



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Edu Humanit Lit

ISSN: 2584-2544 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjehl/>

Volume – III Issue – I (January- February) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



CULTURE AND RHETORIC: CAN THEY EXIST WITHOUT EACH OTHER? A RESEARCH PROPOSAL.

Jakub Z. Lichański 

Professor of humanities in the discipline of literary studies, historian of literature and culture, specialist in rhetoric

| **Received:** 27.01.2026 | **Accepted:** 31.01.2026 | **Published:** 07.02.2026

***Corresponding author:** Jakub Z. Lichański

Professor of humanities in the discipline of literary studies, historian of literature and culture, specialist in rhetoric

Abstract

The problem posed in the title seems both apparent and crucial. Its solution depends on how we understand the terms: culture and rhetoric. The definitions proposed in this study are not immediately obvious. Rhetoric should be understood following Quintilian's "Rhetorice est inveniendi recte et disponendi et eloquendi cum firma memoria et cum dignitate actionis scientia" [Quint., V.10.54]; culture, on the other hand, is cumulative and should be perceived as information obtained from others through mechanisms of social transmission, such as imitation, teaching, or language. In this situation, rhetoric possesses the tools for this social transmission. The tools of transmission will be both imitation (imitatio) and teaching and language, which are related to rhetoric (téchne rhetoriké). With this understanding of both terms—culture and rhetoric—it turns out that the latter is indispensable to culture. This article therefore provides evidence for this hypothesis.

Keywords: rhetoric, culture, AI review of rhetoric and culture, Aristotle, M.F. Quintilian, Philodemos, Martin Borrhaus, Józef I.M. Bocheński OP, Wolfram Ax, Alex Mesoudi, R.E. Volkmann.

AB AUCTORE: RHETORICA ET EIUS EFFECTUS IN CULTURAM

The problem seems apparent, as rhetoric is one of the most important tools of culture (*Histoire de la rhétorique* 1999; Booth 2004; Lichański 2017a). Of course, we must remember that there is no consensus among scholars on clear definitions of both concepts. I will mention just two examples: Leonhard von Spengel's still

important study, which, although published in 1863, has not lost its relevance and provides over 50 definitions of rhetoric from ancient times – though we too rarely use them (Spengel 1863, 481-526). On the other hand, although this source is not entirely reliable, a review of the bibliography provided under the entries "Kultura [Culture]" and "Culture" on Wikipedia (<https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kultura>, [2025-10-24] and <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture>, [2025-10-24]) reveals a profound complexity in understanding the concept.

It should also be remembered that rhetoric itself, in its classical sense, is currently being marginalized, even as a result of linguistic research, especially when it comes to text linguistics. This also applies to pedagogy, where rhetoric as a tool in education is no longer important, and if it is invoked, it is more likely as a collection of stylistic devices and as a propaedeutic for oratory. Finally, postmodern thinking is also reluctant to refer to classical rhetoric. In this situation, the question of rhetoric's role in culture, while undisputed historically until the late 19th century, seems entirely marginal in the 20th and 21st centuries. However, programs such as WAC (*Writing Across the Curriculum*) (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Writing_across_the_curriculum, [2025-10-24]) indicate that we are witnessing a renaissance of rhetoric, and its role in culture, particularly in education, which is one of the mechanisms for the social transmission of information, remains important.

Is the categorical statement I opened this discussion with at least a significant risk of error? I believe that the research hypothesis that rhetoric is indispensable to culture, considered one of the most important mechanisms for the social transmission of information in areas such as imitation, teaching, and finally, language, is defensible¹. The text "*Culture and Rhetoric: Can they exist without each other? Research proposal*" is an attempt to demonstrate that the hypothesis: rhetoric is one of the most important tools for culture is a thesis.

Before I proceed to prove the above hypothesis and demonstrate its validity, I will point out that education is, of course, the most important element of culture, and its role among the mechanisms of social transmission in acquiring information is undeniable (Mesoudi 2011, 1); moreover, culture is cumulative in nature (Mesoudi 2011a, 1-16). Alex Mesoudi demonstrates these propositions using the example of humanist culture, which shaped the intellectual face of a world rooted in the Mediterranean tradition from the 14th to the 17th century. It is also worth paying attention to extremely important texts, such as Martin Borrahus's edition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (Borrahus 1551), as well as Father Jan Wierus's short but extremely valuable text, *Assertiones Rhetoricae* (1577). It is also worth consulting the anthology *Literaturnye manifesty zapadnoevropejskich klassicistov* (*Literary manifests of the Western European classicists*, 1980), or Bernard Weinberg's earlier *Trattati di poetica e rhetorica delo Cinquecento* (1970-1974), to see that Alex Mesoudi's judgment is solidly founded.

