

## RHE 330D Classical to Modern Rhetoric (44115) Fall 2010 • Ruskiewicz

---

Unique Number: 44115

Prerequisite: Completion of at least thirty semester hours of coursework, including English 316K or the equivalent.

Course Website: Blackboard

Place and Time: Monday & Wednesday, 11–12:30; PAR 6

Instructor: John Ruskiewicz

Office: Calhoun 202

Telephone: 471–8764 (personal line); 471–6109 (DRW Office)

E-mail: ruskiewicz@mail.utexas.edu

Office Hours: MW 3:30–5 and by appointment

**Goals:** **Rhetoric 330D Classical to Modern Rhetoric** will survey the history of rhetoric, one of the original seven liberal arts, exploring its impact on political, religious, and literary discourse in the West from antiquity to (almost) modern times.

In "Classical to Modern Rhetoric," we will examine the theorists and practitioners who shaped the arts of speaking and writing in Europe and America. We will read several classical texts (including *Phaedrus*, the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, selections from Cicero and Quintilian) to understand how rhetoric was taught and practiced in antiquity and where it stood in relationship to the other arts of the trivium: logic and grammar. The influence of rhetoric in the Medieval and Renaissance periods will be presented chiefly through literary and religious texts—for example, selected English sermons, *Julius Caesar*, "Areopagitica," and so on. We will also examine the influence of rhetoric on English prose style and the on the development of scientific and philosophical writing.

In the modern period, the course will examine British/Scottish neo-classical and belletristic rhetorics, particularly as they shaped systems of education and literary tastes in England and America. The decline, near disappearance, and renewal of the rhetorical tradition in the last century will be chronicled (briefly) through the work of major figures, including Kenneth Burke, Richard Weaver, Chaïm Perelman, and Stephen Toulmin.

Our focus throughout the semester will be both theoretical and practical: we will read the theory and then examine cultural and political applications

**Coursework:** Coursework in RHE 330D will focus on readings from the work of major rhetoricians and several artists. There will be a midterm and final examination. You will also prepare a series of position papers (approximately 500 words) submitted to the Blackboard Discussion Board for feedback and response, revising them for submission as the major component of the final portfolio. Finally, you will also prepare a twenty-minute oral report on a subject related to the history of rhetoric; these reports will be scheduled throughout the term. I will also schedule conferences with you to work on both your portfolio and oral report.

**Grades:** To pass the course, you must turn in **on time** a full set of response papers. Timely submission of these items is a course requirement: you will be penalized **up to three points** from your course total per paper for position papers turned in late or not at all. Do the math; this is a serious penalty.

Your final grade will be calculated according to the average of the major projects with the following values:

Midterm exam / 30%  
Final exam / 30%  
Oral Report / 10%  
Portfolio / 30%

For more details, check the grading grid on Blackboard. Note that this formula presumes satisfactory attendance and the completion of all routine assignments (including reading assignments) on time.

Your exams, report, and portfolio will receive a letter grade assigned the following values:

A / 100-94  
A- / 93-90  
B+ / 89-87  
B / 86-84  
B- / 83-80  
C+ / 79-77  
C / 76-74  
C- / 73-70  
D+ / 69-67  
D / 66-64  
D- / 63-60  
F / 59-0

The same values will apply to the final course grade.

Do not discard any drafts, notes, papers or research materials you produce during the course until after you have received a final grade. You may want to keep course materials in a folder or on Webspaces. Your final portfolio will be submitted in both electronic and paper form

You will need to load files to Discussion Boards on the RHE 330D Blackboard site. The process is as simple as attaching a document to email. Let me know if you have a problem with the procedure.

**Materials and Textbooks:** For this class, you will need to purchase:

- Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg. *The Rhetorical Tradition*. 2nd Ed. Boston: Bedford-St. Martin's, 2001.

**Attendance/Late Assignments:** You are expected to attend class regularly and to participate in in-class editing, revising, and discussion. If you miss six classes or more, you will fail automatically. Please take attendance seriously.

