

Lydia Meredith

Professor Michael Harker

English 8171

1 May 2020

FINAL EXAM

Step One: Key Rhetorical Terms List

For each of the following terms, provide a **definition**, a two or three related **quotations** from assigned readings, and identify a relevant **source** (“in class lectures” or RT).

- Rhetoric

At the core of rhetoric is language/communication; ergo, the definitions are as plentiful and diverse as the human fingerprint. We experience evolving definitions and use through the ages: Classical: Aristotle defined rhetoric as “the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion. This is not the function of any other art” (Bizzell and Herzberg 181); Enlightenment Era: Adam Smith, and other proponents of reductionism assert, “Rhetoric is now the study of correct grammar and syntax, appropriate style and diction for types of discourse or occasions for speaking, taste or standards of literary and moral judgment, and the means of effective communication in general” (806); for George Campbell, “Rhetoric begins with the search for truth and then proceeds to persuasion, the attempt to move the will to ethical action” (899); and Modern & Post-Modern Era: I. A. Richards defined rhetoric as “... the study of communication and understanding;” Kenneth Burke asserts “Language is a form of human action: it requires an agent with a purpose, a scene of action, a rhetorical strategy, and an actual speech or text ... Seeing discourse this way ... is to see all language as motivated, hence as rhetorical” (14). “Rhetoric is responsive” (Harker).

- The New Rhetoric

The New Rhetoric is characterized as a period during which rhetoric is aimed toward addressing all of the mind’s faculties (a New Science theory) as rhetoric is responsive to scientific, social, and political movements of the Enlightenment Era (Harker). Enlightenment rhetoric is influenced by the new science of psychology “dividing the human intellect into faculties: memory, imagination, and reason” (793) introduced by Francis Bacon. As mentioned above, Adam Smith reduces rhetoric to elocution and other delivery and stylistic matters of “conveying” with fidelity the rhetorical message: argument, truth, opinion, interpretation, etc. (806). Bizzell and Herzberg cites, “Like

Bacon, Locke divides the mind into two general faculties, the understanding and the will” (798).

The term New Rhetoric can be applied in any context where classical notions of rhetoric are “repurposed” and “redesigned” (employing the science of motivated sequence) to convey meaning and persuade audiences. The new rhetoric of social media is an example of such an application.

- Taste

Taste is a mental faculty (associated with the practice of criticism, judgment, eloquence, style and delivery, etc.) frequently employed by Enlightenment Era scholars. Bizzell and Herzberg credit David Hume for introducing the theory of taste to the rhetorical conversation. Taste is associated with the science of psychology -- the basis of Blair’s rhetoric. According to Hume, “Taste is the basis of judgments about what is pleasing, beautiful, elegant, and virtuous (moral). Hume observes tastes’ diversity and relativism but still attempts to set a standard. Hume’s taste standards are based on (1) consensus/judgment that some art/thought/practice (a touchstone) is obviously better than others; and (2) though taste is personal, some persons have better taste than others based on sensitivity and knowledge (experience/practice); and ergo, can make superior taste decisions as experts in their fields (such people are ideal critics and provide the best standard of criticism). Since taste is empirical it can be learned/cultivated” (828-829).

“Blair connects his rhetoric (alongside his contemporaries) to reason, human nature, the need to cultivate taste, and moral improvement. His rhetorical theory is inextricably linked with taste, a quality of the mind. For Blair, cultivating taste leads to higher intellectual pleasures, including the pleasure of virtuous behavior. Blair’s rhetoric seeks to persuade through appeals to reason and the passions; criticism, in turn, evaluates aesthetic objects (on the basis of their appeals to the same faculties). Good taste is thus at the root of both, and human nature is the foundation of taste. Finally the cultivation of taste leads to higher intellectual pleasure -- the pleasure of virtuous behavior. Blair’s rhetoric aims ultimately at a rather classical goal, to produce good men who will speak (and write) well in the service of the community, whether for the pulpit, the bar, or the halls of legislature. “Whatever enables genius to execute well, will enable taste to criticize justly” – good taste is genius and the basis of persuasion – its aim is moral improvement (947-950). Like Quintilian, Blair’s rhetoric is purpose-driven toward excellence for the public good – the epitome of good taste.

- Eloquence

Eloquence is the rhetor’s suit of excellence in the art of oratory/composition: appropriate style and delivery -- undergirded by sound logic of content, effective memory of content, and masterful arrangement of content – toward accomplishing its goal to inform, persuade, please, entertain, etc. Quintilian, a champion of Blair maintains, “Therefore, it matters not which term [for eloquence] we employ. But the thing [eloquence] itself has

an extraordinarily powerful effect in oratory. For the nature of the speech that we have composed within our minds is not as important as the manner in which we produce it, since the emotion of each member of our audience will depend on the impression made upon his hearing. Consequently, no proof, at least if it be one devised by the orator himself, will ever be so secure as not to lose its force if the speaker fails to produce it in tones that drive it home. All emotional appeals will inevitably fall flat, unless they are given the fire that voice, look, and the whole carriage of the body can give them” (Murphy and Pullman Notes).

