

English 788

Cognitive Stylistics

WINTER 2018

Wednesdays, 11:30-02:20, HH 344

RANDY HARRIS

Hagey Hall 247, x35362

Office hours: Monday, 10:00-11:30, Thursday, 10:00-11:30

Cell: (905) 699-7410

RAHA@UWATERLOO.CA

COURSE EPITOME

We will study the way your mind makes and responds to the linguistic configurations called rhetorical figures. You make and respond to metaphors the way you do because your mind is tuned to analogy; you make and respond to metonymies the way you do because your mind is tuned to correlation; you make and respond to antitheses the way you do because your mind is tuned to opposition; you make and respond to ... well, you get the picture. Why? Because you're really good at recognizing, predicting, and completing patterns (in this case, the linguistic configuration known as *reprotia*). Why? Because you're a human, with a human mind, and your mind is a style machine. **You** are a style machine.

Evaluation will depend on two components: participation in discussions and a paper of publishable length and quality. The essay will be a rhetorical analysis of some scientific discourse. Collaborations are encouraged, but only with prior approval.

SNACK SCHEDULE

It is unconscionable to have class in prime comestible time, 11:30-2:00, without adequate refueling opportunities, so we will set up a snack schedule; I'll go first, and a sign-up sheet has been provided for the remaining days.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Assigned readings, as specified on the schedule.¹

RECOMMENDED TEXTS

(There are lots of good books on reserve; all of them are recommended, depending on your interests and the direction your research takes.)

¹ Most of the essays are all available through our library's digital subscriptions or freely available through such sites as *Internet Archives* or *ResearchGate*. But you will need to find them yourselves, individually or collectively. I could assemble them myself. In fact, I *have* assembled them myself, but this is a research assignment. If you are a good researcher, it won't take long. If you aren't a very good researcher yet, then this assignment will be good preparation for your major essay, which puts a premium on research. (Note: you don't have to chase the essays down on your own; good research is frequently collaborative, and good researchers often need help—for instance, by the excellent librarians we have on campus, and by the excellent students around you.) Some advice: gather the essays early on, maybe by dividing up the labour and sharing the results. Don't wait until the week the readings are due to find the essays. I would do it in the first week, if I were you. The essays that *aren't* available through our library, I provide via the course Learn site.

Cognitive Stylistics

JOB DESCRIPTION

Participation	50%
class engagement	15%
proposal presentation	10%
proposal response	10%
weekly posts	15%
Essay (due 11 April)	50%
proposal (due 26 February)	10%
final submission	40%

PARTICIPATION

This is a seminar: you are expected to take an active role in building and delivering the course. We're in this together, to learn from one another.

15 % of your participation mark will come from your active engagement with the issues in the class.

I will use a merit/demerit policy to evaluate your in-class participation. **Merit** will be awarded primarily on the quality of participation: asking relevant questions; making relevant observations; complementing or developing someone else's contribution; and generally being a constructive 788 citizen. Quantity of participation is a positive factor to the extent that more quality contributions are preferable to fewer quality contributions, but quantity on its own is not rewarded. **Demerit** will be assessed reluctantly, and only on the basis of repeated instances (and, admittedly, I don't have much history in assigning demerit points; this warning is usually enough, and, in any case, I'm sure you're a lovely person). The grounds for the demerit system are: absenteeism (you can't participate if you're not here); whispering or chatting while other people are talking; and/or making lengthy, unfocused comments that draw away from the general thread of discussion.

20 % of your participation mark will come from a Proposal Presentation (10%) and a Proposal Response (10%)

The **14 March** class will be extended for a mini-conference format. We will meet in **RCH 208, 10:00-4:00**. It will be given over to presentations and responses about essay proposals. You will need to have a firm idea in mind about what you will write on, and you will present it to the class. You will also need to write up that proposal, submitting one copy to me, one to a respondent (I will work up **an exchange list by 7 March**). The respondent will comment on the proposal, offering criticisms and suggestions. Please note that **the proposals are due to me on 26 February**, and then to your respondents by **9 March** (with any revisions you choose, but still keeping to word limits) to give the respondents time to work up their own presentations.