These problems were discussed in great detail by Stefan Swieżawski in his studies of European philosophy in the 15th century (Swieżawski 1974-1987). These issues were also presented in the volume edited by Małgorzata Frankowska-Terlecka, *Rhetoric in the 15th Century. Studies on the Tradition, Theory, and Practice of Fifteenth-Century Rhetoric* (1988). One could add here the volumes from the series *History of Catholic Theology in Poland*, particularly the second volume (1975), which covers the period from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment, including issues

¹ The volume *Antiquity and Modernity...*, Warsaw 2015, demonstrates the power of reception of ancient philosophy, including rhetoric, in contemporary thought. Also included is *Classical Rhetoric and Contemporary Rhetoric...*, Warsaw 2017, which demonstrates the influence of rhetoric on culture. Similarly, *Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism* 2012, Dziekoński 2023, pp. 33-82, and Horner 1990, *passim*.

related to education. The volumes mentioned, and this is only a selection from the broader literature, fully confirm Alex Mesoudi's assessment.

Of course, one could object to the presented remarks that the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries saw a breakthrough associated with the emergence of Romantic movements, which quite consciously rejected the older tradition. However, an analysis of texts by authors such as Maurycy Mochnecki, Tomasz S. Dziekoński, and Ricarda Huch suggests caution in the view that rhetoric is being abandoned as a significant cultural tool. I pointed out these issues in my study of the Romantic tradition (Lichański 2024, 57-80).

At the same time, I must refer to the review of the relationship between rhetoric and culture conducted by AI. There are suggestions that

Rhetoric and culture are interconnected because rhetoric is the study of persuasion and communication, while culture provides the context for those messages. All cultures are rhetorical, and all rhetorics are cultural, meaning that the way a culture persuades an The way a culture makes meaning is influenced by its own unique customs, values, and historical context. The study of cultural rhetoric examines how these elements interact, shaping public discourse and individual identity. (Culture and Rhetoric, Review from AI, 2025-11-19).

This observation is both accurate and inaccurate. Rhetoric is not the study of persuasion and communication, and culture does not provide the context for these messages. Rhetoric is the science of textual construction and argumentation based on uncertain premises, while culture is one of the mechanisms of social transmission—the transfer of information in areas such as imitation, teaching, and finally, language. For me, these are distinct disciplines, independent, though they certainly interact and draw on each other's methods.

So we return to the title question: can culture exist without rhetoric? I believe the answer is unequivocal—culture cannot exist without rhetoric. It's time, therefore, to prove the hypothesis.

INTRODUCTION

I will therefore reiterate that the problem posed in the title seems both apparent and crucial. It boils down to understanding the terms culture and rhetoric, or more precisely, how we will use them and what referents we use them to describe². The definition proposed in this study is not, at first glance, obvious. Initially, I will understand rhetoric (Spengel 1863, 481-526; Lichański 2007, 1.20-25, 59-87) following Quintilian: *Rhetorice est inveniendi recte et disponendi et eloquendi cum firma memoria et cum dignitate actionis scientia* (Quint., V.10.54). This understanding is echoed by Philodemos: [...] *first, one must carefully consider the content and choose words that are not inappropriate for it, and in the final phase, one must add a beautiful stylistic setting and provide the work with what makes it enjoyable* (PHIL., poet., NK).

Culture poses a greater problem, because, firstly, it is *cumulative in nature* (Mesoudi 2011a, 5)³, and, secondly, it must be perceived as

² In order to determine both the understanding and use of terms and what designates we use them to describe, we must use *the principles of status science*, cf. Volkmann 1885/1987, pp. 33-92, and Lichański, 2007, vol. 1, pp. 98-104.

³ Unless otherwise noted, all translations are by Jakub Z. Lichański.

information obtained from others through **mechanisms of social transmission**, such as imitation, teaching, or language (Mesoudi 2011, 1; emphasis – JZL). In this situation, rhetoric possesses the tools for the aforementioned social transmission. Both imitation (imitatio), teaching, and language are tools used by rhetoric (*téchne rhetoriké*) (CORN., *rhet. ad Her.*, *passim*; Volkmann 1885/1987; Lichański 2025, 3987-3997). With this understanding of both terms—culture and rhetoric—it turns out that the latter is indispensable to culture. This article provides evidence for this hypothesis.

