaton, R. C. "The Aristotelian Enthymeme." Classical Review, XXVII (1914), 113-19.

1046. Seeck, Gustav Adolf. "Empedokles B 17, 9-13 (=26, 8-12), B 8, B 100 bei Aristoteles." Hermes, VC (1967), 28-53.

1047. Segni, Bernardo. Rettorica, et Poetica d'Aristotile tradotte di Greco in lingua vulgare fiorentina da Bernardo Segni Gentilhuomo et Accademico Fiorentino. In Firenze appresso Lorenzo Torrentino Impressore Ducale, 1549.

1048._____. /Another edition./ Bartholomeo detto i' Imperador, & Francesco suo genero: Vinegia, 1551.

1049._____. /Another edition./ La Rettorica, e Poetica d'Aristotile, tradotte dal Greco in Lingua

Volgar Fiorentina da Bernardo Segni. Venezia, 1561.

1050._____. /Another edition./ Helmastadi, 1634.

1051._____. /Another edition./ Venice, 1643.

1052._____. La Politica, la Rettorica, la Poetica ed i Libri dell' Anima di Aristotile. Firenze: Gio Marescotti, 1583-84.

1053._____. /Another edition./ Firenze, 1594.

1054. Segnier, F. La philosophie du Langage d'apres Aristote. Paris, 1838.

1055. Seigel, J. E. "Eloquence and Silence in Petrarch." Journal of the Hisotry of Ideas, XXVI (1965), 147-74.

1056. Shadow, Michael J. "A Comparitive Analysis of the Relationship of Logos to Oral Communication in Selected Works of Heraclitus and Aristotle." Unpublished Masters thesis, California State University, Long Beach, 1968.

1057. Shapiro, Leo. "Dictionary of Some Normative Terms

in Aristotle's Rhetoric." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1947.

1058. Shellens, Max Solomon. "Aristotle on Natural Law." Natural Law Forum, IV (1959), 72-100.

1059. Shilleto, Richard. "Shilleto's Adversaria on the Rhetoric of Aristotle." The Rhetoric of Aristotle. Edited by E. M. Cope. Cambridge University Press, 1877. 222-227.

1060. Shorey, Paul. "Review of Solmsen's Die Entwicklung der Aristotelishen Logik und Rhetorik." Classical Philology, XXVIII (1933), 231-33.

1061._____. "What Teachers of Speech May Learn from the Theory and Practice of Greeks." Readings in Rhetoric. Edited by Lionel Crocker. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1965. 3-29.

1062. Shute, Richard. On the History of the Process by Which the Aristotelian Writings Arrived at Their Present Form. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1888.

1063. Sichirollo, L. "Giustificazioni della dialettica in Aristotele (ontologia, storia, politica)." Studi Urbinati di Storia, Filosofia e Letteratura, XXXVI (1963), 65-114; 279-313.

1064. Sigonio, Carlo. Aristotelis De arte rhetorica libri tres, Carolo Sigonio interprete. Crawviae, 1557.

1065._____. /Another edition./ Ex officina S. I. Zileti: Venetiis, 1566. 262p.

1066._____. De arte rhetorica libri 3. Bononiae: Benatius, 1565. 197p.

1067._____. De arte rhetorica libri 3. Rostochii: Transylvanua, 1577. 286p.

1068._____. Rhetoricorum ad Theodect. libri 3. Quos Carolus Sigonius & M. Antoni Maioragius vertebat. De rhetorica ad Alexan. De arte poetica liber. Argumenta distributionis methodicae, & explanationes ex Joan. Mar. scriptis in 3 priores. Vol. II Venetiis: Morettus, 1584-85.

1069._____. Aristotelis De arte rhetorica libri tres. Opera Omnia, edita et inedita, cum notis

variorum illustrium virorum et ejusdem vita a . . . L. A. Muratorio . . . conscripta. P. Argelatus . . . nunc primum collegit, suasque animadversiones in aliquot Sigonii opuscula adjecit, necnon indicibus locupletissimis exornavit. Mediolani, 1737.

1070. Silburg, Friedrich. Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνης ῥητορικῆς βιβλια γ'. Ῥητορικῆς ὡρὸς Αλέξανδρον βιβλ. α'. Πρὸς ὡοικτικῆς βιβλια. Venetiis, in aedibus B. Zanetti, 1536.

1071. _____. /Another edition./ Venetiis, exusdebat J. Gryphius, 1546.

1072. _____. /Another edition./ Basileae, 1546.

1073. _____. /Another edition./ Venetiis, Aldi, 1551.

1074. _____. Aris. rhetoricae libri 3. Opera quae exstant, Addita nonnunquam ob argumenti similitudinem quaedam Theophrasti, Alexandri Cassii, Sotionis, Athenaei, Polemonis, Adamantii, Melanpodiis. In Tomi cusjusque fine adjecta varians locorum scriptura, e praecipuis editionibus, nonnunquam etiam

e manuscr. cod., etc. Vol. II. Francofurti, 1584.

1075. Simrell, E. "Mere Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIV (1928), 359-74

1076. Simonson, S. "A Definitive Note on the Enthymeme." American Journal of Philology, LXVI (1945), 303-06.

1077. Skriletz, Dorothy. "The Rhetoric: An Aid in the Study of Drama." Southern Speech Journal, XXV (1960), 217-222.

1078. Smith, Craig R. "Actuality and Potentiality: The Essence of Criticism." Philsophy and Rhetoric, III (1970), 133-40.

1079. Smith, K. K. "Aristotle's Lost Chapter on Comedy." Classical World, XXI (1928), 145-61.

1080. Snoddy, Rowena Louise. "The Classical Bases of John Quincy Adams' Theory of Rhetorical Arrangement." Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1948.

1081. Soarez, Cyprianus. De arte rhetorica, libri III

ex Aristotele, Cicerone, et Quintiliano depromptu. Antverpiae, 1575.

1082._____. D. Cypriani Soarez . . . De arte Rhetorica libri tres, ex Aristotele, Cicerone, & Quintiliano praecipuè deprompti. Nunc ab eodem autore recogniti, & . . . locupletatis. Mathias Gastius: Salmanticae, 1577. 240p.

1083._____. De arte Rhetorica libri tres, ex Aristotele, Cicerone, et Quinctiliano praecipue deprompti . . . F. Ceruti . . . Commentariis illustrati. Veronae, 1589.

1084._____. /Another edition./ Coloniae, 1604.

1085._____. /Another edition./ Subjiciuntur . . . Rhetorices tabulae. Rothomagi, 1624.

1086._____. /Another edition./ Antverpiae, 1722.

1087. Solmsen, Friedrich. "Die Entwickelung der Aristotlischen Logik und Rhetorik." Diss. Berlin, 1928.

1088._____. Die Entwickelung der Aristotlischen Logik und Rhetorik. (Neue Philologische Untersuchungen 4), Berlin, 1929.

1089._____. "Demetrios Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας und sein peripatetisches Quellenmaterial." Hermes, LXVI (1931), 241-67.

1090._____. "Drei Rekonstruktionen zur antiken Rhetorik und Poetik, II: Theodektes." Hermes, LXVII (1932), 144-51.

1091._____. "Theodectes." RE Supplementband, V (1934), cols. 1722-34.

1092._____. "Aristotle and Cicero on the Orators Playing Upon the Feelings." Classical Philology, XXXIII (1938), 390-404.

1093._____. "Discovery of the Syllogism." Philosophical Review, L (1941), 410-21.

1094._____. "Aristotlelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric." American Journal of Philology, LXII (1941), 35-50; 169-90.

1095._____. "Introduction." Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetic. Translated by Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater. New York: Modern Library, 1954. v-xxii.

1096._____. Kleine Schriften. 2 vols. George Olms Ver-

lagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim, 1968.

1097. Sondert. Analytical Questions on Aristotle's Rhetoric. Oxford: Talboys & Wheeler, 1824.

1098._____. /Another edition./ 1833.

1099._____. /Another edition./ 1840.

1100. Sonkowsky, Robert P. "An Aspect of Delivery in Ancient Rhetorical Theory." Transactions of the American Philological Association, XC (1959), 256-74.

1101. Spengel, Leonardus. Συναγωγὴ Τεχνῶν, sive artium scriptores ab initiis usque ad editos Aristotelis de Rhetorica libros. Stuttgart, 1828.

1102._____. "Commentatio de tempore quo ab Aristotele libri de Arte rhetorica conscripti et editi sint." Zeits. f. alterthumsw., IV (1837) 903.

1103._____. Specimen Commentariorum in Aristotelis Libros de Arte Rhetorica. München: Libraria Scholarum Regia, 1839.

1104._____. Specimen Commentarii in Aristotele Libri II c. 23 de arte rhetorica. Gratulat. -Schr. 4 Heidelbergae, 1839.

1105._____. /Another edition./ 1844.

1106._____. Ueber das Studium der Rhetorik bei den Alten. (Gelesen in der öffentlichen Sitzung der Akademie der Wissenschaften zur Feyer des drei und achtzigsten Stiftungsjahres. München, 1842.

1107._____. "Über die Rhetorik des Aristoteles." Aus den abhandlungen d.k. Bayer Akad. d. Wissenschriften I. Classe. 6 Bd. (1851), 455-513.

1108._____. Rhetores graeci. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1854-85.

1109._____. "Die Definition und Eintheilung der Rhetorik bei den alten." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XVIII (1863), 481-526.

1110._____. Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica cum adnotatione Leonardi Spengel. Accedit vetusta translatio Latina. Lipsiae, in aedilius B. G. Teubneri, 1867.

1111._____. Caspar Hammer. Rhetores graeci ex recog-

nitione Leonardi Spengel. Leipzig, 1894.

1112. Stahr, Adolf. Aristotelia: Leben, Schriften und Schuler des Aristoteles. Vol. I, 1830.

1113._____. "Rhetorische Schriften." Aristotelia. Halle, 1832. 94-5.

1114._____. "Review of Aristotelis Rhetorica (et Poetica) ex recens. I. Bekkeri." Neu Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik, XII (1834), 127-47.

1115._____. "Drei Bücher der Redekunst übers von Adolf Stahr." Werke. Deutsch von Hermann Bender, Anton Karsh, Adolf Stahr und Carl Stahr. Stuttgart: Werther, 1862. 315p.

1116._____. /Another edition./ Berlin, 1891.

1117._____. /Another edition./ Berlin, 1897.

1118._____. /Another edition./ Berlin, 1900.

1119._____. /Another edition./ Berlin, 1930.

1120. Stanford, William Bedell. Greek Metaphor, Studies in Theory and Practice. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936.

1121._____. "The Quatlity of ὄψις in words." Classical Review, L (1936), 109-12.

1122. Stark, Rudolf. Rhetorika; schriften zur Aristotelischen und hellenistischen Rhetorik. Berlin: George Olms, 1968.

1123. Steele, Edward D. "The Role of the Concept of Choice in Aristotle's Rhetoric." Western Speech, XXVII (1963), 77-83.