Please note that the proposal you hand in (discussed a little further on down the line) and the Proposal Presentation (discussed immediately below) are graded independently.

Cognitive Stylistics

Presentation The conditions of the Proposal Presentation are as follows:

- 10-15 minutes talking, with 15 as an absolute cap
 - about 5 minutes on your thesis
 - about 5 minutes on research (evidence, related analyses, contribution to the field)
- 5-10 answering (after the response)
- 20 minutes total as an absolute max
- no digital aids (handouts and board fine, e.g.; power-point not)
- reading your proposal is wrong, wrong, wrong (you can prepare notes, of course, and even read an argument, if that makes you comfortable, but this is a presentation of what your essay will be about, not a verbatim rendition of the proposal); the written word and the spoken word are different animals.

Grading for the Proposal Presentation will accord with the following rubric:

Clarity and precision: 25%

Professionalism (including satisfying the conditions): 25%

Style (verbal): 25%

Delivery (physical, including use of aids): 25%

Response The conditions of the Proposal Response are as follows:

- 8-10 minutes talking, with 10 as an absolute cap
 - c2 minutes on the thesis
 - c3 minutes on evidence and related analyses
 - c3 minutes on contribution to the field
- no digital aids (handouts and board fine, e.g.; power-point not)
- written response must provided to essayist and to me at the end of the 11 March class

Grading for the Response will accord with the following rubric:

Benefit to the proposer: 80%

omissions, inaccuracies, errors, 40%

opportunities, successes, promise, 40%

Style & Delivery: 20%

Posts 15% of your participation mark will come from your completion of weekly posts (which will not be graded).

The posts are 300-to-400-word opinionated summaries (with one exception): synopses of the week's readings, inter-larded with some evaluation of their cogency, relevance, and value. I want to see (1) that you have read the material, (2) that you have thought about it; and (3) that you have something to say about it. On the several weeks when there is more than one essay to

Cognitive Stylistics

read, you need to focus your posting on one, but draw in the others as you see fit. Your postings should go on the LEARN course site by **11:00 AM on the Monday before the class**. Everyone is expected to read each other's 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. I want the discussion started before we get into the classroom.

You need to make **six postings**, on whichever weeks you choose (one exception, as below). If you make the six postings, by their deadlines, you will get the full 15%. If you make five postings, by their deadlines, you will get 10%. If you make fewer than five postings, or you miss two deadlines, you will get 0% (that's right, 0%).

The exception to the optionality is the **19 March** posting (that is, the one due the week of our 21 March class, which is where it shows up on the schedule). This one is required. It is also free-lance, in the sense that it is not tied to course readings. It must be an article related to your research essay for the class. Remember that your audience will likely not have read it/them, which makes your rhetorical burden somewhat different.

RESEARCH ESSAY

The research essay, due on **11 April**, a week after the final class, is not only your major project of the term (50%), it should be your major learning instrument of the term. In many ways, all the rest of the course is a support system for the essay, and everyone else in the class, the professor and the students, are resources for the development of *your* essay. The research and the way you explore, marshal, and extend that research in the writing process, are what defines your understanding of the material we take up. You should start thinking from very early on about which texts, which cognitive or figurative domains you want to focus on, which genre or theory or perspective you might want to develop arguments around and about, and you should start test driving some of those arguments in class, or in discussion with the rest of us outside of class, in person, by email, or by phone.

Word counts are not an especially good measure of when you should stop writing your essay, or how far you should prune back your profusions. 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 7000 and you've probably been either too ambitious or too undisciplined, or both; meanwhile, see the following section.

You need to target a publication with this essay: find a journal, plan the paper with that journal in mind, and include that information in your proposal, and submit a covering memo with the essay outlining why it 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.) The most appropriate journals are ones in rhetorical theory and criticism, but many literary journals are appropriate, including specialist ones on an author or period, if you are doing a critical reading, as well as some psychology or philosophy of mind journals.

