

Rhetoric vs. Dialectics: A Critical Examination of Plato's Phaedrus

Prakash Chandra Giri*

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the analysis of rhetoric and dialectic, examining how Plato employs rhetoric in Phaedrus. The dialogue between Socrates and Phaedrus reflects the similarities and differences between rhetoric and dialectic. Similarly, it can be divided into three sections: the first two speeches against love, the third speech in praise of love, and a discussion of rhetoric. The dialogue revolves around the art of rhetoric and how it should be practiced. True rhetoric has dialectic which involves collecting and dividing knowledge of a subject in a natural way. This kind of dialectic art can be acquired only by philosophizing systematically about the nature of life and the soul. Rhetoric is called the art of persuasive communication. Persuasion means the relationship between the audience and the speaker. And it denotes a form of motivated discourse. On the other hand, dialectic is more than an abstract principle or method of philosophical ideas. It can be interpreted as a concrete method of social science. That is why rhetoric has become a counterpart of dialectic, which has received a significant effort and amount of attention. This study clarifies how the application of the arguments, the uses of pathos, logos and ethos, Aristotle's notion of statements categorized as division of speeches like invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery are analysed in Plato's Phaedrus. From this study, it is believed that dialectic seems more powerful than rhetoric in Plato's Phaedrus. The main outcome of this study is to analyze and examine the Plato's Phaedrus concentrating on rhetoric and dialectic.

Keywords: *Dialectic, love, ethos, logos, pathos, persuasion, philosophy, rhetoric,*

INTRODUCTION

The text 'Phaedrus' was written by Plato and translated by Robin Waterfield (2002). It consists of a dialogue between Socrates and Phaedrus. Plato, an Athenian philosopher-dramatist had a philosophical influence upon Western tradition and culture. He was highly influenced by his mentor Socrates. He spent most of his time dedicating to the pursuit of philosophy. His contribution appeared on the combination of dramatic

* Faculty, Gupteshwor Mahadev Multiple Campus, Pokhara

realism, intellectual importance and emotional power. The Phaedrus is also called a situated dialogue. It comprises with three speeches between Phaedrus and Socrates. The text 'Phaedrus' is divided into three sections: the first speech delivered by Phaedrus himself mimicking Lysias' speech and two speeches spoken by Socrates. The speeches are focused on the concern of love. The structure of the dialogues seems to be split, changing from speech making to dialectic conversation. The speeches of Socrates show the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy the theory of the forms, dialectic, the relationship between madness and love, truth and philosophy.

Similarly the rhetoric, its ideas, philosophical values and uses of dialectic have been addressed strongly in Phaedrus. The dialogue seems a dialectical discussion of the nature of rhetoric and in-depth analysis of the speeches. There are a lot of uses of rhetoric's philosophical ideas and dialectic in the dialogue. Argumentation, metaphorical ideas, rhetorical analysis and systematic expressions can be observed in Phaedrus. The study shows that when we want to shape rhetoric, we should have the philosophical ideas and dialectics. The study shows the analysis on ethos, logos, pathos and Aristotle's notion and argumentation quoted through Plato's Phaedrus. Thus the similarities, differences and relationship between dialectic and rhetoric can be observed in the Plato's Phaedrus. More significantly it examines the uses of dialectic and rhetoric showing some differences in Plato's Phaedrus and reveals how Plato is trying to employ the rhetoric in the text.

RELATED WORK

The section comprises the studies carried out by different scholars. It mainly discusses on rhetoric, dialectic, their differences and philosophy in the text. Likewise this section elaborates how the rhetorical methodologies are discussed for the analysis of the Plato's Phaedrus. It contains some methodological ideas and terms which support to analyse the text in details.

Rhetoric in Phaedrus

Rhetoric is one of the main concerns of Plato's Phaedrus. This concern encompasses the dialogue right from the scene in which Phaedrus brings with an obsessive and superficial attachment to speech-making. The speech is seen in the country where Phaedrus presents having just come from hearing the great orator Lysias' a public speech. In Phaedrus, Socrates opens the study of good and bad dialogue; his first move is to

specify what he means by good discourse. In the study of Werner (2010), Plato speaks about the rhetoric in the Phaedrus. His rhetoric in the second half of the dialogue has both a descriptive and a normative element. Similarly, in the study carried out by McCoy (2008), it is found that Plato's Phaedrus includes Plato's most explicit and well-developed idea of rhetoric. The dialogue between Socrates and Phaedrus provides an account of good rhetoric. For the first time, an explanation of rhetoric is expressed in its positive sense. Socrates' account of good rhetoric expands good speech as an organic unity of collection and division. His use of rhetoric in the Palinode shows that there is more rhetoric. Socrates' Palinode and his general description of rhetoric are rhetorical.

