



The Rhetoric of Mark Anthony

Godday Eronmonsele Ehimen ¹, Divine Ogede ²

¹M. A. English and Literature, University of Benin

²M. A. English and Literature, University of Benin (in view)

ABSTRACT

This paper examined the speech of Mark Anthony at Caesar's funeral. It answered the following questions: (i) Is the speech actually rhetoric? (ii) What make(s) it rhetoric? (iii) What are the devices that aid the speaker? (iv) What effect does the speech make on the audience? To answer these questions, a rhetorical analysis of the speech has been done in line with the three appeals of rhetoric according to Aristotle. The data used from the primary text, *Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare in Act 3 Scene 2. Other data used include materials from the internet, library and group discussions. In the course of this research, we found out that, in a moment of grief, flattery can be effective; that a bad situation, if well managed, can be turned into a good one, and that the power of life and death lies in the tongue. We also found out that one can possibly make friends and supporters from one's perceived enemies or opponents when the appropriate tools are in place, that not all who bear the name honourable are honourable indeed; that a true friend is one who stands by the truth and defends his/her friend. We learnt that diligence pays; the opposite is disastrous, and that the manner in which one goes about one's mission can also determine results. The conclusion is that the study of Mark Anthony's oratory is a worthwhile endeavour. Its strength lies in its simplicity. While one may endeavour to undertake a rhetorical analysis of any speech for leisure, the study of Mark Anthony's speech will not only serve recreational purpose, but will also broaden one's horizon of thinking. This speech does not only show us that words can be manipulated for aesthetics, it also shows us that the powers of death and life lie in the tongue. Also, the use of valid arguments through rhetoric has been proven by Mark Anthony to be a successful weapon for achieving one's desire.

Key Words: Rhetoric, Mark Anthony, Julius Caesar, William Shakespeare

1.1 Introduction

This paper examines the speech of Mark Anthony at Caesar's funeral, in Act 3 Scene 2 of *Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare. The purpose is to examine the speech as a piece of rhetoric, the appeals of rhetoric it uses, and the literary devices that aid the use of these appeals. It also measures the effect(s) it has on the audience.

1.2 Methodology

This paper adopts the qualitative research method. The data used are from the primary text, *Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare. Other data used include materials from the internet, library and group discussions. Standard textual analysis (analysis using the appeals of rhetoric according to Aristotle) of the speech is made with separate sections on ethos, logos, and pathos.

1.3 Background of Study

1.3.1 The Character of Mark Antony

Mark Antony is both a historic and a literary character. But for the purpose of this paper, we shall focus on the literary character. Mark Antony is one of the leading characters in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. He is a friend as well as a relative to Caesar, relating to him through his mother. He is a close associate of Caesar's and holds him in high esteem and love. The first time we encounter Mark Antony is in Act 1, scene II, as he reveals his readiness to carry out the biddings of Julius Caesar. He says, "When Caesar says this do this, it is performed" (9). This statement, in a way, tells us about the character of Caesar as well as his authority and whatever he says is done. We see this manifest when Flavius and Marcellus are put to "silence" because they undress the status of Caesar.

Mark Antony is a skilled soldier as well as a Consul. He is also a politician and an Orator. However, he does not agree that he has the suit for rhetoric. Even after successfully inciting the people he still says, "I am no Orator, as Brutus is" (155). Mark Antony is a good manipulator. After the death of Caesar, he claims allegiance to Brutus and his fellow conspirators, although Cassius never trusts him. He tells them that he respects and supports them

and even asks them to shake hands with him: "Let each man render me his bloody hand" (125). With this, he gets their trust and he is allowed to deliver a speech at Caesar's funeral. The speech he delivers is considered one of the best speeches ever made. It successfully turns the audience against the conspirators.

The character of Mark Antony, in so many ways, contrasts that of many in the play. For example, where Brutus is facile and gullible, he remains firm and calculative. Brutus easily trusts people but Mark Antony looks beyond outward appearance. He reads the minds of people and knows what they are capable of. Also, unlike Julius Caesar who believes he is indestructible, Mark Antony runs away from the Capitol, and then sends his servant to go and enquire from Brutus if he is allowed to come before them. All through the play, Mark Antony proves to be a strong and sensible character that succeeds in all his ways.