PROBLEMA PRAESENTANDUM

It's worth beginning by recalling the opinion of Martin Borrahaus⁴, who interprets the beginning of Aristotle's Rhetoric as follows:

"Ἡ ρητορική ἐστὶν ἀντίστροφος τῇ διαλεκτικῇ [...] Ars rhetorica dialecticae tanquam ex altera parte respondent [...] or the Art of Rhetoric corresponds to dialectic as if from the other side" (Borrahaus 1551, f. A1r).

In this way, Borrahaus links rhetoric with the skill of asking questions, interpretation, and argumentation, and in this sense it is also part of logic (specifically, the Organon; it includes the Categories, On Interpretation, On Sophistic Proofs, Analytics I and II, and Topics). This issue is crucial because the Greek term – *antistrophos* – indicates at least the dual nature of rhetoric as a science. It is similar to dialectic, yet at the same time merely its counterpart. Rhetoric, as Sonja K. Foss noted centuries later, says something important about the subject of speech (and further, about its structure, etc.), but also about the speaker and his or her audience (Foss 1989, 191-196).

Certain issues related to rhetoric were definitively clarified in the works of Wolfram Ax (Ax 2000; Lichański 2008, 247-256). He emphasized that language must be considered as *lexis* and *dianoia*, or the level of grammar, which only tells how to construct a correct utterance (*the lexis level*, meaning one that is understandable to all users of a given language), and *the level of dianoia* belonging to rhetoric (poetics serves as a "service" to it), which deals with shaping thought, i.e., when we use the rules of grammar (along with syntax) to present it clearly and emphatically in our speech. This was pointed out by, among others, Stefania Skwarczyńska (Skwarczyńska 1954, 2. 324-397) (from the perspective of literary studies) and Leon Zawadowski (Zawadowski 1966, 145-148) (from the linguistic perspective), not to mention other researchers.

QUOMODO CONCEPTUS INTELLEGERE

It is therefore clear how I understand the concepts in the title. Let us reiterate that culture is:

[...] *information obtained from others through mechanisms of social transmission*, such as imitation, teaching, or language (Mesoudi 2011, 1; emphasis – JZL).

Moreover – to reiterate – culture possesses the characteristic of "cumulativeness" (Mesoudi 2011a, 5); this means that past solutions influence our contemporary perception of cultural phenomena (Histoire de la rhétorique 1999; Booth 2004; Lichański 2017a). This also means that, in a sense, we continue to use past solutions, only adapting them to changing circumstances, i.e.,

peristases. These remarks align with Józef Bocheński's reflections on culture (Bocheński 2024, 136-151). He states:

Culture is defined as the totality of all things that humans, as humans, contribute to nature. [...] Culture can be external or internal. [...] Hence, external culture has three parts: religion, social life, and technology. Internal culture, on the other hand, concerns the body or the soul. If it concerns the former, it is physical culture, "sports," cosmetics, etc. If it concerns the latter, it refines either the intellect, the will, or the emotions. Culture that refines the intellect is science, culture that refines the will is morality, and culture that refines emotions is partly morality, partly fine art (Bocheński 2024, 137).

Thus, both terms complement each other.

Rhetoric, on the other hand, should be perceived – I will expand on the ancient definitions provided earlier – as follows:

Rhetoric is a formal system in which rules are defined for constructing, analyzing, and, i.e., uttering an infinite number of correct texts composed of a finite number of correct sentences, or periods. Both the sentences, or periods, and the texts are: organized inventively, dispositionally, and elocutionally. This ordering serves to present specific ideas in the eye and refers to specific values. Both the ordering of texts and the presentation of specific ideas and the reference to specific values are the result of intentional acts of the author (Lichański 2007, I.80).

This can be linked to the previously mentioned remarks by both Stefania Skwarczyńska and Leon Zawadowski (Skwarczyńska 1954, 2. 324-397; Zawadowski 1966, 145-148). However, it is important to recall Philodemus's important reservation that rhetoric can be fully applied only within literature (PHIL., 2006, II.1-3; Asper 2019, 655-674). In law and social life, however, the principle is to strive for truth (PHIL., 2006, II.4). I would also add philosophy and the sciences here, which is consistent with Józef Bocheński's remarks (Bocheński 2024, 96): the aim of philosophizing is to obtain truth for its own sake. The same principle applies to science.

