

# Rhetoric of (re)presentation

## Retoryka (re)prezentacji

8 (3) 2021 EDITOR: EWA MODRZEJEWSKA

### RHETORICA INTER ALIA

MARIA ZAŁĘSKA

UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2973-0173>

[m.zaleska@uw.edu.pl](mailto:m.zaleska@uw.edu.pl)

### Rhetoric and linguistics: forms of connection in the interdisciplinary research

#### Retoryka i lingwistyka: formy powiązań w badaniach interdyscyplinarnych

#### Abstract

Most studies of the relationship between rhetoric and linguistics primarily take the *content* perspective, i.e., the overlapping subject areas of the two disciplines, as the main basis for interdisciplinary research involving them. This study adopts instead the perspective of the *forms* of connection between the disciplines. The object of the study concerns the microforms of interdisciplinary connections, visible in concrete texts, analyzed on the background of such macroforms as interdisciplinarity, among others. The proposed model shows a broader issue of connections of rhetoric with other disciplines, interesting in the context of the often unequal level of formal education of researchers in the disciplines they combine: for one is acquired formally, in the process of education, the other – usually rhetoric – informally, in the process of their own academic life – long learning. This paper adapts Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of ways to achieve cognitive goals in learning, in this case learning an interdisciplinary approach relevant for rhetoric and linguistics. Using excerpts from texts, the proposed model provides insight into the process of combining rhetoric and linguistics from the perspective of the authors undertaking interdisciplinary research.

Większość badań nad relacjami retoryki i lingwistyki uwzględnia przede wszystkim perspektywę *treści*, tj. nakładające się obszary tematyczne obu dyscyplin jako podstawę badań interdyscyplinarnych z ich udziałem. W artykule przyjęto natomiast perspektywę *form* połączenia między dyscyplinami. Przedmiotem badania są głównie mikroformy połączeń między dyscyplinami, widoczne w konkretnych tekstach, ujęte na tle takich makroform, jak m.in. interdyscyplinarność. Proponowany model pokazuje szersze zagadnienie łączliwości retoryki z innymi dyscyplinami, interesujące w kontekście często nierównego poziomu wykształcenia formalnego badaczy w dyscyplinach, które łączą: jedną nabywają bowiem formalnie, w procesie studiów, drugą – zazwyczaj retorykę – nieformalnie, w procesie własnego dokształcania akademickiego. W artykule została zaadaptowana taksonomia Blooma (1956), dotycząca sposobów osiągania celów poznawczych w trakcie uczenia się, w omawianym wypadku dotyczącego interdyscyplinarnego ujmowania omawianych zagadnień. Dzięki niej, wykorzystując fragmenty konkretnych tekstów, można uzyskać wgląd w proces łączenia retoryki z lingwistyką z perspektywy samych autorów podejmujących badania interdyscyplinarne.

#### Key words

rhetoric, linguistics, interdisciplinarity, academic discourse, meta-genres, Bloom's taxonomy  
retoryka, lingwistyka, interdyscyplinarność, dyskurs akademicki, metagatunki, taksonomia Blooma

#### License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 international (CC BY 4.0). The content of the license is available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**MARIA ZAŁĘSKA**

UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2973-0173>

[m.zaleska@uw.edu.pl](mailto:m.zaleska@uw.edu.pl)

## Rhetoric and linguistics: forms of connection in the interdisciplinary research

*Having become an expert in one field,  
immediately become a student in another.*

Gerhart Hauptmann

### 1. Introduction

Departments of Rhetoric, with specialized programs leading to full professionalization in the field, exist at relatively few European universities. Therefore, in order to pursue interdisciplinary research involving rhetoric, professionals of other disciplines (e.g. English, Polish, French etc. studies, literary studies, media studies, linguistics, sociology) must acquire disciplinary rhetorical literacy on their own while doing research. For example, in Poland rhetoric is excluded from the official list of academic disciplines, and yet scholars interested in rhetoric persist in their efforts to give it some institutionalized forms within academic curricula (for a recent account of the situation in Poland, see Bendrat *et al.* 2021).

The case study discussed in this paper concerns research at the intersection of rhetoric and linguistics, two fairly close disciplines, both focused on language and communication. For the reasons mentioned at the beginning, rhetoric tends to be a discipline that is acquired by the scholars informally, as opposed to the other discipline with which they combine it. This undoubtedly has implications for whether the analyses can technically acquire status of *interdisciplinary* research (see below).

In this article, using as an example of the rhetoric and linguistics relationship, we focus on a broader issue of professional expertise: how rhetoric is incorporated into research with interdisciplinary ambitions by scholars who are at different stages of acquiring professional rhetorical literacy? The topic is relevant for scholars as authors, reviewers, readers, and supervisors of interdisciplinary dissertations, as well as for novices, i.e., doctoral students, interested in undertaking interdisciplinary research.

After a brief presentation of previous research in Section 2, Section 3 will discuss the theoretical framework, especially the notion of ‘performative genres’ and ‘meta-genres’ in academic discourse, and Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy applied as a heuristic tool for observing thinking-and-writing in academic texts. Section 4 is a presentation of excerpts from rhetoric and linguistic interdisciplinary research, followed by discussion and conclusions in Section 5.

