HU2130 Introduction to Rhetoric

Room: 134 Walker
Time: 9:35 – 10:50 p.m. TTh
Semester: Spring 2014
Instructor: Associate Prof. Craig Waddell
Office: Room 302 Walker
Office Hours: 2-3 TTh; other times by appointment
Phone: 487-3261 (office)
E-mail: cwaddell@mtu.edu

Required Texts


Online versions (or your own print versions) of various primary texts; see draft schedule of assignments below.

Policy on Multitasking

Extensive research has shown that multitasking simply doesn’t work and that the people who are most confident about their ability to multitask are, in general, the worst at multitasking successfully. The most dramatic evidence we have for this is with respect to using a cell phone (for either talking or texting) while driving. Hence, if you use an mp3 player, cell phone, laptop, tablet, or other electronic device in class, I will count you absent for that day. If you want to test your multitasking potential, visit http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ahg6qcgoay4 (This test is only valid if you haven’t seen this or a similar test previously.)

General Course Description

This course examines the conceptualization (abstraction from practice of principles that can be taught to others) of rhetoric (loosely, the art of persuasion or of practical reasoning) in ancient Greece and the transference of that tradition to ancient Rome.

The course will focus on
1. The historical, social, and cultural contexts for the conceptualization and teaching of rhetoric, with an overview of Greek history from the early Bronze Age (ca. 3000 BCE) to the rise of Macedon and Alexander the Great (ca. 360-320 BCE);

2. Key questions and issues in the early history of rhetoric that remain of interest today (What is rhetoric? What is its scope? Can it be taught? Can virtue be taught? etc.);

3. Key terms and concepts in early rhetoric (logos, pathos, and ethos; enthymeme; kairos; topoi; stasis; etc.);

4. Key figures and texts in the early history of rhetoric (Isocrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, etc.); and

5. Resources for the further study of rhetoric.

**What is Rhetoric?**

A simple answer to this question might be “the art of practical reasoning” or “the art of persuasion.” However, since it was first conceptualized in ancient Greece almost 2,500 years ago, rhetoric has been variously defined by its many theoreticians and practitioners. For example, Isocrates defined rhetoric (indirectly) as the art of determining “what we should do or what we should say”; Aristotle defined rhetoric as “the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion”; Donald Bryant defined rhetoric as “the function of adjusting ideas to people and people to ideas”; Robert Scott defined rhetoric as “not a matter of giving effectiveness to truth but of creating truth”; and Wayne Booth defined rhetoric as “the art of discovering warrantable beliefs and improving those beliefs in shared discourse.”

**What is Conceptualized Rhetoric?**

In the first edition of *Classical Rhetoric & Its Christian & Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (1980), George A. Kennedy says, “All arts, including the arts of discourse, employ techniques to accomplish their purposes. The author may know how to use these techniques, but he may never have taken thought to define them, catalogue them, or conceptualize them. That is, he may be unable to state general concepts describing what he does when speaking, even though he may be a good speaker. One of the most remarkable features of the classical period in Greece is the conscious conceptualization of human faculties, including grammar, rhetoric, logic, and poetics” (6).

Kennedy goes on to say that natural rhetoric occurs in all human societies, and he acknowledges that some degree of conceptualization of rhetoric occurred both in ancient India and in ancient China (for example, in Han Fei Tzu’s [c.a. 280-233 BCE] *Difficulties in the Way of Persuasion*). He claims, however, that “Neither in India nor in China . . . did rhetoric become a separate discipline with a fully developed theory, its own logical structure, and a corpus of pragmatic handbooks. Such a degree of conceptualization is apparently found only in the Greco-Roman
world, where it begins to appear coincident with the rise of Greek philosophy and other forms of conceptualization in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.” (7).

This claim has been criticized as ethnocentric, and in the two decades since Kennedy published this work, much new research has been published on non-Western rhetorics. I suppose that similar criticisms might be raised against the claim that the art of war was first conceptualized in ancient China in Sun Tzu’s *The Art of War*, and that the art of love was first conceptualized in ancient India in Vatsyayana’s *The Karma Sutra*. In any case, it is still useful to examine (1) the social and political conditions that led to the conceptualization of rhetoric in ancient Greece; (2) the nature of that conceptualized rhetoric and the key issues that early rhetoricians and their philosophical opponents debated; and (3) the modern political and educational legacy of classical rhetoric.

