

sharpens his analytic knife and slices accordingly.

Another example of this concept might be the biologist dissecting a frog. If she wants to examine the digestive system she slices one way, in order to examine the throat, the digestive tract, the intestines, the stomach and the bowels. If she wants to examine the circulatory system she slices in quite another way, examining everything from blood vessels in its legs, to arteries in its heart. Or in a totally different way, she might want to examine how frogs adapt to their environment, and she would examine everything from where frogs live to how they gather food. In all cases she is examining a frog. She made the choice not only to examine the frog, but also how to slice it.

When we slice, pick apart, and classify we're looking for an underlying form. What must be recognized is that different kinds of components are revealed through different modes of analysis. Aristotle used the analytic knife on rhetoric, and his analysis is only one example of his knifemanship. Early Greek handbooks divided rhetoric according to the parts of an oration: Proem, Partition, Narration, Proof and Exordium. Friedrich Solmsen judges that Aristotle's quinquipartite analysis (invention, arrangement, style, memory, delivery) is among his most profound and lasting contributions to rhetoric. 16 Indeed, Aristotle's analysis has dominated rhetorical theory for centuries; the "New Rhetorics" of the 20th century afford another view by slicing in quite different ways.

Pirsig concludes:

...there is a knife moving here. A very deadly one; an intellectual scalpel so swift and so sharp you sometimes don't see it moving. You get the illustration that all those parts are just there and are being named as they exist. But they can be named quite differently and organized quite differently depending on how the knife moves. 17

An audience may be accustomed to viewing a subject on the basis of how it's

been analyzed in the past, on the parts that are "just there and being named as they exist." But if the speaker presents a new analysis -- if he or she makes a new slice -- a new truth can be determined about the subject, and the audience is enabled to see this truth.

A religion professor at my college knows how to use the analytic knife. Unlike conventional 101 Religion courses, he does not present a chronological history of religion, nor does he organize his course to spend two weeks on Christianity, two weeks on Buddhism, two weeks on Hinduism, and so on. He slices religion in another way, a way so different from the conventional means that he can't draw up a syllabus for the course, because it's not organized that way. He doesn't even call it a "course," it's a "Digametrip." His students experience religion from a different vantage point, something he calls hexagonic vision.

At first, students are confused, even angry over his violation of typical 101 course standards. They don't know what to expect from one day to the next, they don't understand why they can't call it a course, and they don't have any idea how they could possibly be graded for their work over the next nine weeks.

However, at different points along the Digametrip, students begin to catch on. All it takes is accepting a new way to look at the subject, a setting aside of an expected means of analysis in exchange for a new way. They begin to learn about religion. Religion 101 is still taught by some professors at the college in the conventional way. The very fact that the Digametrip is also called Religion 101 shows that a subject can be sliced in very different ways.

The student who might have found a conventional 101 religion course unimpressive usually comes out of the Digametrip with a positive understanding of religion. The different way of approaching the subject serves as the means for this understanding. Likewise, the practice of applying the analytic knife enables the rhetorician to provide not only a new way to look at the

subject, it also provides a means for developing truth.

### III

The second concept which can be applied when creating rhetorical truth requires as much, if not more, creative invention as applying the analytic knife. Where the analytic knife enables the rhetorician to analyze the subject itself from different perspectives, this second practice involves discovering unconventional sources of material to use in the speech.

Richard Weaver, in *The Ethics of Rhetoric* discusses two sources of argument -- circumstance and definition. He refers to the source of an argument as the "total persuasive effort" 18 of the rhetorician and cites Edmund Burke as a speaker who typically argues from circumstance, and Abraham Lincoln as one who argues from definition. While I will refer to sources of the *materials* a speaker uses, what Weaver says about sources of the *premise for argument* is equally applicable. He writes:

The reasoner reveals his philosophical position by the source of argument which appears most often in his major premise because the major premise tells us how he is thinking about the world.

Putting the matter now figuratively, we may say that no man escapes being branded by the premise that he regards as most efficacious in an argument. 19

Just as the major premise chosen by a speaker reveals how he is thinking about the world, so do the materials he chooses. And when Weaver further states, "Nowhere does a man's rhetoric catch up with him more completely than in the topics he chooses to win other man's assent," 20 it might be added that the sources from which a speaker draws materials reveal much about the speaker. One can tell a great deal about a speaker by the sources he or she relies upon.

