Instructor info (in brief)
Primary email: sean.zdenek@ttu.edu
Yahoo IM: seanzdenek
Webcam: My webcam is now open through Yahoo IM
Virtual office hours: Thursdays 4-6 p.m. on Yahoo IM

Roundtable schedule is available
http://www.faculty.english.ttu.edu/zdenek/courses/5362/summer05/roundtable schedulesummer05.pdf

Questions about syllabus, schedule, rhetorical artifact, etc.?

Structuring class discussion
- One important goal: to foster a culture of close reading
- MOO sessions can get in the way of this goal unless there is some mechanism for managing the speed and direction of discussion. (In other words, if everyone speaks at once, it can defeat the objective of structured discussion and close reading.)
- One suggestion: “Raise your hand” and wait to be called on before sending text to the MOO (e.g. type :has a comment or : would like to respond to [insert student’s name])
- Another suggestion: Have your books nearby and be ready to ground comments in the text (e.g. refer to a page number whenever possible)
- I will also aim to do a better job of managing discussions…

Homework
- Read Foss et al. (on e-reserve), Kuypers Ch. 9, Ling (on e-reserve), and Benson Ch. 2
- Post reading response for Week 3
- First Roundtable next week: if needed, the presenter may ask you to view/read an artifact before class

Roundtable session (overview and example)
- Sample roundtable exercise
- Sample artifact: Zell Miller’s speech at RNC 2004 (text & video)
The scope and nature of rhetoric and rhetorical criticism (Bazerman, Kuypers Chs. 1-3, Schiappa)

- What is the scope of rhetoric? Does it encompass every type of “text” that we might study in the humanities and social sciences? [Bill]
- Is rhetoric too big? [Sara]
- Is all language persuasive? Is all language sermonic?
- How does your artifact fit into this discussion?
- What role do objectivity and subjectivity play in criticism? What role does “politicized criticism” play? [Pam]
- What surprised you about these readings? [Kendall]

Traditional criticism and its limitations (Kuypers Ch. 5, Benson Chs. 1 & 9, Campbell)

- What is traditional criticism? What are its strengths and weaknesses? (Think of Selzer, Hill’s analysis of Douglass’ speech, Leff & Mohrmann’s analysis of Lincoln’s speech, and Wichelns.)
- What are the characteristics of rhetorical criticism according to Wichelns? Note that Wichelns is credited with reviving interest in rhetorical analysis eighty years ago.
- What insights, if any, does a traditional critique of your artifact offer?
- Consider Selzer’s textual/contextual distinction. Which do you prefer in the context of your artifact? [Charlotte]
- In terms of ethics, what are the limitations of the traditional view? How do symbolic theories, according to Campbell, generate an “intrinsic ethic”? [Karen, Pete]
- What are the rhetorical figures and how do they figure in here? [Barbara]

The situational perspective and the second persona (Kuypers Ch. 4 & Benson Ch. 8)

- What is the second persona? Why is it useful?
- How does Black’s concept of the second persona (in Benson p. 161) address the problem in the opening of the essay – i.e. the technical difficulty of making moral judgments in rhetorical discourses? [Erika, Sally]
- What’s the most important lesson about doing situational analysis? How might you apply this perspective to an analysis of your artifact?
• What’s the dominant element or “controlling exigence” in the situation surrounding your artifact? [Lennie, Kim]

Cool down

• What’s the most important thing you take away from the readings and discussion this week? What stands out for you?
• How applicable is the traditional perspective to an analysis of your artifact?
• What did you want to talk about that we didn’t?
• Next week: Kenneth Burke