



Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilišta u Zagrebu



Rhetoric in the Digital Age

Edited by Gabriјela Kišiček and Davor Nikolić

PF press

**Publisher**

University of Zagreb Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences; FF Press

Acting publisher

Domagoj Tončinić

First published online

September 2026

Managing editor

Jana Šarinić

Editors

Gabrijela Kišiček

Davor Nikolić

Volume reviewers

Mika Hietanen, Lund University, Sweden

Blake Scott, University of Tübingen, Germany

Proofreading

Davor Stanković

Design and layout

Sonja Mašić/D-ZNAK

Publishing services

Penta Travel Agency Ltd Zagreb

Every individual paper was initially reviewed by at least two reviewers in a double-anonymous peer-review process in which the identities of both reviewers and authors, as well as their institutions, were kept confidential from all parties. The volume itself was subsequently reviewed by two official volume reviewers who did not previously serve as peer-reviewers of individual papers.

ISBN: 978-953-379-333-7

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17234/9789533793337>



This publication is licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](#) which allows others to share, copy and redistribute the publication in any medium or format, as long as they give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. The content of this publication may not be used for commercial purposes. If the publication is remixed, transformed, or built upon, the modified material may not be distributed.

Copyright © 2026 Authors

Rhetoric in the Digital Age

Edited by
Gabrijela Kišiček and Davor Nikolić

 **PF press**

Zagreb, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of contributors.....	VII
Introduction: Rhetoric in the Digital Age.....	1
SETTING GROUNDS FOR DISCUSSION	7
Jean H. M. Wagemans: The Role of Rhetoric in Defending against Weapons of Mass Persuasion	9
I. PREDIGITAL RHETORICAL CONCEPTS	23
Maud Armani and Thierry Herman: Self-Correction in the Contemporary French Novel: Rhetorical Effects of a Paradoxical Ethos Strategy	25
Fabian Erhardt: Rhetoric of Doxastic Systems: Metaboly and Systasis as Validity-Oriented Operations	37
Jonas Gabrielsen: Orality in Danish Courts	51
Maurizio Manzin: Rhetoric in Times of Change: A Philosophical Defense Against Epistemic Reductionisms	63
Davor Nikolić: <i>Wise People Create Proverbs and Proverbs Create Wise People</i> – On Rhetoric of Proverbs and Proverbs in Rhetoric	73
Joanna Nowakowska: Rhetorical Topoi and Ethical Engagement in the Polish Oxford Debate: Understanding Teenagers' Moral Reasoning.....	79
Federico Puppo: Reason, Reality and Rhetorical Truth in the Digital Age	91
Antonio Rauccio: Rhetoric and Law: An Insight into the Scholastic Doctrine of Legal Government	101
Charlotte van der Voort: A Mass Medium and its Ambiguous Message: Isocrates's Literate Rhetoric.....	111
II. RHETORIC AND DIGITAL MEDIA	123
Maryam Alavi Nia and Gilda Seddighi: From Frustration to Education: How Migrant Nurse-Influencers Use Instagram to Address AMR and Shape Trust in EU Healthcare Systems.....	125
Tejan Green Waszak: Pop-Culture, the Writing Classroom, and the Rhetoric of Hip-Hop	139
Gabrijela Kišiček, Agnieszka Bryła-Cruz and Martin Hinton: Witchcraft in Your Lips? – Prosody as Persuasion in Advertising.....	149
Manfred Kraus: Is There a Speaker in This Post? The Eclipse of the Orator in Digital Social Networks	163
Ivanka Mavrodieva: Rhetorical and Communicative Features of Podcasts in Bulgaria.....	171



III. RHETORIC AND AI	189
Silvia Corradi: Digital Objects in the Rhetorical Situation: A Peculiar Kind of Constraint.....	191
Daria Evangelista: Translated with AI: How are Specialized, yet Highly Rhetorical Texts Translated by DeepL? An Analysis of Preambles in Normative Texts	201
Heather N. Hill: Rhetoric in Crisis: The Value of Rhetorical Education in the Age of AI.....	213
Carlos Monteiro and Alexandra Kuzmina: The Rhetoric of Prompts: Multimodality, Intent, and Ethics in AI Meaning-Making	221
Serena Tomasi: Rhetoric as a Bridge Between Ethics and AI in Predictive Justice	233

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Maryam Alavi Nia is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Bergen and holds a PhD in Media and Communication from the University of New South Wales (UNSW), Australia. Her research examines how trust and institutional relations are negotiated through language and communication, particularly in interactions between migrants and public authorities and institutions. Drawing on discourse analysis informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics, critical and rhetorical approaches, her work spans political discourse, social media, and health communication.

Maud Armani is a PhD student at the Institute of Communication and Cognitive Sciences at the University of Neuchâtel. Her research in discourse analysis and rhetoric explores the impact of reformulation and self-correction processes on discursive image. She is particularly interested in the rhetorical devices used to represent uncertainty in contemporary novels.

Agnieszka Bryła-Cruz is Assistant Professor at Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland. Her main research interests include teaching English pronunciation, the perception of native and non-native accents in broadly understood media, and the rhetorical features of public discourse. Recently she has been conducting empirical studies on the role of phonetics in listening comprehension and has been a co-investigator in the project “Attitude and Identity in Argumentation.”

Silvia Corradi is assistant researcher (postdoc) at the Department of Law of the University of Palermo. She obtained her Ph.D. in *Comparative and European Legal Studies* at the Faculty of Law of the University of Trento. She spent visiting research periods at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) and at the University of Granada. Her research interests include topics concerning the relationship between law, science and technology, virtue epistemology, rhetoric.

Fabian Erhardt is research assistant at the Department of General Rhetoric in Tübingen. He is pursuing his habilitation under Prof. Dr. Olaf Kramer at the Chair of Rhetoric and Knowledge Communication with a thesis on the doxastic and agonistic architecture of validity. He received his PhD from the Institute for Phenomenology and Transcendental Philosophy under Prof. Dr. Alexander Schnell in Wuppertal. Currently, his research focuses primarily on questions of the production, transmission, and reception of opinions and knowledge at the intersection of rhetoric, philosophy, and psychology.

Daria Evangelista, PhD, is a visiting postdoctoral researcher at the University of Amsterdam, where she is conducting a SNSF-funded research project titled *The Awareness-Raising Discourse About the Climate Crisis: An Analysis of Written Texts in Italian at the Interplay Between Rhetoric, Argumentation Theory, and Text Linguistics*. She obtained her PhD in Italian linguistics from the University of Basel, with a dissertation on the rhetorical dimension of normative texts.



Jonas Gabrielsen, PhD, is Associate Professor of Rhetorical Communication at Roskilde University. His research focuses on applied rhetoric, rhetoric and leadership, and rhetoric in legal contexts. He has published on rhetorical topics such as *topoi*, stasis, extemporaneous oratory, and public speaking techniques. He serves as Programme Director of Roskilde University's executive master's programme in Professional Communication and regularly trains communication professionals, leaders, and legal practitioners.

