

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-4017-210203-11119>

Recebido em: 04/12/19 | Aprovado em: 16/06/21

THE HYBRID RHETORICAL ETHOS

O ethos retórico híbrido | El ethos retórico híbrido

Samuel Mateus*Universidade da Madeira (UMA), Faculdade de Artes e Humanidades,
Departamento de Línguas, Literatura e Cultura, Funchal, Portugal

Abstract: There are three main schools for the study of the ethos: the pragmatic-discursive; the symbolic interactionist, and the rhetorical one. This paper aims to give an encompassing and fuller perspective on the rhetorical ethos that can be useful to the contemporary uses of the persuasive communication, including media communication such as advertising or marketing communication. Primarily, it outlines the conceptual employments ethos has suffered by through different subjects. Subsequently, it briefly enumerates the major rhetorical traditions; lastly, it postulates the rhetoric ethos as a hybrid notion that includes both a projected and an intended dimension. We hope this distinction allows us to better will envisage the persuasive communication further than the forum/ agora and its several digital uses in the 21th century.

Keywords: Ethos. Rhetoric. Discursive Ethos. Projected Ethos. Persuasive Communication. Media Communication.

Resumo: Existem três escolas principais do estudo do ethos: a pragmático-discursiva; a interacionista simbólica, e a retórica. Este artigo tem como objetivo dar uma perspectiva abrangente e mais completa sobre o ethos retórico que pode ser útil para os usos contemporâneos da comunicação persuasiva, incluindo a comunicação de mídia, como publicidade ou comunicação de marketing. Começa por delinear os empregos conceituais que o ethos tem sofrido em diferentes disciplinas. Em seguida, enumera sumariamente as principais tradições retóricas. Por último, ele postula o ethos retórico como uma noção híbrida que inclui uma dimensão projetada e uma dimensão pretendida. Espera-se que esta distinção permita melhor prever a comunicação persuasiva para além do fórum/agora e seus diversos usos não-presenciais no século XXI.

Palavras-chave: Ethos. Retórica. Ethos discursivo. Ethos projetado. Comunicação persuasiva. Comunicação de mídia.

Resumen: Existen tres escuelas principales del estudio del ethos: pragmático-discursiva; interaccionista simbólica, y retórica. Este artículo tiene el objetivo de demostrar una perspectiva amplia y más completa sobre el ethos retórico que puede ser útil para los usos contemporáneos de la comunicación persuasiva, incluyendo la comunicación de media, como publicidad o comunicación de marketing. Empieza por delinear los empleos conceptuales que el ethos hay sufrido en diferentes signaturas. A continuación, enumera brevemente las principales tradiciones retóricas. Por último, postula el ethos retórico como noción híbrida que incluye una dimensión proyectada y una dimensión pretendida. Se espera que esta distinción permita anticipar mejor la comunicación persuasiva allá más del fórum/ahora y sus diversos usos no presenciales en el siglo XXI.

Palabras clave: Ethos. Retórica. Ethos discursivo. Ethos proyectado. Comunicación persuasiva. Comunicación de media.

* Docente PhD no Campus Universitário da Penteadá, gab. 1.47 – Funchal, Portugal. Labcom. IFP. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1034-6449>. E-mail: samuelmateus@uma.pt.

1 INTRODUCTION

If one had to say what is the main asset on the rhetorical systems, the triadic structure of logos, pathos and ethos would be one of the first to be mentioned. Indeed, if we approach rhetoric's persuasive communication from the audience standpoint, we face pathos; beginning from the speaker we face ethos; and beginning rhetoric from the speech standpoint we have logos and language. In each case, rhetoric assumes a tripartite division and this triad is the very core of rhetoric from which derives its own system on persuasive communication. "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]. Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible" (Aristotle 1356a).

Historically, we have different types of rhetorical emphasis put into each of this artistic proofs (Aristotle, 1959) giving rise to distinct forms of persuasion: to Plato the importance of rhetoric lies in the possibility of a virtuous ethos of the speaker made only possible by the logos. True speech is considered a way to knowledge (*episteme*). To Cicero, the emphasis in speakers' eloquence will make him highlight the pathos along with the logos. And in contemporary advertising, the focus is still in the pathos even if ethos has become increasingly dominant in the brand communication.

