

The rhetoric of science meets the science of rhetoric

Thirty years before the beginning of the still ongoing cognitive revolution, Kenneth Burke articulated a universalist programme of verbal resources that falls into close synch with many of the findings and principles of that revolution. In this paper, I connect Burke's programme to the insights of Jeanne Fahnestock in her work on figuration and argumentation, and argue that cognitive rhetoric in this mode can undergird rhetoric of science.

Keywords: Burke, Fahnestock, cognitive science, figuration, rhetoric of science

Short title: Science of rhetoric

Yes. I know. You've heard this before.

Every generation or two, some rhetorician wants to put on a lab coat and declares rhetoric is a science. Herb Simons wrote a paper with a similar title at the very beginnings of the rhetoric-of-science movement (1978); and Alan Gross has weighed in, as well (1993). A hundred years before them, David J. Hill wrote a textbook entitled *The science of rhetoric: an introduction to the laws of effective discourse*, intimating that suasion worked pretty much like gravity. We can go further back. An anonymous biographer of Aristotle dates "the science of rhetoric" to our very disciplinary origins, to Aristotle, who founded the field on "scientific principles," in striking contrast to the loose unmethodical approach of Isocrates, who "professed to teach [rhetoric] by mere practice in the schools, as boxing and fencing might be learnt" ("Aristotle," 144). We've been down this road before.

But.

Anonymous has a point. Among the many streams in the rhetorical tradition, there are prominent, divergent courses between the impulse to *understand* persuasion and the impulse to *achieve* persuasion, and those two motives date to the very first writings in the field.¹ Aristotle and Isocrates were animated by both

¹ I certainly don't mean by this that the two enterprises shaped by these impulses—*rhetoric docens* and *rhetoric utens*—do not mutually inform each other, only that they may be, and frequently are, pursued independently (or, more accurately, since it is impossible that the one does

impulses, of course. The division is not as clean and absolute as Anonymous would have it, nor as I am adumbrating in these very brief observations. But Anonymous is clearly right to identify the Aristotelian approach, framed by the man who did so much to anchor the core empirical and formal enterprises that now wear the term *science* so comfortably—physics, biology, geology—is oriented more fully toward understanding, and, for that reason, has a higher claim on that god-term, *science*.

Now, we all know the various and scattered moves to propagate the colligation *science of rhetoric* have been somewhat less successful than for the reverse colligation, *rhetoric of science*. There is no ASTR, no Association for the Science and Technology of Rhetoric. What's different now? What snake oil is Harris selling? The cognitive sciences.

What I propose, in this brief position paper, is to (1) warrant the sub-field, cognitive rhetoric, and (2) connect this sub-field to rhetoric of science, while (3) reconfiguring Kenneth Burke, and (4) riding shamelessly on the coattails of Jeanne Fahnestock.

Cognitive rhetoric, in its fundaments, begins with Kenneth Burke, though its presence has clearly been felt at least as far back as Hesiod, whose princes made sorrows disappear with their sweet flowing speech; or as Gorgias, who likened the psychological results of suasive tools to the physiological affect of the pharmacopoeia; or as Plato, who complained that certain forms of speech appealed to the mind as tasty food to the tongue. Physiology is never far away when these aspects of language—affect, delight, enchantment—are commended or condemned. Burke, who shared the concerns of the ancients for the medicinal as well as the toxic aspects of rhetoric, articulated a programme resting on the axiom that the *form* signification assumes profoundly affects the way human organisms respond to it.

In a language of “human appetites” and aesthetic “desires” (1931, 34-35), Burke charted the semiotic factors that shape the response of humans to language and symbol systems generally.² He was uncomfortable with absolutes, and the

not implicate the other, that they are pursued with one heavily dominant, the other heavily subordinate).

² If we were to adopt a fully Burkean terminology for this project, we would have to call it “cognitive grammar,” since he locates this area of his research in “formal considerations logically prior to both the rhetorical and the psychological” (1969 [1945], xviii). But, (1) *cognitive grammar* is already taken, by an intriguingly overlapping but very differently oriented framework, in linguistics; and (2) Burke’s use of *rhetoric* (as revealed in all of his work, but most expressly identified in *Rhetoric of motives*) is utterly dependent on the “universal resources of verbal placement” (1969 [1950], 22)—that is, on style—which he identifies with grammar. His relevant

terministic apparatus of cognitive science post-dates his work in these areas by decades, but he makes the point penetratingly in this well-travelled passage from *Grammar of motives* that there is something “universal” about certain structures of signification:

[Certain patterns of signification invite our participation because they] awaken an attitude of collaborative expectancy in us. For instance, imagine a passage built about a set of oppositions ("we do this, but they on the other hand do that; we stay here; but they go there; we look up, but they look down," etc.) Once you grasp the trend of the form, it invites participation regardless of the subject matter. Formally, you will find yourself swinging along with the succession of antitheses, even though you may not agree with the proposition that is being presented in this form. ... [A] yielding to the form prepares for assent to the matter identified with it. Thus, you are drawn to the form, not in your capacity as a partisan, but because of some "universal" appeal in it. (Burke 1969 [1945], 58).