Dialectic in Phaedrus

Dialectic is used by Socrates throughout Plato's dialogues. Socrates asks Phaedrus question about the nature of various subjects like love, speech and writing. He has tried to bring and draw the conclusion about the nature of reality. Hayase (2016) argues that a kind of new interpretation of Plato's method of collection and division has been expressed in the Phaedrus. Moreover the discussion about the dialectic in the Phaedrus is clearly shown. Socrates attentively distinguishes the characteristic operations of the method from its applications. Similarly the collection and division should be made spontaneously of one another. For an understanding of its basic operations, the formulations in the Phaedrus no doubt have great significance, being not only the earliest but probably also the most elaborate. The Writer further employs this method in order to define or examine various subject matters. But they are difficult to deal with because they are put forward not for their own sake, but in order to reveal certain rhetorical techniques that have been employed in Socrates' speeches presented. Many experts have examined the collection and division in Plato's late dialogues.

In the middle of the so-called second part of the dialogue there is a passage that appears to describe Plato's dialectical method in detail on which scholars have tended to rely almost exclusively in their attempts to understand the method of collection and division as recommended in the Phaedrus. Finally the writer, Hayase has clarified how collection and division are applied in the cases of three applications discussed in the Phaedrus: simple definition, definition supplemented with division, and scientific analysis. Similarly, Yunis (2009) says that dialectic refers to a method of arguing or reasoning. Plato introduces dialectic into rhetoric because dialectic provides the material for arguments, and speeches must have arguments if they are to persuade. Socrates

describes the rhetorical argument to the two mental procedures, called collection and division that together constitute dialectic. The writer, Yunis summarizes how collection and division give value to the effectiveness of rhetorical arguments.

Rhetoric vs. Dialectics

Generally speaking, Rhetoric means a practical art which uses ornamental words and cynical sophistication and it seems a one way street but dialectic seems more practical and persuasive technique of argument which has logical and deliberative ideas. Leff (2000) states that dialectic deals with argumentative procedures in a more direct way than rhetoric. Likewise, according to Hohmann (2002), the term “dialectician” refers generally to a person having argumentative capabilities; there is a special term “sophist” for someone who practises these capabilities to deceive by means of specious arguments and on the other hand the term “rhetor” marks both the general category of people with an aptitude for persuasive speaking as well as those among them who misuse this aptitude to deceive their audiences. It is accepted that rhetoric can be theoretically sound and used for good an auxiliary role as a kind of handmaiden of dialectic. In Phaedrus, dialectic is understood as a somewhat esoteric process of real definition proceeding by collection and division, uncovers the truth, which is exoterically imparted by the means of rhetoric. Dialecticians generally deal with argumentation in its entirety and rhetoricians are far more likely to divide the arguments into different genres and to know how the ideas, institutions and traditions condition the conduct of argument. Similarly, rhetoric and dialectic contrast because one deals with concrete ideas while another deals with abstract issues. Dialectic is more closely connected with ‘reason’ than rhetoric. Dialectic has the logos of argument, ethos or emotions and it seems to be rationally autonomous because it follows its own procedural norms while rhetoric must answer to the extrinsic demands of the audience.

Plato has paralleled the characteristics of rhetoric with the standards for a superior but hypothetical art of discourse. There is no misunderstanding that dialectic has been defined as the art of discourse which meets the ideas for a true art of speech and dialectic is the art of discourse which employs the combination of synthesis and analysis. It is shown that rhetoric has no inherent capacity for having the truth and so lacks the means to intelligently mislead an audience. The writer calls Socrates’ discourse a speech as an example of applied rhetoric. Plato has followed the idea of arguing for the supremacy of philosophy and its methodological aspect, dialectic (Brownstein,

1965). In the study of McAdon (2004), many studies oppose the idea that Plato in *Phaedrus* advocates an affirmative view of rhetoric that has been dubbed philosophical or dialectical rhetoric. Similarly Plato has made a sharp difference between his and Isocrates' conception of the philosopher and the philosophical method, and Plato's dialectic that is listed in the dialogue is to be known as his "philosophical method" and not as "philosophical or dialectical rhetoric." In addition, Plato throughout his dialogues contrasts his dialectical method with the rhetorical method. Similarly Werner (2010) shows that more importantly, Plato's account of the true seems to place rhetoric quite close to philosophy itself, and mainly to philosophical dialectic. Moreover, it is believed that Plato is not trying to tell the orators how to do their job, but rather is urging them to abandon the job in favour of the philosophical life.

Philosophy in *Phaedrus*

Phaedrus is, without doubt, not only one of Plato's most beautiful dialogues but also one that is particularly inspiring and philosophical. The study of Pawłowski (2020) deals with the topic of philosophical initiatives in Plato's *Phaedrus*. The initiation was the representative of Greek mysteries, especially the Eleusinian and Orphic mysteries which played a large role in the formation of Greek philosophy. The writer mentions that Socrates puts much emphasis the moral and spiritual state of souls that obtain the blessed initiation. Spiritual and moral purity shall always remain the secret yearning of our souls, and especially of philosophers' souls. Moreover, Al-Maini (2014) studies the *Phaedrus* and he continues to fascinate. But the point that scholars are doing an ever-better job of showing how the *Phaedrus* accomplishes the interest it generates, both in itself and in philosophy generally.