The last decades showed a renewed interest in these artistic proofs, not just because their intrinsic value, but also because the emergence of communication media and digital communication brought serious challenges to the traditional theory of classic rhetoric (McQuarrie & Phillips, 2008; Doan, 2017; Mateus, 2018a), especially the ethos.

The first systemization of the rhetorical ethos comes from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in which he describes ethos: "The orator persuades by moral character when his speech is delivered in such a manner as to render him worthy of confidence; for we feel confidence in a greater degree and more readily in persons of worth in regard to everything in general, but where there is no certainty and there is room for doubt, our confidence is absolute." (Aristotle, 1355b). Ethos consubstantiates the persuasion by the character, that is, the appeal to the authority and credibility of the speaker. It concerns his expertise but also his moral authority. Aristotle also indicates the three fundamental components of the speaker's ethos: "There are three things which inspire confidence in the orator's own character-the three, namely, that induce us to believe a thing apart from any proof of it: good sense (*phronesis*), good moral character (*areté*), and goodwill (*eunoia*)" (Aristotle, 1378 a). To Aristotle, the ethos is an artistic proof presented by the speaker to cause good impression and gain audience's trust. They emerge from the character traits that the speaker show to the audience in order to cause a positive imprint (Barthes, 1970). It's not about the character as a characteristic of a person or social group, but traits of character that are perceived by the audience.

The ethos Aristotle presents in his *Rhetoric* is, thus, of a different kind from the Ethos present in *Nicomachean Ethics* or *Politics* treatise (Maingueneau, 2002). In this case, the ethos concerns only what is actually said in the speech (Kennedy, 1991: 39) and

this is the reason why Aristotle considers it as an intrinsic or artistic proof. So, to Aristotle authority (*ethos*) derives from the speech, not from the social status, reputation or wealth – as these are inartistic or extrinsic elements of persuasion. *Ethos* is a consequence of speech or a discursive effect (Maingueneau, 2002) that primarily has to do with enunciation. The speaker's character is not negligible. Yet, the confidence the audience deposits in him comes mainly from his ideas and the moral character he presents to them. "Aristotle (...) associates *ethos* not primarily with the orator's reputation for being [a good] soul but rather with the actual rhetorical competence displayed in the orator's discourse" (Hyde, 2004, p. 13).

This is an important point since Aristotle's conception overlooks fundamental aspects of *ethos* related to reputation and status, and their impact on persuasion. It seems Aristotle was focused on a specific use of authority and credibility (speech), specific communicative situations (a speaker talking in the presence of an audience) and a specific social context (mainly political).

This paper aims to give an encompassing and fuller perspective on the rhetorical *ethos* that can be useful to the contemporary uses of persuasive communication, including media communication such as advertising or marketing communication.

It starts by accounting the conceptual employments *ethos* has suffered by different disciplines. Next, it will briefly enumerate the main Rhetorical traditions. Lastly, it will posit rhetoric *ethos* as a dual notion that includes a thematic and a projected dimension. Hopefully, this distinction better enables us to envisage persuasive communication beyond the forum/agora towards its manifold, digital uses in 21th century¹.

2 ETHOS CONCEPTUAL DISPLACEMENT

Although *ethos* emerged first in the rhetoric field, it has been broadly applied in human and social sciences. Given it is a practical concept describing the different strategies to claim a self-image, the *ethos* has been subject to the attention of different disciplines, including discourse theory (Mota&Salgado, 2008; Maingueneau, 2008; Burbea, 2014).

Because communication is not more conditioned to the oral speech of classical rhetoric, the study of *ethos* today can only succeed if it contemplates its many facets. The *ethos* is not a unitary notion but a complex one that it is approached by distinct disciplines, theoretical contexts, and methodological aims (Mangueneau, 2008, p. 13). Auchlin (2001: 78) remarks that the *ethos* is susceptible to variation: it can be more concrete or more abstract depending on tradition and on the translation of the Greek concept. Character, moral, image, habits, costumes, "air", authority, all these can be understood according to a visual, musical or psychological approach. If it has traditionally been associated with eloquence and orality, it can also be linked to written texts as well as collectives or institutional speaker (for instance, advertising rhetoric).

¹ For instance, Silva (2014) explain how television hosts tend to build their *ethos*.

There are two main schools of the study of the ethos besides the rhetorical one: the pragmatic-discursive and the symbolic interactionist.