Burke shows very clearly here how swinging along with the form provides a rhythm that can easily get us swinging along with the proposition. It awakens an attitude in us of collaboration with the rhetor, very much like a dance, in which we step and sway as the rhetor directs us; collaborating, but inequitably: led. Burke's concern, very much like Plato's, is that being directed in a series of movements by the ‘form’ will get us moving with the ‘matter’ as well. The collaboration is really a highly inequitable faux collaboration; puppetry might make a better analogy than dance.

The question Burke opens up here is how do minds function when they are exposed to the traditional furniture of rhetoric: patterns of concepts and patterns of sounds; in a word, *style*. What are the sources of the "universal" appeal that Burke charts? What is it about the human organism that resonates to successions and to oppositions, and even more fully to successions of oppositions? And to the other collective factors in this passage, left unmentioned by Burke? Let's take the charting a bit further:

work is also chronologically prior to the cognitive revolution. The later stages of Burke's career overlapped with that (still ongoing) revolution, but the positions in his work I am drawing on predate it by several decades. In that period, his direct contact with psychology (virtually *everyone's* direct contact with psychology) engaged either psychoanalysis or behaviorism. The first Burke found amenable with certain currents of motivation, but did not link them to his ‘grammar’. The second he never tired of attacking (an attitude adopted by the first wave of cognitivists—George Miller, Jerome Bruner, Noam Chomsky). Like those early cognitivists, he regarded behaviorism as an exclusively zoological enterprise, whose results had nothing of consequence to say about the human mind. For Burke (in a position advocated by the cognitivists, in apparent ignorance of Burke's arguments), the unbreachable divide was the human use of symbols (see esp., 1966 [1963], 3ff).

- we do this, but they on the other hand do that;
- we stay here; but they go there;
- we look up, but they look down;

It is quickly clear that succession and opposition are not the only “universal resources of verbal placement” (Burke 1969 [1950], 22) the passage deploys. Parallelism is also at work here. Both the succession and the opposition, which mutually reinforce each other, are further bolstered by synchronized rhythmic repetitions. Brute lexical repetition adds another factor to the rhetorical (or ‘grammatical’) pull of the passage, with the three *we*’s, the three *they*’s, pivoted by the three *but*’s, and joined by two *do*’s, two *look*’s. Phonological repetition lends a hand, partially entailed by the lexical repetitions (same words, same sounds), partially augmented by the number of vowels and consonants that make repeat appearances in different words. There are also conceptual repetitions galore, in the precisely repeated words themselves (same words, same concepts), but also in the pairs of antonyms, each of which references the same semantic domain—*down* repeats vertical direction, referenced by *up*; *there* repeats spatial proximity to the rhetor, referenced by *here*; *that* repeats relative-valence-to-rhetor, referenced by *this*. Formal location is also important to the passage, as the repetitions, both syntactically and lexically, concentrate in certain places, mostly beginnings (of phrases or words), also middles. Equally crucial, as well, is that all of these verbal resources are (temporally and/or spatially) proximal to one another. The fact that the oppositions are cheek-by-jowl increases their salience (and, of course, the same is true for the repetitions). Compare, for instance, this succession of antithetical propositions:

- we do this, and we stay here;
- but they go there and we look up;
- they on the other hand do that, and they look down.

If not for the counter-example of an infinite number of power-point presentations, one would almost be tempted to abandon bullets here, the phrasing has fallen so dramatically out of synch. The slight rearrangement causes so much verbal dissonance that these pairings do not easily belong side-by-side. We still have “a set of oppositions” here, in Burke’s description. The specific oppositional pairings, along with the overall thematic *we/they* division, can certainly be reconstructed, and form inevitably plays a substantial role in pointing the way to such a reconstruction (the similarity of the deictics, and of the prepositions, and the identity of full-court repetitions, all exert strong forces of adhesion here). But there is much less of the waltz in this second version, much more of something like hide-and-seek; less collaboration, more wrangle. (Correspondingly, Burke might point out, there is less danger of being pushed and pulled around the rhetor’s dance floor.)