In conclusion, the definition, similarities and differences on rhetoric, dialectic and philosophy were studied by many researchers. Many studies have stated about the concepts on rhetoric, dialectic and philosophical ideas on Plato's *Phaedrus*.

METHODOLOGICAL RELATED WORK

Similarly this paper is analysed on the basis of the following mentioned theoretical methodologies. These prominent ideas will be included in the further analysis. It comprises the short definition and analysis with some people's views on rhetorical triangles, the division of speeches, and argument. These are applied in the discussion and analysis of Plato's *Phaedrus*. Finally the study which showed more significantly to

distinguish the rhetoric and dialectic and examine how Plato has tried to employ the rhetoric in the text 'Phaedrus'.

Rhetorical Triangles: Logos, Ethos and Pathos

The study aims to examine and find out the rhetoric and dialectic following the rhetorical triangles in Plato's Phaedrus. "A Theory of Contemporary Rhetoric" written by (Andrews, 2013) mentioned that there are three types of rhetoric posited: the audience's feeling (Pathos), one that is an appeal to the speaker's character or set of values (Ethos), and one to argumentational proof (Logos) which can be analysed from the Plato's Phaedrus. In fact, rhetoric is defined as the arts of discourse. Aristotle is the father of rhetoric and he defines it as the "art of persuasion" designed for public engagement and debate in an Athenian Society.

Similarly, these rhetorical triad—logos, ethos, pathos—makes rhetoric the art of persuasive or honest communication (Wróbel, 2015). Moreover, Martin (2016) shows that rhetorical study has a long history of focusing on the varied aspects of communication in different domains such as literature, law or philosophy. In the study of Yunis (2017), Plato has developed a structural role for rhetoric as a great means of philosophy. He says that rhetoric is turned into a tool to be used for the development of the social and political ends which are determined mainly by philosophy. On the other hand as mentioned by Walton (1984), dialectic is more than an abstract principle or method of philosophical ideas. It can be construed as a concrete method of social science. It can be applied as a methodology with widespread implications for all of the social science. McAdon (2001) shows that dialectic deals with arguments, discussion and questions and answers, proving exact knowledge and truth. The rhetorical triangles are vividly elaborated in the analysis of Plato's Phaedrus.

The Division of Speeches

While studying rhetoric, the five canons invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery are required. They are the aspects of composing which work together in a synergistic dependent relationship. The division of speeches mentioned by Andrews (2013), the five parts which are also called the division of speeches; inventio (invention), dispositio (arrangement), elocutio (style), memoria (memory), and pronuntiatio (delivery, presentation). This arrangement provided a textbook-like structure for the compositions of orators. Similarly, Reynolds (1989) indicates that the division of

speeches was so important in Greek rhetoric as *lexis*, *taxis*, *herusis*, and *hypocrisis*. They apply to both encoding and decoding, making a complete system for both generating and analyzing discourse. In speech studies, minor changes in the meanings and words of the five terms have been developed in different treatises but the pattern remains as usual. The division of speeches is discussed and analysed exploring *Phaedrus*.

ARGUMENT

An argument is composed of the supporting claims and the supported claim. It may have many premises or it may have one. Arguments play very important role to justify the claims. In fact, the point of arguing or evaluating arguments is to reach the opinions depending upon the reasoned reflection and good judgment. Govier (2013) mentions that an argument is a set of claims put forward as giving support for a further claim. Moreover, from the book entitled "An introduction to reasoning" written by Toulmin et al. (1984), the uses of arguments can be presented. Argument is like an organism. Four elements can be found in any wholly explicit argument: (1) claims and discoveries, (2) grounds, (3) warrants and rules, and (4) backings. The claims are well founded only if sufficient grounds offered in their support. These grounds must be associated with the claims by reliable and applicable warrants justified by appeal to sufficient backing of the relevant kind. Similarly, the strengths of arguments like qualified claims, tentative discovery, rebuttals and exceptions, presumptions and quandaries, relevance and the contexts of arguments will be observed in the *Phaedrus*. Verheij (2005) shows that Toulmin's scheme for the layout of arguments has a great continuing impact among the researchers. Similarly George (2017) states that there are different types of fallacies as there are types of errors in argument. It is said that falsehood has many faces but truth has only one. Logic deals with the rules of correct thinking. Fallacy occurs when the rules are violated. Strictly saying, a fallacy is a type of arguing which appears to be valid and true but actually invalid. There are four main categories of fallacies: relevance, induction, presumption and ambiguity. The usage of argument can be discussed on the *Plato's Phaedrus*.

To sum up, some critics have studied on the area of rhetoric and dialectic. The relationship between rhetoric and dialectic was much focused but the differences between these two scopes are less studied. Many have studied on the role of rhetoric and composition in our daily contexts. Philosophical ideas are reflected quoting the *Plato's*

Phaedrus. Similarly the methodological concepts for the study are elaborated.