The pragmatic-discursive approach of the ethos dates from back the 1980 when Ducrot (1984) integrated the ethos into a polyphonic theory of enunciation, and is today continued, among others, by Mangueneau (1999) and Amossy (2001). Ethos is, in this case, grounded on the efficacy of the written or spoken word and on the speaker (*locuteur*). So, the relationship between *locuteur* and *allocutaire*, between the speaker and those he directly or indirectly addresses to is central. The discursive school of thought on the ethos distinguishes between a discursive ethos (an ethos built by and within the discourse) and a pre-discursive ethos, one that pre-exists the enunciation act possessing a social contour which imposes to the communicative act and discourse itself (Mangueneau, 1999).

Amossy (2005, p. 121) emphasizes also a pragmatic approach that we can include within the discursive school because it will also focus the enunciative dispositive and discursive construction. It culminates, for instance, in stereotypes since all speakers tend to speak within a social group that holds a given *doxa* and a given way to refer to the world.

The symbolic-interactionist approach of ethos is less known but it can be traced back to the work of Goffman (1974) and the construction of the self-image in social interaction. The self-image (*l'image de soi*) concept is very close from the idea of an ethos since it involves the construction of a belief in the social role the individual performs. The interactionist approach privileges the notion of negotiation: the individual or speaker conveys an image, for instance, of expertise that is constantly negotiated and demands a constant flow of communication that supports the conveyed self-image (Burbea, 2014, p. 10).

This negotiation dimension tends to be absent in the rhetorical ethos. As we have remarked in the introduction, Aristotle posits ethos as a discursive act totally controlled by the speaker. The rhetorical speaker is the sole responsible by its ethos, while in the interactionist ethos, individual's self-image is a continuous process requiring the audience. Instead of being there, the ethos consists in a dynamic adaptation to the social interaction. It is strictly related to the way the interaction develops itself. Ethos is, thus, a negotiated self-representation and results from a generalized process of symbolic exchange.

While in the pragmatic-discursive approach of the ethos, the image (authority and credibility) of the speaker is strongly linked to enunciation and discursive production, the social interactionist approach of ethos stresses that the authority and credibility is a dialogic instance that puts both the speaker and the audience into relation. It is no more strictly dependent on discourse and cannot be seen as a given.

These two seminal approaches do not jeopardize the rhetorical ethos. In fact, they are all inter-related and these displacements point to the fact that ethos is an instable notion that is subject to different conceptual articulations.

Having said this, we turn – succinctly – into the specificity of the rhetorical school of ethos.

3 RHETORICAL ETHOS TRADITIONS

The study of ethos from a rhetorical perspective has flourished in the 20th century and it has been accomplished through the classical rhetorical-literary tradition (Gill, 1984). Since the beginning, it has been profoundly influenced by Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (Wisse, 1989; Braet, 1992).

Two traditions inside the rhetorical approach to ethos can be further distinguished.

The first tradition centres around Aristotle's conception that sees ethos as a moral revelation of the speaker's character which pre-exists discourse and, as such, it is reflected or poured into the rhetorical discourse. We find already this perspective in Plato when Socrates, in the *Gorgias*, says that morality is not inherent to rhetoric and claims that only philosophy can guide rhetoric to be in service of virtue, that is, only the moral character that philosophy makes virtuous can guide the orator to persuade beyond merely personal gain (as sophists). When Aristotle says: "for we feel confidence in a greater degree and more readily in persons of worth in regard to everything in general (1356 b)" he is using the Greek word *epieikeia* denoting a person who was reasonable, fair or morally good. So, the ethos came to be known as *epieikeia* assuming its ethical and moral contours. Isocrates, in *Antidosis* also conceives ethos in this way: "...[t]he man who wishes to persuade people will not be negligent as to the matter of character; no, on the contrary, he will apply himself above all to establish a most honorable name (*hôs epieikestatên*) among his fellow-citizens" (Isocrates *apud* Žmavc, 2012, p. 184).

The second tradition relates to the *topoi* or argumentative strategies and is associated with the sophists. Žmavc (2012, p. 185) argues that *Rhetoric to Alexander* exhibits many examples on argumentative strategies based on character presentation (*ethos*). They show how ethos was used to produce a certain effect on the audience and frequently was used in order to reinforce argumentation and justify certain conclusion. Character presentation is used as a means to gain the goodwill of the audience, as Cicero in *De Inventione* remarks.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's *New Rhetoric* (1979) can be described as a modern update on the theory of argumentation and illustrates also this tradition. Although ethos is not subjected to extreme attention, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca presuppose ethos when they talk about the importance of the premises of prior agreement.