The factors at work in Burke's passage—repetition, contrast, parallelism (a particular order of repetition), position, and proximity (along with a few others, like symmetry, similarity, and transitivity)—are the staples of rhetorical style. The instances of these factors in Burke's little example all have venerable names: antithesis, isocolon, assonance, alliteration, epanaphora, mesodiplosis, ... Burke's collaborative expectancy, in short, is built out of rhetorical figures. Here is my cognitive claim, then: rhetorical figures operate in the grooves of the mind. But not only figures: topoi (which Fahnestock has shown to bear systematic correspondences to figures), narrative (which is a kind of ‘succession’ in Burke's terms, and which allows for a wide array plot ‘curves’ through interaction with other factors, like opposition and progression), syllogisms (which are inconceivable without semantic repetition and transitivity); in sum, the whole assortment of verbal and semiotic resources involved in human “efforts to discover and share warrantable assent” (Booth 1971, 106). Rhetoric. Is. Cognitive.

What is new here, you ask? Burke was, after all, working on these ideas in the twenties and thirties. But Burke was working with a wholly untethered notion of universality. That's one of the reasons he puts *universal* in safety-quotes in the passage above. In the last five decades, however, the cognitive sciences have developed a variety of frameworks for investigating the shared structures of brain and of mind that define the human organism. Unsurprisingly, there are compelling overlaps among these frameworks and Burkean formalism. The most celebrated of these overlaps (including in much philosophy of science) is similarity; or, as it is so widely known in such studies, metaphor. But all four of the “master tropes” in one of Burke's set pieces (1969 [1941], 503-517), have received cognitive attention, chiefly among linguists. Schemes, with even more striking cognitive implications, have gone unnoticed, and present very rich research possibilities. We know, for instance, that the brain operates at the most elemental level on repeated neural firings, in repetitious constellations. Repetition is one of the most pervasive aspects of schemes (and some tropes). We know that edges are important perceptually, to the cognitive systems of vision and audition especially. Visual boundaries between objects and non-objects and auditory boundaries between notes and between speech phones are zones of special salience. Schematic activity, as we have seen in Burke's *we/they* passage, clusters at the boundaries of phrases (epanaphora and epistrophe, most obviously, but also mesodiplosis, which regularly marks the junctions between phrases) and words (alliteration is at the beginnings of words, rhyme usually at the end); theories of arrangement stress beginnings and ends of speeches, and transitions between sections.

The research potentials in cognitive rhetoric are very broad. Cross-cultural rhetoric, for instance, can be central in exploring these “universal resources,”

uncovering the different instantiations the factors play in the aesthetic and suasive regimes of different languages and cultures. Developmental rhetoric—as far as I know, a wholly imaginary (sub-)discipline—is tremendously ripe. Any body with more than ten seconds exposure to children knows that they thrive on repetition. But how does it manifest? When does analogic reasoning appear? Is personification linked to Theory of Mind? Apostrophe? Irony? Degenerative rhetoric—also currently a figment of my imagination—is equally ripe, and perhaps more urgent. Do repetitions, schematic placements, and rhythmic intonations, aid dementia patients in understanding or retention? Do Broca's syndrome patients retain the ability to recognize metaphors? Do Wernicke's syndrome patients lose it?

Where is science in all of this? In part, it is embedded in the methodologies necessary to explore some aspects of cognitive rhetoric. Hence, the *science of rhetoric*, which can help ensure, as Gross observed in 1993, that the results of our field begin to add up, rather than just piling up (29). (It may also be worth pointing out at this node in the discussion that incorporating scientific methods, generating scientifically ratified results, publishing in scientifically sanctioned journals, would not hurt the ethotic appeals of rhetoricians seeking to work with scientists.)

Where, then is the *rhetoric of science*? What is the relevance of cognition to the rhetorical exploration of science? We need look no further than our esteemed colleague, Jeanne Fahnestock, whose *Rhetorical Figures in Scientific Argumentation* and related publications (1999; 2003, 2004a, 2004b, as a sampling), elaborates a masterful programme for the investigation of scientific argumentation in figural terms. After Fahnestock published the book, I wrote a mostly appreciative review. The book is magnificent. But I had a petty and ill-founded complaint to make as well. I quote myself (I could paraphrase, but quotation is better for my citation indices):

[...] much laudation [...] Professor Fahnestock does not, however, walk on water. This book has one serious shortcoming, to my eyes, which prevents it from being truly groundbreaking. Aside from metaphor, figuration has long been little more than an embarrassing reminder of the shallowest notions of style for almost everybody, including most rhetoricians. But (aside from the appreciation for metaphor) this is utterly backwards. Figuration runs as deep as it is possible to run. Language cannot but be figured; it flows in what Edward Sapir figured as "well-worn grooves of expression" (1921: 89). These grooves can be optimized to aesthetic or rhetorical ends (or, often, both)--which is where formal theories of figuration come in--but there are no other channels. Figures are the very stuff of language, the bones and muscles, nerves and skin, blood and guts. They are the

very opposite of, in Plato's famous assault, the "colours, and enamels, and garments" (Gorgias 465c³) daubed on, and painted on, and draped over an otherwise pallid, and virtuous, and naked language. Fahnestock sees the linguistic ineluctability of figures truly and argues it clearly. She vitiates all approaches to figuration in which "one begins with a plain message and then adds secondary features that make it more memorable or convincing than it would be without them" (21). But-- sorry for taking so long; here is my complaint--she unaccountably pulls up halt before the inevitable next step. Figures are the stuff of language.

