

Figural Logic

10:00-12:50Th, AL 210

Randy Harris

Hagey Hall 247, x35362

Hours: T 12:30-2:00

Cell: (905) 699 7410

raha@uwaterloo.ca

<http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/~raha>

Rhetorical figures are epitomes of reasoning: metaphor epitomizes analogy; gradatio epitomizes series reasoning; metonymy epitomizes reasoning by example; antimetabole epitomizes reciprocal causality; ... There is an explanation for this. We think along the same grooves as we talk and write. Our minds are built to deploy, process, and store representations, and the *form* of those representations matter. The most productive forms are realized as rhetorical figures and argumentative strategies. We will look at argumentation, in all its forms, from poetry to op-ed pieces to scientific papers to graphics, through the lens of figuration.

Required texts

Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. *Rhetorical Figures and Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Turner, Mark. 2001. *The Literary Mind: The Origins of Thought and Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Theoretical, methodological, and object-text readings (broadly construed), as listed in the weekly schedule.

Recommended texts

Lanham, Richard A. 1991. *A handlist of rhetorical terms*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tindale, Christopher. 2004. *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

[A]syndeta have a special characteristic; many things seem to be said at the same time; for the connective makes many things seem one, so that if it is taken away, clearly the opposite results: one thing will be many.

—Aristotle of Stagirus,
The Rhetoric 1413^b

A note about the readings

Some of the texts we are using, as theoretical readings or as objects of analysis, that are not provided directly (through the course LEARN site, the bookstore, or reserves) are available through our library or over the internet (in one case with a minimal purchase price), but you will have to find them yourself. This minor research is one of the requirements of the course.

Requirements

<u>Essay</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>Presentations</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>"Participation"</u>	<u>20</u>
proposal	10	Epitome	15	Class discussion	10
peer-review draft	5	Critical analysis	15	Weekly posts	10
final submission	35				

Essaying

The research essay is not only your major project of the term (50%), it should be your major learning instrument of the term. If you haven't learned by this point that an essay is a way to think, not just a way to get grades, you're in the wrong place. In many ways, the other components of the course are the support system for your essay, and everyone else in the class, the professor most acutely, but all of the students too, are resources for developing your essay. The research and the way you explore, marshal, and extend that research in the writing process, is what defines your understanding of the course. You should start thinking from very early on about which aspects of figuration and which aspects of argumentation you want to essay, and which theorists and texts you might want to draw into the essay, and you should test drive some of your ideas and analyses in class, and in discussion with each other, inside and outside of class, in person, by email, or by phone. Heck, use the pony express if it's passing by.

In case this does not go without saying: While your work will rest on the foundations we build up throughout the course, do not rely solely on the course readings and the presentations. You will need to do more research both on any object texts you are considering and on the relevant aspects of figuration or argumentation theory you will deploy, as well as on any related literary and/or rhetorical theory.

Word counts are not an especially good measure of when you should stop writing your essay, or how far you should prune back your ramblings. Let the

matter determine the vessel. But if it's under 3000 words, you probably haven't developed enough matter for an appropriate graduate research essay; over 6000 and you've probably been either too ambitious or too undisciplined, or both.

You also need to target a publication with this essay: find a journal, write the paper with that journal in mind, and submit a memo with the essay outlining why your essay fits the journal. (Journals often have word-count criteria, by the way, along with citation requirements, formatting conventions, and so on; you will be graded in part on how well your essay suits the journal you target.)

There are three formal stages to essaying in this class: a proposal, a peer-review, and the final submission. **The proposal** should outline the question you want to address and the way you plan to address it (that is, it should sketch your planned argument), and it should survey the relevant research. I will grade it (as below) and we will discuss it. **The peer-draft** should give a relatively complete version of your argument. Send it to digitally to your assigned peer-reviewer, copying me. Peer-reviewers should read each other's essays critically (use the rubric below as a rough guideline), and should schedule at least two hours at your convenience to discuss them (about an hour per draft). **The final submission** should be ready for prime time. I strongly encourage you to submit your essays for publication, and I will grade it with such submission in mind.

Grading will accord with the following rubrics:

The proposal (out of 100):

Articulation of your thesis, 30

Research synopsis, 40

Style and grammar (sentence and paragraph structure, citation conventions, diction, spelling, punctuation, agreement, ...), 30

Due: 13 June 2013

The peer-review draft (out of 100):

Get a draft to your assigned peer-reviewer by 11 July, 100

Fail to get a draft to your assigned peer-reviewer by 11 July, 0

Due: 11 July 2013

The final submission (out of 100):

Articulation of your claim, 5

Suitability of the essay to the selected journal, 5

Quality of argument (coherence, soundness), 30

Use of evidence, 25

Summary of relevant research, 10

Grammar and style (sentence and paragraph structure, diction, spelling, punctuation, agreement, ...), 25

Due: 31 July 2013

Note: all submissions must include a digital copy.