Tejan Green Waszak is Assistant Professor in the Department of Writing Studies and Rhetoric at Hofstra University. She previously lectured in the University Writing Program at Columbia University. Her research interests include Caribbean literature and culture, postcolonial literary studies, writing studies, performance studies, and poetry. She is co-editor of the anthology *Idea of the Human* (2016).

Thierry Herman is a senior lecturer at the University of Lausanne and associate professor at the University of Neuchâtel, in Switzerland. Author of a thesis on the rhetoric of Charles de Gaulle, he has published several articles on rhetoric, argumentation and linguistics in political, media and academic discourse.

Heather N. Hill, PhD is an Associate Professor and the writing program administrator at Northwest Missouri State University, where she teaches classes that focus on American English dialects, anti-racist writing pedagogy, and rhetorical genre theory. Her scholarship has appeared in journals such as *The Writing Center Journal*, *WLN: Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*, *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, and others.

Martin Hinton is an Associate professor at the University of Lodz. He is head of the Department of Linguistics and Communication and leads the eXplainable Argumentation and Critical Thinking (XACT) research group. Primarily an argumentation scholar researching methods of argument interpretation and evaluation, he also works on rhetoric and the philosophy of language, and is the principal investigator in the projects 'Attitude and Identity in Argumentation' and 'Procedures for Interpreting Multimodal Argumentation'.

Gabrijela Kišiček is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Her research focuses on rhetoric and argumentation, with a particular interest in auditory dimensions of multimodal argumentation. She serves on the governing board of the Argumentation Community of Europe and leads an EU Next Generation project on hate speech. She also has extensive experience as a speech and voice coach for media professionals.

Manfred Kraus is Emeritus Professor of Classics and Rhetoric at the University of Tübingen, Germany. His main research interests are in the history and theory of rhetoric, the theory of argumentation, Greek philosophy, Byzantine and Renaissance studies. He has published widely on the named subjects. He is a member of numerous international societies and past president of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric and of the International Society for the Study of Jesuit Rhetoric.

Alexandra Kuzmina is a researcher at the intersection of Communication Science and Criminology, holding an MA from the University of Groningen and an MSc (dual degree) from Erasmus University



Rotterdam and Ghent University. Her work examines the malicious use of generative AI in online extremism and multimodal propaganda. She currently works at the intersection of research and practice, and is affiliated with Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

Maurizio Manzin is Full Professor of Philosophy of Law at the University of Trento, and director of the Interuniversity Center for Studies on Rhetoric (CIRHET). He authored numerous studies on legal reasoning, and judicial rhetoric. His publications appear in several languages (Italian, English, French, Spanish, Hungarian) in prominent journals and series. He was awarded the Distinguished Scholar of Natural Law Award (International Class) in Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest, 2019.

Ivanka Mavrodieva, Professor, Ph.D., Doctor of Science. Professor of Rhetoric, Business Communication, Public Relations, and Academic Writing at Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski,” Bulgaria. Member of the Executive Board of the Rhetoric Society of Europe (2013–2023). Manager of the academic podcast “The Orator in the 21st Century”. <https://www.youtube.com/@instituteofrhetoricandcomm142>. A lecturer, blogger, podcaster, and trainer, She explores rhetoric as an ancient yet vital science, and communication as a practice that integrates business and artificial intelligence.

Carlos Alexandre de Almeida Vieira Monteiro resides in Coimbra, Portugal. He is a researcher at the Institute for Philosophical Studies (IEF) at the University of Coimbra and a PhD candidate in Philosophy there. Holding Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in Philosophy from the same institution, he conducts research in Rhetoric, Argumentation, Epistemology, Ethics, and Political Philosophy. He has published academic articles and has experience as a speaker at several international conferences.

Davor Nikolić is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. His primary area of research is folkloristics, with emphasis on rhetorical and stylistical topics. The most recent research is focused on small oral genres (such as proverbs and curses), with special focus on their rhetorical features and use in political discourse.

Joanna Nowakowska is a PhD candidate in philosophy at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland. She is completing her doctoral dissertation in the philosophy of ecology. Her research interests include environmental ethics and contemporary ecological thought, as well as rhetoric studies, with focus on formal and informal debating. She is interested in examining the ways in which moral and political arguments about the environment are articulated in contemporary public discourse.

Federico Puppo (Philosophy of Law, PhD) is Full Professor of Philosophy of Law at the Faculty of Law of the University of Trento, Italy (tenure in Philosophy of Law, and Legal Ethics). He also teaches Philosophy of Law at the University of Innsbruck. His research mainly focuses on legal rhetoric & argumentation, legal methodology and legal ethics.

Antonio Rauccio is a PhD candidate in Philosophy of Law at the University of Trento, Italy. His work examines legal obligation and the foundations of legal government, with a focus on the interplay between legal authority and rhetoric. More broadly, he studies how argumentative practices shape the justification and understanding of legal normativity.



Gilda Seddighi is a Senior Researcher at the Norwegian Research Centre with a PhD in gender and media from the University of Bergen. Her dissertation examined the politicization of grievable lives on Iranian Facebook pages. Her research focuses on the intersection of digital technology, migration, gender equality, and inclusion, with particular attention to marginalized and vulnerable groups affected by digitalization and the implementation of AI in society.

Serena Tomasi is an Assistant Professor of Philosophy of Law at the University of Trento, where she teaches Legal Ethics and Legal Drafting. Her research focuses on legal argumentation, logic, and rhetoric. She is Coordinator of CIRHET, the Italian Interuniversity Centre for Studies on Rhetoric, and serves on the Executive Board of the Rhetoric Society of Europe.

Charlotte van der Voort is a PhD candidate at the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics. Her research interests revolve around the interface between ancient (Greco-Latin) and modern rhetoric, argumentation theory, pragmatics, and philosophy of language. Her PhD research project focuses on ancient and modern theories on and practices of strategically ambiguous and implicit communication in argumentative discourse.

Jean Wagemans is Professor of Cognition, Communication, and Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam. Wagemans specializes in Rhetoric and the Philosophy of Argument. He is the originator of the argument classification framework of the [Periodic Table of Arguments \(PTA\)](#). Wagemans authored the chapter [The Philosophy of Argument](#) (2022) in the Cambridge Handbook for the Philosophy of Language and co-authored the [Handbook of Argumentation Theory](#) (2014).



INTRODUCTION: RHETORIC IN THE DIGITAL AGE

<https://doi.org/10.17234/9789533793337.01>

Rhetoric in the Digital Age brings together a selection of papers presented at the 9th *Rhetoric in Society* conference, held in Zagreb in June 2025. The conference theme was chosen to explore the role and status of rhetoric in the contemporary digital era. As an ancient discipline, rhetoric has endured centuries of social change, technological development, and scientific discovery; yet none of these transformations has diminished its relevance or significance. While its institutional standing and pedagogical prominence have fluctuated throughout history, rhetoric has never disappeared from the intellectual landscape.

