

ENC 1101: Introduction to Argument and Academic Writing With Shakespeare
Section: 4404

Instructor: Jimmy Newlin

Email: jnewlin@ufl.edu

Office: 5th Floor Rolfs

Office Hours: Fridays per 4

Classroom: CBD 312

Mailbox: 4301 TUR

Times: MTWRF 3 (11 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.)

Skype office hours will be offered on a week-by-week basis. Skype screenname: jnewlin.

Required texts:

Lester Faigley and Jack Selzer, *Good Reasons*, 4th edition (no readings).

Class Coursepack (available at OBT)

Folger library editions of *As You Like It* and *Othello*

Optional (but *highly* recommended) texts:

Either *The Little Penguin Handbook* or *The Brief Penguin Handbook* (by Faigley)

Course Outline, Expectations and Goals

“If any author has become a mortal god, it must be Shakespeare”

– Harold Bloom (“Shakespeare’s Universalism”)

This summer, we will develop an understanding of different rhetorical situations, concepts, and audience expectations necessary to progressing successfully towards scholarly, academic, and professional goals. We will strive to reach these goals through work that will introduce new ways of thinking about writing, that will promote individual improvements as writers, and that will increase confidence in the approach and undertaking of scholarly reading and writing.

We will focus on writing clear, articulate thesis statements, simple and effective organization, and writing readable prose within *academic* expectations. In the process, we will reflect on what it means to attend and write in an academic institution, what it means to produce knowledge as scholars, and what our responsibilities to the public are as academics.

Precisely because he is so unanimously admired and cited, it is hard to think of a writer who has inspired such diverse and controversial interpretations and misinterpretations than William Shakespeare. Malcolm X cited Hamlet’s “To Be or Not To Be” speech as reason to reject the Civil Rights movement’s tenets of nonviolence (“As long as you sit around suffering the slings and arrows and are afraid to use some slings and arrows yourself, you’ll continue to suffer”); David Duke, the notorious founder of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, cites *Merchant of Venice* in his anti-Semitic tracts. While we won’t read anything as odious as Duke’s hate speech in our class, these two examples certainly show the lengths to which some readers will go to co-opt Shakespeare’s positions as their own. What better way to learn about argument than from those about Shakespeare?

We will read two plays and a handful of individual sonnets for some context (and delight!), but the real focus in the class will be on the play’s secondary materials. Since we come from a number of different disciplines, our class offers a unique possibility to test what Harold Bloom calls “Shakespeare’s Universalism.” By examining the way contemporary academic criticism

has examined some of the same concerns that Shakespeare's plays and poems address (identity, sexuality, gender, race, politics, war, domestic violence, religion, etc.), we will work on preparing our own arguments *in our own disciplines* about the same concerns. You do **not** have to write an "English" paper or a paper about Shakespeare; you just have to write papers that fit the same expectations of scholarly discourse as the essays that we read in class.

Assignments

3 Intro Paragraphs and Peer Review Rough Drafts (45 points; 15 points each)

Writing requires warming up, and constant practice. For each paper except for the movie review, you are required to participate in in-class peer review with at least two other classmates. I will not grade your comments on each others' work, but you will receive credit for them. On peer-review day, please also bring a copy of the first paragraph of your paper, with MLA or APA-styled citations of any sources you have consulted and cited in the essay. I will write comments on the introduction, which you will receive back by the end of class.

Critical Piece: Movie Review (3 pages; 150 points)

This short essay will focus on review of a work of recent popular art (you should choose a work that has some artistic merit and aims to provide more than light, mindless entertainment). Choose the *specific publication* in which you would publish this review: a newspaper, a magazine, or an online site. Keep this audience in mind as you write the review. This first essay will provide a basic impression of your writing style and skills (though by no means a definitive one) and will be a starting point for the semester. You are not required to cite any sources, but you are required to do some preliminary reading about the publication you have in mind for your review. Please include a "Works Consulted" page listing the reviews you read in order to gain a sense of the publication's tone.

Definition/Explanatory Essay (4 pages; 200 points)

By stating that a thing or word means one thing over another is to make an argument. At the beginning of the semester, you will write a short essay where you will consider something or some place in its particular terms and their possible meanings. Consider the way that Stephen Orgel makes his argument about methods of critical reading by redefining a word with a relatively stable meaning ("text"). Or, look at the way Eve Sedgwick uses a neologism ("homosociality") to argue a very specific point about Shakespeare's sonnets. These kinds of approaches to meaning and definition will begin our task of critically expanding our topics to search out and develop new meanings for old topics.