Position papers and other out-of-class assignments are due at the beginning of the class period for which they are assigned. You will be penalized for late papers or for missing your assigned oral presentation day. Short out-of-class assignments or Web forum postings are not accepted late. There is no makeup of in-class work and no extra credit.

**Scholastic Responsibility/Complaints:** Turning in work that is not your own or any

other form of scholastic dishonesty will result in a major course penalty (including possible failure in the course). A report of the incident will also be made to the Office of the Dean of Students. For more information about Scholastic Dishonesty, see [http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/scholdis\\_what\\_is.php](http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/scholdis_what_is.php) or search "Scholastic Dishonesty" on the University of Texas at Austin Website.

Bring any questions you have about grades or policies to me first. Complaints we cannot resolve can be taken to the Associate Director of the Department of Rhetoric and Writing (Parlin 3).

**Accommodation for Students with Disabilities:** The University of Texas at Austin provides upon request appropriate academic adjustments for qualified students with disabilities. For more information, contact the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, 471-6259 at <http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/>.

**Accommodations for Religious Holidays:** By UT-Austin policy, you must notify me of your pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of a religious holy day. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

**Course Overview:** The day-by-day schedule following indicates the dates of lectures, exams, oral reports, papers, and assignments.

## August

### August 25

Course introduction/policies.

### August 30

Lecture/discussion: Stanley Fish, "Rhetoric" (1605-27); Introduction to the Classical Period (19-39)

Position Paper #1: Response to Stanley Fish, "Rhetoric" due in Discussion Board

## September

### September 1

Lecture/discussion: Gorgias (42-46); Anon, "Dissoi Logoi" (47-55); Isocrates, "Against the Sophists" (67-75); Plato (80-86)

### September 8

Lecture/discussion: Plato, *Gorgias* (87-109)

### September 13

Lecture/discussion: Plato, *Phaedrus* (138-68)

Position Paper #2: Response to Plato's *Phaedrus* due in Discussion Board

### September 15

Lecture/discussion: Aristotle (169-77); *Rhetoric* Bk 1 (Sections I-IV, 179-88 and Section XV, 210-13)

### September 20

Lecture/discussion: *Rhetoric* Bk 2 (213–36); *Rhetoric* Bk 3 (236–40)  
Discussion of Oral Reports (PowerPoint presentation)  
Position Paper #3: Response to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* due in Discussion Board

### **September 22**

Lecture/discussion: *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, (241–42; browse 248–65, beginning with Section VIII; read 265–82 a little more closely, beginning with Section XXXI)

### **September 27**

Lecture/discussion: Cicero (283–88) *De Oratore* (from Bks II–III 320–39)

### **September 29**

Oral Report: TBA

Lecture/discussion: Begin reading Quintilian (359–63); *Institutes of Oratory* (Chs I–VII, 364–77; Chs XV–XVI, 385–91; BK X, Chs II–III, 400–07; BK XII, Ch 1, 412–18)

## **October**

### **October 4**

Position Paper #4: Response to *Institutes of Oratory* due in Discussion Board

Lecture/discussion: Introduction to Medieval Rhetoric (431–47)

Augustine (450–54); *On Christian Doctrine* Bk IV (read 456–60 closely; browse 461–82 to section 58; read closely 482, section 59–485)

### **October 6**

Lecture/discussion: Anonymous [of Bologna], *The Principles of Letter Writing* (492–502)

### **October 11**

Midterm examination

### **October 13**

Lecture/discussion: Introduction to Renaissance Rhetoric (555–77); Erasmus (581–85); *Copia* (597–609; skim Bk II, 609–27)

### **October 18**

Lecture/discussion: Peter Ramus (674–80), "Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian" (681–97)

Oral Report: TBA

Position Paper #5: Response to "Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian" due in Discussion Board

### **October 20**

Lecture/discussion: Thomas Wilson (698–701); *The Arte of Rhetorique* (702–09, 730–32)

Francis Bacon (736–39) *The Advancement of Learning/Novum Organum* (740–47)

