Rhetoric 10: Lecture 1 – 1/22/08

- Everything is an argument
- Argument=proffering of a position (position=anything & everything)
- “Never trust a thought that comes while you’re sitting” – Nietzsche
- Arguments are distinctly those things that don’t have proof; proof shuts down an argument, because once you have it you have the answer
- Rhetoric begins where proof evaporates (NOT self-evident)
- To modern rhetoricians, there is no such thing as “self-evident”
- Rhetoric=ways of making sense of things
- Arguments:
  - A) Don’t need to be oppositional
  - B) Everything is one
  - C) Often what feels nice, right, good
  - D) Don’t need to persuade you
- Arguments turn on circumstance; arguments are a much stranger register than logic
- Opposition:
  - Opposition is NOT difference
  - Things that are “opposed” are actually the same (eg. Hot & cold are just two moments within the same thing)
- Rhetoric is a logic of difference; something can just be different without opposing you
- Bugs Bunny is the ultimate modern rhetorician; never engages in a relationship of opposed, but instead, follows the line of fight (eg. He is being cooked in a pan & suggests another recipe instead of playing into the mode & fleeing)
- Abortion example → rhetoricians will question the question
  - Are you for or against abortion?
    - Already framed in a “yes/no” paradigm; already a form of termination too
      - b/c you have to pick one side
    - Take the line of flight/jam the circuit
- We don’t ascribe to the category of truth; it’s just a form of argument → other departments make certain assumptions about things
• Each text is a particular moment → how can it add up to one thing? (eg. All the texts of the War of 1812)
• Rhetoric always questions the terms of discourse itself (this is what ties all these diverse concepts together; the approach)
• Evidence is raw material (different than proof) → still to be interpreted
• Law does not try to get at the truth → its all about an assembly of evidence; the court is not a place where truth happens; its interested in the adjudication of law (general) & circumstance (particular); not “innocent,” but guilty/not guilty (one argument versus another)

Rhetoric 10: Discussion 1 – 1/23/08
• 5 written assignments (1-2 page short response about reading)
• Vince Tafolla
  o vtafolla@berkeley.edu

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 2 – 1/24/08
• Aristotle (Classical Rhetoric):
  o We need rhetoric to convince the less intelligent of the truth
  o Rhetoric is the “dress” or style → most people cannot see the truth & you use it in order to dupe the general masses
  o Rhetoric=fundamentally premised on logic
    ▪ Logic is based on abstraction
  o Goal: use rhetoric to persuade people to your side
    ▪ Create “sameness” (common platform for everyone to rely on)
  o However, contemporary rhetorician believes that logic is not universal
• Contemporary Rhetorician:
  o I don’t necessarily use rhetoric, I am rhetoric
  o Goal: not to have us all agree; commonality should not be privileged over difference
A belief is difference is the major separation from classical

Comparing & Contrasting the Two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical/Philosopher</th>
<th>Modern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commonality →</td>
<td>1. Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requires a loss of self</td>
<td>2. Explicate &amp; Multiply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Persuasion</td>
<td>3. Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evident/logic</td>
<td>4. No axioms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Premised on axioms</td>
<td>5. Embodied event →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Premised on</td>
<td>no logical law/romise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstraction</td>
<td>6. No teleology →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teleological</td>
<td>things go as they go</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In rhetoric, the question is the art → what is the problem?

While in philosophy, there is always the same set of questions

Rhetoric=what you “put on” the truth in order to present the truth; all about expression

Classical exists outside of circumstances vs. modern, where circumstance is everything (eg. Never drink vs. do the right thing); Rhetoric says “do the right thing” → deeply immersed in circumstance

Venue for classical rhetoric:

Courts & politics

Studied it to become part of this, which is outside of the everyday

Contemporary rhetoric:

There is no privileged space

Radically democratizes rhetoric → it’s everywhere

That classical venue is ubiquitous

Modern rhetoric says there is no truth, all there is is what is pretty & presentable; while, classical rhetoric tried to take the objective “truth” & make it pretty/presentable

Modern rhetoricians’ positions are not adamant → they have arguments that are multivalent (these are the types of arguments we make in our papers)

*Later concept: Kairos=decisive/capricious moment

Abstraction/logic tries to remove argument from time (logic is atemporal)

Rhetoric is always temporal/circumstantial

Multiple logics, but none are a privileged moment
Rhetoric 10: Lecture 3 – 1/29/08

*Dissoi Logoi*

- Different words/different logics/contrasting words/contrasting logics
- Logos = simultaneously taking about logic & words
- Anthropological component → looks at what other cultures consider (eg. What culture considers “shameful”)
- Every moment is simultaneously good & bad, but also splayed through a body (a perspective)
- Last line of “On good & bad” (p. 49):
  - “not that I am saying what the good is…”
    - Italicizes “is” because he is not giving a clear definition
    - Never offers a definition (eg. Truth, just, good, etc)
- Definitions are all circumstantial & perspectival (the view onto the situation); eg. A dropped vase sucks for the person who broke it, but is good for the store that is going to sell a new vase
- P. 50 “however I should go on to what cities & nations…”
  - His mode of argumentation is too look at what people do (not saying “this is what I think”)
  - Framing the argument
- Seemly
  - Just stating facts, not passing judgment
- Characteristics of the text
  - Never says that an event is essentially anything, it is always the effects (eg. This act is shameful in the light of such & such individual/culture)
  - Rhetoric operates in the space of the effects of things
- Example is based on a metacategory & all the particular things (state a general law & then give an example)
  - Subsets of a greater set
  - There is the risk of the examples not obeying the master category
- **Pure exemplarity:**
  - Something that is an example of itself
• None of his examples add up to any general rule, but they are each useful in their own way
• Techne = premised on nothing but examples, yet the examples do not add up; no reason to add everything up
• “My argument is not that there is no such thing as good, but the good changes on the situation & the perspective” (Coffen); multiple goods
• His basic argument is “it depends”; his definitions are not universal or fixed, they are always contingent
• “For not everyone has the same views…” (P. 50)
  o Kairos → the moment of opportunity; for the Greeks, Kairos is a God; always changing & it emerges; it IS circumstance (not a law); is-ness/being exists outside of time
• “To put the matter generally, all things are seemly when done at the right moment”
  o He doesn’t get rid of the good/just, he proliferates them (that is just & so is that)
    ▪ Every circumstance is legislated by that circumstance (circumstantial propriety)
• List on the seemly & shameful (p. 50); “shameful to run away from one’s enemies…”
  o His lists are his argument
  o Takes us to an extreme at the end of his list, but an extreme suggests a limit; the “less” extreme & the “greater” extreme are making the same argument; therefore, there is no such thing as an extreme; all he is saying is that things are different; his argument is not say what something is
  o *As the list is going, we become complicit; as a reader, you become trained → it nudges you out of knowing what the good, seemly, and shameful are; at some point, you’ve abandoned your moral righteousness; makes you personally involved; you’re complicit in the argument, NOT in the action per say
• “The will to community is a will to violence at some point” (Coffen)
• Rhetoric is a refusal to a kind of certainty, but it is not the abandonment of all arguments; rhetors are not skeptics
• Protean standard = there is a kind of standard, but it just keeps changing
• This text takes a line of flight → doesn’t answer a question, but says “it depends”
• **Dissoi Logoi (Presentation Example)**
  
  o **Dissoi Logoi**
    - Disagreeing Words
    - Disagreeing Arguments
    - Divided Reason
    - 2-Fold Argument
  
  o Looking to the title in order to try to understand what the text means

  o Disagreeing words (binary/opposition) ➔ a lot of examples in the subtitles to the text (eg. “On good & bad”); argument of dissoi logoi is about these particular pairs of words; shortcoming of focusing on these fragments the text (is there more of a thread running through the text?)

  o Disagreeing arguments ➔ begins each section by pointing to contrasting arguments; contrasting arguments on a general level could be taken as the subject matter of the text

  o 2-Fold argument ➔ what is the structure of this text?; he is making a 2-fold argument in the sophistic sense; argues that the first position he took runs into absurdities in each segment of the text

---

**Rhetoric 10: Discussion 2 – 1/30/08**

**Rhetoric 10: Lecture 4 – 1/31/08**

*Dissoi Logoi cont.*

• What is the author’s evidence to make the argument?
  
  o He uses human behavior ➔ appeals to human life, not logic
  
  o From the beginning, it digs into the palpable/human
  
  o Creates an argument that operates outside of truth & falsehood

• Brings up democracy & critiques a certain democratic method
  
  o ???

• Important terms:
  
  o Ethos ➔ posture/character of the text; how the text speaks to you
  
  o Pathos ➔ appeal to emotion; pathetic=rich with feeling/emotion
  
  o Logos ➔ the logic of the argument(s); presumably the argument itself
None of these are separate; threes 3 are so thoroughly intertwined that they verge on the indistinguishable

- Ethos of this text → sense of humility; never adamant about anything
- Seems to critique the will to a law → the movement from these particulars up to a general law is impossible; he jams the circuit
- Logos of this text → there is a lot of difference in the world; makes an argument for a multi-valence of cultures
- Text does not have a hierarchical structure
  - The “good” is always particular; they do not add up though
- End of text p. 54 “I consider characteristic of the same man…”:
  - Specifically addresses the critique of the sophist, who supposedly knows how to speak but can’t give the truth
  - The person who argues well knows everything about everything (and it gets more absurd as it goes on)
  - Goes from knowledge to action
  - “speak correctly on every topic” → if you learn the basic modes of argument, you can talk about everything
  - “if he argues he can play the flute, he can play the flute”; Argument: if you become in tune with how things go, you can figure out something when it comes your way
- Knowledge is not an accumulation of facts, but rather, a way of going & understanding the world

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 5 – 2/5/08

*Austin, How to do things with Words

- Title is noteworthy
- Sounds like a manual → “how to”; going to facilitate action
- What is the argument of the text?
  - There are certain statements, sentences I can write, etc that do not seem to necessarily be statements of fact
Certain things can be said that are not nonsense, but at the same time, they’re not really descriptive → eg. Shit, damn, ummm
  - Realm of language = phatic; phatic discourse is language that does not necessarily seek to communicate anything per say, but keeps the lines of communication of open
Something is happening that is not verifiable (eg. How are you doing?)
  - Verifiable=open to the judgment of truth hood/falseness

• Explicit performative
  o “I do” in the course of a wedding
    - The very act of saying it, is the act of getting married
  o “I named the ship”
  o “I bet you”
    - This utterance is itself the act of making a bet; not separate; it performs the action; can’t say “you’re lying”
  o Look like other sentences, but it doesn’t conform to a certain grammatical category → operates in a realm that is not descriptive; the realm of action & effects (not the realm of meaning & truth)