CONCLUSIONES PRAELIMINARES

The conclusions are therefore quite obvious: with the understanding of culture as I have presented, rhetoric is a virtually indispensable tool for it. Both in terms of conveying information and as a tool of social transmission. A significant element of this transmission, within the tools of rhetoric, is the topic (Curtius 1997; Emrich 1977, 235-263; Wagner 2009, Bd. 9, Col. 605-626; Ostheeren, Kalivoda, Ranieri, von Rosen, Danuser, Jordan, & Gessmann, 2009, Bd. 9, Col. 630-724; Thompson 2023). It is thanks to the topic that certain motifs recur, ensuring continuity in the way of perceiving, for example, interpersonal relationships; what's more, they are elements of argumentation. But they, along with tropes and figures, are also elements of both continuity and imitation, and are continually perpetuated through teaching and language (Berger 1987; Classen 1988, 7-19; Booth 1991; Collingwood 1937; Göttert 1991).

Moreover, rhetoric, as an important tool of philology and hermeneutics, helps to perpetuate certain ways of perceiving the world and its interpretation (Boeckh 1886; Korbust 1924; Skwarczyńska 1948; Lonergan 1976; Rožděstvenskij 1979; Mantzavinos 2005; Turner 2014; Senegačnik 2021, 103-125; Lichański 2025, 3957-3997). Finally, research on tradition has shown the necessity of its subjective perception (Szacki 1971).

⁴ Description of Borrahaus's study in: Lichański, 2007, vol. 1, pp. 32, 94-96.

DISPUTATIO

However, certain doubts can be raised regarding the presented concept. These can primarily be attributed to changes that have occurred in the perception of language (*Structural Linguistics* 1979) and all the consequences its development has brought. The development of phenomenology has also introduced certain fundamental innovations in the perspective on literary works (Ingarden 1960; Lichański 2017) and, more broadly, culture (Stein 2016, 363-366ff). These changes, such as text linguistics and cultural studies not only among phenomenologists but also postmodernists, raise fundamental doubts about whether rhetoric is a valid tool for cultural research.

However, it can be pointed out that the issues, particularly those related to the development of linguistics, do not contradict the previously stated point. Simply put, the approaches proposed by structural linguistics, in particular, as well as phenomenological research, can be considered complementary to the approach proposed by rhetoric, along with hermeneutics and the general principles of philology (Boeckh 1886; Mantzavinos 2005; Senegačnik 2021, 103-125; Lichański 2025, 3957-3997). The same observation can be made regarding cultural research, because in a phenomenological approach, the problem of values, which is closely related to the issue of culture, can be linked to the previously cited remark by Józef Bocheński; the opinion contained in André Lalande's dictionary is very similar:

[Culture] more generally and usually: The character of an educated person who, thanks to this education, has developed his critical sense and judgment: education that aims to shape this character. [...] Culture, and then its supplementation [culture of memory, culture of mind]. (Lalande 1972. 199-200).

Also, the approaches to culture proposed by, among others, the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (<https://plato.stanford.edu/> (2024-09-30)) and Burkhardt Dücker and Ivo Strecker (Dücker 1998, Bd. 4, col. 1384-1420; Strecker 1998, Bd. 4, col. 1421-1439) indicate that various definitions of this concept can be reconciled with the principles of *téchne rhetoriké*. I also believe that Richard P. Feynman's opinion, quoted as the epigraph, clearly points to the role not only of education but also of the critical thinking that should accompany it. And technical rhetoric, thanks to the tools that are at the stages of inventio, dispositio and elocutio, help find answers to the questions that Feynman posed to the teacher, *resp.* education.

CONCLUSIONES

The conclusion is therefore obvious – the hypothesis that rhetoric is essential in the study of culture has been defended and can be considered a thesis. Moreover, culture cannot exist without rhetoric, but perceived in its classical form as *téchne rhetoriké*. Especially if we remember its important interpretations, for example those proposed by Martin Borrahaus (Aristotle 1551). It is also worth referring to the mottoes with which I opened these considerations. Guillaume Tardif merely recalled that rhetoric is essential when preparing any text (the term "writer" should be understood more broadly). Richard Emil Volkmann, on the other hand, pointed to rhetoric as a tool for shaping social life correctly, i.e., in accordance with Immanuel Kant's principle: *Act in such a way that you always use humanity [the human person – note JZL], both in your own person and in the person of every other, as an end and never merely as a means* (Kant 1953, 62). In both cases, rhetoric proves indispensable to culture; as, by the way, Richard P.