Today, we are confronted with a range of challenges, including misinformation, fake news, the pervasive influence of social media, and the proliferation of hate speech. In this context, rhetoric proves to be not only relevant but essential for navigating the complexities of the digital environment. Many of the contributions collected in this volume address precisely this point.

This is particularly evident in the opening chapter, *Setting the Grounds for Discussion*, in which Jean Wagemans, one of the conference's keynote speakers, examines the role of rhetoric in his contribution, "The Role of Rhetoric in Defending against Weapons of Mass Persuasion". Wagemans argues that "properly understood, rhetoric is not the enemy of truth, not a bag of tricks or a toolkit for spin. It is the disciplined study of how meaning is negotiated, how arguments can persuade, and how public judgment is shaped." In this way, he establishes a conceptual foundation for discussing rhetorical theory and practice in the digital age.

The volume is further divided into three main sections: *Predigital Rhetorical Concepts*, *Rhetoric and Digital Media*, and *Rhetoric and AI*.



The section *Predigital Rhetorical Concepts* addresses a range of topics that predate the digital transformation. Although the central concepts explored in these contributions originate in rhetorical theory prior to the digital age, all the papers demonstrate their continued relevance by establishing clear connections to contemporary rhetorical challenges.

In their paper, “Self-Correction in the Contemporary French Novel: Rhetorical Effects of a Paradoxical Ethos Strategy”, Maud Armani and Thierry Herman examine the concept of self-correction. While self-correction may appear to undermine ethos, particularly in writing, where it can signal an initial failure to articulate the appropriate expression, they argue that it can also produce persuasive effects. From a pragmatic and rhetorical perspective, self-correction may function as a marker of sincerity. Thus, although it may weaken the communicator’s ethos by suggesting linguistic inadequacy, it can simultaneously strengthen personal ethos by conveying authenticity. Their analysis of contemporary French novels explores variations of self-correction with respect to frequency, semantic contradiction, reformulation types, and meta-enunciative evaluation, in order to assess its positive and negative rhetorical effects.

In “Rhetoric of Doxastic Systems: Metaboly and Systasis as Validity-Oriented Operations”, Fabian Erhardt develops a rhetorical theory of doxastic systems structured around the relationships between validity claims, validity criteria, and assignment rules (*Zuordnungsregeln*). He argues that the dynamics of such systems can be understood through three directional movements: the addition, subtraction, and transformation of relations among their components. Drawing on Jean-François Lyotard’s distinction between narrative and scientific knowledge, Erhardt demonstrates that narrative knowledge operates primarily *systatically*, through the re-actualization of supporting relations and the preservation of core validity presuppositions, whereas scientific knowledge operates *metabolically*, by introducing new, potentially disruptive relations and generating difference from established knowledge. Despite their structural opposition, both forms of knowledge share a common doxastic-rhetorical foundation.

Jonas Gabrielsen contributes with “Orality in Danish Courts”, in which he revisits a longstanding concern in rhetoric: the distinction between written and spoken discourse. He shows that this distinction also carries legal significance, particularly in the context of Danish courts, where oral proceedings are required to be delivered through “free presentation.” This requirement is generally interpreted as prohibiting the reading of written manuscripts during oral pleadings; however, its underlying rationale has not been thoroughly examined in legal scholarship, nor sufficiently discussed in relation to rhetorical theories of orality. Gabrielsen’s paper investigates the notion of free presentation, its interpretation in legal doctrine, and the reasons why such a mode of delivery is considered advantageous in judicial contexts.

In “Rhetoric in Times of Change: A Philosophical Defense against Epistemic Reductionisms”, Maurizio Manzin examines the enduring relevance of rhetoric within Western intellectual history, particularly during periods of epistemic transformation. The paper argues that rhetoric recurrently emerges as a corrective and mediating force whenever dominant epistemological frameworks attempt to monopolize truth. Drawing on Karl Jaspers’ concept of the Axial Age, Manzin identifies key historical moments in which rhetoric resurfaces in response to crises of meaning—from its origins in fifth-century BCE Sicily, through Augustine’s reconfiguration of discourse in Late Antiquity, Petrarch’s humanist critique of scholastic dialectics, Giambattista Vico’s challenge to Cartesian reductionism, and Chaim Perelman’s twentieth-century “new rhetoric” as a response to formal logic. The paper ultimately presents rhetoric as a bridge across disciplines, cultures, and historical periods, enabling communication where singular epistemic systems prove insufficient.



Chapter “*Wise people create proverbs and proverbs create wise people* – On rhetoric of proverbs and proverbs in rhetoric”, by Davor Nikolić, presents a preliminary study of his project research on the role of proverbs in rhetorical genres, with a special emphasis on proverbs as a tool of populism and a potential hate speech vehicle. The first part of the paper offers a concise overview of Classical rhetorical literature and its treatment of proverbs and maxims, reminding contemporary rhetoricians of the importance given to proverbial expressions by ancient authors and emphasizing folkloristic and linguistic insights about rhetorical power of proverbs. The second part of the paper offers a methodological frame for further research on rhetorical function of proverbs in political discourse.

In her contribution, “Rhetorical Topoi and Ethical Engagement in the Polish Oxford Debate: Understanding Teenagers’ Moral Reasoning”, Joanna Nowakowska offers insight into adolescents’ moral reasoning. The paper examines how Polish high school students identify and articulate ethical dimensions within the framework of the Polish Oxford Debate. The findings show that participants tend to introduce moral considerations even when debating propositions that are not explicitly ethical. Recurring motifs, such as justice, responsibility for the future, safety, freedom, and the common good, serve as stable anchors shaping argumentation on both sides. Moreover, the study indicates that both engagement and rhetorical quality increase when debate topics resonate with students’ lived experiences, generational concerns, and awareness of contemporary issues, including technological change and social inequality.

In “Reason, Reality, and Rhetorical Truth in the Digital Age”, Federico Puppo explores the relationship between rhetoric and truth in the context of the digital revolution and the so-called post-truth era. Drawing on alethic realism, he defends a conception of truth grounded in reality, broadly understood. On this basis, Puppo emphasizes the importance of Aristotle’s principle of non-contradiction as a necessary condition for meaningful discourse, rhetorical persuasion, and political life. The paper advocates restoring the unity of rhetoric, politics, and ethics, proposing a virtue-ethical framework capable of addressing the techno-moral challenges of the digital age.

Antonio Rauccio, in “Rhetoric and Law: An Insight into the Scholastic Doctrine of Legal Government”, examines the relationship between rhetoric and legal theory. His analysis centers on the concept of legal government and the relationship between legislators and citizens, as mediated through legal discourse. This discourse operates on multiple interconnected levels in which the three classical rhetorical *pisteis* can be identified. Law, he argues, influences citizens’ conduct simultaneously through the threat of punishment (appealing to fear), its directive force (guiding practical judgment), and its authority (eliciting respect and shaping the will), ultimately aiming to cultivate the civic virtue of justice. The paper highlights the explanatory power of this rhetorical framework for contemporary legal theory.