• P. 50 → Constative claims
  - Claims that you can say yes or no about (eg. It is raining outside)

Every text is a chorography of not just your body, but also your experience

Every utterance (even constatives) is in the same breadth performative (eg. “Its raining” → states a reality, serves as a warning, could be a joke, communicating with another person, etc)
  - Language always enacts something

• In Austin’s book, the distinction between the constative & the performative collapses; no such thing as a constative claims that is not performative; collapses the explicit & implicit distinctions

• Porno example → not a representation, but the actual act; lawyer in Canada uses Austin’s argument in order to get porno outlawed (claims that porn IS the act of raping women)
• Saying is doing something, but it’s not always doing what it’s saying (eg. “I’m cool” → the very act of saying that, makes you not cool); there is always a relationship between what is said & how it is said
• What did this text say and how did it go about saying it? (Always consider this when reading)
• The performative ushers in a reorientation of analysis of the thing
  o By moving away from truth (singular), towards effects/actions (multiple, local)
    the sanctity of the gatekeeper of knowledge is undermined
• Opening of the text:
  o “What I shall have to say here is neither…”
    ▪ His argument is not contentious
    ▪ “…at least in parts” → contradicts himself; says its true, but only sometimes (what parts?); truth is supposed to be singular, but he fragments it
      • Argues that truth hood & false hood are not what matters; what matters is action, not if its verifiable, but rather what comes of it
        ▪ “the only merit” → takes truth (which is presumably the goal of his argumentation) and de-centers it; makes it of tertiary importance; redistributes the role of truth; its one merit amongst many, its not the only
  o At the end of the lecture, he has shifted all the terms of the discourse of analysis outside of the realm of truth hood & false hood
  o “I claim” → in fact claiming (present indicative) & he claims truth; truth is not something that exists outside of the performative; its one possible effect of the performative, which comes first; the performative comes first (it acts)
    ▪ He performs his own argument; that is what he begins with; he has an action that follows all the rules he sets forth later
• There is no such thing as a what that is not also a how
*How to do things with Words*

- What does the passage say about the moralists and how does it serve his point?
  - Criticizes: this duplication of the act (the promise out here as a sign of an inward promise) allows the bigamist to say “I didn’t mean it the first time”; this moral posturing allows the person who breaks their word a way out
- What are the limitations of the performative?
  - He doesn’t limit it at all
  - He temporarily tries to impose limits on it to make it visible, but once that happens, he shows that it is not an isolated phenomenon
- The most explicative form of the performative masquerades, it wears a disguise → paradox
- “I do” “I name the ship” → seem to be referential; as if you could refer to them & see if they actually took place, but he says this is not the case (the speech itself is the action)
- “I name the ship, the Queen Elizabeth”
- What I shall have to say here is neither…
- The performative provides a foundation upon which the speech which you judge something as true or false is created

*Continuation of Performative & Howl*

- I am reading this → absolute conflation of the what & the how
- Indexicals → moments in language that don’t really have any meaning; “I” always designates the person who is speaking but does not have a stable meaning
- We need to simultaneously consider the effect/performance/actions while we consider the meaning
- Every text is a speech act → it’s a whole re-arrangements of parts; rhetoric operates in this place where language constantly arranges relationships (between people & people, people & ideas, etc)
- One of the great performances (speech acts) Austin makes is to name the performative
• The mere act of calling this thing the performative is the a great performance → re-structures the way we think about knowledge, text, etc (page 2 of text)
• Affect → the mood of something; conceptual, emotional; the state of the invisible (eg. Emotions, ideas, etc)
• The performative in Austin’s case is designating a specific moment in writing, but the performative occurs outside of language; rather than language being a tool I use to point to something else, it becomes an occurrence (fundamental shift: not just speaking about something that is happening, it is something that is happening)
  o Language can change the terms with which we think/live

*Howl*

• Grammatically: poem is one sentence; Effect?
  o You have to read it all at once; you can’t stop
  o Punctuation is the time signature of the written word
  o Not a solid block of text even though there are no periods; allows you to catch your breath because there are refrains (eg. Who, who, who)
• What’s the argument/logos of this poem?
  o “I saw the best minds of my generation…of night”
    • “Angleheaded hipsters” → looking for a fix of drugs; jones for something; sense of the broken, longing
    • Constant conflation of profanity with the religious → connects longing for a fix to a longing for God; relationships between the high & low
  o “Mohammedan angels” → bring two religions together; a hodgepodge of religions
• **Ginsberg scrambles between the high & low**
• P. 15 → finds all these different things wailing; discovers this intersection of three disparate things; at the point of the word wail, there is this nexus of radically different things
  o Lets language scramble the world
  o Call to the banal (ferry) becoming religious (wailing wall)
  o The holy is not just what happens in Church
• He democratizes the holy
He removes its privilege
It becomes amongst us
Can find the holy by being “fucked in the ass by saintly motorcyclists” (12)

P. 18, third stanza:
Intertwining of the absolutely profane & the absolutely religious (to Mexico, to boys)

This poem always happens in the now, in the reading; not a document about the beats, but rather a performance of beatdom; it does not describe mania, but in the act of reading, you become a maniac; in the very act of reading it you become a beat, it takes your breath away through its refrain

It becomes an incantation, a religious chant \(\Rightarrow\) becomes a lot like a kadash with its refrains; most conspicuous Jewish element

Howl=angry, hungry, horny, expressive \(\Rightarrow\) all at once; not just one

P. 19, “ah Carl…of time”
Almost a strange intimacy with Carl, but the reader is excluded from it
Text is exhausted at this point “ah”
Speaks in a different register

“\(I\)” \(\Rightarrow\) interpellation of reader; you become the writer

P. 19, “the alchemy of the ellipse” \(\Rightarrow\) the poetic pacing of the peace has become alchemical; they are transformative; revelation

“who dreamt…Deus” \(\Rightarrow\) tells you exactly what poem is; he performs an act

Intertwines language & consciousness (noun & dash of consciousness)

By jamming all these things together, the poem becomes a life

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 7 – 2/12/08

*Continuation of Howl

Questions on board:
What’s at stake?
- Interests: Private/public
Who decides?
- By what standard?
• Role of cons claims?
  o Who pays?
• Rhetoric is the analysis of the effects of discourse
• What are the effects of reading *Howl*?
*Barthes, The Pleasure of the Text*
  • “Let us talk about it as though it existed”
    o Beautiful rhetorical moment
  • Writing out loud is not expressive → it does not give you a message
  • “A perspective of bliss”
    o Not from a perspective of communication or meaning
    o Every communication has countless perspectives
  • “the articulation of the body, of the tongue, not that of meaning, of language”
    o There is a moment in language that throws the signifier out the door; language itself that works you over, not just the meaning
*Ginsberg*
  • Performative component here; the mere act of reading it is articulation of the body
  • Different ways of reading it:
    o Psychoanalytic reading → try to see this text as a symptom of somebody
    o Philosopher reading → about the aesthetic; read it as poetry
    o Literary historian → read this as a document of something else
  • As you read, all these different characters/incidences converge at you as the site of the reader
  • This text, in the very reading of it, makes you a beat (performs beatdom); it performs this how & all the multivalences of what it is to how (the anger, frustration, desire); you become an exhausted creature yearning for the starry heavens
  • “yet putting down here” (p. 20)
    o “here” → in the reading of the moment, you make the moment; the saying & designation are the same thing; indexical
    o you are trapping the archangel of the soul right “here” right now
• The question of temporality is a good question \(\rightarrow\) the temporality of the poem & your encounter with it; as you read this poem, is there a point of transformation? When do I become the beat?
  o Not about questioning the temporality historically
• Non-linear
  o “Animal soup of time”
  o It performs the animal soup of time \(\rightarrow\) performatively & in language, it scrambles time
  o It’s so explosive; almost as if it happens all at once

*One page on Nabakov
• Literally occupies a different plane
• Performs right then & there
• Language does not HAVE to be about things
• “Hammock & honey” \(\rightarrow\) how are they connected? Just by sound?; causes you to question because they’re not commonly seen together

*Baker, Changes of Mind
• Plural; what voice is the title written in? \(\rightarrow\) passive?
  o Argues that this title & text happen in the middle voice, neither active or passive (Coffen)
  o The facile distinction between active & passer doesn’t work here
  o Things don’t happen to me or because of me, they just happen!
• What is his argument? How do minds change?
  o Changes in circumstance
  o Changes without your knowing \(\rightarrow\) you just do stuff & it changes
  o P. 5 (“five years of walking through cities…”)
    ■ You just lead a life & next thing you know you have a different opinion of things
  o A change in mind is a conspiracy of an infinite number of happenings \(\rightarrow\) tries to track how his mind changes, but it doesn’t work
  o Trying to change your mind about how minds change
• Argues that minds don’t change logically, but he can’t provide axioms to prove this because then he would be using logic to say that we can’t use logic! (Trying to persuade us that persuasion is not how minds change!)
  o Confusing
• There is a lot of idiosyncratic moments in this text → how do they perform his argument?