1124. Steinschneider, Moritz. "Al-Farabi." Mémoires de l'Academie Impériale des Sciences de Pétersbourg, series 7, Vol. XIII, no. 4 (1869), 278p.

1125. Steinthal, H. "Ἡροδότου Θουρίου?" Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, LVI (1901), 627.

1126._____. "Die Poetik und Rhetorik." Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern. Berlin, Harrwitz und Gossmann, 1863. 254-65.

1127._____. /Another edition./ 1890. 260-71.

1128. Stenius, Sim. Brevis et perspicita paraphrasistrium de arte Dicendi librorum ab Ar. conscriptorum

continuata. Neostadii in Palat., 1586.

1129. Stigen, Anfinn. "Rhetoric and Poetry." The Structure of Aristotle's Thought. Oslo: Universitetsfortoget, 1966. 332-423.

1130. Stites, William Harrison. "The Place of Effective, Responsible and Intelligent Speaking in the Rhetoric and Societies of Classical and Early Modern Cultures." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1954.

1131. Stocks, J. L. "The Composition of Aristotle's Logical Works." Classical Quarterly, XXVII (1933), 115-24.

1132. Stroux, Joh. De Theophrasti virasti virtutibus dicendi. Leipzig, 1912. 29-42.

1133._____. "Aus der Status-Lehre." Philologus, LXXXV (1930).

1134._____. Summum Ius Summa Iniuria in Festschrift Paul Speiser-Sarasin. Basil, 1926.

1135._____. "Controversia." Philologus, LXXXIV (1929), 368-76.

1136. Sturmi, Johanne. Rhetoricorum libri 3. In Lat. sermonen conversi, et scholis brevionibus explicati à Joanne Sturmio. Nunc primum ed. T. Rihelius: Argentorati, 1570. 429p.

1137. Sudhaus, S. "Aristoteles in der Beurteilung des Epikur und Philodemos." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XLVIII (1893), 552-64.

1138._____. "Noch einmal Nausiphanes und Aristoteles bei Philodemos." Philologus, LIV (1895).

1139. Suess, W. "Ethos." Studzien zu den alten Griechischen rhetorik. 1910.

1140. Susemihl, Franz. "Zu Aristoteles Rhetorik." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XXIII (1868), 539-40.

1141._____. "De Rhetoricorum Aristotelicorum libro primo quaestiones critical." Mélanges Classique De Dies a la Mémoire de Ch. Graux. 1883. 87-96.

1142._____. Quaestiones Aristoteleae critical et ecegetical. I Greifswald, 1892.

1143. Sullivan, J. F. "Aristotle's Estimate of Euripides

in His Rhetoric." Classical Bulletin, X (1933-34), 70-71.

1144. Swain, Louis Hall. "Aristotle on Cross-Examination." Southern Speech Journal, III (1938), 24-25.

1145. Tanaka, Michitaro. Benronjutsu. Translated by Mie Ikeda. Aristoteresu. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1966. 59-166.

1146. Tauchnitianae, C., ed. De arte rhetorica libri III ad optimorum librorum fidem accurate editi. Lipsiae: Otto Hotze, 1869. 183p.

1147. Taylor, Thomas. The Rhetoric, Poetic and Nicomachean Ethics. Works, translated from the Greek and Illustrated with copious elucidations from the commentators, by Thomas Taylor. London, 1812.

1148._____. /Another edition./ 1815 (?)

1149._____. /Another edition./ London, 1817.

1150._____. /Another edition./ A. J. Valpy for J. Black, 1818.

1151._____. /Another edition./ 1821.

1152._____. "From the Introduction to His Translation of the Rhetoric, Poetic and Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle." Aristotle's Poetics and English Literature. Edited by Elder Olson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965. 76-81.

1153. Teile, der Ausgabe. De arte rhetorica libri 3. Ad Alexandrum de rhetorica libri 1. De poetica libri 1. 1536.

1154. Tejera, R. Poetics and Rhetoric: Analytic Notes and Review. New York: A.R.D.M. Corp., 1967.

1155. Tesauro, Emmanuele. Il Cannocchiale Aristotelico, Ò sia, idéa dell' arguta et ingeniosa elocutione, che serve à tuta l'arte oratoria, lapidaria, et simbolica esaminanta co' principii dell divino Aristotele. Venice, Paolo Balinoni, 1633. 688p.

1156._____. Il Cannocchiale Aristotelico, Ò sia idea Dell' arguta et ingeniosa elocutione che serve a tutta l'art oratoria, lapidaria et simbolica. Roma, 1644.

1157._____. /Another edition./ Torino, 1670.

1158._____. Settima impressione. Accerescіuta dell' autore di due nuovi trattati, cioè de concetti predicabili, & degli emblemi. Con un nuovo indice. Bologna, 1675.

1159._____. /Another edition./ 1682.

1160._____. Eman. Thesauri; idea argutae et ingeniosae dictionis ex principiis Aristotelis eruta. Francofurti, 1698. (Listed in: M.Ch. Van Hulthem, Bibliotheca Hulthemiana, Université De Gand, 1836. p.285.)

1161._____. Il Cannocchiale Aristotelico. Emanuelis Thesauri . . . Idea argutae et ingeniosae dictionis, ex principiis Aristoteliscis sic eruta ut in universum arti oratoriae & imprimis lapidariae atque symbolicae inserviat. Accessere ab autore adjecti tractatus duo, alter de argutis concionatorum enthymematis, alter de emblematis. Omnia ex Italico Latine conversa. Coloniae, 1714.

1162._____. /Another edition./ Homburg, 1968.

1163. Tessmer, R. Untersuchungen zur aristotelischen Rhetorik. Diss. Humboldt Univ. Berlin, 1957.

1164._____. "Ein Aristoteles-Zitat bei Quintilian." Lemmata. Donum natalicum W. Ehlers sexagenario a sodalibus Thesauri Linguae Latinae oblatum. München, 1968. 291-98.

1165. Theodoricus, D. C. Institutiones rhetoricae ex Aristotele, Quintiliano, Cicerone & aliorum praeceptis method conscriptae. Jema, 1624.

1166. Theilscher, Paul. "Ciceros Topik und Aristoteles." Philologus, LVII (1908), 52-67.

1167._____. "Die relative chronologie der erhaltenen schriften des Aristoteles nach den bestiminten selbstzitaten." Philologus, XCVII (1948), 229-65.

1168. Thillet, P. "Note sur le Gryllos, Ouvrage de Jeunesse d'Aristote." Revue Philosophique de France et de l'Etranger, LXXXII (1957), 352-54.

1169. Thilo, Valentin D. J. Idea Rhetoricae, seu Doctrina de Generibus Causarum ex Aristotele, Cicerone, Quintiliano, Keckermanno, Vossio, Caussino, contracta, exempli praxique illvstrata, cvm Generali vniversae Rhetoricae Delineatione. Regiomonti, 1654.

1170. Thionville, Eugène. De la Théories des lieux communs dans les topiques d'Aristote et des principales modifications quelle a subíes jusqu à nos jours. Osnabrück: Zeller, 1965. 132p.

1171. Thomas, John David. "The Example in Ancient Rhetorical Theory." Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Florida, 1960.

1172. Thompson, Christopher. "Testing Out Aristotle." Today's Speech, XV (1967), 35.

1173. Thompson, W. H. The Phaedrus of Plato. London, 1968.

1174. Thonssen, Lester. "A Functional Interpretation of Aristotle's Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXVI (1930), 297-310.

1175._____. A. Craig Baird. Speech Criticism: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1948. 57-75.

1176._____. /Another edition./ Waldo Braden. 1970.

1177. Throm, Hermann. Die Thesis, Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschicte. Paderborn, 1932.

1178. Thurot, Charles Questions sur la rhétorique d'Aristote. Paris, 1860.

1179._____. Études sur Aristote: Politique, dialectique, rhétorique. Paris, 1861.

1180._____. "Observations critiques sur la Rhétorique d'Aristote." Revue Archéol. IV (1861), 52-65; 291-308.

1181. Tobar, D. Alonso Ordoney da Seyja y. La Poëtica de Aristoteles, dada a nuestra lenqua Castellana. Madrid, 1626. (cf. Hoffman's Bibliographisches Lexicon. Leipzig, 1838. p. 358.)

1182. Tomitano, Bernardino. Ragionamenti della lingua Toscana . . . I precetti della rhetorica secondo l'artificio d'Aristotle, Cicerone nel fine del secondo libro nuovamente aggionti. Venice, 1546.

1183. Toplis, P. "Pascal's Theory of Persuasion and Ancient Rhetoric." Esprit créateur, II (1962), 79-83.

1184. Toscaneela, Orazio. Precetti necessarii, et altre cose Utilissime, . . . sopra diverse cose

pertinenti alla Grammatica, Poetica, Retorica . . . et ad altre facoltà. Venice, 1562.

1185. Tovar, A. Aristoteles Retorica: Edicion con aparato critico. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Politicos, 1953.

1186._____. "Notas criticas a la Rétorica de Aristóteles." Emerita, XXII (1954), 1-54.

1187. Townsend, Howard. "Aristotle and Contemporary Textbooks." Western Speech, XXII (1958), 154-58.

1188. Trenkner, S. "Aristotle, Rhetoric III 12, 4." Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, CLXXXII (1952-53), 3-6.

1189. Tsitsopoulos, A. Ch. "Ἡ φύσις τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς παρ' Ἀριστοτέλει." Platon, XIX (1967), 249-57.

1190. Usener, H. "Lectiones Graecae (Darin: Aristoteles art. rhetorik II, 19)." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XXV (1870), 603.

1191. Usher, S. "Theory and Practice in Greek Oratory."

Proceedings of the Classical Association, LXVI (1969), 29-30.

1192. Ussing, Il. "Observationes criticae ad Aristotelis librum de arte poetica et Rhetoricorum libros." Opuscula Philologica ad Ioannem Nicolaum Madvigium . . . a discipulis missa. Edited by F. Hegel. 1876. 221-233.

1193. Utterback, W. E. "Aristotle's Contribution to the Psychology of Argument." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XI (1925), 218-25.

1194. Vahlen, Johannes. "Zur Kritik der Rhetorik des Aristoteles." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, IX (1854), 555-567.

1195._____. "Zur Kritik Aristotelischen Schriften (Poetik und Rhetorik)." Sitzunsberichten der Phil. -hist. classe d. Wiener Akad. d. Wiss., XXXVIII (1861), 121-32; 59-148.

1196._____. Zur Kritik aristotelischen Schriften Poetik und Rhetorik. (Aus Den Sitzungsberichten der Akademie Wissenshaften), Wien, 1862. 92p.

1197._____. "Rhetorik und Topik: Ein Beitrag zu Aristoteles Rhetorik." Rheinisches Museum für

philologie, XXII (1867), 101-07.

1198._____. De Aristotelis art. rhet. I, 8, 1365b39. Dissertatio, Berolini, 1875. 48p.