NEW DIMENSION

Various studies have been discussing the relationship between dialectic, rhetoric and philosophy. But here in this study, the differences between rhetoric and dialectic and an examination upon Plato's attempt to employ rhetoric can be analysed and discussed through the Plato's Phaedrus. Similarly it can be studied that how Plato has employed rhetoric in Phaedrus. With regard to the Phaedrus, it seems that the proficient rhetor acquires dialectical knowledge for use in rhetoric; dialectic will somehow confer on him philosophical values. Plato situates dialectic at the center of the philosophical life. Plato suggests that rhetoric was somehow different from the truth and it was unteachable. Dialectic is more than an abstract principle or philosophical ideas. It can be construed as a concrete method of social science and its applications. Dialectic provides a method of topical reasoning about the unknown and it considers common aspects of things and weighs relationships. It has become a great means of exploring problems.

In this study, the differences of rhetoric and dialectic are elaborated in Plato's Phaedrus using different methodological backgrounds like rhetorical triangles, the division of speeches, argument and enthymeme. Likewise the dialogue with three speeches can be analysed which shows how Plato is trying to employ the rhetoric. This study could clarify the dialogue spoken between Socrates and Phaedrus. Similarly it explained the contrast between rhetoric and dialectic with some examples and arguments extracted from Plato's Phaedrus. Finally this study attempted to identify some implications which can be studied and applied further.

Literal Comprehension of the Text

Phaedrus, a text was written by Plato, a great philosopher and translated by Robin Waterfield. And it is a text with a dialogue between two people Phaedrus and Socrates, Plato's teacher. The dialogue comprises three speeches which are explained below. These speeches encompass the discussion on the soul, divine inspiration and the practice and mastery of the art.

Lysias' speech

Phaedrus starts to say Lysias' speech. He begins with "You are aware of my situation

and you have heard me explain how, in my opinion, it would be to our advantage if this were to happen.” The speech proceeds to explain all the reasons why it is better to give a favor to a non-lover rather than a true lover. Friendship and companionship with a non-lover, he says, demonstrates objectivity and farsightedness; it does not create gossip when you are seen together, it does not involve jealousy and it allows for a much larger pool of possible partners. He says in detail that it is good to give a favour to one who can best return it rather than one who needs it most. He ends by stating that he thinks the speech is long enough and the listener is welcome to ask any confusion if left. After hearing the speech, Socrates flattering Phaedrus, responds that he is in ecstasy and he comments that as the speech seemed to make Phaedrus radiant. Socrates claims to be able to make an even better speech than Lysias on the same subject matter.

First speech of Socrates

When Phaedrus asks Socrates to deliver speech, then Socrates rather than simply listing reasons as Lysias had done, starts by explaining that while all men desire beauty, some are in love and some are not. Love, or Eros, is a form of madness in which the inborn desire for beauty overwhelms one's sense of morality and control. Socrates concludes his speech with this argument. He says that there are two main principles: one is our inborn desire for pleasure, and the other is our acquired judgment that pursues what is best. He further explains the problem is that one overcomes with this desire will want to turn his body into whatever is most pleasing to himself, rather than what is best for the boy. However, Phaedrus does not become satisfied. He thought that Socrates was about to move ahead and present the benefits of the lover. Socrates justifies his conclusion by telling that he was highly inspired by the Nymphs and did not want to be carried away. He therefore sets out to remedy the situation with a second speech on Eros. The main difference between the first speech of Socrates and Lysias is formal: Socrates' speech is well organized and systematic and he starts with a definition of love, based on a simple moral psychology.

Second speech of Socrates (the Palinode)

Socrates' second speech, called as his a Great Speech, establishes the overarching importance of Eros in life. The main movement of the central part of the Palinode is that it starts with the soul's vision of the region beyond heaven and ends with an analysis of the human condition of love. There are four types of divine madness, derived from

Apollo, Dionysus, the Muses and Aphrodite-the last being Eros. In fact love is a divine and beneficial madness, Socrates likens the soul to a chariot with two horses and a Charioteer. The most important thing for the soul is to raise wings and fly through the heavens with the gods. In the concluding part of the Great Speech, the dialogue changes to a discussion of rhetoric and writing. Phaedrus has been highly inclined by the sophistic view of rhetoric, which states that persuasion trumps truth in the art of rhetoric. Socrates challenges this argument by showing the harmful and bad influences of speaking without knowing the truth. Actually, rhetoric leads the soul. As such the rhetorician must know the souls of different audiences and speak accordingly. Then Socrates claims that the true art of speaking is kept for philosophers. The final topic between Socrates and Lysias addresses the technology of writing. Socrates tells the myth of the god Theuth who discovered writing and transmitted it to the Egyptians. After talking on the importance of philosophy to both spoken and written discourse, Phaedrus and Socrates set out on the path back to the city with ending prayers.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TEXT

This section examines the Plato's Phaedrus with some methodological ideas. It tells how the dialogue between Socrates and Phaedrus takes place and the study shows with some quotes from Plato's Phaedrus. The concepts regarding rhetoric and dialectic are discussed citing some previous studies and Plato's Phaedrus. Similarly the argumentation, the rhetorical triangles (logos, ethos and pathos), the division of speeches (invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery) quoted from Plato's Phaedrus are observed and analysed accordingly.

