

# BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

## Knjiga sažetaka

# 5



DANI IVE ŠKARI A  
MEĐUNARODNA KONFERENCIJA O RETORICI

5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Rhetoric, Postira, April 22 – 25, 2020  
Peta međunarodna konferencija o retorici, Postira, od 22. do 25. travnja 2020.

**BOOK OF ABSTRACTS**

**Knjiga sažetaka**

**DAYS OF IVO ŠKARIĆ**

5th International Conference on Rhetoric

Postira, April 22 -25, 2020

**DANI IVE ŠKARIĆA**

Peta međunarodna konferencija o retorici

Postira, od 22. do 25. travnja 2020.

<http://dis.hfiloloskod.hr/index.php/en/>

[dis5@ffzg.hr](mailto:dis5@ffzg.hr)

**Publisher**

Croatian Philological Association

**Editors**

Alma Vančura

Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić

**Proofreading**

Katja Peruško (Croatian)

Alma Vančura (English)

**Translation**

Alma Vančura

**Logo**

Jadranka Kolić Krželj

**Graphic Design**

Zoran Stoilov

ISBN 978-953-296-184-3

## **ORGANIZERS OF THE CONFERENCE**

Phonetic section, **Croatian Philological Association**

Department of Phonetics, **Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb**

Department of English Language and Literature, **Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek**

## **PROGRAM COMMITTEE**

**Gordana Varošanec - Škarić (chair)** - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**Petra Aczél** - Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary

**Leo Groarke** - University of Windsor, Canada

**Damir Horga** - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia **Ivana**

**Jozić** - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia

**Keith Lloyd** - Kent State University, Ohio, USA

**Maurizio Manzin** - Faculty of Law, University of Trento, Italy

**Federico Puppo** - Faculty of Law, University of Trento, Italy

**Anita Runjić Stoilova** - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split, Croatia

**Jelena Vlašić Duić** - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**Jean Wagemans** - Faculty of Humanities, University of Amsterdam

## **ORGANIZING COMMITTEE**

**Alma Vančura (chair)** - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia

**Zdravka Biočina** - The Zagreb School of Economics and Management, Croatia

**Davor Nikolić** - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**Davor Stanković** - Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**Diana Tomić** - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**Ana Vlah** - Croatian Radiotelevision, Croatia

**Jelena Vlašić Duić**, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

## FOREWORD

Dear virtual participants of "Days of Ivo Škarić", dear authors!

Upon the approach of our fifth conference, which was to be held from 22 to 25 of April 2020 in Postira on the island of Brač, we were reminded of the quickly passed time since the first biennial International Scientific Conference on Rhetoric was organized by the Department of Phonetics of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb and the Croatian Philological Association. The conference was launched in 2012 under the name "Days of Ivo Škarić," in memory of Professor Emeritus Ivo Škarić, who passed away in January 2009. Unfortunately, we used "was to be held" construction in the first sentence of this foreword because we were disrupted by the international coronavirus COVID-19 pandemic, which started in China and very quickly spread all over the world. In March, Croatian Civil Protection Directorate gave instructions on canceling numerous activities that included closing of schools, colleges, concerts, and canceling of scientific conferences. After intense work on putting the conference together to ensure you bring nothing but nice memories from Postira we had no other choice but to cancel the conference, a decision which was done with a heavy heart, but was deemed necessary and prudent considering the havoc the virus has already wrought worldwide. Not wanting to break our tradition, and trying to maintain some sense of normalcy in these troubled times, we decided to keep the continuity of the conference by publishing the 2020 Book of Abstracts in digital form. The conference has already produced numerous publications, including four Books of Abstracts, and two books (first book from Windsor Studies in Argumentation edition called *What Do We Know about the World? Rhetorical and Argumentative Perspectives* (2013) and the second book edited by Anita Runjić-Stoilova and Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić - *New Insights into Rhetoric and Argumentation* from 2017). Several prominent scientists, some of whom were invited speakers at our conferences (e.g. Tindale, Aczél, Bagić), have published their papers in the scientific journal *Govor / Speech* (editor-in-chief G. Varošaneć-Skarić). In *Speech* No. 1/2019 the original scientific articles of several authors were published: a paper titled *More artful methods: Techniques of narrative in argumentation* by Christopher W. Tindale, Petra Aczél's *Teaching rhetoric: A proposal to renew rhetorical education in Hungarian and Central European contexts*, *Anagram - a very brief introduction* by Kresimir Bagić, and *Catachrestic politics: On the tropes of post-Marxism* by Zvonimir Glavaš, to mention but a few. Colleague Martin Hinton's paper, who has attended the conference several times, is being prepared to be published in journal *Speech*. We are very grateful to all the authors and participants for contributing to the quality of the conference and for leaving a lasting legacy by publishing their work.

