

Professor Laurence de Looze
UC 2310 Office Hrs: Tues., 11:30-12:30; and by appt.
email: ldelooze@uwo.ca

Tel: (O): 661-2111, ext. 85859

CL9609B CSTC9579B: *Taxonomy, Analogy, Example, Metaphor: The Problems of Resemblance*

(What ties together the four words at the head of this course's title is that they all have something to do with similarity. As a result, to understand the title of this course – to perceive, in other words, that *similarity* is the similar feature running through all four words – is already to enter into the course content. How does one know that, despite the many differences among phenomena, one is supposed to look for and extrapolate a feature of similarity? And how does it happen that most people who encounter this course title will extract the very same similarity – that is, the *similarity of similarity*?)

This course will ask two deceptively simple questions: How do we know when (or that) things are similar, and what is the relation between our perceptions of similarity and our notions of “reality” and/or “meaning”? Our time will be spent in examining the difficulties that arise in trying to formulate acceptable answers to these questions.

For the last few decades, theoreticians and critics have been greatly concerned with questions of difference/*différance*. This course, however, is much more than a reversal of the difference/similarity equation. It may indeed be true that everything is different from everything else, as has been often put forward, but all human beings live as though this were not the case. Why do people perceive or create similarities, and on what basis (and by means of what strategies) do they establish resemblances? Moreover, what does it mean to say that everything is different from everything else except to imply that at a second level the trait of difference itself becomes the similar feature all phenomena have in common? What, then, does it mean to discover (or construct) similarities? **Why** do we construct or perceive resemblances? And **what does it tell us** when we find them meaningful (or not meaningful)?

I propose to look at considerations of what constitutes resemblance and what resemblance *means* drawn from a wide variety of disciplines and orientations: philosophical writings, literary works, clinical psychology, art history, literary theory, artificial intelligence, etc. Is the ability to construct analogies – which means to perceive similarities – at the very base of what we call human knowledge, as recent studies by clinical psychologists suggest? How do we decide which similarities matter to us, or whether an analogy has “meaning” or not? And what of metaphor which, since Aristotle, has been seen as special kind of analogy? Do any/all/some metaphors actually produce knowledge (Hartman's “cognitive metaphor”; Ricoeur's “semantic collision”)? By contrast, what makes some metaphors “dead”? Is all perception of reality fundamentally “metaphorical,” as Nietzsche maintained? Finally, is what we call “analysis” ever anything more than analogical or allegorical discourse, as Northrop Frye suggested?

Approximative Reading Program

NB: Readings are on “Course Readings” on our OWL site unless otherwise noted

WEEK 1 (7 January) Introduction # 1: Similarity vs. Sameness. And the Role of Categorization.

Readings:

- 1) Laurence de Looze, “Introduction: Why are things similar?” On Resources section of OWL site.
- 2) W.V. Quine, “Natural Kinds” in Quine, *Ontological Relativity and Other Essays* 114-38.

WEEK 2 (14 January)

Readings:

- 1) Eleanor Rosch, “Principles of Categorization” in *Cognition and Categorization*, chapter 2: 27-47.
- 2) Jorge Luis Borges, “El idioma analítico de John Wilkins” (*Obras completas* 1989, 84-7) Eng. Trans. “The analytic idiom of John Wilkins” on Resources section of OWL.
- 3) Aristotle: from *Categories* and *Metaphysics* (*Aristotle: Introductory Readings*, pp.1-8; 143-79; Weldon library online or 2 hr reserve at Weldon)
- 4) Nelson Goodman, “Seven Strictures on Similarity,” in *Problems and Projects* 437-472)

WEEK 3 (21 January)

Readings:

- 1) Excerpts from *The Pillow Book of Sei Shōnagon* (ca. 990 AD)
- 2) Amos Tversky, “Features of Similarity” (*Psychological Review* 84 (1977): 327-51).
- 3) Medin, Douglas L. and Robert L. Goldstone. 1995. “The Predicates of Similarity.” In Cacciari, Cristina, ed. 1995. *Similarity in Language, Thought, and Perception*. Brepols. 83-110.

WEEK 4 (28 January) Professor de Looze is out of the country this week.