Feynman's remark also emphasizes. And let us remember the warning of both Socrates and Christ that in our statements about important matters we should strive to discover the truth, and not amuse ourselves with oratorical tricks, a point emphasized by both Plato and Διδαχή (PL., *de rep.*, II.382e; V.454a; VII.533d; Διδαχή 2025, II.4-5).

Literature and notes

1. *Antyk i współczesność* [Antiquity and Modernity] 2015 = *Antyk i współczesność. Recepcja filozofii starożytnej w myśli współczesnej. Od czasów Nietzschego do początków XXI wieku*, red. Cyprian Mielczarski, Wyd. Nauk Sub Lupa, Warszawa.
2. *Językoznawstwo strukturalne* [Structural Linguistics] 1979 = *Językoznawstwo strukturalne. Wybór tekstów*, red. Halina Kurkowska, Adam Weinsberg, PWN: Warszawa.
3. *Retoryka klasyczna i retoryka współczesna* [Classical Rhetoric and Contemporary Rhetoric] 2017 = *Retoryka klasyczna i retoryka współczesna. Pola i perspektywy badań*, red. Cyprian Mielczarski, Wyd. Scripta, Warszawa.
4. ARIST. = Arystoteles
5. Arystoteles. *Martini Borrahai Stugardiani in tres Aristotelis de arte dicendi libros commentaria. Hermolai Barbari, eorundem versio, cum Graeco textu capitibus suis distincto...*, ex off. I. Oporini, Basileae 1551.
6. Arystoteles 1973 = Arystoteles, *Analityki pierwsze i wtóre* [Primary and secondary analytics], tł., wstęp, kom. Kazimierz Leśniak, PWN, Warszawa.
7. Arystoteles 1975 = Arystoteles. *Kategorie i hermeneutyka z dodaniem Isagogi Porfiriusza* [Categories and Hermeneutics with the addition of Porphyry's Isagoga], tł., wstęp, przypisy Kazimierz Leśniak, PWN: Warszawa.
8. Arystoteles 1978 = Arystoteles, *Topiki* [Topics], tł., wstęp, kom. Kazimierz Leśniak, PWN, Warszawa.
9. Arystoteles 1983 = Arystoteles. *Metafizyka* [Metaphysics], tł., wstęp, kom. Kazimierz Leśniak, PWN: Warszawa.
10. Arystoteles 1988 = Arystoteles, *Retoryka. Poetyka* [Rhetoric. Poetics], tł. i opr. Henryk Podbielski, PWN, Warszawa.
11. Asper 2019= Asper, Markus. *Rhetorik als Literatur. Streifzüge durch Handbücher*. In: *Handbuch antike Rhetorik*, Hrsg. Michael Erler, Christian Tornau, Propylaeum VLG: Berlin, S. 655-674.
12. Ax 2000 = Ax, Wolfram. *Lexis und Logos. Studien zur antiken Grammatik und Rhetorik*, hrsg.. Farouk Grewing, F. Steiner Vlg., Stuttgart.
13. Berger 1987 = Berger, Klaus. *Einführung in die Formgeschichte*, Francke Vlg.: Tübingen [UTB 1444].
14. Bocheński 2024 = Bocheński, Józef Innocenty Maria, OP. *Wykłady z metodologii ogólnej* (Rzym, 1934-1935) [Lectures on general methodology], tom 1, wydanie