## 2. Previous research

In studying the relationship between rhetoric and linguistics, I propose to roughly distinguish three approaches: mirror-like, content-oriented, and form-oriented. A mirror-like approach is not necessarily interdisciplinary research, but rather evidence of mutual interest: rhetoric is viewed through the lens of linguistics and vice versa (Haase 2014; Załęska 2012 and 2014).

Most studies are content-oriented approaches. The overlap of topics and interests between the two disciplines provided a privileged starting point for reflections on their merging (see e.g. Albano Leoni and Pigliasco 1979; Ludovico 1979; Garavelli 1990 and 1995; Parrett 2006; Piazza 2011; Rigotti 1997; Venier 2007).

A form-oriented approach can explore macro-forms (mainly within knowledge studies) or micro-forms (mainly within knowledge acquisition studies, i.e. education research, or within knowledge presentation studies, of which we are interested here in written academic discourse).

Knowledge studies is a cover term that subsumes research in epistemology, philosophy of science, sociology of science, academic discourse, citizen science, to mention just a few. Knowledge studies conceptualize disciplines and relationships between disciplines at a very high level of generality, as top – down macro-forms, such as trends and tendencies. This type of research, providing us with a technical vocabulary (including ‘interdisciplinarity’, ‘multidisciplinarity’, ‘transdisciplinarity’, ‘mutualism’, ‘Mode 1’ and ‘Mode 2’, ‘boundary work’, etc.) offers us cognitive tools through which we may perceive research trends and tendencies (see Still and Good 1992; Gibbons et al. 1994; Klein 1990, 1996, 2021).

The term ‘interdisciplinarity’ is often used as a general label for any way of combining disciplines. Technically, interdisciplinarity is a specific type of research that requires the researcher to have a professional, full-blown knowledge of more than one discipline (e.g. rhetoric and linguistics) in order to accomplish a research goal impossible to reach within a single discipline. Only some of the examples discussed below suggest that the authors have achieved this level of expertise. In other cases, the term ‘boundary work’ seems more appropriate. According to

Klein (2021), ‘boundary work’ is a general term for any activity (not just academic writing) by which people (not just scholars) try to influence the formation of knowledge units: to keep them as they are, to reorganize, reformulate, or discard them. To the best of my knowledge, there are very few studies in this stream on rhetoric and linguistics (see Załęska 2006, 2008, 2012).

Knowledge studies partly overlap with knowledge acquisition studies (i.e., educational research), insofar as the latter concern knowledge acquisition and novice-expert relations within disciplines. This approach is relevant to research at the intersection of rhetoric and linguistics: because of the aforementioned frequent inequality in formal preparation, scholars essentially *know* one discipline and essentially *learn* the other (usually rhetoric). Of the many available models attempting to conceptualize the relationship between knowledge, thinking, and verbalizing knowledge, we follow Bloom’s (1956) well-known taxonomy, adapted to academic discourse (see below), as a convenient point of observation.

Academic discourse (broadly: multimodal forms in which knowledge is communicated) is, so to speak, part of knowledge communication studies. Below, we are only interested in written academic genres. After all, it is from each authors’ individual decisions about content and forms that emerges what is then generalized as interdisciplinarity.

The patterns of production and communication of interdisciplinary research in academic discourse are domain-specific. The problem of interdisciplinary research between the disciplines belonging to the humanities and the sciences is, among other things, their considerable distance, their different ways of thinking and their methods of resolution (forms of this distorted interdisciplinarity have been described by Sokal and Bricmont 1998, among others). The opposite domain-specific problem concerns rhetoric and linguistics, due to their considerable proximity, seemingly similar ways of thinking, and use of so called weak (i.e., general) methods. It seems to many researchers that rhetoric or linguistics can be easily self-learned at a professional level. As the examples below will show, such interdisciplinary study does not always lead to success.

### 3. Theoretical framework

A realistic approach to interdisciplinary research in rhetoric and linguistics takes into account two factors: the frequent inequality in the levels of formal training of scholars in the two disciplines, and individual cognitive differences in scholars (talent for analysis, synthesis, etc.).

Knowledge studies partly overlap with educational research insofar as the latter concerns the acquisition of knowledge. This approach is relevant to this paper

because the focus is on scholars' acquisition of disciplinary rhetorical literacy in the form of long-life learning. The following interpretation of the excerpts illustrating boundary work in rhetoric and linguistics is inspired by Bloom's (1956) well-known taxonomy of cognitive goals (see also current comments in Forehand 2005; Soozandehfar and Adeli 2016). For pedagogical uses, a modification of Bloom's model by Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) might be relevant, yet for the purposes of our analysis the original model is quite sufficient.

