

Workshop 5D

Not Your Mother's Rhetoric: Rhetorical Teaching Across the Curriculum

Linda Berger

Mercer University Walter F. George School of Law

Suzianne Painter-Thorne

Mercer University Walter F. George School of Law

Karen J. Sneddon

Mercer University Walter F. George School of Law

**Not Your Mother's Rhetoric:
Rhetorical Teaching
Across the Curriculum**



**Institute of Law Teaching and Learning
Washburn University School of Law
June 18, 2010**

**Linda L. Berger
Suzianne D. Painter-Thorne
Karen J. Sneddon**

1. When I hear the word “rhetoric,” I think of _____

2. When I hear the phrase “rhetorical teaching,” I think of _____

Introduction

What do we mean by “rhetorical teaching”? At its core, this concept means teaching with an understanding that there is more to the use of language in legal contexts than appears on the surface. If the surface covered everything, if there was nothing to learn but how to read the words and understand their literal meaning, then law professors would have little to do. But if learning the law requires students to uncover what lies beneath the surface, then almost everything we do involves rhetorical teaching.

For example, take the title of this presentation: when we say this is “not your mother’s rhetoric,” we do not (of course) mean that we know your mother and that this is not her rhetoric. Instead, we mean (though we might not have been successful) to call up images and frames as cultural reference points to subtly persuade you of several things: we want you to think that this workshop contains something new (Not Your Mother’s Cookbook, Not Your Father’s Oldsmobile), but we also want you to think that this something new is not so trendy that it will not fit (Not Your Daughter’s Jeans).

Starting with the premise that almost everything we do involves rhetorical teaching, we will use this workshop to illustrate how rhetorical theories and approaches can enrich our engagement with students in the law school classroom. Although three specific law school classrooms will be the focus—Advanced Persuasion, American Indian Law, and Trusts & Estates—the workshop is designed to show how “rhetoric” might apply across the law school curriculum.

Rhetoric as study, process, and perspective¹

First, we begin with a broad view of rhetoric: rhetoric is the study of the use of language (and other symbols) to communicate. Growing out of such study, rhetoric guides our practices in the use of language and other communicative symbols, especially when our goal is to persuade, to motivate, or to reach understanding. At the heart of rhetorical study and practice is an understanding that meaning is not “found,” but instead is constructed out of an interaction of language, context, constraints, audience, and author.

From this broad view of rhetoric, we derive three approaches that can be used to improve law school learning:

1. Rhetoric can provide tools for analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of the legal arguments and legal reasoning advanced by lawyers and judges.
2. Rhetoric can provide methods and techniques for composing more effective legal documents in a variety of settings.
3. Rhetoric can provide lenses and perspectives that help students and lawyers invent and imagine more effective and more persuasive ways

¹ Material in this section is adapted with permission from Linda L. Berger, Linda H. Edwards, and Terrill Pollman, *The Past, Presence, and Future of Legal Writing Scholarship: Rhetoric, Voice, and Community*, 16 Leg. Writing __ (2010).

to frame legal arguments and communicate about legal issues.

1. *Rhetoric as the study of legal arguments and legal reasoning.*

Rhetoric provides many alternative methods for analysis, interpretation, and criticism; we can apply these to help students better understand all forms of legal argument and legal reasoning.

Both classical and contemporary rhetoric offer methods for teaching students to engage in close or critical reading (and for engaging in such reading ourselves). These methods range from reading to identify appeals based on classical rhetoric's modes of persuasion (logos, ethos, and pathos) to applying James Boyd White's questions for rhetorical analysis (context, art of the text, rhetorical community). Understanding narrative structure and argument framing (categories and metaphors) aids students in their interpretations and assessments of the opinions they read as well as the briefs they write and respond to. Professors are using these approaches to evaluate oral arguments, briefs, opinions, and other legal documents and to study particular audience responses; their findings apply directly to their teaching.

