



# CSSR

CANADIAN SOCIETY  
FOR THE STUDY OF RHETORIC

MAY 27, 28, 29 2007  
UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
SASKATOON

# SCÉR

SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE  
POUR L'ÉTUDE DE LA RHÉTORIQUE

27, 28 & 29 MAI 2007  
UNIVERSITÉ DE LA SASKATCHEWAN  
SASKATOON

# PROGRAM

Contact:  
Sylvain Rheault  
CSSR, President  
<[sylvain.rheault@uregina.ca](mailto:sylvain.rheault@uregina.ca)>

# PROGRAMME

Contact:  
Sylvain Rheault  
SCÉR, Président  
<[sylvain.rheault@uregina.ca](mailto:sylvain.rheault@uregina.ca)>



SUNDAY 27 MAY  
ROOM AGRI 4C77  
8:55 to 9:00 a.m. ....

DIMANCHE 27 MAI  
SALLE AGRI 4C77  
8h55 à 9h00

OPENING  
OUVERTURE

---

9:00 to 10:30 a.m. .... 9h00 à 10h30

Chair / Président de séance  
Stephen Pender

ARISTOTLE  
ARISTOTE

---

Monina Wittfoth  
monina@interchange.ubc.ca

Reading Classical Greek Writing Rhetorically: What is  
Plato's Theory of Language?

Critics like Leff, Covino and Welch have adamantly argued that American rhetorical theory's uptake of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* has suffered from a lack of rigour. Leff, for instance, complains that neo-Aristotelians have failed to grasp 1) the relationship of Aristotle to Plato, 2) "Aristotle's conception of the epistemological and ethical status of rhetoric," and 3) the location of rhetoric within the "system" of his other treatises (315). Indeed, regarding their relationship, Francis Sparshott has said that philosophically "Aristotle is standing on Plato's shoulders" (lecture notes). But how might the relationship between Aristotle's and Plato's preferred genres reflect on their theories of language? In this vein – observing a typical blurring of truth and fiction in ostensibly factual literature – classicists scholars have recently puzzled over the insistently rhetorical register of ancient texts and the significance of their genres (Bowie, Gill, Moles, Shrimpton). Furthermore, Poulakos' comments on the innovation entailed in "the sophists" generic shift away from verse remind us of the generic instability of Greek antiquity (13). Taken together these genre/fictionality questions and Leff's complaints invite us to query the epistemological status of rhetoric and, by implication, the rhetoricity of Aristotle's writing. In a recent reading of *Metaphysics*, I was struck by the exemplary research-writer ethos of its opening. It seemed like academic writing *par excellence*: a writer who researches the field objectively, judiciously summarizes previous efforts, and works out their implications by adding a narrow contribution. But how might the suspicions of late modernity reflect on Aristotle's rhetorical technique? And what might reading a text like *Metaphysics rhetorically* reveal about Aristotle's theory of language and the epistemological status of rhetoric? Perhaps the philosophic treatise (as academic writing) is a kind of Aristotelian discovery – a rhetorical form with lasting panache. Kahn has speculated that the seventeen year old Aristotle first

became acquainted with his then sixty year old master's thought by reading the dialogues (81). How does the thinking-about-language inherent in Platonic dialogue shape Aristotle's own rhetorical theory?

This paper examines the thinking-about-language that Aristotle encounters in Platonic dialogue. I believe that the context into which Aristotle writes is deeply conscious of language: Wood, for instance, comments on the kind of post-structuralist atmosphere in the ancient intellectual climate that classicists scholars study, and certainly Plato's *Cratylus* attests to the currency of thinking about the arbitrariness of the linguistic sign. And while recent re-readings of rhetorical theory identify late-fifth-century sophists as the beginnings of the thinking-about-language that produces rhetoric (e.g. Jaratt and Poulakos), already in the early fifth century Parmenides was expressing concerns about linguistic mediation. This paper will trace the attitude towards language outlined in the Platonic text in order to gain fresh insights into ancient rhetorical theory and the intellectual climate that sponsors Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

---

Elza C. Tiner  
tiner@lynchburg.edu

Evidence for the Availability of Aristotle's Rhetoric in  
Late Medieval England

The *Rhetoric* was first translated into Latin from Arabic by Hermannus Alemannus c. 1240, and from Greek into Latin, first possibly by Bartholomew of Messina in a version c. 1250 that survives in three manuscripts and was probably not widely known. Then it was also translated from Greek into Latin by William Moerbeke, which version circulated in the late medieval schools. Giles of Rome (by 1243-22 Dec 1316) also produced a Latin commentary on the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, quite possibly the one in the fourteenth-century catalogue of Augustinian Friary of York, given his prominence as Prior of the Augustinian friars in 1292. In the catalogue, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is listed as 'Item textus rethoricorum' in a listing of Aristotle's works. [1]

