

STYLISTIC APPROACH OF JULIAN THE EMPEROR AND GREGORY NAZIANZEAN

*George Alexandropoulos
University of Athens*

ABSTRACT

This study examines the rhetorical practice in both orators, Gregory Nazianzean and Julian the Emperor. Its purpose is to describe their style and explain the way of their rhetoric choices into a multidisciplinary framework.

1. INTRODUCTION

For the stylistic comparison between these two orators this study is based on three invective texts¹. Julian had written a political speech against Galileos and then Gregory the Theologian wrote in reply two invective speeches². Based on these political speeches, this study aims to define their political and rhetorical strategies combining the traditional rhetoric practice with text linguistic, computational tools. Creating a corpus³ we can have the opportunity to examine these speeches focusing on the shared, common persuasive strategies used by both orators even though they were opponents in the theological and political field. For this reason we use a variety of linguistic theories, such as Mann & Thompson Rhetorical Structure Theory (1986-1988), Searle's speech acts categorization (1969-1979-1994-1996a,b), Fairclough theories (1992-2000), Fairclough and Wodak theories (1997), van Dijk framework (1999-2001) and computational tools such as AntConc⁴. The examined corpus consists of two of Gregory's speeches (first invective: 18, 097 words, second invective: 7, 530 words) and one political speech of Julian (10, 730 words).

2. STYLISTIC CHOICES

¹ For the text of these speeches see Bernardi et al. (1978), Migne (1857-1866), Wright (1912-1913).

² For more details about the content of these speeches see McGuckin (2001) and Athanassiadi (1992).

³ For more details about the corpus linguistics see Biber & Reppen (2011).

⁴ Antconc is a freeware concordancer software program.

Both Julian the emperor and Gregory the theologian resort to certain rhetoric⁵ strategies in order to persuade the public. Each one evokes all the classical rhetoric Aristotle's concepts of ethos, pathos and logos⁶.

2.1. Questions with answer

(1) *Τίς γάρ οὐκ ἂν ἤλιπεν, εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο, ταῖς τιμαῖς ποιήσειν αὐτὸν ἡμερώτερον; Τίς δὲ οὐκ ἐκ τῆς πίστεως, ἦν ἐπιστεύθη καὶ παρὰ τὸ εἶδος, δικαιότερον; ὡς ἀφοῦν δικαίᾳ καὶ βασιλικῇ κρίσει, τοῦ μὲν ἐπιτιμηθέντος, τοῦ δὲ προβληθέντος· ὁ γάρ τὸν δεύτερον τιμήσας, οἷς οὐκ ἂν τις ἤλιπεν, οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ὁ τυχὼν τῆς τιμῆς, δῆλον, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν πρότερον ἄνευ δικαίας ὀργῆς ἐκολάσατο· καὶ τὸ μὲν, τῆς ἐκείνου προπετείας ἦν, τὸ δὲ τῆς τοῦ τετιμηκότος φιλανθρωπίας.*

(Gregory Nazianzean's First Invective against Julian the Emperor 40)

(2) *Ποῦ σὺ τοῦτον ἔχεις τὸν κύκλον ἐν τοῖς σοῖς μαθήμασι; Ποῦ δὲ τὸν ἐπὶ Βηθλεὲμ δραμόντα πρότερον ἐκ τῆς ἐώας ἀστέρα, τὸν ὄδηγόν τῶν σῶν Μάγων καὶ πρόξενον; Ἐχω τι κάγῳ λέγειν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανίων· ἐκεῖνος τὴν Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν ἀνεδήλωσεν ὁ ἀστήρ· οὗτος τῆς Χριστοῦ νίκης ὁ στέφανος.*

(Gregory Nazianzean's Second Invective against Julian the Emperor 5)

(3) *Νυνὶ δὲ ἐπαναληπτέον ἐστὶ μοι πρὸς αὐτοῦς· διὰ τί γάρ οὐχὶ περιτέμεσθε (Δ); 'Παῦλος,' φασίν, 'εἶπε περιτομὴν καρδίας, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῆς σαρκὸς δεδόσθαι πιστεύσαντι τῷ Ἀβραάμ.*

