

A Rhetorical Examination of Memory and Masculinity

by

Dalton Bergan, B.A.

A Thesis

In

Communication Studies

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved

Dr. Mark Gring
Committee Chair

Dr. Brian Ott

Dr. Patrick Hughes

Dr. Mark Sheridan
Dean of the Graduate School

May, 2019

Copyright 2019, Dalton Bergan

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of these papers would not have been possible without the help of several individuals and groups of people. The past two years have brought many new experiences and equally as many challenges. During this time, I have received tremendous support from friends, family, colleagues, and faculty. While the extent to which each of these groups directly influenced the completion of my thesis varies, each has played a role in supporting me to some degree.

I would first like to thank my family. My parents have always encouraged me to be the best that I can be, and continue to believe in my abilities with every new challenge that I face. Without their support, I likely would not have attended Texas Tech in the first place.

My friends and colleagues have also played an important role in my success. They have provided a necessary outlet for stress, and have also encouraged me. My classmates have always been willing to help one another when times get tough, which has made it much easier to complete these papers and many more.

Finally, I would like to thank my committee for their patience and willingness to assist me throughout the creation and revision process. There were many times when I was unsure as to how I should articulate my ideas and arguments, and their guidance has played a large part in refining my papers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....ii

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. THE DUAL MEMORY OF BERLIN’S GEDÄCHTNISKIRCHE.....2

 Theoretical Framework.....3

 Analysis.....9

 Conclusion.....19

 References.....22

III. MASCULINITY AND RHETORIC: VIRTUES OF THE IDEAL ORATOR...24

 Global Masculinity: A Long History in Brief.....26

 The Virtuous Man.....28

 The Ideal Orator.....35

 Conclusion.....41

 References.....43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The following two essays reflect the focus of my studies over the course of my graduate career. While the topics may not seem inherently linked at first glance, the underlying commonality is their basis in rhetorical analysis. In each analysis, I examine the respective artifact by breaking down some of the primary characteristics that enable it to affect audiences.

In the first chapter, I investigate the competing memories at play within the Gedächtniskirche memorial site in Berlin, Germany. This site, I argue, holds two distinct memories that are accessible to varying degrees depending on one's past experiences. By looking into the site's history, architecture, and use of space, I dissect the memories of war and resilience that are present at the site.

In the second chapter, I examine the relationship between masculinity and oratory in ancient Greece. By breaking each concept down and looking into its respective origins and motivating factors, I draw connections between the two and explore the nature of their shared relationship. This serves to contribute to the much larger discussion of modern rhetoric as a whole, ultimately calling into question some of the field's primary assumptions.

CHAPTER II

THE DUAL MEMORY OF BERLIN'S GEDÄCHTNISKIRCHE

The twentieth century saw some of the most significant events in human history. With particular regard to war, it was a century more damaging to human life than any before it (White, 2011). As a public, the ways in which we memorialize the atrocities of war have the power to shape our perceptions of the past. Public memory is itself shaped by memorials, museums, and other cultural sites, each one ultimately contributing to a much larger grand narrative. To that end, this essay is meant to introduce and develop concepts pertinent to public memory through the analysis of a recognized memorial, The Kaiser Wilhelm Gedächtniskirche.

Gedächtniskirche (Memorial Church, in English) is a landmark and memorial in downtown Berlin with a unique and fascinating history. The church building was originally constructed as a memorial to the first emperor of Germany, but is now associated primarily with the city's history pertaining to World War II. After being almost entirely destroyed, the ruined structure became a site of great meaning for those who visited, and even more so to resident Berliners.

In this essay, I argue that Gedächtniskirche is a complex site of commemoration that, at once, acknowledges the horrors and destruction of World War II and celebrates the enduring spirit of Berliners. It accomplishes this unlikely double-coding through a series of key juxtapositions: (1) commercial and commemorative spaces, (2) original and revised histories/meanings of the space, and (3) old and new architectural styles.

To do so, I will start by reviewing some literature from the fields of memory studies and rhetoric. Additionally, I pull a few concepts from the scholarship of related

fields, and will explain how and where they fit in to this conversation. Specifically, I review literature pertaining to public memory, double coding, and the mnemotope. In analyzing the site, I examine the ways in which memory is activated by the three aforementioned juxtapositions, and how these juxtapositions reflect the concepts listed above.

Theoretical Framework

Public Memory

When analyzing a site with the word “memorial” in its name, it seems fitting that a good starting point would be the body of literature pertaining to public memory. Contemporary scholars tend to agree on a number of assumptions from the field of memory studies, all of which can be applied to Gedächtniskirche. One overarching assumption within the field is that remembering is a group activity (Crane, 1997a; Halbwachs, 1992). Public memory stems from a common understanding of history that is specific to a certain group of people. Memory scholars often use the term “collective memory” to describe this phenomenon.

Crane (1997b) explains how the rise of historicism ushered in a culture of preservation that valued collective, public displays of art, artifacts, and objects from past or foreign civilizations. This culture, she argues, makes it “virtually inconceivable to speak of having one’s own sense of historical consciousness except as mediated by the reception of the ‘history’ created by historians and preservationists” (p. 1375). Historians, preservationists, and curators therefore act as gatekeepers of public memory to an extent,

ultimately influencing the ways in which history and memory are accessed by the general public (Crane, 1997a).

Although public memory is a group activity by nature, it is rarely (if ever) the case that groups unanimously agree on a single memory or narrative. As Zielizer (1995) observes, "...one of the fundamental ironies of collective memory is that its collective nature is not necessarily unified" (p. 230). Further, memory does not (and almost always *cannot*) perfectly align with actual happenings of the past. Nora (1989) explains that memory is connected to one's own senses and experiences, making it impossible for any individual to possess an accurate and unbiased account of past events. Likewise, it is equally unlikely that a given text could animate a single undisputed memory. One memory could never encompass all that is known of a given event (Zielizer, 1995), making memory innately partial.

Next, it is assumed that the ways in which publics remember are selected based on present circumstances (Crane, 1997b; Glaveanu, 2017). Groups choose to give attention to certain histories while ignoring others, and this may change over time as conditions of a society change. The past is essentially manipulated to best serve the present. While a group's relation to memory oftentimes justifies the construction of memorials, museums, etc. with which the group positively identifies, it can just as easily justify the removal or deconstruction of those with which the group negatively identifies. Hirst, Yamashiro, & Coman (2018) refer to the current debate surrounding the dismantling of confederate memorials in the U.S. to illustrate this point.

Closely tied to this is a separate assumption, which is that memory constructs narratives that foster a sense of belonging (Crane, 1997b). Individuals within a group

define their identities based on public memory, which connects them to other members of said group. Many memorials and historical sites are intended to promote a group identity, or as Crane says, “a sense of the past valid for members of [their] culture and anyone who encountered their products” (p. 1375).

Continuing, public memory is animated by affect (Dickinson, Blair, & Ott, 2010). The histories that groups choose to maintain are the ones with which they share the strongest emotional attachment. Public memory also requires the use of symbols or material texts such as literary works, language, places, monuments, etc. It is also assumed that memory is partial, and not always agreed upon. Because public memory privileges certain events and people over others, it is impossible for any single memory to convey an entire, unbiased history. Finally, while public memory is used to tell or retell history, it also accumulates its own history over time (Dickinson, Blair, & Ott, 2010). Memory does not remain the same between societies or throughout time, and therefore has a history all its own. As several of these assumptions have made clear, memory is far from being fixed or absolute.