A question may be raised as to how 'textus rethoricorum' in the York catalogue could possibly refer to one work by Aristotle. A compilation of the surviving manuscripts of the Latin translations of Aristotle includes a note with the explicit of one fifteenth-century manuscript of William of Moerbeke's translation, El Escorial, Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo del Escorial, MS. V.III.10, f. 152: 'Explicit liber Rethoricorum Aristotelis secundum translationem Guillelmi' [2] P. Glorieux also provides a clue in his catalogue of works by theologians at Paris in the thirteenth century. Under Giles of Rome is listed 'In lib. Rhetoricorum comm,' probably a variant of Rhet[hor]icorum.[3] These two examples suggest that the genitive plural form rethoricorum circulated in the title of Aristotle's work, both the version of William of Moerbeke

and the commentary by Giles of Rome, and point to the need for a reexamination of evidence for the circulation of his *Rhetoric* from library catalogues of late medieval England, the focus of this conference presentation.

[1] The Friars' Libraries, ed. K. W. Humphries, *Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues* (London: The British Library in Association with the British Academy, 1990): A8, 273b, 66.

[2] Aristoteles Latinus, ed. George Lacombe, A. Birkenmajer, M. Dulong, Aet. Franceschini, and L. Minio-Paluello, *Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi*, 2 vols. (Bruges and Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1957), Part I, note 5, 77; note also says, for other contents, see the printed catalogue, which is G. Antolín, *Catálogo de los códices latinos de la real biblioteca del Escorial*, 5 vols. (Madrid 1910-1923).

[3] Répertoire des Maitres en Théologie de Paris au XIIIe Siècle, *Études de Philosophie Médiévale XVIII* (Paris, 1934): Item 400e, 294.

---

**Jill Ross**

jill.ross@utoronto.ca

---

**Medieval Metaphor: Giles of Rome's Assimilation of Book Three of Aristotle's *Rhetoric***

What little modern scholarship there is on the medieval reception of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* has tended to focus on the place of rhetoric in the logical canon, an issue that Aristotle confronts in Book 1, and on the ethical, political dimensions of the *Rhetoric's* attention to character and behaviour as set out in Book 2. What is so striking about these critical tendencies is the neglect of the rhetorically central question of style, a question that occupies the entire third book of the *Rhetoric*. Giles of Rome, author of the first full commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the late thirteenth century in the Latin West, provides expansive commentary on all the stylistic issues explored by Aristotle in Book Three. While Giles has much to say about all aspects of rhetorical style, his treatment of Aristotelian metaphorical theory is most notable since it so fundamentally reshapes the parameters of that theory by recasting the four-fold categorization of metaphor as set out by Aristotle in *Poetics* 1457b.

Giles of Rome's interpretation of Aristotelian metaphorical theory attempts to draw together all of Aristotle's insights about metaphor and harness them under the master term of *transumptio*, a concept which both exemplifies and encompasses the varying modes of metaphor that Giles sets out. Giles divides metaphor into *transumptio* which forms a base layer of metaphorical thinking to which he adds three other metaphorical modes, the assimilative, the proverbial and the urbane. These modes all share in a common conceptual construction of metaphor, but each one superimposes or adds something unique to the core concept of metaphorical transfer. This paper will explain

Giles's original and important assimilation of Aristotelian theory of metaphor, explore its possible sources in earlier medieval Ciceronian rhetoric and poetic theory, as well as in medieval Arabic receptions of the *Rhetoric*, and assess its impact on the understanding and use of metaphor in later philosophical, theological and rhetorical discourse.

---

**10:30 to 10:45 a.m. .... 10h30 à 10h45**

**Coffee break. .... Pause café**

---

**10:45 to 11:45 a.m. .... 10h45 à 11h45**

Chair / Président de séance

**Stephen Pender**

**ARISTOTLE**

**ARISTOTE**

---

**Randi Patterson**

woodmont@sympatico.ca

---

**Aristotle, Music, and Racism in The Time of Our Singing**

Rhetoricians rarely pair music and rhetoric because rhetoric is mainly concerned with the power of words and images to motivate and persuade for good or evil. However, Aristotle's views on the importance of music, though brief, are still relevant today, especially in terms of emotions, education, and ethos.

Richard Powers' 2003 work, *The Time of Our Singing*, brings these concerns to life in an insightful and comprehensive novel about race in America as experienced by a professional tenor whose mother is an Afro-American singer and father is a German-Jewish physicist specializing in 20th century theories of time. Though racial prejudice stalks the couple, they marry and have children in the belief that "music trumps race."

This belief in the power of music to purify negative emotions is not new. But naming one key emotion, racial fear or hatred, reminds us of the importance music plays in both pathos and ethos. This paper, then, uses the example of race in *The Time of Our Singing* as a context for reading Aristotle's practical views, from *The Politics*, that music should be part of education because it improves the character or ethos of those who learn to perform, and provides listeners with not only useful emotional or "enthusiastic" experience, in the case of beneficial emotions, but also "curative and purifying treatment" or "catharsis," in the case of emotions that need to be purged.

