

The Evolution of the Rhetorical Genre of Apologia

SHARON D. DOWNEY

This essay traces the evolution of the enduring rhetorical genre of apologia from the Greek period to the present. I argue that apologia has undergone significant changes in form because its function has changed throughout history. Specifically, shifts in function produce five "subgenres" of apologia: self-exoneration, self-absolution, self-sacrifice, self-service, and self-deception. The implications for the continued viability of apologia in current times, as well as the critical generic approach grounding the analysis, are examined.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF GENRE THEORY continues to proliferate in rhetorical studies. Two themes ground much of this literature: the concept and parameters of genre,¹ and the "formal properties"² of specific genres. While such definitional and "taxonomical fascination" seems irresistible, it is problematic because it reveals "a tendency among scholars . . . to treat the classification of discourse as an end in itself."³ The result often is less than responsible generic criticism⁴ burdened by "critical determinism"⁵ and "tiresome and useless taxonomies."⁶ Lucas labels this inclination a form-over-function problem, a dilemma which sacrifices meaning in favor of appearance because it "invites attention to what rhetorical genres look like, rather than to how they function."⁷

Apologia provides a case in point. As the subject of considerable scholarly inquiry, and perhaps the "most enduring of rhetorical genres,"⁸ its features are well documented. Consistently following the "recurrent theme of accusation," apologetic discourse may be defined as a "speech of self defense . . . not so much on an individual's policies or ideas," but on her/his character or "worth as a human being."⁹ Precipitated by motives ranging from self-actualization to social repair to survival,¹⁰ rhetors respond to threats against their "moral nature, motives, or reputation"¹¹ by adopting defensive postures of absolution, vindication, explanation, or justification.¹² Apologias manifest a variety of styles including appeals to traditional cultural values, invective, references to a greater divinity, reliance upon legitimate bases of power, factual ac-

counts of an issue, and inductively reasoned organization.¹³ Moreover, an apologia may result from a short clash or a longer, more continuous contest,¹⁴ it may be constructed more offensively than defensively,¹⁵ and it may or may not produce the closure essential to determining success or failure.¹⁶

As enumerated, apologia resembles a catalog of options available to rhetors rather than a unified set of elements which, through their recurrence together, warrant a generic label. This trend toward isolating and categorizing self-defense forms creates a number of conceptual problems: it fails to account for the tendency of forms to surface together in time; it diminishes the importance of their interdependence with the context in which apologia find meaning; and it limits the potential of documenting changes or evolution in the genre. Given the pervasiveness of apologia as a viable and recurrent communicative response to an enduring human exigency, examination of the *functions* and not just the *forms* of apologia is warranted.

As an overarching purpose or goal, a genre's function is a "force that unifies [its] form and content," acting as a "logical principle" which accounts for its unique character.¹⁷ Stemming from the interplay between a rhetor's purpose and an audience's expectations within a certain context, the function of a genre constitutes its meaning, or the way it is used in any given time to satisfy collective needs. Determining the function of a genre is an important critical endeavor, then, because it explains the fusion of forms that makes rhetorical genres recognizable, and because it provides the basis for evaluating the genre's efficacy as well as its endurance or evolution.

This essay examines the *evolution* of the functions of apologia over time. I contend that the genre manifests numerous changes but has persevered because its function has evolved throughout history. Specifically, I claim that shifts in the genre's function produce five distinct versions or "subgenres" of apologia. To support this argument, the essay justifies the genre perspective grounding the analysis, identifies the functions of apologia, and discusses the implications of the analysis for apologia and genre theory.

PERSPECTIVE: THE ANALYSIS OF RHETORICAL GENRES

Generic criticism is fundamental to the enterprise of rhetoric;¹⁸ it is also, however, consistently condemned. In a recent essay, for example, Roland indicts genre theory, contending that much of what passes for genre analysis should not be construed as generic, that generic analysis ought to be reserved for highly select circumstances, and that the most popular approach to genre analysis—the situational perspective advocated by Campbell and Jamieson—is inherently problematic.¹⁹ Since this essay is driven by the very principles he questions, I justify the genre approach utilized in the analysis through a response to Rowland's challenges.

First, Rowland identifies two trends in genre studies: "the interpretive approach [which] uses categorization as a heuristic device for explaining a given work, . . . [and] the ontological approach [which] seeks to identify actual categories of discourse that have an empirical existence."²⁰ The latter constitutes generic criticism while the former comprises metaphorical analysis. In other words, discovering the recurrent elements of discourse which result from constraints imposed on a rhetor's response *is* genre analysis while using a genre that has already been delineated to inform a particular discourse *is not* genre analysis. His distinction seems spurious in light of the critical process demanded in genre identification. According to Harrell and Linkugel, to impute a generic label on a group of discourses necessitates a description of its "normative" factors, a determination of "what speeches participate in which genres," and an "application of [those] factors derived from generic description" to other discourses.²¹ Fundamental to this procedure is comparison and contrast among discourses and between generic conventions and subsequent as well as antecedent discourses.²² Moreover, these features give genre criticism its character and distinguish it from other modes of inquiry. Consequently, a genre is inherently a product of both ontology and interpretation: its empirical existence derives from and is validated by heuristic comparison with other discourses.

Second, Rowland limits the scope of generic inquiry. He argues that a stable genre's existence depends upon relatively fixed and immutable factors which "must be present without significant variation . . . and must be highly constraining [emphasis original]." As a result, "only rarely will the critic be able to define the characteristics of a stable empirical genre or category;"²³ hence, few genre studies are justified. In effect, by assuming that the defining criterion of a genre is a set of constraints which encourages stability, Rowland rejects as inappropriate for generic consideration those "unstable genres" which, apparently void of constraints, evidence fluctuation, change, and evolution. This position contrasts sharply with rhetorical and literary genre scholars who almost unilaterally accept the view that genre evolution is a natural process in discursive forms. For example, Castro notes that any genre undergoes continuous change, assumes many shapes "both synchronically and diachronically, . . . and changes through time as any institution . . . changes through time, but also paradoxically, as any institution, it remains the same."²⁴ His view is echoed in numerous essays examining internal fluctuations, cultural and situational shifts in genres, as well as their birth, growth, transformation, and death.²⁵ In short, a rhetorical genre that varies in time and evolves over time remains a rhetorical genre and, hence merits generic scrutiny.

Rowland's narrow perspective also is antithetical to the goals of genre criticism, goals which make tracing and interpreting shifts in rhetorical genres central to the mode of inquiry. A genre approach is a systematic

comparison and contrast of recurrent features of similar discourses in order to clarify the relationships between text and context to provide insight into the human condition.²⁶ What sets genre criticism apart from other rhetorical perspectives, however, is its emphasis upon tracking the development of forms in time, moving "from the study of rhetors and acts in isolation to the study of recurrent rhetorical action."²⁷ The perspective "aims at understanding rhetorical practice . . . by discerning recurrent patterns that reflect the rules practitioners follow";²⁸ it "point[s] up both the enduring and the idiosyncratic in discourse";²⁹ and it grounds its purpose heuristically in "enhanced cultural and historical understanding."³⁰ The results may culminate in "a critical history exploring the ways in which rhetorical acts influence each other."³¹ In short, genre criticism charts the dynamics of permanence and change in recurrent rhetorical forms (although it is ironic that few genre studies fulfill the evolutionary goals of the method). Roland's negation of the dynamic nature of rhetorical genres, then, undermines the value and critical utility of genre analysis.