In the next section, I want to disclose a third tradition, one that opens space to think the use of ethos in today's mediated world.

4 A HYBRID RHETORICAL ETHOS

Following the pragmatic-discursive and the social interactionist approaches to ethos and along the rhetorical approach, I advance a third tradition in the rhetorical ethos study. It synthesizes the earlier traditions and, at the same time, it adds a new dimension to it. I call this approach a hybrid rhetorical ethos.

Maingueneau (2008) was the first author to mention the hypothesis of a *hybrid ethos* calling attention to the socio-discursive nature of ethos. He is mainly concerned with the discursive ethos, not a rhetorical ethos, that is, the use of discourse to build character as a means of persuasion. According to Maingueneau, the discursive ethos cannot be properly taken without its communicative context and a concrete socio-historical situation. By one hand, ethos is a discursive production and it departs from the exterior image the speaker projects. It is a process of influence that arises from discursive practices (Maingueneau, 2008, p. 17) and given it is proposed in the discourse analysis framework, it differs greatly from the rhetorical ethos. By other hand, ethos is a discursive production that is not isolated from the discursive practices of a society. As such, it presents, according to Maingueneau, a hybrid nature.

I want now to extend this notion of a hybrid ethos and applied it to rhetoric.

I claim the rhetorical ethos is a hybrid notion but, in this case, that does not point exclusively to its socio-discursive nature. Instead, the rhetorical ethos is hybrid because it is simultaneously a discursive and a non-discursive practice. Unlike the aristotelic ethos, I propose to see the rhetorical ethos as both a result of the speaker discourse and a result of its reputation and public image. While Aristotle argues good speech builds a good character, I emphasize that, at the same time, the public image of the speaker also helps to build a good discourse and to secure an esteemed ethos. A hybrid conception of the rhetorical ethos considers also the extra-verbal dimensions of persuasive communication including its reputation, fame, celebrity, non-verbal communications, status, publicly perceived personal qualities and personality. In a short-sentence: the hybrid rhetorical ethos means the recognition of a multiform and polymorphous work on the speaker's character.

This wide perspective on the rhetorical ethos was first alluded by Isocrates and Quintilian. Both classical authors emphasize the importance of the speaker status (what the audience knows about him) opening path to an enlarging conception of the ethos that is pre-oratorical and pre-discursive. Quintilian, in his *Institutio Oratoria* even tells us that what the audience knows about the speaker have more impact than the word he utters in the moment he tries to convince them (Burbea, 2014, p. 8). The confidence that the speaker inspires – before the delivery of the speech – about a given subject seems more important than his own speech on the subject. A hybrid ethos presupposes, then, a strong interdependency between the rhetorical performance and the moral character. But this reciprocity goes beyond the causality relation assumed by Aristotle (discourse as building the ethos) and precedes the very moment of rhetorical performance and speech delivery. It also prolongs the ethos beyond the specific time of rhetorical performance.

This hybrid notion is paramount in advertising.

There are ads that exist only as a kind of argument of authority and are, almost integrally, based on the speaker ethos. Ads from L'Oreal, Nike, Pepsi, among others, use celebrities, sports men and women and public figures to convey their ethos to the products and brands they advertise. These ads consist exclusively in public figures (indirectly) recommending a given brand or product. More important than describing the qualities of the product, these ads rely on the ethos of the public figure to inspire audience's trust and confidence in the brand. Because of that, many brands ceased to sponsor some athletes

exactly because their public or private actions putted in jeopardy their moral character, and therefore, the ethos of the brand they advertise for. This happened in 2014 when Adidas pondered to cease and eventually reduced its sponsorship by 80.000 Euros to football player Luis Suárez after the athlete bit an adversary during a World Cup match between Uruguay and Italy². This occurs because of the importance of the rhetorical ethos to the brand that in this case originated in a word-famous athlete and culminated in the potentially damaging of the Adidas ethos.

There is also a second line of thought that posits the rhetorical ethos as a hybrid notion.

The ethos is associated with the personality of the speaker but it cannot be reduced to it. The hybrid notion of the rhetorical ethos respects likewise his demeanour, attitude and past actions.

