

University of Windsor

## Scholarship at UWindor

---

OSSA Conference Archive

OSSA 3

---

May 15th, 9:00 AM

### Dialectics of criticism: Argumentation in literary reviews

Rob Grootendorst

*University of Amsterdam*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

---

Grootendorst, Rob, "Dialectics of criticism: Argumentation in literary reviews" (1999). *OSSA Conference Archive*. 2.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA3/keynotes/2>

This Keynote is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences and Conference Proceedings at Scholarship at UWindor. It has been accepted for inclusion in OSSA Conference Archive by an authorized conference organizer of Scholarship at UWindor. For more information, please contact [scholarship@uwindsor.ca](mailto:scholarship@uwindsor.ca).

**Rob Grootendorst** (Department of Speech Communication, *University of Amsterdam*)

*"Dialectics of criticism: Argumentation in literary reviews"*

Criticism is a neglected subject in the study of argumentation. In my talk, I explore the possibility of a pragma-dialectical analysis in literary reviews as a specific type of criticism. I argue that literary reviews are argumentative texts in which the critic attempts to convince the readers that his or her judgment is right or, at least, acceptable. The resolution of this non-mixed dispute between the critic as a protagonist and the reader as an antagonist is, pragma-dialectically speaking, highly problematic. First, there is no consensus among critics or between critics and their readers with respect to the norms for judging literature. Second, since the readers, as a rule, have not read the novel before they read the review, there are no facts about the novel known to both critics and readers. So, the pragma-dialectical intersubjective identification procedure and the testing procedure cannot be of any help in resolving the dispute. It seems, then, that the acceptability of the critic's argumentation relies heavily, if not exclusively, on his or her authority. Are literary (and other) reviews based on the fallacy of *ad verecundiam* or is it possible for the critic to observe all the rules for a critical discussion?