1.3.2 The Character of Julius Caesar

Julius Caesar was murdered on March 1544 BC historically speaking. But as a literary character, Julius Caesar is killed on the Ides of March at the Capitol, a day he is supposed to be crowned the king of Rome. He is an army general who has recorded mountains of victories. He is a close friend of Brutus as well as Mark Antony. He is the husband of Calpurnia, but they have no child. We encounter him first in Act 1 scene II on his triumphal return from the war against the sons of Pompey. The people take to the streets to celebrate him. As a believer of traditions and superstitions, we see him telling Mark Antony to touch Calpurnia to make her fertile. For "our elders say, the barren touched in this holy chase shake off their sterile curse." (9)

Julius Caesar is no doubt the greatest person in Rome. He is perceived to be a tyrant, and this necessitates the conspiracy against him. He believes he is indestructible. He sees himself as a demigod, which is why he goes against all the warnings he gets not to go to the Capitol on the Ides of March. When his wife, Calpurnia, tells him of the bad dream she had about him, he merely replies, "Caesar is more dangerous" than the danger, that when the things that threaten him see his face, "they are vanished." Julius Caesar is a typical Shakespearean tragic hero endowed with hubris. His pride is what causes his downfall. He so much believes in his infallibility, contrary to the opinion Cassius holds of him. Cassius sees him as a common man born the same way he is. He even observes the occasions where Caesar demonstrates this. Caesar has once caught a fever. He has also been on the verge of drowning and had to call Cassius for help. But the question of Caesar's immortality is debatable as we see Brutus confessing, "O Julius Caesar, thou art mighty yet, thy spirit walks abroad, and turns our swords in our own proper contrails!" (241) Brutus holds Caesar's spirit responsible for the death of his friends and soldiers. Even after death, Caesar seems to be alive, taking part in the affairs of men. The death of Julius Caesar leads to a civil war in Rome, and subsequently paves way for Mark Antony to be the ruler of Rome. From the foregoing, it is safe to say that Caesar orchestrates his death.

This background has thus shown us who Mark Antony is and also who is Caesar. A juxtaposition of the two characters shows that there are a lot of differences between them, and the death of Caesar paves way for Mark Antony to display his power of oratory. This background, especially the revelation of the character of Julius Caesar, serves as a backbone to the speech of Mark Antony. All the good qualities of Julius Caesar are what form the judgment of Mark Antony and thus give credence to his speech. Also, the character traits of Mark Antony, which serve as his ethos help strengthen his speech by establishing his credibility before his audience. The death of Caesar and his subsequent funeral ceremony is the occasion for Mark Antony's speech.

1.4 Theoretical Background

The paper adopts the Concept of Rhetoric according to Aristotle as its theoretical framework. Aristotle, a Greek philosopher and polymath, defined rhetoric as the art of persuasion. According to Aristotle, rhetoric is the ability to discover the available means of persuasion in any given situation and according to David Jasper, "rhetoric is concerned with persuasion, power and authority" (17). However, Anthony C. Winkler and J.O Ray, M' Cuen see rhetoric as "the art of putting one's case in the strongest and best possible way" (4). One thing that can be deduced from these definitions is that rhetoric involves persuasion, making one's case believable. It involves a systematic laying of facts in support of an argument. Rhetoric is an act of winning over an audience.

The origin of rhetoric according to James L. Golden et al, "is the ancient Greeks. For they were the first Westerners to systematically write down recommendations for making speech persuasive to others" (4). Rhetoric can both be written and spoken, but the most important thing is the effectiveness, as Anthony C. Winkler and Joy Ray, M' Cuen observe: "Judging the effectiveness of a work is, in fact, the chief business of rhetoric" (5).

There is a difference between rhetoric and grammar. Grammar, as Anthony C. Winkler and Jo Ray M' Cuen tell us is concerned with the rightness or wrongness of language use, but rhetoric concerns itself with the effectiveness. "While grammar may speak in terms of standards, rhetoric speaks only in terms of effectiveness. (5) A grammarian will tell you how to arrange words, phrases and clauses but a rhetorician preaches effectiveness. He asks, "Does the speech achieve its purpose? Did your audience believe you?"

Although Gorgias agrees that rhetoric is concerned with speech, not every speech can be adjudged a piece of rhetoric. A speech has to possess the quality of effectiveness for it to qualify as a piece of rhetoric. There is no boundary as to where rhetoric is used or who uses it. In the words of Anthony C. Winkler and Jo Ray, M' Cuen, "Rhetoric is involved in every situation in which communication takes place." (4) Also, everybody in the society makes use of rhetoric. "Advertisers use the principles of rhetoric to sell products, politicians to win votes; and parents, to scold children", opined Anthony C. Winkler and Joy Ray, M' Cuen.