Rebuttal Essay (6 pages; 300 points)

For this paper you will use your understanding of basic conventions of argumentative writing to analyze the structure of an article and its efforts to influence and persuade. After analyzing the rhetorical strategies and effectiveness of the argument, construct a rebuttal where you posit a response to the original article. You may choose to write a rebuttal to a school of thought or shared argument (like the various feminist critics' responses to the patriarchal methods of reading) or a specific author (like the responses to Stephen Greenblatt's "About That Romantic Sonnet").

Proposal Argument Essay (7 pages; 300 points)

For this assignment, you will address a contemporary “problem” from the textbook or outside source and argue why your “problem” should be identified as such, convincing your readers of your feasible solutions with detailed and logical causal analysis. Some research should be done to support your proposal.

5 “Gimme” Points/classroom participation

Revision Guidelines

Students will be allowed to revise one essay for more credit during the semester. It *must* be discussed and approved with the instructor before revision for credit can begin. The revision must be started within one week of its due date and handed in no later two weeks after its due date.

Format Guidelines

All essays must be typed, printed in black ink, double-spaced, 12-point Times New Roman font or equivalent; one inch margins, stapled, numbered pages with your name, course, and section number at the top of the page. Always have two (2) copies of anything you turn in. Also, unless requested specifically by the instructor, all papers *must be handed in as paper copies*. ***Electronic submissions will not be accepted.*** MLA formatting is preferred but not required.

Grading Criteria

Students are responsible for maintaining duplicate copies of all work submitted in this course and retaining all returned, graded work until the semester is over. Should the need arise for a re-submission of papers or a review of graded papers, it is the student's responsibility to have and make available this material.

Additionally, late work will be penalized by one letter grade per day (unless a prior agreement with the instructor was made). Assignments are due at the beginning of class.

Course Grading Scale

Points 1000

A	93 – 100 %	(930-1000)
A -	90 – 92.9 %	(900-929)
B+	87 – 89.9 %	(870-899)
B	83 – 86.9 %	(830-869)
B -	80 – 82.9 %	(800-829)
C+	77 – 79.9 %	(770-799)
C	73 – 76.9 %	(730-769)
C -	70 – 72.9 %	(700-729)
D+	67 – 69.9 %	(670-699)
D	63 – 66.9 %	(630-669)
D -	60 – 62.9 %	(600-629)
F (E)	59 % below	(001-599)

Individual Conferences

You are required to meet with me at least twice during the semester in a mandatory conference. If you schedule and fail to attend the conference, it will count as two absences. I encourage you to schedule additional appointments with me at any time during the session in addition to the required conferences. Class is where material gets introduced and discussed broadly; conferences are where real writing work gets done.

Classroom Behavior

Please keep in mind that students come from diverse cultural, economic, and ethnic backgrounds. Some of the texts we will discuss and write about engage controversial topics and opinions. I absolutely require that you demonstrate respect for your classmates and for ideas that may differ from your own. Our goal is for dialogue to occur, not conflict or proselytizing.

Attendance & Participation

Class discussion is a major element of this course; therefore, attendance is vital for the success of the class. You will be expected to participate in class discussion, which entails being prepared to discuss the readings, handing in assignments on time, participation on the class list-serv, etc.

Attendance is required. The policy of the University Writing Program is that if you miss more than **three** periods during the term, you will fail the entire course. The UWP exempts from this policy only those absences involving university-sponsored events, such as athletics and band, and religious holidays.

General Education Learning Outcomes

You must pass this course with a grade of C or better to receive 6,000-word University Writing Requirement credit (E6). You must turn in all writing assignments to receive credit for writing 6,000 words and pass with a "C" or better. A grade of C or better satisfies the University's General Education Composition (C) requirement. You must pass with a grade of C or better if this course is to satisfy the CLAS requirement of a second course in Composition (C). If you are not in CLAS, check the catalog or with your advisor to see if your college has other writing requirements.

Academic Honesty

As a University of Florida student, your performance is governed by the UF Honor Code, available in its full form at <http://itl.chem.ufl.edu/honor.html>. The Honor Code requires Florida students to neither give nor receive unauthorized aid in completing all assignments. Violations include cheating, plagiarism, bribery, and misrepresentation, all defined in detail at the aforementioned website.

Students with Disabilities

The University of Florida complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Students requesting accommodation should contact the Students with Disabilities Office, Peabody 202. Accommodations are only granted when the student provides official documentation from the Students with Disabilities Office.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a serious violation of the student academic honor code. You commit plagiarism when you present the ideas or words of someone else as your own. You commit plagiarism if you use without crediting the source:

- a) any part of another person's essay, speech, or ideas
- b) any part of an article in a magazine, journal, newspaper, any part of a book, encyclopedia, CD-ROM, online www. page, etc.
- c) any idea from another person or writer, even if you express that idea in your own words.

