

INTRODUCTION

AIDES PENSÉE

TROPOLOGY AND TROPOLOGIC

James W. Fernandez



VICISSITUDES:

THE IMAGINATIVE MOTILITY AND VITALITY OF HUMAN LIFE

Some “Truths” about Tropes and the Dynamic of the Imagination

In this *introductory* essay, and elsewhere in this collection of essays on the tropes, we might best understand a trope as a constituent of “communicative interaction,” verbal or visual, that makes a meaningful movement in the imagination. These mental movements, these arguments of images by which we are moved, are, as far as we know, unique to humans. We achieved them by organizing our communication systems into domains or frames of activity, interest, and action—insofar as we have some sense of these differentiations of experience and are able to articulate them. But more than such an elementary organization is at play. There is a systems-level dynamic involving the constant possibility of recurrent change by predication. And in that ever-present possibility arises the sense of temporality—the sense of a future different from the present. And in that sense there arises the human need for a project more suited to what might come to pass than what suits the present. And that miraculous sense of the possibility of, even the need for, mental movement between domains or frames of experience has opened up the stage for the tropic predications that attract our attention in this collection of essays. How this occurred is quite another question, which we mean to briefly ponder, surely not resolve,

at the end of this introduction. In any event it is these “vicissitudes”¹ of life and their incessant revitalizations and de-vitalizations that have a great deal to do with the feelings of meaningfulness that make sense in and give sense to our lives as humans! In fact we might say quite simply, “In movement lies meaning, and the tropes are the prime agents of mental and actual movement!”

These matters of the movement of meaning to which the essays collected here are particularly attentive are most often creative and revitalizing. All the same, though, such movements can be depressing and stultifying as well, devitalizing in a word; they can bring worlds into belief and “being.” They can bring into being new worlds in which to live only virtually—though these worlds may not really exist other than intersubjectively and figuratively. But we humans can also seek to imaginatively model, for eventual testing, objective reality, whether microscopic or cosmic, whether quarks or black holes, that we cannot otherwise directly experience, thus making them available for future investigation, testing, and objectification.

There are two kinds of truth, then, and correspondingly two kinds of tropes: models and metaphors. This was a distinction urged in the work of Max Black (1962). The fundamental difference is perhaps that models are rule bound and therefore reductive, while metaphors as images are interpretation bound and therefore in the process of inquiry, florescent and expansive, producing imaginative movement not requiring verification and proven conformity with the real world but instead constitutive of it!

Anthropologists as ethnographers are mainly interested in beliefs that hold the members of a culture together or apart, make it meaningful to them, and make them more or less responsive in obeisance or obedience to its presence and potency. And the tropes, as a consequence, are one of the (if not *the*) main constituents, the agglutinative elements, of culture. They are, at the least, crucial constituents of culture that meaningfully capture the popular imagination that ties us together one by one as cooperating subjects into interactive wholes, the “imagined communities” of our lives and loyalties. Because the tropes are part of the integuments of culture, we have very good reason in this collection to single them out as basic to our understanding of social order and disorder—moral order, in short—and hence as eminently objects and subjects of study. The anthropologist, we might go so far as to argue, is or should be mainly a student of the intersubjective imagination,² which is to say the tropes so vitally at play in organized and, in some ways, cooperative social life and moral order (see Fernandez 1986b). But in their study, as we will now go on to observe, we must be cautious. We will never find absolute certainty in their study. The study of intersubjective truth is, in a word, inevitably intersubjective,³ which is to say uncertain.

The Body in the Mind: On Coupling in Its Various Senses and the Mental Reproduction of Meaningful Physical Being and Becoming

To employ a familiarizing, perhaps revitalizing, trope, we may note that these imaginative movements that take place intersubjectively involve a coupling process, a kind of dance between puzzling subjects of interest and objects of meaningful predication/postulation made upon them. Not unlike human coupling, they are or can be creative of new being or senses of being! Hence the aptness of the related and redolent term “copula” for the axis of this propositional/predicative process bridging between puzzling subject and solutional object in which the imagination is inevitably involved and stimulated and, most meaningfully, revitalized in one way or another.

It is well known that human language is recursive and re-combinatory, a dynamic that has made it particularly efficient, powerful, and robust—extraordinarily fertile in word production. But an important part of its power lies in this capacity for informative interassociation of meaningfully differentiated domains or frames of meaning.⁴ It is these interactive capacities and how they developed that is an important part of the challenge to the endlessly fascinating speculation on language origins. We will not forget the urgency of that speculation in this essay but we are mainly interested here in how movement by coupling can be, in the association established, evocative and rich in imaginative meanings, in how we can be edified, and meaningfully moved, by our puzzlements.⁵

Tropology thus addresses mentally productive movement in humans as a kind of mental copulation, bringing into fertile relationship a puzzling subject of interest and desired understanding with, in some way, a more meaningful object or subject of more established understanding. And, surely resonant with the reproductive referent, we do not hesitate to use the related word “copula” to identify the axis of imaginative movement and momentum: a movement that takes place in the predication across the copula of a more meaningful object of interest upon a puzzling or relatively meaningless or confusedly meaningful subject of interest. This predicative coupling across the copula is meaningful in the revitalizing sense. We might call this activity the Romance of the Imagination—in its way, the ultimate productive intimacy proper to human thought and its sense of meaningfulness.

Given the extraordinary mental transformations undergone by *Homo sapiens sapiens*, the question arises of how to account for them, particularly the transformation of communicative interaction from closed, limited call systems of the apes to the astonishingly open, grammatically complex and productive language systems of humans. In the language origins research of the

last decades there has been an intriguing new focus on a change that produces language, namely the change from the obsessive physical, quasi-erotic attention to one another of the apes, seen in grooming, to an equally prominent attention to one another's activities through language: human gossip! This shift from frequent erotic grooming, common among the great apes and especially the bonobos, to frequent social bonding, by means of a much wider, less intimate mechanism, gossip, is something captured succinctly in the title of Dunbar's (1996) captivating and important book on the process of evolution from call system to language system: *Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language*. This extraordinary shift might equally, by our argument here, be labeled, if a bit more colorfully, *From Copulation to the Copula in the Evolution of Language!*

On the Excluded and Included Middle and the Inescapable Uncertainties of Trope-Logic

So, in brief, if we ask what kind of logic is tropologic, we answer first that it is a predicative logic counting on the transitional and agglutinative power of the copula, by which a puzzling domain, or parts of it, of difficult understanding and uncertain meaning seek and are offered from across the copula, and by various figurations, meaningfulness from another domain of experience. The seventeenth-century Spanish playwright Calderón de la Barca's play *La Vida es Sueño* affirms that the inchoateness of life can be better understood as a dream. Indeed, Calderón's assumption finds itself accepted and richly employed—refigured, as it were—in the essay here by our editor Marko Živković, “Dreams Inside-Out: Some Uses of Dreams in Social Theory and Ethnographic Inquiry” (chapter 3). It is in both cases a predication in terms of simplicity and generality matched by Shakespeare's “All the world's a stage.”⁶ In short, it suggests a logic by which something of or from a domain of enriched understanding, say, from the domain of dreams or of stage plays, is predicated upon the puzzlement and paucity of another, more complex and obscure domain of interest—say, interrelational life itself—acting either to resolve its uncertainties or in one way or another minimize it or enrich it. It is an act of construction whose fundamental building blocks are the tropes—the metaphors, metonyms, synecdoche, ironies, etc., the drama or the stage plays etc.—with which, or out of which, the imagination poetically constructs (i.e., “figures out” through creative figurations) its “pleasure domes” of dramatic experience.⁷ The reader will find these figurings-out happening in most of the essays included in this volume.