According to Blair, the science of psychology is a stronger basis on which to build rhetorical theory. Blair discusses self-improvement in eloquence as follows: “The first requirement of the excellent speaker is good character; thus one should practice the virtues. Second, one must have knowledge of the subject of the discourse and, as support for that knowledge, a general familiarity with polite literature. Third comes industriousness; fourth, good models; fifth, practice; and sixth, study of rhetorical theory. The study of rhetorical writers is not to be neglected. Quintilian is the best rhetorician, but even he is too concerned with systematic rhetoric – topics, arrangement, figures” (Bizzell and Herzberg 948).

“For the best definition which, I think, can be given to eloquence, is the art of speaking in such a manner as to attain the end for which we speak. Whenever a man speaks or writes, he is supposed, as a rational being, to have some end in view; either to inform, or to amuse, or to persuade, or, in some way or other, to act upon his fellow-creatures. He who speaks, or writes, in such a manner as to adapt all his words most effectually to that end, is the most eloquent man ... regardless of subject” (970).

- Elocution Movement

“The elocution movement, which focused on delivery, began early in the eighteenth century and lasted through the nineteenth. Elocution offered instruction in correct pronunciation in an era obsessed with correctness. Moreover, elocution found support in psychology, for it analyzed the hitherto neglected area of nonverbal appeals to the emotions, an avenue of persuasion newly restored to legitimacy” (792).

“The 18th century fetish of correctness in language was not restricted to diction and usage but extended to pronunciation.” Linguistic discrimination was a societal staple as it is today – lower class, rustic, comical, incomprehensible dialect was regarded reprehensible and unacceptable in public forums (such as judicial, deliberative, and epideictic/pulpits). Social movements would make English a part of school curricula. Bizzell and Herzberg calls Thomas Sheridan a champion of the elocution movement. “The need for greater attention to delivery had been raised in the previous century by Wilkins and Fenelon. Advice on delivery were offered to preachers and lawyers for acting, facial expression, posture, movement, gesture, projection, tone, pace, and modulation. Sheridan pushed for oratory reform in Ireland, Scotland, and Britain, publishing works on elocution, education, reading, and the introduction of the first dictionary” (802).

- Arrangement

Arrangement is one of the 5 classical canons of rhetoric. For the classical tradition: “Invention is the art of making persuasive arguments in any given rhetorical situation; **arrangement** means [the most effective] ordering of the parts of a discourse according to the rhetor’s audience and purpose; style is the use of appropriate and effective language; memory is memorization [of discourse]; and delivery is the art of performing speech [discourse] using gestures, tone, and vocal modulations” (1630).

Blair’ rhetoric, like most of his contemporaries, replaces invention with the science of psychology (mental faculties). “Blair argues conviction comes from reason and argument, whereas persuasion combines conviction with techniques for stimulating the feelings that move the will. These techniques are method (or organization), ethos, style (aesthetic and pathetic appeals), and delivery” (810). Argument comprises invention, arrangement, and expression. Invention means knowledge of the subject – not *topoi* – and the subject itself determines the appropriate arrangement and manner of expression” (810). Hence, Blair’s method is a substitute for classical arrangement.

- Imagination

Imagination is one of the faculties of the mind. New knowledge and ideas are born from vigorous imagination. Memory another faculty of the mind must be strengthened; because, imagination operates and expands on knowledge that is deposited into the memory. Vico observes, “Just as old age is powerful in reason, so is adolescence in imagination. Since imagination has always been esteemed a most favorable omen of future development, it should in no way be dulled. Furthermore, the teacher should give the greatest care to the cultivation of the pupil’s memory, which, though not exactly the same as imagination, is almost identical with it. In adolescence, memory outstrips in vigor all other faculties and should be intensely trained” (868).

George Campbell’s *The Philosophy of Rhetoric, Chapter 7, Of the Consideration which the Speaker ought to have of the Hearers, as men in general*, “If the orator would prove successful, it is necessary that he engage in his service all these different powers of the mind, the imagination, the memory, and the passion. These are not the supplanters of reason, or rivals in her sway; they are her handmaids, by whose ministry she is enable to usher truth into the heart, and procure it there a favourable reception” (923-924). Section 1 of Chapter 7 speaks to the necessity of being understood; Section 2 speaks to imagination; and Section 3 speaks to memory; Section 4 - 7 speaks to passions and moral sentiments. Campbell says imagination must be engaged for proper reasoning, and without the command of the element of imagination the speaker cannot engage the hearer [with familiar imagery] to engender belief (924). Campbell asserts “... pleasing the imagination preserves the attention of the hearer ... the mind receives considerable pleasure from the discovery of [nuanced] resemblances ... vivid ideas hold attention and

are more easily remembered” (925). Campbell’s treatment of imagination speaks to the essential role it plays in rhetorical strategy.

- Motivated Sequence

Motivated Sequence is a theory of rhetoric founded by George Campbell. “The path to persuasion on Campbell’s theory, passes through each of the faculties [below] in turn. In other words, rhetoric must appeal first to the understanding and produce conviction, without which persuasion cannot follow” (898). For George Campbell, “rhetoric adheres to the motivated sequence. That is, conviction/persuasion are only possible for the rhetor that proceeds through the following steps: (1) Enlightening the understanding; (2) Pleasing the imagination –disposition; (3) Moving the passions; and (4) Influencing the will” (Harker). Campbell asserts, “... that rhetoric must address all the mind’s faculties – the understanding, the imagination, the passion, and the will – to achieve persuasion. In other words, rhetoric must be able to inform and argue, to provide aesthetic delight, to affect the feelings, and to urge action” (898).