**Social and Political Conditions Leading to the Conceptualization of Rhetoric**

According to the traditional story, the art of rhetoric was first conceptualized in the ancient Greek world following the demise of the tyrant of Syracuse, which was then a Greek colony. In 465 BCE, the tyrant Hieron died and was replaced by his brother, Trasybulus. In 465 BCE, Thrasybulus was overthrown by other family members, who were, in turn, overthrown by democratic forces. In the wake of this political upheaval, numerous property disputes were brought before the courts (“Before the time of the tyrants, this land was my great-grandfather’s, and I want it back.”).

An enterprising fellow named Corax reputedly observed a number of cases being tried and abstracted from his observations principles that could be taught (for a fee) to others in order to increase their chances of successfully pleading their cases. Corax and Tisias, who may have been Corax’s student, became renowned for their teaching. In 427 BCE, their fellow Sicilian Gorgias (480-375 BCE) became ambassador to Athens and brought with him a marked skill in rhetoric and a method of teaching it. For the Athenians, this was roughly analogous to the British Rock Invasion.

This traditional story has been challenged by some modern scholars who wonder (1) if Corax and Tisias might be the same person (*Corax* means *crow*, an unusual name for a Greek, but perhaps a nickname for Tisias); and (2) whether either Corax or Tisias ever existed at all. In defense of the traditional story, oral traditions were passed on fairly reliably in ancient times—for about 600 years, for example, in the case of an oral tradition about the Trojan War. Aristotle, who flourished just a century later, reports the contributions of Corax and Tisias (e.g. *Rhetoric* 1402a11; see also Cicero’s report in *On Invention* [2.6] of Aristotle’s account of this tradition in his lost *Synagoge Tekhnnon*).

In any case, one might ask why rhetoric took root in classical Athens. First, the rise of rhetoric in ancient Athens is probably overdetermined, not explainable by any single cause. The rise of literacy, the rise of democracy, and the rise of rhetoric seem to be intertwined, with each stimulating the other. Perhaps stimulating all three was perpetual Greek warfare and the discovery a vast lode of silver at Laurium (southeast of Athens) in 483 BCE. This silver
financed Themistocles’ ambitious naval fleet program—enlarging the fleet from about 70 to about 200 (and subsequently about 300) triremes—and provided an incentive for enfranchising a broader cross section of Athenian society, including the poorer classes who serve as oarsmen on Athenian triremes, and, thereby, inspiring a more committed fighting force. As General Dwight Eisenhower said, “An aroused democracy is the most formidable fighting machine that can be devised.”

According to Pomeroy et al. (2008, p. 217), a trireme required about 170 oarsmen/rowers: 200 triremes x 170 oarsmen = 34,000 oarsmen. In The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. (Basil Blackwell, 1933), A.W. Gomme estimates that in 480 BCE, Athens had only about 35,000 male citizens between the ages of 18 and 59 (p. 26). Even if Gomme’s numbers are off, a fleet of 200 triremes would have required a significant portion of Athens’ adult male citizens (metics [foreign residents] and slaves may also have been employed in this effort).

Some Traditional and Contemporary Issues in the History of Rhetoric

a. Can Rhetoric be Taught?

If lower classes of Athenians are to be inspired to serve valiantly in the Athenian navy, then they must be enfranchised and prepared to participate meaningfully in public deliberation. Those who professed the ability to teach this skill could become wealthy, as Isocrates did. The supporters of oligarchy and hereditary privilege, however, would claim that skill in public deliberation was innate and, implicitly, unique to the traditional upper classes. The rhetoricians would respond that this skill was in part innate, but in part also a function of training and practice.

b. Can Virtue be Taught?

One key concern in the various efforts to define rhetoric has been the notion of persuasion and the extent to which an emphasis on persuasion licenses deceit and manipulation. In Plato’s Gorgias, Socrates allows for the possibility of a noble rhetoric, but denies that such a rhetoric has ever existed:

I am content with the admission that rhetoric is of two sorts; one, which is mere flattery and disgraceful declamation; the other, which is noble and aims at the training and improvement of the souls of the citizens, and strives to say what is best, whether welcome or unwelcome, to the audience; but have you ever known such a rhetoric; or if you have, and can point out any rhetorician who is of this stamp, who is he? . . . For, indeed, I do not know of such a man. (503)