The section concludes with Charlotte van der Voort’s paper, “A Mass Medium and Its Ambiguous Message: Isocrates’ Literate Rhetoric”. This contribution examines how fourth-century BCE rhetorical texts negotiate the tension between oral and written communication. Van der Voort argues that Isocrates uniquely reconceptualizes the constraints of written discourse by recognizing its potential as a form of mass communication that shifts part of the interpretive burden onto the reader. Echoing Marshall McLuhan’s well-known axiom that “the medium is the message,” and building on Jeroen Bons’ insights into Isocratean composition, the paper suggests that the written medium enables the development of novel rhetorical strategies, such as *amphibolos logos* (ambiguous argumentation). As expanding media increase audience reach, such strategies become essential for addressing heterogeneous audiences.



The second part of the volume, *Rhetoric and Digital Media*, examines the pervasive influence of social media and digital platforms on contemporary rhetorical practices. Technological development and the expansion of digital media have profoundly transformed human communication and, consequently, the dynamics of persuasion across public domains, including health communication, advertising, politics, and science communication. Both professional and private communication have increasingly migrated to digital environments, and the contributions in this section analyze the rhetorical features that characterize communication in the contemporary media landscape.

In their paper, “From Frustration to Education: How Migrant Nurse-Influencers Use Instagram to Address AMR and Shape Trust in EU Healthcare Systems”, Maryam Alavi Nia and Gilda Seddighi focus on health communication in digital contexts. Their study examines how Iranian-born, Germany-based nurse influencers on Instagram construct rhetorical spaces for negotiating competing medical epistemologies surrounding antimicrobial resistance (AMR), and how migrant audiences within the EU engage with these narratives. Through a qualitative analysis of selected posts and their accompanying comment threads, the authors identify two key configurations: first, the fracturing of medical authority through embodied testimony, in which antibiotics shift between symbols of care and markers of neglect; and second, the use of satire to expose the semiotic instability of clinical logic, where humour and role-play challenge assumptions about Iranian “excess” and German “minimalism”.

In “Pop Culture, the Writing Classroom, and the Rhetoric of Hip-Hop”, Tejan Green Waszak explores hip-hop as a dynamic rhetorical form and a valuable pedagogical resource. The paper demonstrates how the genre has evolved into a productive site for research and discussion within the writing classroom. Waszak argues that hip-hop artists engage audiences in ways that are both rhetorically powerful and, at times, deliberately unsettling. She highlights the advantages of integrating hip-hop into teaching rhetorical strategies, emphasizing its capacity to help students critically examine diverse modes of communication that operate across both traditional and digital media environments.

The paper “Witchcraft in Your Lips? Prosody as Persuasion in Advertising”, by Gabrijela Kišiček, Agnieszka Bryła-Cruz, and Martin Hinton, investigates the role of prosodic features in advertising discourse. The authors emphasize the rhetorical and argumentative significance of elements such as accent, speech rate, and intonation. By analyzing the relationship between prosody and persuasion, the study offers insights that contribute to the interpretation of multimodal arguments, particularly those combining spoken and linguistic content, and demonstrates the adaptability and continued relevance of classical rhetorical categories in digital communication.

In “Is There a Speaker in This Post? The Eclipse of the Orator in Digital Social Networks”, Manfred Kraus addresses the changing role of the speaker in online communication. He argues that in digital environments, not only does the meaning of a text become unstable, but the traditional rhetorical role of the speaker, or orator as the identifiable source of a message, also becomes increasingly blurred. Kraus analyzes the mechanisms and consequences of this transformation, suggesting that the erosion of the orator’s role poses significant challenges to the possibility of balanced and reasoned argumentation in the public sphere.

Ivanka Mavrodieva, in “Rhetorical and Communicative Features of Podcasts in Bulgaria”, examines podcasts as an emerging and increasingly significant communication genre. She argues that podcasts have developed into a distinct communicative channel encompassing content produced by business organizations, cultural and educational institutions, non-governmental organizations, and other actors. Based on an analysis of selected Bulgarian podcasts, the study demonstrates



that podcasts do not constitute a homogeneous genre; rather, their rhetorical features are shaped both during production and in the post-communication phase, particularly through promotion on digital platforms and social media. Mavrodieva concludes that digital tools contribute to the development of podcasts as a specific form of virtual, multimodal rhetoric.

The third part of the volume, *Rhetoric and AI*, explores how the most recent technological developments have reshaped both rhetorical practice and rhetorical pedagogy. While artificial intelligence undoubtedly offers significant advantages, it also introduces new challenges and raises complex ethical questions. The contributions in this section engage critically with these issues.

In “Digital Objects in the Rhetorical Situation: A Peculiar Kind of Constraint”, Silvia Corradi argues that digital objects constitute a distinct type of constraint within the rhetorical situation. Her analysis highlights the specific characteristics that differentiate digital objects from so-called “natural objects”, focusing in particular on the features of digital or “third-order” technologies. Corradi further examines how the use of digital objects can influence legal practice, emphasizing the need for caution in contexts where such technologies shape decision-making processes.

Daria Evangelista, in “Translated with AI: How Are Specialized, yet Highly Rhetorical Texts Translated by DeepL? An Analysis of Preambles in Normative Texts”, investigates how AI-based translation systems handle rhetorical and genre-sensitive features in specialized discourse. Employing a qualitative, corpus-based approach informed by translation theory, rhetorical analysis, and text linguistics, the study assesses whether DeepL successfully captures rhetorical devices across different textual levels. The findings indicate that the system frequently fails to reproduce key rhetorical features essential for meaning and stylistic accuracy, particularly in normative preambles, thereby underscoring the limitations of current AI translation tools and the continued necessity of human oversight and expert post-editing.

In “Rhetoric in Crisis: The Value of Rhetorical Education in the Age of AI”, Heather Hill poses a central question for contemporary rhetorical studies: what is the role of rhetoric in the era of generative artificial intelligence, and what remains to be taught if systems such as ChatGPT can perform many of the tasks traditionally associated with rhetorical training? Her paper examines how rhetorical education must adapt to a rapidly changing landscape, with particular attention to the capacities that AI cannot replicate. Hill concludes that, although AI may transform the ways rhetoric is taught and practiced, rhetorical education is not diminished but, on the contrary, becomes even more essential.

Carlos Monteiro and Alexandra Kuzmina address another set of challenges arising from AI in their paper, “The Rhetoric of Prompts: Multimodality, Intent, and Ethics in AI Meaning-Making”. They focus on the interpretive and ethical complexities associated with synthetic media, whose origin, authorship, and intent are often ambiguous. These issues extend beyond misinformation to encompass the broader structures through which meaning is constructed, framed, and ethically justified. The authors propose a metatheoretical framework that draws on rhetoric and multimodality to reconceptualize AI-generated content, particularly visual outputs, as sites of ethical engagement and moral accountability.