There is practically nothing we do as humans that does not involve rhetoric. That is why the study of rhetoric is of paramount importance to scholars in the society. Even from the ancient Greek where it originated, rhetoric was never overlooked. This was observed by Daniel N. Erickson, "Rhetoric was an

important part of Greco Roman education, for it enables politicians and others who spoke in public to persuade their audience in an efficient and effective manner” (1). It is in this same light that Plato wrote, *Gorgias*, where he got Gorgias, Socrates, Polus, etc, air their view on rhetoric. In the *Gorgias*, as Daniel N Erickson reports, Socrates engaged Gorgias, Polus, etc on a discussion on rhetoric. As the discussion progresses, Gorgias reveals that rhetoric is for the greatest of human affairs... the best,” (2) which means rhetoric is for the good of the society. But Plato and Daniel Jasper do not agree with this as they believe that it can be used to manipulate the society. Daniel Jasper says, “Never far away is the anxiety that rhetoric may be used by the wicked man as a tool for manipulation to his own evil ends” (17). This, to a great extent, is true as there are no checks on the use of rhetoric, and that, as Polus asserts, rhetoricians have supreme power in the cities they live. A rhetorician can paint a white object black and get the people to believe him. There is indeed an apparent evil in rhetoric.

Rhetoric cannot be separated from the society. It is the human nature to be rhetoric. That is why Lanham, as Daniel reports, sees rhetoric as part of human behaviour (5). The little baby who cries to get its mother’s attention employs rhetoric, because that makes its mother believe that it needs attention. The same thing with the class teacher who employs evidence and his ethos to get his students believe him. Aristotle, according to Clela Jaffe, believes in three types of reasoning:

“Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word
 There are three kinds: the first kind depends on the personal
 Character of the speaker [ethos]; the second on putting the
 Audience into a certain frame of mind [pathos]; the third on
 The proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the
 Speech itself [logos] (332).

Logos, according to Clella Jaffe, often called rational proofs, refers to the verbal arguments you make relating to your subject, arguments such as analogy, inductive, deductive, and causal reasoning” (335). Logos is the same thing as logic appeal. Logos asks the questions: “How reasonable is the speech? Can you prove it?” Instead of focusing on the speaker, it looks at how he employs inductive and deductive reasoning. As we learnt from Clella Jaffe, logos can be achieved through the use of analogy; analogy, he says, is “comparison of one item that is less than familiar or unknown to something concrete and familiar” (335). Logos can also be achieved through “causal reasoning,” and causal reason shows “the link or connection between the two factors” (339).

A rhetorician can argue both deductively and inductively. When you reason deductively, according to Aristotle, you rarely state the entire syllogism, while allowing your audience to fill in the unstated premises. This is known as enthymeme. Enthymeme is the heart of argument. Deductive reasoning “begins with a generalization or principle called the premise and moves logically to an application in a specific case,” says Jaffe (337-338). Inductive reasoning allows you take specific instances or examples and formulates a reasonable generalization or conclusion. From them... inductive reasoning moves from the particular to the general” (337).

Pathos appeals or reasons towards audience’s emotions (Jaffe 342). Pathos is an appeal to emotion. The use of pathos often contrasts the principle of logical reasoning. Pathos often clouds the audience’s sense of reasoning as they are made to respond to the emotional call. The rhetorician using pathos tries to arouse the audience’s sympathy by making them feel his pains. Pathos is the Greek word for “suffering,” but can also come in form of flattery. Aristotle believes that emotions and feelings affect people in their judgment.

Ethos “Comes from your personal qualities”. It looks at the “character traits that make a speaker believable and worthy of the audience’s confidence.” (Jaffe 345) Ethos is the Greek word for “character”. It appeals to the character of the speaker. Ethos is built on the credibility a speaker got from his past record. The credibility can also come from his expertise on the subject of discourse.

By way of concluding, rhetoric as it involves persuasion is important because, as Aristotle observes, it upholds truth and justice and plays down their opposites. It teaches in a way suitable to a popular audience; it analyses both sides of a question, and finally it enables one to defend oneself. The knowledge from this background will assist us in effectively analyzing Mark Antony’s speech, having revealed what rhetoric is and what qualify a speech to be a piece of rhetoric.