1199._____. "Etudie le texte De la Rhétorique." Index Lectionum Universtatis litterariae Fridericae Guilelmae. Berolini, 1875. 3-8.

1200._____. "Zu Aristoteles Rhetorik und Poetik." Hermes, X (1876), 451-58.

1201._____. "Ueber einige Citate in Aristoteles' Rhetorik." Sitzungsberichte der Preussichen Akademia der Wissenschaften, (1902), 166-94.

1202._____. De Scholiis in Aristotelis rhetoricam. 1903.

1203._____. "De Aristotelis Artis Rhetoricae I 8." Opuscula Academica. Vol. I. Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1907. 1-6.

1204._____. "de scholiis Aristotelis rhetoricana." Opuscula Academica. Vol. II. Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1908. 464-78.

1205._____. Gesammelte Philologische Schriften von

Johannes Vahlen. Leipzig und Berlin: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1911. 1-116.

1206. Velentini, L. V. Moralem philosophiam cont., una cum rhetoricis ac poetica. Item, quae spuria sunt, aut quae extra ordinem librorum auscultatoriorum habentur. Apposita quoque hic sunt metaphysica lib. 14. Una cum rerum ac verborum memorabilium ind. copiosissimo. in Opera quae in hunc usque diem extant omnia, latinitate partim antea, partim nunc primum à viris doctissimis donata & Graecum ad exemplar diligenter recogn. Acc in singulos libros argumenta, nunc primum ex optimis Graecorum commentariis in Lat. linguam conversa J. Lodovici Vivis Valentini de libris Aristotelicis, & Philippi Melanchthoria commentationem doctissimam, adiecta nunc primum fuit de ordine librorum Aristotelis . . . . Lugduni: Giuncta, 1542. (cf. also 758.).

1207. Van Hook, Larue. The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1905.

1208. Van Straaten, M. and G. J. De Vries. "Some Notes

on the Rhetoric of Aristotle." Mnemosyne, XVII (1964), 140-47.

1209. Vardman, George T. "An Analysis of Some Factors Relating to the Dialectic of Plato, Aristotle and Cicero." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1952.

1210. Vasoli, Cesare. La dialettica e la retorica dell' Umanesimo. Milano, 1968. 656p.

1211. Vater, J. S. Animadversiones et lectiones ad Aristotelis libros tres Rhetoricum. Accedit Auctarium F. A. Wolfii. Lipsiae, 1794.

1212._____. Animadversiones ad librorum I Rhetoricorum cum notitia et censura graeci scholiastas eorum. Halae, 1794.

1213._____. Aristotelis de Rhetorica libri tres. (Proemium J. S. V. Notitia Scholiastae Graeci. 1820.

1214. Verdenius, W. J. Κλεάρχου Περιπατητικοῦ Autour d'Aristote, Recueil d'etudes de philosophie anciene et médiévale. Louvain, 1955. 367p.

1215. Viano, C. A. "Aristotele e la redenzione della

retorica." Revista di Filosofia, LVIII (1967), 371-425.

1216. Vickers, Brian. Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry. New York: MacMillan Co., 1970.

1217. Victorius (Vettori), Pietro. Petri Victorii commentarii in tres libros Aristotelis de Arte Dicendi. Basilae, 1547.

1218._____. P. Victorii commentarii in tres libros Aristotelis de arte dicendi. Positis ante singulas declarationes Graecis verbis auctoris. Florentiae, 1548.

1219._____. /Another edition./ Bale, 1549.

1220._____. /Another edition./ Florentiae, 1558.

1221._____. /Another edition./ P. Victorii commentarii in tres libros Aristotelis De arte dicendi. Positis ante singulas declarationes . . . graecis verbis auctoris , ijsque fidelites latine expressis, etc. Ex officina Iunctarum: Florentiae, 1579. 756p.

1222._____. /Another edition./ London, 1696.

1223._____. Petri Victorii Commentarij longe doctissimi, in tres libros Aristotelis De arte dicendi, nunc primum in Germania editi. Cum locuplete rerum & Uerborum in ijsdem memorabilium indice. Basileae, 1549.

1224._____. Aristotelis De arte dicendi libri tres. Ad fidem uetustiss. Codicum accuratissima diligentia à Petro Victoria correcti & emendat. Iidẽ latinitate donati per Hermolau Barbaru. Parisiis, Apud Vascosanu, uia Jacobea, ad insigne Fontis, 1549.

1225._____. /Another edition./ 1559.

1226._____. /Another edtion./ Aristotelis de arte dicendi libri tres. (Variae lectiones partim e. p. Victorii commentariis partim aliunde conquisitae.) Apud G. Morelium: Parisiis, 1562.

1227._____. /Another edition./ Aristotelis De arte dicendi libri tres. Parisiis, Ex typographia S. Preuohaeredis G. Morelij, 1582.

1228._____. Rhetorica, Poetica, Moralia nicom. et Magna, Politica et Oeconomica. Venice, 1560.

1229._____. Aristotelis . . . Rhetoricorum Artisque poetae libri omnes. Lyons, 1561. 256p.

1230._____. /Another edition./ Ex officina J. Lucii: Rostochii, 1577. (See no. 257.)

1231._____. Aristotelis Artis Rhetoricae libri III. Rhetorices ad Alexandrum lib. I. De arte Poetica liber I. Addita in fine Varia locorum lectio, partim e probabilioribus editionibus; partim e Petri Victorij commentarijs, et aliorum doctorum Virorum obseruationibus ahaec Index capitum; et rerum ac verborum duo inventaria; alterum Graecum, alterum Latinum. Francofvrti, Apud heredes Andreae Wecheli, 1584.

1232. Vitalibus, D. de (editor?). Aristotelis Varia Opera novissime traducta (Poetica, Rhetorica, Politica,). Venice, 1504.

1233. Vlachos, Gérasime. Anthologie de la rhétorique aristotelicienne. 1683 /In Greek/ (This may be a manuscript. See G. E. Voumvlinopovlos, Bibliographie Critique de la Philosophie Grecque. Athènes, 1966. 78-9.)

1234. Voegelin, Eric. "The Rhetoric of Aristotle." Order

and History. Vol. III. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1957. 359-62.

1235. Vogel, Arthur A. "The Aristotelian Theory of Explanation and Some Recent Criticisms." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1952.

1236. Vogelii, T. A. Aristoteles resolutus, seu succincta ac methodica analysis Aristotelis philosophi: librorum logicorum, physicorum, Ethicorum, Politicorum, Oeconomicorium et Rhetoricorum. Editio altera auctior et emendation. Francofurti, 1625.

1237. Voigt, Michael W. Die rhetorik. Aus dem griechischen übers und mit anmerkungen, einer inhaltsanzeige und vollstandigen registern verehen von Mich. Wenz. Voigt. Prague, 1803.

1238. Voigtellio, G. G. Voigtellio gratulatur D. Schmidt. In est commentatio de tempo e quo ab Aristotele libri de arte rhetorica conscripti et edita sint. Halae, 1837.

1239. Voilquin, Jean and Jean Capelle. Aristote. Art

rhétorique et Art poétique, traduction nouvelle avec texte, introductions et notes par Jean Voilquin et Jean Capelle. Paris, 1944. 572p.

1240. Voit, L. Deinotês, Ein antikes Stibegriff. Leipzig, 1934.

1241. Volkman, Richard. Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Roemer in systemat. Leipzig, 1885.

1242. Vollrath, Ernst. "Der Bezug von Logos und Zeit bei Aristoteles." Das Problem der Sprache. München, 1967. 149-58.

1243. Voltaire. "Art Aristotel de sa Rhetorique." Euvres Completes de Voltaire. Vol. XVII Paris, 1878.

1244. Wackernagel, Wilhelm Karl Heinrich. Poetik, Rhetorik, und Stilistik. (Academische Vorlesungen), Halle, 1873. 452p.

1245._____. /Another edition./ 1888.

1246. Wade-Gery, H. T. "The Spartum Rhetra in Plutarch Lycurgus VI." Classical Quarterly, XXXVII

(1943), 62-72.

1247. Wagner, Russel H. "Wilson and His Sources." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XV (1929), 525-37.

1248. Wallace, Edwin. "The Enthymeme and Example." Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1894.

1249. Wallace, Karl R. "Aristotle's Account of the logical Means for Securing Belief." Unpublished Masters thesis, Cornell University, 1931.

1250._____. "Bacon and the Classical Rhetoricians." Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1943. 169-84.

1251._____. "Aristotle." Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoricians. Edited by Donald C. Bryant, et al. Columbia, Missouri: Art Craft Press, 1968.

1252._____. Understanding Discourse, The Speech Act and Rhetorical Action. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970.

1253. Walzer, Richard. "New Light on the Arabic Translations of Aristotle." Oriens, VI (1953), 91-142.

1254. Warry, J. G. Greek Aesthetic Theory: A Study of Callistic and Aesthetic Concepts in the Works of Plato and Aristotle. London, 1962.

1255. Wartelle, Andre. Inventaire De Manuscrits Grecs D'Aristote. Paris, 1963. 198p.

1256. Wasik, Wiktor. Sebastjan Petrycy z Pilzna i epoka. Warszawa, 1923-35.

1257. Webster, T. B. L. "Prose Style: Isocrates-Demosthenes-theory in Aristotle's Rhetoric." Art and Literature in Fourth Century Athens. London: The University of London, The Athlore Press, 1956. 73-78.

1258. Wecklin, Nicolaus. "Zur Aristoteles." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XXXV (188o), 152-54.

1259. Weidner, Richard. Ciceros Verhaeltnis zur griechischroemischen Schulrhetorik seiner zeit. Erlangen, 1925.

1260. Weill, Raymond. "Politique, Rhétorique, oeuvres

d'histoire naturelle." Aristote et L'Histoire, Essai Sur la 'Politique'. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1960. 317-22.

1261. Weinreich, O. "Ueber einge panegyrische Topoi der Schönheits - und charackterschilderung." Würyburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumwissenschaft, I (1946), 111-117.

1262. Weise, Carolus, ed. Rhetorica. Opera omnia quae extant uno volumine comprehensa sejunctis quantum potuit ab genuinis suppositiciis genuinis autem rectiis quam antechac factum ordinatis, praemissa introductione cum argumentorum conspecta adjectoque rerum indice, ed. Carolus Weise. Lipsiae, 1843.

1263. Welch, Dale D. "The Rhetorical Theory of Aristotle and the Practice of Demosthenes." Unpublished Masters thesis, Cornell University, 1928.

1264. Welldon, J. E. C. The Rhetoric of Aristotle, translated with an analysis and Critical notes. London & New York, 1886. Select passages reprinted in Classics in Linguistics. Edited by Donald E. Hayden, Paul Alworth, and Gary

Tote. New York: Philosophical Library, 1967; Selected Readings in Rhetoric and and Public Speaking With Introductory Comments. Edited by Lester Thonssen. New York, 1942. 35-64.