Rhetoric 10: Discussion 4 – 2/13/08

*Baker, \textit{Changes of Mind}
• P. 4, “Such alert intermissions…they do what they have to”
  o What is it that they have to do?
    • Opinions change & that is the one thing that characterizes them; the only generalization you can make about them
• P. 7. “no more than 12-15%”
  o Empirical evidence that is suspect
• The form that his argument takes
  o He puts disparate things out there & it enters into a relationship with you as a reader
  o Comes to influence your own opinions, which enter into new relationships

TWO MISSING LECTURES (LISTEN TO PODCASTS)

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 10 – 2/21/08

*Roland Barthes, \textit{The Death of an Author}
• Argues that there is no author → author is a particular historical institution; new institution that is only a couple hundred years old; occupies a specific place of authority
  o Think of a film → a lot of people conspire & do their own part; there is no “author”
    • Authorship is distributed
    • Director might be final arbiter of what does or doesn’t go in (more of an editor)
• The author is at the mercy of his creation
• Pollock had no interest to re=present (REPRESENT) reality
• Pollock was a facilitator of chance → according to Coffen, that is what all authors/creators are
• Intention is irrelevant
• Introduces term “modern scripter”
• Understand that author is not writer → author is institution that suggests that author exerts authority; he is talking about the death of an institution
• Bottom of p. 145 “what linguists call a performative”
  o Language refers to a performative; language does
  o Language does not merely point to something outside of itself
• “Author God”
  o God is presumably that which is removed from the world & dictates it; the author tells you what the text means without being part of it
• The text is a tissue of plays → it does not have a center; no in the author or the text
• Inside of you, is not you waiting to get out; not some great origin; compares it to a dictionary, which is comprised of a network of endless references

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 11 – 2/26/08

*Barthes continued
• The effacement of origin that writing performs
• Argues for the good reasons/attending pleasures, freedoms, & delights of the eliminations of origin (things have beginnings, but not necessarily origins)
• An origin is outside argument, but Barthes says no, everything is an argument & performs
• Gives example of looking up words in a dictionary → endless cycle; infinite promise where final meaning never comes
• One performance of the text is that it tells us about the death of the author
• Effacement of origins; 2 ways to think about it:
  o 1. Deferral of meaning in a dictionary; THE meaning can never happen → deconstruction is built on this deferral of meaning (Derrida argues that texts are
always pointing outside themselves; always bleeding over its edges; any attempt
to close off the system is futile)

- This assumes that words should have meaning → According to Coffeen,
you can’t separate the meaning from the affect (so intertwined)
  - 2. Rather than all the affects of language being dictated by the meanings of words,
what you get are constant affects; maybe meaning is eluding you, but there are
other successes/affects

- P. 147, “Once the Author is removed..”
  - Author is capital A; Author designates a particular
    institution/approach/philosophy of the relationship between people & language
  - Removal of institution, not writer → you wrote it, but aren’t necessarily authority
    over it
  - Uses capital & lowercase A → by simple typographical change, what argument is
    being made? → Great paper topic
  - “Claim to decipher a text becomes futile” → trying to find true meaning
    - Texts are performative → they are not symbols (do not point to other
      things); happen in you!
  - “Impose a limit on the text” → everything that happens in the text is limited &
    comes back to the Author

- “The reign of the Author has also been that of the Critic”
  - Critic has a privileged access to the text, but why?
  - There is no absolute right or wrong

- You are the local authority of this text, don’t need someone else!
- The text performs in its language
- “Liberates what may be called an anti-theological acticity”
  - To refuse an author is to usher in a different kind of theology & with it a different
    kind of reading exercise
- “There is, however, someone…a text is made of multiple writings, drawn from many
cultures…hitherto said, the author”, p. 148
  - I write and what is left is the language (not that I am some great writer who
    creates all these multiplicities)
All these multiplicities happen at the site of you reading them

- “he is simply that someone who holds together..”, p. 148
  - Text might have so many affects that the very reading of it renders you schizo
  - Reader becomes a site where the text is projected ➔ not a site of unity, but just that someone that happens to be there
  - Each person is kind of a unity, but also a site of multiplicity

- Author is not origin of text; destination is you as a reader, but this is not the re-discovery of an origin
- Text doesn’t speak to the inside of who you are ➔ we’re interested in the text as a local event; not reading as an act of decipherment, but an event/encounter; not something being told to you, but something happening; *A text is a bound infinity
- **THERE IS NO BASE FROM WHICH THINGS HAPPEN; the minute you write, you become language

---

Rhetoric 10: Discussion 6 – 2/27/08 (Missing Discussion 5 due to illness)

*Barthes, Death of an Author*

- P. 146, “eternal copyists”
- Treat the author names as characters that populate the stage
- Get rejection of this early history of reading ➔ p. 148, “the reader is without history, biography, or psychology”
- Model in the beginning:
  - Chronological: The author is the past of his book ➔ when we read the book, we try to recover the author
  - Barthes rejects this
- 146 “we know that a text is not a line of words”
- Barthes: It’s impossible to rest on any one code (Vincent believes he would argue this)
- The reader is impersonal because the text is not made for a reader; its not owned by a reader; its not unified in the manner that we think of it as
- When we encounter language, we are always becoming alien to ourselves ➔ when we become a reader, we become alien to ourselves
- Reader is impersonal because language demands & cultivates impersonality
*Queneau, *Exercises in Style*

- What argument(s) does this text make?
  - The text never comes out and says “this is what I believe”, but it still clear that it makes a lot of complex arguments
- All the words and language we use have to be questioned: Is there one story? Are there only many stories? Does one thing even happen here?
- No common theme; random linguistic play
- Many different ways of describing the same thing, but is there a same thing?
- Is there one thing & then variations on it? Or is there nothing but variations?
  - There is no neutrality; things are already positioned, inflected
- Are they just 99 versions? → there is some relationship between the parts
  - There does seem to be a connection, but what are the terms of the connection?
- Ontology → makes arguments about the very nature of things
- Argument:
  - Makes an argument that once your dislocate the real/one you’re no longer tethered to the real, there is a proliferation of possibilities (infinite freedom)
- First entry is a notation
  - Is this the one from which the rest deviate?
  - Or is this itself already a deviation?
    - “N” is a already a deviation from something (11:22 in lecture)
      - Has already been bent by humanity
- Every time you go to write a letter, you’ve already inflected it; it’s already an argument
- Fonts change the face of the event
- All writing is a choreography of the body of the reader
- P.19
  - The picture makes an argument about the relationship between human life/bodies & language
    - Always already a deviation
- There is no origin for deviation, it will always already be a deviation (this contorted body); there is NO real thing
• Book has two prefaces, both by translator
• **Write one of the variations of this text over the weekend**
  o Proves that there is no limit to the variations → perspectives are infinite
• The thing is the sum of all the perspectives on it & the perspectives are infinite; hence, a thing is never complete (it’s infinite)
• P. 129
  o Is this a perspective on something?
    ▪ Linguistic perspective → if language has a perspective too, this fundamentally transforms the relationship between humans & language
      • Text takes leave of the human
• One argument:
  o There is no real, per say
  o All there are, are these perspectives & they are infinite
• Another argument:
  o Even with notation, you are already getting an argument
  o There is no neutral → you are always expressing something
  o You are always inflecting, making an argument
• There is NO neutral place in the world because everything is an argument
• What argument do the little drawings make?
  o Every body is making a different posture/argument (they all inflect differently)
  o Language is a contortion → they don’t make any shape they want to make; they are subscribing to a local law created by the language/letter
    ▪ What are the terms of these contortions?
• The text is always in the middle; it doesn’t make clear closures
• This text introduces play as a mode of engaging in the world
• P. 88-92:
  o Cockney, cross-examination, one other → you have three Cs in a row, but they’re all different
  o There is a law there to make that “C” & not another letter, but there is at least three ways to do it → flexible law; absolutely determinative & free at the same time
• Do these bodies look like they’re in pain? Or are they playful?
  o By pushing language to its limits, you push the body to its language → language & bodies are intertwined! (Illustrations)
• Queneau makes the language & the body one in the same thing; the body pushes language & language pushes the body
• These exercises in language extend the human & language
• Why do the bodies look unnatural?
  o You have to take yourself out of the regular
  o When you call something “natural,” it is an argument → the natural is an insidious argument & should always be interrogated!
  o There is no such thing as the natural
• These contorted bodies are a push to re-create the norm; re-create the natural
• Queneau argues for the unfamiliar & sometimes it hurts
• Certain beliefs that language constrains us (I cannot think it unless I have the word for it) → but he argues that this limit is infinite; we need to re-think what freedom is in the first place (is it just freedom from constraint? No, it’s the ability to act within constraints)
• How does this text perform this death of the author? In what ways can we say Queneau is not the author? How does this text perform his own suicide as authority over text?
  o All of these entries (table of contents) read as a list of laws/constraints
  o He continually performs the law that he has been asked to follow → weird declaration of freedom; says give me all the laws & I’ll follow them
  o There is an infinite number of ways this tale can be told → if that is true, then there is an infinite number of laws that he will submit himself to (and this is his freedom)
  o Has a relish for the law → limit & freedom are no longer opposed terms
  o The authority of this text is in the table of contents → a proliferation of laws
• LAST 15 MINUTES MISSING BECAUSE LAPTOP DIED (Hand wrote notes)
• Over the weekend:
  o New permutation; find the law that you will then submit to
*Nietzsche, *On Truth & Lie in the Nonmoral Sense*

- But first, re-cap of Exercises in Style:
  - What is privileged is a moment of utter banality
  - Argument about the nature of that which we privilege
  - Every moment, no matter how banal, is ripped through an infinite number of times → every moment is processed by the world an infinite amount of times
  - A re-distributed of the role of play
    - Through play there is pleasure, but also a certain kind of fulfillment
  - This book dispenses with the real
  - The real is superceded by the play/real/spin
  - When we usher out the real, there is still the proliferation of laws → every page is about structure
  - Banal moment that can be proliferated infinitely, but there are constraints! → what we wrote helps demonstrate the constraint of the law; it is a bound infinity, because there are certain ways to read it
  - Limit & freedom are not opposed → infinite freedom in the limit
  - The death of the author inaugurates a proliferation of law

- N is the beginning of the modern rhetorical moment
- Title: “On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense”
  - Nonmoral = outside the realm of morality
  - What argument does this title perform?
    - There is another way to look at truth; if there is a “nonmoral sense,” then there are multiple sense
    - There are different ways of interpreting truth & lies → morality is just one way to interpret them
    - The very status of truth & lies has changed → it is not a fixated thing
    - Not making claims about the world (eg. “there are no morals”), but rather, reading the world (like a rhetor)
    - These are particular institutions that he is going to interrogate
    - Right from the title, he has already displaced truth
• Manifesto of play (a free movement where there is no clear center; roles are constantly swapping)
• No rigid distinction; things swap roles and move
• Nietzsche multiples perspectives → moral & nonmoral; he moves between a moral & a nonmoral discourse; he rams them together even though they do not speak the same discourse
• “Once upon at time…”
  o He is telling you a story/fairytale
  o Opens with a myth, and then he tells us that myth is the foundation → we are fundamentally mythological beings & yearns for a mythological society, not a scientific one; myth is a type of truth making; science is just myth
  o The essay asks for itself to be re-read at the end
• “In some out of the way corner…invented knowing”
  o Refers to humans as beasts, although we hold ourselves in a different regard (nobility of humanity has been reduced to clever beasts; erases rigid distinction between human and animal)
    ▪ He has shifted our perspective; broken down a category of knowledge that would separate the human from the animal
  o Gives us different view of knowledge → what it means to know
  o Shifts categorical definitions of knowledge
  o In one sentence, he has told us that knowing was invented; not some universal; not eternal; it just another practice with a history (truths, authors, etc have histories; nothing is a given)
  o Numberless, infinite universe → you think you’re the center of the world, but he disperses it; starts with a myth, which to him is a scientific claim; displaces the privileged center
  o In opening myth, he creates an alien landscape → reduced to clever beast in some far out corner; not center
    ▪ Why would you want to know the world?
  o Relationship between de-centered and centered:
He actually proliferates centers; everything is center, not a negative connotation like “de-center”