The study of the tropes, in any case, presumes the recurrent situation in the human condition of puzzlement or deficits of meaning—which might be also called the inchoateness of the human condition or situation out of which

all humans must *work* their way “casting about elsewhere” to supply that meaning. This search for greater meaningfulness can take place within the domain where the subject normally is situated or belongs, in the cases of metonymy and synecdoche, or outside that domain of normal situation or belonging, in the case of metaphor.

The logic of the trope, then, is first that of meaningful predication upon or association of a deficient subject of interest with more meaningful objects or actions of contemplation or evocation. In a manner distinct from symbology,⁸ tropology tries to (1) find or maintain a clear sense of connection between the subject or situation of deficit of meaning and that which is predicated or associated with or upon it; and (2) understand the consequences of this predication or evocative association for the deficient subject in its actions and interactions in the everyday social world, studied by the anthropologist. Given that anthropological method requires or urges long-term participant observation on its practitioners, generally a year or more in a particular society, the discipline as such is well placed to understand the multiple associations at play and being transferred in the plurality of predications taking place day in and day out in human interaction and, most significantly, in human conversation.

The study of the tropes is, of course, widespread in the humanities but, up until recently, not much used in the social sciences. Among the social sciences, to be sure, anthropological ethnography is said to be most proximate to the humanities and thus perhaps most congenial to the figuration-oriented, conceptual analytic apparatus of the humanities and more accepting of it.

Just the same, as tropology is a method of inquiry and understanding that seeks to belong to the social sciences, we should address two issues that often worry social scientists—anthropologists, at least—when one undertakes to introduce concepts more familiar to the humanities. The first issue concerns the difference between the logic of the sciences and the logic of the humanities. Some decades ago, F. S. C. Northrop (1965) pointed out that in the humanities, in contrast to the sciences, there is a tolerance of “the excluded middle.” That is, there is the acceptance that a thing under investigation and being thought about can be and not be at the same time, or can be some one thing and some other thing at the same time. Scientific method, commonly considered, in its intent to find and clarify causal paths and eliminate fuzzy methods is designed to eliminate such ambiguities and ambivalences in observation and explanation. Ethnography, I believe, especially that undertaken in foreign cultures, does force the acceptance of that tentativeness upon us.

Manifestly, the human condition, and life in culture, is full of such ambiguities and ambivalences, and they are an integral part of the so often ambiguous dynamics of that condition and the instability, volatility, and constant turnings of social situations. It is part of the puzzlement of our lives. While tropology

does claim a logic that rests on the agglutinative power of predication, it does not and cannot exclude the presence and uncertainty of multiple meanings and the intermingling of multiple voices⁹ and also the consequent tensions present within and between the tropes investigated. While it is open to the recognition from experience that a dominant meaning or salient voice may claim and maintain a persistent presence in particular social situations, at the same time it recognizes that such presences and understanding are temporal. Other subordinate voices are present that may often, without very explicit or easily calculable volition, assert themselves to gain “market share,” in the effort to capture the imagination, so to speak, and bring about turnings in meaningful replacements and reversals. Out of puzzlement and paucity a turning toward ephemeral or more enduring moments of meaningfulness is forged.

One final point follows from accepting a logic that depends on the copulation of existential domains of experience and that in such a process does not “exclude the middle.” As in the study more broadly of symbolism, tropology recognizes the multivocality of figures of speech and the multiplicity of the tropes available for predication. Consequently, there is a frequent tension as regards discoverable meanings. There is the constant possibility that, in specific social situations, subordinate voices may assert themselves over against the dominant meanings of an existing trope, or set of tropes, and thus subvert a given representation leading to misunderstanding and uncertainty.

ATTITUDES

Three Schools of Rhetorical Thought: Aptness of Argument and Expression

A shorter and rather differently oriented version or arrangement of these essay-chapters was first published in Spanish in 2006, acting upon the invitation of editors of *Revista de Antropología Social*, the preeminent Spanish journal of social and cultural anthropology, based in Madrid.¹⁰ We, that is, those of us who participated in that earlier collection, took that initial occasion to introduce this collection by making reference to the importance of the study of rhetoric in the ancient world, in Greece among the Sophists and in Aristotle, in Rome in the overarching figure of Cicero. And more particularly we took the occasion, in deference to our Spanish hosts, to briefly point out the place of rhetoric in Iberian intellectual history, both ancient and early modern, as well as an important difference to be noted in its employ in these two contexts. Different attitudes toward self and world and different schools of rhetoric were involved. Taking into account these differences of context was inevitably of

importance; they were differences that influenced the sense of aptness and expressiveness of re-figurative and con-figurative argument.

We proceeded, first, to highlight differences of context by reminding ourselves of two well-known schools and figures in the history of Iberian rhetoric: in Roman Iberia and in early modern Spain (i.e., the seventeenth-century Golden Age of Spain). These significant figures were the Iberian Roman, Quintilian (Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, 35–95 CE), a native of Calahorra, La Rioja, and the two brilliant and enduring figures of seventeenth-century baroque, Golden Age Spanish literature: Francisco de Quevedo (1580–1645) from Madrid and Baltasar Gracián (1601–58) from Belmonte, Calatayud.¹¹ In this return to the original English version for publication we have added Cervantes and the Quixote as a third significant school of rhetoric.

We could not in that first collection expand in any complete way on the overall place of rhetoric in the Spanish intellectual and oratorical traditions, and we do not pretend to do so here. It is a subject not subject to easy generalization in any case. What we can do is point out the different ideas on the role of rhetoric and the figurative imagination as between Quintilian, the Imperial Iberian Roman of the first century CE, and the seventeenth-century Golden Age Spaniards: Cervantes (1547–1616) with the Quixote on the one hand, and Quevedo and Gracián, on the other. These three schools of rhetoric are celebrated and considered foundational figures and forces in the study of rhetoric in general and in the study of rhetorical style, most surely in those cultural worlds where the romance languages prevail.

Quintilian: The Sense of an Imperial Order and of the Orator's Loyalty to It

Quintilian was, if not *the* major figure in ancient classical rhetoric, at the least, along with Cicero, and in respect to reputation, the preeminent Roman student and teacher of rhetoric. His pedagogical contribution was to argue that training in rhetoric had a crucial relation to the maintenance of the moral order of the empire. As much a teacher as a theoretician, Quintilian set up a school of rhetoric where he argued the very-evident-to-him connection of rhetoric to the moral and social order of the empire. No man consequently, in his view, could be truly eloquent unless he was in principle a good man by those lights. This was a principle that underlay his great study of rhetoric, his magnum opus the *Institutio oratoria*, a twelve-volume textbook on the theory and practice of rhetoric. It was a textbook that particularly emphasized rhetorical practice, where, very evidently, the ethics of oratorical argument was what he particularly brought to the attention of his students. The orator in his view

should be just and honorable by nature and a user of rhetoric in the interest of such principles.