The original model contains six categories (written here with a capital letter) arranged in a hierarchy: Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, Evaluation. Bloom's model, originally developed to capture the stages of knowledge acquisition in formal education, can be fruitfully adapted to describe also the informal acquisition of disciplinary literacy during scholarly life-long learning. The excerpts discussed below represent a form of overt peer review practices: researchers *evaluate* how well they and other scholars *know*, *understand*, *apply*, and *analyze* rhetorical concepts and what forms of *synthesis* of rhetoric and linguistics they propose. These very ways of transforming knowledge are treated here as the microforms of connections between the disciplines, observable in single texts.

The quality of these connections determines whether a given implementation of boundary work meets the criteria for true, technically understood interdisciplinarity. Bloom's model assumes that each of the six categories can be realized more or less successfully by the learner. Also in the interpretation of the excerpts below, actual ways of performing boundary work may include, roughly, substandard realizations (e.g. irrelevant, trivial, erroneous, etc.); standard realizations (i.e., correct and typical), and excellent realizations (i.e., creative, unexpected, cutting-edge). It is important to emphasize that the qualitative assessment in each case depends on the knowledgeability of the individual scholar and on the convictions that influence his or her judgment.

Due to the limitations of the article's volume, a radical selection of excerpts was unavoidable. The clear-cut sections of the *presentation* below are not meant to suggest that the *realizations* in authentic texts of these six categories are always unambiguous. Rhetoricians are however accustomed to using idealized models (e.g. the model of rhetorical *dispositio*, or 'arrangement,' with its default *ordo naturalis*) that, even at the theoretical level, allow for variations (in the case of *disposito*, different variants of *ordo artificialis*). In the practical stage of analysis, researchers successfully deal with even greater complexity of actual texts than predicted by the model. The following interpretations are therefore intended to serve only as attention-guiding devices that raise (inter)disciplinary awareness about the ways in which boundary work is carried out.

For the purposes of this paper, within written academic discourse it is useful to distinguish between what I call “performative genres” and “meta-genres.” In “performative genres,” such as research papers or academic books, scholars actually “perform” their discipline by ongoing choices of goals, subject and methods. In some very practical sense, linguistics, after all, is what linguists do (and this tautology applies to all other disciplines).

Meta-genres are defined by Giltrow (2002: 187 and 195) as a particular kind of “talk about genres,” an “atmosphere” of “wording and activities.” The examples given (e.g., guidance offered by a Ph.D. supervisor to a doctoral student, or academic writing handbooks) imply that, according to the author, meta-genres should be understood as primarily prescriptive.

In my view, the term ‘meta-genre’ is much more capacious and should not be reduced only to a prescriptively oriented subtype. In this study, I treat meta-genres as manifestations of intertextuality, namely texts about texts, addressing their subject and form. In general, meta-genres can be divided according to the criterion of autonomy (autonomous and non-autonomous meta-genres) and the dominant purpose (descriptive, critical and/or prescriptive meta-genres).

Autonomous meta-genres within the academic discourse include:

- a) mainly descriptive ones (e.g. review articles on the relationships between rhetoric and linguistics, see Mamcarz-Plisiecki 2018);
- b) mainly critical ones (e.g. reviews, polemic papers);
- c) mainly prescriptive ones (e.g. handbooks of academic writing; this category is however out of the scope of this research).

Non-autonomous meta-genres are part of “performative genres.” They manifest itself as those pieces of research papers or books in which authors write about previous interdisciplinary studies in a mainly descriptive way (as summaries, comments, mentions) or in a mainly critical way (skeptical remarks, refutations, positive or negative evaluations). Meta-genres, as scholars’ reactions to what their colleagues are doing in the field of disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, undoubtedly affect collective practices.

#### **4. From the micro-forms of texts to the macro-form of interdisciplinarity**

The following account of studies at the intersection of rhetoric and linguistics adopts a text-oriented perspective on academic discourse, illustrated primarily with excerpts from non-autonomous meta-genres.



#### 4.1 Knowledge

In Bloom's model, the category of Knowledge refers to remembering, i.e., in our case, to a specific kind of scholarly rhetorical *memoria*. Any researcher is expected to have a significant degree of mastery of both disciplines in order to contribute to the further development of knowledge on that basis.

At one end of the continuum of realization of the category of Knowledge, we can observe a vague familiarity rather than in-depth knowledge. In supposedly interdisciplinary texts written by linguists, for example, rhetorical terms may appear quite randomly. Boundary work is thus done on the basis of shallow associations and superficial similarities between concepts. The use of heterogeneous concepts is only meant to give the impression that a linguist is knowledgeable in the field of rhetoric or a rhetorician in the field of linguistics. In other cases, prejudice replaces sound knowledge of what rhetoric actually is:

- (1) A similar case is found in Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson's 1990 article "Rhetoric and Relevance," where rhetoric is enlisted as a negative foil for Relevance Theory (henceforth RT). To this purpose, the authors present an unconventional profile of rhetoric in the article, equating it with the study of figures of speech, characterizing it as a discipline of "intellectual barrenness," and suggesting that as an educational program it features "the same substance ... inculcated by eighty generations of teachers to eighty generations of pupils" (1990:140–143). Whatever such an account is about, it cannot pass for a plausible representation of rhetoric (Zhu and Liu 2011, 3405).