Discussing

Please keep in mind that this is a seminar: you are expected to take an active role in the development of the course. Come to class prepared, contribute to discussions, participate in our collective growth in understanding figuration and argumentation. In particular, think reflectively about all the readings, and think publicly.

I will use a merit/demerit policy to evaluate your participation. Merit will be awarded primarily on the quality of participation: asking relevant questions; making relevant observations; complementing or advancing someone else's contribution; and generally being a constructive rhetor. Quantity of participation is a positive factor to the extent that more quality contributions is preferable to fewer quality contributions, but talking for the sake of talking is not a good idea. Demerit will be assessed reluctantly, and only on the basis of repeated instances. The grounds for the demerit system are:

- absenteeism (you can't participate if you're not there)
- whispering or chatting while other people are talking
- making lengthy, unfocused comments that draw away from the general thread of discussion (verbal wanking)

Please note: It is especially important not to ask long, discursive questions after the student presentations. Those periods are for the student presenters to elucidate their topics, not for the audience to make points (those can come later; the presentations enter the class lore and are always available for relevant discussion).

Posting (8 response posts required)

Note: You need to complete eight posts over eleven weeks. Which eight you submit are solely up to you, but they must be submitted on time.

The posts are 300-to-500-word opinionated summaries: synopses of the week's theoretical readings (not the object texts), inter-larded with some evaluation of their cogency, relevance, and value. I want to see (1) that you have read them, and (2) that you have thought about them; and (3) I want to see the discussion started before we get into the classroom. They should be posted on the LEARN course page by 6:00 PM on the Sunday before the class. Everyone is expected to read all the posts before coming to class; I also encourage commenting on one another's posts, as I will be doing occasionally myself, but it is not required.

The discussion papers will not be individually graded: you will get the full 10 simply for doing them all and submitting them on time, 5 if you miss one deadline, 0 if you miss more than one--yes, you read that correctly: 0. I consider the discussion papers integral to the life of the course.

Presenting

There will be two group presentations, a theoretical summary and a figure outline, in teams of two or three (depending on numbers); each of the teams you participate in must be different. The theoretical summary will outline a reading, pass judgment on its claims, and link those claims to other readings and concepts in the course. The figure outline will introduce a figure, or range of figures, relate it to concepts we take up in class, and show it in critical action (either with respect to object texts we have taken up in class, or with respect to popularly known texts (make sure it is well known; you won't want to waste much time describing it, though some quick reminders of its relevant attributes will be necessary, for popularly known texts as well as for course object texts).

The conditions of the theoretical-summary presentations are as follows:

- 15-20 minutes talking, with 20 as an absolute cap
- one presenter should give a précis of the reading and present the judgment
- one presenter should make connections to other concepts and readings (which should illustrate the précis and demonstrate the judgment

Raha@uwaterloo.ca; 519 888 4567, x35362

- 5-10 answering
- 25 minutes total as an absolute max
- no digital aids (handouts and board fine, e.g.; power-point not)

The conditions of the critical presentations are as follows:

- 20 minute absolute cap
- ≤10 minutes (one presenter) describing, defining, and exemplifying the figure, with any cultural or cognitive implications
- ≤10 minutes (one presenter) applying the chosen figure in an extended way to a relevant artifact
- no questions
- no digital aids (handouts and board fine, e.g.; power-point not)

Grading for both will accord with the following rubric (out of 100):

- Articulation of your judgment / figure, 20
- Support of your judgment / figure, 20
- Quality of argument (coherence, soundness), 20
- Use of evidence, 20
- Style and performance (clarity, professionalism, aids), 20

Readings for student presentations

- 16 May Jakobson, Roman. (1995 [1956].) "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Disturbances". In Linda Waugh and Monique Monville-Burston. *On Language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 95-114.
- 23 May Turner, Mark. 2001. Chapter 1, "Bedtime with Shahrazad."
- 30 May Turner, Mark. 2001. Chapter 1, "Human Meaning."
- 13 June Tindale, Christopher. 2004. *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Chapter 3, "Argument as Rhetoric ..."
- 20 June Tindale, Chapter 3, "..And Rhetoric as Argument"
- 27 June Turner, Mark. 1998. "Figure." In Katz, Cacciari, Gibbs, and Turner, eds. *Figurative Language and Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 44-87.