1265. Welles, C. Bradford. "Rhetoric and the Law." Seminar, XIII (1955-56), 1-16.

1266. Wells, E. W. "A Study of the Technique of Argumentation as Treated by Ancient and Modern Writers." Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Utah, 1927.

1267. Wenig, K. Histoire de la rhétorique grecque. Prague Académie, 1936.

1268. Westermann, Anton. "Techniker vor Aristoteles." Geschichte der Beredtsamkeit in Griechenland und Romer. Leipzig, 1833. 138-43.

1269. Whall, A. L. "Rhetoric, II, 1389-90." The Greek Reader. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co. Inc., 1943. 773-776.

1270. White, H. M. S. "The Principle of Ethical and Emotional Persuasion as Developed by Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian and Campbell."

Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Southern California, 1931.

1271. Wiechmann, G. R. Platonis et Aristotele de arte rhetorica inter se comparatae. Diss., Berlin, 1864.

1272. Wieland, Wolfgang. "Aristoteles als Rhetoriker und die Exoterischen Schriften." Hermes, LXXXVI (1958), 323-46.

1273. Wier, John Rex. "The Relationships of Certain Selected Formulations of General Semantics to Classical Rhetorical Theories of Invention." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1963.

1274. Wikramanayake, G. H. "A Note on the Pistis in Aristotle's Rhetoric." American Journal of Philology, LXXXII (1961), 193-96.

1275. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. "Aristoteles rhet. II 20." Hermes, XIV (1879), 161-86.

1276._____. "Aristotele Rhet. II, 6, 1384b13." Hermes, XXXIV (1889), 617-18.

1277. Wilcox, Stanley. "The Scope of Early Rhetorical

Instruction." Harvard Studies in Classical Studies, LIII (1942), 121-55.

1278. Wiley, Earl. "The Enthymeme: Idiom of Persuasion." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (1956), 19-24.

1279._____. "Aristotle's Topoi: Patterns of Persuasion." Ohio Speech Journal, II (1963), 5-14.

1280. William, F. M. Aristotelische Erkenntnislehre bei Whately & Newman und ihre Bezüge zur Gegenwart. Freibur Herder, 1960. 346p.

1281. Willis, George. The Philosophy of Speech. London, 1919.

1282. Wilson, Harold S. "George of Trebizond and Early Humanist Rhetoric." Studies in Philology, XL (1943), 367-79.

1283. Wilson, John Cook. "On the Genuiness of Aristotle's Rhetoric II." Ebenda, (1884-85), 4-5.

1284._____. "On the Possibility of a Conception of the Enthymeme Earlier than that Found in the Rhetoric and Prior Analytics." Ebenda, (1884-85), 5-6.

1285._____. "Difficulties in the Text of Aristotle (Rhet. 1403b21)." Journal of Philology, XXII (1892), 137-65.

1286._____. "On the Use of ἀλλ' ἡ in Aristotle." Classical Quarterly, III (1909), 121-24.

1287. Wimsatt, W. K., and Cleanth Brooks. "The Verbal Medium: Plato and Aristotle." Literary Criticism: A Short History. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1957. Reprinted in: The Province of Rhetoric. Edited by Joseph Schwartz and John Rycenga. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1965.

1288. Winterowd, W. Ross. "Aristotle and Extrapolation." Rhetoric: A Synthesis. New York, 1968. 18-44.

1289. Wolf, Erik. Griechisches Rechtsdenken III 2: die Umformung des Rechtsdenkens durch Historik und Rhetorik. Frankfurt: A. M. Klostermann. 432p.

1290. Wolff, G. "zu Aristotles Rhetorik." Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, XIX (1864), 631.

1291. Woods, M. J. "Gracian, Peregrini and the Theory

of Topics." Modern Language Review, LXIII (1968), 854-63.

1292. Young, Richard E., and Alton L. Becker. "Twoard a Modern Theory of Rhetoric: A Tagmemic Contribution." New Rhetorics. Edited by Martin Steinmann, Jr. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967. 77-107.

1293. Zahfleisch, Johann. "Zu Aristoteles Rhetorik I 14, 1375a15." Weiner Studien, VIII (1886), 165.

1294. Zehetmeier, Josef. Die Periodenlehre des Aristoteles. Diss. München, 1930.

1295._____. "Die Periodenlehre des Aristoteles (Rhet. III, 8, 9)." Philologus, LXXXV (1930), 192-208; No. 3, 255-84; No. 4, 414-36.

1296. Zeller, Eduard. "Die Rhetorik." Aristoteles und Dies Alten Peripatetiker. Leipzig, 1879. 754-62.

1297._____. /Another edition./ Translated by B. F. C. Costelloe and H. J. Muirhead. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1897.

1298._____. "Aristotle, Die Rhetorik." Die Philosophie der Greichen in Ihrer Geschichllichen Entwicklung. Leipzig: Fuece Verlag (R. Reisland), 1879.

1299._____. /Another edition./ Hildesheim, George Olms, 1963.

1300._____. "Der pseudophilosische Bericht über Theophrast." Hermes, XV (1880), 137-46.

1301. Zinano, Gabriele. Sommarii de Varie Retoricke Grecke, Latine et Volgavi. Reggio, 1590.

1302. Zoll, Allan R. "Toward a Theory of Baroque Lyric Metaphor." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969.

1303. Zucker, F. Ἀνθοπάνος. Ein semasiologische Untersuchung aus der antiken Rhetorik und Ethik. Berlin, 1953.

# CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX


| Date | Entry Number |
|---|---|
| 1475. | 458 |
| 1478. | 459 |
| 1481. | 5 |
| 1484. | 6 |
| 1485. | 418 |
| 1493. | 93 |
| 1500. | 427, 460 |
| 1504. | 419, 1232 |
| 1508. | 721 |
| 1515. | 86, 463 |
| 1519. | 461, 462 |
| 1520. | 19, 447 |
| 1521. | 4 |
| 1523. | 87, 464, 722 |
| 1525. | 88 |
| 1529. | 21, 402 |
| 1530. | 465, 776 |
| 1531. | 394 |
| 1534. | 467 |
| 1536. | 1070, 1153 |
| 1537. | 269, 819 |
| 1538. | 23, 71, 468, 693 |
| 1539. | 22, 395, 809 |
| 1540. | 466, 820 |
| 1541. | 24, 469, 660 |

1542. 758, 1206

1544. 100, 101

1545. 102, 268, 470, 707

1546. 858, 1072, 1182

1547. 25, 705, 708, 1217.

1548. 26, 104, 410, 417, 1218

1549. 105, 837, 1047, 1219, 1223, 1224

1550. 89, 396, 438, 471, 710

1551. 106, 229, 1048, 1073

1552. 709, 711

1554. 690

1555. 107

1556. 552, 909, 1065

1558. 103, 108, 109, 181, 182, 1220

1560. 90, 183, 1228

1561. 72, 885, 1049, 1229

1562. 28, 30, 91, 1184, 1226

1564. 255

1565. 110, 870, 1066

1567. 31, 241

1569. 871

1570. 232, 638, 1136

1571. 17, 256, 333, 712, 872

1572. 73, 242,713, 873

1574. 92, 706, 822

1575. 34, 714, 1081

1576. 74

1577. 111, 257, 785, 1064, 1067, 1082, 1230

1578. 243, 348, 823

1579. 75, 910, 1221

1580. 32, 77, 859

1582. 1227

1583. 755, 787, 1052

1584. 35, 78, 824, 1052, 1068, 1074, 1231

1585. 788, 1068

1586. 278, 1128

1588. 911, 913, 914

1589. 1083

1590. 139, 247, 249, 1301

1591. 715, 855, 917

1592. 874

1593. 918

1594. 793, 919, 1053

1595. 140, 789, 920

1596. 921

1597. 252, 875, 940

1598. 886

1600. 790

1602. 253, 522, 792

1604. 1084

1605. 250, 767

1606. 254, 887, 908

1607. 716, 794

1608. 33, 79, 380, 922

1609. 9

1612. 912

1613. 381

1614. 79, 661

1618. 923

1619. 248, 382, 489, 490, 725, 846

1620. 924

1623. 491

1624. 112, 403, 409, 1085, 1165

1625. 36, 542, 925, 1236

1626. 1181

1629. 37, 543

1630. 404, 928,

1633. 579, 1155

1634. 113, 1050

1637. 564

1638. 7

1642. 42

1643. 233, 1051

1644. 234, 1156

1645. 544, 927

1646. 251

1648. 929, 1029

1651. 338, 565

1654. 258, 383, 1169

1660. 1030

1661. 1031

1663. 1033

1668. 736

1669. 122, 816

1670. 1157

1671. 898

1672. 263, 1032

1673. 43, 817, 1034

1674. 1035, 1036

1675. 11, 38, 259, 264, 1158

1677. 1018

1679. 44

1681. 12, 566

1682. 1159

1683. 791

1684. 899

1685. 39, 45

1686. 46,

1689. 49, 717, 930

1691. 265

1692. 367

1693. 47

1696. 492, 1222

1698. 40, 260, 1160

1701. 50

1702. 41

1709. 900

1714. 1161

1715. 13

1718. 261

1722. 1086

1725. 901

1728. 121, 493

1729. 412

1733. 262

1735. 235

1736. 52

1737. 720, 1069

1739. 575

1740. 411

1743. 541

1747. 768

1757. 236

1758. 665

1759. 567, 576

1766. 666, 667

1767. 82

1768. 1020

1770. 384

1772. 53, 456

1773. 138

1777. 955

1784. 385

1786. 54, 931

1789. 386, 795

1791. 211

1794. 1211, 1212

1795. 400

1796. 173.

1801. 1023

1803. 1237

1805. 212, 452, 494

1807. 996

1809. 213, 495

1811. 322

1812. 323, 1147

1815. 1148

1816. 48, 324, 496

1817. 1149

1818. 325, 1150

1819. 55, 915

1820. 214, 719, 1213

1821. 1151

1822. 514, 796, 916

1823. 58, 123, 475, 1040

1824. 685, 1026, 1097

1825. 56

1826. 215, 237, 825

1827. 238, 391

1828. 1101

1830. 853, 1112

1831. 125, 126, 239, 497, 826

1832. 61, 66, 67, 358, 113

1833. 15, 59, 192, 216, 760, 990, 1098, 1268

1834. 1114

1835. 515

1836. 850, 991

1837. 130, 359, 802, 854, 1024, 1102, 1238

1838. 571, 637, 682, 1054

1839. 320, 1025, 1103, 1104

1840. 65, 156, 437, 568, 984, 1015, 1099

1842. 132, 481, 683, 782, 985, 1106

1843. 127, 498. 536, 618, 703, 986, 1262, 1269.