The mosquito, gnat, human, etc all think they’re the center

Picture center of world constantly being re-cast

- As he moves through the piece, he makes everything the center
- “In some way out corner of THAT universe”
  - That → weird distancing; not our universe, or this universe, but THAT one
  - Has multiplied universes; infinite cosmos
- Role of story is one of the arguments of the essay → what is the relationship between truth & story?
- Does not have knowledge being invented on a planet, but on a star → not just on an asteroid, or junk, but on a star
- Always saying multiple things → never takes an ardent position because he is arguing against dogmatism (including arguing against the argument of dogmatism because he thinks its suspect)
- “most arrogant…was only a minute”
  - The invention of knowing œwas the most untruthful moment in the history of the world
  - “mendacious” → how does he mean it? Moral or nonmoral sense?
  - Look for words like “honest, truth, liars”
- Good paper: Show how his language makes him speak in multiple voices & that makes his argument; think of particular moment for an essay!; particular phrasing in text

Rhetoric 10: Lecture Discussion 7 – 3/5/08

*Discussion I led on Nietzsche
- I primarily discussed the disconnect between language and truth because of the barriers established by metaphors
- Questions I posited:
  - Nietzsche constantly refers to the disconnect between language and truth. However, perhaps he ignores the primary purpose of language all together. If
language was established mainly for communication, then why must language necessarily refer to truth and not a more generalized reference?

- On p. 82, Nietzsche writes, "To begin with, a nerve stimulus is transferred into an image: first metaphor. The image, in turn, imitated in a sound: second metaphor." By referencing these metaphors, he is commenting on the gap of knowledge that occurs between a sensational experience and the attempt to explain that experience through language. If we can only speak in metaphors, must we resign to the conclusion that we can never speak "truth"? Or rather, is it possible to compensate for these gaps and communicate "truth(s)" to others?

- Significant interjections by Vince:
  - How we think about knowledge & language:
  - Everything is conditioned by the use we place on it; the relationship \( \rightarrow \) everything is conditioned not only by OUR relationship to it, but also its relationship to other things
  - The creator of language is only concerned with things that he has a relationship with & that is why objective truth is incomprehensible to him (Nietzsche does not deny the truth all together)

* Nietzsche continued

- About the effects of arguing for truth
- A will to myth preceeds, exceeds, & supercedes a will to truth (the will to create, the will to art, the will to mythology)
- “eternities [note that its plural] to which it did not exist” \( \rightarrow \) the constant will to multiplicity (“numberless twinkling universes”)
  - Take what you think is an eternal/a given & show its history
  - These things you take for granted have a history
  - Says that truth/knowing itself has a history (times when truth/knowledge didn’t exist)
- “the flying center of the universe within himself”
  - Rather than de-centering the world, he makes everything the center
o He has made everybody the sun
• “the pride connected…value of existence”
  o We’re addressing a value of existence
  o When we have this thing called knowing (knowing & morality come from the same place; the will to truth is a moral code)
  o Why are we here? What is the point?
  o Those who believe in God/knowledge are nihilists → they try to evade & avoid life; they try to skip over experience
• “since they have been denied the chance to wage the battle”
  o Broken the rigid distinction that would separate man from animals
  o We were only given intellect so we could try to survive because we were not given any other species things
• What’s the intellects may function? To lie → it dis-folds its main power in “dissimulation”; deception; we can lay traps
  o He says this is good; from the moral sense, we’re liars
    ▪ BUT FROM THE NONMORAL SENSE, we’re artists
  o From a moral perspective, the intellect is a liar but then he shifts from that perspective because he is not a moralist → thins thing that dissimulates is a creator; it is the will to art/mythology
• “Deception, flattering…truth could have arisen among them”
  o His ethos of shock is hilarious (Coffen)
• “They are deeply immersed…on the back of things”
  o He doesn’t change his argument, but the tone of his argument
  o Says that we’re all living in a dream world, but this is only negative from a moral perspective
  o At the end, he embraces the dream world!
• “Moreover, man permits himself to be deceived…”
  o We enjoy the wackiness of our dreams & that is what makes us human
  o If you were interested in rationality, you would stop your nutty dreams → but we’re not actually interested in truth! (that is his argument)
• “light of display case” → weird vehicle of science that he is critiquing; uses the language & figures of the very thing he is critiquing; co-ops the language of the thing he is arguing against
• “Given this situation, where in the world could the drive from truth have come from”?  
  o Truth becomes something that has a drive; has a history, is not automatic  
  o Performative argument  
  o At the end, he argues that by the historical moment of the Greeks it is the valuing of art & beauty, not truth
• “Insofar as the individual…for dissimulation”  
  o Knowledge, intellect, ability to think is a defense mechanism
• “With the heard”  
  o Sees it at a special level  
  o We just want to live with others  
  o We use the intellect (amongst other reasons) because of BOREDOM → I start inventing shit because I’m bored  
    ▪ But also NECESSITY → this will to metaphor is necessary; it is impossible to be human & not use metaphors
• His venom is not against metaphor, dissimulation (that is him speaking from the faux position of a moralist); his venom is against the pride of someone who makes something up & declares it is the truth
• “this is to say…first laws of truth”  
  o Truth, in this history of truth, is something built out of convenience, boredom, & necessity; also, it is a rule of language; it is about what is allowed & not allowed to be said  
  o Truth is the law that allows you to say things or not say things  
  o It is a world that has been constructed around certain axis
• “he misuses fixed conventions…reversals of names”  
  o This is precisely what he says the artist does 2 pages later; this is what the intellect does  
  o Like what he does when he uses moral language to bash truth (jams the discourse)
• “being harmed by means of fraud”
o It’s not that people actually care if you live, but they just don’t want the harmful effects of lies
o Not actual truth that they care about → interested in the EFFECTS
o Not just about the principles, but the practice → Nietzsche will always return us to the practice
  ▪ The principle does not efface the experience → on the contrary, the experience comes first (Wiping asses example)
• “He is indifference toward pure…even hostile inclined”
  o Comes back to notion of pure knowledge throughout article
  o Not that kind of truth we want, because it is possibly harmful
• “It is only be means of forgetfulness…grade just indicated”
• “If he will not be satisfied with the truth in the form of… “
  o All knowledge is tautologic
    ▪ It is a self-construing system
    ▪ He does not have a problem with it, but to men of science tautology is the ultimate criticism because you haven’t actually said anything else about the world
    ▪ Tautology functions as a critique of knowledge
• A word is an argument → it doesn’t just designate a thing, it makes an argument about what it is
• Art is a celebration of the subjective, arbitrary, perspective
• Knowledge is a vehicle of power when it is related to law (eg. You have to call this a “moon,” and not anything else); this is what he tells us on bottom of p. 84
• “The ‘thing in itself”…not in the least worth striving for”
  o When I’m trying to name something, it’s not that I’m trying to capture the essence of it; my relationship to it need to be more poetic
• “This creator only designates…boldest metaphors”
  o This is the argument
  o You’re only ever designating a relationship
  o Not the truth, but how you stand before the thing; experience, circumstantial
  o About effects & relationships
• “To begin with...second metaphor”
  o You are constantly removed from the thing itself → impossibility of actually
capturing the truth, but that is not a failure (failure is to think we did; this is
liberating, a will to art and creation!)
  o It is cool that we are trapped in our subjectivities

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 15 – 3/11/08

*Nietzsche cont.

• This moment of creation is not a creation of language (that pre-exists), but is the creation
of relationships between man & the world (the canvas is language)
• Every single word we use to designate something is an argument & we have forgotten
over time that these are arguments (we think that’s how it is, instead of remembering that
they are actually interpretations)
  o *Truth is premised on forgetting
  o Truth is the adherence of a certain designation to a thing; simply an obligation to
say that word for that thing over & over again; does not really speak to the world
• “In particular, let us further...thus altogether unequal”
  o Uses example of leaves
  o The poetic moment is the moment he want to privilege
  o To insist that all leaves are really the same thing is to ignore circumstance (eg.
  Camping with them) & forget all the differences
  o All language necessarily operates at the level of the concept
• It is madness to take all these things that are different and say they are all leaves
• “and likewise with no species”
  o We think hierarchically → we always try to place things in categories of
similarity
  o However, there is an indifferent swarm in nature, & trying to put things into
categories is insane
• “that of course would be a dogmatic assertion..”
  o Argues against dogmatism
  o Renders the question of truth mute; he doesn’t counter it or argue against it
• He forges a new space all together & looks at it in a nonmoral sense
• Wants to get rid of certainty because it is the ground for power
• NOT saying believing in an object Truth is bad \( \Rightarrow \) that would be dogmatic!; just
  wants to privilege something else (eg. Beauty)
• **Not arguing against truth**
  • “What then is truth? . . . and no longer as coins”
  o Truth is the mobile army of metaphor, metonymy, irony, etc
  o All we are every doing is exchanging, extending, blurring \( \Rightarrow \) truth has no
    fundamental claims on the world
• “to be truthful means to employ the usual metaphors”
• “thus to express it morally . . . manner binding upon everyone”
  o Complicated moment because here he is speaking morally
• “thus he lies in the manner indicated”
  o Morality & truth are intimately related because they are prescriptions to act a
    certain way
  o The will to truth starts to take on moral tone
• “everything which distinguishes . . . image into a concept”
  o All that is beautiful and coming at you from the forest dissolve into concepts
• “For something is possible . . . regulative and imperative world . . . characteristics of
  mathematics”
  o What are the effects of having this tethering to abstraction?
  o Once you begin abstracting from the immediate life, something else is possible
    (hierarchies)
  o Not that nature just can’t be classified, but your metaphor can’t be either
  o This great structure of concepts has become a columbarium
    ▪ Dead metaphors \( \Rightarrow \) the life itself is dead; people who live by dead
      metaphors are dead
    ▪ Turns our entire structure of knowledge into a place of death
• Between pages 88 and 89, Nietzsche shifts from speaking morally to nonmorally
• “Man builds with fare more delicate . . . from himself”
• Takes man of truth and turns him into an architect (first turns him into a liar and than an architect)

• “in this he is greatly to be admired..”
  o But not for his drive for truth
  o From the moral & the knowledge to the moral & aesthetic
  o Asks us to view all of life from the aesthetic perspective

Rhetoric 10: Discussion 8 – 3/12/08

*Nietzsche cont.