Standard achievement is to correctly report information and facts. In this case, a linguist's knowledge may manifest itself as a mere *recognition* that a particular concept belongs to rhetoric or to linguistics.

The most appreciated realizations of the category of Knowledge prove a scholar's interdisciplinary erudition. It is not a simple and passive *recognition* that a concept belongs to another discipline, but rather an active *recollection* of non-obvious, perhaps even forgotten pieces of information or definitions. Such realizations can be regarded as knowledge-transforming: once such concepts are reactivated in (inter)disciplinary memory, the body of knowledge that constitutes the reference point for subsequent research changes.

#### 4.2 Comprehension

In Bloom's taxonomy, Comprehension manifests itself explicitly (as clarification and explanation of the known concepts) and implicitly (by performing various intellectual operations, e.g. to identify, to select, to compare, to describe, to predict, etc., on the basis of the information at hand).

The following excerpt is a critique of the sloppy understanding of the term 'rhetoric' within boundary work:

- (2) Where “rhetoric” is explicitly talked about in pragmatic discourse, it is often made to signify or implicate something that bears little resemblance to what the term means traditionally. Where rhetorical thinking is involved in the development of pragmatics, its presence is scarcely acknowledged. Such a pattern directs our attention to a mismatch between referring expression and referent in pragmaticists’ use of the term “rhetoric.” It throws light onto a tension-filled play in their treatment of rhetoric as a topic, between the explicated and the implicated, the articulated and the silent, the absent and the present. Raising questions as to why “rhetoric” should be invoked at all if quite something else is meant, or what its shadowy presence in pragmatic discourse says about the mode of interaction between the two disciplines, the pattern indicates, above all, that the relationship between the two disciplines is more complicated and far subtler than we tend to assume (Liu and Zhu 2011, 3495-3496).

The above excerpt evokes various forms of misunderstanding within boundary work. In some cases, the common denominator is the notion of “lack” (*little resemblance, shadowy presence*). In other cases, however, the common denominator is the notion of “excess”: the pragmaticists go beyond the limits of a generally accepted definition (*why “rhetoric” should be invoked at all if quite something else is meant*). This “opportunistic” and arbitrary concept stretching provokes its deformation and consequent destruction of specialized language as a means of communication both in disciplinary and interdisciplinary research.

The standard realization manifests itself in the form of correct descriptions, metalinguistic operations (e.g. explanation, paraphrases, comments) or exemplification (giving a *typical* example as a proof of understanding a concept). These practices do not go beyond the minimum professional requirements and hence do not contribute to a deeper comprehension of concepts through boundary work.

However, understanding may also be a true (inter)disciplinary progress. Indeed Comprehension can also manifest itself as the ability to grasp the *meaningfulness* and *significance* of some information or to make intelligible a concept hitherto insufficiently understood. In the following excerpt, a scholar argues for a novel understanding of the meaning of ‘cooperation’ within pragmatics and rhetoric:

- (3) Gu’s [(1993, 1994)] way of putting “rhetoric” and “cooperation” to uses reminds us once again that no key concept could keep its meaning intact being transposed from one discursive framework to another. It sensitizes us in particular to what a close examination of CP and NCP together would reveal about the subtly divergent senses which “cooperation” acquires in pragmatics and in rhetoric. Whereas in pragmatics, this key word refers to a general agreement by participants in talk exchanges to abide by a common set of norms, in rhetoric, it is actually suggestive of two separate agreements: S’s agreement to make all the necessary adaptations and adjustments to H so as to produce the effect or result S desires, and H’s consent to yield eventually to S’s argument on condition that it makes sufficient sense to H. At the root of this variation are two discrepant presumptions about language users’ communicative purposes. Pragmatics presumes that participants in talk exchanges share “a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction” (Grice, 1989:26), so that one set of CP-dictated norms fits all. Rhetoric, on the other hand, postulates a teleological divergence between S and H, which makes



it necessary to talk about “cooperation” or its ironical embodiment in NCP separately for the two parties involved (Liu and Zhu 2011, 3411).

Such a way of understanding implies overcoming an additional epistemic difficulty with regard to the essentially *known* information concerning the concept of ‘cooperation’. The author makes a case for a more articulate understanding of the notion of ‘cooperation,’ enriching it with the *subtly divergent senses* issuing from the interdisciplinary approach. A deeper understanding of the concept of ‘cooperation’ also enables the researchers to consider new kinds of examples, *atypical* from the perspective of the previous understanding of the term. Such a comprehension has thus an impact on (inter)disciplinary knowledge. As will be shown below, it provides inspiration for the construction of a new model of relationship between rhetoric and pragmatics (see below, ex. 5 and 9).

### 4.3 Application

In Bloom’s account, the category of Application refers to a person’s ability to use acquired knowledge (facts, concepts, techniques, rules, organizational principles) to solve problems in new situations. In the boundary work, Application refers to the ability to adopt and/or adapt concepts, models, etc. from rhetoric to linguistics-based research or vice versa.