Step Two—Essay questions: Respond to the following prompts.

- In a paragraph of about a half a page, discuss whether or not these rhetorical concepts are **compatible. Perspicuity, Taste, Eloquence.**

The rhetorical concepts of Perspicuity, Taste, and Eloquence are compatible. My understanding of this prompt is to present a discussion on how Perspicuity, Taste, and Eloquence are companionable or similar. **Perspicuity** during the Enlightenment Era, is deemed the epitome of good taste and hallmark of eloquence. During the Enlightenment Era, “classical rhetoric came under attack by adherents of the new science, who claimed that rhetoric obscured the truth by encouraging the use of ornamental rather than plain, direct language. Such spawned a movement to “purify” language especially for science and philosophy – making Perspicuity, or clarity a watchword in discussions of “**ideal style**” during the ensuing centuries” (792). Accordingly, Perspicuity (the ideal style of a rhetor) becomes akin to eighteenth century **Taste**; as taste is the basis of judgment for what is pleasing, what is beautiful/elegant, what is virtuous/moral, what is correct/appropriate. Taste is the basis of critique – as it discerns what is in good taste and what is not. However, only “**ideal critics**” (whose taste is cultivated and trained via experience) are worthy of the task; and only that which is considered, without dissension, eloquent, beautiful, a touchstone of art (in oratory, literature, music, etc.) can be judged “in good taste” (Hume; Blair). *Perspicuity is judged by taste to be pleasing, elegant, virtuous and appropriate.* **Eloquence** is the functional attribute of an “**ideal orator.**” Eloquence is the rhetor’s suit of excellence in the art of oratory/composition: appropriate style and delivery -- undergirded by sound logic of content, effective memory of content, and masterful arrangement of content – toward accomplishing the rhetor’s goal to inform, persuade, please, entertain, etc. Few rhetors are acclaimed to be eloquent, namely Cicero, Demosthenes, and Quintilian, but such men are regarded without dispute to hold

this honor. *Eloquence is judged by taste to be pleasing, elegant, virtuous and appropriate.* Ergo, how are these 3 terms companions? Perspicuity is the hallmark of “ideal style.” Eloquence is the hallmark of “ideal oratory.” Taste is the hallmark of the “ideal critic.” Both Perspicuity and Eloquence are signatures of “ideal taste.” Taste is the mental faculty that argues this claim: Perspicuity and Eloquence are in good taste.

- In a paragraph of about a half a page, discuss the important “NEW theoretical shifts” in how Campbell, Blair, and Whately define rhetoric.

For me, the **important** NEW theoretical shifts *that influenced how* Campbell, Blair, and Whately defined rhetoric are as follows: The first theoretical shift is the **New Science movement**: introduced by Francis Bacon; adopted by John Locke and Adam Smith; and influenced the thought of every thinker during the Enlightenment Era. “Bacon divides the human intellect into the ‘faculties’ of the mind, memory, imagination, and reason. To these he adds two others *that are slightly different in kind*, the will and the appetite. Bacon’s formulation is that rhetoric applies reason to the imagination to move the will – reasoning is not enough to achieve persuasion; to teach people or move them to action, one had to address ALL the faculties” (793). Bacon’s theory of psychology dominated both 18th and 19th century rhetorics. The New Science is basically what these figures knew about human nature; and, their rhetorical intention is to link their rhetorics with science – toward generating pure and impactful thought – from a clear mind, clear language (perspicuity) follows (Harker). Rhetoric, so to speak, becomes a scientific method for oratory/composition. The rhetorics of Campbell, Blair and Whately were significantly influenced; however, to a lesser extent for Whately (given his purpose was more liturgical): Campbell is so influenced by the New Science that his cornerstone scholarship is named, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* – the science of rhetoric; Blair adds on the good taste of virtue toward good deeds; and Whately adds on burden of proof toward defending the faith. The New Science movement also included empiricism theory introduced by Rene Descartes (arguing truth is what the mind cannot find reason to doubt). Campbell, Blair, and Whately were men of ecclesiastical tradition; therefore, revelation (moral evidence) and science were not mutually exclusive.

A second theoretical movement was the **attack/reductionism of classical rhetoric**. John Locke and other scholars, claimed rhetoric functioned to obscure the truth with its use of ornamental language; and, given the New Science (theories of empiricism, rationalism, psychology, and epistemology) rhetoric more appropriately should function as an instrument of delivery and style (a conveyor of truth, argument, or opinion). The New Science rendered rhetoric incompetent and unfit to function as an instrument of invention or logic – the generation of truth and knowledge needed to formulate arguments, policy, interpretations, etc. for different audiences (the pulpit, the bar, the legislature). This tenet influenced Campbell, Blair, and Whately toward nuanced renderings, theories, and practices of rhetoric.