Oratorical prowess, while the result of the confirmed learning of Quintilian's technical teachings, was at the same time to be used to confirm innate goodness. One cannot be so naïve as to believe that there was not a conservative politics at work here in favor of a foreordained view of a hierarchical patrician/plebeian class/caste system politics and associated privileges. In any case, he was mainly concerned with the oratorical confirmation, not to say configuration, of social and, to be sure, of conservative political thought and action.

In any event, one might say of Quintilian that in his view the condition of possibility of the patricians' status itself rested, in important part, on their rhetorical capabilities to address, to effectively and convincingly influence, the maintenance of the existing patrician/plebeian moral order. In Quintilian's efforts to invigorate or reinvigorate the Roman rhetoric capabilities of the patrician class, there lay very practical political concerns for both the maintenance of patrician claims and patrician domination of the empire. Quintilian and the Roman rhetoricians who followed his teaching in general were obviously convinced of the socially constitutive powers of the rhetorical.

Quixotic Dialogue and the Play of Tropes in Culture as a Palaestral Pendulum of Argument in Culture

This transitional introduction is hardly the place to expand on Quintilian's pioneering contribution to the rhetoric literature worldwide and his argument for rhetoric's crucial contribution to the maintenance of the imperial moral/social order. Nor can we follow in any detail Quevedo or Gracián and their competitive use of the rhetorical arts, their production of ingenuities pertinent to their own placement and prestige in the courtier's world of the seventeenth century. But more needs to be said introductorily about the play of tropes in the worldwide classic the Quixote. It so happens that one of our contributors here, Ivo Strecker, and his first essay in this collection, "Don Quixote: Icon of Rhetoric Culture Theory" (chapter 1), offers apt commentary for the contextualizing point we are seeking to make about varying value contexts, or schools, of rhetorical effort. Strecker's essay offers two important suggestions for our present enterprise. He is, of course, treating a now long famous and widely appreciated, often enough halting, conversation between a mad knight-errant and fantasist, Don Quixote, and his squire, the peasant pragmatist Sancho Panza. The one, Alonso Quijano, is in essence an archetypal patrician driven by the resolute bookish fantasy of what, to him, is the noble lifeway of the knight-errant, while the other, his peasant interlocutor, Sancho, is a down-to-

earth if not utterly earthy peasant driven mainly by the state of his stomach (his *panza*).

Strecker suggests first that we be aware of the abundance of dualistic conceptual oppositions popular in Euro-American culture that may or may not be at play in this “grand conversation” and second that we be cautious in our confidence of the fullness—the validity, perhaps—of our interpretations, a point emphasized in our previous section.

In respect to the first caution, Strecker points out that the Quijano/Panza

conversations reveal and shape two different characters who reflect a division of society (master versus serf) and then, in turn, two opposite attitudes, styles of speaking, mental dispositions, views of life, and so on: the idealist versus realist, figurative versus plain style, intoxicated versus sober minds, spirit versus matter, etc. So there is an antinomy and polarity that causes the pendulum of argumentation to swing back and forth without ever coming to rest.

Surely there is a complexity here quite besides the age-old problem of limited dualistic, body-mind thinking and its dynamic variations.¹² For this reader and author of this essay the Quixote interaction has often been argued to be, and taught as, a classic example of the fictionalism/factualism argument. And he has struggled in an ethnography of a new religion in Africa, created by a people often enough said¹³ to be an example of primitive or institutionalized dualism. For there are many rituals in this religion whose purpose or consequence are also, quite contrarily, the obtaining of complementarity, or a “saving circularity,” or “one heartedness,” all in an attempt to “return to the whole”—rather than to accept a settled and final set of dualities of oppositional things and thinking!¹⁴

No doubt this kind of struggle between oppositionality of elements in rituals and belief systems and complementarity could be found in much ethnography and in many engaged and identity-oriented conversations, for that matter. It is a situation that Strecker calls “the pendulum of argumentation” relevant to our understanding insofar as interaction gets beyond brief truncated gossip and hearsay into more engaged conversation and attempts at completed, transformational argument and more extensive storytelling.

And it is the experience of this anthropologist, in studying a half dozen syncretic religions in three parts of Africa from 1955 to 1975, that though the various memberships might seem to be steadfastly dualistic, there is, indeed, a kind of pendulum in play, swinging back and forth between opposition and complementarity. Indeed, it is a play in which the tropes and tropological predication is very much implicated. So Cervantes’s primordial novel raises not only the fictionalism/realism or fact/fiction pendulum likely to be present

in conversation but a swinging search for equation natural to the human situation, not to say the human equation, generally.

The detailed presence of these present or implied oppositional misunderstandings raises the question of what kind of play we have in mind when we think of rhetoric and the play of tropes. Just to take the ongoing discussion here of the four Iberian rhetoricians and the three schools—the first-century Quintilian and the seventeenth-century Cervantes, and Quevedo and Gracián—we are bound to see the difference between, on the one hand, the quite serious “play” of commitment in Quintilian to the moral order of Empire and, on the other hand, the subtly artful verbal play of commitment to self and one’s own placement in an intellectual cum aristocratic cum courtly hierarchy in which Gracián and Quevedo flourished. Here, of course, Cervantes and the Quixote occupy a special and ironic place that exalts them in our understanding and appreciation. For Cervantes is neither a teacher nor a student of a specific moral order, neither imperial nor aristocratic; rather, he famously exists in being a kind of ironic observer and overseer of the moral order of human nature itself and not himself a pupil or product of a particular schooling.

So what we have is two kinds of rhetorical play and a referee to that play itself. A situation in which the game at play involves acceptance of common commitment to overarching imperial values is significantly different than a situation in which the game at play is one of perspectival and experiential differences to begin with, put to the service of an ethic of self-promotion—a kind of play productive of cleverness in slicing and dicing tropological choices in such a way as to favor one’s own advancement, often enough, and most usually, at the expense of others. Any academic not selflessly devoted to an imperial ideology, or fastidious about self-promotion, will recognize either the ego nurturance or the imperial nurturance ever-present in academic life!

Indeed, it has been argued that much of the “play of tropes” is palaestral (Bailey 2007), that is, a kind of wrestling going on between, as is inevitable in the human situation, significantly different bodies and minds, each with differences in perspective and experiences and hence essentially dissimilar in understanding or weighting of the implicit arguments contained in so many conversations. When we think of the play of tropes in various kinds of social conversation, therefore, we think not only of the play between the tropes themselves, between metaphor and metonym, for example, or between irony and sobriety, but of the play between the different individual perspectives of the various participants in the conversations cum arguments.

