INTRODUCTION OUTLINE

I. (My experience)

In August of 1968, as a newly hired instructor, having just received my masters degree from the University of Florida, I had my heart broken when I walked into my first meeting of the English Department on Cumberland Campus and was told, "No, you're not in this meeting, you have been assigned to the Speech Department". When I had been interviewed in February of that year by Granville Diffie, Sue Pine's later to be brother in law, he had asked if I would consider teaching Speech as well as English and since I graduated in March, could I pick up a few Speech courses since the Junior College really needed some speech people. At UF, the English majors thought themselves to be the elite, and we could do anything. Also because of another English major, Grady Johnson, who had bedazzled me, and who was temporarily filling in as assistant to the President until he reported for his teaching position in the fall, the prospect of staying on a few months was appealing.

I did not know that I had cast lot for life.

Though I had taught Freshman English at UF for two years, those few Speech courses I had taken at the request of Granville Diffie, courses like oral interpretation, theatre courses, drama courses, had not prepared me for the Speech classrooms of Florida Junior College in 1968.

I had a solid background in English composition, but I was terribly deficient in rhetoric, and for a while, I was off balance to say the least. I didn't know the principles of rhetoric, I didn't know the theory of rhetoric, I didn't know the philosophy or rhetoric, I didn't know the history. I knew some of the techniques, I read the texts, I worked hard, I had a great liberal arts education, but...
I couldn't answer that question students always ask. "Why?" I would hem and haw, and sometimes hear myself start to say, "Because I said so."

I went back to the University of Florida, I received a Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Public Address. And now when students ask, "Why?", I feel no guilt when I answer, "Because I said so."

II. (Thesis)
Are there really benefits to your taking this course?

III. (Divisions of the thesis)
What is this course going to be about?
What will you gain?

IV. (Relationship/Benefit/Transition)
I know so many of you in this class and I will not individualize or personalize, yet I'm quite sure I will come close to answering the question, "What will you gain?" for each of you. I know if I miss it you will let me know. Let's take a look.

BODY OUTLINE

I. (First Division of Subject (What is the course going to be about?))
We will begin in ancient Greece around 384 BC in Stagira, a small town in Thrace. Or perhaps we will begin with Corax and Tisios, AKA Clorax and Tissue.
We will address both the philosophy and techniques or principles of rhetoric.

This course will address not only what to say, but how and why to say it.

We will study Aristotle's Rhetoric for "the Rhetoric is the study of the human soul. It is a searching study of the audience.. We must know the nature of the soul. We must know human nature, the ways of reasoning, the emotions and the kind of arguments that will persuade each kind of individual as well as the emotional appeal that will gain their assent.

We will learn not only the questions the students will ask, not only the answers we will give, we will learn the answer to that often asked questions, "WHY?"

II. (Second Division of Subject)(What will you gain?)

For some it is simply the Joy of Learning. That wonderful satisfying fullness. "I know something." "Knowledge is power." It sometimes fills us, not like chocolate, but almost.

And this learning increases us, not like chocolate increases, but in another way. We become more valuable to ourselves. Remember when you received your degrees? No one can take that away from you. And no one can take away from you what you take away from this class.

And by increasing your value through learning, you enrich those around you. We are all teachers and we are teachers of the Liberal Arts.

Some people are workers for they have a specific technique or knack (this is in no way disparaging them), but others know the possibilities, and they apply skills and rules thinkingly. They think out how to make the most of the circumstances in which they speak, or read, or write, or teach, or play basketball.
To achieve this kind of command involves learning sophisticated ways of thinking about yourself, about the kinds of communicative situations you are likely to enter, and about the possibilities of language, speech, action, and the people who will become the audience. Acquiring that kind of thinking and speaking is a liberal study.

Liberal because it liberates or frees a person.

But primarily it is a liberal study because when a subject has uses that reach well beyond the subject itself, it is common to call the subject liberal or general.

The study is useful in more vocations than one. To command a liberal study helps a person to get more out of other studies while providing useful skills of its own.

The special value of a liberal study is that it introduces you to additional ways you can think about and understand general facts of life. A study deserving to be called Liberal gives you background into which to fit your specialized concerns.

Consider a simple case: You want to plan a house. Professor Susan Hill planned her house, Jay Smith planned his house. If you know house planning as, say, a carpenter might know it, you could plan a solid, roomy house, and that would be all.

But with a broader knowledge of people and society you could plan a solid, roomy house that would suit the real estate market (economics), would conform to the ordinance of the community in which the house is to be built (politics and sociology), would be attractive on the lot on which it is to stand (aesthetics), and would have features that are readily and attractively described so as to make the house salable (communications).
There are many ways in which a knowledge of speaking in public is applicable beyond itself. I earlier mentioned we are all from the Liberal Arts. Let me add to that some background.

