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According to Ernest Renan, the French historian of religion, inventing the art of rhetoric was the “only mistake the Greeks made.” One of the central aims of this introductory survey of ancient Greek and Roman rhetoric is to reveal the injustice of Renan’s charge. In order to situate the origins of rhetoric in its social and historical context, the course begins by exploring the complex relationship between rhetoric and culture in Classical Greece (law, politics, theatre, and philosophy). With this context in mind, the course then examines the appropriation of Greek rhetorical theory by the Romans, who viewed the pursuit of rhetoric as the loftiest ideal of human existence. By the end of the course it will become apparent that the invention of rhetoric, far from being a “mistake,” represents one of the Promethean achievements of Western intellectual history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Readings (all available online)</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of Sept 15</td>
<td>Gorgias, “Encomium of Helen”</td>
<td>Reading Response (submit via email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous, <em>Dissoi Logoi</em></td>
<td>Reading Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Aristophanes, <em>Clouds</em></td>
<td>Reading Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Aristophanes, <em>Lysistrata</em></td>
<td>Reading Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 6</td>
<td>Plato, <em>Phaedrus</em></td>
<td>Reading Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aristotle, <em>Rhetoric</em> Book 1</td>
<td>Reading Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.1.i.html">http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.1.i.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cicero, <em>The Orator</em> Book 1</td>
<td>Reading Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://archive.org/stream/ciceroonoratorya00cicunoft">http://archive.org/stream/ciceroonoratorya00cicunoft</a></td>
<td>Essay 1: Oct. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27    | Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory*  
Book 2: chs. 1–21  
Book 10: chs. 2–6  
Book 12: chs. 1–5; 11  
| Nov. 3 | Tacitus, “Dialogue on Oratory”  
Lucian, “The Rhetorician’s Vade Mecum” | Reading Response |
| 10    | Aelius Aristides, *Against Plato: In Defence of Rhetoric* | Reading Response |
| 17    | Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*  
Preface  
Book 1  
Book 4  
[http://faculty.georgetown.edu/jod/augustine/ddc.html](http://faculty.georgetown.edu/jod/augustine/ddc.html) | Reading Response |
| 24    | No readings | Essay 2: Nov. 29 |

**Requirements**

**Grade Breakdown**
- 20% Responses
- 40% Essay 1
- 40% Essay 2

**Meetings**
I have scheduled an hour per week for meetings if you wish to discuss the readings: Wed. 4:00-5:00 in HH 256. In addition, I am available on the phone on Thursday and Friday; please email me to make an appointment.
20% Reading Responses
Each week, students are required to write a reading response (1 page) that provides three reasons why the text(s) under discussion are important to the study of ancient rhetoric as you understand it. Responses are due on the Friday of each week (email them). Late responses will not be accepted. Responses are read but not graded: credit is given for completing the assignment. Format: 1 pg.; Times New Roman; 12 pt.; double-spaced; Word docs.

In addition, please email your responses to your colleagues.

40% Essay (8 pp.)
Write an essay in which you compare and/or contrast any two texts on the first half of the syllabus (Greek rhetoric). Do not merely summarize these works. Instead, offer an interpretation that evaluates their significance to the field of rhetorical studies. In addition, develop an argument over the course of the whole essay rather than conjoining two distinct papers. Be sure to support your argument with relevant citations from the text. Format: 8 pp.; 12 point; Times New Roman; 1” margins; MS Word doc or docx.

40% Essay (8 pp.)
Write an essay in which you compare and/or contrast any two texts on the second half of the syllabus (Roman rhetoric). Do not merely summarize these works. Instead, offer an interpretation that evaluates their significance to the field of rhetorical studies. In addition, develop an argument over the course of the whole essay rather than conjoining two or three distinct papers. Be sure to support your argument with relevant citations from the text. Format: 8 pp.; 12 point; Times New Roman; 1” margins; MS Word doc or docx.

Essays will be graded according to the following criteria: 1) grammar; 2) style; 3) structure and coherence; 4) content; 5) argumentation, including use of evidence; 6) originality. An “A” range essay will be excellent in most of these areas; a “B” range essay will be good in most of them; a “C” range essay will be adequate in most of them; and a “D” range essay will be inadequate in most of them.

University of Waterloo Policy on Academic Offences (including plagiarism)
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.

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,
http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm

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, http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm

Appeals: A student may appeal the finding and/or penalty in a decision made under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 - Student Discipline if a ground for an appeal can be established. Read Policy 72 - Student Appeals,
http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm

Academic Integrity website (Arts): http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic_responsibility.html