Finally, in “Rhetoric as a Bridge between Ethics and AI in Predictive Justice”, Serena Tomasi brings together rhetoric, law, and artificial intelligence. Drawing on the case *Re A*, as discussed by Neil MacCormick, she illustrates how legal reasoning addresses ethical pluralism through justification and deliberation rather than mere rule application. Using this case as a lens, Tomasi argues that the central limitation of predictive justice systems lies not only in their technical opacity but also in their inability to provide normatively grounded, publicly contestable justifications. Even so-called



interpretable models tend to explain correlations rather than reasons. In response, she proposes a rhetorically informed model of legal AI, in which systems function as deliberative interlocutors—mapping competing considerations, disclosing value trade-offs, and enabling contestation—rather than as authoritative predictors.

Rhetoric in the Digital Age brings together twenty contributions that address the evolving relationship between rhetoric and digital society. The volume highlights the challenges that rhetoric and rhetoricians face in the twenty-first century across a range of domains within public discourse. At the same time, it offers possible responses to these challenges by proposing new analytical tools, exploring modes of engagement with artificial intelligence, and providing historical perspectives on the recurring difficulties rhetoric has encountered over time.

We sincerely thank all the authors who contributed to this volume for their insightful, valuable, and highly relevant chapters. Their work has made this book a significant resource for scholars of rhetoric and argumentation, as well as for students of rhetoric, communication, media studies, and related disciplines within the humanities. We also believe that this volume will be of interest to a broader readership, particularly those concerned with public communication, persuasion, and critical thinking. We are especially grateful to our distinguished reviewers, Mika Hietanen of Lund University and Blake Scott of the University of Tübingen, whose expertise in rhetorical studies provided invaluable feedback and constructive suggestions throughout the editorial process. Their insights greatly contributed to the quality and coherence of this volume. We would also like to express our appreciation to all the reviewers of the individual chapters. Their careful evaluations and thoughtful recommendations helped the authors strengthen their contributions and ensured the overall scholarly quality of the book. Their commitment and generosity were essential to the editorial process and represent an important contribution to the advancement of rhetorical scholarship.

Rhetoric has consistently proven to be a crucial resource in periods of profound social and intellectual transformation. Although it is inevitably shaped by ongoing technological and societal change, there is little doubt that it will remain an essential discipline in the years and centuries to come.

Gabrijela Kišiček
Davor Nikolić



Maurizio Manzin

University of Trento,
CIRHET - Interuniversity Center for Studies on Rhetoric
maurizio.manzin@unitn.it

RHETORIC IN TIMES OF CHANGE: A PHILOSOPHICAL DEFENSE AGAINST EPISTEMIC REDUCTIONISMS

<https://doi.org/10.17234/9789533793337.06>

Abstract

This essay examines the enduring relevance of rhetoric in Western intellectual history, particularly during periods of epistemic transition. It argues that rhetoric recurrently emerges as a corrective and mediating force whenever dominant modes of knowledge attempt to monopolize truth. Drawing on Karl Jaspers' concept of the Axial Age, the study identifies historical moments in which rhetoric reappears as a response to crises of meaning, from the birth of rhetoric in fifth-century BCE Sicily, through Augustine's reconfiguration of discourse in Late Antiquity, Petrarch's humanist critique of scholastic dialectics, Vico's challenge to Cartesian analytic reductionism, and Perelman's twentieth-century "new rhetoric" as a response to formal logic. In each case, rhetoric does not function as a mere technique of persuasion: it mediates ethical, epistemic, and civic concerns, fostering plurality, dialogue, and interpretive flexibility. The essay aims to show that rhetoric serves as a bridge across disciplines, cultures, and temporal horizons, enabling communication where singular epistemic frameworks fail. By situating rhetoric as both an intellectual and ethical practice, the study underscores its humanistic value in contemporary contexts, particularly amid technological, ecological, and political disruptions. The analysis ultimately defends rhetoric as a civic and philosophical virtue, capable of negotiating uncertainty, cultivating moral responsibility, and sustaining the conditions for shared understanding in transitional and pluralistic societies.

Keywords: *rhetoric, epistemic transition, humanism, persuasion, knowledge plurality, ethical discourse*



1. Introduction: The Periodic Resurgence of Rhetoric

The following reflections aim to offer a synthetic yet conceptually rich overview of the enduring philosophical and historical significance of rhetoric¹, particularly in transitional epochs of Western civilization. The central question animating these pages is not whether rhetoric has survived through history (possibly as a mere artifact of classical education) but how and why it resurfaces with intellectual urgency whenever prevailing paradigms of knowledge and authority begin to fracture.

Could we therefore speak of a philosophy of history with regard to rhetoric? In other words, would it be possible to trace in the unfolding of human time not exactly a deterministic direction or fixed pattern (White 1973), but certain recurring constellations – moments in which rhetoric reemerges as a form of epistemic resistance, as a counter-movement against reductionist monopolies of truth?

Unlike Hegel or Voltaire, I do not assume that history advances toward an ultimate synthesis or *telos*, nor do I believe that some universal patterns govern the progress of reason. Yet, there are discernible epochs in which rhetoric gains renewed importance: epochs defined by crises of meaning, when inherited frameworks of understanding can no longer sustain collective intelligibility. In such moments, rhetoric functions not merely as an ornament or a means of persuasion, but as an existential and epistemological response to uncertainty.

Karl Jaspers' notion of the "*Achsenzeit*" (Axial Age) provides a helpful starting point for this reflection (Jaspers 1949). Jaspers identifies the Axial Age as a period of radical transformation in human consciousness, when humanity transitioned from mythic to reflective, philosophical modes of world-understanding. In the spirit of this framework, we might conceive of rhetoric as a phenomenon that flourishes in transitional epochs – those moments when epistemic certainties collapse, and a pluralistic reconstitution of meaning becomes necessary². Rhetoric, in this sense, is not merely a symptom of instability but an active force that resists epistemic reductionism by reopening the field of meaning and dialogue.

Such transitional periods are rarely peaceful or coherent. They are marked by crises (political, social, and intellectual) where language itself becomes contested terrain. Communication breaks down; consensus dissolves; new vocabularies emerge to articulate experiences that the old ones can no longer capture. It is precisely here that rhetoric intervenes. It does not simply mediate discourse but reconstitutes the very conditions under which dialogue can occur. This reconstructive capacity makes rhetoric indispensable to civic renewal and cultural transformation (Arendt 1958; Nussbaum 2012).

2. The Birth of Rhetoric: Against the Monopoly of Myth

The first crucial moment to consider is the birth of rhetoric in fifth-century BCE Sicily, during the period of Magna Graecia. Figures such as Corax and Tisias, often remembered as the founders of rhetorical theory, lived in a world undergoing profound political change. The expulsion of the tyrant Thrasybulus from Syracuse in 465 BCE marked not only the fall of a despot but the emergence of a new political order, one that required public reasoning and civic deliberation.

¹ For an overview on the history of classical rhetoric from the beginning to modern age cf. Kennedy (1999).