1844. 1105

1845. 556

1847. 57, 60, 193, 482, 654, 966

1848. 368, 545

1849. 68, 169

1850. 158, 194

1851. 195, 761, 1107

1852. 897

1853. 196

1854. 141, 305, 968, 1108, 1194

1855. 305

1856. 266, 305

1857. 197, 641

1858. 344

1859. 70, 128

1860. 170, 1178

1861. 1179, 1180, 1195

1862. 369, 1115, 1196

1863. 416, 903, 969, 1016, 1017, 1109, 1126

1864. 1271,

1865. 546

1866. 274, 406

1867. 306, 342, 1110, 1197

1868. 285, 407, 513, 620, 626, 827, 1140

1869. 62, 122, 198, 1124, 1146

1870. 116, 155, 681, 1190

1871. 700

1872. 199

1872. 199

1873. 63, 129, 865, 1244

1874. 502

1875. 360, 540, 613, 1198, 1199

1876. 677, 1192, 1199, 1200

1877. 308, 1008, 1059

1878. 200, 370, 659, 1243

1879. 1275, 1296

1880. 201, 1258, 1300

1881. 64, 766

1882. 939

1883. 202, 357, 371, 994, 1141

1184. 627, 956, 1283, 1284

1185. 343, 737, 935, 957, 1009, 1241

1886. 353, 487, 612, 958, 987, 1293

1887. 148, 389, 446, 658

1888. 133, 203, 689, 902, 1039, 1062, 1245

1889. 226, 601, 893, 1276

1890. 204, 1127

1891. 486, 1116

1892. 503, 904, 1142, 12, 85

1893. 349, 611, 759, 805, 1137

1894. 205, 531, 1111, 1248

1895. 757, 1138

1896. 267, 280, 424, 527, 679, 892, 1010, 1041, 1044

1897. 150, 723, 724, 1117, 1297, 1298

1898. 240, 866, 937, 959

1900. 14, 206, 734, 806, 834, 963, 1118

1901. 225, 476, 1125

1902. 218, 219, 622, 938, 1201

1903. 154, 207, 226, 1001, 1202

1904. 18, 81, 548, 944, 1014

1905. 549, 580, 606, 642, 643, 1207

1906. 208, 800, 801, 1011

1907. 289, 644, 648, 1203

1908. 1204

1909. 313, 326, 609, 645, 1166, 1286

1910. 209

1911. 175, 176, 621, 1205

1912. 290, 484, 623, 636, 1132

1913. 226, 422, 590

1914. 186, 210, 425, 779, 936, 960, 1045

1915. 286, 317, 574

1916. 610, 894.

1918. 423, 483

1919. 1281

1920. 291

1922. 118, 281, 639, 988, 989, 995

1923. 327, 523, 961, 978, 1256

1924. 98, 292, 347, 485, 501, 945, 946, 947,

1925. 293, 294, 762, 1193, 1259

1926. 440, 553, 1038, 1134

1927. 372, 731, 980, 1266

1928. 948, 1075, 1079, 1087, 1263

1929. 295, 478, 954, 1007, 1088, 1135, 1247

1930. 530, 591, 1119, 1133, 1174, 1294, 1295

1931. 2, 189, 732, 1089, 1249, 1270

1932. 51, 187, 296, 373, 377, 593, 694, 784, 992, 1090, 1177

1933. 581, 650, 1060, 1131, 1143

1934. 83, 356, 374, 474, 534, 569, 570, 582, 605, 650, 777, 810, 848, 993, 1091, 1240

1935. 273, 299, 563, 604, 650, 739

1936. 142, 143, 444, 547, 561, 649, 650, 740, 741, 962, 1120, 1121, 1267

1937. 319, 640, 646, 651, 1005

1938. 300, 811, 845, 981, 1021, 1092

1939. 1, 301, 441, 653, 670, 672, 673, 807, 861

1940. 362, 392, 562, 583, 674, 728, 835, 895

1941. 414, 585, 745, 1012, 1093, 1094

1942. 339, 346, 453, 812, 907, 1264, 1277

1943. 134, 165, 339, 675, 933, 1246, 1250, 1282

1945. 228, 272, 479, 506, 953, 1239

1946. 185, 457, 505, 507, 1076

1947. 246, 555, 586

1948. 337, 539, 701, 876, 883, 1080, 1167, 1175

1949. 166, 180, 227, 332, 363, 655, 836, 839, 979, 1002

1950. 160, 190, 354, 616, 635, 838

1951. 221, 283, 451, 454, 499, 607, 771, 896, 942

1952. 174, 302, 361, 669, 698, 747, 878, 890, 951, 967, 1004, 1188, 1209, 1235

1953. 328, 350, 508, 695, 702, 729, 730, 735, 778, 813, 1185, 1253, 1303

1954. 124, 287, 572, 602, 831, 840, 950, 1019, 1095, 1130, 1186

1955. 149, 159, 364, 578, 634, 754, 773, 841, 975, 1214, 1265

1956. 217, 321, 504, 520, 797, 891, 1257, 1278

1957. 84, 119, 284, 288, 297, 378, 390, 429, 448, 509, 587, 699, 770, 943, 1163, 1168, 1234, 1287

1958. 345, 510, 511, 517, 594, 628, 687, 765, 783, 814, 821, 847, 1187, 1272

1959. 96, 97, 99, 145, 172, 177, 245, 335, 336, 430, 431, 480, 573, 629, 664, 668, 780, 804, 879, 952, 982, 1058, 1100

1960. 10, 95, 131, 298, 318, 375, 449, 500, 619, 624, 662, 763, 1077, 1171, 1261, 1280

1961. 168, 223, 270, 472, 512, 630, 704, 718, 733, 738, 880, 881, 884, 932, 1274

1962. 3, 93, 136, 144, 146, 595, 614, 657, 671, 678, 772, 998, 1183, 1254

1963. 282, 355, 426, 521, 532, 560, 596, 676, 782, 803, 815, 828, 852, 905, 906, 970, 1063, 1123, 1255,

1273, 1279, 1299

1964. 80, 161, 162, 275, 315, 351, 366, 387, 421, 445, 598, 625, 631, 818, 983, 1006, 1208

1965. 147, 163, 179, 224, 271, 276, 279, 296, 311, 340, 428, 455, 488, 518, 529, 592, 597, 647, 647, 656, 696, 742, 832, 842, 851, 882, 971, 1042, 1055, 1061, 1152, 1170

1966. 69, 184, 222, 231, 303, 307, 309, 329, 331, 341, 379, 393, 450, 559, 663, 684, 688, 692, 748, 752, 798, 829, 889, 972, 976, 1043, 1129, 1145, 1233

1967. 85, 120, 188, 220, 277, 316, 350, 352, 388, 413, 432, 443, 584, 603, 686, 691, 726, 774, 775, 843, 844, 997, 1003, 1046, 1154, 1172, 1189, 1215, 1242, 1292

1968. 16, 167, 296, 304, 397, 433, 435, 535, 550, 589, 608, 743, 769, 833, 849, 856, 857, 860, 867, 869, 888, 1037, 1056, 1096, 1122, 1162, 1164, 1173, 1210, 1251, 1288, 1291

1969. 137, 230, 244, 312, 376, 408, 473, 519, 617, 697, 744, 799, 808, 830, 862, 868, 964, 1027, 1191, 1302

1970. 114, 117, 151, 152, 171, 398, 405, 434, 528, 599, 615, 753, 863, 965, 999, 1078, 1176, 1216, 1252

1971. 164, 314, 436, 439, 632, 633, 751, 775, 864, 973, 974

1972. 399

# PART III

## HEADNOTES

### Preface

The history of rhetoric is replete with renowned theorists and practitioners of oral discourse. A meager list of scholars having contributed a theory of rhetoric includes such luminaries as Plato, Cicero, Quintilian, Thomas Hobbes, Joseph Priestley, George Campbell, Hugh Blair, Richard Whately, Thomas De Quincey, I. A. Richards, Richard Weaver, and Kenneth Burke. These and other theorists applied many and varied interpretations to the principles and functions of rhetoric. Yet, for sheer acumen and understanding, these accounts seldom match or approach Aristotle's treatment as developed in the Rhetoric. Aristotle's many (often unique) insights into rhetoric combined with his methodological innovations perhaps qualify the Rhetoric as the most important work on the subject to have survived antiquity. In fact, we would not exaggerate our point by suggesting the Rhetoric is one of the most influential works on rhetoric ever written. Even today the Rhetoric significantly affects research in oral communication. One need only examine modern public speaking textbooks to discover strong Aristotelian traces;

further, the terms "Neo-Aristotelian" and "New Rhetoric" eloquently testify to Aristotle's presence.

Aristotle's works--the Rhetoric included--have been analyzed by numerous commentators, generally with the precision and care typical of classical scholarship. As scholars with an interest in Aristotelian studies represent diverse disciplines and languages, reports of their research appear in a wide variety of sources. Unfortunately for the student who is not multi-lingual, as is often the case, a reliance upon materials in his native tongue is necessitated. The English speaking student is especially handicapped by the lack of analyses of the Rhetoric; further, not only are studies of the Rhetoric in English not overly abundant, but not just a few monographs appear in difficult-to secure journals. The student or scholar, therefore, wishing analyses of Aristotle's rhetorical theories in English often has to contend with a sparse, scattered literature.

The purpose of this book, therefore, is to provide an anthology of studies on Aristotle's rhetorical theories. Access to scholarship on Aristotelian rhetoric is provided in one convenient reference work. Generally, the audience to whom this book is addressed is the student and scholar desiring advanced and relatively full analyses of Aristotelian rhetoric. The delicate line balancing the trade-off between student and scholar interest and the degree to which both may fruitfully read this volume has

been taken into account. Two general guidelines, apart from specific criteria, were observed for justifying the inclusion of each selection: first, philological emendations or interpretations of minor passages or concepts were omitted on the ground that only the most serious reader of the Rhetoric would benefit from such analyses; secondly, survey or introductory articles aimed principally at the undergraduate or casual reader were omitted. More specifically, the following standards were employed: (1) relevance to rhetorical theory, (2) overall significance, (3) primary focus upon Aristotelian rhetoric, and (4) original scholarly contribution.

The major advances and distinguishing features of Aristotelian rhetoric are explored by the contributing authors. The subjects range from Chroust's analysis of Aristotle's early lectures and lost rhetorics to Solmsen's treatment of the Aristotelian tradition in ancient rhetoric. Detailed interpretations of topoi are advanced by Grimaldi and Ochs, while the enthymeme is explicated by McBurney and Bitzer. In addition, ten other subjects dealing with Aristotle's theories of rhetorical discourse are investigated. Moreover, this anthology is the first English commentary on Aristotle's theories of rhetorical discourse since Cope's monumental three-volume edition of 1877

Scholarship focusing upon Aristotle's Rhetoric in the English language, however, is extensive enough to present editorial problems. The inevitable arbitrary

decisions as to format and selection had to be made. Even though the addition or deletion of particular items from this anthology may be argued, the editor nevertheless believes the selections are drawn from and represent the best scholarly interpretations of Aristotle's rhetorical theories; further, my companion work, Aristotle's Rhetoric: A History and Bibliography, provides ample opportunity for even greater scholarly explorations.