While Plato believes in musical idealism that glorifies

music's ability to "transcend" harmful emotions and the real world, Aristotle provides more practical, useful ways to deal with emotions in terms of music. The Time of Our Singing provides us with a fascinating enactment not only of the ongoing nature of these rhetorical debates, but also of the contemporary nature of the rhetoric of music in our racialized world.

---

**Michael Purves-Smith**  
s.purvesmith@rogers.com

**A Question of Reception: Have We Reached the Post Aristotelian World?**

Drawing upon two examples from Aristotle's work, one, the subject of music, narrowly focused, and the other, the topic of degree, informing much of his argumentation, this paper will propose that while the reach of Aristotle's voice may have been universal a generation ago, in the ensuing twenty-five years so much has changed that his influence is sometimes unrecognizable.

Aristotle has relatively little to say about music, but what he does say, especially in the last book of the Politics, is enough to adumbrate the received notions about music that used to define its place in western culture, among them: "let the young practice music . . . only until they are able to feel delight in noble melodies and rhythms, and not merely in that common part of music in which every . . . child and even some animals find pleasure." While music itself remains profoundly unchanged, in less than a generation Aristotle's division of music into noble (highbrow) and common (popular) has drifted into the realm of the politically incorrect and, the topic of degree has become something quite different for the present generation than for those that preceded it.

---

**11:45 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. . . . . 11h45 à 13h30**

**Lunch. . . . . Diner**

---

**1:30 to 3:00 p.m. . . . . 13h30 à 15h00**

Chair / Président de séance  
**Pierre Zoberman**

**RHETORIC AND CLASSICAL AUTHORS  
RHÉTORIQUE ET AUTEURS CLASSIQUES**

---

**Stephen Pender**  
spender@uwindsor.ca

**Rhetoric, Phantasmata, and the Hydraulics of Grief**

Discussing lamentation in *The Arte of English Poesy* (1589), George Puttenham argues that the grief that may be avoided or assuaged by wisdom is beyond "Poeticall mournings in verse." Moral vitiation is the fault of the "owner" and "may be by his well doings recovered again," so is rarely treated in verse; so too are losses and hindrances by "oversight & misguidings of our selves and our things" inappropriate for lamentation. Drawing on classical precedent, particularly Cicero, Puttenham identifies death as well as military or amorous defeat as susceptible to poetic and rhetorical cure. For these events, he advises poets to "play" physicians and apply "medicine to the ordinary sicknes of mankind" and "mak[e] the very greef it selfe (in part) cure of the disease." He endorses a specific remedy: unlike Galenists, who cure with contraries (*contraria contrariis*), poets should be "as the *Paracelsians*, who cure [*similia similibus*] by making one dolour expell another." A brief and controlled period of mourning should substitute for protracted, unpredictable sorrow; Puttenham's poetic cure trumps the remedial properties of time. To describe this process, like his contemporaries, he turns to the methods and metaphors of medicine and understands reading and listening as therapy, fiction as a moral discourse of cure. In his exhortation to heal, his ease with the terms of learned medical theory and practice, and his certainty that persuasion is crucial to literary therapeutics, Puttenham's treatment is typical of early modern accounts of the curative properties of reading; his prescriptions speak to the intimate associations between poetry and emotion, rhetoric and medicine, images and therapy. Drawing on classical and early modern texts, I shall argue that these associations depend on images or 'phantasms,' which underwrite perception, judgement, action, and emotion; as Quintilian wrote, the greatest part of eloquence "concerns the mind: it must be moved and must conceive images of things [*imagines rerum*], and adapt itself to suit the nature of the subject which is theme of the speech." After establishing the centrality of images to deliberation and action in various strains of classical and early modern thought, I shall argue that grief, my main concern, is mollified by reading.

---

**David Ingham**  
dingham@stu.ca

**Irony and Pathos Trump Ciceronian Rhetoric: The Funeral Orations of Brutus and Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar***

Perhaps only slightly less well known than Hamlet's "to be or not to be" is Mark Antony's "Friends, Romans,

countrymen" speech from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. But only those who know the play are aware that his is the *second* funeral oration in the play.

The first is by Brutus. When he delivers it, the mob are screaming for the heads of the conspirators, and Brutus gives his oration to mollify them – and what a job he does. By the end of it, the mob are ready to crown him king. How does he do it? Quite simply, by creating an almost perfect model of Ciceronian rhetoric – the periods are balanced, the use of chiasmus is perfect, and the appeals to logos and ethos (coupled with rhetorical questions) are cogent, as I will demonstrate by referring to Cicero's *De Oratore*.