Third, Roland rebukes Campbell and Jamieson's situational approach, a genre perspective that has garnered a substantial following³² and that grounds the present analysis.³³ A genre, they observe, is "a constellation of recognizable forms bound together by an internal dynamic."³⁴ Such forms are strategic in nature, acting as "stylistic and substantive responses to perceived situational demands."³⁵ *Four* criteria, then, are necessary for generic identification. First, recurring *situations* define a problem that necessitates discursive response. A genre is created out of the recurrent forms that constitute a "fitting response"³⁶ if they consistently satisfy the demands of a situation. Second, genres contain recurrent *substantive* elements composed of primary themes, "modes of proof, canons of logic, topoi motivational appeals," lines of argument, and so on.³⁷ Third, genres manifest recurrent *stylistic* components including organization, "patterns of personal display, . . . figures of speech" and the like.³⁸ Fourth, all three dimensions must occur "*together* in constellation [emphasis original]"³⁹ and be unified by an "internal dynamic," or what emerges as the goal or function of the genre.⁴⁰ If that function fulfills societal needs, a genre will tend to persist and constrain subsequent rhetorical action; if it does not, the genre's function must change to remain viable, or the genre will decay.

Roland criticizes their emphasis upon "situation" as the impetus for the development of rhetorical genres. Hence, because rhetors, not situations, create genres, and because situation too often is associated with "readily identifiable, largely political, occasions—thus dismissing "the vast majority of communicative acts"—Roland provides an alternative perspective grounded in a rhetor's purpose. He then, however, locates purpose within situation.⁴¹ Ultimately, his position extends rather than refutes a genre's situational nature because the strength of

his essay lies in delimiting the situational factors that constrain discourse. His indictment of situation actually establishes the reverse effect: he reaffirms the abiding interdependence between situation and rhetorical genre.

This essay embraces the stance that rhetorical genres exist, persist, and evolve to meet shifting social demands. An examination of the textual and contextual dimensions of the genre of apologia reveals the mechanisms responsible for its divergent functions in history, and illuminates the perceptible pattern of its evolution over time.

ANALYSIS: THE SUBGENRES OF APOLOGIA

The following analysis *reinterprets* apologia *macroscopically*. A speech was considered apologetic if it had been previously named as such in published articles in our discipline;⁴² moreover, the analysis was conducted on those exemplars which were repeatedly identified as enduring artifacts (i.e., Socrates' "Apology") or as significant historical documents (i.e., Nixon's "Resignation Speech"). Coincidentally, the discourses clustered in four groups of time which I label the classical, medieval, modern, and contemporary periods.⁴³ While the labels denoting these periods roughly correspond to accepted historical periods, they serve primarily to identify expanses of time and do not necessarily reflect events which might have transpired in them. The analysis also is macroscopic, meaning that it "submerges differences and details so as to call forth the common characteristics of rhetorical systems as organized wholes."⁴⁴ By focusing on the dominant patterns and trends of each period, depth is necessarily sacrificed for scope. Despite this inherent limitation, the purpose of this essay is to reinterpret self-defense artifacts to see whether an evolutionary inspection of them can provide additional insights into the dynamics of the genre. Using Campbell and Jamieson's criteria, then, synchronically, the substance, style, situation, and function of apologia is described within each period; diachronically, apologias are compared across periods to identify generic change.

*Apologias in the Classical Period*⁴⁵

Situational Features. Classical apologias were managed similarly to the way all judicial proceedings were conducted. When accused of a misdeed, the apologist composed and delivered a speech of self-defense in the presence of her/his accuser(s) and the voting body of the General Assembly who, upon completion of the address, rendered a vote and, if guilty, a sentence immediately. Legally and culturally explicit, the accused was entitled to a defense. The rationale for this stemmed from the value Greeks placed upon the rights, honor, and integrity of the individual, the operable laws at the time, and the stature of pure reason and rationality. Speeches of self-defense followed accusation, or put another way, accusation always preceded apologia. In addition, such

discourses were vital and consequential because of the gravity of the situation. If found innocent, the accused was exonerated; a guilty verdict, however, meant expulsion, imprisonment, exile, or death. For all practical purposes, apologia was a speech of survival with the accused's overriding aim to seek acquittal and not merely to defend one's actions.

Substantive and Stylistic Features. Classical apologia were so argumentatively similar as to be isomorphic. Thematically, speakers' addresses were motivated by loyalty to and in the interests of both the people and the state. More importantly, "guiltlessness" and "shifting blame" permeated classical speeches. Demosthenes' approach is illustrative:

Much more could I say about those transactions, yet methinks too much has been said already. The fault is my adversary's, for having spirited over me the dregs, I may say, of his own wickedness and iniquities, of which I was obliged to clear myself to those who are younger than the event.⁴⁶

The dominant rhetorical posture embraced by classical apologists was *vindication*. Speakers simultaneously denied the charges at hand and shifted blame onto another. Indeed, discourses highlighted the behavior of the accuser(s) more often than that of the accused. For instance, Demosthenes assailed his accuser Aeschines.

Why, then, wretched man, do you play the pettifogger? Why manufacture arguments? Why don't you take hellbore for your malady? Are you not ashamed to bring on a cause for spite, and not for any offense? . . . And you bawl out, regardless of decency, a sort of cart-language, applicable to yourself and your race—not to me.

Stylistically, classical apologists relied on similar argumentative devices syllogistically structured to secure acquittal via shifting responsibility. One prominent strategy was the use of the causal "if . . . then" pattern. In response to the charges that he overly influenced the Athenians to go to war, Pericles responded that ". . . if you were persuaded by me to go to war, because you thought that I possessed these qualities . . . even in a moderate degree more than other men, I cannot now fairly be charged with injuring you, at any rate."⁴⁷

A second obligatory style featured a preference for inquiry order to introduce new lines of argument. Socrates, for example, began virtually every thought with a question suggesting that he knew what his audience wanted to know: "Perhaps some of you may reply: 'But, Socrates, what is the trouble with you? What has given rise to these prejudices against you?'"⁴⁸ A third feature, argument by analogy, was commonly employed when attacking one's accuser(s). Addressing his adversary, Demosthenes stated:

Now do you speak to us about the past? As if a physician should visit his patients, and not order or prescribe anything to cure the disease, but on the death of anyone, when the last ceremonies were performing, should follow him to the grave and expound, how, if the poor fellow had done this and that, he never would have died!

Fourth, counterattack underscored classical apologia. Its intensity often took the form of derogatory labels, as in Demosthenes' designation

of Aeschines as a "third rate actor," "thing," "hireling," "wretched," "ungrateful," "wicked," "of no earthly use," and "an idiot."

Fifth, rhetors frequently referred to the audience, particularly to the immediate audience's vocal reactions to the speech. For example, Socrates proclaimed: "... do not interrupt me with shouts if in my defense I speak in the same way that I am accustomed to speak in the marketplace. . . ." Sixth, speakers regularly mentioned cultural rules and laws justifying their oration. Pericles, for instance, said he knowingly "convened an assembly" for the purpose of addressing the charges against him. Finally, it was not uncommon for apologists to preview how they would argue their cases. Setting up his arguments for the audience, Socrates asserted: "I have to defend myself, Athenians, first against the older false accusations of my old accusers, and then against the more recent ones of my present accusers." Unlike any subsequent period, classical apologias reflected both speakers' and audiences' command of the tools and the process of argument.

