

3. Sophist Project

Due: 5th class, 2/23 (R)—bring 4 copies

Mandatory Revision Due: 2/28 (T)—EMAIL me a copy before class

Optional Revision Last Possible Date: 4/20 (R)

Length: A 2-part essay (500-1000 total words, ~2-4 double-spaced total pages).

Case: The following scenario is adapted from Erasmus:

- A community offers a monetary reward for the murder of a tyrant. A man breaks into the tyrant's home, but the tyrant is away. Only the tyrant's son is at home. The intruder kills the tyrant's son. The tyrant returns to find his beloved son dead. The tyrant then commits suicide. In the ensuing days, there is a dispute over the reward, as some community members do not believe the man has rightfully earned the reward.

Directions:

- In the first section of your essay (250-500 words), argue that the man is entitled to the reward (use the heading *Deserves Reward*). Your audience are the members of the community.
- In the second section (250-500 words), argue that the man is not entitled to the reward (use the heading *Does Not Deserve Reward*). Your audience is the assassin and his friends.
- Each essay should be as convincing as you can make it—the point of this assignment is not for you to choose which position is more right; the point of the assignment is for you argue convincingly each position. If it helps, in the 1st section, imagine yourself as the lawyer representing the assassin; in the 2nd section, imagine yourself as the lawyer representing the community members who do not want to pay.
 - o Assumptions: Obviously the scenario above is sketchy. If you need to invent details to help your case, you must use the same details in both essays (i.e., you can NOT invent convenient details for “Deserves” and then create different details for “Does Not.”

Reminder: Your task is NOT to argue whether killing the tyrant is an ethical act. Your task is to argue that the community should (or should not) pay the reward.

**