The practice of discovering sources may

be named source-ery, and the master of sourcery is a sourceror. Rhetoricians, therefore, must also be sourcerors. Pre-requisite to sourcery is an acquaintance with conventional sources discussed in beginning speech textbooks. A cursory look at a sample of these texts reveals that they are in general agreement as to conventional sources. For instance, one book provides a chapter on "Research for Speaking in Public" and includes sections on library sources, interviews and polls. 21 Another classifies resources under the headings: "You, Interviews, Letters and Questionnaires, and Print Resources." 22 Still another beginning speech text includes an appendix of "Sources of Information and Opinion" which lists as sources specific encyclopedias, yearbooks, directories and biographical dictionaries, magazines, newspapers, government documents, U.S. superintendent documents nongovernmental documents and pamphlets, and bibliographies and book indexes. 23

The conventional sources named in basic texts are fundamental because they tell the speaker where to find information on the subject of a speech. Often, research begins once a topic is selected with a review of sources of materials on the subject. One exercise book on speech preparation goes further and collects "comprehensive, topically organized, objectively reported information" 24 on each of four common speech topics. A speaker need only to choose one of the four topics and then select from pages of data what information to use. This manual, entitled *Speech Preparation Sourcebook*, is an example of research based on the speaker's subject or topic.

But if the speaker stops there, after only researching in terms of a subject, the speech will be lacking in a very important aspect. The true sourceror knows that it is the aim of sourcery not only to research a speech by subject but also by audience. Sourcery is discovering materials for a speech in the audience's frame of reference.

Drawing materials from the audience as well as from the subject may greatly

enhance the effectiveness of a speech. But present day public speaking texts seldom explore the audience as a source of materials. One might best recall Arthur Edward Phillips' pioneering exposition seventy-five years ago in *Effective Speaking* (1908). What Phillips calls Reference to Experience is defined similarly to sourcery:

Reference to Experience, as here used, means reference to the known. The known is that the listener has seen, heard, read, felt, believed or done, and which still exists in his consciousness -- his stock of knowledge. It embraces all those thoughts, feelings, and happenings which are to him real. Reference to Experience, then, means *coming into the listener's life*. 25

Sourcery applies the same principle to materials. When a speaker uses materials with which the audience can identify, the speech not only becomes more effective but also develops rhetorical truth. Audiences make judgments about the speaker's ideas. These judgments are necessarily made from the audience's frame of reference. Phillips explains, "Our own experience, then, is the standard by which we test the truth or untruth of an assertion." 26 When the speaker, then, amplifies his or her analysis with materials from the listener's "stock of knowledge," thus, "coming into the listener's life," rhetorical truth is substantially developed.

Using materials from the audience's experience is also more interesting than relying on documentary evidence only. Phillips observes:

The purpose in speaking is to convey something *to others*, to make something clear to them that is not already clear, to make something impressive that they do not now feel, to have them accept something they do not now accept. 27

Not even the most completely documented, logical demonstration will persuade an audience, if they do not attend or relate to the words. Moreover, in James Winans' apt

phrase, "A speech is not an essay standing on its hind legs." 28 So sourcery improves the interestingness of a speech by applying Phillips' two laws governing Reference to Experience:

1. The more the speaker brings his idea within the vivid experience of the listener, the more likely will he attain his end.
2. The less the speaker brings his idea within in vivid experience to the listener, the less likely will he attain his end. 29

Further, sourcery enhances the speaker's ethos by revealing the range and nature of his or her intellectual storehouse, by reflecting a nimble intellect able to observe likeness in disparate items, and by implying his or her estimate of the audience. The range and variety of sources a speaker draws material from shows whether he or she is widely knowledgeable, or whether, as was said of Desraeli by an opponent, "his world is no wider than the soles of his feet." And materials from the *National Enquirer* or *The Reader's Digest* may not only indicate whether the speaker is acquainted with the best minds, but also, by implication, to whom he or she thinks the audience will best relate.

Sourcery reveals the character of the speaker and, by implication, his or her estimate of the audience; sourcery enlivens interest; and by discovering materials in the audience's frame of reference, sourcery enables the speaker to "(come) into the listener's life." 31 These values of sourcery may be illustrated in the practice of two notable sourcerors, Stephen Jay Gould and Adlai Stevenson.

When Stephen Jay Gould, internationally recognized archeologist, lectured at the 1982 Nobel Conference on "Darwin's Legacy," he practiced sourcery ably. His audience included Nobel laureates, college and high school teachers and students, college alumni and visitors interested in Darwinism. Gould's immensely knowledgeable discussion of misconceptions of evolution proved him to be as learned about evolution as any

of his distinguished colleagues. But what made his speech distinctive and memorable was his use of non-traditional sources, which he purposely adjusted to his audience. These sources ranged from showing slides of magazine advertisements, to lines of poetry by Alexander Pope.