(Julian Against Galileos 351a)

In the above examples Julian and Gregory use directive speech acts through their questions and their answers with representative speech acts they give certain details to the public. The reason why orators use this stylistic choice is to motivate the public or the ideological opponent making them feel that they can participate into the structure of his speech. So, in this way question leads to involvement⁷ and answer to promotion of the text producer's opinion. This rhetorical strategy reminds us of the Socratic method of inducing an agreement by leading the audience to a certain thinking process through the answer as a provided solution.

2.2. Repetition

⁵ For more details about rhetoric strategies see Borg (2007) and Johnstone (1989).

⁶ See Roberts (1984).

⁷ See Chafe (1982).

(4) Ἀκούσατε ταῦτα, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐνωτίσασθε πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν οἰκουμένην· καλῶ γὰρ ἅπαντας, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀπόπτου τινὸς καὶ μεσαιτάτης περιωπῆς, μεγάλῳ καὶ ὑψηλῶ τῶ κηρύγματι· ἀκούσατε, λαοί, φυλαί, γλώσσαι, πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἡλικία πᾶσα, ὅσοι τε νῦν ἐστε, καὶ ὅσοι γενήσεσθε· καὶ ἵν' ἦ μοι μεῖζον τὸ κήρυγμα, πᾶσα δύναμις τῶν οὐρανῶν, πάντες ἄγγελοι, οἳ ἔργον ἡ τοῦ τυράννου κατάλυσις, οὐ τὸν Σηὸν καθελοῦσι τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἀμορραίων, οὐδὲ τὸν Ἰγὺ βασιλέα τῆς Βασάν, μικροὺς δυνάστας, καὶ μικρὸν μέρος τῆς οἰκουμένης κακοῦντας τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· ἀλλὰ τὸν δράκοντα, τὸν ἀποστάτην, τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν, τὸν Ἀσσύριον, τὸν κοινὸν ἀπάντων ἐχθρὸν καὶ πολέμιον, τὸν πολλὰ μὲν ἐπὶ γῆς μανέντα καὶ ἀπειλήσαντα, πολλὴν δὲ ἀδικίαν εἰς τὸ ὕψος λαλήσαντά τε καὶ μελετήσαντα.

(Gregory Nazianzean's First Invective against Julian the Emperor 1)

(5) Λόγῳ τὸ σκότος ἔλυσε, λόγῳ τὸ φῶς ὑπεστήσατο, ἤδρασε γῆν, ἐγύρωσεν οὐρανὸν, ἀστέρας ἔταξεν, ἔσπειρεν ἀέρα, θάλασσαν ὠρισε, ποταμοὺς εἴλκυσε, ζῶα ἐψύχωσεν, ἄνθρωπον πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐμόρφωσε, κόσμον τοῖς ἅπασι περιέθηκε· λόγῳ καὶ τὴν νῦν σκοτόμηναν λύσας, εἰς φῶς ἅπαντα καὶ τάξιν καὶ ἁρμονίαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπανήγαγεν.

(Gregory Nazianzean's Second Invective against Julian the Emperor 31)