Quintilian was also deeply concerned with these two sorts of rhetoric; as he wrote in his Institutio Oratoria:
Too much insistence cannot be laid upon the point that no one can be said to speak appropriately who has not considered not merely what it is expedient, but also what it is becoming to say. . . . these two considerations generally go hand in hand. . . . Sometimes, however, the two are at variance. Now, whenever this occurs, expedience must yield to the demands of what is becoming. . . . the end which the orator must keep in view is not persuasion, but speaking well, since there are occasions when to persuade would be a blot upon his honour. (XI.I.8-11)

More recently, in his book *Thought and Character: The Rhetoric of Democratic Education*, Frederick Antczak has characterized these two types of rhetoric as rhetoric of indulgence and rhetoric of reconstitution (8), and he suggests that for reconstitutive rhetoric to be successful, we need to redefine our conception of rhetorical success. As an alternative to a choice between either crass expedience or principled but futile discourse, Antczak offers reconstitutive rhetoric, which—following Donald Bryant—involves “adjustments of ideas to people and people to ideas—a mutual reconstitution of thought and character” (11).

c. Technical Skills vs. A Liberal Education

One common early criticism of instruction in rhetoric was that all that was being taught was a package of technical skills that any charlatan could use “to make the worse appear the better cause” (Socrates, for example, makes this claim in Plato’s *Apology*; in his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle seems to attributes the claim be able “to make the weaker seem the better cause” to Protagoras [II.25.1402a]). Isocrates, for one, responded that in his school, students would receive a broad education. This Isocratean tradition, passed on through Cicero, is the fountainhead for the Western conception of a liberal education, as manifested, for example, in general education programs.

d. The Scope of Rhetoric

Another key theme in the history of rhetoric is the distinction between contingent knowledge (the traditional realm of rhetoric) and certain knowledge or “truth” (the traditional realm of theology, philosophy, and, by some accounts, science).

Aristotle limits the scope of rhetoric to forensic (judicial), deliberative (legislative), and ceremonial (epideictic or display) discourse: “The subjects of our deliberation are such as seem to present us with alternative possibilities: about things that could not have been, and cannot now or in the future be, other than they are, nobody who takes them to be of this nature wastes his time in deliberation” (*Rhetoric* I.2.1357a5); “Most of the things about which we make decisions, and into which therefore we inquire, present us with alternative possibilities. For it is about our actions that we deliberate and inquire, and all our actions have a contingent character; hardly any of them are determined by necessity” (*Rhetoric* I.2.1357a25).

Many contemporary scholars have suggested broadening this scope. For example, Carolyn Miller writes, “Over the centuries, we have become less certain than Aristotle was about many
things, and what we call the new rhetoric reflects the extension of uncertainty to matters other than Athenian civic affairs—beyond ethics and politics to philosophy, science, and the academic disciplines in general; this extension represents what has been called the rhetorical turn. What is central to both the old, Aristotelian rhetoric and to this new, extended rhetoric is the function of deliberation, which is made possible and useful by uncertainty” (The Rhetorical Turn, p. 162).

In response, some have argued that the concept of rhetoric has become too broad and too vague. If, for example, we claim that all language or, even more generally, all symbol use is rhetorical, then, these critics argue, rhetoric becomes everything in general but nothing in particular. One defense of the broader definition of rhetoric is that rhetoric is not any more diminished by claiming that all language or all symbol using is rhetorical than mortality is diminished by claiming that all humans are mortal.

e. Political vs. Literary Rhetoric

Another theme in the history of rhetoric is the tension between political rhetoric (civic discourse) and literary rhetoric (belles lettres), what Kennedy, following Vasile Florescu, refers to as littaturizzazione. As Brian Vickers notes, “For Isocrates . . . rhetoric was the primary tool in education, and education was directed towards political activity and practicality. For Roman rhetoricians, above all Cicero, the link between rhetoric and the vita activa was fundamental. . . . When rhetoric became corrupted [people] opted out of the active life” (In Defence of Rhetoric, 8). (Contrast the vita contemplativa and the vita voluptuosa [p. 271].) In his Dialogue on Oratory, Tacitus was among the first to note (ironically) that the shift to literary rhetoric, with an emphasis on style rather than invention, was a function of political oppression and the lack of (safe) opportunities to deliberate public policy (Kennedy 111-112; Kinneavy in Murphy 26).

The Modern Political and Educational Legacy of Classical Rhetoric

The primary contribution of classical rhetoric to modern education and political life is providing an impetus for a liberal education that prepares citizens to be active participants in the civic life of their communities and in the larger world.