Once again, the classic conversation between Quixote and Sancho is not only a play between various kinds of tropes, the belly and the brain or the genitals and the soul, and possible oppositional entities such as windmills, on the part of the one, and possible sources of food or drink or foreplay for he himself

or his donkey, on the part of the other. Though the play of tropes in the conversational relations in this Baroque classic is highly stylized and particular, as is the knight/squire relation by definition, it tells us something about the illusory power, the power to produce realities by the play of tropes in general among humans. It is a play, is it not, among beings whose mutuality of interest is always conditioned and challenged by important differences of experience and interests that challenge and devalue the mutual being at play in conversation and that stimulate participants to tell stories out of school. But at the same time it is a play of illusory power, the power to capture the imagination in favor of particular realities favorable to the rhetor rather than to the author.¹⁵

There are, then, important underlying questions that all of us, the contributors, face in this collection of essays as we take up the overall question of the role of the tropes in culture and in establishing the tenor and structural strength of human relations in society that are a consequence of their presence. One question is the question of the tropes as prime agents of fantasy, for, as Strecker points out, our culturally anchored beliefs and accustomed behaviors and social interactions rest more upon fantasy than we ordinarily recognize. Cervantes himself, of course, raises in his now virtually universal text, and in the heedlessly fantastical behavior of Don Quixote therein described, that pervasive question: the degree to which human belief and comportment is in important part fiction if not fantasy driven. In the case of the Quixote, the fiction of nobility with a crucially important mission—a mission supposedly of great meaningfulness in and of itself—becomes quite questionable! What is taken to be the inevitably fruitful consequences of valorous knighthood in tasks undertaken in its service is shown to be of hollow and vacant consequence—fictitious, in a word.

There is, however, in Strecker's essay, an additional and important caution as regards the surety of our interpretive understanding of the tropes themselves, in their singularity and in their inevitable combinatory multireferentiality. Strecker suggests, evoking the work of Steven Tyler, his colleague in the Rhetoric Culture Project,¹⁶ that every instance of attempted interpretation of figurative communication faces the challenge of what is called in psychiatry “overdetermination”—or, by Tyler, “indeterminacy” and “interpretive leeway”—in communication.¹⁷

Though it is by no means a solution to the problem of “indeterminacy” and “interpretive leeway,” the long-term fieldwork commitment of the anthropologist as ethnographer does very often offer a deeper understanding and, at the least, more locally enriched interpretation of what is involved in any instance of the play of tropes. A good example of this enrichment of understanding obtained by extended fieldwork is found in Lydall and Strecker's (1979a, 1979b) own extensive ethnographic work, in which they have been involved

over many years with recurrent conversations by which they have been able to more fulsomely triangulate the meanings of the tropes that are produced in the conversations they have held or that have come to their attention in their accumulating years of ethnography.¹⁸

A Sense of a Hierarchy of Privileged Intelligence Engaged on the Royal Field of Verbal Jousting and Exercising the Clever Egocentric Art of Gaining Reputation

Most interesting in respect to the role of rhetoric and figurative thought in the Spanish literary tradition would be the work of the two major figures of the seventeenth-century Spanish baroque, Quevedo and Gracián. It was a century otherwise referred to as the Golden Age (*Siglo de Oro*) of Spanish literature. Both of these major figures in the Spanish literary tradition are especially known for the inventiveness and subtlety of their use of figurative speech. Gracián's literary ideas and emphasis are best suggested perhaps in the book published at the height of his powers, *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* (Subtle wit and the art of the ingenious) (1642). Both Quevedo and Gracián were noted practitioners of what was called *conceptismo*, a style of expressing oneself involving pungent and subtle use of wit or sharpness (*agudeza*). It was a time of the predominant presence of the royal court and hence the supreme importance of the obtaining and granting of royal privileges and placements. Both of these figures were engaged in that "competition of letters," seeking in their work recognition and high placement on the score sheet of subtlety and ingenuity, particularly Quevedo.

In contrast to the ambitious patriotism and practical optimism of early Imperial Rome of the first century AD, the seventeenth century in Spain despite its creativeness—its Golden-Agedness, one might say—in respect to creative cleverness was in retrospect a time of sensed decline of Empire and hence very frequently an air of irresolute disappointment, pessimism, and consequent satire (Gracián y Morales 1929 [1645]). And the rhetoric of the gifted, like Quevedo and Gracián, was in important part satirical and down-putting. In so being, it risked affectation and an overly manneredness of argument. It was quite unlike the robust moral positivity of social-imperial commitment emphasized to the rhetorician-in-becoming as defined by Quintilian. One must be cautious about such gross generalizations. It still seems fair to recognize an important difference between the "rhetoric of the good man" and his moral convictions of first-century Rome and the rhetoric of the clever and witty man and his subtle sense of his personal place achieved on the jousting field of verbal challenges among relativities characteristic of life in seventeenth-century Spain.

Obviously, in respect to our collection here, it is the role of each particular author to judge and describe his or her own sense of the particular context(s) in which the tropes he or she is dealing with are operating, or at least the rhetorical tradition and school to which they might best correspond. We may, in an overview and an introductory way, however, call our readers' attention here to the various contexts that shape or challenge the revitalizing effect of tropological predication and figuration. Inevitably, one argues, these influences have their distinct effect on the efficacy, aptness, and valiancy of the figurations predicated upon them and employed or referred to in the associated commentary.

PLENITUDE AND FINITUDE

The Warp and Weft of the Imagination: How the Dramatization of the Human Condition Energizes Tropic Predication, Favoring and Fashioning Open Language Systems out of the Closed Call Systems of Animals

What we have argued so far is that to think tropologically is to be made aware of possible movements in meaning, that is, turnings of understanding, accompanied by a sense of possible apt redescription of self and other by turning to another existential domain of experience. To obtain meaning, one turns away from the employ of a particular domain on which one has focused but found puzzling and turns, very often by an aptness of trope, to another domain or another part of that domain that is more illuminating. *Mehr licht!*

We have unabashedly in the process of this essay, indeed, in the very first section, put forth some elemental principles to anchor our argument: “meaning as mental movement,” or “thought as predicative movement.” Very early in our argument we developed a view of the tropes as agents of re-direction, re-description, re-vitalization, or de-vitalization. This reductionism, however satisfying to very human desires for simplification and parsimony, has to be countered with the recognition that the tropes are in their endless predicative activity and possibility also continuous producers of plenitude in human experience and explanatory thought. This point is amply supported by the very diversity of tropes we find in play in the various chapters that follow this introduction—a plethora if not a plenitude! This plethora or plenitude is addressed summarily in our final section, entitled “Multitudes of Edification.”

In any event, there is a kind of double argument going on simultaneously in this introduction: both a simplification of perspectives and a complexification. We might well use Professor Strecker's term for treating the dialogue, and

dialectical tension, in the Quixote between the humble squire Sancho Panza and his knight-errant Alonso Quijano and label this double argument another instance of the inevitable “pendulum of argumentation.” There is a constant effort in human intercommunication, both conversational and more formally intellectual, to make sense together about the complexities—the blooming buzzing confusion, to echo William James—of the human condition! And I might add as the present author and thinking of my earlier ethnographic work (Fernandez 1982), where I identified an “oppositonality/complementarity” at work: the two dynamics might well be called pendulum effects. These are, of course, analytic abstractions, but in that ethnographic work I saw these semi-systematic changes anchored or anchor-able in the ethnography. As another instantiation of this dynamic one could take male/female differentiation, even oppositionality. The various ritual statements of this oppositionality in Bwiti were almost always accompanied by forms of dress and ritual song celebrating complementarity.¹⁹

It would be wrong to think that these successive revitalizations of our thoughts have any finality or finitude to them. For the argument of images has a plenitude and perpetuity in it. Perhaps we might say an infinitude in it, for there will always be puzzlements that arise with the times and a plenitude of tropes—arguments of images—within the purview of imaginative people by which they might be captured. That puzzlement and recapturing seems to be a dramatical fact of human life together. To mildly paraphrase an old saw,²⁰ if there is a puzzled person born every minute there is a trope discovered to capture his imagination.