What do magazine ads and Pope have to do with Darwin? One would hardly think of reading Alexander Pope's poetry in preparation for a speech on evolution. Yet Pope's verse, concluding with the affirmation "Whatever is, is right," best expressed one of the misconceptions Gould refuted -- that evolution develops teleologically, toward an ideal man. As one listener, I may not long remember the conventional sources he cited among his scientific proofs. But I'll not soon forget the point he made by quoting Pope. I'll also remember survival by adaptation to environment, illustrated by ads showing the VW Bug adapting to the environment by mutating into a Rabbit in a garden patch. The use of these non-traditional sources is what sourcery is all about. I may not know much about evolution, but I have seen a great many magazine advertisements and I'm familiar with Alexander Pope. The use of these vivid materials brought Gould's argument into my realm of experience.

Integral to Adlai Stevenson's eloquence is his talent with sourcery. Even Stevenson's campaign speeches were filled with unexpected sources. He often directly quoted not only fellow senators and political figures, but also literary, biblical and historical figures as well. A sampling of his speeches in his 1952 presidential campaign includes quotes from the following sources: Samuel Johnson, Theodore Roosevelt, Aristotle, The Bible, Thomas Jefferson, St. Francis, Justice Holmes, Robert E. Lee, Lawrence of Arabia, Anne O'Hare McCormick, Walt Whitman, Seneca, Emerson, Shakespeare, Tom Paine, Desraeli, Andrew Oliver, Bernard Shaw, Justice Hughes, Thornton Wilder, John Donne, The Talmud, Franklin Adams, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Benjamin Franklin, Herbert Hoover, Brian McMahon, Oliver Wendell Holmes,

John Adams, Alexis e Toqueville, Henry Adams, Dr. Arnold Toynbee, Lord Bryce, Edmund Burke, D.W. Brogan, John Stuart Mill, Keats, Lincoln, Pericles, Fia Giovanni, Senator Fulbright, Plato, President Kennedy, Bill Dawson, Gladstone, Senator Sharpe Williams, Winston Churchill, Robert Frost and Eleanor Roosevelt. 31

A politician who limits research to the subject alone might wonder how in an American presidential campaign Stevenson could quote Shakespeare, Plato, the Talmud, George Bernard Shaw and many others. A sourceror would understand the practicality of these unconventional sources: they benefit the audience, as well as the subject; and they reveal much about Stevenson himself, as well as his estimate of the American audience.

Practicing sourcery requires developing new habits. Standard methods of research of subjects may serve a speaker adequately; unconventional exploration may often improve effectiveness. A fellow student is enlightened by materials discovered on "the dark side of the moon." They'll never be found in a debater's handbook; they won't be listed in the card catalogue. Sourcery, like analytic knifemanship, is the artistry of the rhetorician.

As a senior speech and communications major, I've found the conception of rhetorical truth to be of great interest and importance. This paper has demonstrated how the rhetorician creates truth in human affairs by understanding and applying the analytic knife and sourcery in rhetoric.

To amplify my observations I might add that it required use of the analytic knife and sourcery to create this conception of rhetorical truth which I have presented. To the best of my knowledge the inventive use of the analytic knife and sourcery represents an analysis of principle methods in developing rhetorical truth that I am not aware anyone else has developed. And, if this sourceror's apprentice has properly practiced sourcery to amplify my analysis, something of my ethos may be revealed (my

major advisor requests a copy of this paper rather than a graduation photo) as well as my estimation of what will best enable you, the reader, to accept these concepts.

### ENDNOTES

1. Robert Scott's "On Viewing Rhetoric As Epistemic" (*Central States Speech Journal*, Volume XVIII, Number 1, February 1967) initiated this concept.
2. George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974) p. 15.
3. Robert Scott, "On Viewing Rhetoric As Epistemic," *Central States Speech Journal* (Volume XVIII, Number 1, February 1967) p. 12.
4. Kennedy, p. 13.
5. Donald C. Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (Volume XXXIX, December 1953) pp. 401-424.
6. Thomas W. Benson and Gerald A. Hauser, "Ideals, Superlatives, and the Decline of Hypocsisy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (Volume 59, Number 1, February 1973) p. 103.
7. Gerald A. Hauser, "Searching For A Bright Tomorrow: Graduate Education in Rhetoric During the 1980's," *Communication Education* (Volume 28, Number 4, September 1979) p. 262.
8. Scott, p. 15.
9. Scott, p. 17
10. Woodrow Wilson, *Constitutional Government in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911) p. 6.
11. Wilson, p. 17.
12. William G. Robertz, "The Speaker's Function," lecture (February, 1981).
13. James C. McCroskey, *An Introduction to Rhetorical Communication* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972) p. 178.
14. Robert Pirsig, *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1981) pp. 63-64.
15. Persig, p. 64
16. Friedrich Solmsen, "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric," *American Journal of Philology* (Volume 62, January-April 1941) pp. 35-50.
17. Persig, p. 66.
18. Richard M. Weaver, *The Ethics of Rhetoric* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company 1953) p. 55.
19. Weaver, p. 55.
20. Weaver, p. 114.
21. Michael Osborn, *Speaking in Public* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1982) pp. 117-140.
22. Bruce E. Gronbeck, *The Articulate Person* (Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1983) pp. 37-40.
23. A. Craig Baird and Franklin H. Knowler, *Essentials of General Speech* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968) p. 291.
24. Robert T. Oliver, Carroll C. Arnold and Eugene E. White, *Speech Preparation Sourcebook* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966) p. 1.
25. Arthur Edward Phillips, *Effective Speaking* (Chicago: The Newton Company, 1931) p. 28.
26. Phillips, p. 29.
27. Phillips, p. 32.
28. James A. Winans as quoted without reference by John F. Wilson and Carroll Arnold in *Public Speaking As A Liberal Art* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974) p. 225.
29. Phillips, p. 33.
30. Phillips, p. 28.
31. Adlai Stevenson, *Speeches of Adlai Stevenson*, edited by Richard Harrity (New York: Random House, Inc. 1952).