In the Middle Ages, university courses were described as "Arts". These were systems of rules for generating knowledge. The Liberal Arts of Languages and Sciences were complements.

The Sciences were the QUADRIVIUM (kwa drive em) composed of Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy, and Music. The Quadrivium arranged knowledge into systematic bodies of information.

The Languages were the TRIVIUM (triv e em) composed of Grammar, Logic, and Rhetoric. The Trivium discovered social significance for the products of Science.

Rhetoric, chief among the courses of the Trivium, liberated students from a single view of a problem and led them to social autonomy.

The divisions of classical rhetoric provide directions for teaching critical thinking skills.

But back to what you will gain. I nudged myself into more of what this course is about.

Let's get back to what you might gain; perhaps I should be truthful with you and tell you what I will gain.

"Trees die at the top." We have all heard that. Well, here at FCCJ a number of top branches have changed color and are beginning to droop. Or should I have said "droop" as in "DROP Plan".

Universities have severely limited degrees in Speech, but the need for Speech Instructors increases
instead of diminishes. And our FCCJ's Advisory Boards are demanding that graduates from UNF, Edward Waters, and JU, teach speech. Our Community Advisory Boards are telling us that our students are often unable to make it through interviews adequately. That they lack the oral skills to function interpersonally within the organization as well as outside with clients. They are saying we must provide more courses that teach these oral communication skills.

So we find our schools of higher learning without credentialed people, without people firmly grounded in rhetoric, without the solid foundation that would make them love the discipline.

This is not the future we rhetoricians want.

We began with the question "What would you gain?"

And now you see we end with the statement of "what I would gain"

For, just as the students you teach each day are the future of America, so too are you who sit in this classroom today, the future of our college.

So do you see now, it is I who will gain, for you become the legacy I hope to leave behind.
DEFINITION AND EXPLANATION OF TRIVIUM AND QUADRIVIUM

(From the first time I taught the course--my notes)
(Communication Education, Vol. 35,#2, April, 1986, 174, Teaching Critical Thinking Skills)

In the Middle Ages university courses were divided into two areas, the Arts and the Sciences.

These were a system of rules for generating knowledge.

The seven Liberal Arts of Languages (or Arts) and Sciences were complements, and obviously comprised a Liberal Arts education.

TRIVIUM

The Languages (ARTS), or Trivium were composed of:

Grammar (Latin)
Logic
Rhetoric

These Arts were concerned with (and were to discover) the social significance of knowledge.
These Arts were relatively subjective.
Completion of this study led to a bachelor's degree.

QUADRIVIUM

The Sciences, the Quadrivium, was composed of:

Arithmetic
Geometry
Astronomy
Music

The Sciences arranged knowledge into systematic bodies of information.
The Sciences were relatively objective.
Completion of the Quadrivium led to a master's degree
Rhetoric, chief among the courses of the Trivium, liberated students from a single view of a problem and led them to social autonomy.

The divisions of classical rhetoric provide directions for teaching critical thinking skills.

Peter Ramus, 1515-1572, redefined ancient disciplines: Beginning with the trivium, with the arts of discourse, Ramus defined grammar as the art of speaking well, that is of speaking correctly; dialectic as the art of reasoning well; and rhetoric as the art of the eloquent and ornate use of language.

Skills arising from Invention/inventio/heuristic were insights from researched information and discovery of arguments to support the point of view espoused.

Skills arising from Organization/Disposition were patterns and the organized information of a speech consistent with the image (ethos) of the speaker, and the receptivity (Disposition) of the audience.

Peter Ramus defined grammar as the art of speaking well, that is, of speaking correctly; dialectic as the art of reasoning well; and rhetoric as the art of eloquent and ornate use of language.

(Rhetoric: Concepts Definitions, and Boundaries by Collino and Jolliffe, pg 437 --the above paragraph only)
According to legend, the formal study of rhetoric began in the city of Syracuse on the island of Sicily in the early fifth century B.C.

Several tyrants had been deposed, and land they had seized on the island was being returned to its original owners. Unfortunately, a good deal of time had elapsed since the tyrants first took power, and confusion arose over which families owned what land.

The upshot of this situation was a flurry of court cases to settle the land disputes. Under the judicial system in Sicily at the time, one was required to represent oneself in court. Hired advocates could not argue a case on another person's behalf. Thus, citizen was pitted against citizen, and natural gifts of oratory may have been sufficient to win the day.