I want to end part 3 with something that has long puzzled not only me but thousands of others over a century and a half at least. How do we explain the origins and development of the complex, self-conscious, imaginative open languages of humans when all the other animals including the great apes have closed call systems with only occasionally the barest suggestion of openness and imagination? I want to emphasize this question since, as promised earlier, I want to take up and make some reference in part 3 to the “origin of open language” problem as it relates to the tropes. My speculation is that the origin is in some respects tied into the predication problem, the problem of feeling the existence of various domains of experience and feeling accompanied by the feeling of the possibility of these two domains entering into copulation, that is, finding a copula by which to interrelate them and thereby releasing imaginative images.

Moreover, these images were (early on, it seems arguable) often explicitly or implicitly laden with the dramatic possibilities and assertions of our primordial social animality from chest pounding or dramatized estrous! I hesitate to say we are implicitly dramatic animals and the expressive and expository

energy of that dramatism has to be part of the calculation of our no doubt long-lasting laborious access and final access to our present exquisite competence in articulating our thoughts fully enmeshed in grammatical complexity.

In open, fully copula-ating language use we find also our impulses as social animals to dramatize the tensions of that social animality, to enlist our own imaginations, and to capture others for this understandings in dramatic ways. We are not just social animals; we are dramatic animals, and that dramatism lies in important part in our synesthetic capacities to sense the instructive, possibly revitalizing relationship between two different domains of experience and existence. And to sense also the likely enlightenment to be found in their copulation is a capacity that enables dramaticity and very well may have been crucial to language origins. This may seem an extravagant, overdramatized argument, but let us not forget that two of our most important thinkers about society and culture of the previous generation, Kenneth Burke and Victor Turner, styled themselves or their thinking as dramatism or as “dramatic.” Turner instructively formulated the ethnography of social life as the study of “social drama” (see Rueckert 1963; Burke 1985; and Turner 1974, 1990).

To be sure, we evoke here these related issues of dramatism, social drama, and capturing the imagination because of the obvious role of the tropes in these activities, as enablers, energizers, revitalizers, and dramatizers themselves. But we want also, as promised, to think about their presence returning to the beginnings and the overarching questions we have been raising: the evolutionary question of how our fully open languages, whatever their eventual trope usages and dramatic tensions, could ever have become possible in the first place. More particularly, how could the imagination of the mindful presence of the other and others stimulate interaction to such a degree that early humans shifted from the signaling of call systems to the predicative symboling and grammaticality of language systems. These questions, not incidentally, have been raised importantly in the last quarter century by paleo-anthropologists and paleo-psychologists who focus on human evolution and who attempt various answers to these questions. And we have already mentioned the “grooming to gossip” argument by the paleo-psychologist Dunbar and colleagues.

One might suggest here as we conclude part 3 of the essay that the tropes have played an important part in this difficult-to-explain evolution. They could have been important parts, if not *the* important parts, of that achievement. Might not it have been the development, through powers of association and synesthesia, perhaps, of the ability to recognize the possibility and aptness of referencing associations from one domain of experience to another domain that was an exercise of associational capacity necessary for moving to more complex ideation and expression? Was the usefulness of that predicative pos-

sibility, the very nature of any trope, the discovery that put humans on the road to what was at first crude gossip? Gossip is, after all, naturally inter-domain oriented. Eventually, of course, this would have led to more composed social signaling or signing to a final storytelling with all the refinements of imaginative activity that we presently generate and live with (see Dunbar 1996). Does the use of those nuclei of inter-domain intercommunication—this synesthesia, these warps and wefts of imaginative intercommunication, the tropes—contain, at the very least, an important part of the answer to the becoming of the imaginative (fictive) creatures we have become? Were the tropes in more primitive form some of the earliest instances of the use of the primal imagination? Does our focus, then, upon the tropes in this volume return us to the very foundational capacity of our humanity in its beginnings? Here at the end of this transitional introduction we might well argue that it does. Hopefully we have at least made the case that the tropes are extraordinary aids to human thinking. That is why we have given this introductory essay the title “*Aides Pensée*.” Here we argue that we might have reason to reframe this effort to read “*Aides Parler*.”

Are not the tropes integral to the most ancient weavings of the imagination? If so, then our interest in this volume in the tropes in contemporary ethnography is hardly a novelty, much less a peripherality. It is, rather, an act of touching base with an essential feature of our humanity. In its capacity for turning and transformation lies our capacity for transcendence of the puzzlement of outgrown and outworn circumstance giving back to us the possibility of stimulating dramatic engagement. The tropes in this view lie at the heart of the human imagination; that is to say, they lie at the heart of our humanity and its unique powers of cultural conversation and cultural creation—in short, our ultimate capacity for revitalization and periodic escape from the inevitabilities of morbidity and finitude! *In processing reality, let us say, the plenitude of their presence, as always-available predications, is a never-ending satisfaction!*

MULTITUDES OF EDIFICATION

Vignettes of Trope Transformation: A Thumbnail Approach to the Dramatis Personae of This Collection and Their Edifying Arguments and Some Suggestions on How They Capture the Imagination

We ended the previous section with some ambitious claims and appreciations indeed. Let us retreat a bit into our anthropological shell. The ensuing chapters in this collection are, by and large, quite down to earth. They are, in the majority, the product of extended ethnographic presences among the peoples described. The authors offer, as ethnographers can and must, “thick descrip-

tions” of the problems discussed. But insofar as they are tropological in nature they are all making or causing a turning in the reader’s imagination. They are “arguments of images” (Fernandez 1986a) with the intent, evident or not, of “capturing the reader’s imagination.”²¹ They are also *edifying* responses to puzzles that the authors as ethnographers have inevitably encountered in the field as a natural enough product of any ethnographic inquiry.

The key terms “edifying” and “edification” deserve some special attention here. This author made use of the term in the late 1970s when addressing the way that intellectual activity in the social sciences is carried out, to an important degree, working under the stimulus of puzzlement! I was pointing out the often considerable opaqueness and uncertainty that attend our “communicative interactions” but that nevertheless, despite the uncertainties and ambiguities, can be inspirational, instructional, improving, even uplifting (Fernandez 1981). Though this phrasing and key word, “edifying,” came to me independently and as part of my experience as a scholar of African “systems of thought,” to which context it was then addressed, it turned out to be, I discovered, a term that was central to an important book on pragmatic philosophy, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* by my then Princeton colleague Richard Rorty (1979).²² I have subsequently benefited from his thinking and usages of the word. Let me say how.