An anthology, especially one reprinting essays from journals published in five countries, requires the efforts and cooperation of numerous individuals. It is, therefore, with much appreciation that I express my gratitude to each author who extended the professional courtesy of granting the right to reprint his work. Without their virtually complete cooperation this project would never have been finished. Whatever short-comings this work may have, however, rest solely with the editor and in no way ought to reflect upon the respective authors. Thanks for the same reason are due the editors and publishers of Laval Théologique Philosophique, Revue Des Etudes Grecques, L'Antiquite Classique, Speech Monographs, Quarterly Journal of Speech, American Journal of Philology (John Hopkins University), Transactions of the American Philological Association, The New Scholasticism, Philosophy and Rhetoric, Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie, Traditio, and Princeton University Press. Special recognition is likewise

warranted and extended to those hard working public servants--the librarians of the University of Michigan, Rice, Houston, University of California (Los Angeles), University of Southern California, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State, and the Library of Congress--who lent assistance with this as well as my aforementioned bibliography.

Anton-Hermann Chroust, "Aristotle's Earliest 'Course of Lectures on Rhetoric'," L'Antiquite Classique, XXXIII (1964), 58-72.

The purpose of Anton-Hermann Chroust's essay is to analyze the probable content of and circumstances leading up to Aristotle's opportunity to offer a series of lectures on rhetoric in the Academy. Chroust examines classical works referring to those lectures. In addition, Chroust investigates the lost rhetorical work, Theodectea, in order to support his arguments. Thus, not only do we receive a fascinating picture of Aristotle's early rhetorical lectures but one of his lost rhetorics as well.

Philodemus, a critical observer of Aristotle, is the earliest known source mentioning these lectures. Philodemus states that Aristotle offered lectures in the afternoon, maintaining it "a scandal to remain silent and let Isocrates speak out." (As is commonly known, Isocrates was the chief rival, antagonist, and competitor of Aristotle and the Academy.) Chroust details Philodemus' attack upon Aristotle's attention to the study of rhetoric. Briefly, Philodemus' criticism stems from his belief that Aristotle slighted natural and moral philosophy when he turned his attention to rhetoric. While Philodemus rebuked Aristotle for attempting to combine rhetoric and philosophy, Cicero later praised him for it. Cicero agreed with Philodemus, however, that Aristotle turned to the teaching

of rhetoric as a countermove against the successes of Isocrates and his school.

In recent years much debate has centered upon these early lectures and the conflicting evidence from classical sources. Chroust examines the arguments of Stahr, Diels, Blass, Rose, Heitz, Solmsen, and Kantelhardt, whose research links these lectures with various rhetorical works of Aristotle. Chroust concludes that evidence as to the date and doctrinal content of these lectures is inconclusive, making definitive statements concerning them impossible. We can assume, however, the lectures arose from Aristotle's personal dislike of Isocrates and his school of oratory. And, if two assumptions (as detailed in the text) concerning the Aristotelian Gryllus and Platonic Phaedrus are correct, then a probable date of 360 to 355 B.C. might be affixed to the lectures.

Chroust's essay is especially beneficial for an understanding of the development of Aristotle's rhetorical theories. Chroust's investigation sheds light on two heretofore cloudy facets of Aristotle's background--the early lectures on rhetoric and his Theodectea. Knowledge of the lectures and Theodectea provide a firmer basis for understanding the heritage of the Rhetoric; an appreciation of the lectures and rhetorics preceding the Rhetoric are important in facilitating our grasp of Aristotle's maturing analysis of rhetorical discourse.

Anton-Hermann Chroust, "Aristotle's First Literary Effort: The Gryllus, A Lost Dialogue on the Nature of Rhetoric," Revue Des Etudes Grecques, LXXVIII (1965), 576-591.

The literature of antiquity in our possession represents but a fraction of the works generated by ancient authors. Unfortunately, many of even Aristotle's works have yet to be recovered. Among Aristotle's lost works is the Gryllus--a work on rhetoric. This book is believed to be Aristotle's earliest work. Evidence dates the Gryllus' composition at ca. 360 B.C., probably during Aristotle's eighth year of study under Plato. Chroust summarizes research which has attempted to reconstruct the Gryllus. In addition he theorizes as to the content and thrust of the work.

The work takes its name from Gryllus, the son of Xenophon, who died shortly before the battle of Mantinea. The title of this work is important because it provides information with which to speculate upon its content and purpose. The work's unusual (for Aristotle) title suggests Plato's manner of entitling dialogues and also lends confirmation to the general belief that the work was written in dialogue form. More puzzling, however, is the connection between Gryllus and a work of rhetoric. Did Aristotle, as Heitz suggests, merely wish to commemorate a friend (although no evidence of their friendship survives)? Or, as argued by Thillet and Solmsen, was the work primarily a

polemical piece which argued that not all rhetoric is art while simultaneously attacking certain rhetoricians (especially those having eulogized Gryllus for the purpose of ingratiating themselves to Xenophon)? The later explanation is more probable, suggests Chroust. Further, the Gryllus may be viewed as a polemic against Isocrates and his philosophical and educational ideals.

In the main, however, Chroust concludes that the title of the work is incidental, that it was a work on rhetoric written in dialogue form, echoing the rhetorical standards of Plato, and attacking the teaching of Isocrates. Unfortunately, the work does not survive; in addition to providing us with a better understanding of Aristotelian rhetoric, it would have given us a clearer picture of the young Aristotle.

Chroust's analysis of the Gryllus is useful on several counts: (1) Our knowledge of Aristotelian rhetoric is extended beyond the extant Rhetoric; (2) we are given an indication of Aristotle's motives for having turned to the study of rhetoric; and (3) we snatch glimpses of Aristotle's formative thinking in rhetorical theory.

Theresa M. Crem, "The Definition of Rhetoric According to Aristotle," Laval Théologique et Philosophique, XII (1956), 233-50.

The purpose of Theresa Crem's essay is to clarify Aristotle's definition of rhetoric. Crem examines the Rhetoric's definition of rhetoric by considering Aristotle's aim--as explicated in the first and beginning of the second chapter of Book I--of authoring a scientific presentation of the rhetorical method. The article is divided into two parts, "common considerations of the nature of rhetoric" and a "proper treatment of rhetorical method" (wherein is examined the end of rhetoric).

Crem notes initially that Aristotle's Rhetoric is unique among classical rhetorics in that it is a scientific consideration of the subject. While many rhetorics preceded the Rhetoric and even more followed, the overwhelming majority manifested a handbook format, addressing themselves to concerns of practical advice on public speaking rather than, as is characteristic of Aristotle, to a methodical treatment of the nature of rhetorical discourse. Aristotle wrote neither as a notable teacher of oratory nor as an experienced rhetorician, but rather as a logician.

In examining the defining features of rhetoric Crem clarifies the antistrophic relationship of rhetoric to dialectic. A contrast and comparison of rhetoric and dialectic is demonstrated, as is Aristotle's reason for having established this relationship. From this initial position,

suggests Crem, Aristotle attempted to establish in what the rhetorical method should consist. In Chapter 2 of the Rhetoric he clarified the method, seeing it concerned with the modes of persuasion--proofs. In addition the utility of the rhetorical method was defended. As to the rhetorical method, Aristotle defined it as the faculty of discovering, in any given case, the available means of persuasion. Rhetoric was viewed as a faculty in that it has no determinate subject; it is concerned with observing the available means of persuasion rather than with explicating or defining a particular subject matter. Professor Crem concludes her article by demonstrating Aristotle's attention to the audience and how they are to be considered in light of this definition.

Crem's essay serves as a touchstone for the remaining articles in that she examines the scope, nature, and purpose of Aristotle's definition of rhetoric. Hence, having established definitionally the purpose of rhetoric (persuasion), related concepts are more easily visualized as constituents of Aristotle's overall paradigm. Crem's essay, therefore, provides us with a perspective from which to view the finer operations and subtleties of the Rhetoric.

Robert Price, "Some Antistrophes to the Rhetoric," Philosophy and Rhetoric, I (1968), 145-64.

The purpose of Robert Price's article is to demonstrate that the Rhetoric is not to be considered, in the words of W. D. Ross, a "curious jumble of literary criticism with second rate logic, ethics, politics, and jurisprudence." Price wishes to prove, moreover, that the Rhetoric is a parallel work to the Topics and Analytics--not an application of them.

Rhetoric is announced in the opening line of the Rhetoric as the counterpart or antistrophe to dialectic. Price sees rhetoric and dialectic as antistrophic arts because both share the structures of such arts "as are concerned with the production of certain logoi for certain purposes." Logoi are defined by Aristotle as faculties for furnishing arguments. This distinction may be applied to other works of Aristotle as well. We tend, however, to overlook the other arts which exist in an antistrophic relationship with each other, and, as Price attempts to point out, the Rhetoric as well. Price establishes his rationale for viewing the several arts as antistrophes by noting that they all are faculties for providing logoi. Because these logoi differ vastly Price examines their similarities in terms of sullogismoi (especially, syllogisms in process).

Deliberation is the first antistrophe recognized by Price. He notes that deliberation, although sharing features with the Rhetoric not found in other antistrophes, is not explicitly identified by Aristotle. The second antistrophe is evaluation, which is nowhere discussed by Aristotle. Price analyzes this antistrophe in so far as he sees it as a "reworking of the materials of Deliberation in a manner near to that of both Rhetoric and Demonstration." Recollection, the third antistrophe examined, has as its basis a single passage to be found in Aristotle's Parva naturalia. The fourth antistrophe noted, Demonstration, is characterized by its notions that (1) within a single mind everything occurs, and (2) the object is to discover the grounds of a case in order to generate premises lending themselves to a specific conclusion. Tasks requiring demonstration, however, are quite limited. Dialectic is the fifth antistrophe analyzed. The last antistrophic art examined is rhetoric itself. Having saved rhetoric for last Price shows how it is one of the sister arts having faculties for furnishing logoi. Price does not consider rhetorical syllogisms to be inferior or imperfect nor does he see them as instances of demonstrative syllogisms. In addition, he does not view Aristotle's inartistic proofs as logoi but rather as means for producing conclusions; an orator, rather than invent them, finds such proofs.

Price's analysis, in conclusion, is significant because it explores how the Rhetoric possesses similarities of purpose with the other antistrophic arts as a faculty for furnishing logoi, and therefore aids in a process of defining rhetoric's place in human thought. Price sees the Rhetoric as a member of a family of antistrophic arts. Moreover, Ross' cursory view of the Rhetoric may be ignored with the Rhetoric viewed instead as an allied and parallel treatise to the Topics and Analytics. The importance of Price's analysis also lies in the justification of the Rhetoric's logoi (enthymemes) as different but not defective syllogisms (faculties) for providing arguments.

Brother S. Roberts, F. S. C., "Rhetoric and Dialectic: According to the First Latin Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle," The New Scholasticism, XXXI (1957), 484-98.