Rhetoric and Dialectic in Phaedrus

The dialogue of the text Phaedrus presents the story of a conversation between Socrates and Phaedrus. It has compatible contents in the dialogue. Many claim that it is about rhetoric. One of the great ideas of Plato's Phaedrus is rhetoric (Werner, 2010). Similarly the main idea in the second half of the Phaedrus is to prescribe what the rhetoric should be. While observing the structure of the dialogue, it seems that it is split and changing from speech making to dialectic conversation. It has very strong points to address the rhetoric, and its ideas, philosophical values and the uses of dialectic. The dialogue seems a dialectical discussion of the nature of rhetoric and a depth analysis of the speeches. Socrates commences by establishing that rhetoric should be concerned with the truth

not just what seems to be persuasive. Similarly he explains that if rhetoric is a “leading of the soul by means of speech,” then it is very important to understand the nature of the soul by a speaker (LitCharts, 2021). In *Phaedrus*, the dialectic has been used and it as a form of philosophical dialogue. Socrates himself is using the metaphors which reflect philosophy, rhetoric and the values of dialectic in his encounters with *Phaedrus*. The dialectic has been used as branches of philosophy to show different concepts and (Hayase, 2016) also argues that a kind of new interpretation of Plato's method of collection and division which has been reflected in the *Phaedrus*. And McAdon (2001) shows that dialectic deals with arguments, discussion and question and answer proving exact knowledge and truth. It is stated that rhetoric is a counterpart of dialectic and has received a considerable amount of attention.

Socrates' claim is that the *Phaedrus* is not wholly serious, though it is completely philosophical. Both *Phaedrus* and Socrates talk with the arguments and discuss the noble idea similar to philosophy. The final discussion of writing and philosophizing will display that a genuine philosopher may be both playful and serious in different context with different people while acting in different ways like writing or speaking (Waterfield, 2002). Moreover in the text of Yunis (2017), Plato further acknowledges that rhetoric has a certain utility regarding persuasion. He grants the rhetoric a limited and dependent claim. Plato's dialogues seem the instruments for developing his philosophical and educational agenda. In *Phaedrus*, Plato offers the further criticism of sophistic rhetoric, presents a new philosophically coherent art of rhetoric and shows the new rhetorical art in a challenging way. There, Socrates takes dialectic into alliance with the true art of rhetoric and the new rhetorical *technē*. The portion of the dialogue includes Plato's most important theoretical innovations to the art of rhetoric. First, Plato discusses about the scope of rhetoric. Second, Socrates says that the art of rhetoric is a kind of soul-moving power (*psychagogia*) of discourse and he anticipates psychology as an essential part of rhetoric. Third Socrates argues that the proficient rhetor must have the knowledge of subject matter of his/her speeches. Finally Socrates introduces dialectic which is a systematic way of thinking, arguing and getting knowledge.

Argumentation

An argument is called a set of claims which helps to add support for the further claims. In Plato's *Phaedrus*, some quotes are analysed how argument is used. Verheij (2005) discusses about the Toulmin's scheme for the layout of arguments which help to analyse

the texts. When Phaedrus asks Socrates to be focused on the Lysias' speech, Socrates challenges the speech and offers his own with claims, backings, and his complete arguments. In Phaedrus one of the most summarized arguments is the soul's immortality. For example, Socrates says:

First we have to understand the truth about the nature of the soul,* whether divine or human, by considering what happens to it and what it causes to happen. This gives us the following starting-point for our proof. Every soul is immortal,* because anything that is ever-moving is immortal, whereas anything which causes motion elsewhere and is moved from elsewhere stops living when it stops moving. (p.27, 245c)

Here, it is not much clear whether 'soul' refers to the soul collectively or individual souls. In Phaedrus, it seems the debatable and argumentative. Similarly he brings the reasoning in his logics. For example, Socrates states:

The reason why there is so much determination to see the whereabouts of the plain of truth* is not only that the proper food for the best part of the soul happens to come from the meadow there, but also that it is in the nature of the wings which raise the soul to be nourished by this region. (p.31, 248c)

While observing rebuttal, we can find in the speech of Socrates. Socrates, the mentor of Plato is presented as superior to Phaedrus. In the speech of Phaedrus, there is absence of rebuttal. Lysias does not present his speech personally. So the only rebuttal is Socrates' words. There is a diversity of topics like love, rhetoric, dialectics, philosophy, writing etc. Therefore, Plato's Phaedrus is uniquely intriguing dialogue and its claims. It has wide range of writing styles, dialectic discussion, spontaneous speeches, lines and verses. It brings a sharp transition from speech-making and storytelling which deal with love, to dialectical discussion and analysis of rhetoric.