Reading, Class Discussion, and Quizzes

“We don’t understand anything until we’ve discussed it.”

Russian Proverb

This course is based on common readings, on class discussion of those readings, and on the research projects described below. We’ll focus primarily on what helps most to explain and contextualize both the conceptualization and teaching of rhetoric in ancient Greece and the debates that surrounded this conceptualization and teaching. I expect everyone in the class to keep up with the reading and to participate in class discussion on a regular basis.
We’ll have seven quizzes on our readings and class discussions.

**Evaluation**

Your final grade will be determined approximately as follows:

- Up to 50 points for each of 6 quizzes: 300 points
- Up to 50 points for each of 6 lists of discussion questions: 300 points
- Up to 100 points for one group (or individual) presentation: 100 points
- Up to 100 points for participation in class: 100 points
- Up to 100 points for each of two essays: 200 points
- Total: 1,000 points

**Extra credit: 25 points** for bringing to class before the end of week 2 the required texts with your name permanently marked on the spine or on the inside of the front cover.

A: 930-1000 points
AB: 880-929 points
B: 830-879 points
BC: 780-829 points
C: 730-779 points
CD: 680-729 points
D: 600-679 points
F: 599 or fewer points

**Required Lists of Discussion Questions**

Over the course of the semester, you will be required to submit seven lists of discussion questions with 3 questions on each list. (For specific due dates, please see the below Schedule of Assignments.) **These lists must be typed/word processed** (no last-minute, hand scrawled lists).

Since a key purpose of these lists is to help ensure that you are well prepared for class discussion, **each list must be submitted on the day it is due. I will not accept late lists.**

Since the purpose of these lists is not to quiz the class but to facilitate class discussion, please do not include more than one factual question on any given list. Instead, please focus on questions of interpretation. Ideally, these would be questions (a) that you yourself find intriguing and (b) to which you don’t yet have a clear answer and, hence, (c) you are genuinely interested in discussing/exploring with the class.

**Please double-space your questions, and when questions are drawn from the reading, please cite the relevant page number(s).**
Please consider how you might develop one or more of your discussion questions and the related class discussion into one or more of your essays.

Group Projects on Primary Texts in Rhetoric

In groups of 3, find at least one scholarly article (see section on JSTOR below) on one of the 12 primary texts that we’ll be considering during weeks 6-10, and present a brief oral report to the class on the substance of this article. The report should be accompanied by a short handout (one page), identifying the article (including appropriate bibliographic information) and summarizing the key points (you will need 36 copies of this handout). You can either do this as a group project for one, group grade, or your group can divide the project, each reporting on a different article for three, separate grades.

Using JSTOR and Other Scholarly Databases to Facilitate Your Research

JSTOR is short for (electronic) Journal Storage (check the Wikipedia description at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/JSTOR ). It was founded in 1995 and stores digital copies of article from about 2,000 academic journals, some dating back as far as 1665. Over 8,000 academic libraries worldwide (including Michigan Tech’s library) subscribe to this service. This can be an invaluable research tool.

To use JSTOR, follow the below steps (note that at some point, you will need to log in to your Michigan Tech user account):

2. Select “databases,” enter JSTOR into the search window, and click on GO.
3. Click on JSTOR.
4. Enter your search strategy (key words and/or phrases) into the Search window.

To illustrate, here are selected results for searches (conducted in 2014) entered as separate words or as a combination of words and phrases (enclose in parentheses):

Aristophanes Clouds 3,271 results
“Dissoi Logoi” 281 results
Gorgias Helen 1,219 results
Isocrates “Against the Sophists” 150
Isocrates Antidosis 356
Plato Gorgias 5,841
Plato Phaedrus 6,073
Aristotle Rhetoric 20,496
Cicero “De Oratore” 2,621
Quintilian “Institutio Oratoria” 1,214
Tacitus “Dialogue on Oratory” 36
Tacitus “On Oratory” 217
Tacitus Oratory 1,717
Tacitus “Dialogue on Orators” 55
Augustine “On Christian Doctrine” 388
Augustine “Christian Doctrine” 2,510

Note at the top left that you can sort your results by relevance, by newest to oldest, or by oldest to newest. You can also narrow your results by incorporating additional keywords and phrases into your search strategy. For example, if you add the word rhetoric to the search for Augustine “On Christian Doctrine,” the result drops from 388 to 203.