² A summary table of transitional epochs is provided at the end of the text.



Rhetoric thus arose as both a response to and a catalyst of democratic transformation. It provided citizens with a means to articulate, contest, and negotiate claims in the public sphere. What emerged was not simply a technique of persuasion but an epistemological and ethical revolution: speech became the medium of truth, not merely its vehicle. The old mythic justifications of power, anchored in divine will or genealogical destiny, were replaced by a discursive legitimacy grounded in shared reasoning.

This transformation was more than political. It signaled a deeper shift in consciousness: from monologic myth to dialogic reason. The rhetorical art made visible the plurality of perspectives that compose the social world (Bakhtin 1981). By legitimizing multiplicity, rhetoric became a democratic force, not because it guaranteed equality, but because it created the space where equality could be enacted (Vernant 1965).

Furthermore, rhetoric's emergence entailed a new conception of power. Power was no longer the exclusive property of divine or hereditary authority but a potential distributed among speakers within a *polis*. As Hannah Arendt later observed, action and speech are the modes through which human plurality is realized; to speak is to act in concert with others (Arendt 1958). Rhetoric, in this light, becomes the very grammar of the political: the art that transforms isolated individuals into interlocutors, capable of shaping shared worlds through persuasion rather than coercion.

At the same time, this first rhetorical revolution brought its own ambivalences. Plato's critique of pseudo-rhetoric in the *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus* exposes the danger inherent in persuasion divorced from truth. Yet even Plato's polemic against oratorical abuses reveals rhetoric's centrality: the philosopher's anxiety about true rhetoric is itself testimony to its power. The Sophists' relativism may have unsettled Plato, but it also marked the birth of a self-conscious awareness of discourse as a site of struggle over meaning.

The Sicilian origins of rhetoric thus encapsulate a broader anthropological lesson: whenever societies transition from mythic unity to discursive plurality, rhetoric becomes both symptom and instrument of that change. It mediates the passage from the sacred to the civic, from destiny to deliberation. In doing so, it inaugurates what we might call the first "epistemic pluralism" in Western history.

Rhetoric's early development also shaped education, selfhood, and civic identity. The *paideia* of the *polis* – the education of citizens – was inseparable from rhetorical training. Learning to speak well was not only an intellectual exercise but a moral and political apprenticeship: it meant learning to inhabit the shared space of reason. In this sense, rhetoric was foundational to the formation of what later thinkers would call the "public sphere" (Habermas 1962).

To summarize, the birth of rhetoric represents the first revolt against epistemic reductionism: the reduction of truth to mythic revelation. It marks the moment when human beings claimed ownership of language as a medium of mutual persuasion and critique. It was, in short, the first humanistic revolution.

3. Augustine of Hippo: Against the Monopoly of Grammar

The second transitional moment in our genealogy of rhetoric leads us to Late Antiquity and the early Christian era, where Augustine of Hippo (354–430 CE) stands as a liminal figure between the rhetorical culture of the Roman world and the emerging theological order of medieval Christianity. Augustine's intellectual trajectory – from professional rhetorician to bishop and theologian – reveals a profound transformation in the meaning and purpose of discourse itself.



Educated in the classical tradition, Augustine began his career as a teacher of rhetoric in Carthage and later in Milan. His early writings exhibit the technical brilliance of a trained rhetorician, yet he soon became disillusioned with what he perceived as the vanity of worldly eloquence. The conversion recounted in the *Confessions* marked not only a spiritual awakening but an epistemic reorientation: from (pseudo)rhetoric as persuasion toward rhetoric as illumination. Language, he came to believe, should not merely adorn thought but reveal truth (and truth, for Augustine, was inseparable from the divine *Logos*) (Augustine, *Confessiones*: IX).

In *De Magistro* and *Contra Cresconium*, Augustine developed a subtle critique of the grammatical formalism that dominated late Roman education. The grammarians, he argued, mistook linguistic correctness for wisdom. Their devotion to the purity of form had become a form of idolatry – a worship of the signifier detached from the signified. Augustine saw in this an early form of epistemic reductionism: the confinement of meaning to technical mastery rather than moral or spiritual insight (Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*: II).

For Augustine, grammar represented the ossification of discourse, the reification of language into rigid structures of authority. In contrast, rhetoric, reinterpreted through the lens of Christian charity (*caritas*), became an instrument of moral and pedagogical transformation (Manzin 1998). It was no longer the art of victory (“*ars vincendi*”), but the art of teaching truth in love (“*ars docendi in caritate*”). Persuasion was redeemed as an act of service, oriented toward the salvation and edification of others.

This reconfiguration of rhetoric marked a decisive shift in the Western tradition. Augustine's synthesis of classical eloquence and Christian ethics opened the way for a conception of discourse that was at once hermeneutic and ethical. His reflections anticipated modern concerns about the instrumentalization of language (a problem later taken up by Heidegger and Gadamer, who both saw in language not a tool but the “house of Being”) (Heidegger 2010).

Augustine thus prefigures the hermeneutic insight that understanding is always mediated by language, and that language itself has an ethical dimension. His warning against the “vanity of grammarians” echoes through the centuries, reminding us that linguistic precision without ethical orientation leads to sterility. In contemporary terms, his critique could be read as a defense of the humanities against technocratic reductionism, intended as the tendency to value form and utility over meaning and truth.

Augustine's rhetorical theology also addresses the tension between interiority and communication. For him, the true teacher is not external but internal: the “*magister interior*,” Christ as the inner Word who illuminates the human mind. Yet, paradoxically, this interior illumination manifests itself through speech, through the shared *logos* of the community. The implication is clear: communication, far from being a mere vehicle of thought, participates in the very unfolding of truth.

By transforming rhetoric into a practice of *caritas*, Augustine anticipated the idea (later articulated by Gadamer and Ricoeur) that understanding involves a fusion of horizons, a dialogue between self and other in the medium of language (Gadamer 1960; Ricoeur 1990). In his view, rhetoric was not abolished by revelation but transfigured by it, becoming a mode of communion rather than competition.

In sum, Augustine's work stands as an early philosophical resistance to epistemic reductionism in its grammatical form. Against the monopoly of linguistic formalism, he proposed a vision of discourse grounded in love, responsibility, and transcendence. His legacy continues to challenge any system, ancient or modern, that divorces the mastery of expression from the moral vocation of truth.



4. Petrarch and Early Humanism: Against the Monopoly of Dialectics

The third epochal resurgence of rhetoric appears in the figure of Francesco Petrarca (1304–1374), whose passionate critique of scholastic dialectics inaugurated the humanist revolution of the Renaissance. Petrarch's revolt against the intellectual abstraction of his time was not a rejection of reason per se, but of a particular kind of reason – one that had become sterile, detached from the living realities of human experience.

