Instructor Information

Instructor: Michael Lesiuk  
Office: PAS 1284 (tip: use the map I post on LEARN)  
Office Hours: Mon/Wed 1:30 p.m – 2:30 pm (or by appointment)  
Email: mlesiuk@uwaterloo.ca

Course Description

In this course you will study some of the essential concepts, frameworks, and controversies in the history and theory of rhetoric. What does Aristotle mean when he says rhetoric is the “counterpart of dialectic”? What is the relationship between rhetoric and logic? Or between rhetoric and an informed—or misinformed—civitas?

In addition to questions such as these, we will also explore the relevance of rhetorical theory and criticism to a variety of social, intellectual, and cultural fields, such as law, politics, philosophy, literature, and advertising. As we do this, you will also be improving your own facility with rhetoric, as you use its tools to construct persuasive arguments of varying sorts.

You should leave the class with a firm grasp of basic concepts of rhetorical theory, a sense of the history of rhetoric, and deeper appreciation for rhetoric as an inventive, critical, multimodal, and multidisciplinary enterprise that Quintilian called an “encompassing art” (ars circumcurrens).

Textbooks


Other readings will be on LEARN under “Content,” either as PDFs or links.
Grade Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Worth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Responses (x5)</td>
<td>Five times throughout the term.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class Midterm</td>
<td>Monday, October 29</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay Proposal (with structure commentary)</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Analysis Essay</td>
<td>Monday, December 3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>TBD (Exam Period)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading Responses (x5)**

Five times throughout the term you need to submit a very short “Reading Response” the night before a given reading’s class. This response should *not* discuss the entire reading; rather, you should isolate one of the key terms or concepts in the reading and explain it. After you explain the term or concept, suggest an example of the term or concept from a source outside our syllabus (including a URL or link), with an explanation of why that example is appropriate, or why you thought of it. As long as you can grab a link (so that I can go check it out) your example can be from anything: a blog post, a speech, a movie, a YouTube video, or a specific moment in any of these things.

Write it up, and then submit it into the appropriate Dropbox before 11:59 p.m. the night before the relevant class. For example, if you want to explain and give an example of an *encomium*—a term from the reading for our Wednesday, September 19th class—then you need to submit your response by 11:59 p.m. the night before class, that is, Tuesday, September 18th.

If you submit a response on time and it shows you understand the term or concept, you will get 2/2, no questions asked. You will not be graded on the quality or clarity of the writing, the MLA formatting, or anything except whether you submitted it on time, and whether you demonstrated you understood the key term.

The late penalty on these is 60% per day. In other words, you can submit something a day late, but it'll only be worth 0.8 / 2, and after that, 0 / 2. Obviously, this means the better option is usually to just let that one slide and focus on the next reading. (Also, don't leave all of these until there are five classes left. Stuff will come up; you will be busy.)

I will occasionally (i.e. as much as possible) use these during our in-class discussions.
**In-class Midterm**

A little over halfway through the semester we'll have an in-class midterm. There will be short answer, true/false, fill-in-the-blank, multiple-choice, and longer answer questions.

If you come to class, I will be very, very open about what will be on the midterm and what won't be on the midterm. I won't just tell you “what” will be on the midterm, either; I will tell you exactly how I have worded or structured specific questions. (For example: “You will have to give an example of an enthymeme, and then explain briefly why your example is an enthymeme and not a syllogism.”)

**Final Exam**

At the end of the semester, we'll have an exam. It'll be a lot like the midterm, but a little longer. Again, as the term progresses, I'll be very open about what will be on it. You will have to memorize specific ideas and demonstrate understanding of those ideas, but there will be no trick questions or big surprises.

To do well, you need to do the readings, come to class, listen attentively, take thorough notes, ask questions and engage in the discussions and workshops.

**Essay Proposal (with Structure Commentary)**

Before submitting the essay, you will need to submit a one- to two-page proposal. Your plan should identify the thesis you will argue, and it should give some indication as to *how* you will argue that thesis, including how you will deploy your secondary sources; you should have at least two of them by the time you submit your proposal.