The authors also note memory’s distinctive relationship with place. The two are similar in that they are both “named, bordered, and invented in particular ways” (p. 24), making them both innately rhetorical. Furthermore, places that are specifically linked to memory, such as museums, preservation sites, or memorials, are seen as especially significant by publics. Places form and sustain memory much differently than other mediums, and engage audiences in ways that other vehicles of memory cannot. Dickinson, Blair, and Ott state that “their rhetoricity is not limited to the readable or visible; it engages the full sensorium” (p. 29).

One final concept worth noting is that of the *experiential landscape*. Dickinson, Ott, & Aoki (2006) describe the experiential landscape as encompassing both physical and cognitive influences that predispose visitors to experience a site in a certain way. The physical location of a historical or cultural site, for example, might mandate a particular travel experience that will shape visitors' perceptions and experiences of the site. Likewise, visitors will experience the site in reference to cognitive schemas such as memories, mental images, or similar experiences they have had. Lastly, the landscape of a site can literally shape perceptions by positioning visitors in such a way that they identify with certain memories or viewpoints while ignoring others.

Gedächtniskirche as Mnemotope

As an officially recognized site of memorial, Gedächtniskirche has some explicit and obvious ties to public memory. Perhaps equally obvious is the site's materialization of the past in the present. Archaeologist Anthony Purdy (2002) states that most archaeological artifacts "serve as a vehicle for personal and cultural memory" (p. 94), a statement that could be easily applied to sites of public memory. In the same essay, Purdy coins the term "mnemotope," which he defines as "a chronotopic motif manifesting the presence of the past, the conscious or unconscious memory traces of a more or less distant period in the life of a culture or, metaphorically, an individual" (p. 94).

To fully appreciate Purdy's notion of the mnemotope, one must first understand what is meant by the term "chronotopic." Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin (1937) used the term to describe the complex relationship between time and space in the use of language. The chronotope emphasizes the inseparability of time and space, and highlights the ways in which the two interact. Originally, the concept was used mostly in studying

literature, where different genres are known for using different orientations of time and space.

Bakhtin (1981) later expanded his definition of chronotopes, labeling them as “points in the geography of a community where time and space intersect and fuse. Time takes on flesh and become visible for human contemplation. ...Chronotopes thus stand as monuments to the community itself, as symbols of it, as forces operating to shape its members’ images of themselves.” Keith Basso (1984) investigated the chronotope in Apache storytelling, and noted how certain geographical landmarks seemed to provide a visual representation of time in certain stories. In essence, chronotopic texts are ones that in some way materialize the relationship between time and space, allowing humans to make better sense of the otherwise intangible concept.

This prerequisite knowledge of chronotopes allows for a clearer understanding of the mnemotope. Much like the chronotope, the mnemotope enables a visual interpretation of the past. Additionally, mnemotopes emphasize the memory tied to certain sites, artifacts, or other texts. Mnemotopes render public memory accessible in specific ways that might be otherwise incomprehensible, creating meaning for both groups and individuals. *Gedächtniskirche*’s unusual relationship with memory makes it an especially intriguing text in this sense. As I stated in my thesis, it is a text that effectively activates two disparate memories at once, a phenomenon that will be explored in the following paragraphs.

Double Coding

There are certain texts that can simultaneously hold different meanings that are accessible to different groups of people, or in varying contexts. Take, for example, a

children's show that incorporates adult humor. The jokes intended for adults are typically subtle enough that children do not even notice them, while still holding meaning to any adults who might be watching. These are referred to as "double coded" texts. Double coding is defined as "any sign or text which is open to two different interpretations depending on the frame of reference which is used to interpret it" (Chandler, 2011, p. 111).

The example used above is one of myriad instances of double coding. While more recent scholarship has focused on double coding in television and film (Kafalenos, 2003), the concept has been widely studied in the fields of language and art (Fonagy, 2010; McCarthy & Dimitriadis, 2000). Works of art (think of the kind you would see in an art museum) are known for employing double coding, as many hold differing meanings. The use of double coding in language is more nuanced. Roman Jakobson (1960) illustrates this concept in part in his model of language, noting that communication depends largely on the shared code of the addresser and addressee (the encoder and decoder of a message). In this essay, double coding will be used in assessing the two aforementioned memories commemorated at Gedächtniskirche: the atrocity of war and the resilient spirit of Berliners.

Though double coding has been studied in numerous contexts, it does not appear as though it has yet been used in studies of public memory. Here I investigate how the public memory associated with Gedächtniskirche is materialized in the juxtapositioning present throughout the site. To the best of my knowledge, a body of scholarship examining the double coding of memorial sites is currently nonexistent. By positioning

my analysis at this intersection, this essay contributes something new to both bodies of literature.

It is important to note that the term “double coding” has existed within architecture since the late 1970s, when it was coined by postmodernist architect Charles Jencks in his book “The New Paradigm in Architecture.” To be clear, this is not the definition of double coding that will be used in this essay. Double coding, as Jencks defines it, refers to “the combination of modern techniques with something else (usually traditional building) in order for architecture to communicate with the public and a concerned minority, usually other architects” (Jencks, 1977, p. 8). Although Jencks’ notion of double coding is in some aspects similar to the definition that will be used here, its specificity to architectural design limits its utility within this discussion.

Analysis

Historical Context

Given the rich history of Gedächtniskirche, it would be impossible to conduct a meaningful analysis without first familiarizing oneself with the events that shaped the site. To that end, I begin by reviewing the site’s history. Certain parts will be revisited, and in some cases expanded upon, throughout the analysis that follows, but it is best to understand Gedächtniskirche’s history in full before attempting to dissect particular pieces of it.

According to the city of Berlin’s official website, Gedächtniskirche was originally constructed in 1895 as a functioning Protestant church and memorial to Kaiser Wilhelm I, the first ruler of a unified Germany. The church was built mostly with brick

and stone and featured ornate stained-glass windows. The tallest building in Berlin at the time, the church overlooked what is now the city's commercial district for nearly half a century.

As the capital of Nazi Germany throughout World War II, Berlin was the target of frequent air raids carried out by the British, the Soviets, and the Americans. Though Berlin was raided more than 300 times over the six-year span of the war, the most damaging strike was delivered when British bombers executed a series of three air raids in five days during November 1943 (Middlebrook, 2010). It was during the first of these three raids that the church building was heavily damaged after more than 700 aircraft dropped an estimated 2,500 tons of bombs on the city. While the structure was not entirely destroyed, much of what remained burned down in the fires that resulted from the incendiary bombs used in the raid. When the smoke cleared, the only part of the church building left standing was the partially collapsed main spire.

After the war, the spire and the ruins of the old church were left alone for the better part of a decade. The ruined spire was affectionately nicknamed "the hollow tooth" because of its appearance. In the 1950s, a contest was announced to design and build a new church in place of the ruins. Upon selecting a winner, plans to demolish the old church building in favor of constructing an entirely new one were met with fierce opposition, and numerous protests, from the citizens of Berlin. After such powerful backlash, plans for the new building were revised to instead build around the spire, while still leaving it intact.

The site, as it stands today, consists of five parts spanning less than 100 yards. At the very center stands the spire of the old church. Immediately to the west is the new

church building, with a small chapel next to it. To the east of the old church is the bell tower and a foyer. Both the old and the new church buildings are open to the public, with open entrances that invite visitors to pass in and out. Inside the old church, the main floor is now the Hall of Remembrance, a miniature memorial/museum dedicated both to the history of the site and Berlin's general history as it pertains to World War II. While the new buildings operate as parts of a fully functional church, Gedächtniskirche is presently known primarily as a tourist attraction and landmark.

With this history in mind, I will move into my analysis and dissect the specific ways in which Gedächtniskirche emphasizes its dual memory. This is done through the three juxtapositions mentioned in the introduction of this essay: (1) commercial/commemorative space, (2) original/revised histories of the site, and (3) old and new architectural styles. Each of these juxtapositions draws attention to the site itself and consequently to the memories associated with it.

Commercial/Commemorative Space

Gedächtniskirche is unlike certain other places of public memory in that it was not intentionally built to commemorate either the destruction of war or the spirit of Berliners. Rather, both of these memories were ascribed to it over time. It is therefore worth noting that the location of the site, as it functions today, was not specifically selected. The district in which Gedächtniskirche is located has been developing for decades, while the memorial site has stayed more or less the same. This is one of the three juxtapositions that I argue significantly influences the rhetoric of the site, specifically through the use of space and purpose.

As noted above, the church was originally built over 120 years ago, in an area that was, at the time, otherwise vacant. It was not until much later, in the 1950s and 1960s, that the blocks surrounding the site were developed as commercial complexes. Today, the church building stands in the center of Breitscheidplatz, a popular public square, amongst cafes, restaurants and shopping centers. Breitscheidplatz is located at the very center of what used to be West Berlin, making Gedächtniskirche easily accessible to tourists and passersby.

The open space of the site and obvious architectural differences cause it to stick out like a sore thumb in contrast to the modern, sleek, and cramped aesthetics of the surrounding commercial district (I am currently speaking only of the ways in which the architecture of the site as a whole differs from that of the nearby cityscape; I will get into the juxtapositioning of architecture *within* the site momentarily). The lot on which the site is located is accessible from any point on its perimeter, inviting pedestrians to explore the space. The stark contrast in use of space, in tandem with the Romanesque architectural design, makes it clear that this site is meant to serve a different purpose than the spaces surrounding it. If one were to unwittingly happen upon the site while touring the commercial district, it is hard to imagine a case in which it would not be overwhelmingly obvious that this space functions as a memorial.

The unique space surrounding the site contributes to what Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki (2006) refer to as the experiential landscape. The physical landscape requires that visitors trek through the Berlin's bustling cityscape in order to find the site, an experience that visitors cannot escape even after arriving. Imagine how differently a site like this might be experienced were it located 10 miles outside of the city surrounded by nothing

but fields. To ignore the obvious influence of Gedächtniskirche's surrounding landscape would be to discount a major feature of the site's identity, even if the city is not what most would consider a part of the site. In fact, Gurler & Ozer (2013) contend that memory sites within cities affect memory and identity more positively than those which are not, as their accessibility and inseparability from their environment make them a part of everyday life for the city's residents.

According to Dickinson, Blair, and Ott (2010), places of public memory are largely influenced by their location, and every site of memory has "unique topographies, geographies, and contextual structures" (p. 29). This is an undoubtedly powerful factor when looking at the location of Gedächtniskirche in relation to the city of Berlin.

Breitscheidplatz has been a rapidly developing district for over 50 years. One could name hundreds of possible ways that the space currently occupied by Gedächtniskirche could have been redeveloped to evolve with the area surrounding it. That the site is still standing in an open lot on highly sought commercial ground speaks very strongly to its importance and value, and indicates that the space holds more worth functioning as a memorial than it would as any other alternative. Had the old church building been demolished and a new one built in its place, it is possible that the site would have been bought out and redeveloped for commercial purposes by now. The people of Berlin protested to keep the spire where it is, which signals an immensely powerful emotional attachment to the site. Berliners have actively chosen to preserve this site, and in doing so have preserved the memories associated with it.

Original/Revised Histories

Perhaps the most unique aspect of Gedächtniskirche as a site of public memory is the way in which its memory has changed over time. The life span and history of the site sets it apart from the vast majority of other places of public memory, making it a particularly fascinating object of study. Not many places have been designed with the intent to memorialize something, destroyed, and remade to memorialize something else entirely. In this section, I discuss in more detail the history of Gedächtniskirche, with a focus on the ways it has influenced the memory of the site.

Wilhelm II originally had Gedächtniskirche built as a memorial to his grandfather, Wilhelm I, King of Prussia and later German Emperor. Upon initial design, the walls and ceilings of the church's interior were covered in mosaics depicting Prussian history up to the time of Kaiser Wilhelm I. Weekly Protestant services were held at the church, and it was fully operational prior to its destruction in World War II.

During World War II, air raids were a fairly frequent occurrence in Berlin, often targeting residential areas of the city (Middlebrook, 2010). As a result, nearly 40% of the city's population had fled by the end of the war. Many who stayed had lost much to the bombings, both as individuals and as a city. In most cases, Berlin's strategy was to demolish and replace the buildings that had been damaged. Since Gedächtniskirche had been a prominent architectural feature in the city, there was some disagreement as to whether or not it should face the same fate. Citizens had been proud of it before the war. Many still felt attached to the church building even in its ruined state, only now they were connected to it for a different reason.

What remained of the ruined church building became known as “The Heart of Berlin,” and the spire became a metaphor for endurance and resilience. Berlin’s break-it-down-and-build-it-up reconstruction techniques reinforced the notion that to destroy the spire would be to destroy the memory. With no reminders of the aftermath of World War II, how would future generations remember or experience the city’s history? It is in exactly this way that the old church building acts as a mnemotope, materializing memory of the destruction of war in a way that no other site in Berlin can. Simultaneously, Gedächtniskirche represents the post-war beliefs of Berlin citizens, and reflects the values that fueled the city (and arguably the nation) during its reconstruction.

Reading Gedächtniskirche as a double coded text is only possible to those who can access the full memory of the site. Although the memory of war is accessible (and likely obvious) to practically all who visit, the memory specific to Berlin citizens may not be. It takes a rather intimate knowledge of the site’s history to interpret this memory, which many tourists probably lack. The Hall of Remembrance within the old church serves to provide some of this history, enabling those who take time to interact with the exhibits to access both memories to a greater extent. This reflects the notion that memory relies on material supports, and aligns with Dickinson et al.’s characterization of places of public memory as incorporating other media (p. 30).

Inside the Hall of Remembrance exists another small-scale juxtaposition that adds yet another layer to the site’s complex memory. The hall, which is only about 50 feet long, contains displays that memorialize the events specific to Gedächtniskirche before, during and after World War II. If one were to look only at the exhibits without noticing anything else, it would seem as though the site was not memorializing anything else.

However, the walls and ceilings of the old church building are still filled with mosaics paying tribute to Prussia and to Wilhelm I. There are places where it is clear that some mosaics have been restored or pieced back together, but they otherwise exist as they did when the church was originally built. The mosaics preserve the mostly forgotten memory of Kaiser Wilhelm I, to whom the original church building was commemorated. While the design of the Hall of Remembrance allows for the mosaics to be viewed in full, it is clear that the museum privileges the memories associated with World War II. Though the church building was designed and named as a memorial to Wilhelm I, his memory seems to have fallen to the wayside in comparison to those that tell the history of World War II.

To further emphasize the unique materialization of memory at the site, compare Gedächtniskirche to its could-be sibling: the Frauenkirche in Dresden. Both buildings suffered the same destruction as a result of air raids during World War II, but exist as virtual opposites today. The Frauenkirche, after standing in ruin for several decades, was ultimately rebuilt using its original design. Although bricks and pieces of rubble from the original church building were incorporated into the new structure, architectural historian Mark Jarzombek (2004) argues that the bricks (and by association the memories attached to them) were “dispersed throughout the fabric of the building so that it was no longer possible to read its former presence back into existence” (p. 56). In an alternate time and place, Gedächtniskirche might have received the same treatment. This would undoubtedly alter the memory experienced by visitors to the site, and likely not for the better. The decision to build around the ruins of the original church, rather than over them, is what allows for memory to materialize in the manner that it does.