Function of Classical Apologia. Although classical apologia were shrewdly prepared discourses, utilizing logical devices did not guarantee success. Apologists did enjoy the benefits of cultural norms which presumed the right of self-defense and provided rhetors with opportunity to avail themselves of all of the means of persuasion. As finely tuned, reasoned documents, classical apologia symbolized and reflected the values of the period and historically served as paradigms by which subsequent apologia can be compared. The situational, substantive, and stylistic forms fused together in the classical period to produce an obligatory speech of self-defense, in which one sought acquittal of formal accusations through logically constructed, vindictive strategies. Classical apologia functioned as self-exoneration.

*Apologia in the Medieval Period*⁴⁹

Situational Features. The medieval period evidenced significant changes from the classical Greek era. Many of the norms grounding Greek practices failed to survive in this period of raw political power and religious fervor. Characterized plainly by "the explosive association of religion and politics,"⁵⁰ one's actions were interpreted relative to the unconditional "legitimacy of the monarchy [which] was absolute and divinely ordained."⁵¹ Consequently, if a person was brought to trial—the setting for apologia—charges stemmed from two primary sources: treason or heresy. Like the classical period, apologists spoke in their own behalf and not through an intermediary; unlike the classical period, apologists opted whether or not to defend themselves. Importantly, their motives were dissimilar. Few speakers were driven to attempt exoneration; instead, most apologists had been found guilty *prior* to their defense. Thus, because death was the likely sentence, speakers engaged in acts resembling purification.

The state of the verdict notwithstanding, the accused spoke in a face-to-face public setting, though not always at a judicial proceeding. In many cases, the apology was delivered at the scaffold immediately preceding execution. In contrast to the classical period, the accuser was not obliged to be present;⁵² however, the immediate audience symbolically represented the accuser as a knowledgeable and hostile group because the charges against the accused violated listeners' important political, cultural, and religious beliefs. Subsequent to the oration, closure was produced immediately whether the end result was verdict, sentence, or death.

Substantive and Stylistic Features. The overriding theme of medieval apology was dictated by the situational constraint of verdict preceding apology. Such a theme encompassed the ritual of confession in which one sought forgiveness for past transgressions and appealed for divine intervention in the future. Accepting one's fate, welcoming one's death, and convincing oneself of the forgiveness of God merged to form the substance of medieval apology.

As part of the expectation of confession, apologists sought to address "posterity" for the benefit of future generations through linking their actions to virtue; simultaneously, for the benefit of their own mortality, apologists had to make "a good death."⁵³ Their dominant rhetorical posture, then, was *justification*. Speakers attempted to clear their names—albeit with a flavor of martyrdom⁵⁴—and exact promises for a better future. Harrison's words are representative: "Oh, what am I, poor worm, that I should be accounted worthy to suffer anything for the sake of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ! I have gone joyfully and willingly, many a time, to lay down my life upon the account of Christ, but never with so much joy and freedom as at this time."

Stylistically, apology were merely sprinkled with suggestions of defense grounded in *logos*. Wentworth, for example, employed a causal argument, stating: "As to this charge of treason, I must and do acknowledge that if I had the least suspicion of my own guilt I would save your Lordships the pains. I would cast the first stone."⁵⁵ Signs of counterattack sometimes surfaced as well, similar to Luther's condemnation of the church and papacy for allowing excessive indulgences.⁵⁶

However, in noticeable contrast to the classical period, the frequency of diety references and the abstract, transcendent quality of medieval apology dominated discourses. Above all, medieval apology were suffused with references to God. Harrison's conclusion is illustrative:

He hath covered my head many times in the day of battle; by God I have leaped over a wall, by God I have run through a troop, and by my God I will go through this death, and He will make it easy to me. Now into Thy hands, O Lord Jesus, I commit my spirit!

Moreover, consistent with the prominence of religious themes, virtually all medieval apology were free of classical argument. Both dynamics are understandable because, in most cases, the speaker's death was immi-

ment. Thus, rhetors tended to resist the temptation of contesting their cases and instead transcended their dilemma by emphasizing the glories of afterlife. Emotional, abstract, and devoid of argument, medieval apologia emerged as a last rites declaration and an optional prerequisite to death.

Function of Medieval Apologia. The medieval period exhibited an apologia markedly different from the classical period. Evolving from exoneration to absolution, no strategy could alter a preordained decision. Regardless of the quality, eloquence, or intensity of the address, medieval apologia emerged as a ritual without meaningful consequences for the speaker. Given this constraint, it is not surprising that the intrinsic nature of apologia adapted to the period's situational parameters. The important transcendent flavor of apologia, the unwillingness to defend one's innocence, the power of references to God, the need for atonement, and the tone of finality merged into understandable form. While apologies in both periods conformed to situational exigencies, medieval apologia adjusted to the *futility* of argument while classical apologia adapted to the *advantages* of argument. Thus, medieval apologia were optional confessions through which one sought release from a predetermined outcome by utilizing emotional, transcendent, justification strategies. Medieval apologia *functioned as self-absolution*.

*Apologias in the Modern Period*⁵⁷

The modern period, defined here as encompassing the 18th and 19th centuries, retained the medieval period's apologetic features and validated the reemergence of classical forms. Culturally, the modern period was characterized by shifting social structures and heightened revolutionary ideas.⁵⁸ Revolutionaries during this time sought "the destruction of [the hierarchical] social order . . . and the substitution of an order based on the legal equality of all citizens in the nation-state."⁵⁹ While the classical period valued democracy and individual rights, and the medieval period autocracy and the rights of the powerful, the modern period openly expressed tension between both prevailing ideologies.

In both Europe and the United States, insurrection originated with leaders of the oppressed who adopted roles as martyrs. Thus, the reappearance of honor and integrity accorded to the individual, in addition to argument as the vehicle for self-defense, typified discourses. The emotional tide of religious and political loyalty also persisted as an undercurrent. Importantly, the context in which rhetors delivered apologia was highly charged because it featured well known rebels fighting against an unjust ruling class or governing body. Apologists addressed audiences by choice not necessity and could elect an intermediary (lawyer or other) to defend them. Moreover, apologia were delivered sometimes before and sometimes after the passing of judgment on the accused. Contingent upon the state of the verdict, then, the

modern period reflected situational conditions of its preceding periods: their motives varied from exoneration and potential survival to absolution and certain death. Discourses were enacted in the public arena—courtroom or gallows—and, since the misdeed was a punishable crime for which the ultimate penalty was death, closure occurred immediately.

The most discernable change from preceding periods lay in the constitution of the audience. As in previous periods, one's accuser(s) was known, and the audience was apt to be well informed about the accused and the nature of the charges. However, unlike the medieval period, immediate and extended audiences often were sympathetic to the cause embraced by the accused. Alliance with the apologist, then, became increasingly conspicuous. For example, John Brown's revolt against slavery (and subsequent trial for murder) drew the attention of the governor, Thoreau and other prolific writers, and well known citizens of the state, all of whom supported Brown's position and vocalized as much before, during, and after his trial.⁶⁰ More so than in previous periods, the audience exerted pressure upon the context of apologia, reflecting a shift from a closed to a more open rhetorical situation.