The elocution movement was a significant movement. “The elocution movement, which focused on delivery, began early in the eighteenth century and lasted through the

nineteenth century. Elocution offered instruction in correct pronunciation in an era obsessed with correctness. Moreover, elocution found support in psychology, for it analyzed the hitherto neglected area of nonverbal appeals to the emotions, an avenue of persuasion newly restored to legitimacy” (792). According to Harker, “clarity in language meant clarity in thought [mind] and purity in purpose” (Harker). Sheridan, among other scholars pushed for improvement in linguistics for lawyers, preachers, and statesmen in duty toward the public good.

George Campbell, (1719 – 1796), influenced by Adam Smith – a Scottish philosopher and economist, is a Scottish clergyman and scholar setting forth his theories in, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. According to Bizzell and Herzberg, Campbell advanced Aristotelian rhetoric and became the turning point for the development of rhetoric in the 18th century” (901). Campbell’s work synthesizes the key concerns of rhetoric: “the relationship of rhetoric to contemporary philosophy, improving pulpit eloquence, the popular interest in elocution, the connection of rhetoric with literature and criticism, and the long standing claims of rhetoric” 807. Campbell uses ‘the science of human nature’ to determine the principles of rhetoric that “operates on the soul of the hearer, in the way of informing, convincing, pleasing, moving, or persuading – maintaining that arts as well as sciences must seek their first principles in scientific psychology” (808). “Campbell seeks to ground rhetoric in science and to make rhetoric an essential element of science” (808) – elevating the position of rhetoric. Campbell introduces his theory of Motivated Sequence to rhetorics. Campbell “maintains that scientific proof relies on precisely the same basic mental operations as moral reasoning” (808). Eloquence is distinguished by what is appropriate and correct and clear (809). For Campbell, science, morality, and other disciplines may co-exist; ergo, the classical canons are “advanced” by Enlightenment innovation and practice; but, classical rhetoric does not have to be stripped of all merit. (Bizzell and Herzberg; Meredith’s reading response)

Hugh Blair, (1718-1800), called “the Quintilian of the 18th century,” returns the public good to the rhetorical conversation ... Blair received universal approval and universal application of his pedagogy” (947). Blair is highly influenced by David Hume, though not an atheist, Blair latches on to taste/judgment/criticism and scientific theory. Blair feeds the popular desire for rules of taste, guidelines for writing and speaking, and well-digested samples of proper literature. To this day, rhetoric (civic operations) takes a back seat to literature in English departments because of Blair’s leaning towards and elevation of literary criticism. (Bizzell and Herzberg; Meredith’s reading response)

Whately employs The New Science to garner societal credence for his arguments during an age of skepticism. “Whately is also interested in the motivated sequence and taste, but he sees rhetoric as an offshoot of logic. Thus, he provides a more systematic process through which conviction is achieved, one that values – among other things – the burden of proof. Whately is curious about what audiences are willing to accept as true. He suspects that people tend to fall on one side or another in a debate even before they consider opposing arguments. In such cases, people often place the burden of proof on the side they disagree with” (Harker). Whately, “instead of requiring more attention to observed facts, such as details of style, rhetoric needs a theory of persuasion that

describes the actual processes by which conviction is formed. Whatley proposes to search out the basis of rhetoric in language and psychology ... Whatley focuses on argument from testimony and probability since they are most likely to help clergymen who are refuting scoffers. He appeals to science and logic as the foundation for his argument, speaking of probability as the basis of discovery ... rhetoric's proper province is to argue the truths found by other means – science or revelation" (984-1001).

- In one page or less, **discuss the contributions of Spencer, Bain, and Hill.** What aspects of Enlightenment-era rhetorical theory **inform their understandings of language and education?**

The contributions of Spencer, Bain, and Hill are principally in the field of language and mass education; influenced and informed by the Enlightenment Era rhetorics of Campbell, Blair, and Whately. Again rhetoric responds to change – as the nature and scope of public education change. The Enlightenment Era was a period characterized by science, social and political movements. The philosophy of human nature -- and that all white men had one – was an equalizer for a world accustomed to elitism, monarchy and tyranny. The New Science movement brought attention to the human condition; lived oppression based on gender, race, and class. The French Revolution, the American Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, Abolitionism were all events that influenced rhetorical philosophy; and the advancement of language and education in this period. Leading the efforts of nationalizing education was Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Education nationalization happened in France and Germany by the end of the 18th century and in Britain by the end of the 19th century. (Bizzell and Herzberg 812) From the Industrial Revolution emerged math and science curricula -- reading, writing, and arithmetic became standard instruction for the lower classes, along with lessons in religion, citizenship, and the pleasures of sobriety. Secondary education was by and large for the commercial classes, whose members required solid literacy skills and the ability to do complex calculations (812). “The rhetorics of Sheridan, Blair, and Campbell were quite well suited to the curricular needs of most 19th century schools in Britain and America” (983). According to Bizzell and Herzberg, “Bain used the rhetorical theory of his countryman Campbell to devise a psychological approach to written composition that still influences the field. Bain wrote psychology books and is considered the founder of the modern scientific study of psychology. Bain is responsible for the decisively influential formulation of the modes of discourse – description, narration, exposition, and persuasion and for the notion of paragraph unity as an important feature of written discourse ... Bain developed a new theory of composition in response to the curriculum reform happening in the 19th century when he published *English Composition and Rhetoric* in 1866. Rhetoric instruction was moving from speaking to writing because “mass education meant instruction in technical subjects and in the vernacular” (1141). Due to this shift, rhetoric instruction was broken down into two different courses: elocution and writing. Unfortunately, the split privatized discourse making it move from the public sphere to the private sphere. Bain produced a straightforward text in the hopes to continue the methodization of composition instruction, which could help “to cultivate in [pupils] a copious fund of expression, and to render more delicate their discrimination of good and ill effects” (1145). Bain’s theory of the brain’s intellectual powers include (1) *Discrimination*: Feeling of Difference, Contrast, and Relativity -- "the mind is affected by change;" (2) *Similarity*: Feeling of Agreement -- "when like objects come under our notice, we are Impressed by the circumstance" and (3) *Retentiveness*: Acquisition, Memory -- "the ability to retain successive impressions without confusion, and to bring them up afterwards" (1147). (Bain Presentation Handout)