Oral Report: TBA

### **October 25**

Lecture/discussion: Shakespeare/Milton Selections from *Julius Caesar*, *Henry V*, and "Areopagitica"

Oral Report: TBA

### **October 27**

Lecture/discussion: Introduction to Enlightenment Rhetoric (791–812)

John Locke, "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding," (814–27)  
Oral Report: TBA

## November

### November 1

Lecture/discussion: Giambattista Vico (862–64); "On the Study Methods of Our Time,"  
Section VII (871–75)  
Gilbert Austin (889–90), *Chironomia* (890–97)  
Oral Report: TBA

**November 3** Lecture/discussion: Hugh Blair (947–49); *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles  
Lettres*: Browse Lecture II on "Taste" (954–61); read Lecture XXV (969–74)  
Lecture/discussion: Introduction to Nineteenth Century Rhetoric (983–98)  
Richard Whately (1000–02), from *Elements of Rhetoric* (1003–14)  
Oral Report: TBA

### November 8

Lecture/discussion: Alexander Bain and Adams Sherman Hill (1141–44); Alexander Bain  
(1145–48); Adams Sherman Hill (1149–51)  
Discussion of portfolio assignment  
Position Paper #6: Response to Whately, Bain & Hill due in Discussion Board Oral  
Report: TBA

### November 10

Lecture/discussion: Herbert Spencer (1152–54), from *The Philosophy of Style* (1154–67)  
Oral Report: TBA

### November 15

Lecture/discussion: Introduction to Modern & Postmodern Rhetoric (1183–1202)  
Kenneth Burke (1295–97); "Language as Symbolic Action" (1340–47)  
Oral Reports: TBA

### November 17

Lecture/discussion: Richard Weaver (1348–49), "Language Is Sermonic" (1351–60)  
Oral Reports: TBA

### November 22

Lecture/discussion: Chaim Perelman (1372–74); from "The Realm of Rhetoric" (1379–83)  
Oral Reports: TBA

### November 29

Lecture/discussion: Stephen Toulmin (1410–12); from "The Uses of Argument" (1417–  
23)  
Oral Reports: TBA

## December

### December 1

Lecture/discussion: Stanley Fish, "Rhetoric," again, (1605–27)  
Final portfolio of Position Papers due. Papers submitted on this date will receive regular  
comments.  
Oral Reports: TBA

### December 3

Extended deadline date for final portfolio. Papers must be submitted through mail slot in Calhoun 202 not later than 1:00 pm. Papers submitted on this date will receive truncated comments.

### December 8

Final examination: 9–12 pm (room to be announced).

**Specific Course Assignments:** Following are course assignments as they appear on the RHE 330D Website:

### Portfolio

**Purpose:** To provide a reflective, well-written response to the rhetorical tradition as you have encountered it this term

**Length:** Approximately 15 double-spaced pages

**Format:** Submitted in both paper and electronic form (as a file attached to the appropriate Blackboard Forum)

**Final version due:** December 1 at 11:00 am for typical comments; December 3 by 1:00 in Calhoun 202 for truncated remarks

On the final day of class, you will submit in both paper and electronic form a portfolio representing your work this term in RHE 330D. This portfolio functions as the equivalent of a research paper: it should be prepared and presented with similar care.

Your portfolio should include **revised versions of your five best position papers** bracketed by **an introduction of 1–2 pages** and **a brief conclusion**. The original position papers should be reshaped to reflect what has been learned over the semester. They should also, to some degree, talk to each other, becoming part of a coherent argument about the rhetorical tradition. You can introduce new ideas, repudiate earlier claims, or recast your work entirely.

The portfolio should be carefully composed and edited: grammar and mechanics will count. If you draw on sources or quote from the authors we have read this term (and you should), document those borrowings correctly using MLA style. The portfolio itself should follow MLA style in format. Be sure that your document meets the following criteria:

- It has a proper opening page with title, author's name, and course information. (MLA does not use a separate title page.)
- It has 1-inch margins all around.
- It is paginated in the upper right-hand corner on all pages, including the first.
- It is double-spaced throughout, including the Works Cited page, if one is included.
- It is properly documented.
- Titles of books are either underscored or italicized consistently.