Substantive and Stylistic Features. Modern apologia embodied numerous classical and medieval forms. If verdict followed apologia, discourses assumed classical form; when verdict preceded apologia, discourses favored medieval form. The most prominent pattern of modern apologia, though, fused the disparate characters from both periods, resulting in a measureably different subgenre which may best be labeled "defiant resignation."

Self-sacrifice or martyrdom materialized as the theme binding modern apologia. Brown, for instance, offered himself as a scapegoat for his cause:

Now, if it is deemed necessary that I should forfeit my life for the furtherance of the ends of justice, and mingle my blood further with the blood of my children and with the blood of millions in this slave country whose rights are disregarded by wicked, cruel, and unjust enactments—I submit; so let it be done.

His words echoed those of other modern apologists all of whom acceded to the ruling of the court, but stridently refused to surrender their conscience, commitment, or integrity. In addition, speakers accented sacrifice with appeals to the audience for furtherance of the cause embraced by the martyr. For example, reminding the court that his final "expressions" were for his countrymen, Emmet proclaimed, "if there is a true Irishman present, let my last words cheer him in the hour of his affliction."

Bolstering and differentiation tactics augmented the tenor of defiant sacrifice. Because modern apologists attempted to secure identification with audiences and show contempt for their accusers, they embraced a posture of *explanation*. Emmet's discourse represents these dual motives:

Let no man write my epitaph: for as no man who knows my motives dare now vindicate them, let no prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them and me repose in obscurity and peace, and my tomb remain unscrubbed, until other times, and other men can do justice to my character; when my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written.⁶¹

Logical arguments, references to both immediate and extended audiences as well as to God, the tone of resignation, and an adherence to legal formalities proliferated in modern apologia. But, autobiographical references emerged as the most prominent feature of explanation. Rhetors offered a detailed chronology of significant events in their lives and reiterated the bases for their beliefs. Such reminiscences took on a much more important role than in preceding periods because of the critical role ethos played in maintaining the apologist's crusade for truth and justice. Collectively, modern apologia supplied sympathetic audiences with knowledge and incentive to continue the battles for which apologists were to give their lives.

Function of Modern Apologia. While the modern period accommodated disparate apologetic forms, they did converge into a coherent generic product. The discourses served as symbolic reminders of both the apologist and the audience's responsibilities. Whether the accused was to live or die mattered little compared to the import of the message to others. Ironically, despite their martyr quality, such discourses were consequential. Where most classical apologia determined the apologist's fate, and most medieval apologia were incapable of altering fate, the value of most modern apologia lay in directing the responsibilities and commitment of others in the future. Thus, the discourse constituted an optional speech of martyrdom in which one sought to create a legacy through explanation, ethos-building, and defiant resignation. Modern apologia functioned as self-sacrifice.

*Apologia in the Contemporary Period*⁶²

Contemporary apologia emulate antecedent forms and revise them dramatically. The 20th century may best be described as a period of expansion, innovation, ingenuity,⁶³ and culture shock. Although encompassing the least expanse of time, says Boulding, the period represents a pivotal point in history, a "great transition . . . that divides human history into two equal parts."⁶⁴ Stemming principally from technological advancements and enormous developments in all facets of communication, our time is marked by "a totally new social force—a stream of change so accelerated that it influences our sense of time, revolutionizes the tempo of daily life, and affects the very way we 'feel' the world around us."⁶⁵ Our complicated era creates tension and uncertainty which is manageable only through the endorsement of a "pseudo" version of reality, a force in which image and illusion dominate.⁶⁶ McGee calls this tendency the "fractur[ing] and fragment[ation] of American culture," a condition which also has irrevocably altered the nature of

rhetoric. Coherent, complete discourses characteristic of all preceding periods have been supplanted by "fragmented," transient, unfinished, and often "invisible" texts which make shared meaning difficult but remain the only vehicle for meaning.⁶⁷ Due to the "explosion" of knowledge in the 20th century, then, much of public rhetorical practice is an enactment of image management through discursive fragments. The rapid evolution of apologia parallels these dynamics. Since two different subgenres surfaced during this time, each will be treated in a separate section.

Situational Features to 1960. Two major occurrences affected apologia. First, public self-defense rhetoric shifted from the judicial to the political arena; second, the burgeoning mass media paradoxically expanded human's access to events but alienated citizens from participation in those same events. Within this admittedly broad context, individuals presenting a defense of their conduct did so by choice and, like the classical period, after accusation. Since most apologists were politicians, the nature of the charges against them stemmed primarily from betrayal of trust, indiscretion, corrupt practice, or mishandling of an issue. Consequently, the potential repercussions lacked the gravity characterizing previous eras. Indeed, because apologists faced potential loss of credibility, elected office, or political aspirations rather than death, rhetors were motivated to repair threats to their reputations.

Speakers typically opted for a public setting, and most often via mass media.⁶⁸ As a result, the recipients of the message became the extended "mass" audience. In a marked difference from previous periods, while mass mediated apologia were part "of a short, intense clash of views,"⁶⁹ resolution was somewhat arbitrary since no conventional procedure for rendering judgment existed. Instead, apologists' success depended largely upon popular press or public opinion, and that necessitated attention to image as well as to charges. In the absence of formal verdict, then, closure depended either on the relative passage of time, if closure occurred at all, or on the relative success of image management.

Substantive and Stylistic Features to 1960. Early contemporary apologia resembled classical apologia because of the reemergence of argument, reasoning, invective, vindictiveness, and detailed examination of issues surrounding charges against the accused. Themes similar to the classical period grounded discourses: rhetors' loyalty and patriotism, their denial of guilt, and their condemnation of malicious others. For example, Truman, accused of a communist conspiracy in the hiring of Harry Dexter White, attributed the assault on his character to political machinations.

There is one aspect of this affair that should be clear to everyone. That is the obvious political motivation of this attack on me. In launching this attack, the Republican Attorney General worked hand in glove with the Republican National Committee. The manner and the timing of what has been done make it perfectly clear that the powers of the Attorney

General have been prostituted for hopes of political gain. No election, my friends, is worth that much.⁷⁰

Although contemporary apologia revived many classical forms, two important differences arose. First, sometimes the accused implicitly shifted blame through vague or abstract references to the accuser. MacArthur represented this subtle maneuver in his "Old Soldiers Never Die" address to Congress: "There are those who claim our strength is inadequate; . . . I have been severely criticized in lay circles; . . ." and "Efforts have been made to distort my position. It has been said in effect that I was a warmonger."⁷¹ Such veiled references imply either that disguising the "enemy" was strategically advantageous or that one's accuser(s) could no longer be clearly defined as in previous periods.

Second, dual motives surfaced. MacArthur's "Old Soldier's" speech and Nixon's "Checker's" speech ostensibly responded to slurs against their characters. However, given the setting in which the accusations occurred—Nixon's during Eisenhower's presidential campaign, and MacArthur's during his popular military reign, the opportunity arose to exploit the situation for more than exoneration. A successful defense on Nixon's part undoubtedly would boost Eisenhower's campaign efforts. Therefore, in addition to presenting his side of the story, Nixon appealed to the voting public on behalf of Eisenhower.