Academic Integrity

Members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to both follow and promote principles of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. That includes me as much as you (which is one of the reasons I spell things out in this much detail). If you think any aspect of my conduct, including teaching, marking, and counseling, is unfairly detrimental to you or the class in general, you have not only the right but the obligation to let me, the English Department Chair, or the Dean of Arts, know about it, whomever you are most comfortable speaking with or you feel most appropriate for hearing your views and their reasons. I will be just as scrupulous in my observations of your conduct and your assignments, and if I find you to be dishonest, unfair, or irresponsible, the matter will be reported, and consequences will follow.

The late policy is simple: don't be. If personal concerns, including health issues, prevent you from meeting a deadline, contact me ahead of time to make arrangements; if unforeseen circumstances prevent you from meeting a deadline, contact me when you are able and we can work something out. Please note that bad planning, conflict with assignments in other courses, and video-game addictions (to list a few attested reasons offered by students in the past) are not interpretable as personal concerns.

Discipline: You are expected to know what constitutes academic integrity [check Academic Integrity at UW] to avoid committing an academic offence, and to take responsibility for your actions. You have taken the Academic Integrity Workshop and signed the integrity agreement, but if you remain unsure whether a given action constitutes an offence, or if you need help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about "rules" for group work/collaboration, please ask me, or another academic advisor, or the Associate Dean in Arts for Graduate Studies. Ignorance is not a defence. For information on categories of offences and types of penalties, refer to Policy 71, Student Discipline. For typical penalties check Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties.

Appeals: A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 (Student Petitions and Grievances) (other than a petition) or Policy 71 (Student Discipline) may be appealed if there is a ground. If a judgement falls against

you and you feel you have a ground for an appeal, please refer to Policy 72 (Student Appeals).

Grievances: Any student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70, Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4. When in doubt please be certain to contact the department's administrative assistant who will provide further assistance.

Note for Students with Disabilities: The Office for Persons with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the OPD at the beginning of each academic term.

A note about the schedule

Unfortunately for the class, I have to be away at a conference for the first week in June; no class and no office hours that week. Your posting obligations remain the same, though I would naturally expect a bit more cross-talk among the posts, since you won't have a chance to discuss your opinions in class. I will monitor the posts from afar, and will add my own chatter as appropriate.

Schedule

	Date	Primary texts	Object texts
	9 May	Bredin, Hugh. 1992. "The Literal and the Figurative" <i>Philosophy</i> 67.259, 69-80.	
Tropes	16 May	Burke, Kenneth. 1941. "The Four Master Tropes." <i>The Kenyon Review</i> 3. 4, 421-438.	Levant, Ezra. Rant (video)
	23 May	Lakoff, George. 1993. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." <i>Metaphor and Thought</i> (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 202-251.	<i>3rd Race at The Honeymoon Is Over Downs</i> (video)
	30 May	Bredin, Hugh. 1984. "Metonymy." <i>Poetics Today</i> 5.1, 45-58.	Lubitsch, Ernst. <i>To be or not to be</i> (movie)
	6 June	Fahnestock, Jeanne. 2004. "Figures of Argument." <i>Informal Logic</i> 24.2, 115-135. (No class meeting; no office hours)	
	13 June	Nerlich, Brigitte. 2010. "Synecdoche: A Trope, a Whole Trope, and Nothing but a Trope?" <i>Tropical Truth(s)</i> . Berlin: De Gruyter, 297-320. (Proposal due)	Newton, Isaac. "A Letter of Mr. Isaac Newton ... containing his New Theory about Light and Colours" (print)
Schemes	20 June	Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. Chapter 1, "The Figures as Epitomes"	Waits, Tom. "Christmas Card from a Hooker in Minneapolis" (audeo)
	27 June	Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. Chapter 2, "Antithesis."	Seuss, Dr. <i>The Zax</i> (print)
	4 July	Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. Chapter 3, "Incrementum and Gradatio."	Mirandola, Pico Della. "Oration on the Dignity of Man" (print)
	11 July	Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. Chapter 4, "Antimetabole." (Peer-draft due)	Carlin, George. "Stuff." (video)
	18 July	Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. Chapter 5, "Ploche and Polyptoton."	Hitchens, Christopher. "The New Commandments" (video and print)
	25 July	Harris, Randy. 2013. "Figural Logic in Gregor Mendel's Experiments on Plant Hybrids." <i>Philosophy & Rhetoric</i> .	

Raha@uwaterloo.ca; 519 888 4567, x35362