Another way to narrow your focus is to consider the nature of the journals in which various articles are published; this is often made apparent by journal titles. For example, Rhetorica, Rhetoric Society Quarterly, and Rhetoric Review are all journals in rhetoric. Journals in philology and classical studies might also be good choices.

From this point, you can select Page Scan to scan pages for your keywords highlighted in yellow; you can request a PDF copy of the article, which you can either read online or download to your desktop (at this point, you’ll be asked to accept JSTOR’s terms and conditions of use); or you can request a summary of the article.

Another searchable database of scholarly articles is Project MUSE (check the Wikipedia description http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_MUSE ). To link to Project MUSE from the Tech library, follow the above procedure, but enter MUSE rather than JSTOR in the database search window.

Finally, you should also know about Google Scholar http://scholar.google.com/# which also allows you to search for scholarly articles.

Your Essays
You will compose two essays of approximately 800-1200 words each, analyzing some aspect of rhetoric that interests you or applying what you have learned about rhetoric to argue for or against an issue of contemporary concern locally, nationally, or internationally. As is indicated in the below schedule of assignments, during weeks 7 and 10, we will meet one-on-one to brainstorm for topics for these essays. I will not accept an essay for which I have not approved the topic.

There are only so many hours in the week; hence, it’s difficult to find times for 35 conferences, and a missed conference will be hard to reschedule. Each essay counts for 100 points; hence, a missed conference (if we can’t reschedule it) means a loss of 10 percent of your total grade for the semester.

**Essay Format**

In each of your essays, document and cite your sources with MLA documentation style. With the MLA system, documentation of sources is provided at the end of your essay by a list of works cited, arranged alphabetically by the authors’ last names. Later in the semester, I’ll provide more information about using MLA style.

Your essays must be word processed and printed on 8.5” x 11” white paper in an easily readable (e.g., Times) 12-point font with one-inch margins on all four sides. Include at the top of the first page the following information (single-spaced): your name, the course title, and the date. **Double-space the body of your essay.** Single-space the entries in your list of works cited, but double space between entries.

**Policy on Late Essays**

If you do not submit your essay on time, you will lose 10 points for every day that it is late. I will not accept any essay that is more than one week late.

**Policy on Missed Conferences**

Class policy on missed conferences is similar to the policies on absences and late assignments:

1. If you must miss a conference for a reason that would be covered by Michigan Tech’s policy on excused absences (illness, death in the family, etc.), that will count as an excused absence from your conference. Please try to notify me in advance, and make arrangements to make up this conference; initiating this rescheduling is your responsibility. On the first such incident, I will take your word for the reason for missing the conference. On subsequent absences, I may require verification from the Dean of Students Office or from a medical professional.

2. If you miss a conference for a reason not covered by Michigan Tech’s policy on excused absences, on the first such occurrence, I will penalize you 10 percent if you submit notification in advance of the conference and 20 percent if you do not submit notification in
advance of the conference. You should then attempt to reschedule the conference; initiating this attempt is your responsibility. **On subsequent unexcused absences, there will be no rescheduled conference.**

The Michigan Tech Multiliteracies Center (formerly The Writing Center)

Michigan Tech has an excellent Multiliteracies Center, which is located in Walker 107. I encourage you to schedule, regular weekly appointments with a writing coach. Establish a schedule early in the semester, because appointed times (as opposed to drop-in times) tend to get booked quickly. For more information, call 487-2007 or check the Center’s Web page at [http://www.mtu.edu/humanities/resources/mtmc/what-we-offer/](http://www.mtu.edu/humanities/resources/mtmc/what-we-offer/)

Attendance Policy

“Eighty percent of success is just showing up.” Woody Allen

According to the Michigan Tech Attendance policy, an absence is excused under the following conditions:

- A student is participating in off-campus, University-sponsored activities, such as field trips, fine arts performances, intercollegiate athletics, judging teams, job fairs, etc. The faculty or staff members supervising the off-campus activity will send a notice to all academic departments and the Office of Student Affairs before the activity takes place. The notice will include the name and date of the activity, the name of the supervising person, a list of all participating students, and their classes.

- The instructor is assured that a student’s absence from class was due to circumstances beyond the student’s control. The student must provide verification of the special circumstance if the instructor requests it. Excuses are usually given in the following circumstances: illness, funeral of any relative or close friend, military duty, court appearance, and personal emergencies.