But just let me say this last word. Regardless of what happens, I am going to continue this fight. I am going to campaign up and down America until we drive the crooks and Communists and those that defend them out of Washington; and remember folks, Eisenhower is a great man. Folks, he is a great man, and a vote for Eisenhower is a vote for what is good for America.⁷²

The dual motive apologia, if successful in negating wrongdoing, not only repaired ethos but potentially elevated the accused's image. For the first time, then, apologies were not strictly defensive reactions but strategically offensive actions.⁷³

Concerned principally with clearing their names, contemporary apologists utilized the posture of *absolution* by retaining the classical pattern of categorical denial and engaging in an in-depth "particularization of the charges at hand."⁷⁴ However, promoting audience understanding through an emphasis upon shared beliefs emerged more prominently in contemporary apologia. Hence, because apologists linked their actions to the power of cultural values, they also relied on the posture of *explanation*. This view intimates that audiences cannot condemn apologists if they identify with apologists' motives. Nixon, for example, after carefully detailing his life academically, professionally, and financially, portrayed himself as a common man with common financial burdens: "It isn't very much. But Pat and I have the satisfaction that every dime that we have got is honestly ours." In both postures, the goal is to vindicate the rhetor and reframe the situation to work in the best interests of the speaker.

Stylistically, contemporary apologia were replete with causal reasoning, inquiry order devices, arguments by analogy, namecalling, audience

identification strategies, detailed evidence and examples, autobiographical narratives, and an overall pattern of induction. Importantly, speakers uniformly refused to accept anything less than their own desired consequences. By his own admission, for instance, Nixon demanded full vindication and Eisenhower's election. Apologists' pattern of defining their own standards for resolution implies a rhetoric whose fate is actively being created not recreated.

Function of Contemporary Apologias to 1960. Contemporary apologists faced accusations threatening their reputations and, understandably, sought to reinstate credibility. While similar to classical discourses, three critical differences set contemporary apologia apart from their classical counterparts. First, apologia were directed to a mass public, identified through assumed shared values and reached via mass media. Consequently, adaptation to this detached, heterogeneous audience became paramount. Second, apologists possessed both political pasts and futures. Coupled with media exposure, contemporary apologia appeared orchestrated more for political than self-defense motives. Indeed, Nixon's and MacArthur's addresses intimated that a defensive response could result in political gain. In short, apologia might "get them off" and "get them going." Third, the absence of tangible consequences distinguished contemporary apologia from those in previous periods. Clearly, apologia involved risks; however, with the fear of formal retribution removed, such risks were mild when compared to the benefits apologia might serve. Void of prescriptive resolution, contemporary apologia evolved into strategically offensive discourses potentially furthering a rhetor's aspirations through absolution, explanation, and value-oriented appeals to a mass audience. Contemporary apologia to 1960 *functioned as self-service.*

Situational Features after 1960. Three interdependent forces, resulting from momentous cultural events in the 1960s and 1970s, radically reshaped the nature of apologia. First, a gradual but perceptible distrust of the bureaucracy in general and politicians in particular permeated the contemporary period. The turbulent sixties, the tragedy of Vietnam, Watergate and the resignation of Richard Nixon, accompanied by far-reaching scandals such as ABSCAM, "treated [the public] to 'rhetoric' at its worst."⁷⁵ The resulting erosion of public confidence led to the "alienation of voters from politicians and the political process."⁷⁶ Thus, a second constraint on apologia rested with audience estrangement stemming from a combination of suspicions about leadership in America, "limited knowledge" of appropriate responses to such disgraces,⁷⁷ and a media-inundated audience increasingly "inured to tales of scandal and tragedy."⁷⁸

A third pivotal occurrence paralleled these events: the proliferation of mass media and the power of the press to mold and define reality. Gold notes that the media's emphasis on "inciting conflict" and uncovering "exciting and dramatic events" in politicians' lives led to the exploita-

tion of trivial remarks which when "transmit[ted] and repeat[ed] . . . all over the country means that even frivolous accusations have great damaging *potential* [emphasis original]." ⁷⁹ Thus, administrative corruption, media intervention, and public disillusionment figured prominently in altering apologia.

The development of apologia as an *asituational* response accented the genre's most remarkable change. Politicians adopted a chronic defensive posture, utilizing the form under "nonapologetic" conditions⁸⁰ or when "no legitimate rhetorical situation" existed.⁸¹ That accusation precedes apologia could no longer be presumed in this period because its threat was everpresent. Moreover, charges against the accused usually were implied not explicit,⁸² often emanating from rumors and innuendo. Consequently, contemporary apologies featured the absence of a "well-delineated enemy."⁸³ The circumstances which historically precipitated apologies became increasingly difficult to identify, although press conferences or interviews comprised the setting in which accusatory remarks were likely to be bandied about. Unlike other eras, the later contemporary period was marked by diminished opportunities and arenas for the enactment of apologia.

Situational ambiguities generated discourses containing multiple motives. One consistent goal remained to manage the potentially damaging repercussions of "accusation," regardless of its origin, scope, or accuracy. Edward Kennedy's Chappaquiddick Speech, for example, was motivated in part to explain his guilty plea for leaving the scene of an accident; and Jimmy Carter's statement to the American people after the aborted rescue of American hostages held in Iran ostensibly disclosed information about the attempt and its subsequent failure. However, more compelling covert motives competed with rhetors' overt goals. Ling argues that Kennedy's dual motives—to clear himself of responsibility for Mary Jo Kopechne's death and to retain his senatorial seat—were antithetical to those stated in his speech.⁸⁴ Carter's address, in retrospect, appeared designed to offset certain criticism about the inexplicable failure of the world's most technologically advanced military equipment, and to force Iran to the negotiation table. Moreover, a common goal uniting political candidates' actions revolved around "keep[ing the] candidate viable."⁸⁵ The uncertainties of the situation, then, established the conditions for varied, hidden, and sometimes deceitful aims.

Similar to the early contemporary period, discourse often not only failed to produce closure, but maintained, escalated, or prolonged conflict. Given the hazy circumstances within which contemporary apologia existed, it is not surprising that the forms of apologia adapted to what was, in effect, a pseudo-apologetic context.

Substantive and Stylistic Features after 1960. Two contradictory themes emerged in speeches during this period. On the one hand,

rhetors accepted full responsibility for the events in question. Kennedy, for example, asked not “to escape responsibility” for his actions and regarded his failure to report the accident immediately “as indefensible”;⁸⁶ Nixon “tried to do his best” and “regret[ed] deeply any injuries” resulting from events culminating in his resignation⁸⁷; and Jimmy Carter repeatedly emphasized that all decisions regarding the hostage rescue in Iran were his.⁸⁸ On the other hand, ironically, all speakers shifted blame for their circumstances: Kennedy to the scene of the accident,⁸⁹ Nixon indirectly at staff members involved in the Watergate affair,⁹⁰ and Carter to an Iran unwilling to negotiate the hostages’ release. While these themes are internally incompatible, they suggest a contextual redefinition made more palatable by the morally expected assumption of responsibility.

As such, contemporary apologia manifested a subverted posture of *explanation*. Under the guise of full disclosure, speakers offered a descriptive summary of their recollection of events, presumably to detail the charges, defend their actions, and avoid public condemnation. Theoretically, description can be compelling and persuasive because its nonargumentative nature precludes critical evaluation by recipients with limited information. For the less gullible, however, the discourses were fraught with discrepancies. About both Kennedy and Nixon, King argues that their apologies “falsify[ed] the political reality [they] pretend to confront.”⁹¹ So profound were the incongruities that these discourses exemplified misleading narrative and dishonest apology.⁹²

A second viable rhetorical stance was *avoidance*. Perhaps because of the ubiquitous nature of accusations, symbolic responses often consisted of ignoring or dismissing a charge altogether.⁹³ Press conferences, for instance, provided one forum for the President to engage in such practices. A more pervasive kind of avoidance was evident through rhetors evading potentially damaging responses by redirecting the focus of their addresses to other issues. Although Nixon’s resignation speech was not successful despite eliciting sympathy, nevertheless he redefined the occasion so that reviewing his accomplishments and easing the transformation of power seemed appropriate.