Rorty was a neopragmatist in the tradition of John Dewey who questioned the possibility of any final certainty in philosophy, however systematic a philosopher might be. He saw the philosopher’s task not as that of finding final truth or certainty—one might say “finding finitude” in explication—but rather as that of enabling continuously creative and revealing philosophical conversation. The task was not that of finding “commensuration between academic cultures” but that of pointing out their uniqueness and hence their contribution to the enduring “conversation of mankind.” And this conversational enablement, for Rorty, largely consisted in producing re-descriptions of the human self and his or her social and cultural circumstances. What Rorty envisioned was a philosophy without epistemology (1979: 356) that is without the drive for truthful knowledge and the privileged positioning that its discovery offers to its possessors. What he was aware of—which I, in my non-philosophic way, was aware of as well—was the degree of opacity present on all sides in the academic conversations going on in the social sciences and humanities, and in fact in all human conversation.

What I put forth in the late 1970s in the phrase “edification by puzzlement” was the sense that in the academic enterprise we rarely, if ever, fully understand the arguments of others. Yet it is a part of our entrepreneurial life to be stimulated to respond to these others by formulating and rethinking our own structures of understanding, our existing edifices as it were, of which we

alone, or with a few colleagues, have been the architects and masons. Encountering and working through, as far as a non-philosopher is able, Rorty's own sense of his philosophy without epistemology, his edifying rather than systematically specifying philosophy, in short, I was struck with its pertinence to anthropological ethnography and, for the ethnographer, its communicative possibilities and obligations! Anthropological field ethnography is a very special, one might say peculiar, kind of conversation that leads, or should lead, to mutual edification—not a state of exact mutual knowledge, as one would expect to be produced by the systematicities of formal science, but a state of mutual reflection, re-description, and revision of existing convictions.

Rorty was also a person who took the tropes—mostly metaphor—quite seriously as playing a fundamental revelatory role in the edifying conversations philosophers offered. Indeed, in his posthumous lectures he argued that philosophy was a kind of poetry, dependent, as poetry is, upon the tropes in obtaining edifying effects in its lucubrations and articulations (see Rorty 2016). One can hope that the reader of these ensuing chapters will find something of the same trope-generated poetic effect at play!

Brief Comments on the Motivated Movement and Turnings in Argument That Are Taken in This Collection

We may turn now, finally, to this introductory encounter, by means of thumbnail sketches, vignettes, with the rich diversity of our various ensuing essays. At this point in the final whirl of the carousel the reader-rider can hardly be surprised by the notion that to think tropologically is to be aware of movements in meaning, that is, turnings of understanding natural to the predicative process and paradigm. These, hopefully, should stimulate, in Rorty's words, re-description—freshenings, we can call them—of certain of our preexistent impressions. These thumbnails are of course intended to be only prefatory groundwork for the much richer texture of the chapters themselves and their detailed arguments. We turn now to thumbnail treatments of our ensuing collection in the hopes of priming the pump for the more extended edification that awaits.

Chapter 1 (Ivo Strecker). An essay, persuasive in its findings, of the ever-presence of the rhetorical in all human meaning making and, indeed, the condition of humankind's creative existence in culture. This argument, apt for this collection, is exemplified in the unique, indeed eternal, if strained conversation between the illustrious but illusioned knight, Don Quixote, and his earthy squire, the one preoccupied with his fantasies and his honor and the other with the feed for his donkey and his belly (Panza). The now classic extended conversation of this archetypal pair cautions us from overgeneralizing vectors

in the emotional movements energized by the tropes that we emphasize in these vignettes. It shows us, rather, the pendulum of affect and argument by which and in which the imagination so often plays in human conversations and intercommunications. The argument is enriched by close reference to a many-years investigation by the author and his wife of the cultural world and figurative wisdom of the Hamar of Ethiopia.

Chapter 2 (John Leavitt). An essay exploring the meanings associated (i.e., “swinging”) with the principle liminality of human experience: the universal diurnal turning from day to night, from the work-a-day world to the rest-a-night world. Turning to the trope of twilight we discover how it humanizes the human condition. It would be difficult to find an ethnographically richer account of this universal liminality of the human situation and a better sense of managing the recurrent times of transition from the work-a-day to the rest-a-night than this essay, focused as it is upon a Central Himalayan crepuscular configuration and its swinging interlude!

Chapter 3 (Marko Živković). An essay written by one of the victims of a situation involving a scandalous and corrupt government and a bewildering kind of magical realism that is hard to believe, hard to describe, impossible to influence critically: a situation calling out for a saving trope. The anthropologist turns to the dream trope, coming to see in it the necessarily bizarre governing principle of this strange and estranged instance of governmentality: it is a kind of dreamwork. It is a work that can only be made sense of, as far as the civic conscience is concerned, by the rhetorical use of the dream trope working at another level of consciousness than the normal, to-be-expected everyday work of the civic conscience-ness!

Chapter 4 (Joseba Zulaika). An essay that evokes the situation in Bilbao and the Basque country of increasing, ruinous skepticism about the old realities of faith and the ready availability of helpful spiritual presences, as well as an accompanying lack of confidence in the realities of now outmoded disciplinary methods that can only remind one of the adjacent rusted ruins of the city’s once prosperous and potent iron and steel industry and, in turning to them, suggests a transferable, a convertible trope of material ruin and material reconstruction offering, in a material/spiritual predication, a transferable hope of spiritual resurrection, a methodological resurrection, and an overall sense of a possible and graspable re-constructible future.

Chapter 5 (Michael Carrithers). An essay, one might say, following so closely on Zulaika, that also explores the consequence of moral ruin and the tropic effort to relieve the extraordinary weight of a shameful past contaminated by

a vicious genocidal politics, the shipwreck of Nazism and the producer of the Holocaust. A notable essay following the attempt by one of Europe's "most civilized people" to come to terms with the weight of the former ghastly situation so as to reorient the present to a revitalized moral code. The author follows the fits and starts of that attempt to refigure that past and reorient a once contaminated moral order by taking up tropes to tell a new story. The tropic turn is to tell a wholly revitalizing and reorienting story, a reseeded of the landscape of national being, an extraordinary effort at reorientation closely followed in its anguished temporizing.

Chapter 6 (Gustav Peebles). An essay examining the situation where the acquisitive accumulative, exploitative uses of money make this bright shining fictional coin of efficient marketing and mutually profitable exchange into the primal stuff of self-production and self-interest, an excrement aptly identified with that primal Freudian configuration of the child's primal world where he or she must come to terms with one's very personal production learning to alienate it accordingly.

Chapter 7 (James W. Fernandez). An essay that focuses on two tropes, two *aides pensée*—the path and the garden—that so frequently find pictorialization in our dream life, where they are in contest both for our conscious and calculating understanding and for its enrichment. They express the perpetual tension between contingency and playfulness and are constantly subject to various path-ologies, especially for that pathfinder and gardener who is the ethnographer! They are also readable in evolutionary terms as the progression in thoughtways/lifeways from the expedient times of hunters and gatherers in their aleatory wanderings, of pastoralists settling down to follow their animals' instincts and one stage or another of progressing agri-culturalists anchored to the algorithms of their agro sciences and subjected to the long-term dependency on, and unpredictability of, the local weather.

