

My eyes glazed over the new assignment. The title read "*Why Sentences*, by Stanley Fish." As I read through I grew progressively more infuriated by Fish. His inability to create a proper connection between the overarching theme of his work to the art styles he used as examples rubbed me the wrong way. He began by stating implicitly sentences are to writing as paint is to painting, and continued on to explain why.

I do happen to have the comprehensive understanding of the meaning Fish was trying to convey. The goal of his writing was to show that during the progression of development, the artwork reveals itself - an idea with which I would generally agree with. *However*, Fish's intentions are rendered moot by the fact that he fails to convey his goal with the flawed connection between sentences and paint. This *severely* detracts from the cohesion of *Why Sentences*.

In the creation of any artwork, there are several levels of complexity. Let's take the two forms of artwork Fish employs in his writing, and use those as examples. Painting consists of paint, details, imagery, and landscape. Writing consists of words, sentences, paragraphs, and the final product. Each level relates to each other respectively. Words and paint by themselves are relatively insignificant, but when used in elaborate combination, more complex artistic details and sentences are developed. These sentences/details, then used in combination with more of each other, due to increased complexity, eventually develop into paragraphs/imagery. Again, the imagery/paragraphs are used in succession to create the final product/landscape.

Fish falls into a philosophical issue where he evaluates the paint solely subjectively and the words entirely objectively. The problem with this is that nothing is totally objective or subjective. Let's say we had an image that contained the words live, laugh, and love, as well as a painting that had imagery of a beat, a smile, and a heart. The original image, the one with words, has an objective meaning clearly elucidated by the definitions of said words. The subjective meaning is left completely up to the individual viewing it. The same goes for the painting. The objective meaning is apparent due to what the images directly represent. The subjective meaning, again, is left up to the individual viewing it. The use of this common misconception denigrates and borderline discredits what Fish has stated; all simply due to the spoiled logic.

OLD:

Fish also falls into a problematic state in which he switches between subjectivity and objectivity for evaluations. Sometimes basing images upon personal opinion, sometimes basing them on practical uses. These cannot be directly compared, an image cannot be deemed valuable on a large-scale because of one certain person's feelings. Same goes for emotional evaluation. Something that is widely considered beautiful doesn't mean that it has to be beautiful in the eyes of everyone. The common use of this misconception discredits anything Fish has stated simply because of the spoiled logic.