Readings:

- 1) George Lakoff: *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*, chs. 1 & 2.
 - 2) 3) Porphyry, *On Aristotle’s Categories*, tr. Steven K. Strange, “Introduction” (1-12) and pp. 49-94. Weldon Library, 2 hr reserve.
 - 3) Michel de Montaigne, “De l’Experience” / “On Experience” (*Essais / Essays* III.13)
- Optional: Laurence de Looze, “Chapter 2: from similarity to sameness” on OWL

WEEK 5: (4 February) Universals/Realism vs. Nominalism/Conceptualism/Non-literality/Analogy

Readings:

- 1) Michael J. Loux, *Metaphysics* Chapters 1 & 2 (19-89)2)
- 2) Andrew Ortony, “Beyond Literal Similarity” (*Psychological Review* 86 (1979): 161-80).
- 3) Nietzsche, Frederic. “On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense.” In *Philosophy and Truth*. 79-97.
- 4) Douglas R. Hofstadter, “Introduction: A Musico-Logical Offering.” (*Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid* 3-28).

Optional: Laurence de Looze, “Chapter 3 Analogy” on OWL

WEEK 6: (11 February) Analogy

Readings:

- 1) Douglas L. Medin and R. L. Goldstone, “The Predicates of Similarity” *Similarity in Language, Thought and Perception*, ed. Cristina Cacciari (Brepols, 1995), 82-110.
- 2) F.P. Dinneen, “Analogy, Langue, and Parole,” *Lingua* 21 (1968): 98-103.
- 3) Anttila. *Analogy* (1977.): Chapters 1, 2, 4.1-4.3
- 4) Tilman Lichter, “Bill Clinton is the First Lady of the USA: Making and Unmaking Analogies,” *Synthese* 104 (1995): 285-97.
- 5) Hofstadter, Douglas, and M. Mitchell, “The copycat project: An overview” in K. Holyoak and J.

Barndon, eds., *Advances in Connectionist and Neural Computation Theory, Vol 2: Connectionist approaches to analogy, metaphor and case-based reasoning* (Norwood: Ablex, 1994), sections 1, 3, 4, 7, 8.

Optional/Recommended: Hofstadter, Douglas R. 1985. "Analogies and Roles in Human and Machine Thinking." *Metamagical Themas: Questing for the Essence of Mind and Pattern*. New York: Basic Books. 547-603.

WEEK 7: (18 February) Reading Week: no class

WEEK 8: (25 February): Analogy/Metaphor

Readings:

- 1) Gentner, Dedre. "Are Scientific Analogies Metaphors?" In Miall, David S., ed. *Metaphor: Problems and Perspectives*. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1982. 106-32.
- 2) Juan Manuel, *El conde Lucanor*, tr. John England, Prologues, Exemplum #1.
- 3) Black, Max. "Metaphor." *Models and Metaphors*, chapter. 3 (25-47)
- 4) Way, Eileen Cornell. *Knowledge Representation and Metaphor* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991. *Studies in Cognitive Systems* 7. Chs. 1, 2, 6. (Weldon Library 2 hr reserve)
- 5) Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*, chapters 1-13 (pp. 3-68), chapters 20-27 (pp. 126-222) (Weldon Library 2 hr reserve)

WEEK 9: (3 March): Metaphor

Readings:

- 1) Aristotle: *Poetics* ch. 21 & 22 (*The Poetics of Aristotle*, tr. Stephen Halliwell, 55-58).
- 2) Cicero, *De oratore* III. xxxviii. 152 - xlv 173 (ed. and trans. H. Rackham, Harvard UP, pp. 119-37).
- 3) Paul Ricoeur, *La métaphore vive/The Rule of Metaphor*, étude/study 1, 6.
- 4) Samuel Levin, "Standard Approaches to Metaphor and a Proposal for Literary Metaphor", *Metaphor and Thought*, 124-35.

Optional: Laurence de Looze, "Metaphor, Analogy, and Ideology" (on xerox)

WEEK 10: (10 March) Metaphor

Readings:

- 1) John R. Searle, "Metaphor," *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 83-111.
- 2) Paul de Man, "The Epistemology of Metaphor" *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks, 11-28. (NB: Peruse this book!)
- 3) Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "Essay On the Origin of Languages," *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, Vol 7., trans. and ed. John T. Scott, 289-332 [notes: 566-81] (French ed. in *Oeuvres complètes* [NRF/Gallimard], vol 5.)
- 4) Charles Hartman, "Cognitive Metaphor." *Poétique* 49 (1982): 327-39

Recommended Optional: Paul de Man, "Metaphor (Second Discourse), *Allegories of Reading* 134-49, and Emmanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, ch. 59.