Chapter 8 (Steve Coleman). An essay that treats of the situation of the de-italization attendant upon general abandonment of the Irish language, Gaelic. But a trope is found to remind the Irish of the real matter of which they are made and in which they remain rooted, from so many thousands of burials: the ever fertile and ultimately invigorating ancestral clay of the Emerald Isle. Let that ever-present clay be, ironically, the revitalizing trope in which the ancestors and the echoes of their talk is found and out of which they and their language can spring again anew.

Chapter 9 (Bernard Bate). An essay that explores the misrepresentations, both inadvertent and intended, as well as the part/whole politics that arise in

a nation, ours, that for a second time commits itself to a colonial war—first Vietnam and then Iraq. Both of these enterprises have been undertaken parapractically, mistakenly invested in the guise of or in the name of the defense of liberty, a pretense focused particularly in and around that eternal trope of that so often bellicose solidarity, the flag, so often vested with a fetish power and regularly taken in ritual re-representations as part and parcel of the sacred whole of national identity!

Chapter 10 (Mary Scoggin). An essay evoking a people living, as the citizens of China now do, in the de-vitalizing unrest of a one-party state, subject to its clumsy, often enough repressive, and even ruthless actions as a distant authoritarian regime. For those ever seeking a way to speak truth to power, it is a parlous situation best treated with the sure-handedness of an archer most often merely pricking, and sometimes dangerously drawing blood, but always with the possibility of cleverly, though not aggressively, addressing this repressive power with irony's arrow.

Chapter 11 (William O. Beeman). An essay that shows us, that makes us hear, as it were, the increased expressivity that musical tropes in their variety add to the already added meaning obtained by the interdomainal linguistic or visual play of the kind of tropes we are familiar with in these essays.

Chapter 12 (Dale Pesmen). As an essay pertinent to the main themes of our collection, it presents a creative stream of quite conscious narrative in the form of a conversation by the author with herself and her putative readers about the always present and always possible turnabouts, the volatility (precariousness, capriciousness, unpredictability) of human conversation. Hence an important demonstration of the tangentialism and/or breakpoints that can produce tropes or are themselves responses to a predicated trope!

Chapter 13 (Terence Turner). An essay using both field data from the Kayapo of Brazil and frame theory from the social sciences; a rethinking of structuralism showing the powers of transformation and transcendence that can be obtained by the play of tropes together with the play of frames as posited in frame theory.

James W. Fernandez is professor emeritus of cultural anthropology at the University of Chicago. He taught previously at Smith College, Dartmouth College, and Princeton University. For the first quarter century of his career he carried out ethnographic research on religious revitalization in Africa, and his second ethnography in that pursuit, *Bwiti: An Ethnography of the Religious Imagination in Africa* (1982), won the Herskovits Prize of the African Studies

Association. A focus on the “play of tropes” and the “figuration of cultural that is to say intersubjective realities” has been a constant in his career and ethnography since the 1950s.

Notes

1. Axiomatic in this essay and indeed in this author’s work generally is the obligation in our ethnographical storytelling to pay attention to and convey the vicissitudes of local life, its becomings, and its fallings away. In this regard, see the exemplary collection of essays edited by Michael Carrithers (2009) on the rhetorical vicissitudes that constitute the very tenor of life and one way in which we humans feel the presence and pressure of culture. This present author, working the first quarter century of his career (from 1955 to 1980) on religious movements in Africa, has approached the vicissitudes of living from the point of view of Wallace’s (1956) revitalization theory, laid out in a classic paper that has led to a multitudinous literature. It treats of the overall effort of maintaining and, in the event, regaining vitality and continuing to thrive!
2. The absolutely central place of “intersubjective truth” or fiction, as the cognitive revolution that made humans human and gave them culture in a fulsome way, is argued forcefully by the new and virtually universal public intellectual Yuval Noah Harari (2014: chaps. 2 and 6; 2017: chaps. 3 and 4) in his series of books. Of course, Harari’s insights have been long preceded in the social sciences, in large and in small, by, on the one hand, “fictionalism” in philosophy and, on the other hand, such enduring gems of thought as Clifford Geertz’s (1972) observation in *The Interpretation of Culture* that culture is essentially “stories we tell each other about each other.” The most important philosophers dedicated to “intersubjectivism” have been the phenomenologists and especially Edmund Husserl (1950). This present author, from the point of view of an interest in consensus as a kind of intersubjectivity (and making a distinction between social and cultural consensus), analyzed the kinds of ways in which individuals agreed or disagreed with each other (Fernandez 1965).
3. This is a point made persuasively nearly a century ago by John Dewey (1929) in his book, foundational for American neo-pragmatism, *The Quest for Certainty: A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action*.
4. For illuminating discussion on the frames/domains debate, see the essay in this volume by Terence Turner (chapter 13).
5. For an argument about the instructive, edifying consequence of puzzlements when dealing with “intersubjective truth,” see Fernandez 1981.
6. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, act 2, scene 5.
7. A Coleridgean notion employed by this author (Fernandez 1982) in an “ethnography of the imagination” that attempts to “figure out” at length how the members of an African revitalization movement, Bwiti, themselves through their figurations “figure out” the “religious pleasure dome” they present to their participants. As regards this Coleridgean phrase, “pleasure dome,” it derives from his *Kubla Khan*.
8. See the argument on this issue between one of anthropology’s important students of symbolization, Victor Turner, and the author (Turner and Fernandez 1973).
9. There is a rich, masterful awareness of this multiplicity in the work of our colleague, the late Paul Friedrich (1991). This is a rewarding essay on the tropes and a full complement and companion to Kenneth Burke’s (1941) pioneering “Four Master Tropes.”

10. The title was “Monografico: La tropología y la figuración del pensamiento y de la acción social”; it was published as a special issue of *Revista de Antropología Social* 15 (2006): 5–317. María Càtedra and Asensción Barañano, the journal editors, had invited the author of these introductory lines to act as editor of the proposed *monografico* and make a collection of essays by like-minded colleagues on the role of the figurative imagination in society and culture. They promised to translate these into Spanish, as they did. Consequently, almost all of the essay chapters of the first collection, although originally written in English, were only available in Spanish for more than a decade and a half. But their importance and, often enough, brilliance has seemed to justify their re-presentation here again in their original English, opening them up to a wider readership in their original language than is and was possible in Spanish. Some significant changes have been made in this English version as compared with the Spanish, most notably the inclusion here of Cervantes and the Quixote as one of the schools of thought along with Quintilian and Quevedo and Gracián.
11. Cervantes and the Quixote was not originally included here because the author of *El Quixote* (the classic was published between 1604 and 1614) was a surpassing (i.e., universal) presence in Spanish as well as in world literature and it was uncomfortable to categorize him and it in the terms of the discussion of schools and as simply a figure of the Spanish Baroque and Golden Age. He and the Quixote much surpassed that!
12. Among which is, of course, the instability of any dualistic view and the inevitable transformations of it, according to time and temperament, studied by structuralist theory!
13. Most notably by the author of the valuable pioneering Fang ethnography, Gunter Tessenmann (1972 [1913]), who in those chapters discussing their religion takes the Fang as impressive exemplars of primitive archetypal dualistic thinking.
14. For a discussion of both the institutionalized dualism and the way complementarity is achieved in rituals of various kinds, that is, rituals of “one heartedness,” see Fernandez 1982 (pp. 344, 371, 390–393, 639, and 649).
15. One of the important insights that rhetoric culture has long offered is its recognition of rhetoric’s ontological power to “realize illusions.” It is in that sense that Strecker speaks of Quixote as an icon of culture, which is to say a primordial portrait in European literature of the power of literature—the literature of knightly nobility, as it were—to create realities, giants out of windmills. For a similar argument, see Barbaruk 2015 (especially pp. 43 and 540–551).
16. Since the turn of the twenty-first century, a consortium of scholars under the stimulus of anthropologists Ivo Strecker (Mainz University) and Steven Tyler (Rice University) have participated in the many conferences and publications of the International Rhetoric Culture Project (<http://www.rhetoric-culture.org/>).
17. Strecker instances here Steven Tyler’s signal postmodern work on indeterminacy in communication, in, from the speakers’ point of view, what is being said and, in interpretation from the listener’s point of view, what is meant (see Tyler 1978: 137). The present author (Fernandez 1980: 13–43) has treated this as the “inchoate in communication” and, inevitably, the “inchoate of inquiry.”
18. Despite this fulsomeness of ethnographic attention it does not escape “indeterminacy,” that is to say, “the inchoate of inquiry.”
19. We can also see this dynamic tension as captured in the weaving trope as both the opposition and complementarity of the warp and the weft of culture.
20. “There is a sucker born every minute and a sharper to take his money,” P. T. Barnum reportedly said.