A hybrid rhetorical ethos traces a *continuum* between rhetorical performance and character positioning (ethos) of the speaker while it accentuates the discursive and the pre-discursive aspects of persuasive communication, as well as its verbal and non-verbal aspects. The ethos is not just claimed by what the speaker says, it also vindicated by what he does (both before and after the speech situation). The ethos is also latent in what is not being said and frequently it is betrayed in the little hesitations, in the selection of words, in the body language or even by events of his personal and private life. When a speaker faces an audience is not just facing its judgement; it also facing what the audience thinks about his public and private actions.

In fact, the rhetorical ethos does not depend solely on the orator; it is also a product of the audience. Rhetorical ethos may start with the speaker but exists only when it is perceived, evaluated and integrated by the audience. The ethos is a shared production between speaker and audience. It is also a central notion to the audience since it is the audience that judges the moral character of the orator. This judgement has to do with evaluating the orator conformity to social-binded morality. So, while the speaker (indirectly) claims an ethos by his words and his deeds, it is the audience that must acknowledge it. That's why the ethos is a co-production of orator and audience and is a place of symbolic exchange. The ethos is moral and social image of the speaker but is also the result of a proceed of conceding it importance and conformity to moral rules by the audience.

That's why, the rhetorical ethos needs to be successful. And this takes us to the distinction between the intended ethos and the produced ethos.

5 THE PROJECTED AND THE INTENDED ETHOS

In the last section, I traced two lines of thought about the hybrid nature of the rhetorical ethos: by one hand, it goes beyond discursive practices and the time/place of rhetorical performance. By other hand, ethos if hybrid because it results from a co-production between the orator and the audience. Respectively, this corresponds to the distinction between projected ethos and the intended ethos.

² The case had been given wide attention by the media. See <https://bit.ly/37bWuMa>.

Because rhetorical ethos is not limited to the propositional content of the orator's discourse, it is useful to separate between the ethos that it is built in discourse and clearly stated (ex: "I am one of the leading experts in this field, seen my many world awards, and recommend you to buy this particular product or brand") and the ethos that is alluded to, insinuated, presupposed or indirectly stated. Dascal, for instance, separates between a thematised ethos and a projected ethos (2005, p. 61).

We take this latter notion further and argue that the hybrid nature of rhetorical ethos points to the projected ethos, especially in contemporary persuasive communication.

While the thematised ethos can openly be discerned and recognized, the projected ethos is not exclusively verbal and manifests itself in several semiotic modes of signification. The projected ethos is an indirect path to credibility coming from the emanation of trust. It encompasses, thus, the idea of a non-discursive ethos. The concept of immediacy is not far from the projected ethos. Immediacy describes the actions reducing the perceived distance between two or more persons. Mehrabian (1972: 6), who first coined the term, defines it as "the behaviour which increases mutual sensory stimulation between two people" and believed it produced closeness and positive attitude towards the other. Researchers found that immediacy behaviours (nonverbal clues including, eye contact, tonality, body tenseness, style and vocal elements) indicate warmth and positive belief, communicate personal involvement and show availability and inclusion (Andersen *et al.*, 1979). The projected ethos involves immediacy in which the speaker's communicative power is used to improve interpersonal relationships and posit strong positive perceptions about a person's character.

The projected ethos takes its efficacy from being not always consciously perceived by the audience. The audience cues the character of the orator, not just because his expertise, authority or reputation but, mostly, because of his manners, attitudes and non-verbal prompts. So, the audience tends to assume them. In this sense, the audience is not evaluating, judging or approving the speaker's ethos. It is merely focused in him and this way the projected ethos is not subjected to audience's rational assessment. More than invoked, the character is implied. And it is this casual suggestion of the projected ethos that makes the speaker trustworthy, reliable and honest.

What we observe in advertising, live speeches or even television and internet speeches is not so much the discursive production of an explicit ethos of the orator/brand but the many ways he projects its character.

Take for example, the case of Hillary Clinton wincing to her audience during her United States presidential campaign in 2016. Is this a matter of ethos? No doubt. But, is this a discursive and explicit production of her ethos? Not really. She does not say anything, although her recurrent actions imprint in the audience a perception about her character. Hillary was constantly grimacing to their audience, making eye-contact, smiling, gesturing, reacting to the applause. This is better described as an indirect production of her ethos making her an accessible person, sensible and focused in their audience. It alludes to their supposedly sympathetic nature, a kind of candidate of the people. This is, above all, a projected ethos: it seems natural, spontaneous, unintentional and unimportant, yet, it supplies crucial (non-verbal) cues about the character of the speaker.