As every student of the Rhetoric knows, "rhetoric is the counterpart of dialectic." This statement, found in the opening paragraph of the work, is Aristotle's attempt to establish the relationship of rhetoric to logic. There has been some disagreement, however, as to how and in what manner rhetoric is a counterpart or antistrophe of dialectic. It is important to distinguish the differences and commonalities of rhetoric and dialectic in so far as Aristotle's statement expressing their relationship is as much definitional as descriptive. Likewise, knowing the materials and bounds of each discipline gives us a clearer interpretation of the Rhetoric vis-ā-vis Aristotle's logical works. Brother S. Robert's article is important, therefore, because in an illuminating fashion it details and clarifies the similarities and differences between these two concepts.

Roberts employs William of Moerbeke's commentary of Aristotle's Rhetoric as commented on by Giles as the basis for his analysis. As Giles' commentary played a significant role in early Aristotelian scholarship and because its essential interpretation differs little from modern renderings, its distinction of rhetoric and dialectic is of interest.

Robert's article is divided into two parts: an examination of how rhetoric and dialectic differ, and secondly, their commonalities. These two concepts are seen to differ across several dimensions. Alfarbius, for example, was to comment that dialectic is concerned with universals, and rhetoric, particulars. In addition, Giles notes that dialectic generates greater probability because rhetoric is moved by the will. Also, dialectic is to be viewed as an instrument for discovering truth while rhetoric is properly the province of statesmen interested in persuasion. And too, rhetoric is more concerned with mortal affairs while dialectic the speculative realm; consequently, rhetoric may turn its attention to the arousal of passions while dialectic avoids them.

The similarities of rhetoric and dialectic are likewise detailed. These two disciplines are seen akin in terms of their probabilistic nature, rationality, and quasi-universality. Robert considers rhetoric and dialectic alike, finally, in that both are acts of reason "whereby men attain all that is knowable."

Whitney J. Oates, "The Problem of Value in the Rhetoric," Aristotle and the Problem of Value (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), 335-50.

Whitney J. Oates notes that perhaps the most striking characteristic of Aristotle's Rhetoric is its ambivalence concerning a theory of value. Oates suggests the Rhetoric attempts two lines of analysis in explicating rhetoric--that of aligning rhetoric philosophically with logic, politics, and ethics, while, secondly, developing the practical concerns of a rhetorical handbook. We note, therefore, a moral rhetoric linked to ethics, politics, and logic while an amoral, or indeed immoral, treatment emerging when matters of rhetorical practicality are discussed.

Evidence of an amoral theory of rhetoric arises when Aristotle advises the political orator in the ways of expediency, efficiency, and advantages over apparently the "secondary" matters of justice and honor. Likewise, in the Rhetoric's passage aligning rhetoric to logic and the ethical branch of politics, suggesting it to be partly like dialectic as well as sophistical reasoning (dealing with words), his underpinning for a philosophically grounded rhetoric gives way. Thus, we are left with the uncomfortable choice of deciding whether a moral, immoral, or amoral rhetoric is advanced by Aristotle.

Oates suggests Aristotle could not have envisioned the Rhetoric as a handbook for three reasons: First, the

Rhetoric is situated in the corpus primarily with works which treat of or relate to Aristotle's metaphysics or philosophy. Secondly, Aristotle makes clear his intention to relate the work to his other treatises and, lastly, suggests Oates, Aristotle recognized that rhetoric must be treated philosophically if it is to transcend the level of a non-intellectual discipline. Oates concludes that had Aristotle developed a more thorough and overriding theory of value the confounding elements of the Rhetoric's ambivalence would not have arisen. In short, Oates sees Aristotle's work as an amoral rhetoric.

Oates' analysis is important because it places in proper perspective not only the role of the orator and his justification for adapting truth to the common factor but for its clarity in categorizing, in regards to value, the work. It is, after all, important to realize that rhetoric as Aristotle envisioned it was essentially amoral. In this context Oates has provided us with a framework with which to view the whole concept of persuasion as it implies the adjusting of ideas and arguments to individuals for the purpose of affecting their behavior.

James H. McBurney, "The Place of the Enthymeme in Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, III (1936), 49-74.

Aristotle made many contributions to rhetorical theory. Perhaps chief among his advances was the notion of "enthymeme." Because Aristotle spoke of the enthymeme as the "very body and substance of persuasion," scholarly attempts at explicating the concept are numerous. James H. McBurney's analysis is one of the more valuable available.

McBurney begins his analysis by contrasting the levels of knowledge--science, dialectic, rhetoric, and sham reasoning. McBurney than seeks to define the enthymeme by examining pertinent passages of the Rhetoric wherein it is treated. He analyzes: (1) probabilities and signs as the materials of the enthymeme; (2) the example; (3) the relationship of enthymeme to topoi; (4) its relationship to ethos and pathos; (5) the distinction between refutative and demonstrative enthymemes; and (6) passages suggesting the suppression of a proposition. McBurney, having discussed the enthymeme from these six viewpoints, concludes that: (1) the enthymeme is to rhetoric as the syllogism is to logic; (2) probable signs and causes constitute the premises of an enthymeme; (3) "these premises are drawn from topics varying in specificity and exactness from the particular facts of a given substntive field to the most general principles of probability"; (4) language

may be phrased to affect ethos, pathos and probable truth; (5) not all enthymemes can be stated as valid syllogisms because of deficiencies in the inferential process; (6) rhetorical examples may be reduced to an enthymematic form; and (7) a suppressed premise is characteristic but not necessary to the enthymeme. McBurney concludes by examining the enthymeme's use after Aristotle and by suggesting its place in contemporary rhetorical theory.

McBurney's analysis of the enthymeme was a pioneering work in the field. The thoroughness and clarity of his arguments together with his introductory remarks on reasoning in Aristotle, are widely noted. Lloyd Bitzer, however, disagrees with a number of McBurney's conclusions. The reader is urged, therefore, to turn next to Bitzer's essay to note contrasting interpretations on some key concepts.

Lloyd F. Bitzer, "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (1959), 399-408.

Several scholars have followed McBurney in examining Aristotle's enthymeme. Among them is Lloyd F. Bitzer, who criticially assesses the varied definitions and in the process offers a new interpretation. Bitzer, like McBurney before him, notes the enthymeme as developed by Aristotle is a perplexing concept in that no consistent statement of it is made. It is appropriate and not without justification, therefore, that Bitzer synthesizes and critically analyzes research conducted in this area.

Bitzer challenges the definitions and notions developed by Lane Cooper, James H. McBurney, Edward Cope, Charles Sears Baldwin, and Thomas De Quincey. Briefly, he demonstrates that while the enthymeme is a syllogistic form distinguishable from dialectical and demonstrative syllogisms, neither premise probability by itself nor an enthymeme's formal deficiency constitutes its essential feature. Likewise, he suggests, enthymemes by definition are not necessarily concrete while syllogisms are abstract. Thus while most enthymemes are probable, formally deficient, and concrete, we cannot generalize and say all exhibit such characteristics. Having examined various inadequacies of current interpretations, Bitzer next advances his own analysis of the enthymeme.

We ought to consider the term "incomplete syllogism" (one or more suppressed premises) in a special sense; an "incomplete syllogism" to Bitzer means that the "speaker does not lay down his premises but lets his audience supply them out of its stock of opinion and knowledge." Premises may or may not be verbalized. The enthymeme, therefore, accomplishes for rhetoric what the question-answer format does for dialectic: "The speaker draws the premises for his proofs from propositions which members of his audience would supply if he were to proceed by question and answer." The resulting syllogisms Bitzer calls "enthymemes." Bitzer concludes by emphasizing that a speaker and audience jointly must produce enthymemes if they are to occur.

Bitzer's analysis is important for several reasons: (1) he summarizes all the research investigating Aristotle's enthymeme; (2) he demonstrates that enthymemes are not incomplete syllogisms in the traditional sense; (3) he believes premises are verbalizable; and (4) Bitzer suggests a vital commingling effect of enthymemes upon the speaker-listener relationship.

Gerard Hauser, "The Example in Aristotle's Rhetoric: Bifurcation or Contradiction," Philosophy and Rhetoric, I (1968), 78-90.

The two forms of logical proof established in the Rhetoric are the enthymeme and example. We have noted McBurney and Bitzer's analyses of the enthymeme and their summaries of research investigating this concept. They observed that considerable studies of the enthymeme have been conducted. The example, however, has received scant attention by comparison. Gerard Hauser's study examines the example and attempts to resolve a conflict in the manner Aristotle treats the subject.

The example in Book I is elevated by Aristotle to a place of lofty importance--rhetorical induction. In Book II, however, we discover disparate statements concerning the example. Rather than a mode of proof independent yet co-ordinate with the enthymeme, as in Book I, Book II asserts the example to be but a special form of enthymeme, subordinate to and serving merely as a source of materials for the enthymeme. Aristotle's definition seemingly emerges riding a contradiction which, unfortunately, is never resolved internally.

In attempting to resolve the conflict, Hauser turns to Aristotle's doctrine of induction (as exemplified in his theories of epistemology and metaphysics) to explain the rhetorical example. Hauser argues, as demonstrated in the Metaphysics and Organon that Aristotle had a bifurcated concept of induction. Thus, Hauser suggests, Aristotle

likewise may have envisioned a bifurcated theory of example; allowing us to take at face value the description of example found in Book II--the example as a support in enthymematic proof. Thus, the Rhetoric develops not a disparate doctrine of example but rather one consistent with Aristotle's bi-modal theory of induction. Gerard Hauser's essay is important, therefore, for suggesting an answer to a previously confusing riddle concerning the dual-definitions of "example" found in the Rhetoric.

Joseph T. Leinhard, S. J., "A Note on the Meaning of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Aristotle's Rhetoric," American Journal of Philology, LXXXVII (1966), 446-54.

There has been much investigation in recent years focused upon the concept of pistis; the theories advanced, however, have not always been consistent. Lienhard attempts to resolve the conflicting interpretations. He examines in particular the work of Grimaldi and Wikramanayake. Lienhard's analysis is important because it distinguishes the relationship of the forms of proof to each other and to rhetorical discourse in particular.

The specific details of each scholar's argument is left for the reader's study. Basically, however, Grimaldi saw the meaning of pistis in the following relations: "pistis as matter (ethos, pathos, pragma) is ordered by pistis as effect." Consistent with this view Grimaldi thought it inaccurate to separate ethos and pathos from a third, logical, proof. It is Wikramanayake's belief, though, that ethos and pathos are proofs independent of other considerations and that parallel to them is another form of proof consisting of the enthymeme and example--logical proof. In order to determine the efficacy of either position Lienhard turns to the Rhetoric and examines the several senses in which the term pistis is employed.