(6) Ἰᾶται Ἀσκληπιὸς ἡμῶν τὰ σώματα, παιδεύουσιν ἡμῶν αἱ Μοῦσαι σὺν Ἀσκληπιῶ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ Ἑρμῇ λογίῳ τὰς ψυχὰς, Ἄρης δὲ καὶ Ἐνὼ τὰ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον συναγωνίζεται, τὰ δὲ εἰς τέχνας Ἥφαιστος ἀποκληροῖ καὶ διανέμει, ταῦτα δὲ πάντα Ἀθηνᾶ μετὰ τοῦ Διὸς παρθένος ἀμῆτωρ πρυτανεύει. σκοπεῖτε οὖν, εἰ μὴ καθ' ἕκαστον τούτων ὑμῶν ἔσμεν κρείττους, λέγω δὲ τὰ περὶ τὰς τέχνας καὶ σοφίαν καὶ σύνεσιν· εἴτε γὰρ τὰς πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν σκοπήσειας, εἴτε τὰς τοῦ καλοῦ χάριν μιμητικὰς, οἷον ἀγαματοποιητικὴν, γραφικὴν, ἢ οἰκονομικὴν, ἰατρικὴν τὴν ἐξ Ἀσκληπιοῦ, οὗ πανταχοῦ γῆς ἐστὶ χρηστήρια, ἃ δίδωσιν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μεταλαγχάνειν διηνεκῶς.

(Julian against Galileos 235a-c)

The repetition of the above underlined lexical elements has as a main goal to give emphasis and promote the orator's opinion about an issue. In example (4) through the repetition of the lexical element (ἀκούσατε) Gregory tries to motivate the audience's thought and ensures the conditional equality⁸ between text producer and public making them feel that they can participate in the text production. In examples (5) and (6) the repetition promotes and gives emphasis to the orator's thought.

⁸ See Sornig (1989).

2.3. Appeal to authority

Both speakers incorporate in their texts intertextualistic⁹ sources in order to strengthen their argumentation. Alexandropoulos (2012) supports that Julian in *Against Galileos* uses the intertextualistic sources with certain functions, such as evidence, contrast and background. In the next lines some examples of intertextuality enables us to understand the way of their functions in both orators.

(7) Ταῦτα εἰδὼς καὶ ὁ θεῖος Δαβὶδ, ἔν τι τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τὸ συνεσάλθαι τίθεται· καὶ χάριν ὁμολογεῖ τῷ συστειλάντι, ὡς τοῦ τὰ δικαιώματα μαθεῖν ἐντεῦθεν προσγινομένου· καὶ, "Πρὸ τοῦ με ταπεινωθῆναι", φησὶν, "Ἐγὼ ἐπλημμέλησα· διὰ τοῦτο τὸ λόγιόν σου ἐφύλαξα"¹⁰. μέσην πλημμελείας τε καὶ διορθώσεως τιθεῖς τὴν ταπεινώσειν, ὡς ἐκ μὲν ταύτης γεννωμένην, τὴν δὲ γεννήσασαν· ἁμαρτία μὲν γὰρ ταπεινώσεως μήτηρ, ἐπιστροφῆς δὲ ταπεινώσεις. (Gregory Nazianzean's First Invective against Julian the Emperor 32)

(8) Ταῦτα μὲν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανίων καὶ τῶν ἄνω συμπασχόντων τοῖς ἡμετέροις, κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην τοῦ παντός ἁρμονίαν τε καὶ οἰκείωσιν· τὰ δὲ ἐξῆς ὁ ψαλμὸς συμπληροῦτω μοι· ὅτι "Καὶ πόλεις καθεῖλες" (ὡς τὰς παλαιὰς ἐκείνας ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀσεβήμασιν), ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς καθ' ἡμῶν παρανομίαις, τὰς μὲν πελάγεις ἐπικλυσθείσας, τὰς δὲ σεισμῶν κατενεχθείσας, ὡς μικροῦ καὶ τὸ λειπόμενον ἔχειν εἶπεῖν, ὅτι "Ἀπόλετο τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν μετ' ἧχου"¹¹ καὶ περιβοήτου τῆς ἀπωλείας· τοσαύτη γὰρ αὐτῶν ἢ πτώσις, καὶ τοιοῦτο τὸ σύντριμμα, καὶ τῶν ἐκ γειτόνων, καὶ μάλιστα τῆς ἀσεβείας περιχαιρόντων, ὡς πολλοῦ χρόνου δεῖν αὐταῖς, εἴ τις ἄρα καὶ τολμήσειε τοῦτο πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν. (Gregory Nazianzean's Second Invective against Julian the Emperor 6)

In examples (7) and (8) Gregory Nazianzean incorporates into his speech the intertextualistic source so as to prove and support his thought. In this way the orator promotes himself as an honest and reliable personality.