2. *Rhetoric as the process of composing legal documents.*

The most obvious application of rhetorical theory and analysis in law school teaching is its usefulness in teaching the process of composition. Classical rhetoric's "topics" (typical categories of argument) are used for invention, helping law students and lawyers imagine a range of proofs. Classical rhetoric also provides guides that help law students check their logical arguments for validity and effectiveness, and it is the foundation for all later advice about arrangement (organization) and style.

Contemporary rhetoric, specifically the New Rhetoric, is the source of much of our understanding about how to teach writing as a process for making meaning through the interaction of reader and writer, text and context. New Rhetoric theory is the source for law school applications using reading journals; writers' memos; peer review; writing conferences; drafting, feedback, and revision as a recursive process; and portfolios and other forms of guided self-reflection.

More recently, law teachers have turned to contemporary rhetoric, narrative and metaphor theory, and persuasion research to advise students and lawyers about how to construct arguments. This advice derives from approaches such as Stephen Toulmin's layout of argument ("an argument is *movement* from accepted *data*, through a *warrant*, to a *claim*"); Chaim Perelman's starting points for argument (an argument is designed to move the audience from agreement about the starting points or premises to agreement about some conclusion); Kenneth Burke's pentad as a system for analyzing language use as a mode of action (examining the inter-relationships or tensions among the elements that constitute the dramatic

action: the act, the scene, the agent, the agency, and the purpose); and George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's cognitive metaphor theory (metaphor shapes our perception and understanding).

3. *Rhetoric as perspective or lens on legal communication.*

Perhaps most important, law teachers may use rhetoric to provide different perspectives or lenses to guide the process of imagination and invention. Rhetoric's ability to un-earth embedded pathways and to unsettle preconceptions can be tapped in a number of ways. Thus, rhetoric can help writers see through new eyes by suggesting techniques to make the familiar strange, look from the outside in and the inside out, and link abstractions to concrete images and stories.

As already noted, classical rhetoric's general and special topics can generate lines of argument. Similar kinds of "topics" that lend themselves to re-seeing legal arguments include those identified with literary criticism: contrasting appearances with reality; finding a previously overlooked, but "ubiquitous" argument; or discovering a paradigmatic structure in a literary text that provides form and framework.

Other rhetorical tools for invention include such concepts as Kenneth Burke's pentad for examining narrative action and his suggestions for metaphor modeling ("try to consider [the concept] in as many different ways as its nature might permit"). As always, rhetoric is both topic and tool. That is, we can teach the use of invention methods themselves, and we can teach what we discover when we use these methods.

Selected Bibliography²

Rhetorical Teaching Across the Curriculum

I. Points of Access to Reading in Law & Rhetoric*

A. *Background reading in classical and contemporary rhetoric*
Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader (John Louis Lucaites et al. eds., Guilford Press 1999).

Edward P.J. Corbett & Robert J. Connors, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (4th ed., Oxford U. Press 1999).

Sonja K. Foss, Karen A. Foss, Robert Trapp, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric* (3d ed., Waveland Press 2002).

B. *Background reading in composition theory*
Erika Lindemann, *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers* (3d ed., Oxford U. Press 1995).

The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook (Edward P.J. Corbett et al. eds., 4th ed., Oxford U. Press 2000).

C. *Background reading in narrative theory*
Jerome Bruner, *Making Stories: Law, Literature, Life* (Harv. U. Press 2002).

The Narrative Reader (Martin McQuillan ed., Routledge 2000).

D. *Background reading in cognitive metaphor theory*
George Lakoff & Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (U. Chi. Press 1980).

Metaphor and Thought (Andrew Ortony ed., 2d ed., Cambridge U. Press 1993).

² Compiled by Linda Berger 2010 from suggestions made by colleagues including Karen Sneddon, Sue Painter-Thorne, Amy Sloan, Tom Cobb, Michael Smith, Kirsten Davis, and others.

E. *Background reading in law and rhetoric*
Peter Goodrich, *Legal Discourse: Studies in Linguistics, Rhetoric and Legal Analysis* (Palgrave Macmillan 1987).