We invited Keith Lloyd (Kent State University at Stark, United States) with a lecture entitled *Approaching Rhetoric Comparatively to Reinterpret Democracy in Global Terms - Perspectives from India and Present* and a prominent Swedish scientist Cornelia Ilie (Strömstad Academy) with a lecture *Navigating the Public-Private Divide: Ambivalent myths about gendered rhetoric* to be our keynote speakers at this fifth, unfortunately cancelled, conference. By publishing their abstracts, we hope to make up for the loss of not being able to enjoy their live talks. We hope we will see them at the sixth conference.

This conference should have brought something new - a roundtable discussion on the fruitful educational and scientific contribution of professor emeritus Ivo Škarić, whose moderator was to

be associate professor Jelena Vlasic Duić. Invited speaker of the roundtable, professor emeritus Damir Horga was familiar with professor Škarić's entire body of work, collaborated with him on numerous occasions, and has worked side by side with Professor as a lecturer at the School of Rhetoric for talented high-school students for twenty years. Assistant professor Elenmari Pletikos Olof, who was his assistant and mentor at the School of Rhetoric, and Branimir Stanić, former student of the School of Rhetoric and now working as the editor of the cultural section of *Glas Koncila* and lecturer in communication sciences at the Faculty of Croatian Studies, were also invited to the roundtable. Last but not least, called to participate was full professor Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić, head of Aesthetic Phonetics and Orthoepy of Croatian language at the Department of Phonetics of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Zagreb. She was a lecturer at the School of Rhetoric and after Professor's passing, held the helm of ten more Schools. We sincerely hope that they will contribute with their insights into Professor's life and work at the sixth conference, which, we believe, will be able to take place in 2022.

The Fifth International Scientific Conference on Rhetoric "The Days of Ivo Škarić" was organized by the Department of Phonetics of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb and the Phonetics Section of the Croatian Philological Association with the assistance of the Department of English Language and Literature in Osijek. Experts and scientists from Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine and the United States were expected to attend this fifth conference. The papers that were to be presented at the conference included various topics covering comparative rhetoric, the history of rhetoric, comparative analysis of discourse (male and female rhetoric-leadership discourse), argumentation, public speaking, rhetoric and education etc.

Out of a total of 29 abstracts by 36 authors, the online Book of Abstracts contains abstracts of invited speakers Keith Lloyd, Cornelia Ilie and Damir Horga (Roundtable), followed by the abstracts of other authors listed in alphabetical order.

The committee chairs wish to thank all the committee members for their efforts in organizing the conference, especially Diana Tomić, the president of the Phonetics Section of the Croatian Philological Association, who helped in solving numerous organizational issues, and Zdravka Biočina for her assistance in finding sponsors and organizing excursions around Brač. We also thank Elenmari Pletikos Olof, head of the Department of Phonetics, for co-financing the roundtable. Lastly, we want to thank Metka Bezlaj, the secretary of the Croatian Philological Association.

We would also like to thank the sponsors of the event: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek, Department of Phonetics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, Municipality of Postira and the Tourist Board.

Zagreb, 19<sup>th</sup> of April 2020

Chair of the Program Committee

Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić, full professor

Chair of the Organizing Committee

Alma Vančura, assistant professor

## PREDGOVOR

Dragi virtualni sudionici „Dana Ive Škarića“, cijenjeni autori!