You should also include a brief commentary on your essay structure in your proposal. This is because we will be learning about the classical rhetorical structure, and we'll be discussing when and why it makes sense for a rhetorician to occasionally “break the rules” of the classical rhetorical structure. (For example, sometimes you might want to move the *refutatio* up earlier, if you're making a particularly bold claim and, for the sake of your *ethos*, you need to perform your awareness of this fact.) With that in mind, then, this is simply your chance to apply these ideas to your own work. You do not need to stick to anything you say in this commentary, but you should show a nuanced understanding of the most relevant rhetorical factors that you will consider in your writing.

I will give out a rubric and a sample template closer to the deadline. You will be graded on the following criteria:

- The articulation of your thesis (is it clear? nuanced? does it go far enough?);
- The depth and quality of your research (does the writer indicate how they will deploy their research? is the research appropriate?);
- The clarity, style and rhetorical sophistication of the writing.
“Serious rhetorical analysis [...] makes texts move like bullets in The Matrix, their motion slowed and their trajectories magnified for careful study.”

- John J. Ruszkiewicz and Jay Dolmage

The final essay should be a critically-informed analysis of one rhetorical artifact or text. Your essay should have a thesis statement, and it should deploy secondary sources in order to explain central aspects of your artifact.

By “rhetorical artifact or text” I mean something like a speech, a written argument, a novel or a poem, but you could also analyze a T-shirt, an advertisement, or a website interface. Anything that makes a coherent argument will work.

By “critically-informed” I mean that you should use a critical approach that is informed by ideas and concepts we will explore in the course, and this means you will have to do some secondary research in addition to our textbook.

Your analysis should slow things down and uncover aspects of the text or artifact that one would not otherwise notice. You might analyze what the text is arguing, if you think your text’s “real” argument is in some way hidden or obfuscated; or, you might analyze how the text is constructing its argument, if you think that's particularly interesting or unique; or, given the rhetorical situation, you might evaluate the effectiveness of the text’s argument.

I suggest looking at our textbook from Deanna Sellnow, *The Rhetorical Power of Popular Culture*. You’ll see that each chapter takes a different critically-informed rhetorical perspective—Neo-Aristotelian, Marxist, Feminist, Narrative, and so on. You do not have to explicitly adopt one of these perspectives, but they should give you a good indication of what I mean by “critically-informed.” Also, you’ll see that each chapter in Sellnow’s book includes a sample student essay and a list of additional “References” that are relevant to the specific rhetorical perspective, and these are generally all excellent starting points for your secondary research.

As with the proposal, I will give out a rubric and a sample format closer to the deadline. You will be graded on the following criteria:

- The articulation and strength of your thesis (is it clear? nuanced?);
- The sophistication and depth of the analysis (is this original, or is it arguing something we really already know?);
- The macro-level quality of the writing (does the structure follow a logical organizational pattern? does each paragraph build on the previous one?);
- The micro-level quality of the writing (are the sentences clear?);
- The MLA formatting (is it on-point?).
**Classroom Etiquette**

No one should ever be teased, or made to feel small, embarrassed, self-conscious, or unsafe. So, don't do any of those things. Be open-minded. Be active in the discussions, ask relevant questions, make salient observations, look for and point out connections between readings and discussions. Don't be afraid to ask stupid questions. Contribute to a classroom atmosphere where your peers are not afraid to ask stupid questions.

For the readings, please have them done *before* you come to the relevant class. You'll learn more this way. At the end of the class, pay attention if I give hints about “what to look for” in the next reading. Again, you'll learn more this way.

Please try to bring the readings with you to class. Thankfully, both our textbooks are thin, and any PDFs I give you will be even thinner.

Please bring pens and pencils with you, for in-class exercises, notes on handouts, and annotations. We'll be doing this sometimes because there are cognitive benefits to doing so.

**Late Penalties**

- As above, the late penalty for the Reading Responses is 60% per day.
- The late penalty for the proposal is 10% per day.
- The late penalty for the essay is 5% per day, and it is capped at 30% after six days. After six days, I will still accept it, but you should come talk to me.

**Academic Integrity**

*Academic Integrity:* In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. See the [UWaterloo Academic Integrity webpage](https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/) and the [Arts Academic Integrity webpage](https://arts.uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/) for more information.