Interpreting Law and Literature: A Hermeneutic Reader (Sanford Levinson & Steven Mailloux eds., Northwestern U. Press 1988).

Anthony Kronman, *Rhetoric*, 67 U. Cin. L. Rev. 677 (1999).

Law's Stories: Narrative and Rhetoric in the Law (Peter Brooks & Paul Gewirtz eds., Yale U. Press 1996).

Neil MacCormick, *Rhetoric and the Rule of Law: A Theory of Legal Reasoning* (Oxford U. Press 2005).

The Rhetoric of Law (Austin Sarat & Thomas R. Kearns eds., U. of Michigan Press 1994).

Gerald Wetlaufer, *Rhetoric and Its Denial in Legal Discourse*, 76 Va. L. Rev. 1545 (1990).

James Boyd White, *Reading Law and Reading Literature: Law as Language*, in *Heracles' Bow: Essays on the Rhetoric and Poetics of the Law* (U. of Wisconsin Press 1985).

James Boyd White, *Law as Rhetoric, Rhetoric as Law: The Arts of Cultural and Communal Life*, 52 U. Chi. L. Rev. 684 (1985).

II. Rhetorical Teaching Across the Law School Curriculum

A. *Rhetoric's place in the law school curriculum*

Leslie Bender, *Hidden Messages in the Required First-Year Law School Curriculum*, 40 Clev. St. L. Rev. 287 (1992).

Linda L. Berger, *Studying and Teaching "Law as Rhetoric": A Place to Stand*, 16 Leg. Writing __ (2010).

Elizabeth C. Britt et al., *Extending the Boundaries of Rhetoric in Legal Writing Pedagogy*, 10 J. Bus. & Tech. Comm. 213, 213 (1996).

Leigh Hunt Greenhaw, *To Say What the Law Is: Learning the Practice of Legal Rhetoric*, 29 Val. U. L. Rev. 861 (1995).

Philip C Kissam, *Thinking (by Writing) About Legal Writing*, 40 Vand. L. Rev. 135 (1987).

Pamela Lysaght & Cristina D. Lockwood, *Writing-Across-The-Law-School Curriculum: Theoretical Justifications, Curricular Implications*, 2 J. ALWD 73 (2004).

Carol M. Parker, *A Liberal Education in Law: Engaging the Legal Imagination Through Research and Writing Beyond the Curriculum*, 1 J. ALWD 130 (2002).

Carol McCrehan Parker, *Writing Throughout the Curriculum: Why Law Schools Need It and How to Achieve It*, 76 Neb. L. Rev. 561 (1997).

B. Rhetoric's place in the legal writing curriculum

Books

Kirsten Konrad Robbins-Tiscione, *Rhetoric for Legal Writers: The Theory and Practice of Analysis and Persuasion* (West 2009).

Michael R. Smith, *Advanced Legal Writing: Theories and Strategies in Persuasive Writing* (2d ed., Aspen Publishers 2008).

Articles

Linda L. Berger, *A Reflective, Rhetorical Model: The Legal Writing Teacher as Reader and Writer*, 6 Leg. Writing 57 (2000).

Linda L. Berger, *Applying New Rhetoric to Legal Discourse: The Ebb and Flow of Reader and Writer, Text and Context*, 49 J. Leg. Educ. 155 (1999).

Elizabeth Fajans & Mary R. Falk, *Against the Tyranny of Paraphrase: Talking Back to Texts*, 78 Cornell L. Rev. 163 (1993).

Neil Feigenson, *Legal Writing Texts Today*, 41 J. Leg. Educ. 503 (1991).

Ellie Margolis & Susan L. DeJarnatt, *Moving Beyond Product to Process: Building a Better LRW Program*, 46 Santa Clara L. Rev. 93 (2003).

Laurel Currie Oates, *Beyond Communication: Writing as a Means of Learning*, 6 Leg. Writing 1 (2000).

Teresa Godwin Phelps, *The New Legal Rhetoric*, 40 Sw. L.J. 1089 (1986).

