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1. **Rhetoric**
   1. “…common ideas, conventional language, and specific information to influence audiences’ feelings and behaviors” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 7). “…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).
   2. “…a special sort of human activity; it takes a special kind of practice to understand it; and by understanding it, one acquires a special perspective on the world itself” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 6).
   3. Rhetoric is the art of constructing the most persuasive choices for an audience in order to move said audience and influence their decisions and/or opinions.
   4. Daughton, S. & Roderick, H.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.; Bryant, D.C. (December, 1953). Rhetoric: Its functions and its scope. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX* (4). Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88N0NpNHlWdEtkVEE&usp=sharing>
2. **Criticism/Critic**
   1. “…what good critics do: building an argument about social conditions by observing what people say” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 23). “…the essence of criticism – that essence consists in the comparison of an object or act with an implicit or explicit set of norms” (Fisher, 1987, p. 75).
   2. “Criticism therefore requires special discernment: the ability to stand simultaneously in the midst of and apart from the events experienced” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p 23).
   3. Many may claim that they are practicing the art of criticism, but it is just that – an art. The key facet and factor of the true definition of a critic is one who can knowingly comment on the subject they are critiquing and, as Hart and Daughton (2005) put it, one who also appreciates and acknowledges the art of persuasion (p. 23). On the same note as discussed in class, inartistic is defined as taking one person’s opinion; wherein, there is a lack of critical perspective employed.
   4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.; Fisher, W.R. (1987). *Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument.* Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
3. **Rhetorical Criticism**
   1. “…business of identifying the complications of rhetoric and then unpacking or explaining them in a comprehensive and efficient manner” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 22).
   2. “…rhetorical criticism documents social trends…provides general understandings…requires that one isolate a phenomenon for special study…describe special aspects of that phenomenon…interpret the patterns noticed…and evaluate the phenomenon” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, pp. 23-25).
   3. It is one thing to be able to analyze and identify a piece of rhetoric, it is another to be able to, as Hart & Daughton (2005) put it, explain how we know what we know (p. 6).
   4. Daughton, S. & Roderick, H. P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
4. **Logic of Persuasion –**
   1. “In persuasion, every act is rational (to the actor) at the time…the logic of persuasion is always credibility-driven…the logic of persuasion is always saliency-driven…the logic of persuasion is audience-dependent…a logic of association…often a logic of emotion…in persuasion, these claims stand as argument” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, pp. 80-83).
   2. “…therefore, what Aristotle said of the nature and principles of public address, of the discovery of all available means of persuasion in any given case, must stand as the broad background for any sensible rhetorical system” (Bryant, 1953, p. 404).
   3. Logic of persuasion can be a tricky business, in that if the emotional authenticity, integrity and register of the critic are not kept in check and such appeals are not looked at with their own critical lens, said logic breaks down to the base entreaties of a salesperson harking their wears by employing false empathy.
   4. Bryant, D.C. (December, 1953). Rhetoric: Its functions and its scope. The *Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX* (4). Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88N0NpNHlWdEtkVEE&usp=sharing>; Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
5. **Public Discourse**
   1. “…the function of public discourse in identifying, promulgating, and adjudicating values and, thus, in constituting and sustaining social groups” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 47).
   2. “…and they are sustained through public discourse in which adherence to these values is reinforced and, also, through the public argumentation in which these values are deployed or put to the test” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p.62).
   3. Public discourse constitutes the flow of language (symbols) within the public sphere about societal issues and concerns.
   4. Graff, R. & Winn, W. (n.d.). *Presencing Communion in Chaim Perelman’s New Rhetoric*. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
6. **Narrative Paradigm**
   1. “…a dialectical synthesis of two traditional strands in the history of rhetoric: the argumentative, persuasive theme and the literary, aesthetic theme…philosophical statement that is meant to offer an approach to interpretation and assessment of human communication – assuming that all forms of human communication can be seen fundamentally as stories, as interpretations of aspects of the world occurring in time and shaped by history, culture, and character” (Fisher, 1987, p. 2).
   2. “…insists that human communication should be viewed as historical as well as situation, as stories competing with other stories constituted by good reasons, as being rational when they satisfy the demands of narrative probability and narrative fidelity, and as inevitable moral inducements” (Fisher, 1987, p. 2).