*Discipline:* A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offences, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about “rules” for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. When misconduct has been found to have occurred, disciplinary penalties will be imposed under Policy 71 – Student Discipline. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to [Policy 71 - Student Discipline](https://uwaterloo.ca/policies/71). For typical penalties check [Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties](https://uwaterloo.ca/policies/other-guidelines/).
**Grievance:** A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4. When in doubt, please be certain to contact the department's administrative assistant who will provide further assistance.

**Appeals:** A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than a petition) or Policy 71 - Student Discipline may be appealed if there is a ground. A student who believes he/she has a ground for an appeal should refer to Policy 72 - Student Appeals.

**Territorial Acknowledgement**

We acknowledge that we are living and working on the traditional territory of the Attawandaron (also known as Neutral), Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee peoples. The University of Waterloo is situated on the Haldimand Tract, the land promised to the Six Nations that includes six miles on each side of the Grand River.

**Schedule**

_of Readings and Assignments_

*Please note: This schedule is subject to slight changes for readings.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>“What should I know?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Monday, September 10**  
Welcome and Class Introduction  
(No readings. See the handout.) | What’s at stake in trying to define “rhetoric”? |
| **Wednesday, September 12**  
- Lunsford - ch. 1 – “Everything Is An Argument” *(PDF)*  
- Keith & Lundberg - ch. 1 - “The Rhetorical Tradition” |  
**3 Types of Rhetoric:**  
Forensic, Epideictic/Demonstrative, and Deliberative  
**3 Types of Artistic Proofs:**  
Ethos, Pathos, & Logos  
Why was rhetoric (and, more specifically, oratory) important to ancient Athens and democracy?  
Who were the Sophists? What did Plato think of them? What did Aristotle think of them? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>“What should I know?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Monday, September 17** | • Keith & Lundberg – ch. 1 – “The Rhetorical Tradition”  
• Sellnow – ch. 2 – “Expanding the Rhetorical Tradition” | In Keith and Lundberg:  
Audience (p. 12)  
Sender / Message / Receiver / Medium (pp. 12-13)  
Kairos (p. 15)  
Public sphere vs. Private Sphere (p. 18)  
What does Gorgias, a Sophist, argue about audiences in “The Encomium of Helen”? (p. 14) |
| **Wednesday, September 19** | • Keith & Lundberg - ch. 3 - “ Situations and Speech Types” | In Keith and Lundberg:  
The Rhetorical Situation (p. 27)  
Speech Classifications:  
Eulogy, Encomium, Apologia (pp. 28–29)  
Lloyd Bitzer’s Terminology for Rhetorical Situation:  
Exigence, Audience, and Constraints (p. 31) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>“What should I know?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Monday, September 24** | • Keith & Lundberg - ch. 4 - “ Argument and Persuasion”  
*Today we’ll focus only on pp. 37–47 from chapter 4. However, please read the entire chapter (pp. 47–57) because it will pay off later on in the semester.* | In Keith and Lundberg:  
Syllogism vs. Enthymeme (pp. 38–41)  
Premise, Claim and/or Conclusion (pp. 38–41)  
Ethos and Pathos (again!) (pp. 41–43)  
Enthymemes vs. *Paradeigmata* (examples) (pp. 40–41)  
2 Types of *Paradeigmata* (p. 41)  
Topics or *Topoi* (pp. 43-44) |
| **Wednesday, September 26** | • Keith & Lundberg – ch. 5 – “Organization” | In Keith and Lundberg:  
5 types of common organizational pattern (p. 59)  
Classical Rhetorical Structure  
Exordium / Narratio / Partitio / Confirmatio / Refutatio / Peroratio (p. 60)  
(Read the sample speech, too, for examples of these.) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>“What should I know?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Monday, October 1** | • Keith & Lundberg – ch. 6. – Style  
*Today we’ll focus on figures rather than tropes, but read about the tropes (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche) as well.* | In Keith and Lundberg:  
The difference between a Trope and a Figure  
**Figures:**  
Repetition of Words & Phrases  
Anaphora, Epistrophe, Interlacement, Anadiplosis  
Repetition of Sounds  
Alliteration, Rhyme, Assonance  
Others:  
Antithesis, Progression/Klimax, Asyndeton, Rhetorical Question, Tricolon |
| **Wednesday, October 3** | • Cialdini, Pre-suasion excerpt (PDF) | From Keith and Lundberg ch. 6  
**Tropes:**  
Metaphor, Metonymy, Synecdoche |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, October 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No class! Happy Thanksgiving!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, October 15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tolentino, “The Repressive, Authoritarian Soul of Thomas the Tank Engine and Friends” (PDF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Wednesday, October 10** |
| No class! Happy Midterm “Study” Break! |