Yet Antony is able to overturn entirely the efforts of Brutus. How does *he* do it? Antony even begins in precisely parallel fashion: that of Brutus begins "Romans, countrymen, and lovers." At once more genuine and less overstated ("friends"), this more intimate, less declamatory style is part of how Antony wins the hearts of his countrymen – or cunningly manipulates them, to look more objectively at it. He twists facts, argues narrowly on only one part of an argument, shamelessly employs pathos, and masterfully uses irony (by the fourth repetition of "so are they all, all honourable men," the phrase positively drips with sarcasm).

This paper will perform a close rhetorical analysis of both orations, showing that Shakespeare not only absorbed all that classical rhetoric had to teach, but also was able to go beyond it brilliantly.

---

**Shannon Purves-Smith**  
s.purvesmith@rogers.com

**Pity and Fear and the Problem of Ugliness: Opposing Opinions from Aristotle and Victor Hugo**

This paper explores the inner conflict we experience when confronted with ugliness, and especially, human ugliness. The absence of beauty has historically been associated with the absence of goodness and remains an avoided subject of discussion today. No one wants to admit to the distressing emotional assault of loathing, fear, and simultaneous empathy provoked by the truly unsightly. As Alexander Nehamus paraphrases Aristotle, "We fear for ourselves what we tend to pity others for, and we pity others for what we would fear for ourselves."

Victor Hugo has treated the subject of the grotesque in such literary works as *Notre Dame de Paris* (*The Hunchback of Notre Dame*) and "Le Crapaud" (The Toad) from his extensive poem, *La Légende des siècles* (*The Legend of the Ages*.) In these, either the hideous protagonist or another "base" creature expiates the deformity and suffering of another by an act of supreme sacrifice. Thus Hugo argues against the traditional association of moral inferiority with physical imperfection.

In keeping with the CSSR Special Session, "Re-examining Aristotle's *Rhetoric*," I will discuss those areas of the *Rhetoric* that deal with this sensitive subject and attempt to reconcile Aristotle's rather severe but pragmatic advice on ugliness with Hugo's sympathetic and currently more acceptable view.

---

**3:00 to 3:15 p.m. .... 15h00 à 15h15**

**Coffee break. .... Pause café**

---

**3:15 to 4:30 p.m. .... 15h15 à 16h30**

**ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING  
ASSEMBLÉE GÉNÉRALE ANNUELLE**

---

**7:00 p.m. .... 19h00**

**BANQUET**

Rembrandt's  
243, 21<sup>st</sup> Street East  
(in/dans l' Hotel Senator)  
(306) 244-8555

---

**MONDAY 28 MAY** **LUNDI 28 MAI**  
**ROOM AGRI 4C77** **SALLE AGRI 4C77**  
**9:00 to 10:30 a.m. .... 9h00 à 10h30**

Chair / Présidente de séance  
**Shannon Purves-Smith**

**RHETORIC AND ETHICS  
LA RHÉTORIQUE ET L'ÉTHIQUE**

---

**Jim Gough**  
jim.gough@rdc.ab.ca

**Communicating for Influence within Ethical Borders**

Most communication with others is intended to influence them. Advertising communication sets up a challenge to determine what are acceptable ethical limits to effective influence of an audience. The view that personal autonomy is a primary right is contrasted with the view that "branding" produces conditions which approximate unacceptable exercise of situational control and propaganda to limit an individual's capacity to make autonomous choices. The focus for this paper is the possible conditions that need to be provided in order to

provide ethical borders to protect autonomous decision making challenged by excessive means to influence choices, means which subvert ethical decision making.

---

**Sylvain Rheault**  
sylvain.rheault@uregina.ca

**Pourquoi combattre? : la déchosification comme justification**

La majorité des activités humaines peuvent être envisagées comme des métamorphoses, des "transformations de l'information" comme dirait McLuhan. Par exemple, le travail constitue une métamorphose, puisque on transforme la matière ou les idées en autre chose. Le combat serait une activité du même type. Mais que s'agit-il ici de métamorphoser? Le combat consiste à métamorphoser une personne en chose (conquête) ou à retransformer en personne ce qui est considéré comme une chose (émancipation).

Pour justifier pourquoi une collectivité doit prendre les armes contre une autre collectivité, les dirigeants évoquent des raisons qui s'appuient rarement sur des impératifs de conquête (s'ils le font, c'est avec de brillantes ellipses: Bush disait qu'il voulait un "changement de régime" en Irak. Mais qu'advient-il alors de l'ancien?) Les justifications s'appuient plutôt sur des impératifs d'émancipation. Il s'agit de "libérer" (retransformer en personnes des choses), d'assurer la "sécurité" (éviter que des personnes soient transformées en choses).

La communication propose de revisiter les stratégies rhétoriques les plus souvent exploitées pour justifier les combats en mettant en lumière les métamorphoses implicites et en faisant intervenir les pôles de "chose" et de "personne".