Into this situation, the story goes, in approximately 467 B.C., stepped a teacher and entrepreneur named Corax. Corax had studied the ways of oratory and argument and even begun to systematize some of the principles of these arts.

He began to teach others, for a fee, to defend their claims in court. Thus, the first school of rhetoric was established, rhetoric had its first recognized teacher, and rhetoric became profitable.

Apparently Corax's students often were successful in court, so rhetoric also became important to public life.
Rhetoric's connection with education, profit, and civic life would contribute greatly to its controversial nature in subsequent history.

Another famous, though likely apocryphal, story indicates that Corax—whose name means "crow"—became so busy teaching rhetoric that he had to hire a teaching assistant. Corax took under his wing, so to speak, a talented young man names Tisias (whose name, interestingly enough, means "egg").

Corax agreed to tutor Tisias in the fine points of rhetoric in exchange for a reduced fee and for Tisias' services as a teaching assistant. For unknown reasons, the student, Tisias, decided to his teacher, Corax, claiming that he should not have to pay any money at all for studying with Corax.

Corax and Tisias decided to settle their dispute in court. The arguments advanced during this legendary trial were brief.

TISIAS developed an opening dilemma that went something like this:

Either Corax DID NOT teach me rhetoric or he DID teach me the art. If I prove that Corax DID NOT teach me rhetoric, clearly I owe him NO money. If I fail to prove that he taught me NO rhetoric, then the fact of my failure to successfully plead my case will prove that he DID NOT teach me rhetoric and I will owe Corax NO money.

Not to be outdone by his pupil, Corax developed a perhaps predictable dilemma in response, which ran something like this:

Either Tisias learned rhetoric from me or he did not. If I prove that I DID teach Tisias rhetoric, then he owes me my fee. If, however, Tisias pleads his case successfully, then it proves that I taught him rhetoric and he owes me my fee.
What's a judge to do in a situation like this? Being a clever individual himself, the judge threw the case out of court at this point, reputedly saying, "A bad egg from a bad crow."
THE SOPHISTS

The story of Corax and Tisias, whether true or not, make several points about rhetoric that are important to understanding the early history of the art.

First, rhetoric as a systematic art was developed by a group of orators, educators, entertainers, and advocates called SOPHISTS (from the Greek word sophos, meaning wise or skilled). These people taught rhetoric or the art of logos, and the title sophistes (plural, sophistae) carried with it something of the modern meaning of professor—a learned, skilled person, authority, expert, teacher.

Sophists also hired themselves out as professional pladers and speech writers. As rhetoric quickly was becoming important to achieving success, particularly in governmental careers, the services of Sophists as teachers were sought out by aggressive, success-oriented young men.

Second, the Sophist often employed a method of teaching that involved learning to argue either side of a case, and some of them even boasted of "making the worse case appear the better," a statement often attributed to a famous sophist named Protagoras.

Third, the specious nature of the arguments advanced by Corax and Tisias illustrates the suspicion with which the art of rhetoric and Sophist as teachers of the art were greeted by tradition Greek society. The Sophists' ability to persuade with clever arguments and stylistic techniques, and their willingness to teach others to do the same, led many Greeks to see the Sophists as a dangerous element in their society.
Plato, the teacher of Aristotle, lived in Athens in the generation following the arrival of the first Sophists, encouraged this suspicion with his dialogues, Gorgias, Sophist, and Protagoras.

Gorgias was a great practitioner of rhetoric and a famous stylist who died in 380 B.C. He was known as a skeptical philosopher and stylist and is famous, among other things, for his three-part formulation of radical Skepticism:

1. Nothing exists
2. If anything did exist, we could not know it.
3. If we could know that something existed, we would not be able to communicate it to anyone else.

Protagoras is alleged to have been "the first person who charged for lectures", and some considered him to be the first of the Greek Sophists.

His most famous maxim was:

"Man is the measure of all things; of things that are not, that they are not; of things that are, that they are."

What he meant by this claim, in true Sophistic fashion, has been the subject of much debate.

At least he seems to have had in mind that people make determinations about what is or is not true, and that no ultimate or absolute appeal can be made to settle such questions once and for all.

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) who was born around the time the Sophist Gorgias died (380 B.C.), commented on the Sophists' empty arguments. More than four centuries after Aristotle, Sophists from Greece still were plying their trade in Rome, and similar suspicions attended them.
However, some recent scholarship presents the Sophists as important intellectual figures who have received a somewhat undeservedly negative press. (Susan Jarratt, Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured)

Regardless of the examples set by Corax and Tisias, and the questions raised by the art of rhetoric as practiced by the Sophists, rhetoric caught on and was an enormous success in the Greek-speaking world of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

(James Herrick, The History and Theory of Rhetoric)