1.5 Review of Related Scholarship and Justification of Study

Over the years, scholars and literary critics have attempted the analysis of Mark Antony’s speech as a piece of rhetoric. One of such is Kleinhenz. In his article, Kleinhenz observes side by side, the effects of the two speeches and concludes that Mark Antony’s speech is superior to Brutus’ because of its effects on the audience. He attributes Brutus’ failure to his inability to understand the audience. He opines that Mark Antony succeeds due to his mastery of “emotion, subtlety and Logic” (32). Kleinhenz is able to note what makes Antony’s speech superior, but he does not show us how he happens to make use of these “emotion, subtlety and logic,” that is, the devices that aided him. He only shows us what, but does not tell us how. This marks a point of departure for this paper.

Another scholar, J.V, observes that personification, tautology, irony and antistrophe, rhetorical questions, antithesis, hyperbole, metaphor and aposiopesis were the devices used in the speech. Pathos, to him, is the main appeal of the speech, but with casual reference to ethos and logos. However, he does not

measure the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the devices and the speech as a whole. He also restricts the devices to the above listed ones. What about others like sarcasm, pauses, suspense, etc?

Eilen Dunleavy does a discursal analysis of Mark Antony's speech in his essay. He looks at the effects of the speech and concludes that "His words cause the angry mob to scour the street of Rome for anyone who took part in his murder" (6). Eilen opines that Antony plays with the people's emotions, but does not tell us how he does this. He also states that Antony creates a common bond between himself and the crowd by continually addressing them as "friends", "Romans," and countrymen." Nevertheless, Eilen's major business in this article is the result of the speech and not the process. The "substance" is as important as the "form". He has only looked at the substance, but this paper is poised to not only look at the substance in much detail, but also the form.

Stephen A. Newman is not left out as he considers Brutus's speech temporarily successful, but Mark Antony's "very successful." He goes further to highlight the lessons from Brutus's speech, one of which is "influencing audience's membership" and that the "speech is artificially crafted with strong parallel statements and rhythmic repetitions." He asserts that the techniques that helped Brutus include the reliance on the dichotomy between freedom and slavery, Caesar living versus Caesar dead, loyalty to friend versus loyalty to Rome. Contrary to Brutus, he says Antony halts to let the crowd react to his words, he interacts with them... calms them, and then stirs them up again. Newman concludes by asserting that "One speech is a model of rhetorical art, yet steeped in deceit; the other is flawed but (temporarily) successful... (16). Newman appears a bit farther than others in his ability to state the lessons from Brutus's speech, but he does not lay emphasis on the use of rhetorical devices.

No much known works have been done by Nigerians on this topic. However, Adeyemi Johnson he makes some casual comments. In "Buhari, Jonathan and The Forgetfulness of Nigerians," Adeyemi compares the emotions and sentiments that built up during the 2015 Nigerian general elections to that in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. He observes that the "senators, like Cassius who sought power... tried to sway the public by calling Julius Caesar a tyrant" and that "Mark Antony brought the public back to reality.... While trying to chastise the forgetfulness of Nigerians of the past, he laments that those who seek power stop at nothing to "erase public memory." (1) The usefulness of this article to the topic on ground stops at the point of analogy.

Another scholar, Rhadube, points out that Mark Antony makes use of "formulaic oral expressions to persuade and entice the play's citizens into action," and "oral testimony is his most powerful tool". Mark Antony appeals to the people's emotions and observes pauses at the end of his first salvo, he says. He also notes that Mark Antony is the noblest man in Rome. He, however, does not look at the perspective of other appeals coupled with the literary devices used. This is one the grounds the paper hopes to cover.

An anonymous writer postulates that Mark Antony levels himself with the audience and treats the crowd as his equal but ends up flattering them. The writer attributes the success of Antony to the use of persuasive techniques, and that the persuasion is indirect, mostly achieved through rhetorical questions. Nevertheless, he or she does not reveal other techniques used, other than the rhetorical questions. He or she also does it look at the appeals of rhetoric.

Similarly, Antony Vottima compares Mark Antony and Martin Luther King speeches and observes that "the similarities between the two speeches are unreal; seemingly orchestrated" (1). He further says that kings letter is written upon a structure of a strong pathological appeal combined with a powerful use of repetition and moving language. Likewise, Mark Antony's speech, he says appeals to emotion. His final judgment is that they appeal mainly to pathos.

Looking at these articles one notices that they differ from that of Mark Antony, which is the subject of my discourse. Mark Antony's speech is borne out of the desire for revenge. Also, Mark Antony's audience is different from that of all these other ones. The only similarity we can observe is the use of rhetorical appeals, especially pathos, as observed by Antony Vottima.