Otkad su Odsjek za fonetiku Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu i Hrvatsko filološko društvo 2012. godine pokrenuli bijenalnu međunarodnu znanstvenu konferenciju o retorici u znak sjećanja na profesora emeritusa Ivu Škarića, koji je preminuo u siječnju 2009., pod nazivom „Dani Ive Škarića“, nismo ni bili svjesni brzoga protoka vremena te dolaska već pete konferencije koja se trebala održati od 22. do 25. travnja 2020. u Postirima na otoku Braču. Kažemo „trebala“ jer nas je u tome naumu omela globalna pandemija prouzročena virusom COVID-19 koji je krenuo iz Kine i uskoro se proširio svijetom. Civilna zaštita Hrvatske dala je upute o otkazivanju brojnih aktivnosti vezanih uz okupljanje – od zatvaranja škola, fakulteta, koncerata do otkazivanja stručnih i znanstvenih skupova. Nakon što smo vrijedno pripremali konferenciju kako bismo svim sudionicima osigurali kvalitetne i nezaboravne dane u Postirima te napravili raspored, morali smo u ožujku poslati obavijest o otkazivanju skupa, što je bila ne samo nužna nego i razumna odluka s obzirom na ono što je u međuvremenu virus prouzročio diljem svijeta. Kako je peta konferencija bila radosno postignuće organizatora, odlučili smo da se kontinuitet održi barem *online* izdavanjem Knjige sažetaka za 2020. godinu. Konferencija je do sada već ostavila tiskane tragove kao što je izdanje četiriju knjiga sažetaka, dviju knjiga temeljenih na proširenim radovima (*What Do We Know about the World? Rhetorical and Argumentative Perspectives* (iz 2013. godine) te *New Insights into Rhetoric and Argumentation* iz 2017. godine koju su uredile Anita Runjić-Stoilova i Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić), ali i objavljenim radovima nekoliko istaknutih znanstvenika od kojih su neki bili pozvani predavači na nekoj od konferencija (npr. Tindale, Aczél, Bagić) u znanstvenom časopisu *Govor/ Speech* (glavna urednica G. Varošaneć-Škarić). Primjerice, u *Govoru* broj 1/2019 objavljeni su originalni znanstveni radovi Christophera W. Tindalea *More artful methods: Techniques of narrative in argumentation*, Petre Aczél *Teaching rhetoric: A proposal to renew rhetorical education in Hungarian and Central European contexts*, Krešimira Bagića *Anagram – vrlo kratak uvod* i Zvonimira Glavaša *Katabretnost politike ili o tropima postmarksizma*. U *Govoru* za 2020. u pripremi su i neki drugi radovi, primjerice onaj Martina Hintona, koji je nekoliko puta sudjelovao na konferenciji. Svim autorima i sudionicima vrlo smo zahvalni što su pridonijeli kvaliteti konferencije i ostavili trajan trag u svojim radovima.

Pozvani predavači ove pete, nažalost, neodržane konferencije trebali su biti Keith Lloyd (Sveučilište Kent State u Starku, Sjedinjene Američke Države) s predavanjem *Approaching Rhetoric Comparatively to Reinterpret Democracy in Global Terms – perspectives from India and Present* te istaknuta švedska znanstvenica Cornelia Ilie (Akademija Strömstad) s predavanjem *Navigating the public-private divide: Ambivalent myths about gendered rhetoric*. Objavljivanjem sažetaka bar ćemo donekle ispuniti prazninu ovogodišnje nemogućnosti uživanja u njihovim predavanjima. Nadamo se da će nam učiniti to zadovoljstvo na šestoj konferenciji.