Terrill Pollman, *Building a Tower of Babel or Building a Discipline? Talking About Legal Writing*, 85 Marq. L. Rev. 887 (2002).

J. Christopher Rideout & Jill J. Ramsfield, *Legal Writing: A Revised View*, 69 Wash. L. Rev. 35 (1994).

Kristen Konrad Robbins, *Philosophy v. Rhetoric in Legal Education: Understanding the Schism Between Doctrinal and Legal Writing Faculty*, 3 J. ALWD 160 (2003).

III. Rhetorical Theory for the Law School Classroom

A. *Classical rhetoric for the classroom*

For a sampling of articles, see Michael R. Smith, *Rhetoric Theory and Legal Writing: An Annotated Bibliography*, 3 J. ALWD 129 (2006).

Edward P.J. Corbett & Robert J. Connors, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (4th ed., Oxford U. Press 1999), at 33–71 (logic), 84–130 (topics for invention), 256–292 (arrangement), 376–411 (style).

Michael H. Frost, *With Amici Like These: Cicero, Quintilian and the Importance of Stylistic Demeanor*, 3 J. ALWD 5 (2006).

Michael H. Frost, *Introduction to Classical Legal Rhetoric: A Lost Heritage* (Ashgate 2005) (collection of articles published between 1990 and 2003).

Kirsten Konrad Robbins-Tiscione, *Rhetoric for Legal Writers: The Theory and Practice of Analysis and Persuasion* (West 2009), at chs. 5–7 (invention), ch. 8 (arrangement), ch. 9 (style).

Kristen K. Robbins, *Paradigm Lost: Recapturing Classical Rhetoric to Validate Legal Reasoning*, 27 Vt. L. Rev. 483 (2003).

Michael R. Smith, *Advanced Legal Writing: Theories and Strategies in Persuasive Writing* (2d ed., Aspen Publishers 2008), at pt. II (logos strategies), pt. III (pathos strategies), pt. IV (ethos strategies), pt. V (rhetorical style).

B. *Contemporary rhetoric for the classroom*

Linda Levine & Kurt M. Saunders, *Thinking Like a Rhetor*, 43 J. Leg. Educ. 108 (1993) (applying classical rhetoric and the approach of Lloyd F. Bitzer, *The Rhetorical Situation*, 1 Phil. & Rhetoric 1 (1968) to legal argument).

Kurt M. Saunders, *Law as Rhetoric, Rhetoric as Argument*, 44 J. Leg. Educ. 566 (1994) (applying Toulmin's and Perelman's approaches to legal argument).

Richard K. Sherwin, *A Matter of Voice and Plot: Belief and Suspicion in Legal Storytelling*, 87 Mich. L. Rev. 543 (1988).

C. Composition and New Rhetoric theory for the classroom

Books

Sonja K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism* (4th ed. 2009).

David Bartholomae & Anthony R. Petrosky, *Facts, Artifacts and Counterfacts: Theory and Method for a Reading and Writing Course* (1986).

Articles

Linda L. Berger, *A Reflective, Rhetorical Model: The Legal Writing Teacher as Reader and Writer*, 6 Leg. Writing 57 (2000).

Linda L. Berger, *Applying New Rhetoric to Legal Discourse: The Ebb and Flow of Reader and Writer, Text and Context*, 49 J. Leg. Educ. 155 (1999).

Hillary Burgess, *Little Red Schoolhouse Goes to Law School: How Joe Williams' Teaching Style Can Inform Us about Teaching Law Students*, 17 Perspectives 180 (Spring 2009) (discussing Joseph M. Williams, *Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace*).

Bari R. Burke, *Legal Writing (Groups) at the University of Montana: Professional Voice Lessons in a Communal Context*, 52 Mont. L. Rev. 373, 397 (1991).

Kirsten K. Davis, *Designing and Using Peer Review in a First-Year Legal Research and Writing Course*, 9 Leg. Writing 1 (2003).