---

**10:30 to 10:45 a.m. .... 10h30 à 10h45**

**Coffee break. .... Pause café**

---

---

**10:45 to 11:45 a.m. .... 10h45 à 11h45**

Chair / Président de séance  
**Michael Purves-Smith**

**RHETORIC AND IDENTITY  
LA RHÉTORIQUE ET L'IDENTITÉ**

---

**Pierre Zoberman**  
Zmanp@aol.com

**A Rhetoric of the Written Body: Proust**

Following upon Lee Edelman's intuitions in *Homographesis*, this paper will extend the notion of homographesis (as a strategy for identifying/creating bodily signs of homosexuality so as to forestall the threat of homographic confusion and make sure that bodies signify homosexuality unequivocally). I will explore the specific strategies which allow Proust in *A la recherche* to write bodies that connote race (specifically Jewishness) and homosexuality, as the only two *essential* traits. As essences, they are always *already there* but time only *inscribes* them more and more clearly and turns them into direct signifiers of identity. Paradoxically, as the interpretation of the bodies-turned-into-texts becomes univocal, they also go through a process of de-individuation. As homo/Judeo/IDgraphesis (to expand Edelman's concept) removes any ambiguity from the body, it turns it into the body of *the* homosexual, *the* Jew. The same might be said of the emergence of the Guermentes nose on the faces of all family members (but Proust debunks the claim that aristocracy could ever be an essence, whereas Zion and Sodom, the two "races" metonymically linked by their common origin in the Scriptures, are gradually revealed as essences). Every "homo/Judeo-graphed" body becomes a paradigm, a prototype, or, in a more rhetorical lexicon, an antonomasia—Swann as *the Jew*, Charlus as *the homme-femme*, *the "invert"*, and even, *the charlus*.

This exploration is only the first step in a long-term project to study the way in which practices of body-inscriptions give meaning and value to the body as texts. Pour une rhétorique du corps écrit : Proust

Cette communication, qui s'inscrit dans la ligne d'*Homographesis* de Lee Edelman, étendra la portée de la notion même d'*homographèse*—comme stratégie visant à identifier/créer des signes corporels de l'homosexualité pour parer à toute menace de confusion homographique et s'assurer que les corps signifient l'homosexualité de manière non équivoque. J'explorerai les stratégies spécifiques qui permettent à Proust, dans la *Recherche*, d'écrire des corps qui connotent la race (et spécifiquement la judéité) et l'homosexualité comme les deux seuls trait réellement *essentiels*. En tant qu'essence ces deux traits

sont *toujours déjà là*, mais seul le temps les *inscrit* de plus en plus clairement et en fait les signifiants immédiats d'une identité. Paradoxalement, à mesure que les corps-faits-textes deviennent univoques, ils subissent en même temps un processus de désindividuation. À mesure que l'homo/judéo/identito-graphèse (pour étendre le concept d'Edelman) débarrasse le corps de toute ambiguïté, elle en fait le corps de l'homosexuel, *du Juif*, etc. On pourrait dire la même chose de l'émergence du nez des Guermentes sur le visage de tous les membres de la famille (mais Proust réduit à néant l'idée même que l'aristocratie puisse jamais être une essence, alors que Sion et Sodome, les deux « *races* » liées métonymiquement par leur origine scripturaire commune, se révèlent graduellement comme des essences). Tout corps homéo/judéo-graphié devient un paradigme, un prototype ou, dans un lexique plus rhétorique, une antonomase – Swann devient *le Juif*, Charlus *l'homme-femme*, *l'inverti*, ou même *le charlus*.

Cette exploration n'est que la première étape d'un projet à plus long terme, l'étude de la manière dont les pratiques d'inscription corporelle donnent sens et valeur au corps comme texte.

---

---

**11:45 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. . . . . 11h45 à 13h30**

**Lunch with CATTW. . . . . Diner avec l'ACPRTS**

At Louis (restaurant/pub)  
Memorial Union Building (MUB)

---

---

**1:30 to 3:00 p.m. . . . . 13h30 à 15h00**

Chair / Présidente de séance  
**Rebecca Carruthers Den Hoed**

**RHETORIC AND LANGUAGE  
LA RHÉTORIQUE ET LE LANGAGE**

---

---

**Donna Lillian**  
lilliand@ecu.edu

**The Politics of Courtesy Titles: Traditionalists versus Abolitionists**

Current English usage shows considerably variability in how people are expected or permitted to address one another. Choosing not to use courtesy titles in contexts in which traditional social structure warrants their use not only establishes for the speaker or writer a particular ethos, but may also constitute a challenge to the ethos of the addressee, particularly when the addressee may be committed to the maintenance of a hierarchy implied by the use of differential courtesy titles. As part of my current study of surnames and courtesy titles involving

approximately 3,000 English-speaking respondents, I ask about respondents' preferences not to use courtesy titles at all. While some respondents do indicate a preference to eliminate all use of courtesy titles, most still prefer to retain traditional address patterns with courtesy titles in at least some contexts. The present paper explores the qualitative data explicating people's reasons for those choices. For those who advocate eliminating titles, the reasons are primarily political, although for some, practical considerations are paramount. Preliminary results indicate that neither age nor gender are factors which affect people's views on whether or not to use courtesy titles, although both variables are significant in determining which title will be used to address women. This paper addresses the important social and political variables which interact with seemingly 'trivial' decisions about how to address other people.