In works such as *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia* (*On His Own Ignorance and That of Many Others*) and the *Familiars*, Petrarch attacks the pretensions of scholastic dialecticians, who, he claims, “know everything about the heavens but nothing of their own souls.” His polemic encapsulates a crucial epistemological critique: dialectics, in its medieval form, had reduced truth to formal coherence. It could demonstrate “*veritas connexionum*” (the truth of logical connections) but not “*veritas sententiarum*” (the truth of lived judgment) (Petrarch, *Letters on Familiar Matters*: XIV; cf. Manzin 1994).

Petrarch's humanism sought to restore eloquence (*eloquentia*) as a mode of knowledge that embraces affect, imagination, and moral sensibility. He regarded rhetoric not as an inferior substitute for dialectic, but (Aristotelianly!)³ as its necessary complement counterpart (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*: 135 a 1): a discipline that reintroduces the warmth of humanity into the cold machinery of syllogism. The humanist recovery of Cicero, Seneca, and Augustine reflected this aspiration: wisdom must be spoken beautifully, for truth divorced from eloquence risks becoming inhuman (Cicero, *De Oratore*: II).

In this respect, Petrarch inaugurates a second “axial” turning in the history of Western thought, one that anticipates later debates between scientific rationality and humanistic understanding. His elevation of rhetoric as a mode of ethical and emotional intelligence can be seen as a precursor to what modern philosophers call *phronesis*: practical wisdom that arises not from deduction but from engagement with concrete situations (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*: VI; Bitzer 1968; Farrell 1995).

Moreover, Petrarch's critique of dialectics possesses a prophetic resonance in our own time. In an era increasingly governed by algorithmic logic, predictive analytics, and the reduction of human meaning to data points, his humanism reminds us that truth is not exhausted by formal correctness. Understanding requires empathy, narrative, and moral imagination – dimensions that rhetoric, more than any other discipline, cultivates (Barthes 1994; Fisher 1984).

In this sense, Petrarch's revaluation of rhetoric anticipates what contemporary philosophers like Paul Ricoeur would call a *narrative epistemology*: the idea that human beings understand themselves and their world through stories that mediate between the factual and the meaningful (Ricoeur 1984). For Petrarch, the poetic and rhetorical imagination is not a deviation from truth but its deepening, its incarnation within the affective and temporal texture of life.

Petrarch's defense of eloquence also had political implications. By grounding knowledge in human experience, he implicitly challenged the scholastic claim to intellectual authority. The university dialecticians had built a monopoly over knowledge by defining it as syllogistic demonstration. Humanists like Petrarch broke this monopoly by asserting the legitimacy of *eloquentia humana*: the voice of lived wisdom that speaks from within, rather than above, the human condition.

³ In fact Petrarch accused the contemporary neo-Aristotelians of scholasticism of having an erroneous and reductive interpretation of Aristotle.



Thus, once again, rhetoric reappears at a moment of epistemic crisis: when the dominance of dialectical abstraction threatens to alienate knowledge from life. Rhetoric, in Petrarch's hands, became an act of resistance against intellectual desiccation and moral indifference. His humanism remains a call to remember that truth, to be humanly meaningful, must be not only thought but also spoken, felt, and shared.

5. Vico and the Enlightenment: Against the Monopoly of Analytics

The fourth pivotal moment in our historical survey of rhetoric emerges in the early modern period with Giambattista Vico (1668–1744), whose philosophy represents a decisive critique of Cartesian reductionism. Descartes' method, privileging deduction and mathematical abstraction as the sole pathways to knowledge (Descartes 1637), epitomized a form of epistemic reductionism in which human experience and cultural particularity were subordinated to universal rational structures (Toulmin 1992).

Vico, in his *Scienza Nuova*, argued that such a reductionist vision overlooked the historicity and cultural embeddedness of human understanding. Knowledge, he maintained, is inseparable from the practices, myths, and languages that constitute human societies. Truth is not merely discovered but enacted: it is “made” through human institutions, stories, and symbols (Burke 1969). Hence his famous dictum, “*verum ipsum factum*”: truth is not just an abstract idea, but manifests itself in human arts and action (Vico, *The New Science*: §331).

In Vico's framework, rhetoric assumes a central epistemic function. Far from being mere ornamentation, rhetorical practice enables the human mind to grasp the socially constructed nature of reality. It mediates between analytic abstraction and the historical, mythopoetic texture of culture. By attending to narrative, metaphor, and persuasion, rhetoric complements logic and analysis, offering a fuller understanding of human experience.

Vico's critique is not only methodological but also ethical. Against the Enlightenment's universalist pretensions, he insisted on the particularity of human communities and the limitations of abstract reasoning divorced from social context. His work prefigures hermeneutic approaches in modern philosophy and cultural studies, emphasizing interpretation, historical consciousness, and the inseparability of cognition from culture (Cassirer 1923–1929).

Vico's insistence on the cognitive dimension of rhetoric underscores its enduring significance (Crosswhite 1996). In moments when analytic methods claim exclusive authority, rhetoric resurfaces to restore epistemic plurality. Through metaphor, narrative, and ethical persuasion, it maintains a connection between abstract knowledge and lived human reality, thus resisting the impoverishment of understanding that accompanies methodological reductionism.

6. Perelman and the 20th Century: Against the Monopoly of Formal Logic

The fifth stage in this historical survey arrives in the twentieth century with Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, whose *Traité de l'argumentation* (1958) inaugurated the notion of a “new rhetoric.” Perelman responded to the growing dominance of formal logic, which, in his view, could not account for the richness and complexity of human reasoning in legal, moral, and political contexts.

Perelman argued that formal logic, while invaluable within its domain, imposes a reductive structure on discourse, privileging universality at the expense of context, audience, and ethical judgment. The “new rhetoric” sought to recover the art of reasonable persuasion, attending not



only to the structure of argument but also to its reception and its grounding in shared human norms. By emphasizing the concept of the “universal audience,” Perelman bridged ethical considerations with epistemic practice, insisting that argumentation must aim at reasonable assent rather than coercive victory (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1958).

Of course, I am well aware of the ambiguities inherent in Perelman’s notion of “new rhetoric,” having also written about it in the past (Manzin 2012). But what seems relevant to me is that, beyond Perelman’s fidelity to a correct interpretation of rhetoric, he believed this discipline should represent an argumentative renaissance capable of transcending logical formalism and restoring to public speech the dignity of which the oratorical techniques of totalitarianism had deprived it.

In historical perspective, Perelman’s work represents *de facto* a continuation of the recurring pattern noted in our survey: rhetoric reemerges whenever a domain of knowledge claims monopoly over truth. Just as Augustine countered grammatical formalism, Petrarch resisted scholastic dialectics, and Vico opposed analytic reductionism, Perelman responded to the dominance of formal logic and to the past and present dictatorships’ split between persuasion and reasonableness. Rhetoric, in each instance, functions as a corrective – a practice that restores plurality, dialogue, and ethical deliberation to discourse.