Hill chaired rhetoric at Harvard. Bizzell and Herzberg explain, Bain's modes of discourse and paragraph, joins Hill's grammar use and style, alongside a stripped down version of rhetoric, to respond to the needs of mass education. Hill's book, the *Principles of Rhetoric*, was used commercial-post war. He defined rhetoric as "the art of efficient communication by language – an art that a good writer and speaker must conform. Rhetoric is an art not a science because it does not observe, discover, or classify; but shows how to convey from one mind to another the results of observation, discovery, or classification – it uses knowledge, not as knowledge, but as power. Logic simply teaches the right use of reason" (1149). Hill pushes grammar and exposition principally. Hill taught an English necessary for his day – which was to earn a living; and prescriptive because of the large number of students. This leads him into an examination of the four principles "which apply to written or spoken discourse of every kind:" grammatical purity, clearness, force ("the quality that selects the most effective expressions and arranges them in the most effective manner"), and elegance (1149). However, he stresses greater importance on grammatical purity and clearness over force and elegance, noting that if writers aim to be perspicuous, "other merits will be likely to come unsought" (1149). Through his invocation of writers such as John Locke and Herbert Spencer, Hill argues that writers should use clear language and sensible arrangement in order to keep the audience's attention, while staying true to their character which makes their composition and voice unique, citing Dante and Shakespeare as "ideal" examples (1151). Hill concludes by reminding writers of their innate qualities outside of the learned skills of rhetoric that can give "life" to their work (1151). (Hill Presentation Handout)

Spencer has many works to his contribution to language and education including *Social Statistics*; *The Philosophy of Style*; *The Principles of Psychology*; and *The Study of Psychology*. Spencer was a self-taught, prolific writer, known for his theory of the economy/efficiency of language, evolution and the study of sociology; he greatly influenced science education. He was heavily influenced by Jean-Baptiste Lamarck's theory of evolution, published in 1839 and applied its concepts to society at large. Spencer came to believe that evolution was "the key to all natural and human systems" (1152). His writing greatly influenced the American education system, especially in the field of science education and composition. In composition, Spencer's principle of economy applied to style, influenced the "form-content split;" the "growing mechanistic view of composition;" and increasing emphasis on appeals to psychological faculties, clarity and correctness, and plain style (1153). Key thoughts on rhetoric, language, and education are: (1) there does not yet appear to be a "general theory" of rhetoric, but there should be. Based on an analysis of commonly held "maxims" of good rhetoric -- we can derive a general rule of thumb that is simple -- well-arranged rhetoric is best because it allows readers to expend mental energy on understanding the ideas of a piece, rather than trying to decode the writer's language; (2) Good composition is dependent upon practice and natural aptitude, rather than understanding of rules of composition; and (3) An ideal writer will not have a fixed writing style, but instead vary their style to fit whatever feeling they are experiencing, and subject they are writing about in the moment – they

will “unconsciously write in all styles,” and their work will be “one whole made up of unlike parts that are mutually dependent” (1167). (Spencer Presentation Handout)

- In two pages or less, explain **why rhetorical theory** in the Western tradition **changed over time**. Give at least three illustrations from figures discussed this semester.

“Rhetoric is responsive” (Harker). Rhetoric by its nature is responsive – as advancements in civilization in every life domain move – so does rhetoric. Accordingly, as Western tradition changed over time, so did Rhetorical theory. A glimpse, at how rhetorical theory movement influenced the rhetorical scholarship of figures we have studied this semester, follows:

