**For Berlin**

1. Identify three terms in the article that you don’t completely understand. Try to figure out what they mean in the essay’s context, and do a little outside research about them if necessary. Note the terms and your discoveries in your response.

Common sense realism in the article is defined as the existence of the material world as being indisputable. Here, this concept as superfluous as it does not define anything new or clarify any points. “ All Knowledge is founded on the simple correspondence between sense impressions and the faculties of the mind”.

Epistemic knowledge seems like a paradoxical concept as epistemic is defined as the relation between knowledge or the degree of its validation. If you translate this, epistemic rhetoric emphasizes epistemological aspects and focuses primarily on form and style and also content. This concept was slightly difficult to grasp from the text then defines how other types of rhetoric can overlap such as New rhetoric which denies that truth is discoverable in sense impression.

This paper states that the aim of rhetoric is to adapt the discourse to readers and also states that when the individual is freed from the biases of language, society, or history, they can reach a clear and distinct image of the world. This seems to conflict with the goal of rhetoric as rhetoric often uses relations and focuses on finding biases in and manipulating them to argue their point the most. In order to use rhetoric effectively, you need to understand the bias of others and learn to utilize it to your advantage in order to reach an understanding between both parties.

1. Identify and reproduce (and cite) in your response three or so sentences (they can be taken from throughout the piece) that you feel are most important to the article. After each, briefly explain what the quotation is saying and why you think it’s significant.

“Language is at the center of this dialectical interplay between the individual and the world. For Neo-Aristotelians, Positivists, and Neo-Platonists, truth exists prior to language so that the difficulty of the writer or speaker is to find the appropriate words to communicate knowledge.”

“The world readily surrenders its meaning to anyone who observes it properly, and no operation of the mind-logical or otherwise-is needed to arrive at truth.”

 “This version of the composing process leads to a view of what can be taught in the writing class that rivals Aristotelian rhetoric in its comprehensiveness. Current-Traditional and Neo-Platonic Rhetoric deny the place of invention in rhetoric because for both truth is considered external and self-evident, accessible to anyone who seeks it in the proper spirit.”

1. Please compose two or three questions about the text—whether they concern Berlin’s argument or the pedagogical theories he explores.

Why does Berlin believe that the clearest pedagogical expression of new rhetoric is found in Berthoffs writing if he argues the differences between the approaches of Berthoff, Young, Becker, and Pike?

Is the understanding of epistemic knowledge or necessary, is it already implied by common reasoning?

**For Flower and Hayes**

1. This claim generally means that writers follow a general writing process in which they plan out and coordinate their writing. This can be identified through brainstorming, relating topics, and other techniques. Here, essentially, it is an act of composing a piece of writing that can vary between writers depending on personal habits and preferences. Within my own writing, I follow the template of writing down all of the possible counter arguments for my topic and look into decomposing each segment into a positive for my own arguments. This way, I am able to accomplish both planning of my own arguments and also critique at the same time.
2. The process is can be hierarchical as writers will prioritize certain elements above the other such as their thesis and supporting arguments and also the cognitive model process in where it is a departure from traditional writing processes, it emphasizes completion of stages.
3. This can generally be true, but the writer can also write first and then find a new goal later on in the process. This can be accomplished by having a general idea of which topic your writing will explore as you can extend your topic/thesis to different areas. This extension can either strengthen your topic/arguments or can lead you to change your stance.
4. High level goals are relating to the stance that the author takes and low level goals are usually the small sub goals that do not directly serve the high level goals. Here, we see that these goals are not established all at once, but can be found through new findings and can be influenced by the goal-directed thinking process.