- łacińsko-polskie, opr., wpraw. Dariusz Radziechowski, tł. Alicja Marczevska, Dariusz Radziechowski, Wyd. Wolski, Kraków.
15. Boeckh 1886 = Boeckh, August. *Encyclopadie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften*, wyd. Ernst Brauschteck, wyd. 2 red. Rudolf Klusmann, Teubner Vlg., (reprint: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH) [także: <https://archive.org/details/encyklopdieund00bcuoft/mode/2up>, (2024-10-02)].
 16. Booth 2004 = Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric. The Quest for Effective Communication*, Blackwell Publ., Malden.
 17. Booth 2004 = Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric. The Quest for Effective Communication*, Blackwell Publ., Malden.
 18. Classen 1988 = Classen, Carl Joachim. *Ars Rhetorica: l'essence, possibilities, Gefahren*, "Rhetorica", vol. VI, n° 1, p. 7-19
 19. Collingwood 1938 = Collingwood, Robin G. *The Principles of Art*, Oxford University Press, London.
 20. CORN. = Cornificius, Quintus
 21. Cornificius 2019/2020 = Cornificius, Quintus. *Rhetorica ad Herrenium*, tł., kom. J.Z. Lichański, "Forum Artis Rhetoricae" 2019, (57) 2, s. 5-160 [najnowsze wyd.: *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, prolegomena, edizione, trad., commento G. Calboli. De Gruyter, New York, Berlin 2020 [SWC]].
 22. Culture, por. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture>, [2025-10-24].
 23. Curtius 1997 = Curtius, Robert Ernst, *Literatura europejska i średniowiecze łacińskie* [European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages], tł. A. Borowski, wyd. 2, Kraków.
 24. Διδαχή 2025 = Didachè. *Nauka dwunastu Apostołów* [The Didachè. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles], wydanie dwujęzyczne; tł. pol. Kamil Mańka, Wyd. Akapit, Toruń.
 25. Dücker 1998 = Dücker, Burkhardt. *Kultur*. In: *HWdR*, Bd. 4, col. 1384-1420.
 26. Dziekoński 2023 = Dziekoński, Tomasz. *Rozprawa obejmująca ogólny rys historii retoryki w Polsce* [A treatise covering the general outline of the history of rhetoric in Poland]. w: *Retoryka*, wyd. J.Z. Lichański, DiG, Warszawa [seria: „Forum Artis Rhetoricae” nr 2, s. 33-82].
 27. Emrich 1977 = Emrich, Bertold. *Topika i topoi* [Topics and topoi], tł. J. Koźbial, "Pamiętnik Literacki", R. 68, z. 1, s. 235-263.
 28. Foss 1989 = Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism As the Asking of Question*, "Communication Education", Vol. 38, pp. 191-196 [pol .tł. "Forum Artis Rhetoricae" 2016, 47 (4), s. 70-79].
 29. Frankowska-Terlecka, Małgorzata. Red. *Retoryka w XV stuleciu. Studia nad tradycją, teorią i praktyką retoryki piętnastowiecznej* [Rhetoric in the 15th Century. Studies on the Tradition, Theory, and Practice of Fifteenth-Century Rhetoric], Wyd. Ossolineum, Wrocław et al., 1988.
 30. Göttert 1991 = Göttert, Karl-Heinz. *Einführung in die Rhetorik*, W. Fink Vlg.: München [UTB 1599].
 31. *HWdR* 1992-2015 = *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, Hrsg. von W. Jens, G. Ueding, Red. G. Kalivoda et al., Bd. 1-12, Max Niemeyer Vlg., W. de Gruyter, Tübingen, Berlin-Boston.
 32. *Histoire de la rhétorique* 1999 = *Histoire de la rhétorique dans l'Europe moderne: 1450-1950*, ed. Marc Fumaroli, PUF, Paris.
 33. Horner 1990 = Horner, Winifred B. Ed., *The Present State of Scholarship in Historical and Contemporary Rhetoric*, Univ. of Missouri Press, Columbia, London.
 34. Ingarden 1960 = Ingarden R., *O dziele literackim* [About the literary work], tł. Maria Turowicz, PWN, Warszawa.
 35. Kant 1953 = Kant, Immanuel. *Uzasadnienie metafizyki moralności* [Justification of the metaphysics of morality], tł. Mściława Wartenberg, PWN, Warszawa.
 36. Korbut 1924 = Korbut, Gabriel. *Wstęp do literatury polskiej: zarys metodyki badania literatury* [Introduction to Polish Literature: An Outline of Literature Research Methodology], Wyd. Kasa im. J. Mianowskiego: Warszawa.
 37. Kornificjusz = Cornificius, Quintus
 38. Kultura, por. <https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kultura>, [2025-10-24].
 39. Kultura i retoryka, Przegląd od AI (Culture and Rhetoric, Review from AI), [2025-11-19].
 40. Lalande 1972 = Lalande, André. *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie*, ed. 11, PUF, Paris, p. 199-200.
 41. Lichański 2008 = Lichański, Jakub Z. *Retoryka i poetyka: siostry czy rywalki? Komentarz do rozdziału XIX 1456a35-1456b15 „Poetyki” Arystotelesa* [Rhetoric and Poetics: Sisters or Rivals? Commentary on Chapter XIX 1456a35-1456b15 of Aristotle's "Poetics"]. w: *Od poetyki do hermeneutyki literaturoznawczej. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Adamowi Kulawikowi w 70. rocznicę urodzin*. Kraków, s. 247-256.
 42. Lichański 2015 = Lichański, Jakub Z. *Nietzsche i retoryka – niezrealizowany projekt* [Nietzsche and rhetoric – an unrealized project]. w: *Antyk i współczesność. Recepcja filozofii starożytnej w myśli współczesnej. Od czasów Nietzschego do początków XXI wieku*, red. Cyprian Mielczarski, Wyd. Nauk Sub Lupa, Warszawa, s. 81-105.
 43. Lichański 2017 = Lichański, Jakub Z. *W poszukiwaniu najlepszych form komunikacji, czyli dlaczego wciąż jest nam potrzebna retoryka* [In search of the best forms of