Having gone through the above works on rhetoric, with some closely related works to the rhetoric of Mark Antony, I noticed that they are significantly different from the purpose for which Mark Antony uses rhetoric. Arising from this difference, this work is set to find out what Mark's Antony's rhetoric is all about and what makes his use of rhetoric significantly different from others, and to answer the question of the effect his speech has on the audience.

2.1 Ethos

According to M. H Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham, "Ethos is a person's overall disposition or character" (242). Ethos is achieved by the credibility of a speaker; the credibility which emanates from his reputation. Mark Antony achieves this ethos appeal basically in three ways: by borrowing reputation from Brutus and his co-conspirators, his own reputable character, and partially from Julius Caesar. Mark Antony, as a skilled rhetorician reigns on the already established reputation of Brutus and his friends. When Mark Antony comes to addresses the Plebeians, his audience, being much aware of their state of mind he walks in, in borrowed robes of honour. He does not come on his own, but rather, "under leave of Brutus and the rest". He first neglects his own reputation which seems to be less important at that moment, and approaches them in the name of Brutus. Brutus, they all know, is an honourable man, so are the rest. So before Antony establishes his ethos, he has to first of all lean on the mighty character of Brutus. This is the sense in which borrowed reputation is used. Therefore, Mark Antony achieves his ethos appeal through the reliance on the ethos of Brutus. Brutus is believed to be an "honourable" Roman. Whatever he says or does is adjudged right because of this. When he comes to give his reason for killing Caesar his best friend, he does not present factual evidence to the people, but relies on his honour:

Romans, countrymen and lovers!

Hear me for my cause,

And be silent, that you may hear: believe me for mine

Honour, and have respect to mine honour, that you may

Believe. (35)

The only instrument with which he comes to convince his people is his honour, and he does succeed with it, though temporarily. So when Mark Antony comes to address them “under leave of Brutus...” the chances for success is high. There is no dispute as to whether Mark Antony himself is credible, but the point here is that Mark Antony gains access to the peoples’ confidence through Brutus.

Immediately Mark Antony tells his audience who has given him the permission to speak, he becomes a spokesman of Brutus. The audience, having much confidence in Brutus and having been earlier addressed by him, become receptive. They believe that whoever Brutus allows to speak is worth listening to. Added, the manner in which Antony approaches them does not give room for doubt. He says, “friends, Romans, countrymen lend me your ears. I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.” He is very much aware of the state of mind of his audience. So he decides to call them friends and tells them he has not come to eulogize Caesar.

Prior to the arrival of Mark Antony, the credibility of Brutus had been fully established. After successfully gaining the attention and confidence of his audience through the support of Brutus’s ethos, Antony unveils the purpose of his speech: to show how wrong Caesar’s murderers are, how selfish their act is. After successfully buying his audience’s trust through the image of Brutus, Mark Antony begins to confront this same image that had helped him. The contrast between him and Brutus becomes more glaring the moment he says “He was my friend, faithful and just to me.” One begins to wonder, Is this not the same Caesar Brutus said was ambitious? But of course, “Brutus is an honourable man”. He goes ahead to tell them: “He had brought many captives home to Rome whose ransoms did the general coffers fill...Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?” (143) The audience at this point becomes puzzled. Brutus had told them Caesar was ambitious, and now another person is telling them the opposite.

Even after systematically negating the character of Brutus, which the people held in high esteem, and with which he appeared, Mark Antony still remains believable as a result of these factors: Mark Antony is Caesar’s friend, he is a Consul of the people, he is an army general who fights to defend his people, and finally, Mark Antony, as well, is an honourable Roman who has a reliable past.

2.2 Logos

Logos according to M.H Abrams and G.H Geoffrey signifies both word and rationality (70). Logo is the appeal to reason, the use of logic to win an argument. Using logos involves deductive and inductive reasoning. Mark Antony uses this appeal basically in three different ways by:

- i. providing a series of evidences;
- ii. questioning the reasoning faculty of his audience
- iii. validating his evidence

Mark Antony employs literary and rhetorical devices, such as rhetorical questions, contrast, sarcasm, flashback, apophasis, etc to enhance his argument.