(9) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Μωσῆς αἰτίαν ἀποδέδωκε κομιδῆ μωθώδη τῆς περὶ τὰς διαλέκτους ἀνομοιότητος. ἔφη γὰρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνελθόντας πόλιν ἐθέλειν οἰκοδομεῖν καὶ πύργον ἐν αὐτῇ μέγαν, φάνα δὲ τὸν θεόν, ὅτι χρὴ κατελθεῖν καὶ τὰς διαλέκτους αὐτῶν συγγέαι. καὶ ὅπως μή τις με νομίση

⁹ For more information about intertextuality see de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), Bakhtin (1981· 1986·1993), Kristeva (1980), Riffaterre (1978·1983·1990).

¹⁰ *Psalms* 118, 71.

¹¹ *Psalms* 9,7.

(12) ἔκ μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνης, καθὰ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος λέγει, βλάπτεται μὲν οὐδὲν ὁ προσφερόμενος, ἡ δὲ συνείδησις τοῦ βλέποντος ἀδελφοῦ σκανδαλισθεῖ ἄν καθ' ὑμᾶς, ὧ̃ σοφώτατοι καὶ ὑπερήφανοι.
(Julian against Galileos 229cd)

In general the audience is forced to take part in the text production through vocatives. Besides this, in the above examples the superlative degree adjectives give an evaluative character to these vocatives, as they evaluate the political opponent with a dose of irony.

2.5. Use of the personal Pronoun

It is noted that both orators use the personal pronoun *ἐγὼ* before different verbs in order to state their opinion and express their intention. In Gregory's first speech the personal pronoun *ἐγὼ* is followed by these verbs *διαλέξομαι* for commissive speech act and *οἶδα* for representative speech acts. In Gregory's second speech the personal pronoun is combined with these verbs: *ἐξηγήσομαι*, *καταλύσω*, *οἶδα* either in commissive speech acts or in representative as a means for the producer of the text to express his opinion. In his speech *Against Galileos* Julian combines with the below verbs: *γενόμενα*, *μακρολογῶ*, *ἐντέλλομαι*, *φαίην ἔν*, *ὑπερασπίζω σου*, *παραδώσω* (16 N of occurrences), which are included either in representative or commissive speech acts. In addition, it is also worth mentioning that both orators use mostly verbs, such as *οἶδα*, *οἶμαι* with or without subject, since it is incorporated in the suffix in Greek. These verbs give them the opportunity to express his ideas, opinion and the knowledge they have about an issue because of their character.

Table 1. Frequency of private verbs *οἶμαι* and *οἶδα*

Private Verbs	Gregory First Speech	Gregory Second Speech	Julian Against Galileos
οἶμαι	R ¹⁴ 284, F ¹⁵ 6	R 448, F 2	R 127 F 11
οἶδα	R 169, F 10	R 259, F 6	R 440 F 3

Based on the above table we understand that Gregory prefers to use more than Julian the verb *οἶδα* (16 times in total). It must be said that this verb is mostly (14 times from 16) in negative form (*οὐκ οἶδα*) and is accompanied by a clause. Through the negative forms the text producer expresses his opinion for the content of this clause and reveals his doubt about the truth of this

¹⁴ R means Rank.

¹⁵ F means Frequency.

clause. In two other cases, this verb is accompanied by adverbs such as $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}$, as an indicator for displaying text's producer deep knowledge of what he says. Instead of Gregory, Julian through $\omicron\tilde{\mu}\alpha\iota$ promotes himself as a modest personality. In most cases the verb $\omicron\tilde{\mu}\alpha\iota$ is used by both orators in a parenthetical way, as an attempt to express their opinion kindly and modestly.