7. Conclusion: A Humanistic Defense of Rhetoric (Rhetoric as a Bridge)

Across the epochs of Western history, a consistent theme emerges: rhetoric operates as a *bridge*. It mediates between domains of knowledge, ethical perspectives, and temporal horizons (Weaver 1987). In political life, it facilitates deliberation amidst conflicting values; in the humanities, it restores suppressed or marginalized voices; in interdisciplinary research, it enables dialogue between scientific, historical, and social perspectives (Habermas 1981).

Rhetoric bridges not only disciplines but also generations and cultures. By cultivating epistemic plurality, it allows disparate forms of knowledge to coexist and interact. It mediates understanding without demanding conformity, enabling ethical negotiation and the possibility of consensus without coercion. In this sense, rhetoric is both epistemic and ethical, sustaining the delicate balance between disagreement and dialogue.

Moreover, rhetoric embodies a sort of philosophy of uncertainty. It flourishes precisely in transitional epochs, when dominant paradigms fail to fully account for the complexities of human experience. By creating spaces for reflection, dialogue, and ethical engagement, rhetoric contributes to the resilience of civic and intellectual life (Zappen 2004). It transforms moments of epistemic crisis into opportunities for renewal and humanistic cultivation. In a word, it is capable of responding to the uncertainties and (sometimes even apocalyptic) fears that mark periods of great transition, avoiding the twists and turns of epistemic authoritarianism and dogmatism or ideology.

To conclude, rhetoric must be recognized not as an antiquarian relic or a subsidiary art, but as a vital humanistic resource. As Susan Haack reminds us, human endeavor encompasses many forms of inquiry and creation beyond the scientific: historical, legal, literary, philosophical, artistic, and narrative practices all contribute to human understanding and flourishing (Haack 1993). Rhetoric belongs in a central position to this wider spectrum of humanistic activity.

In contemporary times, characterized by rapid technological change, political polarization, and challenges to epistemic authority, we may be entering a new axial moment. Artificial intelligence, ecological threats, and global interconnectedness pose not merely technical problems but ethical and hermeneutic challenges. Rhetoric, understood as a form of truth-seeking characterized by a



practice of persuasion grounded in ethical engagement and epistemic plurality, remains a crucial tool for navigating these challenges.

Rhetoric is not reducible to a technique (Zarefsky 2010); it is a philosophical orientation, a civic and ethical habit of mind. It cultivates dialogue, sustains plurality, and allows for disagreement without enmity. It resists the monopolies of reductionist knowledge while proposing alternative ecologies of understanding (Booth 2004). Above all, rhetoric teaches us to inhabit transitional epochs with critical discernment, imaginative empathy, and hope for shared understanding.

Let us therefore reclaim rhetoric as both an academic discipline and a civic virtue. Let us teach, practice, and defend it as one of the most humane ways of navigating uncertainty, cultivating community, and imagining a shared future where truth is not a dogmatic scarecrow nor a surrender to the suggestive force of the opinions of the strongest.

– Summary Table –

Reference Author(s)	Epochal Transition	Dominant Epistemic Reductionism
Rhetoricians of Ancient Greece	Aristocracy > Democracy	Myth, Superstition
St. Augustine of Hippo	Roman Empire > Middle Ages	Grammar
Francesco Petrarca	Middle Ages > Renaissance	Dialectics
Giambattista Vico	Renaissance > Modern Age	Analytics
Chaïm Perelman	Modernity > Post-modernity	Formal Logic
...	(in progress)	AI?

References

- Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. 2012. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by Robert C. Bartlett and Susan D. Collins. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. 1954. *Rhetoric*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Modern Library.
- Augustine. 1991. *Confessiones*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Augustine. 1995. *De Doctrina Christiana*. Translated by R. P. H. Green. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1994. *The Semiotic Challenge*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. 1968. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 1 (1): 1–14.
- Booth, Wayne C. 2004. *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1969. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cassirer, Ernst. 1923–1929. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. Vols. 1–3. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cicero. 1942. *De Oratore*. Translated by E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Crosswhite, James. 1996. *The Rhetoric of Reason: Writing and the Attractions of Argument*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Descartes, René. 1637. *Discours de la méthode*. An 1850 English translation by Donald A. Cress is provided on the internet: <https://grattoncourses.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/rene-descartes-discourse-on-method-and-meditations-on-first-philosophy-4th-ed-hackett-pub-co-1998.pdf>
- Farrell, Thomas B. 1995. *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fisher, Walter R. 1984. "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument." *Communication Monographs* 51 (1): 1–22.



- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1960. *Truth and Method*. New York: Continuum.
- Haack, Susan. 1993. *Evidence and Inquiry: Towards Reconstruction in Epistemology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1962. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1981. *Theory of Communicative Action*. Vols. 1–2. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kennedy, George A. 1999. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Jaspers, Karl. 1949. *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte* [The Origin and Goal of History]. Zurich: Artemis-Verlag.
- Heidegger, Martin. 2010. *On the Way to Language*. San Francisco, CA: HarperOne.
- Manzin, Maurizio. 1994. *Il petrarchismo giuridico. Filosofia e logica del diritto agli inizi dell'umanesimo giuridico* [Legal Petrarchism: Philosophy and the Logic of Law at the Beginning of Legal Humanism]. Padova: CEDAM.
- Manzin, Maurizio. 1998. *Ordine politico e verità in sant'Agostino. Riflessioni sulla crisi della scienza moderna*. [Political Order and Truth in St. Augustine: Reflections on the Crisis of Modern Science]. Padova: CEDAM.
- Manzin, Maurizio. 2012. "Vérité et logos dans la perspective de la rhétorique judiciaire. Contributions perelmaniennes à la culture juridique du troisième millénaire." [Truth and Logos Within the Perspective of the Judicial Rhetoric: Perelman's Contributions to the Legal Culture of the Third Millennium]. In: *Chaim Perelman. De la nouvelle rhétorique à la logique juridique*, edited by Benoît Frydman and Michel Meyer, 261–288. Paris: PUF.
- Nussbaum, Martha. 2012. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Perelman, Chaim, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. 1958. *Traité de l'argumentation – la nouvelle rhétorique*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Petrarch, Francesco. 1991. *Letters on Familiar Matters*. Translated by Aldo S. Bernardo. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Plato. 2004. *Gorgias*. Translated by Walter Hamilton. London: Penguin Classics.
- Plato. 2025. *Phaedrus*. Translated by Christopher Rowe. London: Penguin Classics.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1984. *Time and Narrative*. Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1990. *Oneself as Another*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Toulmin, Stephen. 1992. *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vico, Giambattista. (1744) 1984. *The New Science*. Translated by Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Vernant, Jean-Pierre. 1965. *Myth and Thought among the Greeks*. London: Routledge.
- Weaver, Richard M. 1987. *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. Chicago: Henry Regnery.
- White, Hayden. 1973. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Zappen, James P. 2004. *The Rebirth of Dialogue: Bakhtin, Socrates, and the Rhetorical Tradition*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Zarefsky, David. 2010. *Public Speaking: Strategies for Success*. New York: Pearson.



9 789533 793337