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THE AESTHETIC DIMENSION OF RHETORIC ACCORDING TO FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE AND IMPLICATIONS IN EDUCATION

SOTIRIA, A. TRIANTARI
University of Western of Macedonia
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ABSTRACT

Reflecting on Nietzsche's views we perceive his tendency to consider the aesthetic action of rhetoric, which its power can be found in the language that serves primarily rhetoric. The common point between literature and rhetoric - but also in the philosophy - is the language, which with its aesthetic dimension serves both arts. We will show that according Nietzsche in rhetorical style, as also in the literary, the means of speech should be used artistically. I will defend my view that Nietzsche delivers certain ways (verbal forms) in his treatise about Rhetoric. Having as a starting line these ways he shows that he uses the aesthetic dimensions of language, with aiming finally to intensify and increase what he says. From this position we comprehend that the conscious use of artistic means of speech leads in "turning rhetoric into literature". The aesthetic relationship of rhetoric and literature has the implications in education. This relationship gives freedom to speech and helps the modern student to be led to the transmission of knowledge through literal texts. Keywords: Aesthetic; rhetoric; literature; language; speech form; education;

1. STARTING-POINT AND PURPOSE OF THE QUESTION

By studying Steve Whitson’s and John Poulakos’ article "Nietzsche and the aesthetics of Rhetoric" in the Quarterly Journal of Speech my attention and my interest was caught by the sub-section "the Aesthetic Path" for the rhetoric. Both the authors claim that "for Nietzsche rhetoric is not an epistemological undertaking, but an artistic action that leads to order the chaos of life. This action produces symbols that do not function as a truth but as beautiful veils that cover the chaos in which the people live" (Whitson & Poulakos, 1993, p. 76). They base their opinion on the extensive work of Nietzsche Will for Force (§428) and they explain that with the above lines Nietzsche states that symbols are not referring to the reality of the things it selves, but in the call of aesthetic forms, that constitute undiscerning pieces in the ostensible Being. If, therefore, we consider that Nietzsche stresses the aesthetic action of rhetoric, which its power can be found in the language that serves primarily rhetoric; we conceived that the two authors in their article leave unanswered the question regarding the relation between rhetoric and literature, provided that both belong in the arts. I am referring to the specific relation, because in the literature the aesthetic dimension is quite obvious. Regarding the rhetorical and the literary style the means of speech are being skilfully used, but this does not
mean that there is no difference among them.

2. THE CONNECTION OF THE RHETORIC WITH LITERATURE

The rhetorician follows specific linguistic forms that beautify the speech as well as structured style in order to convince his audience. An able writer can create and devise verbal forms freely, without any restrictions. The common point between literature and rhetoric - but also in the philosophy - is the language, which with its aesthetic dimension serves both arts.

Nietzsche in his *Lessons of Rhetoric* (Nietzsche, 2004) - most of them are copies from various books of other, and our research will not be based completely on them- points out that the power of rhetoric does not lie in discovering the truth and the substance of things with the help of dialectic. The power of rhetoric is in the language, which "does not wish to teach but to transfer to the others a subjective stimulus and it acceptance" (Nietzsche, 2004, p. 107). The aim of the language is not just the transmission of knowledge, the language here is not simply a body of teaching, but something more and needed; is the carrier of a subjective stimulus from the speaker (the rhetorician) to his audience, that is able it involves the psychological support and sentimental rise of his listeners. However, how this psychological support is going to be achieved? The degree of psychological support will be recognised through the use of linguistic means, like the metaphor, the metonymy, the exaggeration, the comparison, and etcetera by which the rhetorician achieves the intensification and the increase of what he says. For Nietzsche each word constitutes an artistic way, a turn from the things in the speech. We could refer to the “turning” of the literature into rhetoric. With one only small difference Nietzsche that points out, saying that: "Generally, we as empiric users of the language, we consider the entire ancient literature, and mainly the roman, as something artistic and rhetorical" (Nietzsche, 2004, p. 106). If we do not know the rules of the language and the style of rhetoric, and by just having an empirical - daily - knowledge of the language, then of course the ancient and the roman literature will be considered as something artistic and therefore rhetorical.