Ove se godine trebao održati i Okrugli stol o bogatome edukativnom i znanstvenom doprinosu profesora emeritusa Ive Škarića čija je moderatorica trebala biti izvanredna profesorica Jelena Vlašić Duić, a pozvani govornik profesor emeritus Damir Horga koji je poznavao cijelo područje rada profesora Škarića, bio mu suradnik u brojnim aktivnostima i predavač na Govorničkoj školi „Ivo Škarić“ punih dvadeset godina. Uz njega su na Okruglom stolu trebali

govoriti docentica Elenmari Pletikos Olof, koja je bila njegova asistentica i mentorica na Govorničkoj školi, Branimir Stanić, bivši polaznik škole, a sada urednik rubrike iz kulture u novinama *Glas Koncila* i predavač na komunikologiji na Hrvatskim studijima te prof. dr. sc. Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić, predstojnica Katedre za estetsku fonetiku i ortoepiju hrvatskoga jezika na Odsjeku za fonetiku Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, koja je bila predavačica na Govorničkoj školi te nakon profesorova odlaska vodila još deset škola. Nadamo se da će svi oni dati svoj doprinos o uvidu u profesorov rad na šestoj konferenciji koja će se, duboko vjerujemo, moći održati 2022. godine.

Petu međunarodnu znanstvenu konferenciju o retorici „Dani Ive Škarića“ organizirali su Odsjek za fonetiku Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu i Odjel za fonetiku Hrvatskoga filološkog društva uz pomoć Odsjeka za engleski jezik i književnost Filozofskog fakulteta u Osijeku. Na ovoj petoj konferenciji trebali su sudjelovati stručnjaci i znanstvenici iz Njemačke, Sjedinjenih Američkih Država, Švedske, Portugala, Mađarske, Poljske, Ukrajine i Slovenije. Radovi koji su trebali biti predstavljeni na skupu obuhvaćaju, primjerice, komparativnu retoriku, povijest retorike, komparativnu analizu diskursa (muška i ženska retorika, diskurs ljudi na vodećim položajima), argumentaciju, javno govorenje, retoriku i obrazovanje.

Od ukupno 29 sažetaka 36 autora u *online* Knjizi sažetaka nalaze se prvo sažetci pozvanih predavača Keitha Lloyda, Cornelije Ilie i Damira Horge (Okrugli stol), a sažetci ostalih autora slijede abecednim redom.

Predsjednice Odbora zahvaljuju svim članovima Odbora na njihovim nastojanjima u vezi s organizacijom skupa, osobito Diani Tomić, predsjednici Odjela za fonetiku Hrvatskoga filološkog društva koja je rješavala brojne organizacijske probleme te Zdravki Biočini na pomoći oko sponzoriranja i organiziranja izleta po Braču koji će nas, nadamo se, čekati za dvije godine. Također, zahvaljujemo pročelnici Odsjeka za fonetiku Elenmari Pletikos Olof zbog sufinanciranja Okruglog stola te tajnici Hrvatskoga filološkog društva Metki Bezlaj na ugodnoj suradnji.

Zahvaljujemo i sponzorima Filozofskom fakultetu u Osijeku, Odsjeku za fonetiku Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu, Općini Postira i turističkoj zajednici.

Zagreb, 19. travnja 2020.

predsjednica Programskog odbora  
prof. dr. sc. Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić

predsjednica Organizacijskog odbora  
doc. dr. sc. Alma Vančura



## PROGRAM

### DAYS OF IVO ŠKARIĆ

5th International Conference on Rhetoric

Postira, April 22 – 25, 2020

#### Wednesday, April 22<sup>nd</sup> 2020

18.00 Registration and Reception

#### Thursday, April 23<sup>rd</sup> 2020

9.00 – 9.15 Opening Ceremony

**9.15 – 10.15 KEYNOTE SPEAKER**

**Keith Lloyd**

Approaching Rhetoric Comparatively to Reinterpret Democracy in Global Terms - Perspectives from India Past and Present

10.15 – 10.45 *Coffee break*

**10.45 – 11.45 SESSION 1: History of Rhetoric, Argumentation**

*Moderators: Keith Lloyd & Alma Vančura*

10.45 - 11.05 **Susan C. Jarratt**

Julia Domna: A Woman's Rhetorical Leadership in the Third-Century Roman Empire

11.05 – 11.25 **Christina Matthiesen**

Teaching Imitation and Argumentation: Caught between Past Significance and Present Effectiveness

11.25 – 11.45 **Agnieszka Szurek**

Constructing the self, constructing the place and its history. Amateur memoirs of women and men from small Mazovian towns