• Objective truth is incomprehensible because of the chain of metaphors → never reaches the object; you only begin with a metaphor and never with an object at all

• He often describes a “will to truth,” which he attributes to a scientific man; the scientific man forgets he is an artistically creating man and begins to value truth as if it is independent from himself
  o A drive for the formation of metaphors can be compared to a will to truth

• “Prison from his own products (89)
  o Enters into metaphors & becomes imprisoned there

• The scientific man & intuitive man use their metaphors differently & so experience the world differently

• P. 80:
  o “continuous fluttering around this solitary flame of vanity”
    • Has already connected pride & invention knowing (through invention, we have become blind to the value of existence) → bugs, kill themselves
    • Something about the human pride in its knowing that is dangerous
  o After mentioning display case, he produces it for us
    • Quivering blood, flowing bowls → as if object being dissected

• Intimate relationship between knowledge & life (since we don’t have speed, etc we have deception and that allows us to preserve ourselves)

• This truth drive has somehow become opposed to our powers of dissimulation

• Knowledge is always implicated in relations of power (I learn about something so I can dominate it)
• We think of knowledge as something we are proud of because it allows us to approach the truth, but we’re just fooling ourselves; not outside of us
• The drive for truth is a expression of the drive to subordinate something to our existence (drive to metaphor is also a drive to dominance but they have different effects; eg. Scientific man subordinates himself to his concepts & it is still a means of preservation; artistic man is different)
  o Both desire to preserve a form of life, but they’re not exactly the same
  o Disrupts the category of human, because not all human life is the same
    (personifies it with these 2 figures)
• Man is so proud of knowledge that he keeps working at truth \think of fly that is so entrenched by something that it destroys itself by running into it
• Truth drive succeeds in its nihilism and destroys itself

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 17 – 3/18/08 (Missed 16 due to conference)

*Nietzsche cont.
• Learning truth is just learning to order the world in a certain way (uses example of his child)
• Knowledge is a series of language laws; a series of prescriptions
• Everything is a projection/metaphor, we just forgot that there was this creative moment (p. 86; “only by forgetting this primitive…
• You must shed all categorical assumptions in order to see what Nietzsche is talking about (“this fire flow of metaphors”)
• Man is an “artistically creating subject” (86)
  o We are first & foremost artistic creatures & that is how we engage the world
• Out of boredom & necessity we create truth \not first truth, but first art!
  o Art & truth are not irreconcilable
• “insect or the bird perceives…quite meaningless”
  o No such thing as a correct perception
  o Moves us towards a proliferation of perspective that privileges difference (rather than progress of regress)
• The knowledge system might be interesting, but it’s not going to be true
• Every word is a preference for one side of a thing or another
• “for between two absolutely different spheres…an aesthetic relation” (86)
  o Uses desk example → lap can be a desk & perhaps what we consider something a desk that is not
• Whole 1st Section:
  o His move:
    ▪ Words don’t name the thing in the truth, they are an interpretation of the thing
    ▪ To try to make an argument to get at the truth is a moot exercise
    ▪ But we try to get at the truth because we want the effects of the truth (which are repose & security)
    ▪ The world eludes us (a familiar argument), but this is not his argument → it is a component of his argument, but it is NOT that words fail
      • Words only fail if you look at it from the perspective from truthhood and falsehood
      • Only if you think words should EXPRESS the truth & capture something, then that is when you fail
      • BUT, he doesn’t think it should → you can’t get at the truth so let us look at it from a different perspective:
        o Look at the relationship between language, truth, & the world from a different perspective and what happens?
          ▪ We can only SUCCEED; no such thing as failing
      • Argues that words succeed (not in capturing the truth), but in proliferating perspectives → once you shift perspectives your very assessment of the relationship between knowledge, truth, humanity, etc changes with it
• LEFT AT 11:45 FOR MEETING; GET REST OF NOTES FROM PODCAST

Rhetoric 10: Discussion 9 – 3/19/08

*Nietzsche finished
• Stoic man
Should we have faith in our beliefs?

Scientist vs. Artist vs. Stoic Man

Scientist:
- Seeks order/repose
- Master or concept
- Volatize perceptual metaphors
  - Disembodied
- Rational
- Builds rigid world
- Architect/mighty genius of construction
- Tower
  - = empty rigid space
  - D.N.E. progress
- Timid, needy man, gloomy officiousness
- Laborer/service

Artist:
- Liberated intellect
- Destructive, ironic (edifice)
- Edifice as play thing
- Clever, proud, luxuriant, daring

Scientist & Artist:
- Will to power
- Seek to dominate
- Use metaphor

Stoic man:
- Wears mask
- Governance by concept
- Dignified, unchanging symmetrical features
- Learns from experience
Rhetoric 10: Lecture 19 – 4/1/08 (Missed 18 due to Model UN conference; PODCAST)

*The Medium is Massage: Inventory of Effects

*Notes start at noon because of laptop issues (see handwritten notes)

- “Book is like a factory” → hyper-specialized parts put together to make the work
  - The alphabet & industrialization are parcels of the same logic (neither good, nor bad, just an effect)
- Book is all about effects → like rhetoric; not a judgment
- “We impose the form of the old on the new”
  - Problem is when we try to impose old technology on the new
- “Inventory of Effects”
  - Literally breaks the line; logic of right to left is disturbed
  - All on cover of book
  - Another way this is not a book
  - Creative act is breaking the sentence
- How does typography inflect the word?
  - Gives the words voice/sound
    - Inflection (capitalizing, bolding) plays with the acoustics of the page (synesthesia)
- Taking over the East on the logic of the West
  - Discussion on languages that read top to bottom (eg. Mandarin)
- The size of the book makes an argument
  - It can be read on the go
  - Not meant to be read alone in privacy of room
- Newspaper
  - Medium that brings radically different things together under one umbrella
  - Complicated medium → distributes your body; works you over in ways differently than a book does; think about the choreography of reading a newspaper
- Massage → works you over completely, in every aspect of your life
- Argues that technology is acoustic → happens all around us; all at oneness
  - Book operates in acoustic space
  - This book will happen not as much visually as it will aurally
• He tries to jam our circuits → we have to alienate ourselves from the environment we take for granted in order to see how technology has affected us/the world (eg. Consider internet → we are so engrained by it that we don’t really how greatly it has impacted the way we communicate)
  o Fundamentally changes how we relate to one another
• The Wealth of Social Networks
  o Reference to see how things change how we think about ourselves

*The Medium is Massage: Inventory of Effects
• “Societies have always been changed..content of the communication”
  o The means of communicating shape us more than the content does
  o Media is the terms with which we communicate things
  o Relationships between people are shaped by the means through which they can communicate → shifts how we approach critique/analysis; the “what” takes a second seat to the “how”
• “The alphabet..by osmosis so to speak”
  o Printing press fragments and isolates us
  o The word versus the visual image versus the sound → each one inflects our experience; the speed of it, how we make sense of things, etc
• P. 44 “the dominate organ…eye for a ear”
  o “Hearing is believing” → pun; the book is a book of puns; its jams things together; reverses traditional notions
• p. 44 “Continuous and connected”
  o Distinctly visual moment
  o How do you turn that into sound?
  o This is a PRIVELIGING of the eye (nothing good or bad about doing this; merely a fact, an inventory of effects)
• Not just the text that choreographs your experience, but also TEXTUALITY
• “Electronic technology fosters..” (beginning)
  o Electronic technology is already a multiple medium; it is the medium of media
op Medium of proliferation & multifarious

• P. 10 “Our time is a time for crossing…often result”
  o Constantly jamming things together in order to discover things → the exposing of the environment; does not want things such as the alphabet to be something that you take for granted any longer; wants to discover new affects

• P. 26, “All media work us over completely…work as environments”
  o All media are extensions of some human faculty
  o All technology is an extension of us, but it also forms & shapes us

• “Media, by altering the environment…ratios of sense perception…perceive the world”
  o Each medium distributes our senses in certain ways (amplifies & de-amplifies certain things)
  o All media distributes our senses in these different rations (not necessarily good or bad, but just a new distribution → AN INVENTORY OF EFFECTS)
  o A medium is the inflection/shaping of an environment

• Argument: The book as a medium isolates/fragments us from each other → we read along

• P 63 “our s is a brand-new world…literacy divorced us”
  o Argument: Electronic circuitry (internet) is primordial (tribal existence)

• “Electronic circuitry profoundly…active interplay”
  o Interplay of social networks on a computer and you get all the information at once (blogs, websites, etc)

• You write to a computer & it writes back (different interplay than with a TV)

• P. 68 “We have now become aware…as a work of art”
  o Sounds like Nietzsche → everything is play; keep re-inventing

• “…process of discovery”
  o Whole work is an art gallery, but also a teaching
  o Art is not distinct from knowledge, but IS knowledge
  o This book arranges itself as an art happening & is also performing a pedagogy (teaching you to read & thing differently); has made the two one in the same
  o Think about the connections to Nietzsche

• “the main obstacle…print technology”
The mode with which we analyze media needs to change
Can’t analyze from a fixed point of view (psychological) → that goes back to our isolation
Can’t have a fixed point of view, but need a proliferation of a points of view

• “print technology created the public”
  If you didn’t have a newspaper, magazine, etc you would not have a public → it would just be people around you; newspapers create public (eg. “Americans think this..”)

• Experts & Amateurs:
  Expert is a lot like Nietzsche’s scientist or philosopher → how can they be part of a world that is changing if they already know?; they do not listen
  The amateur does not know
  This new world entails a not knowing → in a world of electronic circuitry, networks are constantly emerging; the world is a place of chance

---

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 21 – 4/8/08

*Brief comments on Medium & then Poetical Dictionary

• Medium:
  The media distributes our bodies throughout the world
  Complicated notion of extension → not just my car is an extension of my leg, but my leg is now an extension of the car
  Looks at diverse media & how it re-distributes our sensory experiences (eg. TV gives our eyes this strange reach to countless places)
  Consider Bluetooth earpiece → literal extension of ear, but also a projection of your body all over the world
  This book is a synesthesia → in reading this book, we hear this book
  How can you argue that this book is acoustic?
    Manipulation of the typographic/visual aspect of this book in order to amplify/de-amplify (eg. BANG)
    Plays with the sound of the page when he bolds, makes smaller & bigger
Picture where the ear is where the eye “should” be → personal note: think about how this plays with conventional thought
  - Trying to perform the argument
  - Synesthesia!