Please feel free to talk to me about your portfolio. You may also get advice from the Undergraduate Writing Center as you develop this project—though probably not from consultants currently in the RHE 330D course. The portfolio will receive a single grade unrelated to the marks or comments you may have received on the individual position papers.

The portfolio will be graded on this scale:

- **C** for presenting an adequately formatted and edited sequence of reworked position papers that convey an accurate sense of major themes covered in the 330D course.
- **B** for presenting a confidently edited sequence of significantly revised position papers that critically assess the major figures and themes covered in the 330D course.
- **A** for presenting an impressively edited and stylish sequence of intelligently revised and expanded position papers that together defend a coherent thesis about the history of rhetoric as examined in RHE 330D.

### Oral Report

Once during the term, each member of RHE 330D will present an oral report (about 15–20 minutes) on some theorist, text or topic related to rhetoric. You may choose to cover a rhetorician or theorist from Bizzell & Herzberg's *The Rhetorical Tradition* not included on our syllabus. Or you may apply the principles of rhetoric explored in the course to a significant rhetorical text or texts—an argument, manifesto, speech, or other public document or production with some historical significance.

In either case, plan on consulting with me about your topic and make an office appointment early in the term to discuss your strategy, sources, and potential materials. I would encourage you to schedule your report so that it coincides with what we are covering in class: for example, a report about a Renaissance writer should occur while we are covering other 15th–16th century rhetoricians. However, I will eventually assign dates for reports so that they don't all occur in a cluster at the end of the term.

This is a graded assignment worth 10% of your grade, so plan your oral report carefully. Choose an author or text you can research well enough to show **a degree of expertise**. (A bibliography follows all the figures covered in Bizzell & Herzberg.) Be sure to provide the background facts about the author or text (who, what, where, when, why), and then lead the class into a brief discussion of its rhetorical dimensions.

You may use whatever media our classroom will support, including PowerPoint, audio or visual recordings, even paper handouts with additional material or discussion questions. But you may also keep the report simple, relying on your own rhetorical skills.

The assignment will be graded on this scale:

- **Seven points** for showing up with a respectable topic and getting through it.
- **Eight points** for presenting that topic coherently and showing an adequate knowledge of the subject gained from research.
- **Nine–Ten points** for presenting the material impressively, engagingly and professionally, and meeting all the criteria in the "Making an Oral Presentation" PowerPoint available under "External Links." A notably successful presentation will also lead your colleagues into a serious and self-sustaining discussion.

### Response Papers

During the course of the term, you will be asked to write **a series of papers in response to specific reading assignments** in RHE 330D Classical to Modern Rhetoric. These six assignments are listed in the syllabus. Submission of these papers is a course requirement, but will not have a direct bearing upon your final grade. Instead, the papers will provide the material for your end-of-the-term course portfolio described in more detail in an "Assignments" item below. However, you will receive feedback on the response papers—and should use the comments in revising the items for the portfolio.

The individual response paper assignments are described on the Discussion Board

where you will post your entries and respond to those of your colleagues. You will also turn in a paper copy of each assignment to me. Be sure that the paper copy is **double spaced, has ample margins, and includes a useful title, your name, and course information**. Improperly formatted papers won't be read.

In general, a response paper should run **approximately five hundred words**. Use the study guides prepared for the assigned authors (posted under course documents) to stimulate your thinking. But be sure that your response paper develops a coherent idea and, perhaps, a thesis. Response papers should be thoughtful and reflect your careful reading of texts, but they may also be tentative and intellectually playful. You will have an opportunity to rethink and expand them before they become part of the graded portfolio. But these items themselves should also be carefully and persuasively written, with a minimum of mechanical slips and gaffes.

### **Response Paper #1**

Write a response paper of approximately 500 words in which you examine "Rhetoric" by Stanley Fish (BH, pp. 1605–1627). You may find this a puzzling and difficult assignment, especially if you haven't had previous courses in rhetorical/ critical theory or postmodernism. But I don't expect you to have such a background. What I want you to get from Fish is some sense of the historical issues we'll be addressing throughout the semester. (Look carefully at the syllabus and you'll notice that we return to Fish's essay on the last class day.)