Lienhard identifies six ways in which Aristotle interpreted pistis, five of which are relevant to rhetorical

discourse. The confusion is tentatively laid to rest, however, with the observation that Aristotle carefully and intentionally changed the meaning of the word depending upon its context. The evidence suggests, though, that before Aristotle changed the context he clearly warned the reader. Lienhard concludes by noting that "pistis means the state of mind produced, it occurs in the singular or in a verbal or adjectival form." This is to say, therefore, that each of the five senses of the term applicable to rhetoric refers to the proof which induces belief; and hence pistis is the key to Aristotle's philosophy of discourse.

William M. A. Grimaldi, S. J., "The Aristotelian Topics," Traditio, XIV (1958), 1-16.

The Aristotelian topoi are recognized by Grimaldi as having played a significant role in Western culture even though, curiously enough, they have not been understood fully. The topoi have been obscured by a number of factors, including Aristotle's reluctance to announce forthrightly what he meant by the concept. A decline of methodology following Aristotle, further, and Cicero's misdirected emphasis (which passed to Quintilian and from him into the middle ages and Western tradition), facilitated the misinterpretation of topoi. Grimaldi believes it a genuine loss that this truncated form of the topics fails to engender the richer form of discourse he sees them providing.

Grimaldi, therefore, critically analyzes the "particular" and "general" topics as developed by the Rhetoric. Particular topics are sources through which a subject may be more clearly seen, while general topics are forms of inference allowing the artist to develop further conclusions. Additionally, general topics concern universal principles of probability that apply equally well to all disciplines and express a common human experience--virtue, expediency, or justice. The general topics embrace the possible and impossible, greatness and smallness, what will or will not occur, and what has or has not happened.

Particular topics, however, draw their materials from their respective disciplines. Thus, a special topic would involve a proposition unique to a certain genus. The particular topoi furnish premises for enthymemes and are more widely used than general topics.

Grimaldi's analysis is especially important for an understanding of material topoi, for he sees them divided into particular and general topoi. He shows how these topoi are not to be considered commonplaces, as often has been urged, and demonstrates their capacity for furnishing premises for enthymemes. Grimaldi does not discuss, however, the formal topics. Thus, following Grimaldi's treatment one next should read Donovan Och's analysis of the formal topics.

Donovan J. Ochs, "Aristotle's Concept of Formal Topics," Speech Monographs, XXXVI (1969), 419-25.

Donovan J. Ochs, unlike Grimaldi who examined the particular and general topics, analyzes Aristotle's concept of "formal" topics. Ochs' specific purpose is an explanation of the twenty-eight forms of formal topoi found in Book II of the Rhetoric. He develops the argument that rhetorical topics ought not to be viewed as a logical system of invention but rather as primary, indivisible, and inherent elements from which enthymemes are constructed. He demonstrates this thesis by examining the rhetorical topics along a time-line development of the Rhetoric and the intervening development of the Topics. By designating the various stages of the Rhetoric we note that Aristotle's theory of topics preceded the enthymeme. Ochs indicates that not until the first expansion of the Rhetoric were the genera-materials and "commons" added.

The term "element," which is equated with a topic both in the Rhetoric and Topics, is defined as the first "inherent thing out of which a thing is constructed." Aristotle conceives of "topic" and "element" as being synonomous terms. A topic, of course, is viewed as that under which enthymemes fall. This does not imply, as Ochs points out, that the twenty-eight topics constitute a logical system. It is, in fact, a general conclusion of most commentators that these topics do not provide premises

for rhetorical arguments. Rather, as Ochs concludes, they seem more akin to an amalgam of "miscellaneous molds into which rhetorical arguments usually are cast." Formal topoi, therefore, as distinct from general and particular varieties, are seen as lines of argument rather than means for furnishing premises. It is obvious, therefore, that formal topoi are not dependent upon subject matter. In conclusion, we recognize the value of Och's essay arising from his analysis of formal topoi, a subject not developed by Grimaldi.

William W. Fortenbaugh, "Aristotle's Rhetoric on Emotions," Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie, LII (1970), 40-70.

William F. Fortenbaugh notes with disappointment that many scholars have found the Rhetoric's treatment of the emotions superficial. Fortenbaugh, however, thinks Aristotle's analysis is neither superficial nor lacking in precision. Rather, he sees the Rhetoric's treatment of the emotions as important for philosophical psychology, ethical theory, and, obviously enough, rhetorical theory. Fortenbaugh confirms this thesis by analyzing the Rhetoric's treatment of happiness and pleasure.

Aristotle, Fortenbaugh suggests, saw much value in the study and application of the emotions to rhetorical discourse. Aristotle believed an orator must understand correctly the individual emotions and their capacity to affect the judgment of auditors. Further, should the orator's understanding of them be in any way deficient, the proper emotional response desired from an audience would not materialize. Essentially the means of analyzing the emotions are knowing: (1) the ground for an individual emotion; (2) the object of an emotion; and (3) the condition of men which lends them to a particular emotion.

Fortenbaugh, in justifying the Rhetoric's account of the emotions, concludes by indicating the significance of this treatise for rhetorical and ethical theory as well as philosophy. While his analysis of the importance of

emotions to rhetorical theory is of particular interest to us, the application of the emotions to ethical theory and philosophy is equally revealing. Moreover, Fortenbaugh's analysis of the emotions is the most thorough interpretation available. Fortenbaugh lifts our understanding of the Rhetoric's treatment of emotions from the belief Aristotle merely echoed popular beliefs to a position seeing the emotions as an integral and representative part of Aristotle's philosophy.

Robert P. Sonkowsky, "An Aspect of Delivery in Ancient Rhetorical Theory," Transactions of the American Philological Association, XC (1959), 256-274.

Aristotle treats delivery very briefly in his Rhetoric. Delivery, however, is considered by Aristotle to be a "function" of rhetoric, even though he does not give to it the same degree of prominence afforded the functions of invention, arrangement, and style. The rather perfunctory and obligatory manner in which delivery is mentioned leaves the reader pondering its overall significance. Does an orator need concern himself with the probable effectiveness of his delivery when constructing and arranging his speech? It is Sonkowsky's belief that this question should be answered affirmatively.

Aristotle's celebrated and yet tantalizingly brief description of rhetoric is expanded by Sonkowsky through an analysis of the several parts of the Rhetoric. In addition Sonkowsky examines rhetorical tracts other than the Rhetoric for an answer to the question of whether delivery is important in the process of speech composition. Cicero, Plato, and Theophrastus are analyzed for supportive evidence. Sonkowsky suggests that in the Aristotelian tradition delivery was not something to be added after the process of literary composition had been completed; rather, he sees delivery as vitally involved in the very labors of composition. Sonkowsky confirms his thesis by an examination of Aristotelian proofs, emotions, and style. Further,

from the "debate" between Aristotle and Plato over the philosophical importance of rhetoric, Sonkowsky is able to demonstrate how the vividness of oral composition clashed with the rhetorical delivery of written speech and how rhetorical delivery was somehow thought to resemble divine inspiration.

Sonkowsky's article is viewed as an important work for at least two reasons: (1) delivery, in the Aristotelian tradition, is analyzed in terms of its relationship to other concepts embodied in the Rhetoric, and (2) Aristotle's influence or fuller treatments of rhetoric, such as Theophrastus' and Cicero's, is demonstrated. Moreover, Sonkowsky's treatment allows for greater appreciation of a previously assumed shallow analysis of delivery by Aristotle.

Otto Dieter, "Stasis," Speech Monographs, XVII (1950), 345-69.

While many rhetorical concepts have a lineage traceable to modern works, stasis has a history as old as rhetoric itself. Surprisingly, however, relatively little research has been conducted on its nature and scope. Otto Alvin Loeb Dieter's detailed article corrects this oversight by examining stasis in its intellectual and historical context. Dieter, therefore, explores Aristotle's Physics and rhetorical works other than the Rhetoric. Because of the singularness of Dieter's article, however, its inclusion in this anthology is warranted.

Dieter notes initially that early research on stasis often exhibited shortcomings in scope and design which vitiated reported findings. Among such shortcomings was the failure to adequately deal with the term itself--even on a definitional level. Second, Greek thought and culture were seldom correlated with or seen as having any bearing upon stasis. Third, many commentators incorrectly assumed stasis originated from the stoics. Fourth, Aristotelian influence has been seen as eminating solely from the Rhetoric and Organon. Finally, an interesting Pseudo-Augustinian rhetoric generally has been overlooked.

Dieter opens his analysis by examining the Aristotelian doctrine of kinesis and stasis developed in the Physics. He notes that a physical interpretation of

stasis indicates it is an unavoidable and indispensable concomitant of all contrary and opposite rectilinear motions.

Dieter next demonstrates the adaptation of Aristotle's physical philosophy to rhetoric. Rhetoricians, he suggests, found Aristotle's theory of motion especially useful in that it provided the condition for a scientifically based rhetoric. And too, this philosophy provided rhetorical discourse with a theoretical foundation. Dieter concludes by explaining certain passages of extant rhetorical works seemingly influenced by stasis. Many of these passages by ancient rhetoricians heretofore have been shrouded in confusion. Viewed in context of Aristotle's doctrines, however, they become readily intelligible. Thus, Aristotle's physical interpretation of stasis is seen as measurably influencing rhetorical theory.

The inclusion of Dieter's article in this anthology serves to remind the reader that orators were to gleen principles applicable to rhetoric from Aristotelian works other than the Rhetoric.

Friedrich Solmsen, "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric," American Journal of Philology, LXII (1941), 35-50; 169-90.

In "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric," perhaps the most frequently cited essay on Aristotelian rhetoric in the English language, Friedrich Solmsen identifies Aristotle's major contributions to rhetoric and his influence upon subsequent rhetorics. Rather than detail every conceivable "contribution," however, Solmsen takes the wiser course of examining those significant concepts previously ignored or inadequately developed by ancient rhetoricians.

Solmsen identifies five essential differences between Aristotelian rhetoric and those rhetorics developed by his predecessors. The most readily noticeable departure of Aristotle from his contemporaries is the manner in which rhetorical materials are organized. Traditionally, rhetoric had been divided under partes orationis, even to the extent of subdividing each section into various species. Generally, however, there were four recognized parts of a speech--proem, narration, proofs, and epilogue. Aristotle attacked the superficiality of this approach and opted for a division into proofs, style, and disposition. Second, the Rhetoric is distinguishable from other texts in its treatment of proofs. It is here that his theories of ethos, pathos, and logos emerge. In addition, the enthymeme is for the first time introduced, and evidence and topoi are

seen in new light. Aristotle develops a careful analysis of the emotions, how they play upon the feelings and how a speaker's character affects his success. Fourth, Aristotle recognized three types of speaking encounters--the epideictic, forensic, and political. Finally, it was Aristotle who formally developed the virtues of style. He saw clarity, ornateness, and appropriateness as qualities a good speech should possess.

Solmsen concludes by detailing extensively how the Rhetoric's unique characteristics left their mark on later rhetorical systems. This article nicely rounds out our scholarly journey into the ancient world's most impressive rhetorical treatise.