Language is profoundly cognitive. Throw modus ponens into the breach and you've got: figuration is cognitive. (Harris 1999, 92)

I ended the review with the most reprehensible of my complaints, "Fahnestock missed the boat" (103). It was certainly not her job, especially in a book that does so much else, so brilliantly, to integrate that work with the voluminous multidisciplinary research that constitutes cognitive science. But she was gracious enough to respond not as the remark deserved. She did something quite wonderful.

She sifted through a great deal of that voluminous research (2005), identifying several important points of contact, and sketching a research approach of reciprocal support. She proposes, first, that cognitive science needs to be informed by a figuratively rich "rhetorical theory of language" (174) in place of the arhetorical generative theories that have been the staple of cognitive science for most of its existence. She is exactly right in this. Cognitive science *does* need rhetoric.⁴ And she suggests, second, that rhetoricians need to be open "to potential scientific grounding," reminding us that rhetoric always, in the end, "come[s] down to human brains acting on human brains" (175).

What makes this cognitive grounding especially crucial for rhetoric of science is exactly what makes rhetoric of science the crucial occupation it is in the first place. Science is where human brains (and their associated perceptual and mechanical systems) make the most robust, most hopeful, most dangerous constellations of knowledge that human brains can make. Science is what calls the tune for most of our dances.

³ www.mylibrarybook.com/books/831/Plato/Gorgias-16.html

⁴ In fact, there is a growing opening in exactly this area, in the linguistic framework I invoked above, Cognitive Linguistics. It finds itself on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) *Metaphors we live by*, extending their approach to a few select tropes See, for instance, the journal, *Cognitive Linguistics*, published by Mouton de Gruyter. What this line of research shows is how much they could benefit from collaborating with rhetoricians.

The position that the form of signification profoundly affects the response of human organisms is well known in the history and philosophy of science, perhaps most closely associated with Gerald Holton's work on themata (1973). Signification that comes in simpler packages, or comes with greater implications, or comes with closer integration to already accepted significations, is more attractive to those human organisms we call *scientists*. They are more likely to call it true, to add it to their repertoires, to deploy it in the making of artificial organs and renewable energy devices and environmental poisons and weapons of mass destruction. The more we understand the elemental components of that knowledge (deeper and more pervasive than Holton's themata), the more we can chart its reliance on the kind of wetware that defines us as human organisms, the better equipped we are to influence and educate the culture that defines us as social, political, historical, organisms.

I am not claiming there are laws of suasion, as Hill did, in my appeal to a science of rhetoric, only that cognitive science has immense promise as a pillar in a new 21st century *rhetoric docens*, for understanding science as an epistemological extension of human organisms.

Cited

“Aristotle.” 1848. *A new general biographical dictionary*. Ed. H.J. Rose *et al.* London: Richard Clay. v2, 142-153.

Booth, Wayne C. *Modern dogma and the rhetoric of assent*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burke, Kenneth. 1966. *Language and symbolic action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, Kenneth. 1969 [1945]. *The grammar of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, Kenneth. 1969 [1950]. *The rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Fahnestock, Jeanne. 1999. *Rhetorical Figures in Scientific Argumentation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fahnestock, Jeanne. 2003. Verbal and Visual Parallelism. *Written Communication*, 20, 123-152.

- Fahnestock, Jeanne. 2004a. Preserving the Figure Consistency in the Presentation of Scientific Arguments. *Written Communication*, 21, 6-31.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. 2004b. Figures of Argument. *Informal Logic*, 24, 115-135.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. 2005. Rhetoric in the age of cognitive science. *The viability of rhetoric*. Ed., Richard Graff. New York: State University of New York Press, 159-179.
- Gross, Alan G. 1993. The rhetoric of science and the science of rhetoric. *Proceedings of The Canadian Society for the Study of Rhetoric* 4 (1991-92), Ed. Albert W. Halsall. CSSR, 1993, 8-35.
- Harris, Randy. 2001. Review of Fahnestock (1999). *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 31, 92-104.
- Hill, David J. 1877. The science of rhetoric: an introduction to the laws of effective discourse. Sheldon & Co.
- Holton, Gerald. 1973. *Thematic origins of scientific thought: Kepler to Einstein*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Plato. c350 BCE. *Gorgias*. Trans. B. Jowatt. Web. 31 August 2012. www.mylibrarybook.com/books/831/Plato/Gorgias-1.html
- Simons, Herbert W. 1978. The rhetoric of science and the science of rhetoric. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 42, 37-43.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.