- The instructor deems it excusable. Some examples might include professional and graduate school interviews, plant trips, job interviews requiring travel, and professional society meetings.

A full description of the University’s attendance policy is available at [http://www.mtu.edu/dean/conduct/policy/attendance/](http://www.mtu.edu/dean/conduct/policy/attendance/)

I keep a record of attendance for two reasons:

1. Because if you’re doing poorly in class, these records can help me to determine if poor attendance is part of the problem.
2. Every professor at Michigan Tech is required to submit attendance-verification rosters. These rosters are used for two purposes:

a. To identify before it’s too late to make the appropriate corrections students who

   • think they are registered for a course, attend all semester and complete the work, but receive no grade at the end of the semester because they were never registered;

   • have never attended a class because they mistakenly think they have dropped the course and, hence, wind up receiving a failing grade at the end of the semester;

   • attend an incorrect section of a course and receive a failing grade at the end of the semester from the section for which they are registered but which they never attended.

b. To comply with federal law that stipulates that universities must verify that students who receive Title IV financial aid are attending the classes in which they are enrolled. (Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended in 1998 establishes general rules that apply to student financial assistance programs, including Pell Grants, Academic Competitive Grants, National SMART Grants, Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, Federal Direct Loans, Federal Perkins Loans, and Federal PLUS Loans. Approximately 85 percent of Michigan Tech students receive some form of financial aid.)

**Policy on Accountability for Excused Absences**

I can allow up to two excused absences without documentation. However, if you want credit for more than two such absences, you must provide the appropriate documentation from the Dean of Students Office, from a medical professional, or from some other appropriate source.

**Policy on Religious Observance** (also from attendance policy at http://www.mtu.edu/dean/conduct/policy/attendance/):

“Michigan Tech permits students to be excused from class on holidays observed by their religious faith. Students who wish to be absent for a religious holiday are responsible for making arrangements in advance with their instructors to make up class work and exams. Instructors may expect a reasonable limit to the number of absences requested.”

**Michigan Tech’s Academic Integrity Policy**

See http://www.sa.mtu.edu/dean/judicial/policies/academic_integrity_policy_2006.pdf

“Academic integrity and honesty are central components of a student’s education, and the ethical conduct maintained in an academic context will be taken eventually into a student’s professional career. Academic honesty is essential in a community of scholars searching and learning to search for truth. Anything less than total commitment to honesty undermines the efforts of the
entire academic community. Both students and faculty are responsible for insuring the academic integrity of the university.

This policy applies to the academic conduct of all persons at Michigan Technological University who have ever matriculated at the University, whether or not the person is enrolled at the time an allegation of academic dishonesty is made.

This policy addresses academic dishonesty in course work. Allegations of dishonesty in research or publication are addressed under the Scientific Misconduct Policy.

Procedures to ensure fairness and due process for all parties involved in any apparent violation of the Academic Integrity Policy will be developed, and periodically reviewed, by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the members of the Academic Integrity Committee appointed by the University Senate.”

**Academic Integrity Policy**—**Definition of Academic Misconduct**

[http://www.mtu.edu/dean/conduct/policy/academic-integrity/definition.html](http://www.mtu.edu/dean/conduct/policy/academic-integrity/definition.html)

**“Plagiarism**

Knowingly copying another’s work or ideas and calling them one’s own or not giving proper credit or citation. This includes but is not limited to reading or hearing another’s work or ideas and using them as one’s own; quoting, paraphrasing, or condensing another’s work without giving proper credit; purchasing or receiving another’s work and using, handling, or submitting it as one’s own work.

**Cheating**

Intentional, unauthorized use of any study aids, equipment, or another’s work during an academic exercise. This includes but is not limited to unauthorized use of notes, study aids, electronic or other equipment during an examination; copying or looking at another individual’s examination; taking or passing information to another individual during an examination; taking an examination for another individual; allowing another individual to take one’s examination; stealing examinations. Cheating also includes unauthorized collaboration. All graded academic exercises are expected to be performed on an individual basis unless otherwise stated by the instructor. An academic exercise may not be submitted by a student for course credit in more than one course without the permission of all instructors.  **[Note: this is also known as self-plagiarism.]**

**Fabrication**

Intentional and/or unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation during an academic exercise. This includes but is not limited to changing or adding an answer on an examination and resubmitting it to change the grade; inventing data for a laboratory exercise or report.