New/Old Architectural Styles

Earlier, I briefly touched on the architectural contrast between Gedächtniskirche and the city surrounding it. Here, I jump back into the discussion of architecture, only this time examining the juxtapositioning at play *within* the site. The old church and the new church are built in starkly different styles, which makes the site even more unique. After reviewing a brief architectural history of the site, I explain how this juxtaposition calls attention to the memory at play.

The original church building was designed by German architect Franz Schwechten, who won the design competition after it was announced by Wilhelm II. The design was a neo-Romanesque style that made use of white stone around the entire exterior. When the building was destroyed and another competition opened to rebuild, winner Egon Eiermann's design was chosen, but needed to be revised after protesters refused to let him destroy the old church building. The new church building and its belfry are built from concrete, steel, and stained glass, and take on a less flashy, modern look. Though the windows are not transparent enough to see through, the stained glass allows natural light to flood the worship space from all sides. The church is an octagonal building that sits fairly low, and the belfry is a hexagonal tower that is much thinner but much taller than the church. Strangely, the two were built on opposite sides of the old tower, adding to the contrast even more.

It is obvious that the buildings were constructed in distant eras and under much different architectural influences. While the new buildings are not much to look at from the outside, the antiquity of the old church building, coupled with the fact that it is half destroyed, makes it stand out as the most interesting part of the site. Even in its state of

ruin, the old church building is noticeably taller than either of the new additions, so attention is naturally drawn to the part of the text with the richest memory.

Wardell (2004) explains that the evolution of church architecture has seen a shift from large ornate churches to smaller and less exhibitionistic designs. Churches built in Gothic and neo-Romanesque fashions typically emphasized verticality, with the nave, steeple or dome of the church extending as far skyward as possible. This not only made the church an easy landmark to locate from any part of town, but also impressed upon visitors a sense of diminution in the presence of the divine. Modern church buildings tend to be lower to the ground, with high ceilings and an abundance of natural light. Wardell argues that these characteristics serve to materialize the Christian ideals of simplicity and inwardness.

In his analysis of megachurches, Dickinson (2015) further explores the history of religious architecture. In Western culture, specifically, showy church designs were the result of a fusion with capitalistic ideals. Stained glass windows, ostentatious organs, and generally intricate architecture reflected the churches' attempts to remain relevant and meaningful as the world around them became increasingly enthralled with capitalism. Oddly, though, this same obsession is what eventually drove the churches back to simplicity. The modern church building "eschews more traditional church architectural forms for forms familiar to visitors from contemporary business architecture, including the mall and the office building" (p. 134). While this particular analysis is specific to megachurches, the shift toward a slightly more human-centered appearance has been seen in churches of all varieties, including the new church building and other structures around Gedächtniskirche. Dickinson argues that the use of a more comfortable or inviting

appearance is meant to imitate suburban landscapes, and to ultimately attract those who subscribe to a consumerist culture.

While many memorials rely heavily on the displays contained within the space to activate memory, the memory at Gedächtniskirche is equally present in the architecture of the site. The exterior architectures of both the old and new church building contain histories all their own, and the interior architecture of the old building influences the rhetorical experience of visitors to the Hall of Remembrance.

Ultimately, the architectural juxtapositions of Gedächtniskirche promote specific memories (the destruction of war) by drawing attention to the vehicles in which they are housed (the ruined spire). The architecture not only influences the vehicles of memory present at the site, it actually *is* a vehicle of memory itself. Few sites are so heavily defined by their architectural elements, and the competing aesthetics of the site showcase memory in a way that is specific to Gedächtniskirche.

Conclusion

After analyzing Gedächtniskirche through the juxtapositions that are salient to the rhetorical experience of the site, it is clear that it functions in ways that are remarkably unique. The site is obviously a place of public memory, and is widely recognized as functioning as such. While the space has had several distinct purposes over its lifetime, it has always been explicitly tied to memory in one way or another. In this sense, Gedächtniskirche is unlike any other memorial. The site is overflowing with memory, acting as a material representation of the past while also holding a memory all its own.

For better or for worse, World War II was a defining period (perhaps *the* defining period) in Berlin's history, and Gedächtniskirche stands as one of the city's most

prominent artifacts from the era. The memory of war and destruction is almost palpable, and the history and work behind the preservation of the site tells another emotionally charged story. Though visitors might not necessarily experience or agree upon the same memories of the site, all can agree that memory is overwhelmingly present throughout.

One of the most intriguing qualities of Gedächtniskirche is the shifting commemorative purposes of the site. Assuming the church building had never been damaged and was still standing in its original form today, it would still be functioning as a place of public memory, only with a much different purpose. The original building commemorated Prussian history and Wilhelm I, and if the entire text were still accessible, one could write a full-length rhetorical analysis on the memory of the church alone. However, this memory has been overpowered and diminished by the memories that are now popularly associated with the church building. This phenomenon is one that I would imagine is quite rare, but could make for an incredibly fascinating collection of analyses if one were able to locate enough texts with similar histories.

As an established place of memory, Gedächtniskirche also acts as a double coded text. Though this term is typically applied to reference dual meanings in works of art or literature, it also applies nicely when discussing the dual memories present at this particular place of memory, as evidenced above. Surely, Gedächtniskirche is far from being the only existing double coded place of memory. The concepts of double coding and memory just so happen to go well together, and it is my hope that future analyses will continue to explore this relationship.

Finally, Purdy's notion of mnemotope was expanded to include Gedächtniskirche, and could reasonably apply to any place of public memory. The mnemotope proved

especially useful in analyzing Gedächtniskirche's material representation of memories from distant pasts. This concept is the culmination of memory, materiality, and meaning, and is one that I believe warrants further investigation within memory studies. This essay has provided one example of how that might be done, but developing the concept even more could greatly benefit memory scholars.

My hope is that by introducing concepts from outside the field of public memory and amalgamating them with those from within the field, this essay might act as a starting point for their continued development. The relationship between the fields of rhetoric and memory is one that has been steadily evolving, and will continue to evolve. These fields already borrow from one another to some degree, and it is inevitable that rhetoricians and memory scholars will continue to borrow from other fields as well. In doing so, both the borrowing and the lending fields will benefit from the mutual development of concepts and ideas, ultimately resulting in more refined scholarship within all fields.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1937). *Forms of time and the chronotope in the novel*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. University of Texas Press.
- Basso, K. (1984). *Stalking with stories: Names, places and moral narratives among the western Apache. Text, Play and Story: The Construction and Reconstruction of Self and Society*. Washington: American Ethnological Society.
- Chandler, D. (2011). *A dictionary of media communication*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Crane, S. A. (1997a). Memory, distortion, and history in the museum. *History and Theory*, 36(4), 44-63.
- Crane, S. A. (1997b). Writing the individual back into collective memory. *The American Historical Review*, 102(5), 1372-1385.
- Dickinson, G. (2015). *Suburban dreams: Imagining the good life*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Dickinson, G., Blair, C., & Ott, B. (2010). *Places of public memory: The rhetoric of museums and memorials*. Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press.
- Dickinson, G., Ott, B. L., & Aoki, E. (2006). Spaces of remembering and forgetting: The reverent eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 27-47.
- Fonagy, I. (1971). Double coding in speech. *Semiotica*, 3(3), 189-222.
- Glaveanu, V. P. (2017). Collective memory between stability and change. *Culture & Psychology*, 23(2), 255-262.
- Gurler, E. E. & Ozer, B. (2013). The effects of public memorials on social memory and identity. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 82, 858-863.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hirst, W., Yamashiro, J. K., & Coman, A. (2018). Collective memory from a psychological perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 22(5), 438-451.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). *Language and poetics. Style in Language*. Cambridge, Mass.