Important tip: There should never be a time when you copy and paste something from the Internet and don't provide the exact location from which it came. All acts of plagiarism will result in failure of the assignment and may result in failure of the entire course. Plagiarism can occur even without any intention to deceive if the student fails to know and employ proper documentation techniques. Unless otherwise indicated by the instructor for class group work, all work must be your own.

E-Mail. Electronic correspondence is an important part of communication in the academic and professional world. While you may not submit any assignments electronically, you *must* have a working email address so that you can receive messages from the instructor (including the list-serv messages).

COURSE SCHEDULE

This schedule is only a guide and is subject to FREQUENT change. Assignments and readings are due the day they are listed on the syllabus, not the following day.

WEEK 1 (JUNE 29 – JULY 3):

MON – COURSE INTRODUCTION

TUE – *Good Reasons* chaps. 1 and 2 (“Why Argue” and “Reading Arguments”)
– Stephen Greenblatt: Preface to *Will In The World*

WED – *Good Reasons* chap. 5 (“Analyzing Written Arguments”)
– Stephen Greenblatt: Preface to *Will In The World*
– Classmate's choice of Movie Review (extra credit opportunity)

THU – **MOVIE REVIEW DUE**
– In class reading: sonnets

FRI – NO CLASS

DEFINITION AND SONNETS UNIT: “Definition Arguments and the Question(s) of Identity” WEEK 2 (JULY 6 – 10)

MON – *Good Reasons* chaps. 4 and 8 (“Drafting and Revising Arguments” and “Definition Arguments”)

- Casey Charles: “Was Shakespeare Gay?: Sonnet 20 and the Politics of Pedagogy”
- In class reading: sonnets

TUE – Stephen Orgel: “What Is A Text?”
– Sonnets

WED – Eve Sedgwick: from *Between Men*

THU – Sedgwick: from *Between Men*
– Bruce R. Smith: “I, You, He, She, and We” (*)
– Conferencing or Roundtable (*)

FRI – Peer Review: **BRING TWO (2) COMPLETED ROUGH DRAFTS AND ONE COPY OF YOUR FIRST PARAGRAPH**

REBUTTAL AND *OTHELLO* UNIT: “Rebuttal Arguments and the Feminist Response to Shakespeare(’s Critics)”

WEEK 3 (JULY 13 – 17)

MON – **DEFINITION ESSAY DUE**
– *Othello* Acts 1 - 2

TUE – *Othello* Acts 3 - 5

WED – continue discussing *Othello*
– film excerpts from Tim Blake Nelson’s *O* and Oliver Parker’s *Othello* (*)

THU – *Good Reasons* chaps. 12, 16, and 18 (“Rebuttal Arguments,” “Planning Research,” and Evaluating and Recording Sources”)
– Stephen Greenblatt: “About That Romantic Sonnet...” and follow-up letters to the editor

FRI – Topic Roundtable
– Conferencing

WEEK 4 (JULY 20 – 24)

MON – Barbara Hodgdon: “Race-ing *Othello*, Re-engendering White-Out, II”

TUE – Jyotsna Singh: “*Othello*’s Identity, Postcolonial Theory, and Contemporary African Rewritings of *Othello*”

WED – Gayle Greene: “‘This That You Call Love’: Sexual and Social Tragedy in *Othello*” (*)

THU – finishing up Hodgdon, Singh, and/or Greene

– film excerpts from Tim Blake Nelson’s *O* and Oliver Parker’s *Othello* (*)

FRI – Peer Review: **BRING TWO (2) COMPLETED ROUGH DRAFTS AND ONE COPY OF YOUR FIRST PARAGRAPH**

PROPOSAL AND *AS YOU LIKE IT* UNIT: “Proposal Arguments and The Question of Enjoyment: How Do/Should We Enjoy Shakespeare?”

WEEK 5 (JULY 27 – 31)

MON – **REBUTTAL ESSAY DUE**

– *As You Like It* Acts 1 - 2

TUE – *As You Like It* Acts 3 - 5

WED – continue discussing *As You Like It*

– film excerpts from Kenneth Branagh’s *As You Like It* (*)

THU – *Good Reasons* chap. 13 (“Proposal Arguments”)

– How have some of our readings from earlier in the course also been proposal arguments?

FRI – Topic Roundtable

– Conferencing

WEEK 6 (AUGUST 3 – 7)

MON – Harold Bloom: from *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*

TUE – Catherine Belsey: from *Why Shakespeare?*

WED – Peer Review: **BRING TWO (2) COMPLETED ROUGH DRAFTS AND ONE COPY OF YOUR FIRST PARAGRAPH**

THU – No Class

FRI – **PROPOSAL ARGUMENT DUE**

(*) indicates possible/optional reading or class activity