11.45 - 12.00 *Coffee break*

- 12.00 - 13.00**      **SESSION 2: Argumentation and Political Rhetoric**  
*Moderators: Petra Aczél & Anders Sigrell*
- 12.00 – 12.20      **Petra Aczél**  
Rhetorical action and political change – a conceptual frame for rhetorical analysis
- 12.20 – 12.40      **Martin Hinton**  
Informal Argument Semantics and the Evaluation of Political Rhetoric
- 12.40 - 13.00      **Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca & Kinga J. Rogowska**  
Genres in pre-election discourse
- 13.00 - 14.00**      **SESSION 3: Comparative Discourse Analysis, Argumentation**  
*Moderators: Iryna Khomenko & Martin Hinton*
- 13.00 - 13.20      **Iryna Khomenko**  
Arguing-related proverbs in Ukrainian and Anglo-American cultures: a comparative study
- 13.20 - 13.40      **Piotr Mirocha**  
Topoi in corpus-driven discourse analysis. Case of discourses on migration and Europe in the Croatian and Serbian media after 2012
- 13.40 – 14.00      **Petar Bodlović**  
How does the burden of proof arise in a discussion?
- 14.00 – 15.00      *Lunch*
- 15.00 – 16.00      Sightseeing (Guided walking tour of Postira)
- 16.10 – 17.50**      **SESSION 4: Stylistics, Visual Rhetoric**  
*Moderators: Boris Beck & Diana Tomić*
- 16.10 – 16.30      **Patrycja Kupś, Mariusz Urbański**  
Structure for narratives
- 16.30 - 16.50      **Boris Beck**  
Travel and race metaphors: the rhetoric of Libresse commercials
- 16.50 - 17.10      **Davor Stanković, Davor Nikolić**  
Verbal Play and its Rhetorical Effect
- 17.10 - 17.30      **Lilian Bermejo Luque**  
On the distinction between visual argumentation and other types of visual persuasive communication
- 17.30 -17.50      **Aleksandra Majdzińska-Koczorowicz**  
An amalgam of the verbal and the visual in chosen welfare animal advertisements

- 17.50 – 18.05 *Coffee Break*
- 18.05 – 19.05** **SESSION 5: Rhetoric in (Social) Media**  
*Moderators: Damir Horga & Lilian Bermejo Luque*
- 18.05 – 18.25 **Mirjana Matea Kovač, Ana Mršić Zdilar**  
Media manipulation in Croatian newspapers – reality or a myth?
- 18.25 – 18.45 **Nera Martinović, Alma Vančura**  
Croatian presidential candidates and the social media
- 18.45 – 19.05 **Zdravka Biočina, Ivanka Rajh**  
Students' perception of Greta Thunberg as a speaker
- 19.30 – 20.30 *Dinner*

## Friday, April 24<sup>th</sup> 2020

- 9.00 – 10.00** **KEYNOTE SPEAKER**  
**Cornelia Ilie**  
Navigating the public-private divide: Ambivalent myths about gendered rhetoric
- 10.00 – 10.20 *Coffee break*
- 10. 20 – 12.00** **SESSION 6: Male and female rhetoric – leadership discourse**  
*Moderators: Anita Runjić Stoilova & Davor Stanković*
- 10.20 – 10.40 **Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić, Branka Šegvić**  
Male and female rhetoric in political interviews
- 10.40 – 11.00 **Anita Runjić Stoilova**  
Manipulative use of pragmatic markers in the speech of Croatian presidential candidates: 2019 Presidential Election
- 11.00 – 11.20 **Diana Tomić, Alma Vančura**  
Male and female rhetoric – are there any differences? The analysis of TED talks
- 11.20 - 11.40 **Jagoda Poropat Darrer, Elenmari Pletikos Olof**  
Leading the Winning Symphony: A Rhetorical Analysis of Figurativeness in Croatian Presidential Speeches
- 11.40 - 12.00 *Coffee break*