## CHAPTER NEWS

Hard work and perseverance paid off when East Central College was granted a Pi Kappa Delta charter in August, 1982, and became the Missouri Chi chapter.

The young chapter travelled to tournaments in Oklahoma, Illinois, and Missouri as well as attended the Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament and Convention in Estes Park, Colorado during the past year.

Plans for the 1983-84 year include various

tournaments plus hosting the Missouri Chi Tournament November 4-5, 1983.

Officers for the upcoming year include William Laubert, president; Janet Limbert, vice-president; Chris Cooper, secretary; and Melissa Marquart, treasurer. Other members include Beth Pike, Volund Rasmussen, and Tina Dickerson. Debbie Otto is the director of forensics.



*[seated] Volund Rasmussen and William Laubert [standing] Debbie Otto, Director, Beth Pike, Chris Cooper, Janet Limbert, Tina Dickerson, and Melissa Marquart*



PROVINCE	GOVERNOR	COLLEGE	PHONE
The Plains	Mark Stucky	Bethel College Newton, KS 67117	(316) 283-2500
The Missouri	Bob Derryberry	Southwest Baptist Bolivar, MO 65613	(417) 326-5281
The Illinois	T.C. Winebrenner	Univ. of WI-Whitewater Whitewater, WI 53190	(414) 472-1363
The Pacific	Don Brownlee	California State U. Northridge, CA 93130	(213) 885-2000
The Sioux	Joel Hefling	S. Dakota St. U. Brookings, SD 57006	(605) 688-4151
Lower Mississippi	David Ray	U. of AR-Monticello Monticello, AR 71655	(501) 367-6811
The Lakes	Brenda Logue	Towson State Univ. Towson, MD 21204	(301) 321-2988
Upper Mississippi	James Norwig	U. of WI-LaCrosse LaCrosse, WI 54601	(608) 785-8528
The Southeast	Fran Hassencahl	Old Dominion Univ. Norfolk, VI 23508	(804) 440-3828
The Northwest	Steven Hunt	Lewis & Clark College Portland, OR 97219	(503) 244-6161
The Northeast	Al Montanaro, Jr.	State Univ. College Plattsburgh, NY 12901	(518) 564-2000
The Colonies	Bradford Kinney	Wilkes College Wilkes-Barre, PA 18766	(717) 824-4651

## Final Words From The Editor

*Margaret Greynolds, Georgetown College*

It has been a genuine pleasure serving as editor of *The Forensic*. When I accepted the position, I realized that it carried with it a great deal of responsibility for the well-being of the organization, and I also realized that following the very fine term of Harold Widvey would be an awesome task, but I had no idea that the problems which plague an editor can never be put on paper nor conveyed to the next person holding the position. As the old saying goes, "You had to be there". I certainly have learned a great deal about the membership, about publishing and postage problems, about authors and delays in receiving materials, and I think I learned why and how normally

professional people can elevate procrastination to an art through elaborate development of excuses, good, bad, and incredible.

I appreciate your patience with me as editor. I have been plagued with health problems and with other various ills, and all the officers and the membership have been supportive of our efforts and extremely helpful when called upon. I have met by mail many old and new members and supporters of Pi Kappa Delta, and through their letters I have gotten a renewed belief that nothing can really harm our organization. Special people make Pi Kappa Delta special, and we never seem to be without a never ending stream of them flowing with energy and enthusiasm.



**34th National Convention  
and Tournament**

**March 20-23, 1985**

**Fayetteville, Arkansas**