According to Bizzell and Herzberg, classical rhetoric is challenged early by French scholars Peter Ramus (1515-1572) – Ramistic doctrine; and Rene’ Descartes (1596-1650) -- Cartesian doctrine; and British scholar, Francis Bacon (1561-1626). Ramistic doctrine, “dominat[ing] rhetoric at the beginning of the 17th century,” amputated invention, arrangement, and memory from classical rhetoric; and a theory shift toward science/faculties of the mind ensued -- leaving rhetoric to an elocutionary function only: style and delivery (791). According to Ramistic doctrine, the canons of invention, arrangement, and memory inform logic (reasoning); ergo, these canons are more appropriately placed within the discipline of logic (791). As Cartesian doctrine, (“that which the mind cannot find reason to doubt”), empiricism, experimental science and inductive reasoning, became *the standard* to seek truth; Ramistic doctrine became inconsequential; so, “the Ciceronian conception” of classical rhetoric returned to its former position (as the foundation of rhetorical study) until well into the 18th century (792-793). Genre linkages were added to rhetoric by scholars and belletrists to rhetoric’s traditional civic domains (forensic-judicial, deliberative-legislative, and epideictic-honor) to include history, poetry, and literary criticism. “Before the end of the 17th century, rhetoric came under attack [again] by adherents of the new science who claimed that rhetoric obscured the truth” ... these scholars advocated for language reforms to purify communication toward the goal of perspicuity (792). Francis Bacon’s psychology was added to the rhetorical conversation. Bacon asserted that the human intellect is comprised of memory, reasoning and imagination; and included will and appetite to rhetorical functions. Bacon surmised more than logic is needed to move the will, suggesting “rhetoric applies reason to imagination to move the will ... [scholarship followed that would link and expand] psychology, philosophy, and epistemology ... and influence rhetorical [theory and practice] well into the 19th century” (792-793). While being a proponent of science, Bacon respected eloquence without ornaments. “The elocution movement [began early in the 18th century and lasted through the 19th century] advanced the last 2 canons of rhetoric, delivery and style -- restoring delivery and style as tools of persuasion with a focus on correctness and psychology-emotion. Style, centered on perspicuity, not ornamental, continued its force through the 19th century” (792). These movements would advance, expand, and redirect the study of classical rhetoric to include “taste and literary judgment, instruction in correct and effective speaking, and a

respectable scientific theory of psychological persuasion” (792). Subsequent scholars discussed below, practicing through the Enlightenment era, were either influenced by or were influencers of these movements – and guided the study of classical/traditional rhetoric into the 19th and 20th centuries.

- John Locke, (1632-1704), influenced by Ramus, Descartes (empiricism), and Bacon’s theory of psychology, “divides the mind into 2 faculties, understanding and will ... understanding reflects upon perceptions and produces ideas, words refer to ideas, and ideas are signs of real things/truth that are formed using mental faculties – the source of all knowledge.” Such thought diminished the classical canonical function of invention, arrangement, and memory. Locke’s major criticism of rhetoric was obscurity of meaning – advocating for perspicuity and improvement of language. Locke does not “link rhetoric explicitly with the process of creating ‘true’ knowledge” (816).
- Giambattisto Vico, (1668-1774), professor of rhetoric at the University of Naples, criticizes Descartes for his theory that all knowledge is sourced from empiricism. Vico, not esteemed in his day and time, because of his Cartesian position, believed knowledge is bound up in situated/cultural/social context expressed by language, and knowledge cannot be separated from language that is derived from human reason, passion, and imagination (800). Vico maintains that the goal of philosophy is correct reasoning, while Locke maintained that the goal of philosophy was perspicuity. Vico’s philosophy leaves room for the agency of classical rhetoric; but adds imagination to the realm of logic (800).
- David Hume (1711-1776) influenced by Locke, held that ideas come only from sense impressions and our mental operations on them; ergo, revelation, reasoning, and testimony have no place in the rhetorical conversation. Hume only acknowledged style and delivery (eloquence) in high regard; and linked taste (the basis of judgment) to the conversation of rhetorical study (828-829)

Rhetorical theory in the Western tradition changed over time. Each part (invention, arrangement, memory, style and delivery) receives attention from figures during the Enlightenment period in some way – either refuting, maintaining, advancing, expanding, subtracting, or adding theory or practice to the work of ancient philosophers, rhetoricians, statesmen, such as, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and St. Augustine. The Enlightenment change agents were influenced and motivated by personal, social, political, scientific, and other societal milieu and developments during this period. Since its ancient beginnings, rhetoric (being language and being communication) was responsive to environmental stimuli; hence, rhetoric will continue to evolve, as scholarship and innovation continue to arrest the minds of great thinkers in society. (Bizzell and Herzberg; Meredith Reading Response)

Step Three—Short Answer: (Respond to three prompts in about a half a page or less)

- List/define the five parts of the classical canon of rhetoric. Trace the fate of invention or **delivery** during the Enlightenment period.

According to J. J. Murphy's interpretation of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, **the five canons of classical rhetoric** "are not mere philosophical distinctions, but chronological action steps toward the preparation and delivery of an oration to an audience ... ask[ing] the rhetor to do five things, one after another:

1. Find ("**invent**") ideas
2. **Arrange** them in an order
3. Put Words ("**style**" to the ideas)
4. Remember ["**memory**"] the ideas, their order, and their words
5. **Deliver** (transmit) the ordered and worded ideas to [an] audience through sound, facial expression, and gesture" (Murphy, et al. 131).

The following list and defines the 5 parts of the classical canon of rhetoric:

Invention: "Invention (*inventio*) is the devising of matter, true or plausible, that would make the case convincing" (Murphy, et al. *Rhetorica Ad Herennium Book I*, 134). The practice in Ancient Greece was to use the collective wisdom of the community, topics, probability and an array of other invention technologies to generate ideas (for arguments, opinions, interpretations, declarations, policy, criticisms, thoughts, theories, knowledge, truth, et cetera) appropriate for diverse rhetorical situations. The reasoning employed to determine what is appropriate relied upon the logic of enthymemes (commonplace premises/deduction/syllogisms) and probability.