   3. As we’ve learned in class – the philosophical ground for the narrative paradigm is ontology, and there are several presuppositions that structure the paradigm, including:
      1. Humans are essentially storytellers.
      2. Paradigmatic mode of human decision-making and communication is “good reasons”.
   4. Fisher, W.R. (1987). *Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument.* Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
7. **Etic**
   1. “…studies behavior as from outside of a particular system, and as an essential initial approach to an alien system” (Black, 1980, p. 331).
   2. “One perspective on rhetorical criticism – the etic – holds that theory is to practice as means are to ends. The other perspective – the emic – holds that theory is to practice as ends are to means…etic criticism applies general ideas for the purpose of illuminating specific rhetorical transactions” (Black, 1980, p. 332).
   3. Etic critics are those who utilize objectivity in their analysis; the outsider looking in.
   4. Black, E. (1980). A note on theory and practice in rhetorical criticism. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44* (Fall). Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
8. **Emic**
   1. “…studying behavior as from inside the system” (Black, 1980, p. 331).
   2. “…account of two standpoints – the etic and emic – for the description of behavior has proved to have been suggestive in fields other than linguistics, and it may also have a certain limited utility in rhetorical criticism as well…the emic orientation, on the other hand, has the activity of criticism instrumental to the attainment of rhetorical theory” (Black, 1980, p. 331).
   3. Emic critics are those who are subjective in their analysis. An excellent example one encyclopedia provides for further clarification – modern medical science defines disease in culture-free (etic) ways, and people as a society define illness based on their cultural context (emically).
   4. Black, E. (1980). A note on theory and practice in rhetorical criticism. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44* (Fall). Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
9. **Communion**
   1. “Community is defined not by ‘the specific rules which govern argumentative behavior’, but by a group’s adherence to shared values, by a ‘common language’ and a ‘characteristic mode of expressing social communion’” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 62).
   2. “The speaker tries to establish a sense of communion centered around particular values recognized by the audience, and to this end he uses the whole range of means available to the rhetorician for purposes of amplification and enhancement” (Fisher, 1987, p. 49).
   3. Powerful persuasive tool which includes the creation of a shared sense of community and belonging which serve to engage the audience and create a narrative fidelity in order to increase the persuasiveness of the message.
   4. Fisher, W.R. (1987). *Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument.* Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>; Graff, R. & Winn, W. (n.d.). *Presencing Communion in Chaim Perelman’s New Rhetoric*. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
10. **Deliberative & Forensic Oratory/Discourse**
    1. “According to Aristotle, the speaker sets himself different goals depending on the kind of speech he is making: in deliberative oratory, to counsel what is expedient, that is, the best; in legal oratory to establish what is just” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 48).
    2. “While strengthening the audience’s adherence to shared values is the “end” in epideictic, these shared values in turn serve as starting points or “means,” for deliberative and forensic discourse” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 50).
    3. Values and the disposition of one’s audience are what compose the premise and ability for deliberative and/or forensic speeches ability to “induce action.”
    4. Graff, R. & Winn, W. (n.d.). *Presencing Communion in Chaim Perelman’s New Rhetoric.* Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing
11. **Value-Judgment**
    1. “…deep-seated, persistent beliefs about essential rights and wrongs that express a person’s basic orientation to life” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 236).
    2. “In Perelman’s view, argumentation in the realm of practical affairs (politics for example) is characterized by the redeployment and circulation of value judgments that have force for the members of the specific community to which it is addressed” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 62).
    3. Value judgments are subjective in that they guide the audience to uncover and see those values which have been presupposed and assigned as a persuasive technique to instill a sense of community based on the assumption of shared values and commonly held beliefs.
    4. Graff, R. & Winn, W. (n.d.). *Presencing Communion in Chaim Perelman’s New Rhetoric.* Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>; Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
12. **Reasoning/“Good Reason”**
    1. “reasoning…packages of emotions and ideas serve as arguments in the ordinary world” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 83).
    2. “…this means that both rhetors and audiences always have “good reasons” for doing what they do. Even though these reasons may not meet the critic’s personal standards of goodness, this proposition suggests that any message that becomes popular will have a powerful logic to it” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 80).