The projected ethos is especially important in today's advertising and marketing efforts. Brands do not need to fully state their ethos: they just need to insinuate, that is, to project their ethos. So, if a brand posits itself as *premium*, it may achieve it through ethos. But, above all, it will instil in the audience's minds (its clients and brand fans) its ethos by the events it promotes, the celebrities it sponsors, the size and elegance decorations of its stores, or even the way it delivers the product to the customer (including packages). This is not a linguistic discursive production of ethos but a projected one. Ethos is also outside linguistic enunciation. It manifests indirectly, yet it is primordial to audience's perception of the brand ethos.

The second line of thought about the hybrid nature of the rhetorical ethos concerns the active role the audience in producing the orator's ethos. It is useful, in this case, to differentiate between the intended ethos and the effective, real produced ethos. Indeed, the intended ethos by the speaker is not always coincident with the produced ethos seen (and interpreted) by the audience.

Retaking the example of Hillary Clinton, one could remark that the ethos projected by wincing may be interpreted, assumed or understood in a way radically different from the one initially intended. Instead of projecting warmth and humanity, audience members can think in it as an artificial, second-thought, public-relations, strategic attitude. So, the intended ethos of giving the presidential candidate a warm character may be totally different from the produced ethos as taken by the audience.

The gap between intended ethos and produced ethos is crucial from a rhetorical standpoint and especially in a time of intense mediatization.

Given the multiple angles, images, videos, and discourses that are accessible at any given point in time or place, persuasive communication is now more sensible to the ways the produced, effective speaker's ethos (taken by the audience) confirms or jeopardizes the intended ethos. Since audience members have almost infinite information about speakers, brand and organizations (ex: the Instagram and Facebook account everyday update information about the orator) and what they are doing, media impose a new condition to speakers: they must always try to be coherent between the intended ethos they project (or that they explicitly and discursively state) and the produced ethos perceived by the audiences. The fragmentation of visibility brought by modern media (Mateus, 2017) accentuates the hybrid nature of rhetorical ethos by imposing speakers with the need to always conform to the explicit ethos. But audiences are in constant evaluation of contemporary speakers and may signal incongruences between what is intended (including what is said and what is projected) and what they infer from it – the produced ethos has received by the audience.

In fact, many contemporary scandals (Thompson, 2000) emerge from this discrepancy between the intended ethos orators try to control and the produced ethos interpreted by audiences. Media shows examples of produced ethos that are not compatible to the initial, intended, rhetorical ethos. A good example of this is the case of a Portuguese national deputy (Ricardo Robles) that, in his political discourses, argued against real estate speculation, but had sold a building by almost five times his initial cost

shortly after he had bought it, as a national newspaper made public³. So, the intended ethos explicit in his political discourses were rapidly put into check after media publicly spread a behavior that showed an ethos in total contrast to the intended one. In this case, the deputy was, indeed, forced to resign in order to not affect the ethos of his political party.

In sum, the hybrid nature of the rhetorical ethos obliges us to consider these two additional dimensions: how it is projected (this is, produced indirectly beyond linguistic discourse) and how it is dialogically co-produced with their audiences (this is, how the effective produced ethos departs from the intended one).

6 CONCLUSION

In order to explain what was meant by a hybrid nature of ethos, this paper briefly enunciated the main approaches that have been working in this notion: besides, the rhetorical tradition, it briefly talked about the pragmatic-discursive and the symbolic interactionist approaches. The objective was not to present a fully assessment on those disciplines but to start differentiating them from the rhetorical approach that specifically relates ethos to persuasive communication.

Within the rhetorical approach to ethos, two main traditions were enunciated: ethos as moral revelation of the speaker's character (which be traced to Aristotle); and ethos used as *topoi* or argumentative strategies. A third rhetorical ethos tradition was suggested: a perspective of a hybrid ethos in rhetoric that extrapolates the discursive as well as spatial and temporal boundaries of the orator's speech. By a hybrid nature of rhetorical ethos, it was meant all the contextual and non-verbal injunctions that helps to build the authority and character of the orator (before and after the rhetorical performance) and that tended to be disregarded (or object of minor attention since Isocrates and Quintilian's broader conception of the ethos is not dominant in literature) by the two traditions of conceiving ethos in traditional rhetoric.