Arrangement: "Arrangement (*dispositio*) is the ordering and distribution of the matter, making clear the place to which each thing is to be assigned" (134). There are different theories/formulas for how to organize an oration/composition; but, integral to effective arrangement is rhetorical "audience analysis," including audience perception, the understanding of ideas invented, and other audience analytics that facilitate persuasion. Pullman asserts, "for the sake of order some formulas are necessary ... [and reiterates] **arrangement** (*taxis*) [of the] parts of a speech [should be done] in a manner [that is] best suited to the audience's needs and expectations" (Pullman's Notes).

Style: "Style (*elocutio*) is the adaptation of suitable words and sentences to the matter invented" (134). Pullman notes suggest, from Aristotle's *Rhetorica, Book 3*, "style [means use of] good Greek, words in their prevailing sense, metaphors where there is a logical relationship between the two domains, and where the audience clearly understands the domain that is being borrowed to explain the unknown domain ... 'neither flat nor above the dignity of the subject, but appropriate,' movement/*energia*, vivid detail, images, that audience can experience vicariously, make them feel there, implication of 'city' sophisticated/urbanity, smart (antithesis of country naïve) – and making 'appropriate' connections between things your audience can't perceive as connected." Pullman further explains, "**Style** (*lexis*) [is use of] clarity, brevity, good Greek (*or skilled use of language*); style is your own voice/ethos; from a rhetorical perspective, style is about choice and flexibility, adjustments to the occasion, audience, your integrity (ethos), and the way you feel about your subject. Consider: fitness for the occasion; fitness with the subject; and fitness of your intended ethos."

Memory: “Memory (*memoria*) is the firm retention in the mind of the matter, words, and arrangement” (134). According to Pullman, “our natural memories are notoriously fallible (as it convicts innocent people by recollection of what we thought we saw) and are powerful feeling generators (as it recollects feelings of joy to dissolve feelings of despair) and memory is the handmaiden of persuasion (as it relieves delivery fear/anxiety by recalling success).” Pullman continues, “Memory, the treasure house of the ideas supplied by invention, the guardian of all the parts of rhetoric, is of two kinds: (1) natural memory, which is aided by discipline; and (2) artificial memory (enhanced memory from discipline [memory improvement strategies]) which depends upon backgrounds and images. The speaker must learn various methods of searching his memory. Memorizing words is appropriate when done for the sake of training” (Pullman Notes).

Delivery: “Delivery (*pronuntiatio*) is the graceful (*venusate*) regulation of voice, countenance, and gesture” (134). Pullman explains, “Delivery is about [the appropriate management] of voice (intonation, rhythm, pitch, and volume) and gesture (how one uses one’s hands, holds one’s body, moves, stands, dresses, makes eye contact” (Pullman Notes). In *On Invention* Cicero offers the following definition, “... Delivery, is a regulating of the voice and body in a manner suitable to the dignity of the subjects spoken of and of the language employed” (Pullman Notes). (*This prompt treatment was previously submitted as a Reading Response for this class.*)

Tracing the Canon of Delivery:

Delivery remains a force in the rhetorical conversation: from classical rhetoric, where Aristotle diminished the value of style and delivery; to Quintilian’s elevation, offering an entire chapter to its treatment; to Enlightenment era – where some figures reduced classical rhetoric to just the domains of style and delivery; to Enlightenment era -- during the same era, but later -- where style and delivery claimed the attention of an entire movement, the Elocution movement; to the 21st century -- where speech and communication owns an entire field in the academy. In this brief trace, we have to lift the theory of Thomas Sheridan who understood that comprehension, meaning and persuasion are also informed by elocution – not just the first 3 canons: Sheridan asserts, “Great elocution depends on correct grammar, diction, pronunciation, tone and gesture” (879-888). Sheridan aim was to restore elocution to its “proper stature in rhetorical study -- arguing that such a revival would bring vast improvements to religion, morality, government, and the arts” (802). Austin is also “devoted to elocution but distrusts the natural, conversational approach to public speaking; [consequently, he is] known for his contributions to nonverbal communication,” such as, his extensive treatment on gestures (889). (Bizzell and Herzberg; Meredith Reading Response)

- Within rhet/comp studies, the 19th century has been described by bibliographers and critics as a “vacuous wasteland.” Explain the basis for this claim and refute it, citing scholarship from the last decade to support your answer.