Moreover, it is necessary to define the usage of the personal pronouns by both orators. For this reason the following table (3) lists the uses of the first and second personal pronouns by both orators.

Table 3. Personal pronouns usage

Pronouns	Gregory First Speech	Gregory Second Speech	Total Amount in Gregory's Speeches	Julian <i>Against Galileos</i>
1st person sg reference ἐγώ	6	6	12	6
ἐμοῦ, μοῦ	0	0	0	0
ἐμοί (ἔμοιγε), μοι	2	3	5	2
ἐμέ, με	19	0	19	0
Total amount	27	9	36	8
1st person pl reference ἡμεῖς	12	9	21	12
ἡμῶν	25	16	41	25
ἡμῖν	33	9	42	33
ἡμᾶς	35	11	46	35
Total amount	105	45	150	105
2nd person sg reference σὺ	2	5	7	14
σοῦ, σου	7	3	10	2
σοί, σοι	15	7	22	15
σε, σε	4	0	4	0
Total amount	28	15	43	31
2nd person pl reference ὕμεῖς	1	1	2	1
ὕμῶν	6	1	7	6
ὕμῖν	12	1	13	12
ὕμᾶς	3	1	4	13
Total amount	22	4	26	32
Total of all 1st and 2nd personal pronoun	182	73	255	176

Based on the above table it is seen that Gregory generally uses more frequently the 1st and 2nd personal pronouns than Julian does. It is worth mentioning that the first personal pronoun (*ἐγώ*) in singular is used with the same frequency (6 times) by both speakers in each of their speeches. The same thing happens with these types: *σοί, σοι, ἡμεῖς, ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν, ἡμᾶς, ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν* between Gregory's first speech and Julian's. In this way we could say that both orators, even though they differ in their political and theological orientation, they try through their speeches either to involve into the content of their text not only themselves but also the audience, or to be detached from the audience so as to express their ideas and thoughts. Last but not least, it is noted that Gregory in his second speech reduces the use of the personal pronouns in all cases except for the nominative of the first personal pronoun (*ἐγώ*) as a strategy of his communicative goal.

2.6. Impersonal syntax

(13) Καὶ τοῦτο δηλον ἐξ ὧν βραχὺ μὲν παρ' αὐτῶ τὸ τῆς πειθοῦς, πλεῖον δὲ τὸ τῆς βίας εὐθύς ἐπόμενον ἦν ἴν', ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς θήραις, ἢ ταῖς πάγαις ἀλῶμεν, ἢ τοῖς διώγμασι, καὶ εἷς γε τρόπος πάντως ἡμᾶς χειρώσεται.
(Gregory Nazianzean's First Invective against Julian the Emperor 63)

(14) Ἄξιον δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτο παραδραμεῖν τοῦ ἀνδρός, μεγίστην τῆς ἐκείνου κακοδαιμονίας ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ἔχον ἀπόδειξιν.
(Gregory Nazianzean's Second Invective against Julian the Emperor 14)

(15) Μικρὸν δὲ ἀναλαβεῖν ἄξιον, ὅθεν ἡμῖν ἦκει καὶ ὅπως ἔννοια θεοῦ τὸ πρῶτον, εἶτα παραθεῖναι τὰ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ θεοῦ λεγόμενα, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπανερέσθαι τοὺς οὔτε Ἕλληνας οὔτε Ἰουδαίους, ἀλλὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίων ὄντας αἰρέσεως, ἀνθ' ὅτου πρὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων εἶλοντο τὰ παρ' ἐκείνοις, [...] φαῦλον δὲ καὶ ἐπισευρμένον βίον ἐκ τῆς παρ' ἡμῖν ῥαθυμίας καὶ χυδαιότητος, τοῦτο τὴν ἀρίστην θεοσεβείαν ἠθέλησαν ὀνομάζεσθαι.
(Julian against Galileos 42e-43b)

In all the above examples both orators use impersonal syntax either with representative speech acts, so as to legitimize and give emphasis on their thought, or directive speech acts (*μικρὸν δὲ ἀναλαβεῖν ἄξιον*) that give a more evaluative character to the message because of their deontic modality.