communication, or why we still need rhetoric], Coll. Columbinum, Kraków 2017.

44. Lichański 2017a = Lichański, Jakub Z. *Filologia – Filozofia – Retoryka. Wprowadzenie do badań (nie) tylko literatury popularnej* [Philology – Philosophy – Rhetoric. An Introduction to the Study of (Not) Only Popular Literature], DiG: Warszawa.
45. Lichański 2024 = Lichański, Jakub Z. *Światopogląd romantyczny dziś, czyli po co nam romantyzm* [The Romantic Worldview Today, or Why Do We Need Romanticism?], w: *Romantyzm w dyskursach pedagogiki kultury*, Wyd. Difin, Warszawa 2024, s. 57-80.
46. Lichański 2018 = Lichański, Jakub Z. [Rhetoric, Mathematics, Physics, and Argumentation Introduction to the Discussion](#), “Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Litteraria Polonica” 48 (2), pp. 21-37.
47. Lichański 2025 = Lichański, Jakub Z. *Philology and its Status (in in the Context of Other Sciences)*, “International Journal of Social Science and Human Research” vol. 008, issue 006, p. 3987-3997.
48. *Literaturnyje manifesty zapadnoevropejskich klassicistov* 1980 = *Literaturnyje manifesty zapadnoevropejskich klassicistov* [Literary manifestos of Western European classicists], sobr. Tekstob, vstupitelnaja statja, red. N.P. Kozlova, Izd. Moskovskogo Univ., Moskva.
49. Lonergan 1976 = Lonergan, Bernard, J.F. *Metoda w teologii* [Method in theology], tł. Andrzej Bronk, IW PAX, Warszawa.
50. Mantzavinos 2005 = Mantzavinos, Chris. *Naturalistic Hermeneutics*, Oxford Univ. Press.: Oxford [por.: <https://www.amazon.pl/Naturalistic-Hermeneutics-Chris-Mantzavinos/dp/0521848121>, (2024-10-21)]
51. Mesoudi 2011 = Mesoudi, Alex. *Cultural Evolution: How Darwinian Theory Can Explain Human Culture and Synthesize the Social Sciences*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.,.
52. Mesoudi 2011a = Mesoudi, Alex. *Culture and the Darwinian Renaissance in the Social Sciences and Humanities*. (For a special issue of the *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, “The Darwinian Renaissance in the Social Sciences and Humanities”), “Journal of Evolutionary Psychology”, pp. 1-16.
53. Ostheeren, Kalivoda, Ranieri, von Rosen, Danuser, Jordan, Gessmann, 2009 = Ostheeren, Klaus. Kalivoda, Gregor. Ranieri, Filippo. von Rosen, Valeska. Danuser, Hermann. Jordan, Stefan. Gessmann Martin. *Topos*. In: *HWdR*, Bd. 9, Kol. 630-724.
54. PHIL. = Philodemos
55. Philodemos 2002 = Philodemos, *O muzyce. O utworach poetyckich. Epigramy* [About music. About poetic works. Epigrams], wstęp, tł., oprac. Krystyna Bartol, Prószyński i S-ka, Warszawa [seria: Biblioteka Antyczna].
56. Philodemos 2006 = Philodemos, *On Rhetoric: Books 1 and 2*, [wyd., przeł., oprac.] C. Chandler, New York, London (*Studies in Classics*).
57. PL = Platon
58. Platon 1990 = Platon, *Państwo* [De republica], tł. opr., wstęp Władysław Witwicki, t. 1-2, Wyd. AKME: Warszawa.
59. QUINT. = Quintilianus Marcus Fabius
60. Quintilianus 1971 = Quintilianus Marcus Fabius, *Institutiones oratoriae*, wyd. Ludwig Radermacher, t. 1-2, Teubner, Lipsiae.
61. Rechowicz, Marian. Red., *Dzieje teologii katolickiej w Polsce* [The history of Catholic theology in Poland], t. 2, cz. 1-2, Wyd. TN KUL, Lublin 1975.