The use of common artistic means does not declare directly also the identification of rhetoric with the literature, neither their complete distance. However does Nietzsche, based on the description and the mentality that was established in the antiquity and in his time regarding the use of artistic means in the rhetoric; proceeds radically beyond, and seeks - if not in the absolute degree and along with the literature - more freedom in the linguistic use? Does he seek in presenting rhetoric as a artistic action, that deviates from the chaos of life and brings order, and as an art that functions "as an empowerment of feelings about life, as the life’s stimulant"? (Nietzsche, 2001, §802, p. 370).

The above pointing out gives us the fuse to refer to the reasons, by which Nietzsche was guided to the use of the various speech forms in his work.
3. THE REASONING OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE SPEECH FORM

We could state that rhetoric for Nietzsche is art and as he claims in his work his Will for Force "each art functions accentually, increases the force, turns on the wish and stimulates all the detail recollections of intoxication..." Moreover, he points out that each art elects an aesthetic state and "each aesthetic state has an overabundance of communication means, with a extreme receptivity for stimuli and points" (Nietzsche, 2001, §809, p. 374). The use of artistic means of speech is an important aesthetic criterion, that reflects, according to Nietzsche the way to turn rhetoric to literature and that is why "... the reader and the listener wish for a completely different representative form and for this the ancient literature sound to us as "rhetorical". It addressed to our ears in order to impress them" (Nietzsche, 2004, 107; Pernot, 2005, p. 302; Vickers, 1988, pp. 340-374). The above lines show that according to Nietzsche the language is not based on metaphysical symbols or non linguistic references but to the language itself; that means that the ways, the artistic means do not have a literal importance, but are considered as more artistic means (Bitzer, 1978, pp. 67-98). Rhetoric as an art attempts through the verbal forms to penetrate in the depth of reality. It is not about the reality of truth but the one that the rhetoric creates itself, in order to stimulate the sentimental and emotional world of the person.

On the occasion of what has already been reported we will show that according Nietzsche in rhetorical style, as also in the literary, the means of speech should be used artistically. I will defend my view that Nietzsche delivers certain ways (verbal forms) in his treatise about Rhetoric. Having as a starting line these ways he shows that he uses the aesthetic dimensions of language, with aiming finally to intensify and increase what he says. Nietzsche elects the aesthetic linguistic delight the rhetoric offers in his work The birth of Tragedy (Nietzsche, 1983), which is distinguished for the artistic linguistic means. From this position we comprehend that the conscious use of artistic means of speech leads in “turning rhetoric into literature”. The particular term declares the process through which forms and parts of rhetoric are being transferred to the literature. The relation of rhetoric and literature is presented bidirectional, as the rhetoric does not focus on the speeches only, but is also extended in the literary compositions. The presence of rhetoric is intense through the linguistic use mainly in the aesthetic field, because as Nietzsche points out: "rhetoric is a further development of artistic means, which are inherent in the language, in the clear light of intellect (Nietzsche, 2004, p. 107) ".

The aesthetic dimension of the language in rhetoric gives people the possibility of revealing a world better than the one with which they are closely related. This possibility is provided by rhetoric, which uses linguistic pictures, aiming to satisfy the perceptive appetites and transmit by the "word-creator" rhetorician not only the stimuli and sentiments but also representations of sentiments (Nietzsche 2004, pp. 107-108). The rhetorical language is an artistic creation, which is able to satisfy in time the sight’s and audition’s delights (Whitson & Poulakos, 1993, p. 138). The language functions rhetorically, because "it wants to transmit glory, not science"