- Jarzombek, M. (2004). Disguised visibilities. In E. Bástea (Ed.), *Memory and architecture* (49-78). Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Jencks, C. (1977). *The new paradigm in architecture*. England: Academy Editions.
- Kafalenos, E. (2003). The power of double coding to represent new forms of representation: The Truman Show, Dorian Gray, “Blow up,” and Whistler’s Caprice in Purple and Gold. *Poetics Today*, 24(1), 1-33.
- McCarthy, C. & Dimitriadis, G. (2000). Art and the postcolonial imagination: Rethinking the institutionalization of third world aesthetics and theory. *A Review of International English Literature*, 31(1&2).
- Middlebrook, M. (2010). *The Berlin raids*. South Yorkshire, England: Pen & Sword Aviation.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux des mémoire. *Representations*, 26, 7-24.
- Purdy, A. (2002). The bog body as mnemotope: Nationalist archaeologies in Heaney and Turner. *Style*, 36(1).
- Wardell, B. R. (2004). *A short history of church building*. Charlottesville, VA.
- White, M. (2011). *The great big book of horrible things*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Zielizer, B. (1995). Reading the past against the grain: The shape of memory studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12(2), 214-239.

CHAPTER III

MASCULINITY AND RHETORIC: VIRTUES OF THE IDEAL ORATOR

In January 2019, an advertisement released by Procter & Gamble to promote its line of Gillette shaving razors provoked national backlash when its message failed to land with some audiences. The advertisement addresses Gillette's predominantly male target market, drawing attention to the toxic male behaviors that have, to put it lightly, received criticism in recent years: sexual harassment, bullying, and general misogyny, to name a few. The ad ultimately calls on men to hold themselves and their peers accountable for such actions, and to be their best by showing empathy and intervening when a situation calls for it. Some applauded the company for shining a spotlight on these issues, yet others lambasted Gillette for implying that all men behave in such ways (Smith, 2019). The company has stood by the ad, saying that it was intended to start a conversation. And start a conversation it did.

While Smith's article suggests Gillette's advertisement was clearly divisive, it did not mark the first time that masculine behavior has come under scrutiny. Organizations such as The Representation Project and A Call to Men have drawn attention to toxic masculinity using such strategies as documentaries, social media campaigns, and even traveling conventions. Other organizations have focused on raising the standards for men in more specific arenas. The Inside Out Initiative, for example, asks sports coaches to hold their players to an ethical code of conduct, and Promise Keepers organization has been helping men better fulfill their familial roles since the 1990s (Heath, 2003). Perhaps the most significant initiative in recent years, though, lies in the #MeToo movement,

which has brought toxic masculinity into a more public spotlight by exposing the sexually predatory behaviors of Hollywood celebrities.

While it is certainly not the case that all men are inherently problematic, or that it is exclusively men who are capable of exhibiting toxic behaviors, it is clear that masculine practices have become a hot button issue. Though an ideal examination of this topic would unpack and resolve all of the issues pertaining to masculine behaviors, such a task is not achievable in one essay, if at all. As noted, the influences of masculinity have been explored in many capacities. Foss & Griffin (1995) isolate the negative influences of masculinity to the development and study of rhetoric. Though rhetoric is often perceived as being synonymous with persuasion, this viewpoint ascribes to rhetoric an inherent patriarchal bias. Persuasion, they argue, is based largely on masculine values. As the authors put it, “the value of the self for rhetors in this rhetorical system comes from the rhetor’s ability to demonstrate superior knowledge, skill, and qualifications—in other words, authority—in order to dominate the perspectives and knowledge of those in their audiences” (p. 3). Inherent to this argument are the masculine values of dominance, control, and authority. Although the potential for resistance is more present in persuasion than in physical dominance, both methods serve as means for imposing the authority figure’s will on those whom he or she makes subject to said authority.

Foss & Griffin argue that the problem with persuasion (and by common association, rhetoric) lies in the undesirable masculine qualities inherent to the practice. But how did these qualities come to influence rhetoric in the first place? Examining the conditions under which rhetoric was created is a necessary starting point in beginning to answer this question. To that end, I contend that the gendered sociocultural values of

ancient Greece dictated not only the construction of gender performance, but also the performance of rhetoric as oratory. Further, I argue that, while Foss & Griffin are correct in citing Greek masculine ideologies as the driving force behind persuasion and rhetoric, their discussion lacks acknowledgement of the virtues from which these masculine ideals were derived. To begin, I will provide a brief history of masculine practices as a whole before investigating those practices that were specific to ancient Greece. In doing so, I will explore the sociocultural roots of these practices, specifically with regard to Greek virtues. Next, I will examine the emergence of rhetoric as a result of the very same system of values. Finally, I will revisit the argument posed by Foss & Griffin, drawing once again from the ancient Greeks in order to assess the genesis of this problem.

Throughout this paper, I commonly refer to masculinity as a “performance.” This is not to suggest that the actor is pretending to be masculine when he in fact is not, but rather to emphasize the necessary outward demonstration of gender. As I explain, many aspects of gender were judged based on a man’s actions, requiring that he act or “perform” in line with what was expected of him.

Global Masculinity: A Long History in Brief

Masculine practices have been documented as far back as ancient Egypt. According to Matic (2016), Egyptians closely associated masculinity with beauty. The masculine form was seen as beautiful in and of itself, but men also had very high beauty standards in relation what is typically considered the norm for masculine beauty in other societies and civilizations throughout history. It was common for men to wear cosmetics in order to improve their outward appearance, and it was tradition for elite men to be buried with various beauty products instead of jewelry or other treasures. Although most

would likely agree that the Egyptian civilization was historically significant, many of their sociocultural practices, particularly those pertaining to gender, failed to extend beyond the boundaries (both geographic and temporal) of ancient Egyptian society (Matic, 2016).

Jumping forward in time to ancient Greece, we begin to see the advent of gender performances similar to those in place today. Connell (1995) posits that Greek society (via the Roman Empire) laid the foundation for patriarchal and masculine practices that would eventually come to characterize Western ideology. Seeing as many Roman values and practices stemmed from those of the ancient Greeks (Bang, 2015), Greece is credited as the birthplace of these values.

The expansion of the Roman Empire served as a conduit for the patriarchy, and subsequently, masculine gender norms (Connell, 1995). The role of soldier was limited to men, making conquest a man's job by association. As Roman soldiers began to dominate foreign lands, so too did their beliefs and ideologies. In fact, the value of conquest itself was engrained into the lands that Rome would come to dominate. This trend continued well beyond the Roman Empire, with many European nations spreading similar gendered practices through conquest.

Looking again to ancient Greece as the site of origin for many of these values, I focus specifically on those related to the performance of masculinity. As I make clear throughout my analysis, the values of masculinity influenced nearly all other social aspects of a man's life in ancient Greece. It should come as no surprise, then, that the values of rhetoric align closely, and sometimes even coincide, with those of masculinity. It is therefore imperative that from the ancient Greek and Roman perspectives, one who

hopes to understand the qualities of a good orator must first understand the qualities of a good man. As such, I will use the following section to explore the values (and in many cases, virtues) that defined masculinity for the Greeks.

The Virtuous Man

In his book documenting Greek masculinity, Joseph Roisman (2005) begins by drawing attention to several contextual factors that played a role in setting gender norms. He explains that, in accordance with their antithetical views, the Greeks defined gender relationally, seeing masculine as the opposite of feminine. Strangely, though, masculinity was rarely measured in relation to femininity. Even when attacking one's character, it was more common to make him out to be a bad man as opposed to an effeminate one.