    3. The (good) claims or proofs that are the direct result of this process build the critic’s persuasive argument.
    4. Daughton, S. & Roderick, H. P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
13. **Epideictic Rhetoric**
    1. “…ceremonial speech that praises or blames” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 4). “…form of argumentation aimed at increasing the audience’s intensity of adherence to value-judgments that are by their nature incapable of being demonstrated by apodictic logic” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 48).
    2. “…epideictic ceremonies provide opportunities for the inculcation and periodic reaffirmation of communal values and that, in so doing, epideictic discourse secures resources for invention (premises on the order of the “preferable”) and establishes a ground for future argumentation” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 48).
    3. Epideictic rhetoric functions, in part, by reaffirming societal values (explicitly, as they relate to “ceremonies”) in order to establish a foundation for discourse, and as Graff & Winn note, for future argumentation.
    4. Daughton, S. & Roderick, H.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.; Graff, R. & Winn, W. (n.d.). *Presencing “Communion” in Chaim Perelman’s New Rhetoric.* Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
14. **Disposition**
    1. “…make use of dispositions already present in the audience, and values are for them means that make it possible to induce action” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 50).
    2. “Moreover, it stirs or strengthens in audience members a disposition to act, a disposition that will be made salient when confronted with effective arguments” (Graff & Winn, n.d., p. 50).
    3. Knowing the pre-disposition of one’s audience lends itself to understanding said audience’s values and essentially allows the rhetor to craft their persuasive statement in order to potentially assuage any fears and indulge their known nature.
    4. Graff, R. & Winn, W. (n.d.). *Presencing Communion in Chaim Perelman’s New Rhetoric.* Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
15. **Values**
    1. “…deep-seated, persistent beliefs about essential rights and wrongs that express a person’s basic orientation to life” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 236).
    2. “For example, Americans have always believed that values can be taught, just like mathematics…Americans believe that all instruction, even value-based instruction, can be systematized, personalized, and efficiently delivered” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 237).
    3. A simple laymen’s term for values are those beliefs held by society which guide moral action based on what is believed to be good or bad, desirable or undesirable.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
16. **Myths**
    1. “…Master Stories describing exceptional people doing exceptional things and serving as moral guides to proper action” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 236).
    2. “…myths provide a heightened sense of authority…myths provide a heightened sense of continuity…myths provide a heightened sense of coherence...myths provide a heightened sense of community…myths provide a heightened sense of choice…myths provide a heightened sense of agreement” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 244).
    3. Several valuable critical probes with which to analyze any given myth, as provided by Levi-Strauss, including – source, combination of elements, harmony, synchronic time, context, oppositional forces – and in addition to the overall response that the myth elicits from the audience.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
17. **Fantasy**
    1. “…the creative and imaginative interpretation of events that fulfills a psychological need” (Bormann, 1982, p. 7). “…abbreviated myths providing concrete manifestations of current values and hinting at some idealized vision of the future” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 236).
    2. “Fantasy theme analysis has continued as a humanistic method of rhetorical criticism but newer developments have resulted in the branching off of a general theory of communication (symbolic convergence)…that sharing fantasies is closely connected with motivation, and is an important means for people to create their social realities” (Bormann, 1982, p. 289).
    3. A common question that draws from this theme is that of the irrational and rational qualities of it; wherein, Bormann posits that language reflects more of man’s mythmaking tendencies than it does his rationalizing tendency.
    4. Bormann, E.G. (1982). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: Ten years later. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 68.* Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88N0NpNHlWdEtkVEE&usp=sharing>; Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
18. **Evidence**
    1. “…forms the foundation and supporting walls of discourse” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    2. “Naturally, the evidence used in public arguments rarely meet rigorous standards of empirical testing…on many occasions for many listeners, some evidence is enough evidence” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 83).
    3. The evidence one draws from in order to craft any persuasive argument is paramount in building their ethos, so long as it is not plagiarized.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
19. **Toulmin and Reasoning**
    1. “A useful method for understanding reasoning…a new way of thinking about informal human argument…approach equips the critic with a system that may explain why a given message failed to persuade. Like other critical tools, the Toulmin approach provides the critic with a technical language for describing rhetorical trends which cannot be easily described in lay language” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, pp. 92-98).
    2. “Toulmin’s system reduces arguments to a kind of outline so as to establish their overall logical movement…provides an economical way of talking about large quantities of discourse” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 93).
    3. In today’s day and age where we covet fast downloading of information, to be able to highlight and breakdown an argument for your audience, adhering to the Toulmin model, only lends itself to your credibility and potential effectiveness.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
20. **Warrants**
    1. “…key to the Toulmin approach…Toulmin describes warrants as ‘general, hypothetical statements which can act as bridges and authorize the sort of step to which our particular argument commits us’” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 93).
    2. “…if a rhetor makes the assertion that ‘Ransom money should never be paid to free U.S. hostages seized abroad’ (Major Claim) because ‘you can’t deal with terrorists’ (Major Data), the ‘missing part of the argument is something of the sort: ‘Only terrorists would seize an airplane’ (Warrant)” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 93).
    3. There are three types of warrants found in public argument – substantive, motivational, and authoritative – ideas based on fact, suggesting a desirable end, and based on the credibility of the rhetor.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
21. **Rhetorical Presence**
    1. “…a vividness of detail that brings to life the ideas advanced” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 90).
    2. “…narrative must also have rhetorical presence” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 90).
    3. There is a reason why Hemmingway’s narrative rhetoric is still studied and revered today – his vivid descriptions and attention to detail bring to life the stories he weaves.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
22. **Critical Probes**
    1. “…reveal how a given message functioned and how its authors perceived the rhetorical circumstances” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    2. “…the critic who uses these critical probes becomes something of a building inspector, prowling around in the basement and walking amidst the scaffolding to see whether the rhetorical structure is as good as it should be and, if not, why nobody noticed” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    3. Critical probes provide a framework for the analyst to compose questions in order to assess the validity of the statement.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
23. **Serial Examples**
    1. “Adds totality to a speaker’s remarks by presenting, in scattered fashion, numerous instances of the same phenomena” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    2. “How frequently are groups of examples found in the message? Is there any overall logic to the types of illustrations chosen? Which arguments are devoid of examples? Why?” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    3. Serial examples are those examples which may not seem as if they have any relationship with one another, but when crafted and linked accordingly, form an overall picture that lends itself to the evidence.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
24. **Extended Example**
    1. “Adds vivacity to a speaker’s remarks by presenting a detailed picture of a single event or concept” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    2. “How many different extended examples are used? How much detail is provided within them? Are ‘story qualities’ clearly apparent in the examples?” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    3. Considering that when conducting a training program you lose your audience’s interest if a particular narration proceeds for longer than 15 minutes, the use of extended examples should be done carefully and sparingly.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
25. **Quantification**
    1. “Adds a feeling of substantiveness to a speaker’s remarks by concrete enumerations” (Daughton & Hart, p. 84).
    2. “How often are dates, sums, and quantities provided in the message? When are they used? What sorts of arguments do they support?” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    3. Facts and statistics can aid the rhetor, if they are not overwhelmingly littered throughout, in order to provide scientific proofs to back their claims.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
26. **Isolated Comparisons**
    1. “Adds realism to a speaker’s remarks by drawing analogically on a listener’s past experiences” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    2. “What sorts of ‘equations’ are set up by the speaker? In offering the comparisons offered, what assumptions about the audience does the rhetor seem to be making?” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    3. The rhetor assumes his audience’s past experience, in order to draw on them and create a sense of community and generalizability.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
27. **Extended Comparison**
    1. “Adds psychological reference points to a rhetor’s remarks by successively structuring his or her perceptions along familiar lines” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    2. “Are extended comparisons extensively or infrequently used? What sorts of arguments are developed with this device?” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 84).
    3. This comparison is employed as an extension of the isolated comparison; wherein, the rhetor identifies with experiences that are commonly held by their audience.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
28. **Testimony**
    1. “Adds to the inclusiveness of a rhetor’s remarks by quoting appreciatively from known or respected sources or depreciatively from sources of ill-regard” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    2. “What sorts of persons/sources does the rhetor depend on? How often is this dependency manifested? Is there an obvious logic to the persons/sources chosen for support?” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    3. In order to add credibility and build one’s own ethos, a rhetor utilizes sources as evidence, including their personal testimony, in order to build an argument. This is seen in Ken Burns (attempt) to utilize testimony to build a backing to his statement that scientists are creationists too (in the debate with Bill Nye where he provides videos of other scientists who are also creationists).
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
29. **Definition**
    1. “Adds to the specificity of a rhetor’s remarks by depicting opposed elements” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    2. “Is any major attempt made here to define important concepts? Which key terms/ideas are presented without definition?” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    3. It is wise to be careful of what definitions one includes in any academic writing in this day and age considering prolific (disreputable) sources such as Wikipedia.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
30. **Contrast**
    1. “Adds a dramatic quality to a rhetor’s remarks by depicting opposed elements” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    2. “Are both elements of the contrasts drawn from audience experiences? Is dependence on contrasts heavy, moderate, or light? Do contrasts overshadow comparisons and is it significant that they do?” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 85).
    3. If the rhetor can get the audience to see the bad compared to the good as based on their own experiences, one can better build a case knowing that such a contrast drawn between two oppositions speaks to said audience.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
31. **Genre/Generic study**
    1. “…a class of messages having important structural and content similarities and which, as a class, creates special expectations in an audience” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 116).
    2. “Genres exist because rhetors are imitative, borrowing from yesterday when deciding what to say today. Genres like the political commercial on television and the gold-watch speech at the retirement dinner develop because people’s life experiences are so similar: They are born, they grow up, they fall in love, and they die” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 104).
    3. As Daughton & Hart (2005) further expand upon and note – messages form identifiable clusters over time, revealing implicit societal truths to stabilize social life – all critics are generic critics (p. 116).
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
32. **Universalizing Topics**
    1. “…from which most ideas derive…some variations on these themes can be found in any message, public or private” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 62).
    2. “…systematic use of these universal topics in criticism has not been as common, even though such a system can be helpful to the critic…reasonably complete way of categorizing persuasive arguments…reducing a message to its essential…reveal patterns of argument…allows the critic to make proportional statements” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 62).
    3. When taking into consideration the sixteen universal topics our texts lists – including existence, degree, spatial, etc. – I too find as a student that they resonate and I personally hold that the list is a good reference with which to categorize rhetorical works.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
33. **Dialectic Struggles/Strategies**
    1. “…struggles between Good and Evil. Such grappling heightens the importance of the issues at stake…the struggle is between rationality and irrationality” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, pp. 244, 327).
    2. “Marxists are particularly sensitive to the dialectical strategies of rhetoric…the job of rhetoric, then, is to explain, justify, and ultimately relieve such dialectical tensions” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 327).
    3. Dialectical strategies can be particularly challenging amongst opposing view sets, but ultimately the attempt is to realize and assuage differences, rather than claim one side as being right, and the other wrong.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
34. **Dissociation**
    1. “…assumes the original unity of elements comprised within a single conception and designated by a single notion, and then challenges this unity by identifying a source of incompatibility between the elements” (Ritivoi, 2008, p. 186).
    2. “Dissociation is a key argument technique in Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s new rhetoric…how dissociation works in argumentative contexts” (Ritivoi, 2008, p. 185).
    3. The use of dissociation in varying rhetorical situations can serve a similar purpose as aforementioned contrast or comparisons, in that one can advance a particular rational view by distinguishing another as irrational.
    4. Ritivoi, A. (2008). The dissociation of concepts in context: An analytic template for assessing its role in actual situations. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 44*, 185-197. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
35. **Identification**
    1. “…are the ‘aligning symbols’ that serve such functions…common rhetorical experience makes it possible…can also partially bridge hierarchical separations” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, pp. 274-275).
    2. “For Burke, drama could not succeed unless it invited an audience to (1) reexamine and (2) activate its identity…he saw that people identified with one another when their common interests were dramatized for them, just as if they were biological organisms exchanging chemical properties in order to survive” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 274).
    3. Identification speaks to what Daughton & Hart (2005) refer to as the, “universal language of emotions” (p. 275); wherein, a sense of community and identity is structured around commonalities and/or shared experiences.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
36. **Enthymemes**
    1. “…increasingly relying for meaning on references to other texts, thus becoming more and more allegorical” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 196).
    2. “Aristotle called this type of argument, requiring that the audience provide some unspecified bit of cultural knowledge, an enthymeme” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 196).