At one end of the continuum of realizations, we can observe a rather mechanical transfer of a concept or model from one discipline to another. In this case, a linguist simply *knows* that a rhetorical concept or model do exist (for example, the system of logos, ethos, and pathos). Even without an in-depth *understanding* of their meaning, he or she *applies* it to address a problem issued from linguistics. Such an application can be a convenient and attractive way to impress the non-knowledgeable readers.

The standard realization manifests itself as a practical competence to act correctly under typical conditions, with reference to typical examples, to solve typical problems. Familiar concepts or models – e.g. rhetorical ones – function as a ready-made solution to an intellectual problem, to be applied to novel, yet typical situations.

Application, however, can also be accomplished in more challenging ways. An example can be drawn from the beginnings of mutual scholarly interest among rhetoricians and pragmaticians. Rhetoric and pragmatics were initially seen as entirely incommensurable. The starting point for problem solving in one discipline was (and still is) a creative approach to possible applications of already available tools, models or concepts developed in another:

- (4) It [= pragmatics] developed initially quite independently of rhetorical theory. One can even see a reverse phenomenon – researchers and experts in rhetoric apply the apparatus developed by Oxford analysts to their own classifications (Mamcarz-Plisiecki 2018, 117, transl. mine).

For rhetoricians of the time, the use of pragmatic tools to resolve rhetorical issues was not unthinkable, but so far simply unthought of. That is why, in the situation described in the example (4), the ability to use information to solve entirely new problems required creativity and argumentation abilities. Rhetoricians had to argue that rhetoric and pragmatics had something in common, which made it possible to think about solving (partially) common problems with common tools. Such an application required the ability to insightfully relate well-known pragmatic theories to rhetorical issues, and thus to situations not only *new* but also *atypical* from the perspective of pragmatics. It was therefore not a simple analogy, but rather a creative conceptual leap, with far-reaching implications for shaping the relationship of the two disciplines within boundary work.

#### 4.4 Analysis

Etymologically, analysis refers to the ability to divide: to disunite a unity into its constituent parts, distinguished on the basis of their characteristics, and to establish relationships between these parts in order to gain knowledge. Analysis is thus a way of dealing intellectually with the complexity of an object or phenomenon by dissecting it into smaller elements and gaining insight from within.

In a research paper, it is important to define the scope of the analysis. For analysis can be designed by the scholar as an end in itself, simply providing knowledge about the parts and their relationships within a whole. However, it can also be intellectually apprehended as an element of the analysis/synthesis conceptual pair. Analysis then performs a sort of auxiliary function to the synthesis to which it is supposed to lead.

Analysis always offers some degree of novelty as it concerns individual insight into the complexities of a peculiar issue. However, the ways in which analysis is carried out vary considerably in terms of their methods and results.

Novices often treat ‘analysis’ as a cover term for any way of exploring a topic. It can be even a chaotic “academic flow of consciousness” (Duszak 1994), perceived by readers as random heterogeneous distinctions, without any detectable goal underlying the choice of criteria.

A standard analysis is founded on the category of Application. Some particular scheme of analysis (e.g. five canons of rhetoric) is adopted – and often adapted to another discipline – to explore a new portion of research material or some typical issue. The result of such an analysis is the highlighting of new details, distinctions,

and relationships perceived within the discussed “whole.” On a meta-level, this further confirms the convenience of using a given scheme of analysis.

Intellectually challenging analyses have a potential to impact interdisciplinary research:

- (5) Gu (1993, 1994) distinguishes, in his thoughtful reexamination of speech act theory and conceptions of CP [= Cooperation Principle], between “pragmatic cooperation” and “rhetorical cooperation,” assigning them the aims to attain “informative goals” and to reach “rhetorical and extralinguistic goals” respectively (1994:181). He grounds this distinction in insights derived from rhetoric, e.g., that “rhetorical goals” are sensitive to “situational contingencies” and are hence to be “achieved” rather than “assumed” (1994:182), or that perlocutionary act is “transactional” in nature and is “a joint endeavor between S and H” (1993:422). With this distinction, Gu shows that rhetoric’s scope of application is not limited to “persuasive speech” only (Liu and Zhu 2011, 3411).

By identifying features of the communicative purposes of pragmatics and rhetoric, the author argues that analytical distinctions between “pragmatic cooperation” and “rhetorical cooperation” is reasonable. The result of such an analysis is not only a principled, systematic distinction between rhetoric and pragmatics, but also a conceptual basis for a synthesis (see below, ex. 9).

#### 4.5 Synthesis

In Bloom’s account, Synthesis implies creation of new knowledge at the abstract level: generalizing; combining and transforming elements into a new, organized, and coherent structure. Thanks to the previous analysis, at the stage of synthesis the knowledge about the discussed whole is qualitatively different. In other words, the analytical “de-composition” of some original “whole” is followed by a synthetic “re-composition,” meant to be an advance in (inter)disciplinary knowledge.