2.2.1 Use of Evidence

The success of every orator depends largely on his/her ability to support his/her proposition(s) with good pieces of evidence. Mark Antony does not prove deficient in this. After making his claims, he provides his audience with a handful of facts. His claim is that Julius Caesar, whom Brutus has said was ambitious, is faithful and just. This assertion happens to be a very controversial one because “an honourable” man has just told them Caesar “was ambitious,” and here he holds a totally different view, a view that merits a public execution, probably by lynching. To them, this claim is an abomination. How dare he contradict the “noble Brutus?” But as a skilled rhetorician, Mark Antony simply pours down his pieces of evidence:

He hath brought many captives home to Rome

Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill.

When that the poor have cried Caesar hath wept.

You all did see that, on the lupercal,

I thrice presented him a kingly crown, which he did thrice refuse. (143)

After which he asks: “Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?” To which he answers: “Ambition should be made of sterner stuff” (143). And then introduces a contrast: “Brutus says he was ambitious”. Ironically, “Brutus is an honourable man”. Looking at these pieces of evidence, it is very tempting to believe him. In fact, Mark Antony’s audience is under compulsion to believe him. First, Caesar “hath brought many captives home” and, instead of claiming their “ransoms” leaves it for the state. The question now is how come an ambitious person let go of his right to collect the money used as ransom for the release of these captives? With this piece of evidence alone, one is tempted to ask if Brutus and his fellow conspirators actually know the meaning of ambition. The meaning of the word, and the use in which they have put it here are self contradictory. This is like saying a man is a thief, but found a box containing a huge amount of money and leaves it untouched.

2.2.2 Questioning Reasoning

Mark Antony, after giving his evidence, goes on to question the reasoning ability of his audience, because at that time they seem to have lost their ability to think. He asks, "What cause withholds you then to mourn for him?" (143) He has just told them that Caesar was not ambitious, and goes ahead to give his proofs. He has also reminded them of the love they have for Caesar, but it still appears they are not moved. He begins to wonder what is wrong. Can't they think again? Why are they not crying? Why can't they wake up from their slumber? Then he explodes: "O judgment! Thou art fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason!" (148) To him, this is bizarre. This is a clear case of irony. Men have lost the quality that makes them superior to other mammals, the ability to reason. This irony is meant to bring the Romans back to their senses. He deliberately chooses to compare them to beasts, in order to challenge their reasoning faculty. He indirectly tells them that the beasts are now better than them, since the beast now possesses the ability to think. And this, of course, strikes them hard as we see the first Plebeian saying, "He thinks there is much reason in his sayings". And the second Plebeian follows suit by saying, "If thou consider rightly of the matter, Caesar has had great wrong" (145). From this moment they begin to see things in different light. All the things Mark Antony has told now begin to take different shapes in their minds. The fourth Plebeian ponders on the flashback Mark Antony uses to recall how Caesar rejected the crown three times, and says, "Marked ye his words? He would not take the crown, therefore, certain, he was not ambitious" (145).

Mark Antony has successfully got them to believe him. He has successfully extracted them from the erroneous pool of thought which Brutus had sunk them. At this minute nothing holds them back. After preparing their minds, Mark Antony goes ahead to load their minds with tears provoking statements. Now he is sure that whatever he says will mean something to them. He now has the full confidence that his audience can reason, and hence continues:

But yesterday the word of Caesar might have stood against the
world; now lies he there,
and none so poor to do him reverence.

O masters, if I were disposed to stir your hearts and minds to munity and rage

I should do Brutus wrong...." (145-146)

In essence, it is this awakening of their minds that gives room for his successful transition from the use of logos to the use of pathos.

2.2.3 Validation of Evidence

The third way Mark Antony uses logos is by the validation of his evidence. To validate means to render valid, to make authentic. Mark Antony achieves this by making his evidence as concrete as possible. We will recall that the first set of evidence Mark Antony provides are mere abstractions, but the very last piece of evidence comes in concrete form—the testament. This has a great effect on the Plebeians. It helps to validate all other pieces of evidence. Unlike Brutus, Mark Antony's argument relies heavily on the use of logos. The only instrument Brutus uses to convince his audience is his ethos. But Mark Antony proves to be a better rhetorician in his use of logic.

Mark Antony proves himself a master rhetorician by adroitly providing a handful of evidence, questioning his audience's sense of reasoning, and validating his evidence by providing a concrete evidence. The speech makes for a good piece of rhetoric, unlike Brutus' that lacks logos.