---

---

**Moldovan Andrei**  
moldova@uwindsor.ca

**Perelman on the Argument by Analogy**

In my essay I will show that Perelman's and Olbrechts-Tyteca's (1969) treatment of the argument by analogy is relevant to the contemporary discussion of the topic. The latest reconstructions of this argument that have been made by informal logicians (such as A. Juthe 2005, M.Guarini 2004, T.J.McKay 1997) respond to critiques of previous models (such as Govier's 1999 and 2002, against the deductive reconstruction of the argument) and overcome their limitations. I will give two arguments supporting the claim that newer reconstructions are still inappropriate, as they are done without taking into account the audience to which the argument is directed. The specific problem is that these schematic reconstructions include a list of relevant similarities between the two analogous cases, which does not reflect the actual use of the argument. However, not mentioning any similarities would not be a better alternative. I will argue that the solution is to follow Perelman's and Olbrechts-Tyteca's approach to argumentation by analogy, and to introduce the audience as a criterion to determine what similarities must be specified in the premises of the argument. There can be a correct reconstruction of the argument from analogy, but only if it is an audience-dependent one. This conclusion is relevant to a broader discussion in the theory of argumentation, as it shows that without an explicit reference to the audience, a correct reconstruction of this argument is not possible. Thus, it makes a point in favour of a rhetorical reconstruction of arguments in general, and against a treatment of the argument from analogy exclusively with the tools of informal logic.

---

---

**3:00 to 3:15 p.m. . . . . 15h00 à 15h15**

**Coffee break. . . . . Pause café**

---

---

3:15 to 4:15 p.m. .... 15h15 à 16h15

Chair / Présidente de séance  
Donna Lillian

**RHETORIC AND THE UNIVERSITY  
LA RHÉTORIQUE ET L'UNIVERSITÉ**

---

**Johanne Provençal, Heesoon Bai**  
johanne\_provençal@sfu.ca, heesoon\_bai@sfu.ca

**The Rhetoric of Scholarship: Questions of Genre and Method**

The presentation is meant to take the form of a discussion, following brief presentations by each of the panel members who will question the rhetoric of scholarship with a focus on two issues: genre and method in scholarship (and research, though note is made of rhetorical distinctions between the two and the implications of tensions between research/scholarship on scholarly work).

The presenters will draw on rhetoric/genre theory of Bazerman, Burke, Coe, and Giltrow as well as the socio-cultural theory of Bourdieu, Lyotard and Veblen in order to open discussion on the relationship between rhetoric and genre in scholarly work in general, and in Canadian scholarly journals in particular. One of the presenters also brings to bear on this discussion ten years of academic and professional work in both literary and academic publishing in Canada.

The presenters will then turn discussion to the question of rhetoric of method in research and scholarship, calling for the need to recognize the possibilities (and necessity) of authentic (in contrast to objectified and codified) knowledge that dialogue, as method and genre, brings to scholarly work and the scholarly community. Following the lead from such diverse thinkers as Martin Buber, Pierre Hadot, and David Bohm, we will show that the open-ended, interactive, and even embodied characteristics of dialogue makes dialogue a practice of living enquiry that we sorely need today, especially in the context of resisting fundamentalist discourse.

A discussion on the rhetoric of scholarship is appropriate not only to the conference theme of "Bridging Communities: Making Public Knowledge, Making Knowledge Public" but also to cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary issues and tensions of contemporary scholarship and a diverse and global, scholarly community.

---

---

**Janelle Hutchinson**  
janelle.hutchinson@usask.ca

**A Pseudo-Event for Sale: A Further Examination of the Maclean's University Rankings**

In his classic work *The Image*, Daniel Boorstin describes a pseudo-event as one which is surrounded by ambiguity, yet whose primary purpose is to be reported – it is a self-fulfilling prophecy characterized by the absence of spontaneity. Easily recognizable examples of pseudo-events include press conferences, news releases, and the so-called 'news leak.' In this paper, I will argue that every year thousands of Canadians flock to the newsstands to purchase Canada's own pseudo-event - the annual *Maclean's* University Ranking.