The Rhetorical Triangles: Ethos, Pathos and Logos

The rhetorical triangles ethos, logos and pathos are analysed taking the quotes from Plato's Phaedrus. As in the book "A Theory of Contemporary Rhetoric" written by (Andrews, 2013) states that there are three types of rhetoric posited the audience's feeling (Pathos), one that is an appeal to the speaker's character or set of values (Ethos), and one to argumentational proof (Logos) which can be analysed here from the Plato's Phaedrus.

Ethos

While observing Ethos in the Plato's Phaedrus, there are a lot of ethos which can be extracted from the dialogue in which some examples are elaborated as below. Socrates refers that the reputation of the rhetor is so important and develops with each success. And the reputation is carried through to future generations, sharing him the ability to persuade others. Socrates says:

Well, then, once he has gained the power of Lycurgus or Solon or Darius, and has become a good enough politician or ruler to have achieved immortality as a speech-writer in a community, doesn't he, during his own lifetime, consider himself to be of godlike stature, and don't subsequent generations have the same opinion of him, when they contemplate his writings? (p. 44, 258c)

And Phaedrus is very impressed and interested with Socrates' story that he has a question on Lysias' character and ability to compete with Socrates. He says:

I'm rather worried, then, that Lysias may be humiliated, if he is even prepared to work up another speech to rival yours. The point is, you see, my friend, that just recently a politician was rudely finding fault with him for exactly that, and was using the term 'speech-writer' as a term of abuse throughout.* So it may be that concern for his reputation will stop him writing speeches. (p. 43, 257c)

While observing ethos in Phaedrus, Socrates tells:

So suppose an orator who doesn't know about good and bad gains power in a city which is in the same state of ignorance and tries to persuade it, not by eulogizing some miserable donkey as if it were a horse, but by making bad seem good. (p.47, 260 c)

He explains that the rhetor's capacity to convince and persuade the people is based upon the knowledge of his subject matter. If there is no good knowledge on the matter, this will not be trustworthy. Similarly, Socrates mentions:

What's really shameful, though, is getting it wrong—speaking and writing shamefully badly. (p44, 258d)

This quote represents both ethos and style. Socrates says that a rhetor's reputation is concerned with his capacity to make a good piece of writing.

Pathos

While observing Pathos in the Plato's Phaedrus, some quotes from the dialogue have been cited with meaning and analysis. Socrates refers to love and he appeals to the desire to find love with a person as he states:

A man who is ruled by desire and is a slave to pleasure is surely bound to see to it that his beloved gives him as much pleasure as possible. (p 18, 238e)

Likewise Socrates states:

Moreover, it so happens that the two speeches do apparently contain an example of how someone who knows the truth can mislead his audience by playing a joke on them in the course of his speech. (p50, 262d)

It can be stated that the rhetor sees the audience's lacking and uses it to his advantage. It seems like propaganda for the audience. For example, he could interconnect the subject with their beliefs to draw them in. But the rhetor should manage that it is the art of knowledge that persuades rather than deceitful tactics. Moreover Socrates appeals:

For no body which is moved from outside itself has a soul, while everybody which is moved from within itself, from its own resources, has a soul, since this is what it is to be soul. If this is so—if souls and only souls are self-movers—it necessarily follows that soul is ungenerated and mortal. (p28, 245e)

Logos

There are some examples extracted from Phaedrus which reflect the logos. Socrates clarifies that if we want to be a successful rhetor, we must have knowledge of the subject what we are delivering about. We cannot easily persuade others if we have no any facts and truth. The first example, Socrates says:

Now, if something is going to be spoken well and properly, the mind of the speaker must know the truth of the matter to be addressed, mustn't it? (p.46, 259e)

Similarly he insists that the rhetorician is not much informed with the truth of the content. He should know the truth and speak. However, his knowledge of the truth and capability to speak, it may not make sure that one will be a good speaker. He says:

But has our criticism of the art of speaking been unnecessarily crude, my friend? She might perhaps reply as follows: 'Incredible! What a pair of

babblers you are! It's not as if I force people who are ignorant of the truth to learn to speak. In fact, my advice, for what it's worth, is that someone should take me up only after having grasped the truth. But the crucial point in what I'm saying is this: without me knowledge of how things really are will make no contribution at all towards expertise at persuading people. (p.47, 260d)

THE DIVISION OF SPEECHES

The division of speeches is reflected in Plato's *Phaedrus*. According to (Andrews, 2013), Aristotle's notion of statement and proof are categorized into five parts which are also called the division of speeches; *inventio* (invention), *dispositio* (arrangement), *elocutio* (style), *memoria* (memory), and *pronunciatio* (delivery, presentation). They are also quoted and explained extracting from the Plato's *Phaedrus*.