Pages with thumbs:
  - Mirrors you back onto yourself → this is what you look like when reading

How does the text speak to (implicate) us?
  - In what ways does this book not let you isolate yourself?
    - With mirror, you are folded into the body of the text
    - Forces a contingency between the book and your surroundings (the book implicates you in a community [you and your immediate environment]) → instead of isolating you, forces you into surrounding spaces

Performative pedagogy → performs a teaching; if you are capable of reading this book, you are capable of reading technology in the modern age

*Lohren Green, Poetical Dictionary

- What is this book?
- “Still state”
- Definition give an experience of the word
- There is explicitly a call to the physical & sensual
- Glee is gleeful, bleak is bleakful, acrobatic is acrobatic → ever-shifting law of experience
  - Not just tactile, but different experiences pending the word
  - A shifting experience defined by the word
  - Proliferation of laws (think *Exercises in Style*)
- “A dictionary is both a book of words and a cosmos” (preface)
  - A dictionary with all the words in it, if each one is that experience, would be an entire world
- “Letters, lines, & lineages”
  - Objects of the dictionary
  - But are also defined!
• In other words, a dictionary has letters, lines, & lineages, but it also defines these words
• Brings to the fore the form of the dictionary → brings the dictionary as a medium to light
• Think about the structure of a dictionary:
  o All these radically incongruent things coexist
• From first paragraph of preface, Green amplifies the internal incongruities of a dictionary
  o Dictionary is this things w/all these different things
• Every definition of every word could be seen as a performance of an argument about how to read this dictionary
  o Uses comparison of a zoo: every structure is defined by the logic of its own ecology (eg. Arctic vs desert); zoo is a structure that structures all these other things
• This book has a will to multiplicity → explodes & amplifies; this book seeks to question
  o Last line of preface is a question → this book makes of the definition of question; knowledge lies in the question, not the answer
• The great pedagogy of this book is that it teaches us about a structure
  o A structure that is open & changes, but is a structure nonetheless
• These words have a logic that immanent to them, but at the same time that logic is not fixed, but circumstantial → paradoxical
• “Plastic is a word, with its own pliant stretch & snap into place” (xii)
  o Plastic is plastic
  o This book constantly unfolds into itself
• “This special synthesis of body and concept…” (xii)
  o That’s what a word is!
  o You do need a word’s concept, but they also have a body
  o Sense=body + concept
    • Body & concept are not always aligned! (diarrhea [aligned] vs. abbreviated [not aligned])
• “Where then, in this combination of mood & notion...” (xiii)
  o A word is a combo of mood & notion
  o A word is simultaneously a particle & a wave
• What is our access to words?
  o Do we have to take them out of sentences to understand them → dictionaries pull words out of play; places them in a vacuum (“rarified air of clean-room analysis”)
    ▪ Mirrors our relationship to material (eg. If we pull this into a lab & study it, then we’ll understand it)
• Our relationship to words is a temporal & circumstantial relationship
• This book gives us an alternate relationship to language & knowledge
• “A gesture, an envoy…what a word can be…flexibility structure their heterogeneity” (xiv)
  o Generous → it can be all these things!
  o Not like a traditional dictionary, where all words have to behave in a certain way
  o “this poetical dictionary”
    ▪ Not definitive; this is one poetical dictionary amongst many
      • Dictionaries precisely argue for their certainty (“this is the definition”) → HE ARGUES THE OPPOSITE OF THIS
        o Rather than seeking to be definitive, it seeks to be perspectival
      o A flexible structure → rhetoric is the inauguration of new ways of thinking about the structure of experience
• Notice how he calls this “abridged” → because it can only be a portion of it? (Coffen jokes that the unabridged one is larger than the universe)
• The word occupies Green each time and splays him out → he puts himself at the mercy of the law & shape him into a new possibility each time; not Green’s private subjectivity, but he has to give himself up (he is not the author, but rather, they play thing of these words!)
• For Thursday:
  o Write an entry in poetical dictionary → perform the definition of the word
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*Last week presenters that did not get to present!

- References the part about Alice:
  - Performance of an argument → the nonsense is a sentence that Alice is giving
  - Relation to Alice in Wonderland is an apt reference because she is a figure that enters a transformed world
    - About a powerful transformation of reality [personal note: McLuhan’s argues that technology transforms reality too!]

*Poetical Dictionary

- Empty pages → what do they signify?
  - Contrasts with dictionary entries, where everything is filled
    - P. 14 of preface → dictionaries have an astounding compression
  - Think about the relation between words → considerable distance between them is created by empty pages
  - He calls attention to the perspectival nature of this dictionary; p. 20 of preface → you might object to some of these definitions [eg. Is glee to boyish?]
    - This openness within the text opens itself to other perspectives & poetical dictionaries
  - Open format that allows you to attack it from multiple perspectives → not forced to fit author’s paradigm
  - Allows words to unfold in their own particular manner

- P. 30, foreplay (specific discussion of shape in relation to definitions)
  - Not compact → semi-colons draw it out & everything flows into everything [similar to foreplay]
  - Very open ended → perhaps suggesting that you don’t know how long foreplay can go on

- Discussion of “queasy”
  - Multiple ways it performs queasiness on reader
  - Uses disgusting diction (diction itself is nauseating)
  - The structure of the definition rocks in a fashion similar to the way boat would rock to cause queasiness/sea sickness
• The different definitions of are not separated by periods [like in a traditional dictionary], but semi-colons \(\rightarrow\) hints at the way different definitions relate to one another

• P. 94 chart
  o Hurricane \(\rightarrow\) there is normally a set line between everything, but there is no definitive line of a hurricane; its grabs everything together
    ▪ There is not the conditions on sea/conditions of land differentiation
    ▪ Greater than or equal to 64 knots \(\rightarrow\) there is a lower limit, but it has an infinite potential of intensity; breaks down categories that structure the definition

• P. 15 in the preface “the best poetical dictionary…one exception and one omission”
  o What is meant by this exception & omission? \(\rightarrow\) Is it perhaps best to leave out mentioning them? Is not pointing them out the only way to represent them?

• Dedicates the dictionary to someone
  o Says there is no privileged access to words, yet he dedicates it to someone
  o Perhaps it is another way of calling attention to his perspective

_________________________________________________________________
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*Poetical Dictionary

• What’s at stake in the title?
  o Is there something about poetry that suggests the efficacy about performing the performative?

• P. 14 of preface:
  o “it gives the living standard”
    ▪ Not just a life standard, but it is active \(\rightarrow\) the standard itself is in motion
    ▪ Rhetoric is interested in the different standards
    ▪ Both constituent & constitutive of the experience
      • Constitutive = makes the thing happen
      • Constituent = at the mercy of the thing
        o *Is the situation, but is also at the mercy of the situation
        o It is itself, but it is also changing all the time
  o “a system of multifarious life”
• generous!
  • “performed portraiture, conceptual calligraphy”
    • Concept is no longer separated from the paper/body
    • Writing with concepts (Nietzsche did a similar thing by making concepts palpable [called them “bony”])
• His words are defined not simply for the sensuality \(\rightarrow\) folds the sensuality & the concept together (fold the body into its meaning)
  • This creates a new kind of knowledge that is simultaneously conceptual & physical
• Chiasmus \(\rightarrow\) the intertwining of things
• “the style of information” (xiv)
  • No such thing as a fact that is not an argument \(\rightarrow\) another way of looking at this is that it has a style
• Move of Lohren: takes experience & makes it part of knowledge; has re-shaped the domain of what is considered knowledge
• “Though the traditional dictionary…its sense of words”
  • Takes the thing that is presumably free from aesthetic critique & gives it one (through diction such as “masterpiece”)
• “monochromatically curt retentiveness”
  • Speaks in a certain tone \(\rightarrow\) curt!
• “its compendious density…perfunctory remarks”
  • Tries to throw away the body of words & just have pure meaning
  • Green believes you cannot separate yourself from the sumptuousness of words
• “clumsy joy that seems to hiccup in its fly”
  • this descriptions lets you know the butterfly (Coffen)
• Performs words like “curt, stiff, & grid” well because it is these things!
• “The booked worked furiously…in anarchy” (xvi)
  • How can it do all these things? (even contradictory things)
    • If the unabridged version had a performance of every word, then the entire book would be cosmos folded within its pages
    • There would be an impossible cacophony & a simultaneous harmony
• “no one overriding principle of selection” (xvi)
  o This book has a relentless will to the multiple
• “Region, time, mood…some way of being” (xviii)
  o Coffen uses example of how we all pronounce certain words differently
• Last page of preface “rather than parsing…protean standard”
  o Protean=constantly shifting
• “especially here, there is room for error…what is it?”
  o There is no privileged access to words → incredible democratization
• Foreplay definition
  o Ends in a colon

Rhetoric 10: Lecture 23 – 4/15/08

*Poetical Dictionary finished & Phaedrus

• Third to last sentence “and it is this I hope…thoroughly and throughout”
  o This notion of enjoying a text → interesting relationship to knowledge; not just to know something, but to enjoy it
  o To enjoy something is a superceding of knowledge → includes both the conceptual & experiential dimensions of knowing
  o Joy as a way of standing towards life
  o “Thorough” → want to account for all the complexities of the text
• This text re-casts the boarders of the knowable
  o Considers style & body to be something part of knowledge

*Phaedrus

• At the end of the dialogue, Socrates says “never trust anything that is written down” → how are you supposed to take a man at his word who says anything written down is necessarily frivolous?
• Opening: “Characters of the Dialogue”
  o What is it about a character that disturbs voice?
    ▪ Already a will to fiction
The minute you have a character, the character throws into question the voice of the text

Dialogue = between two people; rhetoric is the modes of operating in the between state of the world; always the encounter between two things (eg. How do you situate with it?)

- Speaking in multiple registers at once

- “Scene”
  - Spontaneous → Socrates is this weird teacher that wanders the street
  - Meet on the street → not is some contrived hall of pedagogy; rhetoric happens everywhere!

- Socrates bumps into Phaedrus

- What is the relationship between the invisible & the invisible side of language?

- Socr: “Feast of eloquence” (3)
  - Uses consumptive terms [eg. Appetite] to define words
  - Palpable, sensual figures that talk about language

- 2 speeches are about love & lust (what is the relationship between the expression of something & its truth?)