| **Friday, October 12** |
| • Sellnow – ch. 6 – A Neo-Marxist Perspective |

**In Sellnow**
- Marxism / Marxist
- Subject Position
- Models vs. Anti-Models
- Hegemony
- Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week 7</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, October 22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Gerard Genette Handout (PDF)  
• Booth, “Control of Distance” (PDF) |

**In Genette**
- Order, Duration, and Frequency
- Free Indirect Discourse / Free “Untagged” Speech

**Wednesday, October 24**
No readings! We’ll just prep for the midterm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week 8</strong></th>
<th><strong>Readings</strong></th>
<th><strong>“What should I know?”</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, October 29</td>
<td><strong>Midterm</strong></td>
<td>All the things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wednesday, October 31 | - Sellnow – ch. 4 – Dramatistic Perspective  
- Keith & Lundberg – “Kenneth Burke and a New Definition of Rhetoric” – pp. 52-56  

Psst... you should have already read the Keith & Lundberg bit, back in Week 3. | In Sellnow:  
Dramatism  
Terministic Screen  
God Term vs. Devil Term |
| In Keith & Lundberg | Identification | Compare Burke’s “identification” to other concepts like ethos / pathos, Burke’s implied author, and subject position. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week 9</strong></th>
<th><strong>Readings</strong></th>
<th><strong>“What should I know?”</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monday, November 5 | - Sellnow – ch. 7 – Feminist Perspectives | In Sellnow:  
Patriarchy/Patriarchal (p. 162)  
Sex vs. gender (p. 162)  
“male gaze” (p. 168; it comes up again in the “Visual Perspectives” chapter, p. 244 in 3rd edition)  
First-, second-, third-, and fourth-wave feminism (pp. 165-66)  

Note: If you are thinking of using a feminist perspective of some sort, I do recommend checking out next week’s readings. | |
| Wednesday, November 7 | No readings.  
Proposals & Research Workshop. | Bring a laptop! |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week 10</strong></th>
<th><strong>Readings</strong></th>
<th><strong>“What should I know?”</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monday, November 12 | - Butler – *Gender Trouble* excerpts (PDF) | In Butler  
Why does she say there need not be a “doer behind the deed” (p. 142).  
Why does Butler like drag? How or why does it illustrate her point about interior/exterior and performance? |
| Wednesday, November 14 | - Sellnow, from ch. 8, “Visual Pleasure Theory” (pp. 244-65) | In Sellnow  
Male gaze (p. 244)  
Fetishism and Voyeurism (p. 245) |

Note: Proposals due by 11:59 p.m. tonight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>“What should I know?”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 19</td>
<td>1-on-1 Meetings</td>
<td>This week, what you should “know” is dependent on what you discover or invent in the process of building your critical analysis argument. Work on your essays. Go to the library. Read, take notes, re-read, make connections, prep, discover, invent, organize and arrange. Finally, argue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 21</td>
<td>1-on-1 Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Week 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday, November 26</th>
<th>Keith &amp; Lundberg, re-read pp. 56-57, and look at “Toulmin” handout on LEARN.</th>
<th>Toulmin Argumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toulmin Argumentation: Data, Claims, Warrants, Backing and Grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain and/or understand what Toulmin “adds” to the concept of an enthymeme or syllogism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 28</td>
<td>Keith &amp; Lundberg, re-read pp. 50-52.</td>
<td>In Keith &amp; Lundberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Keith &amp; Lundberg: Fallacy (p. 50).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand the notion of “fallacy” in relation to syllogism, enthymeme, premises and conclusions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fallacy as non sequitur (p. 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fallacies (pp. 51-52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hominem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad populum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal to authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post hoc ergo propter hoc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slippery slope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red herring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be covered in class:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strawman and selective strawman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Week 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday, December 3</th>
<th>No readings. Exam prep!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Essays due by 11:59 p.m. tonight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>