Since we didn’t get to the MOO Appetizers for Week 1, I want to start with them before getting to the Appetizers for this week. I’ve copied the list from last week below. The list for this week is short, because we will have a lot to do and I want to get to everything. Please check this list for your name.

If you’ve been assigned a MOO Appetizer for this week, please prepare a response to your appetizer in advance and be ready to post it in the MOO during class when it’s time to talk about it. Time permitting, we may or may not get to your Appetizer.

To prepare your response, compose a 3-5 sentence answer. Please keep in mind that the purpose of the Appetizers is to generate class discussion; each Appetizer has more than one right answer. You should also be prepared, if needed, to justify/explain your response. We’ll spend a little time on each question.

One more reminder: The student assigned to Appetizer #7 this week is responsible for providing a transcript of our entire MOO session and posting it to WebCT after class (under the discussion topic, “MOO transcripts”). (Why #7? #7 is #1 for Week 2, and the student assigned to #1 is responsible for the transcript.)

If you have any questions at all about any of this stuff, please drop me an email (sean.zdenek@ttu.edu). Thanks, Sean Zdenek.

1. **[Bill]** What is the scope of rhetoric? By taking issue with Foss’s wide-ranging definition, Kuypers (pp. 5-6) offers a narrowed definition that limits rhetoric to the study of “more publicly impressive use of symbols with generally agreed upon meanings.” In contrast, Selzer’s definition (in Bazerman p. 281) is much larger in scope, and seems to encompass all types of human endeavor (not just spoken and written communication). Where do you stand on the question of the scope of rhetoric?

2. **[Sara]** Is rhetoric too big? See the Schiappa article for a discussion of Big Rhetoric and Schiappa’s own answer to this question. Do you agree with Schiappa?

3. **[Pam]** Edwin Black says that “the critic should just shut up about politics” (in Kuypers p. 31). But he also says that “Only an idiot is without political convictions” (p. 31). In your opinion, what role does “politicized criticism” (p. 30) play in the art of rhetorical criticism? Is it possible to be objective, as Kuypers defines it (p. 24)?
4. [Kendall] Edwin Black says that “Good criticism is always a surprise,” whereas bad criticism simply offers us conventional opinions or mechanical applications of methods of criticism (in Kuypers p. 30). In the readings for this week, what insight/claim/statement has surprised you the most? Why? (I realize that most of the readings this week are not examples of criticism, but the question still applies.)

5. [Barbara] As Selzer implies in his section on style (Bazerman pp. 289-290), rhetoric offers us a long list of names for rhetorical techniques. These are the tropes and figures of rhetoric. Go to http://rhetoric.byu.edu/, browse the “flowers” of rhetoric, and choose three that are not mentioned by Selzer and that you think we will find interesting or useful. Don’t choose metaphor, simile, irony, or hyperbole.

6. [Charlotte] Selzer divides rhetorical criticism into textual and contextual (see Bazerman Ch. 10). Both have their uses and often are used together, even if one approach is usually dominant. (Selzer asks us to resist the distinction between textual and contextual criticism, p. 302.) Which approach do you prefer in the context of your rhetorical artifact? Why?

7. [Karen, Pete] According to Campbell’s “The Ontological Foundations of Rhetorical Theory” (on e-reserve), how are theories of symbolic behavior more satisfying than either “traditional” (neo-Aristotelian) or “behavioristic” approaches to rhetoric? How do symbolic theories generate an “intrinsic ethic”? (The question of ethics and moral judgment in criticism is an interesting one, I think. It surfaces in other readings too: both Black essays and Kuypers introductory chapters.)

8. [Erika, Sally] 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?

9. [Lennie, Kim] In your opinion, what is the most important lesson about doing situational analysis (Kuypers Ch. 4)? How might you apply this perspective to a situational study of your own rhetorical artifact? Optional: What is the “controlling exigence” (p. 40) that demands a response in the case of the situation surrounding your artifact?

10. [Anyone] What are the strengths and weaknesses of the “traditional” approach? In the case of Leff & Mohrmann’s analysis of Lincoln’s Cooper Union address (in Benson p. 173), what are the strengths of an approach to criticism grounded on “the speech as a speech” (as opposed to a “man as myth” analysis)? Same question for the Hill essay (Kuyper Ch. 5).

11. [Anyone] Wichelns’ essay (in Benson Ch. 1) is credited with reviving interest in rhetorical analysis in the 20th century (see footnote 5 in Kuypers p. 83). According
to Wicheln's, what are the characteristics of rhetorical criticism? How are these characteristics reflected in and absent from the examples Wicheln cites?