The ranking has been criticized since its inception as a meaningless ratings game, but this issue has become the most popular of the *Maclean's* editorial year, turning it into a rhetorical exigence that, at least until 2006, university administrations seemed unable to ignore. In May 2005, I presented my analysis of the introductory essays that accompany each issue of the highly anticipated annual *Maclean's* University Rankings. My previous analysis focused primarily on the audience for those essays, and how the nostalgic tone appealed to alum of the Universities, not the prospective students for which the survey is reportedly targeted. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> installment of my analysis, this paper will examine the content encompassed within the rankings and how it strongly establishes itself as a pseudo-event *par excellence*. I will further reflect on the forces that have allowed this self-fulfilling prophecy to flourish, captivating Canadian audiences for the last sixteen years.

---

---

---

---

<b>TUESDAY 29 MAY</b>	<b>MARDI 29 MAI</b>
<b>ROOM AGRI 4C77</b>	<b>SALLE AGRI 4C77</b>
<b>9:00 to 10:30 a.m. ....</b>	<b>9h00 à 10h30</b>

Chair / Président de séance  
Sylvain Rheault

**RHETORIC AND THE MEDIA  
RHÉTORIQUE ET MÉDIA**

---

**Judith Kearns, Brian Turner**  
j.kearns@uwinnipeg.ca

**Call me simple, but...: Rhetorical Tensions in the Globe and Mail Columns of Christie Blatchford**

Though she has written regular columns for both of our



national newspapers, award-winning journalist Christie Blatchford seems never to have attracted scholarly interest in this country. The authors consider this neglect unfortunate. Given the substance, complexity, and sheer quantity of her work, Blatchford constitutes a valuable case study in how prominent rhetors in the popular media reflect and influence public attitudes.

In this presentation, we focus on one particular dimension of Blatchford's recent *Globe and Mail* columns: her recurrent treatment—in topic, image, and argument—of false or misleading appearances, uncertain identities, secrecy, and concealment. Since Blatchford reports regularly on crime and frequently discusses war and politics, this motif may be seen, from one point of view, as an almost inevitable consequence of her "beat" and of the times; that the discourse of a 21<sup>st</sup> century journalist writing about con artists, car bombers, and federal slush funds is loaded with binary oppositions between appearance and reality and laced with the tropes and images of camouflage seems unexceptional. But Blatchford's handling of this motif suggests more than topical inevitability. It suggests an author who is herself divided, nostalgic and pragmatic, struggling to balance modernist desire for a fading, common-sense ethic with postmodern recognition of shifting values and multiple truths. The presentation will examine some of the rhetorical tensions in columns which seek both to acknowledge contemporary uncertainties and to defend traditional values such as patriotism, respect, and trustworthiness.

---

**Tess Laidlaw**

tess.laidlaw@usask.ca

### **The Flu Pandemic: At a Bookstore near You**

In every battle, there is something to gain and something to lose, and it is the magnitude of this fear that determines the nature and course of most battles. As fears about an avian influenza pandemic surge and wane, a cadre of authors has published books for public consumption on topics ranging from the flu's scientific and historical context to how to prepare for the coming pandemic. Readers browsing the bookstore shelves may even be forgiven if they are confused about whether an avian influenza pandemic is already underway.

Vincent Lam, Giller Prize-winner and author (with Colin Lee) of *The Flu Pandemic and You: A Canadian Guide*, was an emergency-room doctor during the 2003 SARS pandemic. In this book, he draws upon his experience and expertise to educate readers about avian influenza and to provide recommendations for preparedness. The genesis of book was, according to a *Toronto Life* interview with Lam, Margaret Atwood's idea: a response to the media coverage of avian influenza was needed to "put things in perspective." Yet, this response itself has now become *part* of the media coverage of avian influenza, and its impact has been influenced by such contextual elements

as Margaret Atwood's name on the cover and the media buy-in to the book by such outlets as CTV and *Macleans*. Using techniques of close reading and cluster analysis, this paper presents a case study of the rhetorical strategies Lam uses to respond to and simultaneously perpetuate fear, all in the name of disaster readiness, in order to offer insight into the pandemic of unease that currently grips the public imagination.

---

**Jeanie Wills**

jeanie.wills@usask.ca

### **Advising the Advertiser: Claude Hopkins' Aristotelian Theory**

From Aristotle to Burke, rhetorical theorists note that messages are planned and shaped based on audience analysis and message positioning. While he never uses the word "rhetoric," let alone implies he is theorizing about it, 1920s advertising man Claude Hopkins offers advice to novice advertising people on how to shape and address appeals to an audience of consumers that essentially constitutes a rhetorical theory. Hopkins' *My Life in Advertising* and *Scientific Advertising* may seem initially like a memoir and "how to" book, but underlying the advice is a set of theoretical assumptions that still inform advertising theory and practice today, so much so that David Ogilvie, writing forty years later, suggested that no one should attempt to write copy without reading Hopkins' works.