I argue that the 19th century should not be described as a “vacuous wasteland.” Bizzell and Herzberg, continuing the dialogue of rhetorical tradition, introduce 19th century figures, theory, and practice ascribing to this notion: “The rhetorics of Sheridan,

Blair and Campbell were quite well suited to the curricular needs of most nineteenth century schools in Europe and the United States, at least if they did not include many female or nonwhite students. From the modern point of view, all these rhetorics play down the classical tradition ... they present an outline of classical rhetoric while loudly rejecting the *topoi* and syllogism as unscientific; and they defend what remains with arguments from psychology ... Finally the 18th century rhetorics were easily adapted to the literacy needs of mass education in a commercial-industrial society. Apparently no new theory was needed; **and certainly none was forthcoming**” (983-984). This thread of thought, leading to a conclusion that 19th century rhetorics were not forthcoming, is challenged by the scholarship of Lynee Gaillet and Elizabeth Tasker below:

According to Lynee Gaillet and Elizabeth Tasker, in the article “Recovering, Revisioning, and Regendering the 18th- and 19th- Century Rhetorical Theory and Practice,” scholarship was forthcoming. The critics of this era ignored 19th century scholarship responses to female and nonwhite students. Gaillet restates the Bizzell and Herzberz claim before offering her refutation, “Often considered an uninteresting and uneventful period in rhetorical history, the 19th century, *until recently*, was routinely dismissed as a rhetorical wasteland, a period defined only by its-current-traditional approach to writing instruction” (74). Gaillet and Tasker contend, “... recent research on the period explores the interdisciplinary relationship among education, religion, social practices, and technological developments; revisits the reputation of the field’s heroes and villains, aligning these figures’ work with cultural practices and events of their time; and adds previously overlooked voice to the rhetorical tradition.” Scholarship evolving from such research and exploration includes Linda Ferreira-Buckley’s survey of 19th-century rhetoric in the *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition* published in 1996. This work discusses emerging rhetorical trends influenced by “empiricism, Scottish common sense philosophy, associational and faculty psychology, Romanticism, scientism, and phrenology that contest the sterile, stereotypical view of the period” 74. Gaillet and Tasker further point to other works (associated with women and minority rhetorics) in this article challenging the wasteland notion, and prove that the 19th century was “indeed a vital period in the development of rhetorical history” (74). Gaillet and Tasker maintain that additional scholarship and research is needed; and such efforts, will definitely unveil scholarship and add to the inventory of 19th century works.

- Define Scottish commonsense philosophy, locating this idea in the work of one figure from this period.

Scottish commonsense philosophy is a reactionary philosophy to Enlightenment Era skepticism; and functions, fundamentally, epistemologically. Questions such as the following ensue: What can we know to be truth/justified belief/opinion? How do we acquire truth/knowledge? What should be the basis of belief -- reason/rationale/logic or perception from the human senses of sight, sound, taste, and/or feeling/touch? Can we trust methods of reasoning to discover and justify truth? Or, can only perceptions from senses and experiences be trusted? These questions have arrested the minds of

philosophers and theologians through the ages. I offer just a few thoughts concerning the commonsense philosophy.

Scholars during this period, believed that “rhetorical argument should be built on commonsense; whenever possible, on assumptions the audience already holds” (Bizzell and Herzberg). From a seemingly enduring premise, ethos and logos (artistic, intrinsic proof/evidence) is strengthened **by using knowledge already held as creditable** by the audience. Scottish commonsense philosophy is developed by several figures of the Enlightenment Era. Thomas Reid is known as the forerunner of commonsense philosophy; however, I choose to focus on treatment by George Campbell.

Campbell holds that commonsense is an original source of knowledge common to all mankind” (909). Suggesting that commonsense is either innate or learned through societal norms, Campbell maintains, “... [commonsense] prevails in different degrees of strength; but no human creation hath been found originally and totally destitute of it.” Campbell further asserts that commonsense should be the basis to advance knowledge. Examples of commonsense assurances (upon which knowledge can be advanced) are (some paraphrased): “Whatever has a beginning has a cause; when there is a cause there is an effect; the future will resemble the past; we are body and mind; there are other bodies in the universe besides me; the clear representations of my memory, in regard to past events, are indubitably true” (911).

Campbell believes that commonsense is requisite to advancing knowledge. He declares, “... a full conviction of them [is needed] to advance a single step in acquisition of knowledge, especially in all that regards, mankind, life, and conduct” (911). Struck by these thoughts, Campbell concludes, “It must be owned that to maintain propositions, the reverse of the primary truths of common sense, doth not imply a contradiction; it only implies insanity ... if there be no first truths, there can be no second truths, nor third, nor indeed any truth at all” (911).

Note: Despite the COVID-19 pandemic, I have truly learned and been enlightened by the content of this course. I hope this final exam submission is a worthy reflection of such learning and enlightenment.

Works Cited

Bain Presentation Handout

- Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. "David Hume." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 828-840.
- . "Enlightenment Rhetoric." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 789-799.
- . "George Campbell." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 898-899.
- . "Giambattista Vico." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 814-827. ---. "Gilbert Austin." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 674-679.
- . "Gilbert Austin." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 889-890.
- . "Hugh Blair." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 947-949.
- . "John Locke." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 814-827.
- . "Peter Ramus." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 674-679.
- . "Thomas Sheridan." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*, 2nd ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000, pp. 879-880.

Gaillet, Lynee & Tasker, Elizabeth, Chapter 4: Recovering, Revision, and Regendering
the History of 18th- and 19th-Century Rhetorical Theory and Practice. (Posted
Readings)

Hill Presentation Handout

Harker, Michael. Harker Lecture Notes

Murphy, J. J., Katula, R. A., & Hoppmann, M. (2014). *A Synoptic History of Classical
Rhetoric* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Pullman, George. Pullman Lecture Notes

Spencer Presentation Handout