**Facilitating Academic Misconduct**

Knowingly or recklessly allowing or helping another individual to plagiarize, cheat, or fabricate information.”
Sanctions for academic dishonesty range from warnings to expulsion from Michigan Tech. For more information, visit http://www.mtu.edu/dean/conduct/policy/academic-integrity/sanctions.html

The Americans with Disabilities Act

MTU complies with all federal and state laws and regulations regarding discrimination, including the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). If you have a disability and need a reasonable accommodation for equal access to education or services at MTU, please call the Dean of Students (487-2212). For other concerns about discrimination, you may contact your advisor, your department head, or the Affirmative Action Office (487-3310).

DRAFT Schedule of Assignments and Class Activities

Dates indicate when reading and writing assignments are due, not when they are given. I’ve used the following abbreviations for our texts: AG = A Brief History of Ancient Greece; CR = Classical Rhetoric & Its Christian and Secular Tradition. Please bring to class each day the book we’re currently reading.

I’ve provided links to online versions of each of the primary texts listed below. If you want to check other online translations, either search Google or visit any of the following sites:

The Perseus Digital Library: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/
The Internet Archive: https://archive.org
Project Gutenberg: www.gutenberg.org

Week 1:
TU 1/14: Class begins: introductions; overview of course(review syllabus
TH 1/16: AG: Introduction and Ch. 1 “Early Greece and the Bronze Age”

Week 2: Monday, January 20: Martin Luther King Day
TU 1/21: AG: Ch. 2 “The ‘Dark Age’ of Greece and the Eighth-Century ‘Renaissance’ (c. 1200-750/700 BC)”
TH 1/23: AG: Ch. 3 “Archaic Greece (c. 750/700-480 BC)”; typed list of 3 questions for class discussion; Quiz 1

Week 3:
TU 1/28: AG: Ch. 4 Sparta; film: “The Greeks: Crucible of Civilization” (Part 1); for further information, visit www.pbs.org/empires/thegreeks/
TH 1/30: AG: Ch. 5 “The Growth of Athens and the Persian Wars”
Week 4:
TU 2/4: AG: Ch. 6 “The Rivalries of the Greek City States and the Growth of Athenian Democracy”; CR: Ch. 1 “Traditional and Conceptual Rhetoric”; Film: “The Greeks: Crucible of Civilization” (Part 2); typed list of 3 questions for class discussion; Quiz 2

February 5 – 9: Winter Carnival

Week 5:
TU 2/11: AG: Ch. 7 “Greece on the Eve of the Peloponnesian War”; Film: “The Greeks: Crucible of Civilization” (Part 3)
TH 2/12: AG: Ch. 8 “The Peloponnesian War”; CR: Ch. 2 “Technical Rhetoric”

Week 6:
TU 2/18: AG: Ch. 9 “The Crisis of the Polis and the Age of Shifting Hegemonies
TH 2/20: CR: Ch. 3 “Sophistic Rhetoric”; show and discuss Aristophanes’ The Clouds
(For an online English translation by Jeffery Henderson, visit the Perseus Project at http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0241); group presentation on The Clouds; typed list of 3 questions for class discussion; Quiz 3

Week 7: Meet this week to brainstorm for topics for first essay
TU 2/25: Continue with The Clouds; Dissoi Logoi (Contrasting Arguments); Gorgias’s Encomium of Helen (Speech in Praise of Helen)
http://www.bemidjistate.edu/academics/departments/english/donovan/helen.html; group presentations on Dissoi Logoi and Encomium of Helen
TH 2/27: CR: Chapter 4 “Philosophical Rhetoric”; Isocrates’ Against the Sophists
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0144%3Aspeech%3D13%3Asection%3D1 and Antidosis
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0144%3Aspeech%3D15%3Asection%3D1; group presentations on Against the Sophists and Antidosis

Week 8:
TU 3/4: Plato’s Gorgias
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0178%3Atext%3DGorg.%3Asection%3D47a and Phaedrus
http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0174%3Atext%3DPhaedrus; group presentations on Gorgias and Phaedrus
TH 3/6: Aristotle’s Rhetoric

March 8 – 16: Spring Break
Week 9:
TU 3/18: CR: Ch. 5 “Rhetoric in the Roman Period”; Cicero’s De Oratore (On the Orator) https://archive.org/details/cicerodeoratore01ciceuoft; group presentation on De Oratore
TH 3/20: Quintilian’s Institutio Oratoria (The Orator’s Education)
https://archive.org/details/institutioorator00quin; group presentation on Institutio Oratoria; typed list of 3 questions for class discussion; Quiz 4; essay #1 due