2.7. Contrast and antithesis¹⁶

(16) Ταῦτα οὐ σέβεις (S), ἀλλ' ἀτιμάζεις (N)...
(Gregory Nazianzean's First Inveictive against Julian the Emperor 70)

(17) Γελῶ σου τὸν Πῶνα, καὶ τὸν Πρίαπον, καὶ τὸν Ἐρμαφρόδιτον, καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ μανίας περικεκομμένους ἢ διεσπασμένους θεοὺς (S). Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν τῆ σκηνῆ παρήσω, καὶ τοῖς κοσμοῦσιν αὐτοὺς ποιηταῖς· ἐγὼ δὲ εἰς παραίνεσιν τινα καταλύσω τὸν λόγον (N).
(Gregory Nazianzean's Second Inveictive against Julian the Emperor 32)

(18) Ὅτι δὲ οὐχ Ἑβραίων μόνον ἐμέλησε τῷ θεῷ, πάντων δὲ ἔθνῶν κηδόμενος ἔδωκεν ἐκείνοις μὲν οὐδὲν σπουδαῖον ἢ μέγα (N), ἡμῖν δὲ μακρῶ κρεῖττονα καὶ διαφέροντα, σκοπεῖτε λοιπὸν τὸ ἐντεῦθεν (N).
(Julian against Galileos 176ab)

In the above examples both orators try to persuade through the rhetorical relation of contrast and antithesis. In example (16) the antithesis is ensured through the syntactic schema οὐ... ἀλλ' ; the main message of this structure is revealed in the nucleus of this sentence (ἀλλ' ἀτιμάζεις), as Julian is disapproved of his impiety. The disapproval operates as a means for Gregory's praise. In the same way example (17) contributes to the text's producer's goal as he states that he will give an encouraging character to his speech and will stop any kind of disapproval and ridicule.

In example (18) the metalinguistic expression σκοπεῖτε λοιπὸν τὸ ἐντεῦθεν gives the opportunity to Julian to invoke the audience attention as a directive speech act. Besides this, the antithetical conjunction (οὐχ μόνον-δέ) and the antithetic pair (ἐκείνοις μὲν-ἡμῖν δέ) contribute to the contradiction of two theological systems. The orator leads the public to make this certain comparison through the relation of contrast, as he wants to give emphasis on the negative characteristics of the empire with reference the theological system that must change. If these characteristics change, then his political goal for improvement and elaboration will be achieved. To sum up, in all the examples the rhetorical relations of antithesis and contrast promote the text producer and enable him to have a favourable effect on the public.

2.8. Lexical similarities

For the purposes of this analysis at this point follows table 2 with the most frequently used words in order to draw some conclusions about the vocabulary used by orators examined.

¹⁶ For more information about coherence see de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), Mann & Thompson (1986· 1988), Hoey (1993) and Winter (1977).

Table 2. The most frequent content words in both orators

Gregory Nazianzean Word Frequency		Julian Word Frequency	
Λόγος	85	Θεός	213
Θεός	65	Μωυσής	50
άσέβεια	38	άνθρωπος	48
Χριστιανός	38	Λόγος	34
εύσέβεια	23	Κύριος	18
Χριστός	16	Ψυχή	15
ψυχή	15	Ίουδαίοι	12
βασιλεύς	14	οἶμαι	11
άλήθεια	13	μᾶλλον	12
βασιλεία	13	Χριστός	8

Even though they are two personalities with different political and theological thoughts and beliefs they use a basic, core vocabulary that gives them the opportunity to express their ideas about their theological system. It seems that these words have a moral content and reflect the importance of certain concepts for the policies of these two orators. These words also reflect the theological system of that period which was based on piety before the Gods.