Rather, the performance of one's masculinity was measured against the performance of other men in the community (Roisman, 2005). This standard was especially important for men who were considered to be in their prime, generally between the ages of 30 and 60. While young men could begin attending assemblies as soon as they became legally independent at the age of 18, it was not until they turned 30 that they were allowed any form of decision-making power. Still, these men were under close surveillance by the older men of the community, and were expected to adhere to the same masculine standards as the "true" men. As Roisman explains, "the standards of manhood were demanding and encompassed almost all aspects of behavior" (p. 9).

The notions of *masculinity* and *maleness*, both in the ancient world and the contemporary one, are oftentimes conflated, or viewed as more or less synonymous. Though the performance of masculinity was not (and is not) exclusive to males, women who behaved in masculine ways were labeled as abnormal, or even appalling (Marchal,

2014). Throughout this essay, many uses of the term “man” could be more aptly replaced with “masculine performer,” but I will use the former in the interest of space. That being said, conceptions of masculinity in ancient Greece were different than they are today, as was masculinity’s relation to maleness. Marchal (2014) emphasizes some of the ways in which the two terms were distinguished, specifically through certain practices of ancient Corinthians. As he explains, it was not uncommon for Corinthians to step outside of expected gender norms, as evidenced by the practices and dress of lesbians, transgender individuals, and drag kings. Corinthian women sometimes partook in masculine practices, though this was often seen as unnatural. Marchal makes the claim that “to resist the social and cultural oppression based upon sex, one needs to get outside the categories of sex” (p. 104). This was most easily seen in the practices of lesbian women, as they were categorized neither as men nor as typical women.

Likewise, the practices of Corinthian drag kings challenged gender roles by “revealing differences from and dissonances within various gender and sexual norms” (Marchal, 2014, p. 103). Though this performance of masculinity was different from the virtuous masculinity that is often associated with ancient Greece, it serves to separate what is masculine from what is male. This distinction will be revisited below, as it is one that plays a fundamental role in discussing masculinity as it has existed throughout history.

Masculinity and its associated values were deeply rooted within the culture of ancient Greece. Jones (2012) speaks to the importance of two Greek virtues known as *andreia* and *paideia*, both of which are associated with the performance of masculinity. *Andreia* is recognized as one of the four cardinal virtues of ancient Greece, and is loosely

translated as “manly courage” (Roisman, 2005). Those who demonstrate *andreia* are bold enough to speak up for their beliefs, while also respecting those around them. *Andreia* also places a heavy focus on the outward performance of masculinity, and embodies the Greeks’ notions of what makes a good man (Jones, 2012).

Paideia, on the other hand, was “a lifelong process containing both socio-political and moral dimensions and demanding to be fostered both publicly and privately” (Jones, 2012, p. 146). This was linked to a man’s upbringing, and could be taught both formally and informally. Men in Greece were expected to be well educated, and the “ideal” citizen was one who clearly exemplified *paideia*. The notion of education within the society of ancient Greece was slightly different from contemporary conceptions, as the Greeks valued gymnastics and sport more than most modern schools do. *Paideia* therefore included the mastery of both academic and physical pursuits. Ideal citizens (in this case, men) were supposed to be physically mature in appearance, while also possessing the knowledge and cultural training to act as effective members of the polis. Roisman (2005) notes that *paideia* was also tied to a man’s sense of morals, and that those who acted according to a strong moral code were viewed as exemplary men. Lastly, *paideia* was closely tied to the virtue of *arête*. This connection is significant when comparing the virtues of masculinity with those of rhetoric, as will be explained in the following section. As Jones (2012) notes, masculinity was something performed both in public and in private settings, meaning it was constant and ongoing.

With both *andreia* and *paideia*, as was the case with all things virtuous in ancient Greece, the key was in finding what Aristotle referred to as “the golden mean.” Each of the four virtues represents a perfect and desirable balance between two opposing ends of

a spectrum. In the case of *andreia*, it lies between cowardice and recklessness. In book II of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle specifies that not all virtues are an exact midway point on their respective spectrums, stating “to the mean in some cases the deficiency, in some the excess is more opposed” (II, 8). Continuing with the example of *andreia*, it was believed to be much closer to rashness than it was to cowardice. The ideal man was one who displayed this golden mean of each of the virtues.

Another defining virtue tied to masculinity was that of temperance, or what Roisman (2005) refers to as *sōphrosunē*. This referred to moderation and one’s ability to demonstrate self-restraint, whether it be holding oneself back from violence, or refraining from overindulgence. Once more turning to book II of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, temperance is seen as the mean between pleasures and pains, with excess pleasure being connected to self-indulgence (II, 7). Those who lacked the willpower to resist the appeal of desire were seen as weak, and therefore less masculine. Roisman describes the bad or wicked man as one who “gave way to pleasures or any desires that a man was supposed to control, which often led to sexual misconduct, wasting of resources, violence, or other forms of wrongdoing” (p. 7). Halperin (2002) posits that men who overindulged in sexual pleasure were often seen as feminine, even going so far as to say that the inability to resist such pleasure was a distinguishing characteristic between men who were simply effeminate and men who were “inverts.” Both types of men were viewed as lacking masculinity, but while the former was simply “soft” in displaying his masculinity, the latter was passive to the extent that he preferred to submit himself sexually to other men. While this may be a rather extreme example, it is one that shows the negative

consequences associated with straying too far away from the perceived “golden mean” of the virtues.

Catano (1990), in his discussion of self-making, suggests that four additional virtues, although not considered to be cardinal virtues, also played a part in defining masculinity. Initiative, honesty, perseverance, and loyalty were all tied to a man’s ability to make his own destiny, which was in turn tied to the performance of masculinity. Of all the Greek masculine ideals discussed in this essay, self-making may be the most enduring and prominent in today’s society. Self-making was heavily dependent on aggression and self-reliance, both of which are viewed as highly masculine traits today (Bem, 1974).

Even further, Catano argues that, because of the relationship between self-making and masculinity, men who were not seen as self-made were also not seen as masculine. Self-making required rejection of the feminine. As a result, men who did not appear to be self-made were often viewed as feminine. Though self-making was not exclusive to men, per se, it was rare that a woman would explicitly reject the feminine or exercise a high degree of independence.

One aspect of masculinity that was essentially synonymous with maleness in ancient Greece was that of being well educated (Jones, 2012). As discussed earlier, possessing and demonstrating educatedness played a large part in performing masculinity. The relationship between education and masculinity worked in the opposite direction as well, as those who took on the role of a teacher were expected to behave in masculine ways. Since education was only afforded to males, it was not something that females could “perform,” for lack of a better term, even if they wanted to. On the subject

of education, Peers (2006) states “sexual difference was absent because women were absent” (p. 200).

Looking again to Halperin’s breakdown of gender and sexuality in ancient Greece, the relationship between teacher and student was occasionally pederastic in nature. This intuitively might sound contradictory, as being masculine required being educated, but submitting oneself was seen as radically feminine. The difference here is that boys, in this instance, were not making the choice to submit themselves for pleasure. Whereas inverts actively desired to be penetrated, boys involved in pederastic interaction were “more or less willing objects of adult male desire” (p. 122). Since the motivation to submit oneself was not derived from arousal, pederasty was not viewed in the same light as inversion.

Upon reaching adulthood, men typically took on multiple roles including husband, father, son, master, statesman and citizen, all of which required education to varying degrees if they were to be properly fulfilled. In all cases, a man was expected to display his masculinity. In Athens, specifically, the construction of masculine gender norms centered heavily on a man’s speaking ability (Roisman, 2005). Masculinity was viewed as a tool of sorts, meaning that displaying it effectively was greatly beneficial to one’s social standing, whereas lacking masculinity or displaying it incorrectly was detrimental.