- Socr: “What? Don’t you think that hearing…the most instant task?”
  - First time we see irony explicitly in this text
  - He means it, but not to that extent → definition of irony; means it, but also doesn’t
    - In other wants, sure he wants to hear it, but no it’s not the most important thing

- There is a quotation
  - The only way to know something is quotation is to see it written down, but Socrates says to never write anything down (has to be a visual text!)
  - This text is a written text, but just in case you think it’s supposed to be read aloud, this reminds you that it has to be written
  - First time we see Socrates speaking in someone else’s voice → he does this throughout the text; ventriloquism

- Phaedr: Yes, Socrates, the talk was very much…non-lover than to a lover”
o Socrates & Phaedrus are clearly not lovers ⇒ at the same time, we see Socrates trying to seduce Phaedrus to philosophy
  ▪ We are witnessing the seduction of a non-lover (the handsome young Phaedrus)

o Lysias is current Phaedrus’ lover, but by the end Socrates has persuaded him away & Phaedrus says you are right

• Soc: Well now, how splendid…help democracy! (4)
  o Socratic irony
  o Something absurd about how we read this that we don’t take it at its word
  o We have to read it for how it says it, not just what it says ⇒ tend to the performative!

• Phaed: How’s that dear fellow?...To get me a fortune” (4)
  o Not sincere
  o Another mode of speaking where the man is not saying what he means
    ▪ Performative component that undermines the words
  o However, this is false modesty, not irony

• This texts makes a distinction between different ways of not saying what you mean
  o Socrates effaces what he says because you cannot completely be a man of the body because you have a soul
  o However, Phaedrus constantly unfolds into the material/sensual

• Socrates: I’ve lost track of myself
  o He constantly loses track of himself
    ▪ Words come out of his mouth that aren’t his
    ▪ Moves in different ways where he is constantly losing track of himself
    ▪ What does it mean to be the author of yourself?

• “Good talk” (4)
  o What is good talk?
  o This is what is at stake in rhetoric
  o Is it talk of the good; talk that makes your soul good? Or is it a feast of eloquence [sophistry]?
  o This text is a question of “good talk”
• Socr: Good, good…under your cloak in your left hand (5)
  o This dialogue explicitly conflates speech & the penis (human body)
  o Conflation of sex & writing
• Socr: Let’s leave the road here…wherever you like (5)
  o Explicit discussion about where they want to sit
  o Brings the background to the foreground
    ▪ Not just an innocuous background anymore
  o Place matters (personal note: not just about the “truth” necessarily, but the situation/context!)
• Socr: If I followed the learned in disbelieving…need quite a bit of leisure (6)
  o Mythical culture vs. scientific man who tries to rationalize (think Nietzsche)
  o Indulges the sensuality of his body; never privileges just the soul
• Both indulge the incredible sensuality of the place where they are going to talk
• Soc: Forgive me, my appetite is for learning (7)
  o The sensuality of the world coupled with the will to know more
• Soc: You, however, seem to have found the remedy…books and cold lead me on tour of all Attica and anywhere else you pleased
  o Ill follow words, written words [book], anywhere yet he says not to take seriously the written word!

_________________________
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*Phaedrus*

• If the exchange is a flirtation between Socrates & Phaedrus, then everything Socrates is performing is an indirect reaction intended to impress Phaedrus
• P. 6, Phaedr.: do you really believe in the truth of this tale?
  o Socrates speech is a fanciful re-evaluation; he is merely trying to impress Phaedrus
• Socrates’ first speech: lovers vs. non-lovers
  o Makes same argument as Lysias, because Phaedrus asks him too
    ▪ Does not necessarily believe it though
  o Very scenarios specific
• P. 46 ⇒ relation of rhetoric to persuasion
  o The truth is related to how persuasive you can be
    ▪ If you don’t understand something, you can’t speak on it
  o He is performing it: he is giving a speech about it, so he must know it; performs his own credentials
  o To understand something is to break it down until it is indivisible
• The “lover” is the person who desires the beloved (passive object)
• The “non-lover” should be understood in its contrast with the lover ⇒ non-lover seeks gratification but is not concerned about the love object
• Does Socrates appear in this dialogue as a lover or a non-lover?
  o Vince points us to p. 6, “I conduct my researches not into them, but into myself”
    ▪ Identifying the project of philosophy/of this dialogue as a research into himself
    ▪ The philosopher is one type of lover ⇒ sees a beautiful body & it inspires him to remember beauty
• P. 37 ⇒ “desire that the soul of their beloved…produce this resemblance” […exactly like their god]
  o Procession of souls
  o Every particular soul is defined by the nature of the god it partakes of
  o In patterning oneself on a God, it begins with a beautiful object, which causes you to recall beauty within itself, and then you ascend up to memory of original state (beloved itself gets subordinated to beauty)

_________________________________________________________________
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*Phaedrus
• Every part of the text is argumentative
• Writing undoes our individuality
• The speaking man is self-present to himself, but in writing you are absent
  o Refers to this as “absence of Father” ⇒ written text doesn’t have a father
• Socrates is constantly the conjurer of absences (paradox because he constantly argues for self-presence); absences refer to people who aren’t there!
• What you get is a distribution of the argument → this text is a text about argument; it is an exemplary rhetorical text
• “Isn’t it eloquent in its use of language?”
  o But what is the use of language? → this is the topic of the dialogue
• Soc: do you really think I’m joking? Don’t I seem serious? (12)
  o Key ironic moment
  o Difference between what is real and what seems
• What is at stake for Socrates?
  o Whether anything can ever be told truly
• Soc: How’s that? Are you and I to praise the speech on the grounds of the author’s relevance?...merely as a piece of rhetoric
  o Ambivalence about the authority over your own words
  o Classic dismissal of rhetoric → “merely rhetoric”
• Critique of the written word: gets rid of our memory by externalizing things!
  o This is the Socratic argument against writing
• Socrates’ lack of memory is a symptom of someone who writes [he critiques writing, yet he must be some type of writer because he can’t remember anything → but it doesn’t matter because you don’t have to remember the things that are written down]
• The spoken word cannot be neatly distinguished from the written word (Derrida) → writing inaugurates a self-distancing (it is a part of you, but it enacts a type of distance from you & yourself)
• Socrates recognizes that to be a good rhetorician you must be in the world & learn from the experience → critiques PROFESSION of rhetoric; cannot be learned, but must be experienced
• Soc: “I shall speak with my head covered” (17)
  o Weird moment
• Multiplicity of voices come through Socrates’ mouth (type of séance)
• Soc: Once upon a time.. [Socrates’ First Speech] (16)
  o Like Nietzsche! → Socrates, like Nietzsche, privileges play over truth
• Soc: “It is evident that you have become responsible for yet another, spoken by me” (22)
  o I’m speaking, but you’re the cause; ventriloquism
• “through my bewitched mouth” (23)
• Question of whether Phaedrus is consistent to himself (but Phaedrus does go through a conversion in this text → he moves from rhetoric to philosophy); p. 24
  o Phaedrus & Lysias have sex [they are lovers], so Socrates is the non-lover
  o But Socrates is a lover in another notion [and Lysias is a non-lover because he just has sex]
• Socrates Second Speech (the second speech is a recantation)
  o Structurally: Socrates argues one side & then the other
    ▪ Performs the role of the classical rhetorician by arguing both sides of the case
    ▪ He might privilege one over the other, but he is still capable of arguing both sides
      * How of the dialogue: he performs the job of the rhetorician
  o First paragraph: “you must understand, fair youth,…from Himera”
    ▪ Once again, it is NOT him speaking!
    ▪ Should be his recantation, his pious speech, but he does not take responsibility
    ▪ He speaks, but it is not his words (speaking & not speaking; dialogic)

---
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*Phaedrus* cont.

• Socrates Second Speech
  o If you are the son of a euphemism, might you already be a bastard child?
  o The change of the word is the change of reality & the change of reality is the change of the word (cannot separate)
  o “mere man” (p. 26)
    ▪ Socratic nihilism → privileges God over man; Nietzsche claims that Soc is the beginning of the nihilist revolution
• Claims to privilege love over lust, but he performs in a pornographic way; performs the opposite of what he is claiming to be arguing
  o P. 28, first full paragraph & first sentence after:
    • Argues that as an individual, you are already a composite (multiplicity)
    • How can you be at once singular and a composite?
    • Argues about a specific kind of composite: “both mortal & immortal”
    • These two things (the human & the divine) are fundamentally opposed, yet he is arguing that we are all a composite of both
      o “the composite structure of body and soul joined together”
        • The negotiation of the mortal & divine cannot be understood through reason; Socrates argues unreasonably; proof goes out the window!
        • Life itself cannot be made sense of through proof/evidence/argument (which is what classical rhetoric argues) → Socrates argues against this & brings in myth/story because that is the only way to explain this condition
  o P. 30, “of that region beyond...knowledge of her”
    • Critique of rhetoric
    • Language necessarily fails because all the beauty cannot be contained in it
    • If language always fails, then how can you speak?
      •Ironically → irony becomes the mode of arguing this mediation
  o “Experiencing direct & pure knowledge” → The God’s do not have to use language; they have a direct experience with this “truth”; our body gets us in the way of this truth
  o Reality, according to Socrates, is pure nothing (but it is a full nothingness; “colorless”
  o Socrates shares Nietzsche’s critique of the philosopher & scientist, & that type of knowledge → all knowledge of things is tempered by the body
• *This is why you can’t be committed to this world → Do not commit to truth; not the truth of philosophy or scientist
  • N → truth of the flux of nature
  • S → the ether; the pure, rarified air of the ether than explodes any claim to truth
  o “This is the Decree of Destiny…in its first birth…or a lover” (31)

  • Hierarchy
    • 1. Philosopher = seeker of wisdom (always puts himself first)
    • 2. Monarch
      o etc
  o All pedagogy is memory! → you know the truth, you just have to remember it
  o “Not disfigured…oysters in a shell” (34)
    • For N → you need your body, to know truth
    • For S → you are imprisoned by your body; it is an obstacle
  o “Now a man whose initiation is long past…old awe steals over him” (34)
    • Man sees beautiful & it is a memory-device → love is when I see beauty that reminds me of the truth
  o “support for the entire structure of the soul”
    • Entire structure of the soul is an erect penis (Coffeen)
    • This is his discussion of love, yet the dialogue becomes pornographic → moments of lust are breezed over, but this moment of love is a moment of penetration
  o Dialogue is full of puns → “pricking”; “passions that are sealed are opened”
  o “drenches all the soul with sweat” (39)
    • Weird coupling of the invisible & the visible
    • The divine & the crass human thing
    • *IRONY → brings together two opposed things without effacing either!; has a respect for both of them
• Dialogue changes now; strange critique of rhetoric is coming
• Phaed: “admiration for your speech” (42)
  o Again, a return to the beauty of speech
*Phaedrus* cont.