According to Nietzsche in order the aesthetic dimension be achieved in the language it should be based beyond of itself and the ways, "that are considered to be rhetoric’s most important technical mean" (Nietzsche, 2004, p. 108). The use of verbal forms renders the language artistic or even figurative that transubstantiates reality, in order to include it in the languages' parameters. This artistic dimension of language is elected in *The Birth of Tragedy* where the German philosopher referring to the picture of appearance, that springs and "is consecrated" by the beautiful hallucination; he uses the way of synecdoche, saying "maja" (that he is translated as hallucination) instead of the word "hallucination" (Nietzsche, 1994, p. 55; Mourellos, 1996, p. 50). Respectively in his work *The twilight of Idols* says "bildung" instead of education. Moreover, we distinguish the way of metaphor, as in the scene of the Dionysian artistic ecstasy, where the person expresses himself through dance and songs; Nietzsche gives the "person" a new meaning calling him "nobler clay" and "expensive marble" (Nietzsche, 1994, p. 35). In *The Twilight of Idols* Nietzsche discusses about the "art", that means as he expresses it in other words, "the existence of aesthetic performance and notice". We should also, point out the third form of metonymy, which according to Nietzsche the poet "despoiled from the mind" instead of saying "incapable to create". In *The Twilight of Idols*, Nietzsche refers to the educated philosopher and instructor as the one who "dances with the pen" instead of "learns to write" (Nietzsche, 1983, p. 109; Nietzsche, 1994, p. 57).

We should point out that we present certain examples taken from two works of Nietzsche in order to express his wish to use skilfully the linguistic means, to charm his audience, achieving at the same time to convince of what he says. With the use of linguistic forms he implies the powerful element of persuasion, which is inherent in the author. Nevertheless, in his work *The Birth of Tragedy* the use of linguistic forms is more frequent comparatively to The *Twilight of Idols*. Moreover, in the first work we find other modifying expressions, as for instance the irony. Nietzsche uses the irony, in order to expresses and attract more the attention of his audience in regard to Socrates’ attitude saying: "Platonic speech was the boat where the lost ancient poetry was saved together with all her children: stacked now all in a narrow space and frighten they obey to the only one captain, Socrates, they were sailing in a new world, that was never tired to look at the superb spectacle of this parade" (Nietzsche, 1983, pp. 109-110). In *The Birth of Tragedy* the philosophical speech is also literal, as here the adversative relation between the Dionysian and Apollonian impetus suggest, in Nietzsche’s argumentation, an affinity between the aesthetical and ontological categories. In his reflection the aesthetic rhetoric focuses on the human body as a sensitive entity that is being attracted by the language (Whitson & Poulakos, 1993, p. 141; Lingis, 1977, pp. 46-52). This element becomes obvious, when he refers to the conceptual dimension of dance; where the dance is presented
as the physical equipment of the person, in order to live the global harmony (Demopoulos, 2006, pp. 99-114).

Aesthetic rhetoric is being expressed with words that move the physical senses. Nietzsche achieves it with the following verbal picture, where pleonasm, comparison and exaggeration: "In the dance and in the song the person express himself as member of superior community; he has forgotten how to walk and how to speak and he is ready to fly in the skies, dancing. The charm speaks through his gestures. As the animals now speak, and honey and milk flows from the ground, from the person supernatural sounds are coming out" (Nietzsche, 1983, p. 34). Nietzsche believes not only in the improvement but also in the metamorphosis of human nature with the help of education, which enables the person to realise his goals and to rise. This objective of the instructive process, that is also the reality, is being expressed through analogies (the animals speak and honey and milk flows from the ground- thus from the person sounds are coming out) and it is being extended and enriched with the metaphorical language of the art, stressing its aesthetical dimension, which it could seen in the literature.

According to the aforementioned examples it is obvious that in The Birth of Tragedy the writer, the rhetorician and the philosopher are being identified in the personal style of Nietzsche. He wishes to achieve his rendering as a rhetorician that handles well the rhetorical forms, recognizing through their use the expediency (the rhetorical possibility, persuasion, comprehension of psychology of the audience). Nietzsche is also a proficient man of letters, as he handles intelligently the artistic linguistic means, where the power of rhetoric lies. In this approach of rhetoric with the literature the aesthetic rhetoric receives an essential role, provided that, as it was already said, according to Nietzsche rhetoric is an artistic action. In that artistic practice the aesthetic state is inherited and he claims in his work Will for Force, is the source of languages and the higher point of communication and communicativeness among the living creatures. Nietzsche philosophizes based on the aesthetic dimension of philosophy, and apart from a man of letters and rhetorician is also a philosopher. In his thought predominates the aesthetics and the art, that lead him to see the person as an artist-creator and the world as human work of art that is not finished yet.