Respond to what you do understand in Fish—to any particular sections or paragraphs that intrigue you or help you, perhaps, to see a connection between the rhetorical tradition and the world in which you live—political, social, civic, or otherwise. Take some risks: it's early in the semester.

Post your response to the assigned reading to this discussion board and be sure to read and **comment on one or more of your colleagues' papers**. Be sure, too, to bring a double-spaced print version of the response paper to class; I will comment on it and return it to you in a few days.

For general information about the purpose, length, and structure of position papers, check "Response Papers" under the "Assignments" menu.

**This assignment is due before class on August 30 in both electronic and paper forms.**

### **Response Paper #2**

Write a response paper of approximately 500 words in which you explore Plato's intriguing dialogue *Phaedrus* (BH, pp. 138–68). Read the introduction to *Phaedrus* carefully, remembering that it is written as a dialogue between characters. Consult the study guide as well to appreciate the connections this work has to the rhetorical tradition. Respond to any features that command your attention, from its famous depiction of *eros* to its description of an ideal art of rhetoric.

Post your response to the assigned reading to the discussion board and be sure to read and comment on one or more of your colleagues' papers. For general information about the purpose, length, and structure of position papers, check "Response Papers" under the "Assignments" menu.

**This assignment is due before class on September 13 in both electronic and paper form.**

### **Response Paper #3**

Write a response paper of approximately 500 words in which you explore Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Respond to the full reading assignment, from all three books (BH, pp. 179–86, 210–40). Be sure to consult the study guide as you prepare your paper.

Post your response to the assigned reading to this discussion board and be sure to read and comment on one or more of your colleagues' papers. For general information about the purpose, length, and structure of position papers, check "Response Papers" under the "Assignments" menu.

**This assignment is due before class on September 20 in both electronic and paper form.**

### **Response Paper #4**

Write a response paper of approximately 500 words in which you examine Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory*. Be sure to examine the full reading assignment (BH, pp. 320–39, 364–77, 385–91, 400–07, 412–18) and to consult the study guide as you prepare your paper. But because of the breadth of Quintilian's work, you may want to respond in detail just to one particular section: for example, his definition of oratory or his theories of education.

Post your response to the assigned reading to the discussion board and be sure to read and comment on one or more of your colleagues' papers. For general information about the purpose, length, and structure of position papers, check "Response Papers" under the "Assignments" menu.

**This assignment is due before class on October 4 in both electronic and paper form.**

### **Response Paper #5**

Write a response paper of approximately 500 words in which you examine Peter Ramus's *Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian* (BH, pp. 681–97). You should have a good time reacting to this pugnacious piece—which differs significantly from most works we have read to this point. As always, be sure to consult the study guide as you prepare your paper. Don't be afraid to adopt a little of Ramus's swagger, but remember how he met his end: defenestration.

Post your response to the assigned reading to the discussion board and be sure to read and comment on one or more of your colleagues' papers. For general information about the purpose, length, and structure of position papers, check "Response Papers" under the "Assignments" menu.

**This assignment is due before class on October 18 in both electronic and paper form.**

### **Response Paper #6**

Write a response paper of approximately 500 words in which you explore the readings by Richard Whately (BH, pp. 1000–14), Alexander Bain, and Adams Sherman Hill (BH, pp. 1145–51), placing these short pieces in a context set by Bizzell & Herzberg's discussion of "The Rhetoric of Composition" on pp. 993–95. You may also want to consider whether the way you were taught writing in elementary and secondary school (and college, too, perhaps) was related more to the composition methodology of writers like Whately, Bain,

and Hill than to the rhetorical tradition.

Post your response to the assigned reading to the discussion board and be sure to read and comment on one or more of your colleagues' papers. For general information about the purpose, length, and structure of position papers, check "Response Papers" under the "Assignments" menu.

**This assignment is due before class on November 8 in both electronic and paper form.**