Elizabeth Fajans & Mary R. Falk, *Against the Tyranny of Paraphrase: Talking Back to Texts*, 78 Cornell L. Rev. 163 (1993).

Mary Kate Kearney & Mary Beth Beazley, *Teaching Students How to "Think Like Lawyers": Integrating Socratic Method with the Writing Process*, 64 Temp. L. Rev. 885, 894–895 (1991).

Steven J. Johansen, *"What Were You Thinking?": Using Annotated Portfolios to Improve Student Assessment*, 4 Leg. Writing 123 (1998).

Richard K. Neumann, Jr., *Donald Schon, the Reflective Practitioner, and the Comparative Failures of Legal Education*, 6 Clin. L. Rev. 401 (2000).

Teresa Godwin Phelps, *The New Legal Rhetoric*, 40 Sw. L.J. 1089 (1986).

J. Christopher Rideout & Jill J. Ramsfield, *Legal Writing: A Revised View*, 69 Wash. L. Rev. 35 (1994).

Nancy Soonpaa, *Using Composition Theory and Scholarship to Teach Legal Writing More Effectively*, 3 Leg. Writing 81 (1997).

Robin Wellford, *The Law School Student-Faculty Conference: Towards a Transformative Learning Experience*, 45 S. Tex. L. Rev. 255 (2004).

Joseph M. Williams, *On the Maturing of Legal Writers: Two Models of Growth and Development*, 1 Leg. Writing 1 (1991).

D. *Narrative theory for the classroom*

For helpful descriptions of narrative theory and structure, see Anthony G. Amsterdam & Jerome Bruner, *Minding the Law* 110–142 (Harv. U. Press 2002).

For a sampling of articles, see Kathryn Stanchi, *Persuasion: An Annotated Bibliography*, 6 J. ALWD 75, 77-87 (2009).

Applied Storytelling Symposium, 14 Leg. Writing 3 (2008).

Kenneth D. Chestek, *The Plot Thickens: The Appellate Brief as Story*, 14 Leg. Writing 127 (2008).

Linda H. Edwards, *Once Upon a Time in Law: Myth, Metaphor, and Authority*, 77 Tenn. L. Rev. ____ (2010).

Brian J. Foley & Ruth Anne Robbins, *Fiction 101: A Primer for Lawyers on How to Use Fiction Writing Techniques to Write Persuasive Facts Sections*, 32 Rutgers L.J. 459 (2001).

Carolyn Grose, *Storytelling Across the Curriculum: From Margin to Center, from Clinic to the Classroom*, 7 J. ALWD ____ (2010).

Ruth Anne Robbins, *Harry Potter, Ruby Slippers and Merlin: Telling the Client's Story Using the Characters and Paradigm of the Archetypal*

Hero's Journal, 29 Seattle U. L. Rev. 767 (2006).

Jennifer Sheppard, *Once Upon a Time, Happily Ever After, and in a Galaxy Far, Far Away: Using Narrative to Fill the Cognitive Gap left by Overreliance on Pure Logic in Appellate Briefs and Motion Memoranda*, 46 Willamette L. Rev. 255 (2009).

Richard K. Sherwin, *The Narrative Construction of Legal Reality*, 18 Vt. L. Rev. 681 (1994).

E. *Framing and metaphor theory for the classroom*

Linda L. Berger, *How Embedded Knowledge Structures Affect Judicial Decision Making: A Rhetorical Analysis of Metaphor, Narrative, and Imagination in Child Custody Disputes*, 18 S. Cal. Interdisc. L.J. 259 (2009).

Linda L. Berger, *Of Metaphor, Metonymy, and Corporate Money: Rhetorical Choices in Supreme Court Decisions on Campaign Finance Regulation*, 58 Mercer L. Rev. 949 (2007).

Linda L. Berger, *What Is the Sound of a Corporation Speaking? How the Cognitive Theory of Metaphor Can Help Lawyers Shape the Law*, 2 J. ALWD 169 (2004).

Marie A. Failing, *New Wine, New Bottles: Private Property Metaphors and Public Forum Speech*, 71 St. John's L. Rev. 217 (1997).