Since synthesis at the theoretical level is by definition a creative achievement, it is difficult to find instances of any standard realizations. At most, in the boundary work on rhetoric and linguistics, one can find syntheses based on typical patterns, for example, the relation of inclusion (the hyperonym “language sciences” is an overarching category for linguistics, rhetoric, discourse analysis, etc.), the relation of hierarchy (rhetoric as “a kind of metalinguistics,” see Mamcarz-Plisiecki 2018, 117), configuration (synecdochic relation part/whole, according to which rhetoric is a part of linguistics; antistrophos relation, see below, ex. 7 and 8). The category of time (e.g. rhetoric as proto-linguistics; see e.g. Rigotti 1997, Piazza 2011) and the category of scale (micro-, macro-; e.g. Hopper 2007) are also used, as in the following excerpt:

- (6) Under certain conditions, in relation to textual research, the function of such a general, integrating partial research approaches, “macro-”linguistics can be fulfilled precisely by rhetoric (Mamcarz-Plisiecki 2018, 118).

The series of examples below illustrate a more complex, principled synthesis. The model creatively uses antistrophos as shaping tool to model the relationship between rhetoric and pragmatics:

- (7) No effort to address our originative question of “how pragmatics is related to rhetoric” can afford to ignore this blending of similarities and differences, overlapping and separateness, convergence and divergence. Yet merely recognizing the high complexity of such a formation is far from enough. To be truly illuminating and instructive, any answer to the question must also offer a general framework within which the practitioners concerned are able to position themselves vis-à-vis each other’s discipline and to coordinate their individual efforts in the pursuit of their common interests and shared goals. [...] we believe that in a classical model of interdisciplinary relationship, once adopted to connect rhetoric to the ancient art of dialectic, we do have a strong candidate for the job. This is the model which Aristotle invokes when he pronounces, in the very beginning of his *Rhetoric*, that “[rhetoric] is an antistrophos of dialectic” (1354a) (Liu and Zhu 2011, 3412).

Such a way of constructing synthesis has a generative potential: it offers a principled frame of reference within which subsequent researchers can conduct boundary work:

- (8) An *antistrophos*-based relationship is capable of accommodating the intricacies and complexities of a multi-faceted relationship. It is conducive to a “reciprocal and reversible” kind of disciplinary self-invention in both fields. And most significantly, it exhorts against treating each other as an object for appropriation, or as an *other* to be turned into the same (Liu i Zhu 2011, 3403, italics in original).

The authors argue for a principled synthesis, understood not as a simple addition of contents but as a foundation on the theoretical concept (in this case, on the above-mentioned technical notion of “cooperation” in its new understanding, see above, ex. 3):

- (9) Tentatively, we have shown NCP [=Non-Cooperative Principle] to be a foundational principle in rhetoric comparable in applicability and functionality to CP [= Cooperative Principle] in pragmatics. With this step taken, it becomes possible for us to try and deepen our understanding of how pragmatics is related to rhetoric by comparing and contrasting CP and NCP. Though never tried before, this promises to be a productive approach, for it focuses our attention on *cooperation* as a conceptual cornerstone in *both* fields, inviting us to look into the way this concept plays out in grounding and structuring the two disciplines respectively, and throwing light onto significant similarities and differences that have escaped our attention so far. Adopting this new approach [...] enables us to perceive of a disciplinary relationship between pragmatics and rhetoric that is richer, more intimate and yet less clear-cut than has been assumed (Liu and Zhu 2011, 3410; italics in original).

The form of the antistrophos and the notion of cooperation serve the authors to design a system within which a principled and non-trivial understanding of the relationship between rhetoric and pragmatics can operate.

#### 4.6 Evaluation

Evaluation manifests itself as formulation and argumentation of value judgments. In Bloom's model, Evaluation is placed at the top of the hierarchy: its implementation requires not only factual knowledge but also knowledgeableability of scientific criteria and a fairly inquisitive mind to spot the flaws in peer-reviewed, published research work.

The category of Evaluation in academic discourse is usually referred to by the term 'criticism'. Etymologically, the word 'criticism' means: 'making judgments based on criteria' (Załęska 2016). The outcome of a criteria-based judgment can be positive or negative (e.g. in music criticism or literary criticism). A broader concept – critical thinking, underlying the formulation of criticism – is, according to Govier (1987, 238), thinking about another product of thought (i.e. an argument, thesis, theory, definition, hypothesis, question or problem), in a skeptical, evaluative and deliberative way.

The easiest way to judge is to imply a positive evaluation by simply accepting entirely the previous studies. Negative comments, if any, often seem merely a ritual fulfillment of critical stance expected from scholars in the academic discourse.

The standard ways of assessment include both positive and negative evaluations concerning details of prior boundary work: topic selection, methods, interpretations, results.

The most challenging ways to practice such an intertextual critique touch on issues fundamental to the discipline itself and to the notion of interdisciplinarity:

- (10) For unlike pragmaticists, who treat their discipline's constitutive assumptions seriously, rhetoricians in general do not show a similar concern about theirs. Contemporary rhetoricians' attitudes toward this topic range from being satisfied with a vague impression of what counts as "rhetorical principle" to flatly denying its existence. Within the rhetorical discourse, the concept is either left alone in benign neglect or employed loosely to signify anything from a general intellectual virtue (e.g., consistency), a key term (e.g., purpose), to a basic strategy (e.g., adaptation). The collective indifference might have a lot to do with the commonplace in classical rhetoric that principles are needed only in specific sciences, not in general arts like rhetoric. In continuing to subscribe to this assumption, rhetoricians forget that their "general art" has already been turned into a modern discipline as in need of constitutive principles as any other inquiry, (Liu and Zhu 2011, 3408; note 15).