The relative *absence* of stylistic elements typified contemporary apologia. In cases featuring discourse, speeches frequently enacted patterns of description including vague chronologies of events which added no new information, testimonials,⁹⁴ and visible lack of argument, detail, or evidence.⁹⁵ More often, apologetic responses assumed the form of fragments—short statements usually in response to questions—and reflect Gold’s observation that, for political candidates wrestling with the exigencies of press accusations that automatically presumed culpability, “time equals guilt”;⁹⁶ consequently, the less said the better.

Function of Contemporary Apologia after 1960. The fixed conditions prompting apologia in preceding periods patently did not apply for

contemporary apologia. Historically, whatever form apologia assumed, the genre itself could be identified by recurrent situational markers. Accusation always preceded apologi (whether or not verdict intervened); apologia were reactive responses not initiating actions, and complete texts not fragmented symbols; apologists addressed distinguishable, relevant audiences; and apologies culminated in resolution as well as some kind of demonstrable effect. The latter contemporary period, however, evidences a paucity of recurrent features: apologia need not require accusation, audience, setting, or resolution. As a result, discourses were either rendered impotent in the face of the media or under the exclusive control of rhetors.

Contemporary apologia's situational, substantive, and stylistic dimensions merged to produce calculated avoidance. Such rhetoric reflects contradictory, self-serving motives, "masks moral responsibility,"⁹⁷ exploits audience ignorance and emotions while championing the same values breached by the apologist,⁹⁸ undermines facts and accuracy, and shuns confrontation of issues. The net effect was a staged event,⁹⁹ a decisive rhetoric of manipulation. That this subversive form persisted implies the existence of some pragmatic purpose. In the absence of rules for the conduct of apologia, contemporary apologia may well have functioned as delay or postponement tactics—a view intimating that time heals, distorts, forgives, and forgets. Nixon's reemergence on the political scene, as well as Kennedy's senatorial tenure and Carter's increasingly visible role as foreign affairs expert, attest in part to the potentials of the form. Still, these discourses reveal attempts to maintain the viability of rhetors through asituational, offensively-grounded avoidance. Contemporary apologia *functioned as self-deception*.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Self-defense in response to accusation is an ontological human trait, as relevant today as it was in the classical period. What distinguishes the past from the present is not the existence of threat followed by defense, but the manifestation of the response, the situational conditions accompanying it, and its emergent meaning. The foregoing analysis supports the view that apologia is characterized by fixed and dynamic forms as well as continually evolving functions. What accounts for the genre's fusion of forms with function in any given period are the limits imposed by situational conditions. At least until the contemporary period, recurring situational dimensions—the most influential of which included an explicit accusation, a specific accuser, a known audience, an assortment of fixed forms, a meaningful judgment, and a definite resolution—dictated the nature of self-defense rhetoric. To this list might be added cultural ideology for the degree to which a society needs and/or values certain conventions, it will naturally provide avenues for their expression. Situation, then, defines function, which, in large

measure, determines discursive form. In one sense, the analysis reaffirms Campbell and Jamieson's delineation of genre as a situational construct; in another sense, it argues that the function or meaning of the genre is its most critically useful feature because it informs substance and style while reflecting situation. This latter idea should not be surprising since function incorporates the recipients of apologia and not just its forms in isolation. As a consequence of shifts in function, the genre has been able to retain its communicative value as a "fitting" rhetorical response.

The interdependence of text and context in different historical periods produced five purposes of apologia—exoneration, absolution, sacrifice, service, and deception—with one particular function prevailing in a given period. This does not mean to suggest that other functions were not operative because surely no one response can encompass the ubiquitous and intricate nature of self-defense rhetoric no matter how constraining the situation might be. Yet, this analysis does imply that one function enjoyed prominence; hence, it may be indicative of a larger cultural trend and, in part, symbolize that culture's value system.

Part of the value of analyzing apologia over time rests with what the genre's evolutionary pattern implies for the contemporary period. There is continuity to history; consequently, the contemporary apologia resembles and owes its origins to historical antecedents. Its emergent function, however, is disconcerting. This assessment may be better understood by examining trends in the evolution of the genre. Over time, apologia have come to exist within an increasingly detached rhetorical situation. The drama that bound accused, accuser, and audience in the classical period gradually gave way to audience alienation, ambiguous accuser, and aversive apologist. Similarly, the genre manifests a precipitate decrease in standards or rules for the conduct of self-defense. Where the classical period incorporated a myriad of conventions prescribing who, what, when, where, how, and why apologia would be enacted, apparently those conventions fell out of favor through time, eventually to be replaced by rhetor control. Indeed, progressive variations in apologia's function coincided with rhetors' increasing dominion over the apologetic situation, a condition implying diminished collective consciousness of the purpose or value of the genre. Moreover, as discourses became increasingly shorter in length, less accurate, ethical, or consequential, they grew more descriptive, pragmatic, and expedient. Taken together, these dynamics parallel the decline of public deliberation in general, preempt recipient assessment of the discourse, and pave the way for arbitrary use of the genre.

Whether the contemporary ritual of apologia can be preserved in the absence of a solid ethical foundation that facilitates its own regeneration and fulfills expectations is unclear. Butler implies that it cannot when she argues that "future apologiae . . . will not be decisive features in any

major controversy" because "strictly defensive appeals" are apt to lead to contempt rather than sympathy or empathy.¹⁰⁰ Recent events, however, challenge her evaluation. Two patterns of self-defense response are prevalent. The first posture is a continuation of that manifest in the later contemporary period. For example, Ronald Reagan's refusal to respond to charges of misconduct in the Iran/Contra affair, despite mounting evidence of his complicity, exemplifies paradigmatic and deceptive avoidance. In contrast, one-time presidential candidate Gary Hart's failure to utilize calculated avoidance in response to allegations of infidelity all but sealed his rapid fall from grace. These examples seem to confirm the continued viability of self-service and self-deception.

A second pattern, however, which suggests the potential emergence of a different function, poses a threat to the genre. Gold's analysis of political apologia intimates that the genre appears to be assuming unconventional symbolic importance. She notes that "apologetic strategies . . . are a form of self-disclosure" that can minimize the adverse effects of accusation. This certainly seems true of Bill Clinton's (and his wife's) response to charges of his involvement in a long-term affair with Gennifer Flowers. Their choice to discuss this issue repeatedly in "up close and personal" interviews is disarming and did not damage his bid for the presidency.

In addition, Gold's observation that "candidate[s]' ability to free [themselves] rhetorically from political nettles is often seen as analogous to [their] ability to lead the country out of the dark forests of domestic and foreign crises"¹⁰¹ suggests a link between apologia and perceived competence or leadership. For example, in an interview on a television news broadcast, a political analyst attributed presidential candidate Paul Tsongas's failure to the absence of accusation: he could not garner public support since he had no opportunity to prove his "mettle" by extricating himself from a compromising situation. If she is right, then current apologia not only differ appreciably from their immediate predecessors but challenge the whole of apologia's history by obscuring the genre's distinctive relationship to character. If this trend is confirmed, apologia no longer constitutes a genre but functions as a symbolic strategy.