Masculine virtues were learned in part through teachings and social interaction, but were also apparent in literary works of the time. The occupation of poet was one that only men held in ancient Greece, which means that literature from the time was produced exclusively by males (Keith, 2000). The performance of masculinity was embodied in

many texts, especially in epics. Epic heroes were often depicted as hyper-masculine, though the ways in which they learned to become so masculine reflected the actual practices of ancient Greeks. For example, in the *Illiad*, Achilles is told by his father that a man should always be the best and be above others, and is told to follow in the footsteps of another hero as a guide to his own conduct. In *The Odyssey*, Telemachus receives similar instructions from his tutors, who “train” him to act masculinely. Exemplary of the central role that Homeric epics played in Greek culture, heroes in these stories represented ideals of masculinity (Keith, 2000). They were a model to be imitated. Students oftentimes went so far as to identify with (or even *as*) versions of heroes such as Achilles or Odysseus while learning the material.

The male hero was considered to be masculine to a degree that the average man could not possibly match (Fowler, 2004). The heroes of Greek epics were exemplary displays of virtue, thereby making them exemplary displays of masculinity. Fowler emphasizes this in saying “the key to understanding the heroic personality is its extreme level of male energy” (p. 80). He warns, however, that this overflowing energy also makes heroes (or any man imitating a hero) susceptible to extreme anger, passion, or recklessness. Viewing epic heroes as models of ideal (albeit unattainable) masculinity gave Greek men a “goal,” of sorts to strive for.

The expectations pertaining to gender (particularly masculinity) in ancient Greece were monitored and reinforced through a variety of cultural practices and products. In many cases, these gender ideologies were linked directly to virtue. This is a significant relationship, and one that influenced many other facets of Greek life. As the next section

will explore, the role of orator was linked to many of the same virtues as masculinity, an occurrence that I argue is no coincidence.

The Ideal Orator

While masculine reputation relied on perpetual performance within all spheres of life, the performance of rhetoric as oratory was generally limited to a more tangible stage. Given its particular significance in Athens, Hansen (1987) looks specifically to the Athenian Assembly and Athenian courts as two important settings for oratory. Orators would sometimes speak in front of crowds comprised of more than 6000 other men. It was therefore imperative that orators were well practiced, and able to demonstrate the highly valued masculine virtues described above. Men could not even attend these events before the age of 18, and could not participate in any capacity before 30.

In order to train and prepare for participation in court or assembly, young men would enroll in the institution of the *ephēbia* (Roisman, 2005). This was a form of military service for men between the ages of 18 and 20, but also emphasized civic and religious virtues including competitiveness, conformity, discipline, and obedience. In Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (Book II, Chapter 12), he characterizes young men as being fickle, quick-tempered, and lacking the willpower to resist desire (1389a-1389b). While they do show courage and an appreciation for honor, it is often in excess. Roisman adds that young men were generally perceived as aggressive, disrespectful, and thoughtless. In addition to correcting these attitudes in preparation for civic engagement, *ephēbia* was intended to keep young men out of trouble by placing them under the supervision of more mature adults.

Roisman also explains that young men also learned the virtues desired in an orator through observation. This not only entailed attending assembly and trials, but also took place informally through interactions with older males. Adults acted as role models for the young, and took it upon themselves to supervise their actions. Because each party was watching the other intently, men both young and old knew better than to step out of line in the presence of other men. Although any adult male could reprimand a younger one regardless of the relationship between the two, this power was rarely exercised. Because correcting a man's behavior in public could be damaging to his reputation, the older males would often refrain from doing so under the assumption that a young man would recognize his own mistakes.

In addition to the education received through the *ephēbia*, males were educated specifically in the art of rhetoric through a series of exercises known as *progymnasmata* (Penella, 2011). Starting as early as the age of 12, boys could begin these exercises, which began with basic reading and writing. In the second stage, boys would read and analyze poetic texts including those of Homer, Hesiod, and Euripides. In the third and final stage, reading was focused on the works of famous orators, with the additional task of composing and delivering prose pieces. This phase ended with a declamation, which was an oration on a hypothetical or imaginary theme (Penella, 2011). Upon successfully demonstrating the skills they had obtained through the *progymnasmata*, this phase of training was complete.

Training, in both a formal and informal capacity, continued until the community judged a man as being both mature and educated enough to participate in civic affairs. A man was typically deemed mature when he was able to show mastery of the virtues

taught in the *ephēbia* (Kleijwegt, 1991). Additionally, the virtues of self-restraint, *sōphrosunē* (temperance), respect, and cooperation all played a part in judging a man's maturity. Taking all these virtues into account, the ideal orator was a shining example of *arête*. As briefly mentioned above, *arête* is also tied to the performance of masculinity. This virtue, however, was not as easily displayed as others.

While there is not a direct translation to English, *arête* generally encompasses all facets of excellence. Hawhee (2004) explains that *arête* was tied to goodness, glory, prowess, courage, *timē* (honor), and *philotimia* (love of honor). This was not a personality trait in the sense that an individual either did or did not "have" *arête*, though. *Arête* was measured as the sum of one's entire reputation. It relied on the acknowledgment of the community, and was achieved through constant and repeated behavior. Hawhee (2002) describes *arête* in saying that "one cannot just *be* virtuous, one must *become* virtuosity by performing and hence embodying virtuous actions in public" (p. 187). She uses Achilles as a prime example of *arête*, as he was both brilliant in battle and destined for glory.

While *arête* was undoubtedly tied closely to one's performance of masculinity, it was also an essential virtue for the ideal orator to master. In fact, Hawhee (2002) cites *arête* as a foundational virtue in the art of rhetoric. As mentioned, *Arête* was often, though not exclusively, associated with war or battle. According to Hawhee, this association largely influenced the development of rhetoric as a "battle" in its own right. As Foss & Griffin pointed out, the goal of the rhetor is to ultimately dominate his opponent through persuasion. Even Plato, in *The Sophist*, referred to the typical sophist as "an athlete in the contest of words" (231e). *Arête*, therefore, is a prime example of a trait

that was highly valued in both masculine practices and in rhetoric, suggesting that a man could only be his best if he was able to overcome and dominate his opponent when “battle” called. Looking again to Plato, let the significance not be lost on us that *Gorgias*, a dialogue exploring the nature of rhetoric, opens with the following line: “in war and battle, they say, one must partake in this manner...” (447a).

Arête, while highly regarded amongst the virtues, is derived from an even grander value, and one that fueled many aspects of Greek life: agonism. Hawhee (2004) describes agonism in great detail in her book *Bodily Arts*, crediting it as a driving force of war, philosophy, religion, art, and politics in ancient Greece. Given its connection to *arête*, agonism was most easily seen in war or in physical contests. But, just as with *arête*, Hawhee argues that the Greeks’ infatuation with agonism also played a crucial role in the emergence of rhetoric. She echoes Foss & Griffin in recognizing persuasion as a battle for control, only using words in place of weapons.

Poulakos (1995) explains that part of agonism’s appeal stems from *athlios*. *Athlios* refers to the “prize” or reward that one gets from victory. This prize need not be tangible, as the victory itself is often its own reward. In fact, the appeal of *athlios* is not even exclusive to competitors in an agonistic encounter. Audiences, too, are intrigued by the prospect of victory, even if the victory is not their own.

A secondary, and perhaps more important appeal of agonism lies in the *agôn*, or the gathering itself (Hawhee, 2002). Though the allure of victory surely plays a large part in justifying the gathering, competition alone has a certain appeal to it that draws audiences. The Greeks were especially fond of competition, hence agonism’s central role in virtually all arenas of ancient Greek society (Daqing, 2010). In both athletic and

rhetorical competitions, agonism intrigues and ultimately rewards audience members. Consider, for example, any of the Pan-Hellenic games. Amongst them, the Olympic Games are probably the most famous and most obvious example of *agôn*. However, other games such as the Pythian Games, Nemean Games, and Isthmian Games explicitly incorporated oratorical events as part of the competition (Daqing, 2010). In addition to the Pan-Hellenic games, in which competitors from any Greek polis could participate, communities held numerous local competitions featuring events of all varieties.