21. In a long-taught course on oral narrative, a main thematic argument is that humans are “argumentative animals” bent on, for various purposes, “capturing the imagination” of the other and that such capturing is what storytelling and other kinds of narrative persuasion are mainly about!
22. See, especially, the introduction and chapter 8 (“Philosophy without Mirrors”) in Rorty 1979 for much fuller exploration of the edification trope.

References

- Bailey, F. G. 2009. “The Palaestral Mode of Rhetoric.” In *Culture, Rhetoric and the Vicissitudes of Life*, ed. Michael Carrithers, 107–120. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Barbaruk, Magdalena. 2015. *The Long Shadow of Don Quixote: Interdisciplinary Studies in Performance*, vol. 3, trans. Patrycha Poniatowska. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Black, Max. 1962. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in language and Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1941. “Four Master Tropes.” *Kenyon Review* 3(4): 421–438.
- . 1985. “Dramatism and Logology.” *Communication Quarterly* 33(2): 89–93.
- Carrithers, Michael, ed. 2009. *Culture, Rhetoric and the Vicissitudes of Life*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Crocker, J. C., and J. David Sapir, eds. 1977. *The Social Use of Metaphor*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dewey, John. 1929. *The Quest for Certainty: A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action; Gifford Lectures*. New York: Minton.
- Dunbar, Robin. 1996. *Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language*. London: Faber and Faber.
- . 2005. *The Human Story: A New History of Mankind’s Evolution*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Durham, Deborah, and J. W. Fernandez. 1991. “Tropical Dominions: The Figurative Struggle over Domains of Belonging and Apartness in Africa.” In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. J. W. Fernandez, 190–210. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Fernandez, James W. 1965. “Symbolic Consensus in a Fang Reformatory Cult.” *American Anthropologist* 67(4): 902–929.
- . 1974. “The Mission of Metaphor in Expressive Culture [and Comments and Reply].” *Current Anthropology* 15(2): 119–145.
- . 1980. “The Dark at the Bottom of the Stairs: The Inchoate in Symbolic Inquiry and Some Strategies for Coping with It.” In *On Symbols in Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Harry Hoijer*, 13–43. Malibu: Undena.
- . 1981. “Edification by Puzzlement.” In *Explorations in African Systems of Thought*, ed. Ivan Karp and Charles S. Bird, 44–59. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- . 1982. *Bwiti: An Ethnography of the Religious Imagination in Africa*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1986a. “The Argument of Images and the Experience of Returning to the Whole.” In *The Anthropology of Experience*, ed. Victor W. Turner and Edward M. Bruner, 159–187. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- . 1986b. *Persuasions and Performances: The Play of Tropes in Culture*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

- Friedrich, Paul. 1979. "Poetic Language and the Imagination: A Reformulation of the Sapir Hypothesis." In *Language, Context and the Imagination: Essays by Paul Friedrich*, ed. Anwar S. Dil, 440–517. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 1991. "Polytropy." In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. J. W. Fernandez, 17–55. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gamble, Clive, John Gowlett, and Robin Dunbar. 2018. *Thinking Big: How the Evolution of Social Life Shaped the Human Mind*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1972. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1983. "Blurred Genres: The Refiguration of Social Thought." In *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*, 21–35. New York: Basic Books.
- Gracián y Morales, Baltasar. 1929 (1645). *Agudeza y Arte de Ingenio*. Madrid: La Rafa.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1990. *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, trans. Christian Lenhardt and Shierry Weber Nicholsen. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Harari, Yuval Noah. 2014. *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. London: Harvill Secker.
- . 2017. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. London: Vintage.
- Husserl, Edmund. 1950. *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Lydall, Jean, and Ivo Strecker. 1979a. *The Hamar of Southern Ethiopia*, vol. 2, *Baldambe Explains*. Hohenschäftlarn: Klaus Renner Verlag.
- . 1979b. *The Hamar of Southern Ethiopia*, vol. 3, *Conversations in Dambaiti*. Hohenschäftlarn: Klaus Renner Verlag.
- Northrop, F. S. C. 1965. *The Logic of the Sciences and the Humanities*. New York: World Publishing.
- Quevedo, Francisco de, y Villegas. 1972 (1635). *Los Sueños*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Quintilian, Marcus Fabius. 1872. *Institutiones Oratoriae*, Books 10–12.
- Rorty, Richard. 1979. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2016. *Philosophy as Poetry: The Page-Barbour Lectures*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Rueckert, W. H. 1963. *Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Stark, Frank M. 1996. *Communicative Interaction, Power and the State: A Method*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Strecker, Ivo. 1998. "'Our Good Fortune Brought Us Together': Obituary for Baldambe." *Paideuma* 44: 59–68.
- Tessmann, Gunter. 1972 (1913). *Die Pangwe. Völkerkundliche Monographie eines westafrikanischen Negerstammes. Ergebnisse der Lübecker Pangwe-Expedition 1907–1909 und früherer Forschungen 1904–1907*, vols. 1 and 2. New York: Johnson Reprint.
- Turner, Victor. 1974. *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 1990. *By Means of Performance: Intercultural Studies of Theater and Ritual*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, Victor, and James W. Fernandez. 1973. "Analysis of Ritual: Metaphoric Correspondences as the Elementary Forms." *Science* 182(4119): 1366–1367.
- Tyler, Steven. 1978. *The Said and the Unsaid: Language, Thought and Culture*. New York and London: Academic Press.
- Vico, Giambattista. 1999. *The New Science: Principles of the New Science concerning the Common Nature of Nations*, trans. David Marsh. London: Penguin.
- Wallace, Anthony F. C. 1956. "Revitalization Movements." *American Anthropologist* 58(2): 264–281.

White, Hayden. 1976. "The Tropics of History: The Deep Structure of the New Science." In *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*, 197–217. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1953. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.