It was argued that this crossbred nature of the rhetoric ethos is composed by the projected ethos and the intended ethos, as well as an effective and produced ethos, two concomitant conditions of ethos building. If these conditions may be deemed helpful it is just because they synthesize a vast literature on this subject that opens the possibility of renewing the rhetorical ethos theory, just like Discourse and Pragmatics Studies had recently made to the concept of ethos.

Probably the most useful contribution of conceiving the hybrid nature of ethos is to enlarge it towards the audience.

In fact, it was claimed that ethos is not just produced by the orator, not just produced while he speaks; in contrast, ethos is also produced by behaviour choices and non-verbal communication (including design and multimodal communication), as well as symbolic attributions related to the speaker but also to the venue or medium through which he communicates. Sometimes a speaker makes the audience perceive him as important, not

³ <https://sol.sapo.pt/artigo/620460/ricardo-robles-teve-predio-a-venda-por-5-7-milhoes-de-euros>.

just by what is says but how he performs and incarnate his ideas. Classical oratory, for instance, was embodied by all the formal values of roman society, including *dignitas*. This *dignitas* (the speaker's demeanour, appearance, gestures, voices, volume, movements, etc) must likewise be included in the construction of the orator's ethos.

By other hand, a great advantage of envisioning ethos as a hybrid notion of persuasive communication has to do with the possibility of see it dialogically.

The distinction between an intended and a produced ethos stresses the fact ethos is a co-produced instance: both speaker and audience actively contribute to erect the (perceived) character of the orator. The speaker is the main producer of the ethos – as all literature on classical rhetoric underscores. From him depends a self-image he wants to project towards the audience. But, at the same time, that projected image of the self must be recognized and acknowledged in order to be effective. This is to say ethos is not only a quality showed by the speaker; it is also a quality the audience must perceive and accept. In other words, ethos is first produced by the speaker but, in second place, it is produced by the audience when it identifies the intended ethos (responsibility of the speaker) as the same of the perceived ethos (responsibility of the audience). Ethos is, then, co-produced since both speaker and audience assume different responsibilities in the construction of the ethos: the speaker assumes the obligation to provide and claim a given ethos, while the audience assumes the obligation to recognize and accept it.

There is, still, a third advantage of considering a hybrid ethos. This encompassing and dialogical conception of the rhetorical ethos is better suited to the challenges of modern mass communication. Today's Media Rhetoric (Mateus, 2021) is substantially different from the classical times and not always assumes an argumentative dimension. A hybrid ethos is better equipped to describe media communication since it is no longer done predominantly in verbal ways. Media communication such as advertising does not rely in long speeches in order to build the speaker/brand ethos; instead, it is based on visual communication and their discourses need to be extremely concise in order to fit the 30 second advertising spots. So, media is changing the way ethos is built. And with more and more interactive technologies of digital communications, ethos is no longer a one-way, unidirectional, linear process. Building reputation and authority - ethos - is now largely dependent on how media (and their professionals like journalists) deal, portray and disseminate the intended ethos of the speaker/brand. Because it relates both speaker and audience, media communication heightens the dialogical dimension of the hybrid nature of the ethos. And because modern Media are largely based on visuals (television, you Tube, Facebook, Instagram, Websites), any study on the ethos formation, in our times, need to account the projected ethos and its several ways to build ethos beyond the strict oral or the written word.

As a final remark, I stress that what was first indicated by Isocrates and Quintilian (the ethos being related with a reputation preceding the speaker) is, in our days, a crucial aspect of building the speaker's ethos. And since Media have rendered complex this construction of the rhetorical ethos, it is even more urgent to pay attention to the attributes ethos presents to us in the context of an extremely mediatised world. The perspective on the hybrid nature of the rhetorical ethos seems, thus, crucial to open new possibilities of study rhetoric in Media.