Cognitive Stylistics

Peer Review There will be two rounds of peer reviewing for your essay. The first, as above, is in the context of the mini-conference and concerns only the proposal. The second, due on **26 March**, will be in the context of the Writing Workshop (two days later, on 28 March). This one will not be graded. I advise you to follow the Golden Rule on this one: review as you would wish to be reviewed: rigorously and courteously, aiming to improve the essay as much as possible both for the context of the course (improving its chances for a high grade) and the context of the profession (improving its chances for publication).

Proposal The essay proposal, due on **26 February**, should identify the thesis you will be arguing, an account of how it fits into the relevant literature, the basic structure of your argument, the trajectory your research will take, preliminary research, the journal you are targeting, and the reasons why your project is suitable for that journal. It should be no more than a page of your own format (please God, though, not a crammed, 9-point text, single-space, no-margin block of ink), plus another page for references and bibliography.

Grading will accord with the following rubrics:

Essay Proposal

Articulation of your thesis	2%	10%
Relevance to literature/ appropriateness to journal	3%	
Research synopsis	3%	
Style and grammar (sentence and paragraph structure, citation conventions, diction, spelling, punctuation, agreement, ...)	2%	

Essay

Articulation and framing of your thesis	5%	40%
Research (quality of sources; scale of coverage; appropriateness to topic)	10%	
Evidence (quotation, paraphrase, citation)	10%	
Argumentation (relevance, coherence, structure)	7.5%	
Style and grammar (as above)	7.5%	

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; one of the reasons that I spell things out in this much detail in our syllabus is to make our mutual responsibilities as clear as possible. If you think any aspect of my conduct, including teaching, marking, and counseling, is unfairly detrimental to you or the class in general, or inhibits your ability to thrive, you have not only the right but the obligation to let me, the English Department Chair, and/or the Dean of Arts, know about it, whomever you are most comfortable speaking with or you feel is the most appropriate for hearing your views and their reasons. I will, in

Cognitive Stylistics

turn, endeavour to ensure your conduct is ethical and professional, towards me, each other, and all relevant texts.

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.

Please note that the essay in particular comes with over three months to work on, and plenty of in-course scaffolding to assist your completion. I realize you have other courses and other assignments, and that not everyone works at the same pace or in the same frame of mind, but there is sufficient time and there are sufficient resources, for you to submit the essay on time.

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 satisfied the Academic Integrity criteria for your degree, I know, but if you are at all unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, if you need help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating, bullying), or you are unclear about the appropriate conduct for group work/collaboration please seek guidance from me, from the Associate Chair, Graduate Studies, or the Associate Dean of Arts, Graduate Studies. But ignorance is not a defence for ethical transgressions. For information on categories of offences and types of penalties, refer to [Policy 71, Student Discipline](#). For penalty criteria, check [Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties](#).

Appeals: A decision made or penalty imposed under [Policy 70 \(Student Petitions and Grievances\)](#) or [Policy 71 \(Student Discipline\)](#) may be appealed if there are grounds. If you believe you have grounds for an appeal refer to [Policy 72 \(Student Appeals\)](#).

Grievances: If you believe that a decision affecting some aspect of your university life has been unfair or unreasonable you 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 Graduate Coordinator who will provide further assistance.

Note for Students with Disabilities: The Office for AccessAbility Services, 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 AccessAbility Services at the beginning of each academic term.

Schedule

Dates	Topics	Readings	Assignments
3 Jan	Hello; how are you? Why are we here?		
10 Jan	Your brain on rhetoric	Dissanayake (2001), Jack (2010), Jack & Appelbaum (2010), Jacobs (2015); 70pp	Weekly posting
17 Jan	Burkeana	Burke (1925, 1968 [1931], 1941) 89pp	Weekly posting
24 Jan	Cognitive Poetics	Harrison & Stockwell (2014), Jacobs (2017), Pandit & Hogan (2006), Tsur (1996); 67pp	Weekly posting
31 Jan	Cognitive Rhetoric	Fahnestock (2005), Gregg (1984), Kearns (1996), Eubanks (2008); 82pp	Weekly posting
7 Feb	Rhetorical Figures	Bredin (1992), Harris & Di Marco (2017), Turner (1997); 74pp	Weekly posting
14 Feb	Study day		
21 Feb	Study week		
28 Feb	Cognitive Narrative	Fludernik (2010), Zunshine (2011); 26pp	Essay proposal <u>Due 26 Feb</u>
7 Mar	Cognitive Criticism	William (2012); 19pp	Weekly posting
14 Mar	Mini Conference in RCH 208, 10:00-4:00		
21 Mar	Rhetoric of Science	Fahnestock (1996); 27pp	Weekly posting (freelance)
28 Mar	Your Essays	Writing Workshop	Peer Response <u>Due 26 Mar</u>
4 April	Progress reports, discussion; so long and thanks for all the fish.		
11 April	Essay due		