3.1 Pathos

Pathos is the appeal to emotions. The emotion can be positive or negative. It is positive if it elicits happiness, in which case, flattery is the major tool, while the negative emotion is that which gives birth to either tears or anger. Pathos happens to be the most dangerous form of rhetorical appeal, because it beclouds sense of reasoning. Through the help of literary/rhetorical devices such as apophasis, rhetorical questions, contrast, Mark Antony elicits pathos in three different ways:

- (i) pathetic expressions
- (ii) emotions
- (iii) flattering

3.1.1 Pathetic Expressions

Mark Antony carefully carves and selects his words to make his audience feel his pain. He uses touching expressions to elicit pity and support. Below are some examples of such expressions: "If you have tears, prepare to share them now. Look, in this place ran Cassius dagger through; see what a rent the envious Casca made; Through this, the well-beloved Brutus stabbed, And as he plucked his cursed steel away, Mark how the blood of Caesar followed it, as rushing out of door, to be resolved. If Brutus so unkindly knocked, or no; For Brutus, as you know, was Caesar's Angel. Judge, O you gods, how dearly Caesar loved him! This was the most unkindest cut of all" (151). With these kinds of expressions, one cannot help but cry.

The use of symbolism and historical allusions also helps Mark Antony to achieve his pathos. After stating his case before his audience, he provides them with the "mantle", a cloak, of Caesar's that reveals all the stabbings. Before this, he tells them to be ready for the tears they are about to shed. He says "If

you have tears, prepare to shed them now” (151). And then, “You all do know this mantle. I remember the first time ever Caesar put it on. It was on a summer’s evening in his tent, that day he overcame the Nervii (151). The symbolic cloak and the historical reference to the defeat of the Nervii remind the audience of the brutal killing and the earlier victory of Caesar which move them to tears. The display of the “mantle” helps Mark Antony to humble his audience with pathos. At this juncture, Antony has moved from using abstract expressions to concrete symbols.

Mark Antony also uses his personality as a live symbol before the audience. It is not enough for him to seek emotional response from his audience; he also has to be in an emotional state. He introduces this through the use of a pause and hyperbole: “My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar, and I must pause, still it comes back to me (145).

3.1.2 Flattery

Antony partly achieves pathos by flattering his audience. Although this is not well pronounced, it is worth mentioning here. He flatters them by observing in them a good human attribute. He says, “You all did love him once...” (143). This statement bares more than what meets the eyes. The effect can best be understood if you say to someone, “You have no love in you.” Of course we know how the reaction would be. So, Mark Antony’s noting of his audience’s ability to love, to them, is a virtue. They are indeed flattered. By observing that they have the ability to love, Mark Antony seeks a re-demonstration of this act of loving. He wants them to do what they are capable of doing—love—and this love should cause them to riot. He says, “You all did love him once, not without a cause; What cause withhold you then to mourn for him? (143) What he indirectly says here is that, “You are not stones! You have the ability to love, and you have demonstrated it before. Why don’t you do it again now?” The use of flattery here may look contradictory to the prevailing mood of the context of the speech, but the fact cannot be denied that his spotting of positive trait in them elicits a better reception of his speech and in return, generates a positive response. He uses this to prepare their minds for the yet-to-come emotional outburst.

Mark Antony appeals to pathos by feeding his audience with tears-provoking words and images of pain, being emotional himself, and by flattering them. He takes them into the world of emotions and by the time they come out, Caesar’s death means something different to them. They no longer see his death as the death of tyranny, as claimed by Brutus, but as an assassination of good, as the death of love and peace. Thus, Mark Antony moans, “Here was Caesar! When comes such another? (157)

4.1 Summary

Mark Antony proves a better rhetorician than his counterpart, Brutus. He makes use of three rhetorical appeals: ethos, logos and pathos. He realizes ethos in three different ways: by borrowing the perceived ‘honourable’ image of Brutus and his fellow conspirators, by depending on his reliable character, and by leaning on the good image of the dead Caesar. On logos, he provides a series of evidence, he concretizes the evidence, and finally he validates his evidence. Mark Antony achieves his ethos through the use of pathetic words and symbols, by being emotional himself, and by flattering his audience. He achieves an overall success by the means of the above techniques. His oratory contrasts that of Brutus in his use of pathos and logos. Brutus only makes use of ethos, which also differs from the way Mark Antony uses his. Mark Antony’s speech, by all standards, passes for an effective piece of rhetoric, while Brutus is marred by lack of evidence and passion.