This essay suggests that the evolution of a genre stems from shifts in its function over time. As such, delineating its functions in addition to its forms yields a more comprehensive understanding of the role of rhetorical genres in human affairs. In the history of literary thought, Connors argues, "generic criticism . . . flourish[es] . . . during periods of cultural anxiety when established definitions are created as absolutes to shore up against perceived chaos."¹⁰² If rhetorical studies follow a similar path, then the renewed interest in genre theory and criticism is a commentary on our complicated era as well as an acknowledgment of the precarious state of our most enduring genres.

ENDNOTES

1. Rhetorical genres have been conceptualized in a variety of ways. While most scholars would agree that a genre is a class, kind, or category of discourse, the means by which rhetorical genres are particularized remains theoretically problematic. For example, genres have been delineated by their forms, audience expectations, functions, cultures, and situations. Moreover, few genre studies focus upon the same factors or embrace similar methodological principles. See Karlyn Kohns Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, eds., *Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action* (Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1976); B. L. Ware and Wil A. Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59 (1973): 273-283; Thomas D. Clark, "An Exploration of Generic Aspects of Contemporary American Christian Sermons," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 63 (1977): 384-394; Kathleen M. Jamieson, "The Standardization and Modification of Rhetorical Genres: A Perspective," *Genre* 8 (1975): 183-193; Jackson Harrell and Wil A. Linkugel, "On Rhetorical Genre: An Organizing Principle," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 11 (1978): 262-281; Carolyn R. Miller, "Genre as Social Action," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984): 151-167; Walter R. Fisher, "Genre: Concepts and Applications in Rhetorical Criticism," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44 (1980): 288-299; and Thomas Conley, "The Linnaean Blues: Thoughts on the Genre Approach," in *Form, Genre, and the Study of Political Discourse*, eds. Herbert W. Simons and Aram A. Aghazarian (Columbia, SC: U of South Carolina P, 1986) 59-78.
2. Stephen E. Lucas, "Genre Criticism and Historical Context: The Case of George Washington's First Inaugural Address," *The Southern Speech Communication Journal* 51 (1986): 354.
3. Roderick P. Hart, "Contemporary Scholarship in Public Address: A Research Editorial," *The Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (1986): 292.
4. Miller 151.
5. John H. Patton, "Generic Criticism: Typology at an Inflated Price," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 6 (1976): 5.
6. Thomas M. Conley, "Ancient Rhetoric and Modern Genre Criticism," *Communication Quarterly* 27 (1979): 53.
7. Lucas 354.
8. Ware and Linkugel 274.
9. Ware and Linkugel 274.
10. Noreen W. Kruse, "Motivational Factors in Non-Denial Apologia," *Central States Speech Journal* 28 (1977): 13-23.
11. Ware and Linkugel 274.
12. Ware and Linkugel 282-283.
13. See, for example, Sherry Devereaux Butler, "The Apologia, 1971 Genre," *Southern Speech Journal* 37 (1972): 281-289; James H. Jackson, "Clarence Darrow's Plea in Defense of Himself," *Western Speech* 20 (1956): 185-195; Howard Dorgan, "The Doctrine of Victorious Defeat in the Rhetoric of Confederate Veterans," *Southern Speech Journal* 38 (1972): 119-130; Wil A. Linkugel and Nancy Razak, "Sam Houston's Speech of Self-Defense in the House of Representatives," *Southern Speech Journal* 34 (1969): 263-275; Bower Aly, "The Gallows Speech: A Lost Genre," *Southern Speech Journal* 34 (1969): 204-213; and Jackson Harrell, B. L. Ware, and Wil A. Linkugel, "Failure of Apology in American Politics: Nixon on Watergate," *Speech Monographs* 42 (1975): 245-261.
14. Lawrence W. Rosenfield, "A Case Study in Speech Criticism: The Nixon-Truman Analogy," *Speech Monographs* 35 (1968): 449.
15. Ellen Reid Gold, "Political Apologia: The Ritual of Self-Defense," *Communication Monographs* 45 (1978): 306-316.
16. See Howard H. Martin, "A Generic Exploration: Staged Withdrawal, The Rhetoric of Resignation," *Central States Speech Journal* 27 (1976): 247-257; Gerald L. Wilson, "A Strategy of Explanation: Richard M. Nixon's August 8, 1974 Resignation Address," *Communication Quarterly* 24 (1976): 14-20; and Richard A. Katula, "The Apology of Richard M. Nixon," *Today's Speech* 23 (1975): 1-5.

17. Robert C. Rowland, "On Generic Categorization," *Communication Theory* 1 (1991): 131.

18. See Fisher; and Campbell and Jamieson.

19. Roland 133-134.

20. Roland 129.

21. Harrell and Linkugel 274-276.

22. Campbell and Jamieson, "Introduction" 27.

23. Rowland 140-141.

24. Donald F. Castro, "Tragedy, The Generic Approach: A Metacritical Look," *Genre* 7 (1974): 251.

25. See, for example, Alastair Fowler, "The Life and Death of Literary Forms," in *New Directions in Literary History*, ed. Ralph Cohen (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins U P, 1974) 77-94; Rosalie L. Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance* (Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1973); Edwin Black, "The Sentimental Style as Escapism, or the Devil with Dan'l Webster," in *Form and Genre* 75-86; Jamieson; and Kathleen Hall Jamieson and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Rhetorical Hybrids: Fusions of Generic Elements," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 146-157.

26. For a discussion of the purposes of genre criticism, see John F. Reichert, "'Organizing Principles' and Genre Theory," *Genre* 1 (1968): 1; Fisher 291; Campbell and Jamieson, "Introduction"; and Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton U P, 1957): 247-248.

27. Campbell and Jamieson 27.

28. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Introduction," *The Southern Speech Communication Journal* 51 (1986): 295.

29. Hart 292.

30. Herbert W. Simons and Aram A. Aghazarian, "Introduction," in *Political Discourse* 18.

31. Campbell and Jamieson 27.

32. Among those whose works follow the perspective espoused by Campbell and Jamieson are Harrell and Linkugel; Simons and Aghazarian; and Miller.

33. Obviously, Campbell and Jamieson's formulation is not the only way in which to conduct a generic analysis. Harrell and Linkugel, for example, identify four different modes of genre classification. However, because their perspective synthesizes the literature on genre criticism, adapts that literature specifically to the analysis of rhetoric, and accords value to both form and context, I find it to be the most appropriate method for this analysis.

34. Campbell and Jamieson 21.

35. Campbell and Jamieson 19.

36. Campbell and Jamieson's genre perspective stems in part from Bitzer's concept of rhetorical situation. See Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.

37. Simons and Aghazarian 7.

38. Simons and Aghazarian 7.

39. Campbell and Jamieson 20.

40. I interpret "internal dynamic" to mean the function of the genre. Although Campbell and Jamieson do not explicitly state this, they do note that a genre's internal dynamic accounts for both the "fusion of forms" and the unique character of a genre (21-22).