References

- Bredin, Hugh. 1992. The literal and the figurative. *Philosophy* 67.259, 69-80.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1925. Psychology and form. *The Dial* 79 (July), 34-46. (Also in *Counter-statement*, pp.29-44.)
- Burke, Kenneth. 1941. Four master tropes. *The Kenyon Review* 3.4, 421-438. (Also in *Grammar of Motives*, pp. 503-517.)
- Burke, Kenneth. 1968 [1931]. Lexicon rhetoricae. *Counter-statement*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 123-183.
- Dissanayake, Ellen. 2001. Becoming Homo Aestheticus: Sources of aesthetic imagination in mother-infant interactions. *SubStance* 30.1/2, 85-103.
- Eubanks, Philip. 2008. An analysis of corporate rule in globalization discourse: Why we need rhetoric to explain conceptual figures. *Rhetoric Review* 27.3, 236-258.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1996. Series reasoning in scientific argument: "Incrementum and gradatio" and the case of Darwin. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 26.4, 13-40. (This is also Chapter 3, "Incrementum and gradatio" in *Rhetorical figures in science*, pp.86-121.)
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. 2005. Rhetoric in the age of cognitive science. In Graff, Richard (ed). *The viability of rhetoric*. New York: State University of New York Press, 159-180.
- Fludernik, Monika. 2010. Narratology in the twenty-first century: The cognitive approach to narrative. *PMLA*125.4, 924-930.
- Gregg, Richard B. 1984. Perception, knowing, and symbolic inducement: The beginnings. *Symbolic inducement and knowing: A study in the foundations of rhetoric*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 25-51.
- Harris, Randy Allen, & Chrysanne Di Marco. 2017. Rhetorical figures, arguments, computation. *Argument & Computation* 8.3, 211-231.
- Harrison, Chloe, & Peter Stockwell. 2014. Cognitive poetics. In J. Littlemore & J.R. Taylor (eds). *The Bloomsbury companion to cognitive linguistics*. London: Bloomsbury, 218-233.
- Jack, Jordynn. 2010. What are neuro rhetorics? *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 40.5, 405-410.
- Jack, Jordynn, & L. Gregory Appelbaum. 2010. "This is your brain on rhetoric:" Research directions for neuro rhetorics. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 40.5, 411-437.
- Jacobs Arthur M. 2015. Neurocognitive poetics: Methods and models for investigating the neuronal and cognitive-affective bases of literature reception. *Frontiers of Human Neuroscience* 9.186.
- Jacobs Arthur M. 2017. Quantifying the beauty of words: A neurocognitive poetics perspective. *Frontiers of Human Neuroscience* 11.622.
- Kearns, Michael. 1996. Reading novels: Toward a cognitive rhetoric. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 26.3, 17-30.
- Pandit, Lalita, & Patrick Hogan. 2006. Morsels and modules: On embodying cognition in Shakespeare's plays. *College Literature* 33.1, 1-13.
- Turner, Mark B., 1997. Figure. *Figurative language and thought*, Cristina Cacciari, Ray Gibbs, Jr., Albert Katz & Mark Turner (eds). Toronto: Oxford University Press, 44-87.
- Tsur, Reuven. 1996. Rhyme and cognitive poetics. *Poetics Today*17.1, 55-87.
- William, J. 2012. Cognitive poetics and common ground in a multicultural context: The poetry of Zehra Çirak. *The German Quarterly* 85.2, 173-192.
- Zunshine, Lisa. 2011. What to expect when you pick up a graphic novel. *SubStance* 40.1, 114-134.