62. Rožděstvenskij 1979 = Rožděstvenskij, Jurij W. *Vvedenije v obszczuju filologiu* [Introduction to General Philology], Izd. Wyzszaja Szkoila, Moskva.
63. Senegačnik 2021 = Senegačnik, Branko. *August Boeckh, klasični filolog in hermenevtik* [August Boeckh, classical philologist and hermeneutic], „Primerjalna Knjizevnost”, nr 2, s. 103-125.
64. Skwarczyńska 1948 = Skwarczyńska, Stefania. *Systematyka głównych kierunków w badaniach literackich* [Systematizing the main trends in literary studies], I, ŁTN, Łódź.
65. Skwarczyńska 1954 = Skwarczyńska, Stefania. *Wstęp do nauki o literaturze* [Introduction to the study of literature], t. 1-3, IW PAZ, Warszawa, t. 2.
66. Spengel 1863 = Spengel, Leonhard von. *Die Definition und Eintheilung der Rhetorik bei den Alten*, “Rheinisches Museum für Philologie” 18, s. 481-526.
67. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* = *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/> (2024-09-30).
68. Stein 2016 = Stein, Edyta (św. Teresa Benedykta od Krzyża). *Filozofia psychologii i humanistyki* [Philosophy of psychology and the humanities], wstęp, opr. Beate Beckmann-Zöller, tł. Piotr Janik SJ, Marcin Baran SJ, Jolanta Gaca, Wyd. Karmelitów Bosych, Kraków
69. Strecker 1998 = Strecker, Ivo. *Kulturanthropologie*. In: *HWdR*, Bd. 4, col. 1421-1439.
70. Świeżawski 1974-1983 = Świeżawski, Stefan. *Dzieje filozofii europejskiej w XV wieku* [The history of European philosophy in the 15th century], t. 1-6, Wyd. ATK, Warszawa.
71. Świeżawski 1983 = Świeżawski, Stefan. *Między średniowieczem a czasami nowymi: sylwetki myślicieli XV wieku* [Between the Middle Ages and the Modern Period: Profiles of 15th-Century Thinkers], Wyd. Więź, Wyd. Znak, Warszawa-Kraków.
72. Świeżawski 1987 = Świeżawski, Stefan. *U źródeł nowożytnej etyki: filozofia moralna w wieku XV* [At the Sources of Modern Ethics: Moral Philosophy in the 15th Century], Wyd. Znak, Kraków.
73. Szacki 1971 = Szacki, Jerzy. *Tradycja* [Tradition], PWN: Warszawa

74. Thompson 2023 = Thompson, Stith, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Motif-Index_of_Folk-Literature, (18-01-2023).
75. Turner 2014 = Turner, James. *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton.
76. Volkmann 1885/1987 = Volkmann, Richard Emil. *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht dargestellt*, 2 Aufl., Leipzig (repr. Hildesheim
77. WAC = Writing Across the Curriculum.
78. Wagner 2009 = Wagner, Tim. *Topik*. In: *HWdR*, Bd. 9, Kol. 605-626.
79. Weinberg 1970-1974 = Weinberg, Bernard. Ed., *Trattati di poetica e retorica delo Cinquecento*, vol. I-IV, Laterza & Figli, Bari.
80. Wierus 1577 / 2000= Wierus, Jan. *Assertiones Rhetoricae*, Poznań. W: Lichański, Jakub Z. *Retoryka: od renesansu do współczesności – tradycja i innowacja*, DiG, Warszawa, s. 44-61.
81. Writing Across the Curriculum, por. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Writing_across_the_curriculum, [2025-10-24].
82. Zawadowski 1966 = Zawadowski, Leon. *Lingwistyczna teoria języka [Linguistic theory of language]*, PWN, Warszawa.