Week 10: Meet this week to brainstorm for topics for second essay
TU 3/25: CR: Ch. 6 “Literary Rhetoric”; Tacitus’ Dialogue on Oratory
http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/15017?msg=welcome_stranger#DII; group presentation on Dialogue on Oratory
TH 3/27: CR: Ch. 7 “Judeo-Christian Rhetoric”; Augustine’s On Christian Doctrine
http://www.ccel.org/a/augustine/doctrine/; group presentation on On Christian Doctrine

Week 11:
TU 4/1: CR: Ch. 8 “Greek Rhetoric in the Middle Ages”
TH 4/3: CR Ch. 9 “Latin Rhetoric in the Middle Ages”; typed list of 3 questions for class discussion; Quiz 5

Week 12:
TU 4/8: CR: Ch. 10 “Classical Rhetoric in the Renaissance”
TH 4/10:

Week 13:
TU 4/15: CR: Ch. 11 “Neoclassical Rhetoric”
TH 4/17: Essay #2 due

Week 14:
TU 4/22: CR: Ch. 12 “Classical Rhetoric in the Twentieth Century”
TH 4/24: Typed list of 3 questions for class discussion; Quiz 6

General Education and Assessment

A liberal education that helps to prepare citizens for active participation in a democratic culture has been a fundamental goal of instruction in rhetoric for over 2,400 years, first articulated by Isocrates; passed on through his work to the Roman world by Cicero, Quintilian, and others; and thence transferred more broadly to Western Europe and the New World. A subset of a liberal education is “general education,” a set of courses that all students are required to take to help prepare them for citizenship.

The North Central Association is one of six, regional accreditation associations in the United States. These associations work to ensure that the colleges and universities they assess are
providing legitimate courses of study for their students. This helps to avoid unscrupulous organizations from setting up shop and awarding, for example, 90-day, mail-order degrees. Generally speaking, a degree from an institution that is not accredited is less valuable (on the job market) than is a degree from an accredited institution. In addition, federal scholarship and loan money may not be available for students at institutions that are not accredited.

Among the things that an accreditation association evaluates is a university’s general education program. According to the North Central Association’s Higher Learning Commission,

The institution [in this case, Michigan Tech] articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess. [http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/criteria-for-accreditation.html](http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/criteria-for-accreditation.html)

For its General Education Program, Michigan Tech has defined a set of learning goals that are consistent with the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ “Liberal Education and America’s Promise” (LEAP) initiative [http://www.aacu.org/leap/](http://www.aacu.org/leap/). These goals are defined on the university’s assessment site at [http://www.mtu.edu/assessment/program/university-learning-goals/](http://www.mtu.edu/assessment/program/university-learning-goals/) and include the following:

1. Disciplinary knowledge
2. Knowledge of the physical and natural world
3. Global literacy and knowledge of human culture
4. Critical and creative thinking
5. Communication
6. Information literacy
7. Technology
8. Values and civic engagement

The “Core 2000 Courses” are two sets of 2000-level courses (one set in Humanities and Arts, the other in Social Sciences) that are intended to meet some of these goals. The General Education Committee has selected HU 2130 Introduction to Rhetoric as a course that might meet goals 4 (critical and creative thinking) and 8 (values and civic engagement). To test this hypothesis, the committee will select several essays from the class to seek evidence that these goals are being met or, at least, are being addressed. Hence, as of November 19, 2012, the following language has been required in all Michigan Tech syllabi:
“Student work products (exams, essays, projects, etc.) may be used for purposes of university, program, or course assessment. All work used for assessment purposes will not include any individual student identification.”

Work to be assessed will be selected randomly, and neither you nor I will know in advance what work will be selected. The purpose of this assessment is neither to evaluate you (the work will be assessed anonymously) nor to evaluate me; instead, it is to determine whether or not Introduction to Rhetoric is an appropriate choice for assessing learning goals 4 and 8 or whether another course should be selected for this purpose.

The rubrics for goals 4 and 8 are available as PDF files at http://www.mtu.edu/assessment/program/university-learning-goals/; I’ve also attached copies. Please note that although there is definitely overlap, these rubrics are neither required nor expected to be precisely my own means of evaluating your work for the class. These are two, separate evaluations.