- Presenter discusses lovers vs. non-lovers:
  - If you’re a lover, you’ll begin to hold a grudge
  - In his first speech, Socrates defines love as a desire of sorts (later goes into detail)
- When Socrates first refuses to give his speech, he fully intends to give it but just wants Phaedrus to say he wants to hear it (manipulative)
- Soc: “Lovers are not sound, but sick” (ironic; think of expression “lovesick”)
- Other member of section discusses differences between first and second speech:
  - In Soc’s first speech, he is channeling other sources
  - However, in second speech it is more him
- In second speech, as he is recanting his first speech he says that he was bewitched & it was not actually him giving the speech
  - P. 25, “now you must understand, fair you…I should proceed as follows”
    - He attributes this second speech to someone else, so can we actually say it is the real him? (Vince points this out)
      - However, to support the position that the 2nd speech may be more identified with Socrates, there are less voices that may be evoked as the possible speaker
      - Also, right before he gives the speech, he uncovers himself (sense of Socrates appearing)
- Religious element of Phaedrus:
  - If Socrates wants to make the case that he is not teaching a manner of religion, this text would not help (there is a lot of connection between the description of the erotic relationship & following God)
  - 2nd speech has a strong posture of religion
- The lover disciplines himself but he also disciplines the beloved
- Discussion of power relations in the text → how are we as the reader implicated?
  - We our in a relationship of subservience → constant game because we’re never sure whether or not Socrates is speaking as himself or if he is serious (my opinion); but remember, he says “I conduct this research into myself”
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*Phaedrus*

- Phaedrus says to Socrates after second speech that this one was “more beautiful”
  - Misses the point!; not about being more beautiful, but about speaking of the good
- Makes the argument that when you speak, you are self-present to yourself; you are Father of your own words because if someone counters, you can respond
  - However, it is weird because Socrates is constantly leaving the scene even when he is speaking (eg. He hears voices)
    - He is both present & non-present to the scene (eg. Muses take his place; series of other voices speak through him)
- The seducer & the non-lover becomes akin to the sophist
- MISSED a little bit
- “they make report of those who live…discourse mortal and divine” (45)
  - The best way to honor these Gods is to engage in discourse
  - Best definition of irony: both mortal and divine \(\rightarrow\) speaks in the mortal world, but then effaces its own mortality and points to the divine/truth
- What is the relationship between words and truth?
- Phaedrus only speaks in one voice at a time, while Socrates is dialogic
- Phaed: “On this point Socrates, …not from the real truth” (46)
  - Classic critique of rhetoric
  - You just have to be able to manipulate the crowd
- Phaed: “Socrates, we need these arguments…how they’ll say it”; then Soc’s response that follows (47)
  - Performed a séance \(\rightarrow\) beckoned all these people and told them to persuade Phaedrus
  - Speaker can answer himself, while written text cannot
- “every discourse, like a living creature...and the whole” (53)
  - Whenever you hear a text talk about how a text should (moral prescription) be, you should question if the text itself accomplishes that
  - Does Phaedrus?
- Third Narrative of rhetoric:
The seduction of the reader

- From seriousness to irony

- The movement from the manful to the mad (Missed this part)

- In what ways is irony necessarily evoked in the performative?
  - Distinctively the relationship between what one says and how one says it

- P. 56 → talking about all these different arguments about how to conduct a speech

- Soc: “well what if I do?...indirect censure” (56)
  - Irony
  - When Soc is bashing rhetoric, does he really mean it?

- The moments that seem most to not fit in the dialogue are the ones that define it (Coffeen)

- P. 58 → critiques the school of sophistry (critique of rules; codified rhetoric)

---
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*Phaedrus*

- P. 67 → talking about establishing a science of rhetoric
- P. 66 “Tisias” → Socrates speaks in quotes; who is actually speaking?
- Science of rhetoric
  - How can you have rules for rhetoric?
  - Rhetoric is saying the right thing at the right time → all circumstantial; no overarching rules
- Socrates privileges experience over science/fixity → but Socrates is fundamentally different than what Nietzsche offers
- When Socrates gets to his critique of writing, it is based on a myth that is made up (not a well reasoned argument; not the back & forth dialogue with Phaedrus, but rather, **myth-making as a form of argument!**) → just like Nietzsche!
  - Makes up a myth to critique writing → writing is a semblance of truth; not the truth itself
- P. 67-9 ties to myth-making & Nietzsche
- Discussion here about writing can be likened to debate about lover vs. non-lover
“Rolls about all over the place” (70) \(\rightarrow\) lover rolls the right way, while non-lover does not

• “into the hands of those who have no…unable to protect or help itself” (70)
  o Critique of writing, but it IS writing! \(\rightarrow\) performance

• P. 72 “A man must first know the truth…”
  o Is this how the dialogue proceeds? Does he create universals?
    - No \(\rightarrow\) it’s a series of mishearings; plays back & forth; ventriloquisms; no hierarchies of principles & and sub-principles

• P. 73 “worthy of serious attention”
  o Nothing that has ever been written is worth being taken seriously
  o The very thing you’re reading is being called into the here & now \(\rightarrow\) happening in the very act of reading it; folded into the performative
  o “there is the man who thinks”
    - Creates hypothetical character to speak through
    - Deferral of self-presence
    - Does not take responsibility!
    - Amplifies the ambivalence, play

• P. 73 “sake of true instruction”
  o Yet he fails in his instruction of Phaedrus; Phaedrus has not learned to be ironic; he thinks he knows!
  o Socrates uses Phaedrus as a foil to teach us

• Always the third voice: Plato

• P. 73-4 “if a man composes his work with the full knowledge…”
  o At the exact moment where he is telling people not to be prose writers, he is writing in prose

• P. 74 “to call him a lover..”
  o Text is woven together through metaphors
  o “lover of wisdom” = philosopher

• The whole thing is a speech; how can Socrates speak to us if he says speech should always be spoken, yet he is writing? \(\rightarrow\) IRONY
• **Phaedrus as a Performative Pedagogy**
  
  o This text can be read as this because it is explicitly set up as a student-teacher relationship
    
    ▪ However, the student is not Phaedrus, but the reader → we are witness to the text
  
  o You can reveal the differences of this text by comparing it to others! (think about play here)
  
  o Language will never be spoken (always fails when trying to convey the truth), yet we still speak → Socratic irony!; we have to speak in irony

• Nietzsche & Plato:
  
  o For Nietzsche, myth-making is a speaking of the truth because it can endlessly morph; its flexibility; endless differentiation (just like nature)
  
  o For Socrates, myth-making plays a different role; myths do speak a kind of truth, but it is always in an ironic mode → always repeats irony; you do mean the myth as truth, but you never know the truth

    ▪ Nietzsche does not make this double-move! → for N, he says what is truth? (a mobile army of metaphors)

    ▪ For Socrates, it is ALWAYS irony; one trope

  o Phaedrus asks Socrates, “do you think all these myths are true?” and he says “all researches go into myself”

    ▪ Use this passage to argue that myth has to be about the question who am I; know thyself

    ▪ Question he constantly returns to is you have to know yourself
      
      • Makes up these myths, but they are always an interrogation into himself

        ▪ While for Nietzsche, he just wants to play; could careless about knowing himself

      ▪ Ties back to irony; myth is all about irony, because ironic mode is what we always connect with Socrates

  o For N, myth-making is truth-making, but at the same time it is endlessly in flux
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*Phaedrus*

- **Phaedrus – Student or Moron?**
  - Implies that Socrates is static → he only stays with 2 voices; performs the dialectic/ironic life
  - P. 75 (closing of book) → “Beloved Pan…” to the end
    - Idea that there is a contrast between the philosopher and the sophist → the sophist claims to possess wisdom, while the philosopher is the lover of wisdom
    - “Let me believe it is only the wise man who is rich” → belief itself suggests a lack of knowledge; suggests the lack that a philosopher has
    - “Let the mass of my gold…make his own” → strange transformation, where Socrates states that he does actually possess wisdom (but all along he had been the philosopher, who merely loved it but could not hold it)
  - “Let us go”
    - Perhaps this is the moment where Socrates gives up on Pheadrus → instead of including him in his prayers, he just says let us move on
    - However: “Is there anything else we should ask, Phaedrus?”
      - This seems to suggest that Socrates does value his opinion; why else would he ask this
  - Does Phaedrus think for himself?
    - He constantly channels the opinions of others & chooses between these opinions, but does he ever just offer his own opinion?

- **The present & not present of the written word**
  - Writing is an externalizing process that makes it so the person does not have to remember
  - P. 13 “at the moment I can’t tell you…prose writers”
    - Only wants to remember the ideas & the “truth” (student opinion)
    - Points to the critique that writing causes your memory to fail
    - It is the idea that what is said is more important than the person who said it
  - Socrates argues for the self-presence of the spoken word
*William Burrows*

- What do you call this?
  - Sounds like a short story, but is it one?
- Does not follow grammar, does not stick to recognizable form
- Forces upon us a reckoning of the absolutely different
- Throws at us the impossibility of knowing him on any terms other than his own
  - In other words, you cannot come to know & understand the text outside of the terms he establishes
- Coffeen says the important aspect is a “rhetoric of affirmation” → not about what he does not do, but what he creates
- Constantly bashes the vampire (the ultimate negative figure; rather than giving life, he takes life)
  - A lot of critical thinking is “vampiric” (sucks the life out!)
- Who is speaking in this essay? How does it deploy its arguments?
- He deploys gestures & sees everything as gestural → never gives just a clear logic
- He does not argue with words
- The image has a multiplicity that the word does not have → image is a kind of life while word is a kind of death
- Everything that is quantitative exhausts itself at one point (and thus becomes vampiric)
- Images are palpable (section about unhealthy individuals that visit the hospital) → deploys visceral life through his words
- Operates in a place beyond truth and lies (does not allow for a distinction between word and image)
- What is at stake in a piece of knowledge is a life that is lived
  - There is no such thing as a knowledge that is not lived through
    - NOT knowledge for knowledge’s sake
- Just because we’ve gotten rid of certainty & truth does not mean we get rid of the capability to make ethical judgments
  - Still leaves himself the possibility of assessment
- “The only relief he could possibly have would be to go insane”
The relief will be insanity → the madness of this own text becomes a kind of relief from it

- Reveals to us the ugliness of the vampire, which is at the heart of capitalism
- When we operate in a qualitative universe, we still have the ability to make sense → we can assess & pass judgment (even though we get rid of certainty, there is still distinctions between things)
- Immortality is a fundamental call to more quantity (“I want more of this!”)
- Goodbye Coffeen! AMAZING class!