41. Roland argues that "genres are created out of the interaction of three related factors [needs, limiting purposes in confronting those needs, and societal limitations on appropriate rhetorical responses] . . . [which act to] create perceived strategic constraints . . . limit[ing] the options . . . open to rhetors" (134). Later, he notes that "situations that lead to the creation of stable genres consist of perceived needs, purposes, and societal limitations" (135).

42. I drew heavily on the apologies examined in Ware and Linkugel's essay.

43. This classification scheme is designed for ease of reading and organizing the analysis. The classical period encompasses approximately 1200 B.C. to 1 B.C., although the

speeches analyzed in this period cover from 430 B.C. to 330 B.C. The medieval period encompasses approximately 1000 to 1700, although the speeches analyzed in this period cover from 1500 to 1670. The modern period encompasses approximately 1700 to 1900, although the speeches analyzed in this period cover from 1780 to 1880. The contemporary period encompasses approximately 1900 to the present, although the speeches analyzed in this period cover from 1950 to the present.

44. Douglas Ehninger, "On Systems of Rhetoric," in *Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric: Selected Readings*, ed. Richard L. Johannesen (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) 328.

45. The data for classical apologias was collected from the following speeches: Socrates' "Apology," Pericles' "In Defense of Himself," Demosthenes' "On the Crown," Isocrates' "On the Antidotes," Lysias' "Defense on a Charge of Taking Bribes," and Antiphon's "On the Murder of Herodes."

46. Demosthenes, "On the Crown," in *The World's Famous Orations, Vol. 1*, ed. William Jennings Bryan (New York, NY: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906): 143-185.

47. Pericles, "In Defense of Himself," in *Famous Orations* 27-33.

48. Plato, "Socrates' 'Apology,'" *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito*, trans., F. J. Church (New York, NY: Bobbs-Merrill, 1956) 21-50.

49. Apologias analyzed in the medieval period include Martin Luther's "Luther Defends Himself at the Diet of Worms," Thomas Harrison's "Speech from the Scaffold," Thomas Wentworth's "Defense," Sir Thomas More's "Remarks at His Trial," and Thomas Cranmer's "Speech at the Stake."

50. Roland L. Stromberg, *A History of Western Civilization* (Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press, 1969) 296.

51. Charles Carlton, "The Rhetoric of Death: Scaffold Confessions in Early Modern England," *The Southern Speech Communication Journal* 49 (1983): 71-72.

52. This difference also accounts for the deletion of a strategy sometimes used in the classical period: there was little or no opportunity for the speaker to engage in a dialogic confrontation with the accuser.

53. Carlton 70.

54. Carlton 75-78.

55. Thomas Wentworth, "Defense," in *The World's Orators, Vol. 6*, ed. Guy Carleton Lee (New York, NY: G. P. Putnam & Sons, 1900) 49-63.

56. Martin Luther, "Luther Defends Himself at the Diet of Worms," in *Treasury* 85-89.

57. The following modern apologias were analyzed: John Brown's "A Martyr's Course," Jean Paul Marat's "Defense Against the Charges," Robert Emmet's "Protest Against Sentence as Traitor," Mirabeau's "Against the Charge of Treason," Moreau's "Speech in His Own Defense," Walpole's "On a Motion for Addressing the King for His Removal," Burke's "Attempts to Vindicate Himself Before His Estranged Constituents," and Robespierre's "Facing the Guillotine."

58. Stromberg 461, 512.

59. Stromberg 461.

60. Introduction to the speech of John Brown, "A Martyr's Course," in *Treasury* 499-500.

61. Robert Emmet, "Protest Against Sentence as Traitor," in *Treasury* 214-219.

62. Contemporary speeches analyzed until 1960 include Douglas MacArthur's "Old Soldier's Never Die," Richard M. Nixon's "Checker's Speech," Harry S. Truman's "His Side of the Case," Clarence Darrow's "Plea in Defense of Himself," Victor Hugo's "The Death Penalty," Eugene Debs "On Receiving Sentence," and Adlai Stevenson's "The Hiss Case." Speeches analyzed after 1960 include Edward Kennedy's "Chappaquiddick Speech," Richard M. Nixon's "Resignation Speech," and Jimmy Carter's "Rescue Attempt of the American Hostages in Iran."

63. Stromberg 632-633, 824-847.

64. Kenneth E. Boulding, *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century: The Great Transition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964) 1.

65. Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock* (New York: Random House, 1970) 18.

66. Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961).
67. Michael Calvin McGee, "Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54 (1990): 274-289.
68. Rosenfield labels such discourses "broadcast apologia."
69. Rosenfield 449.
70. Harry S. Truman, "His Side of the Case," *U.S. News and World Report*, 27 Nov. 1952: 38-40.
71. Douglas MacArthur, "Defense in Conduct of the War in Korea," in *Treasury* 816-821.
72. Richard M. Nixon, "Radio Address," *U.S. News and World Report*, 3 Oct. 1952: 66-70.
73. Gold 306-316.
74. Ware and Linkugel 278. The authors label these tendencies as "factors" or "modes of resolution" which combine to produce one of four postures of self-defense.
75. Gold 309.
76. Gold 309.
77. Robert A. Vartabedian, "Nixon's Vietnam Rhetoric: A Case Study of Apologia as Generic Paradox," *The Southern Speech Communication Journal* 50 (1985): 380.
78. Butler 287.
79. Gold 308, 315.
80. Vartabedian, "Nixon's Vietnam Rhetoric" 366.
81. In her analysis of post-Watergate apologia ("From 'All the President's Men' to Every Man for Himself: The Strategies of Post-Watergate Apologia," *Central States Speech Journal* 35 [1984]: 259), Carole Blair notes that the exigencies precipitating rhetoric were "artificially-created and self-serving."
82. Vartabedian, "Nixon's Vietnam Rhetoric" 378-379.
83. Butler 283.
84. David A. Ling, "A Pentadic Analysis of Senator Edward Kennedy's Address to the People of Massachusetts, July 25, 1969," *Central States Speech Journal* 21 (1970): 83. See also Kruse 22.
85. Gold 316.
86. Edward Kennedy, "Address to the People of Massachusetts," in Zad Rust, *Teddy Bare: The Last of the Kennedy Clan* (Boston, MA: Western Islands, 1971): 270-273.
87. Richard M. Nixon, "Resignation Speech," *U.S. News and World Report*, 19 Aug. 1974: 71-72.
88. James Carter, "President's Statement," *Department State Bulletin* 80 (1980): 38.
89. Ling 83-84.
90. Richard M. Nixon, "The Watergate Affair," *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 15 May 1973: 450-452. For a discussion of Nixon's penchant for shifting blame, see Robert A. Vartabedian, "From Checkers to Watergate: Richard Nixon and the Art of Contemporary Apologia," *Speaker and Gavel* 22 (1985): 52-61.
91. Robert L. King, "Transforming Scandal into Tragedy: A Rhetoric of Political Apology," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71 (1985): 290.
92. King 299. See also Vartabedian, "From Checkers," 60; and Wilson 14-20.
93. Gold 311, 313; Blair 258.
94. Gold 314.
95. Wilson 18; Butler 285; Ling 86.
96. Gold 316.
97. King 290.
98. Butler 287.
99. Martin 247-257.
100. Butler 288.
101. Gold 315.
102. Robert J. Connors, "Genre Theory in Literature," in *Political Discourse* 42.

Copyright of Western Journal of Communication is the property of Western States Communication Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.