REFERENCES

- AMOSSY, R. (2001). Ethos at the Crossroads of Disciplines: Rhetoric, Pragmatics, Sociology. *Poetics Today*, 22(1), 1-23.
- AMOSSY, R. (2005). "O ethos na intersecção das disciplinas: retórica, pragmática, sociologia dos campos. In: Amossy, R (Org.). *Imagens de si no discurso: a construção do ethos*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2005.
- ANDERSON, J.F., Anderson, P.A., & Jensen, A.D. (1979). "The measurement of nonverbal immediacy". *Journal of applied communication research*, 7,153-180
- ARISTOTLE (1959). *Ars Rhetorica*. Edited by W. D. Ross. OCT. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- AUCLIN, A. (2001). "Ethos et expérience du discours: quelques remarques ». In: M. WAUTHION; SIMON (éds.). *Politesse et idéologie. Rencontres de pragmatique et de rhétorique conversationnelle*. Louvain: Peeters, 2001, pp. 77-95
- BARTHES, R.. (1970). "L'ancienne rhétorique. Aide-mémoire", *Communications*, Paris: Seuil, n° 16, pp. 172-229.
- BOLATITO, O. (2012). « Linkage between Persuasion Principles and Advertising", *New Media and Mass Communication*, Vol.8
- BRAET, A. (1992). "Ethos, Pathos and Logos in Aristotle's Rhetoric. A Reexamination". *Argumentation*, 6, 307-320.
- BURBEA, G. (2014), "L'ethos ou la construction de l'identité dans le discours", *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov*, Vol.7 (56), n°2, p.7- 18
- DASCAL, M. (2005). "O ethos na argumentação: uma abordagem pragmatética". In: AMOSSY, R. (Org.). *Imagens de si no discurso: a construção do ethos*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2005.
- DOAN, VX. (2017), "Rhetoric In Advertising", *VNU Journal of Science: Policy and Management Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (2017) 30-35
- DUCROT, O. (1984). *Le dire et le dit*. Paris: Minuit.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- HABIB, P. (2008). "O Ethos na argumentação: análise discursiva de uma carta-protesto de Sobral Pinto ao Presidente Costa e Silva", Tese de doutorado, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais.
- HYDE, M. (2004). *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. University of South Carolina.
- MAINGUENEAU, D. (1999). «Ethos, scénographie et incorporation». In Amossy, R. (éd). *Images de soi dans le discours: la construction de l'ethos*. Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, pp. 75-100.
- MAINGUENEAU, D. (2002). "Problèmes d'ethos", *Pratiques*, n°113-114.
- MAINGUENEAU, D. (2008). "A propósito do ethos". In MOTTA & SALGADO (orgs.). *Ethos discursivo*. Trad. Luciana Salgado. São Paulo: Contexto, p.11-29.
- MATEUS, S. (2017). "Visibility as a key concept in Communication and Media Studies", *Communication Studies*, n° 25 (2), pp. 109-124.
- MATEUS, S. (2018). *Introdução à Retórica no séc. XXI*, Covilhã, Labcom Books, 2018 [ISBN: 978-989-654-438-6].
- MATEUS, S. (2018a). "Affective Persuasion- what is it and why it matters" In Clark, Carlton and Zhang, Lei (ed.), *Affect, Emotion, and Rhetorical Persuasion in Mass Communication*, London: Routledge, 2018, pp.69-80.
- MATEUS, S.(2019). "Formas Emotivas do Discurso Persuasivo", *Media&Jornalismo*, V.18, n°34, Publicidade: teorias, métodos e práticas, p.127-141, acessível em https://doi.org/10.14195/2183-5462_34_9
- MATEUS, S. (ed.) (2021). *Media Rhetoric: How Advertising and Digital Media Influence Us*, Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- MEHRABIAN, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. Chicago, IL: Aldine-Atherton.
- PERELMAN, C. and O-T., L. (1979). *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Trans. by J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver. Notre. Dame and London.

SILVA, F. (2014). “A construção do Ethos entre os apresentadores de telejornais”, XXXVII Congresso Brasileiro de Ciências da Comunicação, Intercom.

THOMPSON, J. B (2000). *Political Scandal: Power and Visibility in the Media Age*, London, Blackwell.

WISSE, J. (1989). *Ethos and Pathos from Aristotle to Cicero*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

ŽMAVC, J. (2012). “The Ethos Of Classical Rhetoric: From Epieikeia To Auctoritas” In van Eemeren, FRANS H., GARSSSEN Bart (Ed.). *Topical Themes in Argumentation Theory: Twenty Exploratory Studies*, London, New York: Springer, pp.181-192.



Este texto está licenciado com uma Licença Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional.