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**1. Pragma-dialectic:**

* Pragma-dialect “Groarke has shown how the pragma-dialectical principles of communication can be applied to our interpretation of images in argument” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 104).
* “Pragma-dialectics maintains that we should interpret speech acts in a way that renders them comprehensible, sincere, relevant, consistent, and appropriate in the context of the other speech acts that surround them.” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 104).
* Being pragma-dialectic allows the critic to view a visual argument from the balcony, by placing emphasis on all other contexts that are present that work along with the visual element.

Birdsell, D. S., & Groarke, L. (2007). Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 43(3/4). 104.

**2. Visual Flag:**

* “An image functions as a *visual flag* when it is used to attract attention to a message conveyed to some audience” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 104).
* “Visual flags solve a fundamental problem in argumentative discourse, in which someone who wishes to convey a message to an audience must try to stand out against a flood of messages that others are trying to send.” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 104).
* A visual flag is a tool that a rhetor can use to point their audience to a specific point they wish to make.

Birdsell, D. S., & Groarke, L. (2007). Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 43(3/4). 104.

**3. Visual Demonstration:**

* *“visual demonstration…*is used to convey information which can best be presented visually.” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 105).
* “Visual demonstrations also can present abstract information that is not conveyed easily in words “ (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 105).
* Visual demonstration provides a medium between images and how we define what we see.

Birdsell, D. S., & Groarke, L. (2007). Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 43(3/4). 105.

**4. Visual Symbol:**

* *“*Visual symbols*”* have strong associations that allow them to stand for something they represent In part, we are able to communicate effectively with images because we share (at least to some degree) a common vocabulary of symbols that can be used to make convenient references.” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 105).
* “What can be said of visual symbols often applies to words and verbal symbols as well. Knowledge of a symbol system is required to decode any symbol, whether verbal or visual.” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 105).
* An audience can interpret visual symbols based on previous experiences.

Birdsell, D. S., & Groarke, L. (2007). Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 43(3/4). 105.

**5. Visual Archetype:**

* “a kind of visual symbol whose meaning derives from popular narratives.” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 105).
* “he visual archetype provides a convenient way to declare that someone is *not* telling the truth.” (Birdsell & Groarke, 2007, p. 105).
* Visual Archetypes allow us to understand and draw meaning from different images based on how we understand a particular event.

Birdsell, D. S., & Groarke, L. (2007). Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 43(3/4). 105.

**6. Rhetoric:**

* “Rhetoric, therefore, is the method, the strategy, the organon of the principles for deciding best the undecidable questions, for arriving at solutions of the unsolvable problems, for instituting method in those vital phases of human activity where no method is inherent in the total subject-matter of decision.” (Bryant, 1953, p. 407).
* “rhetoric must be understood to be the rationale of informative and suasory discourse both spoken and written” (Bryant, 1953, p. 407).
* Rhetoric is the combination of ideas and useful persuasion and ideas that rhetor’s use to evoke a positive or negative reaction from their audience from which deliberation on unanswerable questions exist.

Bryant, D. C. (1953). Rhetoric: Its Functions and its Scope. “*Quarterly Journal Of Speech*, 39(4), 407.

**7. Oratory:**

* oratory have taken on, like rhetoric itself, rather limited or distorted meanings,…practitioner of public address” (Bryant, 1953, p. 407).
* “Baldwin has pointed out, when prose itself was virtually defined as oratory and history, when even history was composed largely in the spirit of oratory” (Bryant, 1953, p. 403).
* When President Barack Obama makes a State of the Union speech, it is immediately recognized as the speech itself being a piece of oratory.

Bryant, D. C. (1953). Rhetoric: Its Functions and its Scope. “*Quarterly Journal Of Speech*, 39(4), 403-407.

**8. Language:**

* “language…the symbolization of thought, exhibits two entirely different modes of thought. Yet in both modes the mind is powerful and creative. It expresses itself in different forms, one of which is discursive logic, the other creative imagination.” (Bormann, 1982, p. 289).
* “language, man’s prime instrument of reason, reflects his mythmaking tendency more than his rationalizing tendency.” (Bormann, 1982, p. 289).
* According to Borrman, it is important to understand the use of language in that it helps us analyze how we think and communicate with others.

Bormann, E.G. (1982). 1. Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: Ten Years Later. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech, 68*(3), 289.

**9. Discursive Argument/logic:**

* “Discursive argument requires a common set of assumptions about the nature of reality and of proof.” (Bormann, 1982, p. 292).
* “Therefore, discursive parts of Puritan sermons were cast into the form of exegetical arguments based upon Biblical quotations.” (Bormann, 1982, p. 292).
* In fantasy theme analysis discursive logic/arguments requires the sharing of ideas between groups.

Bormann, E.G. (1982). 1. Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: Ten Years Later. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech, 68*(3), 292.

**10. Fantasy Type:**

* “The presence of the fantasy type in the communication of participants in a rhetorical vision indicates that they have shared the fantasy themes that comprise that type prior to the time they drew the comparisons upon which the abstraction was based.” (Bormann, 1982, p. 295).
* “When a community of people have come to share the fantasy type until it is thoroughly ingrained in their consciousness they will respond to general statements which allude to the type or to code words that signal the type without the supporting references to specific themes.” (Bormann, 1982, p. 295).
* When Fantasy Type are discovered, it helps give context to group communication and ideas.

Bormann, E.G. (1982). 1. Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: Ten Years Later. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech, 68*(3), 295.

**11. Rhetorical Vision:**

* “As we studied these problems we discovered interrelated sets of fantasy themes of broad scope. We used the term rhetorical vision to indicate these integrated symbol systems.” (Bormann, 1982, p. 294).
* “The sharing of fantasies within a group or community establishes the assumptive system portrayed in the common rhetorical vision.” (Bormann, 1982, p. 292).
* Groups communicate and through their interactions and roles, form a rhetorical vision of a message.

Bormann, E.G. (1982). 1. Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: Ten Years Later. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech, 68*(3), 292-294.

**12. Croup Fantasizing:**

* “Group fantasizing correlates with individual fantasizing and extrapolates to speaker-audience fantasizing and to the dream merchants of the mass media.” (Bormann, 1972, p. 396).
* “Bales provided the key part to the puzzle when he discovered the dynamic process of group fantasizing” (Bormann, 1972, p. 396).
* Group fantasizing is the most integral part of how fantasy theme analysis chains out.

Bormann, E. G. (1972). Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech, 58*(4), 396.

**13. Fantasy Chain:**

* “in a fantasy chain and a critic might interpret the manifest content with an eye to discovering the group’s hidden agenda.” (Bormann, 1972, p. 397).
* “Values and attitudes of many kinds are tested and legitimatized as common to the group by the process of fantasy chains.” (Bormann, 1972, p. 398).
* By understanding how fantasy themes are developed, we better understand group dynamics, and also how rhetoric may affect the individuals.

Bormann, E. G. (1972). Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech, 58*(4), 397-398.

**14. Dialectic:**

* “dialectic is the art of logical discussion” (Natanson, 1955, p. 134).
* “Dialectic, for Aristotle, has as its object the achievement of knowledge; rhetoric, persuasion.” (Natanson, 1955, p. 134).
* Even though our class is focused on rhetorical criticism, we often dive further into discovering knowledge through a dialectic setting.

Natanson, M. (1955). “The Limits of Rhetoric.” *Quarterly Journal Of Speech, 41*(2), 134.

**15. Metaphorical style of rhetoric :**

* “Metaphorical style of rhetoric of comparing two dissimilar objects, and because of the comparison, the characteristic of one object is transferred to the other.” (Se-Hoon, 2008, p. 60).
* “Metaphorical style of rhetoric and visual argumentation, both of which can be characterized as implicit argumentation, are likely to increase audiences’ cognitive elaboration when they process the message, which may lead to greater persuasion.” (Se-Hoon, 2008, p. 60).
* As critics, we can look to a metaphorical style of rhetoric to answer question as to why we view different objects the same way.

Se-Hoon, J. (2008). Visual Metaphor in Advertising: Is the Persuasive Effect Attributable to Visual Argumentation or Metaphorical Rhetoric?. Journal Of Marketing Communications 14(1), 60.

**16. Etic**

* “"The etic viewpoint studies behavior as from outside of a particular system, and as an essential initial approach to an alien system.” (Black, 1980, p. 331)
* “The etic critic, holding that rhetorical discourses, or at least clusters of them, are essentially similar and that their similarities are either descriptively summarized or archetypily idealized in one or another theoretical formulation, proceeds to the task of criticism a prioristically.” (Black, 1980, p. 332).
* When analyzing a particular text it is important to approach it from an etic point of view.

Black, E. (1980). A Note on Theory and Practice in Rhetorical Criticism. *Western Journal Of Speech Communication: WJSC, 44*(4), 331-332.

**17. Emic**

* “The emic viewpoint results from studying behavior as from inside the system." (Black, 1980, p. 331).
* “The emic critic, on the other hand, holding that rhetorical transactions themselves constitute the chief source of knowledge in the field of rhetoric and the sole defensible ground for its theoretical formulations, proceeds to the task of criticism with a willing suspension of will itself, seeking to coax from the critical object its own essential form of disclosure.” (Black, 1980, p. 332).
* By establishing an emic point of view the critic, can actually work within the own discourse that they are developing and lead to a better interpretation because of their own knowledge.