WEEK 11 (17 March) Metaphor (NB: last day for handing in research paper topic)

Readings:

- 1) Paul Ricoeur, *La métaphore vive/The Rule of Metaphor*, 2, 4, 7
- 2) Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova* (tr. Nims). 42-55.
- 3) Quintilian, *De Institutione Oratoria* viii 6: 8-114) Paul de Man, "Anthropomorphism and Trope in the Lyric," *French Poetry: The Renaissance through 1915*, ed. Harold Bloom, 265-81 (also in Paul de Man, *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*)
- 5) Baudelaire, "Correspondances"; Rimbaud, "Voyelles"

WEEK 11: (24 March) Metaphor/Figura/Literary Interpretation

Readings:

- 1) Umberto Eco, "Two Problems in Textual Interpretation," *Poetics Today* 2 (1980): 145-161
- 2) Derrida, "Mythologie blanche" (*Poétique* 5 [1971]) (Eng. trans. *New Literary History* 6 [1974]: 5-74.
- 3) Psalms 77: 1-3 (in Vulgate Bible)/Psalms 78: 1-3 (in New Oxford Annotated Bible); Matthew 13: 1-51; John 6: 41-71.
- 4) Erich Auerbach, "Figura," *Studies in the Drama of European Literature* 11-76.

5) Paul Hernadi, *Beyond Genre*, ch. 1.

Optional/Recommended:

Anatole France, *Le jardin d'Epicure* (Eng. trans. *The Garden of Epicurus*)

Holyoak, Keith J. 1982. "An Analogic Framework for Literary Interpretation." *Poetics* 11: 105-26.

WEEK 12: (31 March) Maxim/Proverb/Exemplum

Readings:

1) Karl-Heinz Stierle, "Story as Exemplum–Exemplum as Story: On the Pragmatics and Poetics of Narrative Texts." *New Perspectives in German Literary Criticism: A Collection of Essays*. Ed. Richard E. Amacher and Victor Lange. Princeton UP. Trans. David Henry Wilson and others. 389-417.2)

2) Alexander Gelley, "The Pragmatics of Exemplary Narrative"

3) La Fontaine: *Le Pouvoir des fables - A Monsieur de Barillon*

Optional/Recommended: Paul de Man, "Aesthetic Formalization: Kleist's *Über das Marionettentheater*," *The Rhetoric of Romanticism* (New York: Columbia UP, 1984)

Optional: Laurence de Looze, "Chapter 4 Exemplum" on OWL

Required Work:

Class Participation 20%: Your primary responsibility is to be well prepared. This means not only being present, but having read *and thought about* the primary and secondary texts assigned. Graduate students are expected to do some of the optional reading (I will be attentive to the extent to which graduate students have familiarized themselves with these readings). Participation grades will be based on the degree of preparation and the nature (quality and quantity) of classroom contributions.

Assignments 20%: These are short (1-2) page, *typed* discussions to be handed in in class on the day's readings. They are your opportunity to zero in on some very specific aspect of one of the week's readings in order to analyze it or draw out its implications. The only requirements are that you provide a concise discussion/analysis of some aspect of the week's reading, that you choose one of the asterisked readings on the syllabus, and that the discussion not go over two pages, typed. All students will be required to do 6 of these during the term (you can choose your 6 weeks, with the exception of the first). On any given day I may ask some of the students who have done a précis for that class to read theirs aloud as part of our class discussions. Or I may read one aloud myself. A précis is always due at the beginning of the class meeting and none will be accepted later.

Seminar report 20%: You will be expected to report on and analyze the week's readings once during the term. I will circulate a sign-up sheet on 14 January. You will be held *strictly* to a 30-minute limit. You can work from notes and you can present items in Powerpoint, but you are *not* simply to read a written text (!); I will allow for some discussion at the end of each report. Because of the enrolment numbers, there may be more than one presentation in any given week. Your seminar report may well become the nucleus for the research paper, but this is by no means a requirement.

Research Paper 40%: This is a major essay (around 20 typed pages), with full critical apparatus (notes, works cited, etc--see MLA Style book), which scrutinizes some issue/text/aspect that has come to light during the course. You are *strongly encouraged* to come talk with me about potential paper topics--but only after you have delineated several *in writing*. At the very latest, you must inform me of your topic *in typewritten form* by Week 10. As already noted, the topic can grow out of the seminar discussion you have led. All essays are due on the final day of classes for Winter term (3 April). Late papers will be penalized 3%/day.

It is the student's responsibility to familiarize him/herself with the Statement on Academic Offences (scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic

Offence, at the following Web

site: http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf)