Week 1: Introduction: rhetorical canons and editorial processes

In this week we will introduce some key concepts and ideas from rhetorical theory to frame our ongoing discussion, as well as a basic account of the editing process. 'To edit' can mean many things in different contexts, so we are working with a loose definition this semester so that students can approach it in a way that suits their professional and other interests.

The reading materials for the week are concerned with the so-called 'death of the editor' and the general sense of crisis around editing as a professional activity or a job in its own right. These issues are linked to changes in publishing as a business, in how organisations delegate or conceive of roles people might have in relation to text, and the large-scale digitisation of editorial functions and the proliferation of digital and online tools.

**Readings for week 1**

*Please read at least one (1) of the following articles from eReserve:*

Aranjuez, A. (2017). Death of the editor. *Overland*, *July 2017*.

Murphy, J. S. (2008). The Death of the Editor. *Essays in Criticism*, *58*, 289–310

Greenberg, S. (2010). When the Editor Disappers, Does Editing Disappear? *Convergence*, *16*(1), 7–21.

# Week 2: Rhetoric for editors: a critical vocabulary

This week we will build our understanding of ideas from rhetorical theory and link these to editorial activities. This way of interpreting texts offers a more holistic orientation than an emphasis on grammar or logical argumentation, while still allowing us to consider those questions. The rhetorical tradition offers and analytical framework for thinking about the persuasive effects of texts, but also the process of making texts.

The reading materials for the week include a long introduction to rhetoric as a theoretical and practical field.

### ****Readings for week 2****

Please read as much as you can of the following article from eReserve:

Jarrat, S. C. (2007). Rhetoric. In *Introduction to scholarship in modern languages and literatures* (3rd ed., pp. 73–102). New York: Modern Language Association of America,The Modern Language Association of America.

# Week 3: Higher order editorial concerns

This week we turn towards the editorial process more directly, and think about what it is editors actually do in different contexts.

We can think about editing as addressing either 'higher order' or 'lower order' concerns. 'Higher order' editing can mean initiating or guiding the process of writing. It can also involve concerns about content, structure, overarching argument, and persistent features of style and delivery. 'Lower order' concerns tends to refer to copyediting and proofreading i.e. ensuring that the details of a texts are correct and appropriate.

### ****Readings for week 3****

From eReserve, you must read the following:

Institute of Professional Editors Ltd. (2013, March 1). Australian standards for editing practice.

Please read one (1) of these two practical texts as well:

Snooks & Co. (2002). Editing and proofreading. In Style manual for authors, editors, and printers (pp. 252–269). John Wiley & Sons.

McKenzie, J. (2011). Substance and structure. In *The Editor’s Companion* (pp. 70–93).

# Week 4: Lower order editorial concerns

This week we will turn from 'higher order' to 'lower order' and think about style, grammar, and usage, and the activities of copyediting and proofreading. In this case, the 'big' decisions about a text have been made, and the editor's job is to ensure that everything is correct and consistent within paragraphs, sentences and phrases.

The reading materials for the week include a guide to copy editing techniques. You will aim to apply these in activities and assignments. There is also an additional reading for those interested to learn how to 'mark up' a text by hand.

### ****Readings for week 4****

The following chapter will give you a sense of the importance of decisions about language and style in editorial work:

McKenzie, J. (2011). [Language](https://canvas.sydney.edu.au/courses/20840/files/9823695/download?wrap=1). In *Editor’s Companion* (2nd ed., pp. 94–114). Cambridge University Press.

We have previously advised reading the following chapter from eReserve. It may be a bit narrow to be useful for activities, but remains a thorough account of the kinds of details copy-editors need to attend to:

Flann, E., Hill, B., & Wang, L. (2014). Editing practice: copy editing techniques. In *The Australian editing handbook* (3rd ed., pp. 127–155). Wiley.

If you are curious about marking up a text by hand, or would prefer to work in an analogue mode, you may also find the following useful:

Wang, E. F. B. H. L. (2004). Marking up copy. In *The Australian Editing Handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 66–96). Wiley.

# Week 5: Visual rhetoric and delivery

Within the rhetorical framework, the canon of 'delivery' refers to the point of contact between an audience and an argument, story or other form of discourse. For classical rhetors, this was usually about the conduct and comportment of speakers before a live audience. In a contemporary context, this might cover design, visual elements in a text, but also the medium of delivery (including its affordances and constraints), as well as questions such as how the author's, publication's or organisation's identity is embodied or presented through and around the main text.

The reading materials include a practical outline of design principles for writers and editors. There are many similar guides available online: their applicability or usefulness varies greatly. We will also look at some more critical perspectives on the origins and social effects of 'design thinking'.

### ****Readings for week 5****

Please read both of the following sources from eReserve:

Kristaponis, B. (2014). Five design principles for writers and editors. *American Medical Writers Association Journal*, *29*(3), 100–103.

Williams, B., & Stimatz, L. (2005). The Origins of Graphic Screen Design Principles: Theory or Rhetoric. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, *32*(2), 181–193.

To extend your thinking about critical perspectives on design and textuality, the following is recommended:

Hum, S. (2015). ‘Between the Eyes’: The Racialized Gaze as Design. *College English*, *77*(3), 191–215.