Black, E. (1980). A Note on Theory and Practice in Rhetorical Criticism. *Western Journal Of Speech Communication: WJSC, 44*(4), 331-332.

**18. Narration:**

* “By “narration,” I refer to a theory of symbolic actions-words and/or deeds-that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them.” (Fisher, 1984, p. 2).
* “There is, of course, a tradition in rhetorical theory and pedagogy that focuses on narration as an element in discourse and genre itself.” (Fisher, 1984, p. 2).
* Through the use of narration, we can re-create meaning of a rhetor’s artifact by looking at different meanings associated by its own history.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument. *Communication Monographs, 51*(1), 2.

**19. Narrative Paradigm:**

* “The narrative paradigm. then, can be considered a dialectical synthesis two traditional strands in the history of rhetoric: the argumentative. persuasive theme and the literary, aesthetic theme.” (Fisher, 1984, p. 2).
* “the narrative paradigm insists that human communication should be viewed as historical as well as situational, as stories competing with other stories constituted by good reasons” (Fisher, 1984, p. 2).
* The narrative paradigm places more emphasis on human communication and a sense of storytelling as a way of persuasion.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument. *Communication Monographs, 51*(1), 2.

**20. Paradigm:**

* “By paradigm, I refer to a representation designed to formalize the structure of a component of experience and to direct understanding and inquiry into the nature and functions of that experience-in this instance, the experience of human communication.” (Fisher, 1984, p. 2).
* “Except for these studies, I know of no other attempt to suggest narration as a paradigm. There is, of course, a tradition in rhetorical theory and pedagogy that focuses on narration as an element in discourse and as a genre in and of itself” (Fisher, 1984, p. 2).
* According to Fischer, he sees paradigm as the structure in place that allows for communication to expand and exist.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument. *Communication Monographs, 51*(1), 2.

**21. Narrative Fidelity:**

* “rationality is determined by the nature of persons as narrative beings… and their constant habit of testing narrative fidelity, whether stories they experience ring true with the stories they know to be true in their lives” (Fisher, 1984, p. 8).
* “Second, one does not have to be taught narrative probability and narrative fidelity: one culturally acquires them through universal faculty and experience” (Fisher, 1984, p. 15).
* When utilizing the narrative paradigm, a critic can apply the concept of narrative fidelity to the artifact, to help establish whether or not a piece of rhetoric constitutes “good reasons”.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument. *Communication Monographs, 51*(1), 8-15.

**22. Narrative Probability:**

* “rationality is determined by the nature of persons as narrative beings-their inherent awareness of narrative probability, what constitutes a coherent story” (Fisher, 1984, p. 8).
* “Second, one does not have to be taught narrative probability and narrative fidelity: one culturally acquires them through universal faculty and experience” (Fisher, 1984, p. 15).
* Similar to narrative fidelity, a critic can analyze a text to see whether or not it flows together, and is free of contradictions.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument. *Communication Monographs, 51*(1), 8-15.

**23. Dramatization:**

* “catch on and chain out in small groups are worked into public speeches and into the mass media and in turn, spread across lager publics” (Mohrmann, 1982, p. 114).
* “Absent from this review is any comment on the use of Bales' theories as a source for a dramatistic program in criticism, and dramatism is of the essence for fantasy theme critics. (Mohrmann, 1982, p. 114).
* Dramatization allows for group members to interpret different roles.

Mohrmann, G. P. (1982). An Essay On Fantasy Theme Criticism. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech. 68*(2). 114.

**24. Rhetorical Transaction:**

* “rhetorical transactions are themselves a major source of information about psychological regularities” (Black, 1980, p. 333).
* “rhetorical transaction in what is hoped to be its own terms, without conscious expectations drawn from any sources other than the rhetorical transaction itself” (Black, 1980, p. 332).
* Rhetorical transaction, refers to the process by which rhetoric is created and shaped by rhetor, and then delivered to his/her intended audience.

Black, E. (1980). A Note on Theory and Practice in Rhetorical Criticism. *Western Journal Of Speech Communication: WJSC, 44*(4), 332-333.

**25. Rhetorical Criticism:**

* “rhetorical criticism may be defined may be defined as an artistic expression composed of statements comparing an instance of symbol inducement with an implicit or explicit model of excellence.” (Fisher, 1974, p. 76).
* “Rhetorical criticism should be expressed precisely, systematically, and employ the most convincing forms of reasoning available to the case the critic is making” (Fisher, 1974, p. 78).
* Rhetorical criticism is the process by which critics interpret and analyze messages, by comparing an artifact to different theoretical concepts.

Fisher, W. R. (1974). Rhetorical Criticism as Criticism. *Western Speech, 38*(2), 76-78.