Arguing such an evaluation requires erudite (inter)disciplinary literacy and advanced meta-epistemic competences. One needs to know what the criteria and the standards of their fulfillment are; which criteria are relevant in a particular case, what is the scale of comparison of the implementation of these criteria in the disciplines taken into account. Addressing such very serious issues prompts to rethink the very foundations of both disciplines and of interdisciplinarity.

## 5. Discussion and conclusions

If learning issues are so important in the proposed approach to interdisciplinarity – especially given the aforementioned disparity in the level of formal education in the two disciplines – what can be learned from this “microscopic” bottom-up approach, focused on micro-forms observable in individual texts?

First, one can learn how to shape one’s own meta-cognitive awareness using, among other things, Bloom’s taxonomy. This model is a useful heuristic tool – by definition more experiential and judgmental than rigorous – for both self-monitoring and observing others’ achievements. Like all forms of organizing experience and knowledge, this conceptual framework, at the cost of overlooking some phenomena, offers the gain of seeing others. In this sense, this framework serves as an attention-guiding device and helps scholars read interdisciplinary texts in a dual, content-oriented and form-oriented way.

Second, the focus on single texts teaches an appreciation of the metalinguistic layer. How the terms ‘linguistics’ and (especially) ‘rhetoric,’ supposed to be components of interdisciplinary research, are actually understood in performing genres and in meta-genres? Seeing how much conflict and intertextual criticism is generated by unarticulated assumptions about the very terms used, an attitude of semantic vigilance is needed.

According to the onomasiological approach (i.e., from concept to name), a concept should be defined first, and only after a definition is established can the term ‘rhetoric’ be used. The onomasiological approach values the univocity principle: one concept should be defined by only one term, and one term should refer to only one concept. Scholars who prefer the onomasiological approach construct interdisciplinary research rather narrowly, adopting a chosen definition of rhetoric (e.g. only Aristotelian rhetoric); what goes beyond the definition is supposedly “not rhetoric” and should not be taken into account in “proper” disciplinary and interdisciplinary research.

According to the semasiological approach (i.e., from name to concept), the starting point is the term ‘rhetoric’ and observation how scholars use it in their texts. Scholars who adopt the semasiological approach construct interdisciplinary research quite broadly, accepting the polysemy of the term ‘rhetoric’ and the heterogeneity of its uses. Learning to deconstruct these often hidden semantic preferences, which generate different types of interpretive and evaluative conflicts, therefore has the potential to influence the quality of interdisciplinary research in which rhetoric is involved.

From a bottom-up approach to constructing interdisciplinary relationships, it is also worth learning how to accurately construct the “interface” of interdisciplinary research. We can see that often the constructions of interdisciplinary research are



asymmetrical. Often, a very broadly understood ‘rhetoric’ is faced with a very narrowly understood ‘linguistics,’ reduced, for example, to pragmatics or, even more narrowly, to Grice’s pragmatics only.

And finally, the “interdisciplinary,” through a combination of form-oriented and content-oriented approaches, can notice what insiders of both disciplines regularly point out as the domain-specific problems: the proximity and even overlap of the two disciplines’ areas of interest; the resulting pitfalls of apparent similarity of concepts; and, last but not least, the deceptive ease of using weak methods.

## References

- Albano Leoni, Federico, and Maria Rosaria Pigliasco, eds.** 1979. *Retorica e scienze del linguaggio* (SLI – Atti del X congresso internazionale di studi, Pisa, 3 maggio-giugno 1976). Roma: Bulzoni.
- Anderson, Lorin W., and Krathwohl David, eds.** 2001. *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: a revision of Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Bendrat, Anna, Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca, Agnieszka Kampka, Ewa Modrzejewska, and Maria Załęska.** 2021. “Rhetoric in Poland.” *Southern Communication Journal* 86(2): 119-133. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1041794X.2021.1882547>.
- Bloom, Benjamin, ed.** 1956. *Taxonomy of educational objectives. The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: McKay.
- Duszak, Anna.** 1994. “Academic Discourse and Intellectual Styles.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 291-313.
- Forehand, Mary.** 2005. “Bloom’s Taxonomy: Original and Revised.” In *Emerging Perspectives on Learning, Teaching, and Technology*, ed. Michael Orey, 41-47. [https://textbookequity.org/Textbooks/Orey\\_Emergin\\_Perspectives\\_Learning.pdf](https://textbookequity.org/Textbooks/Orey_Emergin_Perspectives_Learning.pdf).
- Garavelli, Bice Mortara.** 1990. “Retorica e analisi del discorso.” *Lingua e Stile* XXV (3): 495-507.
- Garavelli, Bice Mortara.** 1995. *Ricognizioni. Retorica, grammatica, analisi di testi*. Napoli: Morano.
- Gibbons, Michael, Camille Limoges, Helga Nowotny, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Scott, and Martin Trow.** 1994. *The new production of knowledge. The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
- Giltrow, Janet.** 2002. “Meta-Genre.” In *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre: Strategies for Stability and Change*, ed. Richard Coe, Lorelei Lingard, and Tatiana Teslenko, 187-205. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Govier, Trudy.** 1987. *Problems in Argument Analysis and Evaluation*. Dordrecht – Holland and Providence RI – USA: Foris Publications.
- Grice, Paul.** 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Gu, Yueguo,** 1993. “The impass of perlocution.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 20: 405-432.
- Gu, Yueguo.** 1994. “Pragmatics and rhetoric: a collaborative approach to conversation.” In *Pretending to Communicate*, ed. Herman Parret, 173-195. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Haase, Fee-Alexandra.** 2014. “The Concept of ‘Rhetoric’ in a Linguistic Perspective: Historical, Systematic, and Theoretical Aspects of Rhetoric as Formal Language Use.” *Res Rhetorica* 1(1): 26-45.
- Hopper, Paul J.** 2007. “Linguistics and Micro-Rhetoric. A Twenty-First Century Encounter.” *Journal of English Linguistics* 35(3): 236-252.