4. THE IMPLICATIONS OF NIETZSCHE’S VIEW IN EDUCATION

Nietzsche emphasizes in the aesthetic dimension of language and reveals the essential and crucial importance, which the rhetoric has in education and particularly in the following points:

a. Nietzsche offers the modern teacher and student the basic tool for the teaching of the curriculum and their communicative relationship, which is the formation of speech. The speech in the language of the teacher and the student can be transformed into an aesthetic image, with persuasion being its ultimate aim.

b. The aesthetic image of the structure of speech leads to a redefinition of the
communication code between teacher and student. In this communication of conveying messages the teacher as a good orator can contribute to the linguistic and intellectual development of the child through relevant and persuasive arguments.

c. The use of the speech forms, which usually manifests strongly in the literature, provides flexibility in the structure of thought and speech. This means that the student acquires the ability to respond directly and dynamically in every verbal challenge and knowledge.

d. With today’s that societies being culturally pluralistic and the democracy being disturbed, the aesthetic of language as a form of artistic act becomes the tool for the acceptance and the empathy of experiences and feelings of foreign students and even children with learning difficulties.

e. Through the aesthetic dimension of language Nietzsche lets us envision a communicative code of ethic and psychological penetration between the teacher and the students or even among students, just as the artist tries to communicate with his audience through the art (Kofman, 1993, pp. 36-37).

f. From the aesthetic dimension of rhetoric emerges another aspect of education that connects the mind with the visual image (Foss, 2004, pp. 303-313; Foss, 2005, pp. 142-143, 145; Ehninger, 1972, p. 3). This connection is understood through the verbal forms of metaphors from which the images are transmitted to the mind of the child, which can emotionally affect and help perceive the importance of concepts through visual images. The relationship of speech and image is a tool for the development of teaching methods (Emden, 2005, pp. 62-63). From this position, we could argue that the rhetoric as a tool for the use and formation of speech accommodates the learning of content and concepts concerning similar subjects, contributing to interdisciplinary teaching (such as literature-language history-environment study, physics etc.).

g. The aesthetic relationship of rhetoric and literature gives freedom to speech. This relationship gives the possibility for devising more speech forms, expanding the intellectual and imaginative horizons of students. Furthermore, this relationship (rhetoric and literature) helps the modern student and citizen, who receive daily a barrage of knowledge, to be led to the transmission of knowledge through literary texts. These texts provide knowledge in the subjects of history, philosophy, language, mathematics, etc.

h. With the dynamic use of rhetoric with the richness of speech forms the modern education could ensure the best conditions for a mature democratic dialogue between teachers and students, creating a situation of intimacy and cooperation. This has as a result an improvement of students in the formation and expression of speech and creates a mental happiness to the student. The student as a true artist-orator attempts to develop a communicational practice, satisfying his “perspectivism” which is none other than to better understand himself and the world, creating his own proof of
truth.

5. CONCLUSION

Nietzsche philosophizes through the aesthetic dimension of the language. This fact shows that Nietzsche’s view predominates the aesthetic and the art, which directs him to look at the man-rhetoric as an artist-creator and the world as humane work of art which has not finished yet. In this context Nietzsche attempts the interpretation of the world or the reality as an aesthetic phenomenon by means of the aesthetic dimension of the language, inciting the psychology of the audience in connection to his aesthetic action. Nietzsche provides an aesthetic-artistic action with the rhetoric. The rhetorician is the artist, who understands the power of the life by means of the ability to introduce positively and get the interpretation of the every time real with simplicity.

The rhetorician contents his thought with the help of the aesthetic dimension of the language. He refutes the proof of a truth or an objective reality by means of the glamour of the many perspectives, many viewpoints and many truths. In this way Nietzsche appoints the every time permissible, credible and likeable reality. Nietzsche reveals through the function of the aesthetic dimension of rhetoric language, the revelation of truth and the education of speech. The education of speech leads to right thinking through linguistic rules and helps the student to develop a communicational practice.
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