    3. Premises are presumed to be understood and held by the audience.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
37. **Heuristic-Systematic Model**
    1. “...propose that persuasion and belief change are associated with the amount of thought message recipients devote to the message” (Jeong, 2008, p. 69).
    2. “…several issues that bear upon the heuristic value of this critical procedure are discussed…this has been the most heuristic application of the model to date” (Farrell, 1980, pp. 300, 312).
    3. Akin to experiential learning and on the job training, heuristic is a method for discovering truth through learning hands-on.
    4. Farrell, T.B. (1980). Critical models in the analysis of discourse. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44*, 300-314. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>; Jeong, S. (2008). Visual metaphor in advertising: Is the persuasive effect attributable to visual argumentation or metaphorical rhetoric? *Journal of Marketing Communications, 14(1)*, 59-73. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing
38. **Ethos**
    1. “…the rhetor’s credibility or authority – the right to address an audience” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 152).
    2. “By using preferred words, a rhetor can establish what Aristotle called ethos” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 152).
    3. For example, ethos refers to the reason why we listen to a professor’s lecture on a given subject – because we (more or less) recognize their authority and credibility, their ethos which lends to our assuming that they are sharing good reason and truth.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
39. **Logos/Pathos**
    1. “…logical appeals” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 152)/”…emotional appeals” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 152).
    2. “Certain words can be used to cue pathos, emotional appeals, and logos, as well” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 152).
    3. Logical proofs are more preferred if scientific in their verifiability; wherein, pathos employs more of a tricky appeal which is subject to the individual and sometimes hard to generalize, depending.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
40. **Ultimate Terms**
    1. “Words having special evocative power for a society” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 155).
    2. “Ultimate terms are abstract…efficient…hierarchical…pre-emptive…have unstable meanings” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, pp. 155-156).
    3. Ultimate terms include those such as freedom, democracy and “equal justice for all” for Americans.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
41. **Narrative Probability**
    1. “…good story qualities: followability, completeness, believability” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 92).
    2. “Rationality is determined by the nature of persons as narrative beings – their inherent awareness of narrative probability, what constitutes a coherent story” (Fisher, 1987, p. 64).
    3. Elements of the story which are strung together so as to allow for believability.
    4. Fisher, W.R. (1987). *Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument.* Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing
42. **Narrative Fidelity**
    1. “…reliability and truthfulness” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 92).
    2. “…and their constant habit of testing narrative fidelity, whether or not the stories they experience ring true with the stories they know to be true in their lives” (Fisher, 1987, p. 64).
    3. Stories that are believable because they can be tested against one’s own experiences as empirically tangible.
    4. Fisher, W.R. (1987). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing
43. **Lexicon**
    1. “…words that are unique to a group or individual and that have a special rhetorical power” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 152).
    2. “Lexicons are important to study because they set people apart…lexicons make for efficiency” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 152).
    3. A common example of a group lexicon would be that of a religious text, and/or bible.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
44. **Critical Model(s)**
    1. “…the archetype for idealized performance that is then imposed by the critic upon singular instances of discourse” (Farrell, 1980, p. 301).
    2. “The idea of critical models seems to have derived from the uneasy relationship of art to science…is employed when the critic starts generating some sort of paradigm which he will use as a basis of comparison” (Farrell, 1980, p. 301-302).
    3. These models are also referred to as the prototypes and exemplars of their kind with which we draw ideal generalizable paradigmatic structures from.
    4. Farrell, T.B. (1980). Critical models in the analysis of discourse. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44,* 300-314. Retrieved from <https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B0yo7DjC5I88WExjZmQyX0FVZVE&usp=sharing>
45. **Feminist Rhetorical Criticism**
    1. “Feminist critics ask how messages explicitly describe (and thus implicitly prescribe) ‘appropriate’ gendered behavior” (Daughton & Hart, 2005, p. 284).
    2. “Feminist criticism assumes…that artifacts both shape and reflect the cultures that produced them, including the expectations those cultures have about what it means to be male and female, masculine and feminine” (Daughton & Hard, 2005, p. 284).
    3. Feminist critics challenge societal views beyond just sexist oppression and more from a humanist perspective with the ideal of changing discourse.
    4. Daughton, S. & Hart, R.P. (2005). *Modern Rhetorical Criticism.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.