- Klein, Julie Thompson.** 1990. *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory, and practice*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Klein, Julie Thompson.** 1996. *Crossing boundaries: Knowledge, disciplinarity, and interdisciplinarity*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Klein, Julie Thompson.** 2021. *Beyond interdisciplinarity. Boundary work, collaboration, and communication in the 21st century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liu, Yameng, and Chunshen Zhu.** 2011. "Rhetoric as Antistrophos of pragmatics: Toward a "Competition of Cooperation" in the study of language use." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 3403-3415.
- Ludovico, Anna.** 1979. "Retorica e scienze del linguaggio. Per una funzionale ridefinizione dei termini." In *Retorica e scienze del linguaggio* (SLI – Atti del X congresso internazionale di studi, Pisa, 3 maggio-2 giugno 1976), ed. Federico Albano Leoni and Maria Rosaria Pigliasco, 11-24. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Mamcarz-Plisiecki, Artur.** 2018. "Retoryka i językoznawstwo – obszary spotkania." *Roczniki Humanistyczne* LXVI (6): 111-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/rh.2018.66.6-7>.
- Parret, Herman.** 2006. "Vers une rhétorisation de la linguistique: l'esprit de la rhétorique et le discours." In *Retorica e scienze del linguaggio. Teorie e pratiche dell'argomentazione e della persuasione*, ed. Stefania Bonfiglioli and Costantino Marmo, 137-152. Roma: Aracne.
- Piazza, Francesca.** 2011. "L'arte retorica: antenata o sorella della pragmatica?" *Esercizi Filosofici* 6: 116-132.
- Rigotti, Eddo.** 1997. "La retorica classica come una prima forma di teoria della comunicazione." In *Understanding Argument. La logica informale del discorso*, ed. G. Elisa Bussi, Marina Bondi, and Francesca Gatta, 1-8. Forlì: CLUEB.
- Sokal, Alan D., and Jean Bricmont.** 1998. *Intellectual impostures. Postmodern philosophers' abuse of science*. London: Profile Books.
- Soozandehfar, Seyyed Mohammad Ali, and Mohammad Reza Adeli.** 2016. "A Critical Appraisal of Bloom's Taxonomy." *American Research Journal of English and Literature* 2: 1-9.
- Still, Arthur, and James M. M. Good.** 1992. "Mutualism in the human sciences: towards the implementation of a theory." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 22: 105-128.
- Venier, Federica.** 2007. "Per un superamento della dicotomia langue/parole: sentieri paralleli e intersezioni di retorica, linguistica testuale e pragmatica linguistica." *Acta Romanica Basiliensia* 18: 9-52.
- Załęska, Maria.** 2006. "Pogranicza dyscyplin: językoznawstwo a retoryka." In *Retoryka w Polsce. Teoria i praktyka w ostatnim półwieczu*, ed. Marek Skwara, 11-38. Szczecin: Uniwersytet Szczeciński.
- Załęska, Maria.** 2008. „Retoryka a językoznawstwo.” In *Retoryka*, ed. Maria Barłowska, Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca, and Piotr Wilczek, 174-194. Warszawa: PWN.
- Załęska, Maria.** 2012. "Ordre et chaos dans les disciplines. L'exemple de la rhétorique. Semen." *Revue de sémio-linguistique des textes et discours* 34: 35-50.
- Załęska, Maria.** 2014. *Retorica della linguistica. Scienza, struttura, scrittura*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.
- Załęska, Maria.** 2016. "Krytyka wiedzy specjalistycznej: między kryteriami merytorycznymi a interpersonalnymi." In *Retoryka – wiedza – krytyka*, ed., 5-24. Warszawa: PTR. <http://retoryka.edu.pl/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Retoryka-wiedza-krytyka.pdf>.