My paper contends that Hopkins is, in fact, the first rhetorical theorist of advertising. His psychology of persuasion excludes — in fact mocks — academic learning, and he insists on experience rather than theory as the best guide to success, and as a source of his authority: "any man who by a lifetime of excessive application learns more about anything than others owes a statement to successors" (1). As I will demonstrate, however, Hopkins' works are anchored in a theoretical foundation that assumes an "effect standard" and that is grounded in the enthymematic understanding that "increased sales" are the goal of persuasion in the advertising world. In presenting this argument, I will draw direct comparisons between Hopkins' advice books and the work of other rhetorical theorists, including Aristotle, whom he follows in his intent to provide a practical guide for others.

---

**10:30 to 10:45 a.m. . . . . 10h30 à 10h45**

**Coffee break. . . . . Pause café**

---

---

10:45 to 11:45 a.m. . . . . 10h45 à 11h45

Chair / Président(e) de séance  
Jeanie Wills

**RHETORIC AND HUMOUR  
LA RHÉTORIQUE ET L'HUMOUR**

---

**Julian Demkiw**

julian.demkiw@usask.ca

**Working Fiction: Can "The Office" Provide Clues to Understanding Real-Life Organizations?**

Stories engage, delight, and even persuade [1], but more importantly, as Edwin Black has shown, they help us form our sense of self.[2] As well, by providing "strategies that encompass situations," Kenneth Burke argued, stories can be understood as "equipment for living." [3] Walter Fisher advanced an even more radical notion, proposing a narrative model as the paradigmatic form of human rationality, making story the foundation for human consciousness and communication.[4] For Fisher, rationality is not based on logical, fact-based arguments but rooted in the "nature of people as narrative beings." [5]

As anyone who has spent time there will immediately recognize, organizational life presents a host of communication situations with significant interpersonal, political, and ethical dimensions, all of which we must learn to negotiate. If stories truly are "strategies for encompassing situations," as Burke argued, then we need stories that provide the necessary understanding and approaches to help us master our organizational challenges. Bringing together the theoretical foundations of ethical criticism, Burke's understanding of stories as "equipment for living," and Fisher's model of narrative argument, this paper will approach the BBC mockumentary series "The Office" as a case study for understanding the dynamics of a real-life organization. Fisher describes two tests of an argument's rationality: narrative probability (whether a story is internally coherent) and narrative fidelity (whether a story is consistent with our experience of the world it represents). I propose to apply these tests to "The Office," which so convincingly dramatized its organizational world that the series was mistaken by many of its early viewers for an actual documentary. My goal is to demonstrate that the series can be regarded as a useful case study of organizational interaction that provides insight into its complications and possibilities.

[1] Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 58 (1972): 396-407 and "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: Ten Years Later," *Quarterly Journal of*

*Speech* 68 (1982): 288-305.

[2] Edwin Black, "The Second Persona" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (June 1972) 172.

[3] Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action* 2/e (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1941,1967) 293-302.

[4] Fisher, Walter R. "The Narrative Paradigm: An Elaboration" *Communication Monographs* 52 (1985) 347-367; and "Narration as Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument" *Communication Monographs* 51 (1984) 1-22

[5] Walter Fisher, *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reasons, Value, and Action* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 19xx) 64

---

**Burton Urquhart**

burton.urquhart@usask.ca

**"Squirm": The New Rhetorical Device?: Humour and Discomfort as Enthymematic Social Satire in *Borat: Cultural Learnings of America for Make Benefit Glorious Nation of Kazakhstan***

A new mass media narrative form, labelled variously as "squirm comedy" or "cringe entertainment," has been leading a revolution in contemporary comedy. This genre, most recently and notably displayed in the film *Borat: Cultural Learnings of America for Make Benefit Glorious Nation of Kazakhstan*, is described by Katrina Onstad, arts writer for *CBC.ca*, as "laughing at the self-induced humiliations of characters who are unaware of the excruciating impropriety of their behaviour." While comedy has arguably always involved an element of humiliation, this subversive new form -- "pioneered on *Seinfeld* and perfected on *Curb Your Enthusiasm* and *The Office[s]*" (Onstad) -- takes the experience to a daring level of intensity and extremity. As one notable blogger asks, "why in 2006 [do] the most effective comedians make us squirm? What is it about comedy -- or politics or the world -- that makes us want discomfort and awkwardness with our laughter?" This paper will argue that this new genre of mass media comedy is a highly participatory form in which, through the "excruciating impropriety" of the racist, homophobic, misogynistic, and geocentric "humour," the vagaries of justice in North America and our own "culture-isms" are exposed and foregrounded. I hope to make the argument that this genre is a new incarnation of Kenneth Burke's concept of perspective by incongruity that relies on enthymematic identification to expose and satirize the sometimes bizarre inconsistencies and self-contradictions of contemporary culture.