2.9. Appeal to logic

(19) Τοῦ δὲ ἡ πονηρία τοῖς λογισμοῖς ἐπεσκότισε (S)· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μικροῖς τε ὁμοίως καὶ μείζοσι πλέκει τὸν διωγμὸν (N).

(Gregory Nazianzean's First Invective against Julian the Emperor 75)

(20) Ἄξιον δὲ μὴδὲ τοῦτο παραδραμεῖν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, μεγίστην τῆς ἐκείνου κακοδαιμονίας ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ἔχον ἀπόδειξιν (N). Ἔκειτο μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ ὄχθῃ τοῦ ποταμοῦ, καὶ πονηρῶς εἶχε τοῦ τραύματος· πολλοὺς δὲ εἰδὼς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ δόξης ἠξιωμένων, ὡς ἂν ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον νομισθεῖεν, τέχναις τισὶν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀφανισθέντας, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεοὺς νομισθέντας ἔρωτι τῆς αὐτῆς δόξης ἐαλωκῶς, καὶ ἅμα τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς τελευτῆς διὰ τὸ τῆς ἀβουλίας ἄδοξον αἰσχυνόμενος, τί μηχανᾶται, καὶ τί ποιεῖ; οὐδὲ γὰρ τῷ βίῳ συναναλίσκεται πονηρία· ῥίψαι κατὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ πειρᾶται τὸ σῶμα, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο ἐχρηῖτό τισι τῶν πιστῶν ἑαυτοῦ συνεργοῖς καὶ μύσταις τῶν ἀπορρήτων. Καὶ εἰ μὴ τῶν βασιλικῶν εὐνούχων τις, τὸ πρᾶγμα αἰσθόμενος, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις καταμηνύσας, μίσει τοῦ κακουργήματος τὴν ὁρμὴν διεκώλυσε, κἄν ἐφάνη τις ἄλλος τοῖς ἀνοήτοις θεὸς νέος ἐξ ἀτυχήματος. Ἄλλ' ἐκεῖνος οὕτω μὲν βασιλεύσας, οὕτω δὲ στρατηγήσας, οὕτω καὶ καταλύει τὸν βίον (S).

(Gregory Nazianzean's Second Invective against Julian the Emperor 14)

(21) Καλῶς ἔχειν ἔμοιγε φαίνεται τὰς αἰτίας ἐκθέσθαι πᾶσιν ἄνθρωποις, ὑφ' ὧν ἐπέισθην ὅτι τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἡ σκευωρία πλάσμα ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ κακουργίας συντεθέν (N). ἔχουσα μὲν οὐδὲν θεῖον, ἀποχρησαμένη δὲ τῷ φιλομύθῳ καὶ παιδαριώδει καὶ ἀνοήτῳ τῆς ψυχῆς μορίῳ, τὴν τερατολογίαν εἰς πίστιν ἤγαγεν ἀληθείας (S).
(Julian against Galileos 39ab)

Both orators resort to argumentative rhetorical relations as part of a logical organization pattern. In example (19) through the rhetorical relation of cause Gregory tries to explain the Julian's behavior against Christians. In example (20) through the rhetorical relation of evidence he tries to prove Julian's misfortune. Through the relation of evidence in example (21) Julian tries to prove that Christianity uses myths as a means in order to deceive people. To crown it all, both orators try through the argumentative relations (cause, evidence) and their text organization to persuade and explain to the public everything they talk about.

3. CONCLUSION

Through the above multidisciplinary analysis it is fully understood that Julian and Gregory Nazianzean use some rhetorical strategies that promote their rhetorical and communicative goals. Most of the certain ideological strategies are used in the same way aiming at catching the attention and maintaining the interest of their audience. This does not mean that both orators do not have their personal style, but it means that their ideological and political goal leads them to prefer certain strategies so as to have a favourable effect on public. In this way, no one can deny that orators rely on political holistic characteristics and systematic rhetorical mechanisms in order to persuade.

