**“KAKOU KORAKOS OON”:**

**Rhetoric & the Story of Corax vs. Tisias**

**The Scene: “**Corax (the teacher) and his private student, Tisias were reputedly the first Sophists. Like many young men with an appetite for the worldly success, Tisias sought training from Corax in the hope of being able to become wealthy by practicing the art of rhetoric/ persuasion in courts ( like to become a lawyer). Wishing to make sure he was not duped by his teacher, Tisias contracted to pay Corax only after he had actually won a law case. On this condition his training commenced and soon enough was over. Years went by, and Tisias brought no lawsuit against anyone. Corax had been willing to wait to be paid, but not forever, so he brought a suit against Tisias to recover his fee.”

**Tisias:** Your Honors, I stand before you today in humility of spirit and purity of motive. I ask only that your listen patiently and judge rightly in issuing your verdict.

Your Honors, I charge **Corax** for failing to teach me well the art of Rhetoric. The proof of this charge is here before us today. For if I should lose my case, it will surely proof that I was not taught Rhetoric very well. And this being the case, I should NOT have to pay for the tuition.

For on one should have to pay for services that weren’t rendered according to what was expected.

On the other hand, if I win the case, it shows that I had enough sense and talent to figure out the art of Rhetoric out on my own, despite the negligence of my instructor. But even this is not necessary to my case, for a ruling against **Corax** is a ruling for me. And a ruling for me means I do not have to pay tuition. In either case, then, I should NOT have to pay tuition.

**Corax:** Your Honors, I, too, stand humbly before you. I, too, recognize, in years far more experienced than that of my adversary, your outstanding record of prudent and just decision making on behalf of those whose cause is just. We are indeed fortunate to gain a hearing before you. This, then, is my case.

I have given **Tisias** the very best education in rhetoric of which I am capable, on the condition that he would at some point in his career pay my tuition. This he has not done. Now, if you rule against me – that is, if **Tisias** does in fact win his case – it serves to show that I taught him Rhetoric well, in which case he should be required to pay my tuition. If, however, **Tisias** does not win his case, that would show him to be a poor, or rather a bad student. (We already know he is poor.) Those who are wise, well know that a teacher is not to be faulted if, in discharging his services well and faithfully, the student is simply too stupid, or too lazy, (or too both) to take advantage of those services, expertly rendered.

But even this is unnecessary to my case. For a ruling against **Tisias** is a ruling in favor of me. Such a ruling would, of course, mean that **Tisias** must pay my tuition. In either case, then, my tuition should be paid.

**Who do you think will win the law case and why? Explain!**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**