Invention

Socrates states that the rules of rhetoric can be different based on how an orator speaks the message and he puts some questions which can be correct rule and its rhetorical value. He says:

So how does one write well or badly? Do we need to question Lysias about this, Phaedrus, or any other writer, whether he's already written anything in the past or will sometime in the future, for a political or private audience, in poetic verse or in ordinary prose? (p.44, 258d)

Similarly, Socrates is creating the knowledge that the soul is alive and needs to be nurtured. The soul is the center of a person's moral conscious. Our soul is where the ultimate truth lies.he states:

True being is the province of everything that counts as true knowledge. So since the mind of god is nourished by intelligence and pure knowledge (as is the mind of every soul which is concerned to receive its proper food), it is pleased to be at last in a position to see true being, and in gazing on the truth it is fed and feels comfortable, until the revolution carries it around to the same place again. In the course of its circuit it observes justice as it really is, self-control, knowledge—not the kind of knowledge that is involved with change and differs according to which of the various existing things (to use the term “existence” in its everyday sense) it makes its object, but

the kind of knowledge whose object is things as they really are. And once it has feasted its gaze in the same way on everything else that really is, it sinks back into the inside of heaven and returns home.*Once back home, the soul's charioteer reins in his horses by their manger, throws them ambrosia to eat, and gives them nectar to wash the ambrosia down. (p.30, 247d)

Arrangements

Socrates claims that the rhetor's speech should be systematic and well arranged. Each idea should be communicated well and should have the coherence and cohesion. It should have an introduction, an explanation and a conclusion for any kind of purposes and clarity. He says:

But I'm sure you'd agree that every speech should be put together like a living creature, with its own proper body, so that it lacks neither a head nor feet. A speech should have an end and a beginning, as well as middle, with all the parts written so that they fit in with one another and with the whole. (p.53, 264c)

Socrates notes that the lines can be arranged in order. Socrates practices this example to explain that Lysias' discourse is not written in any particular order. He comments that his thoughts are communicated but they are written in random order. He further states:

He certainly seems to be nowhere near doing what we wanted to see him doing. He doesn't begin at the beginning at all, but tries to swim through his speech on his back and the wrong way round, starting at the end. He begins with what the lover would say to his beloved when he has come to the end of his speech. Or am I wrong, Phaedrus, dear heart? (p.53, 264a)

Socrates makes comments about the part in Lysias' speech. He states that the arrangement of Lysias' speech was not written in chronological order from beginning to end, but it began where it should have ended.

Style

Socrates uses decorative language here to describe a "conversation" between nature and a group of cicadas. Socrates says:

If you like, how pleasant and utterly delightful is the freshness of the air here! The whisper of the breeze chimes in a summery, clear way with the chorus of the cicadas. (p.7 230b)

Socrates has used the metaphor “sweet bend” reminding and telling about the politicians to Phaedrus. He reminds:

You've forgotten about the 'sweet bend', Phaedrus.*† And apart from the bend you're forgetting just how much the politicians with the highest self-regard adore speech-writing and the survival of their written works. (p.43, 257e)

Similarly, in Phaedrus, Socrates gives an explanation of the nature of the soul. He explains soul metaphorically as a winged chariot driven by two horses, one noble and one filled with lowly desires. An analogy he uses:

In my analogy, a soul is like an organic whole made up of a charioteer and his team of horses.* Now, while the horses and charioteers of gods are always thoroughly good, those of everyone else are b a mixture*. (p.28, 246a)

In the dialogue, Socrates asks if the feelings of the author should take priority over the correct use of language and usefulness of his speech. He starts that Lysias' ethos is tied to his thoughts, and that Lysias is more concerned with demonstrating his writing skills, than communicating his story without complicating his meaning.

Memory

Socrates claims that having good memory is a great weapon for an orator. Similarly he claims that a natural ability with knowledge and practice can make us a good rhetor. He states:

Let this be my tribute to memory; it was remembering and longing for those past events which has made me go on rather too long now*. (p34, 250c)

Likewise he mentions that a good rhetor must have ability with knowledge and practice. He says:

If you naturally have what it takes to be an expert orator, you'll be a famous orator, once you have supplemented natural ability with knowledge and practice. (p.61, 269d)

Delivery

Socrates believes that what is said may not be true and important as the way in which it is delivered. The rhetor can change the outcome of his speech by the way the oration

is delivered. He says:

And what if someone went up to Sophocles or Euripides and claimed to know how to compose huge, long speeches on trivial topics and very short ones on important topics, and said that he could choose to make the speeches sad or, alternatively, frightening and threatening and so on? And suppose he went on to say that he fancied himself a teacher of the art of composing tragedies because he could teach others how to do these things. (p.59, 268d)

Similarly he clarifies in his two speeches teaching his audience how to classify each of his speeches so that they may gain a better understanding of how to interpret both speeches. He clarifies:

But there are two kinds of madness, one caused by human illnesses, the other by a divine release from the norms of conventional behavior. (p.54, 265a)

One more example can be taken from Socrates where he is applying the same way as Lysias to deliver his narration on the same subject, but he wants his audience to realize that this discussion has its advantages and disadvantages. He states:

It's your fault. But listen to the rest of the speech. After all, the fit might be averted, I suppose. But we had better leave this in the hands of the gods, while we resume the speech to the boy. 'All right, then, brave heart.* Now that we have stated and defined the matter we have to think about, we can refer to it in what follows and say what benefit or damage is likely to accrue from a lover or a non-lover to the person who gratifies either of them. (p18, 238d)