4.2 Findings

Below are some of the findings of this paper:

- i. An orator can win an argument by borrowing honour from others.
- ii. In a moment of grief, flattery can be effective.
- iii. A bad situation, if well managed, can be turned into a good one.
- iv. Power of life and death lies in the tongue.

4.3 Contribution to Knowledge

This research contributes to knowledge in the following manner:

- i. That one can possibly make friends and supporters from one’s perceived enemies or opponents when the appropriate tools are in place.
- ii. Not all who bear the name “honourable” are honourable indeed
- iii. That a true friend is one who stands by the truth and defends his/her friend.
- iv. That diligence pays; the opposite is disastrous.
- v. The manner in which one goes about one’s mission can also determine results.

4.4 Conclusion

The study of Mark Antony's oratory is a worthwhile endeavour. Its strength lies in its simplicity. While one may endeavour to undertake a rhetorical analysis of any speech for leisure, the study of Mark Antony's speech will not only serve recreational purpose, but will also broaden one's horizon of thinking. This speech does not only show us that words can be manipulated for aesthetics, it also shows us that the powers of death and life lie in the tongue. And also, the use of valid arguments through rhetoric has been proved by Mark Antony to be a successful weapon for achieving one's desire.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H Harpham, Geoffrey Galt, ed, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, Boston: Wadsworth Cengage, 2009. Print
- Eileen, Junleavy. *The Art of Swaying a Hostile Crowd: Mark Antony's Funeral Oration*. Corridors' Inaugural Edition, Dec. 2008 <www.umassd.edu/corridors/seconddessay257.html> 28 May, 2015. Web
- Erickson, Daniel N. *Gorgias, Polus, and Socrates on Rhetoric in Plato's Gorgias*. LCMND e-journal (2004): 1-5 print
- Johnson, Adeyemi, "Buhari, Jonathan and the forgetfulness of Nigerians" <www.nairaland.com/2073629/buharijonathan-forgetfulness-nigerians> 10 April, 2015. Web
- Golden, James L, Berquist, Goodwin F and Coleman, William E. *The Rhetoric of Western Thought*. USA: Kendall/Hunt, 1993. Print
- Gunn, Helen. "Appealing to the Masses: the Rhetoric of Martin Luther King's 'I have a Dream'." <http://dan.drydog.com/helen/the_rhetoric_of_martin_luther_kings_i_have_a_dream.html> 10 April, 2015. Web
- Jaffe, Clella. *Public Speaking: Concepts and Skills for A Diverse Society*, Belmont. USA: Thomas Learning, Inc. 2007. Print.
- Jasper, David. *Rhetoric, Power and Community: An Exercise in Reserve*. London: Macmillan 1993 print.
- J.V, "Rhetorical Devices in Antony's Funeral speech from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*" <<http://cavice.wordpress.com/2011/02/05/ju-rhetorical-devices-in-antony-s-funeral-speech-from-shakespeares-julius-caesar/>> 13 May, 2015. Web
- Kleinhenz, "Comparing Brutus' and Mark Antony's rhetoric in *Julius Caesar*" <www.essayforum.com/writing-3/comparing-brutus-mark-antony-rhetoric-julius-caesar-6915/> 13 May, 2015. Web
- Newman, Stephen A, "Rhetoric, Advocacy and Ethics: Reflections on Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*" NYLS Legal Studies. Research, New York. 04/05-23 [2015] <<http://ssrn.com/abstract=719762>> 16 May, 2015
- Rhadube, "Mark Antony in 2013: Power of Oration and persuasive Rhetoric" <<http://blogs.ubc.ca/etc540sept13/2013/09/29/463>> 30 May, 2015
- Shakespeare, Williams. *Julius Caesar*. Richard Clay Ltd: Bungay, Suffolk. 1982. Print
- Tuason, Ramson, "The Biblical Exodus in the Rhetoric of Martin Luther King", The Stanford FreedomProject <<http://standfordfreedproject.com/multi-media-essays-on-freedomproject/the>> 19 May, 2015. Web
- Vottima, Antony, "Mark Antony & Martin Luther King Comparison Contrast" <<http://www.studymode.com/essays/marc-Antony-Martin-Luther-King-191317.html?topic>> 19 May, 2015. Web
- "Why Mark Antony's Speech So Effective in Persuading His Audience" <<http://www.123Helpme.com/view.asp?id=152083>> 17 May, 2015. Web
- Winkler, Antony C, J.O Ray, M.Cuen. *Rhetoric Made Plain*. O.Lando, Florida: Harcourt Brace Jonavonich. Inc. 1974, Print.