David Fagundes, *Property Rhetoric and the Public Domain*, 94 Minn. L. Rev. 652 (2010).

Laura E. Little, *Characterization and Legal Discourse*, 46 J. Leg. Educ. 372 (1996).

Julie A. Oseid, *The Power of Metaphor: Thomas Jefferson's "Wall of Separation between Church & State,"* 7 J. ALWD __ (2010).

J. Christopher Rideout, *Penumbra Thinking Revisited: Metaphor in Legal Argumentation*, 7 J. ALWD __ (2010).

Michael R. Smith, *Levels of Metaphor in Persuasive Legal Writing*, 58 Mercer L. Rev. 919 (2007).

F. *Persuasion research for the classroom*

Michael J. Higdon, *Oral Argument and Impression Management: Harnessing the Power of Nonverbal Persuasion for a Judicial Audience*, 57 U. Kan. L. Rev. 631 (2009).

Dan Hunter, *Reason is Too Large: Analogy and Precedent in Law*, 50 Emory L.J. 1197 (2000).

Kathryn M. Stanchi, *Playing With Fire: The Science of Confronting Adverse Material in Legal Advocacy*, 60 Rutgers L. Rev. 381 (2008).

Kathryn M. Stanchi, *The Science of Persuasion: An Initial Exploration*, 2006 Mich. St. L. Rev. 411.

IV. Additional Readings in Rhetorical Analysis

A. *Rhetorical analysis generally*

Anthony G. Amsterdam & Randy Hertz, *An Analysis of Closing Arguments to a Jury*, 37 N.Y. L. Sch. L. Rev. 55 (1992).

Michael Frost, *Brief Rhetoric—A Note on Classical and Modern Theories of Forensic Discourse*, 38 U. Kan. L. Rev. 411 (1990).

Kate O'Neill, *Rhetoric Counts: What We Should Teach When We Teach Posner*, 39 Seton Hall L. Rev. 507 (2009).

B. *Audience analysis*

Kenneth D. Chestek, *Judging by the Numbers: An Empirical Study of the Power of Story*, 7 J. ALWD ___ (2010).

Bryan A. Garner, *Judges on Briefing: A National Survey*, 8 Scribes J. Leg. Writing 1 (2002).

Susan Hanley Kosse & David ButleRitchie, *How Judges, Practitioners, and Legal Writing Teachers Assess the Writing Skills of New Law Graduates: A Comparative Study*, 53 J. Leg. Educ. 80 (2003).

Jessica E. Price, *Imagining the Law-Trained Reader: The Faulty Description of the Audience in Legal Writing Textbooks*, 16 Widener L.J. 983 (2007).

Kristen K. Robbins, *The Inside Scoop: What Federal Judges Really Think About the Way Lawyers Write*, 8 Leg. Writing 257 (2002).

James F. Stratman, *Investigating Persuasive Processes in Legal Discourse in Real Time: Cognitive Biases and Rhetorical Strategy in Appeal Court Briefs*, 17 *Discourse Processes* 1 (1994).

C. Rhetoric & Ethics

Elizabeth Fajans & Mary R. Falk, *Shooting from the Lip: United States v. Dickerson, Role [Im]morality, and the Ethics of Legal Rhetoric*, 23 *U. Haw. L. Rev.* 1 (2000).

Steven J. Johansen, *Was Colonel Sanders a Terrorist? An Essay on the Ethical Limits of Applied Legal Storytelling*, 7 *J. ALWD* ____ (2010).

Steven J. Johansen, *This is Not the Whole Truth: The Ethics of Telling Stories to Clients*, 38 *Ariz. St. L.J.* 961 (2006).

Binny Miller, *Telling Stories About Cases and Clients: The Ethics of Narrative*, 14 *Geo. J. Leg. Ethics* 1 (2000).

Jack L. Sammons, *The Radical Ethics of Legal Rhetoricians*, 32 *Val. U. L. Rev.* 93 (1997).