4. REFERENCES

- Alexandropoulos, G. (2012). *Text and context in Flavius Claudius Julian's political speeches: coherence, intertextuality and communicative goal*. PhD Thesis. University of Athens.
- Athanassiadi, P. (1992). *Julian: an intellectual biography*. London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the Novel. In: Holquist, M. (ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. (Trans. by Vern W. McGee). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1993). *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. (Ed. V. Liapunov and M. Holquist. Trans. Vadim Liapunov). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bernardi, J., Mossay, J., Gallay, P. (1978). *Discours, Grgoire de Nazianze; introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Sources Chretiennes*. Paris: Editions du Cerf.

- de Beaugrande, R. & W. Dressler (1981). *Introduction to Textlinguistics*. London: Longman.
- Biber, D., & R. Reppen (2011). *Corpus Linguistics; Volume One: Lexical Studies*. London: Sage.
- Borg, J. (2007²). *Persuasion – The Art of Influencing People*. London: Pearson / Prentice Hall.
- Chafe, W. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and oral literature. In: Tannen, D. (ed.), *Spoken and written language*. Notwood: Ablex, 35-55.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1999). Towards a Theory of Context and Experience Models in Discourse Processing. In: van Oostendorp, H. & S. Goldman (eds.), *The Construction of Mental Representations during Reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 123–48.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Discourse, Ideology and Context. *Folia Linguistica* XXX (1–2): 11–40.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). Discourse, social theory, and social research: the discourse of welfare reform. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4 (2): 163-195.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical discourse Analysis*. In: van Dijk T. A. (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage Publications, 258-284.
- Hoey, M. (1993). A common signal in discourse: how the word “reason” is used in Texts. In: Sinclair, J. M., G. Fox & M. Hoey (eds.), *Techniques of Description in Spoken and Written Discourse: A Tribute to Malcolm Coulthard*. Taylor & Francis, London.
- Holt, E. (1996). Reporting on Talk: The Use of Direct Reported Speech in Conversation. In *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29 (3): 219-245.
- Holt, E. (2000). Reporting on Reacting: Concurrent Responses to Reported Speech. In *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33(4): 425-454.
- Johnstone, B. (1989). Linguistic strategies and cultural styles for persuasive discourse. In: Ting-Toomey, S. & F. Korzenny (eds.), *Language, communication and culture: current directions*. Newbury Park: Sage, 139–156.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Mann, W. C. & S. A. Thompson (1986). Relational propositions in discourse. *Discourse Processes* 9 (1): 57 – 90.
- Mann, W. C. & S. A. Thompson (1988). Rhetorical Structure Theory: towards a functional theory of text organization. *Text* 8 (3): 243 – 281.
- Mayes, P. (1990). Quotation in spoken English. In *Studies in Language* 14(2): 325-363.
- McGuckin, J. (2001). *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography*. Crestwood, NY.
- Migne, J. P. (1857-1866). *Patrologiae Graecae Cursus Completu*.
- Riffaterre, M. (1978). *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press.
- Riffaterre, M. (1983). *Text Production*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Riffaterre, M. (1990). Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive. In: Worton, M. & Still, J. (eds.), *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 56-78.

- Roberts, W.R. (1984). *The Rhetoric and the poetics of Aristotle*. New York: The Modern Library.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1994). How Performatives Work. In: Harnish, R. M. (ed.), *Basic Topics in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 75-95.
- Searle, J. R. (1996a). What is a Speech Act? In: Martinich, A. P. (ed.), *The Philosophy of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 130-140.
- Searle, J. R. (1996b). Indirect Speech Acts. In: Martinich, A. P. (ed.), *The Philosophy of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 168-182.
- Sornig, K. (1989). Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion. Στο: Wodak, R. (ed.), *Language, Power and Ideology. Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 95-113.
- Wright, W. C. (1912-1913). *The works of the emperor Julian*. London: Loeb Clas. Libr.
- Winter, E. (1977). A clause relational approach to English texts: a Study of some predictive items in written discourse. *Instructional Science* 6/1: 1-92.