While agonistic competition was not exactly exclusive to ancient Greece, Daqing (2010) credits the Greek obsession with *philotimia* (love of honor) as the driving force behind their fixation on *agôn*. Though the majority of competitions (whether physical, oratorical, musical, or otherwise) typically afforded the victor some sort of tangible reward, the much more respected prize was that of honor. Olympic events, for instance, only recognized the first place finisher. There was no reward for participation, and to lose was shameful. This served to reify the masculine virtue of *timê* (honor), with victors often gaining significant prestige upon their return home. Because it is intrinsically linked to both practices, *agôn* (and consequently, agonism) represents a highly significant intersection of masculine and oratorical values.

Daqing also notes the link between *agôn* and religion, as competitions were typically held to honor or worship a god. In the case of Athens, this god was Athena, who was believed to be the city's protector (Prior, 1991). Seeing as Athens was the birthplace of rhetoric, it is no surprise that the art developed as an innately agonistic practice. In fact, Athena's influence can be seen in many of the virtues and values discussed thus far. As the goddess of war and battle, her connections to *agôn* and *arête* are explicit. She was

believed to have personally intervened in order to determine the outcomes of Greece's war with the Trojans, blessing mortal warriors and even joining the battle herself whenever she could (Hall, 1997). Even at the time she was born, springing from Zeus's head, she was a fully formed warrior, outfitted with armor and a javelin.

Beyond *agôn* and *arête*, Athena was the source of many other Greek (and particularly, Athenian) values. As counterintuitive as it may seem to derive masculine values from a female deity, Hall argues that the myths surrounding the goddess acted to “draw people together in shared experience, to reinforce agreement about the meaning of events, and to transmit a sense of identity and group membership from generation to generation” (p. 224). Though she was female, the other gods viewed Athena as more masculine than feminine; easily the most masculine of the goddesses (Hall, 1997). The values of Athena became embedded in Athenians' sense of identity, ultimately manifesting themselves in the city's cultural products including religion, gender, politics, and rhetoric. Rhetoric was a product of Athens, which was itself a product of Athena.

The values that permeated Greek culture had an undeniable impact on the lives of Greek citizens. The Greeks employed very particular and intentional methods to ensure that their (male) youth would become capable members of society. Boys were conditioned to conform to masculine ideologies that would eventually make them more effective orators. The virtues emphasized through this form of rearing, combined with the Greeks' penchant for agonism, ultimately served as the clay from which the art of rhetoric was molded. That the Greeks (especially the Athenians) were so meticulous in training and preparing men in oratory speaks on its own to the importance of the art.

Although men held many titles, the role of orator stood out as an exceptionally significant one.

Conclusion

As has been made clear, the Greeks held their virtues in very high regard. It was this set of virtues that governed virtually all aspects of Greek life, ranging from religion to education to art and even war. Men were expected to enact these virtues in all spheres, not the least of which included oratory performance. The judgment of oratorical competence necessarily took into account a man's masculine identity, as the two were inextricably intertwined. Succeeding as a man was a prerequisite to succeeding as an orator, and each served to reinforce the other. While some values and virtues were deemed more important to one's masculine character than to his character as an orator, and vice versa, the two were evaluated based largely on the same criteria.

It is no coincidence that both war and oratory were limited mostly to men in ancient Greece (and in subsequent civilizations for many centuries). It should therefore come as no surprise that the values of one are manifest in the other. As an art constructed by men (who embodied masculine ideals), it makes sense that rhetoric would serve to fortify masculine values, and vice versa. This mutually reinforcing relationship was allowed to go unchecked for centuries during a time when the overwhelming majority of orators were men. Masculinity became engrained in the art of rhetoric to the point that it was so commonplace as to be rendered effectively invisible.

Recently (in relation to the life span of rhetoric), feminist scholars such as Foss & Griffin have drawn attention to this relationship. Though the art of rhetoric undoubtedly has a certain degree of masculinity inherent to it, it is not masculinity itself that poses the

problem. The problem, rather, lies in the lack of *sōphrosunē*, or self-restraint. Those engaged in persuasion often fail to resist the appeal of *athlios* (the prize of victory), resulting in an imbalance of virtue. As Aristotle notes in his discussion of the golden mean, any virtue can be toxic when imbalanced.

Although masculine ideologies played an undeniably fundamental role in the emergence of rhetoric, it is not the case that rhetoric necessarily depends on these ideologies. Foss & Griffin opened this discussion with their proposal for an invitational rhetoric, and it has gained significant traction in the two decades since. While extracting the masculine influence from rhetoric entirely is likely an impossible task, progress can be (and has been) made. Understanding the innate link between the art of rhetoric and masculine gender ideologies is a necessary first step in producing Foss & Griffin's invitational rhetoric.

References

- Bang, P. F. (2015). Platonism: Ernest Gellner, Greco-Roman society and the comparative study of the pre-modern world. *Thesis Eleven*, 128(1), 56-71.
- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42(2) 155-162.
- Catano, J. (1990). The rhetoric of masculinity: Origins, institutions, and the myth of the self-made man. *College English*, 52(4), 421-436.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Daqing, W. (2010). On the ancient Greek agon. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Studies*, 2, 6805-6812.
- Foss, S. K. & Griffin, C. L. (1995). Beyond persuasion: A proposal for an invitational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 62(1), 2-18.
- Fowler, R. (2004). *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge University Press
- Hall, L. (1997). *Athena: A biography*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Halperin, D. (2002). *How to do the History of Homoerosexuality*. Chicago, Ill: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hansen, M. H. (1987). *The Athenian assembly in the age of Demosthenes*. Oxford.
- Hawhee, D. (2002) Agonism and arête. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 35(3), 185-207.
- Hawhee, D. (2004) *Bodily arts*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press
- Heath, M. (2003). Soft-boiled masculinity: Renegotiating gender and racial ideologies in the Promise Keeper's Movement. *Gender & Society*, 17(3), 423-444.
- Jones, M. (2012). *Playing the man. Performing masculinities in the ancient Greek novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keith, A.M. (2000). *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kleijwegt, M. (1991). *Ancient youth: The ambiguity of youth and the absence of adolescence in Greco-Roman society*. Amsterdam

- Marchal, J.A. (2014). Female masculinity in Corinth?: Bodily citations and the drag of history. *Neotestimantica*, 48, 93-113.
- Matic, U. (2016). Gender in ancient Egypt: Norms, ambiguities, and sensualities. *Near Eastern Archaeology*, 174-183.
- Peers, C. (2006). What does a pedagogue look like? Masculinity and the repression of sexual difference in ancient education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 27, 189-208.
- Penella, R. J. (2011). The progymnasmata in imperial Greek education. *The Classical World*, 105(1), 77-90.
- Prior, W. (1991). *Virtue and knowledge: An introduction to ancient greek ethics*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Poulakos, J. (1995). Sophistic rhetoric in classical Greece. *Studies in Rhetoric/Communication*.
- Roisman, J. (2005). *The Rhetoric of Manhood: Masculinity in the Attic Orators*. University of California Press.
- Smith, T. (2019). Backlash erupts after Gillette launches a new #MeToo movement ad campaign. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2019/01/17/685976624/backlash-erupts-after-gillette-launches-a-new-metoo-inspired-ad-campaign>
- Walters, J. (1993). No more than a boy: The shifting construction of masculinity from ancient Greece to the middle ages. *Gender & History*. (5)1, 20-33.