In Plato's Phaedrus, It can be seen a diversity of topics like love, rhetoric, dialectics, philosophy, writing etc. which can be analysed. Plato's Phaedrus is a uniquely intriguing dialogue and its claims. It has a wide range of writing styles, dialectic discussion, rehearsed and spontaneous speeches, lines and verses. It seems that Pathos, logos and ethos are hugely used in the Phaedrus. Similarly argumentations, Aristotle's notion of statements categorized as division of speeches like invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery are extracted from the dialogue.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The study has shown that there are differences between rhetoric and dialectic which are discussed in the dialogue. My main argument with claim is that dialectic is more than an abstract principle or method of philosophical ideas. It deals with arguments, discussion and questions and answer with exact knowledge and truth. In *Phaedrus*, Plato offers the further criticism of sophistic rhetoric, presents a new philosophically coherent art of rhetoric and shows the new rhetorical art in a challenging way. The study further shows that the art of dialectic can only learned by philosophizing in a systematic way about the nature of life and of the soul. Similarly the text introduces and treats a range of philosophical issues, the philosophy of love and relation in the practice of rhetoric and writing. Similarly in *Phaedrus*, the dialectic has been used and it as a form of philosophical dialogue.

Socrates guides his listeners to true knowledge of the topic under discussion. The dialectic has been used as branches of philosophy to show different concepts. Plato's *Phaedrus* is the one which deals with the subjects of three areas; rhetoric, philosophy and dialectic. In the *Phaedrus*, Socrates uses dialectic into alliance with the true art of rhetoric and the new rhetorical *techne*. Dialectic can be taken as a concrete and exact method of social science. It can be applied as a methodology with widespread implications for all of the social science. The study has clarified how rhetoric and dialectic are applied and discussed in the *Phaedrus* extracting the quotes from the dialogue.

REFERENCES

- Al-Maini, D. (2014). Myth and Philosophy in Plato's *Phaedrus* by Daniel S. Werner. *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 52(1), 161-162. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hph.2014.0002>
- Andrews, R. (2013). *A theory of contemporary rhetoric*. Routledge.
- Brownstein, O. L. (1965). Plato's *Phaedrus*: Dialectic as the genuine art of speaking. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 51(4), 392-398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335636509382738>
- George, V. (2017). Unit-4 Fallacy. In. IGNOU.
- Govier, T. (2013). *A practical study of argument*. Cengage Learning.
- Hayase, A. (2016). Dialectic in the *Phaedrus*. *Phronesis*, 61(2), 111-141. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685284-12341302>

- Hohmann, H. (2002). Rhetoric and dialectic. In *Dialectic and Rhetoric* (Vol. 6, pp. 41-51). Springer.
- Leff, M. (2000). Rhetoric and dialectic in the twenty-first century. *Argumentation*, 14(3), 241-254.
- LitCharts. (2021). *Phaedrus by Plato*. <https://www.litcharts.com/lit/phaedrus/summary>
- Martin, J. (2016). Capturing desire: Rhetorical strategies and the affectivity of discourse. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 18(1), 143-160. <https://doi.org/10.1111%2F1467-856X.12065>
- McAdon, B. (2001). Rhetoric Is a Counterpart of Dialectic (E retorike estin antistrophos te" dialektike". *Philosophy & rhetoric*, 34(2), 113-150. <https://doi.org/10.1353/par.2001.0007>
- McAdon, B. (2004). Plato's Denunciation of Rhetoric in the Phaedrus. *Rhetoric Review*, 23(1), 21-39. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327981rr2301_2
- McCoy, M. (2008). *Plato on the Rhetoric of Philosophers and Sophists*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511497827.002>
- Pawłowski, K. (2020). The philosophical Initiation in Plato's Phaedrus. 14(2), 419-430.
- Reynolds, J. F. (1989). Concepts of memory in contemporary composition. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 19(3), 245-252. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/02773948909390851>
- Toulmin, S. E., Rieke, R. D., & Janik, A. (1984). *An introduction to reasoning*.
- Verheij, B. (2005). Evaluating arguments based on Toulmin's scheme. *Argumentation*, 19(3), 347-371.
- Walton, D. N. (1984). Creating a dialectical social science: Concepts, methods, and models. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 3.
- Waterfield, R. (2002). *Phaedrus*. OUP Oxford.
- Werner, D. (2010). Rhetoric and Philosophy in Plato's Phaedrus. *Greece & Rome*, 57(1), 21-46. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S001738350999026X>
- Wróbel, S. (2015). Logos, Ethos, Pathos. Classical Rhetoric Revisited. *Polish Sociological Review*, 191(3), 401-421.
- Yunis, H. (2009). Colloquium 7: Dialectic and the Purpose of Rhetoric in Plato's Phaedrus. Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy,
- Yunis, H. (2017). Plato's Rhetoric in Theory and Practice. *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*, 121.