<b>12.00 – 13.40</b>	<b>SESSION 7: Rhetoric &amp; Education</b> Moderators: Gordana Varošaneć Škarić & Elenmari Pletikos Olof
12.00 - 12.20	<b>Anders Sigrell</b> Rhetorica rediviva – rhetoric in the Swedish educational system
12.20 - 12.40	<b>Kirk W. Junker</b> Educational Foundations in Rhetoric Built Common Law Practice as a Liberal Art, Not as a Social Science
12.40 - 13.00	<b>Janja Žmavc</b> Rhetorical education in primary school – classical techniques and practices in a process oriented approach to teaching rhetoric
13.00 - 13.20	<b>Marina Pavlović, Jelena Vignjević</b> Parent-teacher meeting as a rhetorical challenge for educators
13.20 - 13.40	<b>Ana Vlah</b> Persuasion and/or Influence in Group Discussion
13.40 – 14.30	<i>Lunch</i>
14.30 – 19.30	Sightseeing (Discovering island's history and culture)
21.00	<i>Conference dinner</i>

## Saturday, April 25<sup>th</sup> 2020

### Sessions in Croatian language

9.00 - 10.00	<b>OKRUGLI STOL / ROUND TABLE</b>  U potrazi za vremenom Ive Škarića/In Search of Ivo Škarić Time Predsjedavajući/Moderator: Jelena Vlašić Duić  Sudjeluju/Participants: <b>Damir Horga, Elenmari Pletikos Olof, Branimir Stanić, Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić</b>
10.00 - 10.20	<i>Coffee break</i>
<b>10.20 – 11.00</b>	<b>SEKCIJA 8: Retoričke analize / SESSION 8: Rhetorical Analyses</b> Moderatori: Elenmari Pletikos Olof, Branimir Stanić
10.20 – 10.40	<b>Jelena Vlašić Duić</b> Obrada prozodijskih sredstava u nastavi hrvatskoga jezika
10.40 – 11.00	<b>Sandra Lukšić</b> Komunikacijsko-strateške metode u motivacijskim govorima predsjedničkih kandidata
<b>11.00</b>	<b>CLOSING OF THE CONFERENCE</b>

**TABLE OF CONTENT / SADRŽAJ**

<b>Keith Lloyd</b> .....	<b>1</b>
APPROACHING RHETORIC COMPARATIVELY TO REINTERPRET DEMOCRACY IN GLOBAL TERMS - PERSPECTIVES FROM INDIA PAST AND PRESENT	
<b>Cornelia Ilie</b> .....	<b>3</b>
NAVIGATING THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIVIDE: AMBIVALENT MYTHS ABOUT GENDERED RHETORIC	
PODJELA JAVNOG I PRIVATNOG: PROTURJEČNI MITOVI O RODNOJ RETORICI	
<b>Damir Horga</b> .....	<b>5</b>
PROFESOR IVO ŠKARIĆ - FONETIČAR	
PROFESSOR IVO ŠKARIĆ – THE PHONETTTIAN	
<b>Petra Aczél</b> .....	<b>7</b>
RHETORICAL ACTION AND POLITICAL CHANGE – A CONCEPTUAL FRAME FOR RHETORICAL ANALYSIS	
<b>Boris Beck</b> .....	<b>8</b>
TRAVEL AND RACE METAPHORS: THE RHETORIC OF LIBRESSE COMMERCIALS	
<b>Lilian Bermejo Luque</b> .....	<b>9</b>
ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN VISUAL ARGUMENTATION AND OTHER TYPES OF VISUAL PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION	
<b>Zdravka Biočina, Ivanka Rajh</b> .....	<b>10</b>
STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF GRETA THUNBERG AS A SPEAKER	
<b>Petar Bodlović</b> .....	<b>11</b>
HOW DOES THE BURDEN OF PROOF ARISE IN A DISCUSSION?	
<b>Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca, Kinga Rogowska</b> .....	<b>12</b>
GENRES IN PRE-ELECTION DISCOURSE	
<b>Martin Hinton</b> .....	<b>13</b>
INFORMAL ARGUMENT SEMANTICS AND THE EVALUATION OF POLITICAL RHETORIC	
<b>Susan C. Jarratt</b> .....	<b>14</b>
JULIA DOMNA: A WOMAN'S RHETORICAL LEADERSHIP IN THE THIRD- CENTURY ROMAN EMPIRE	
<b>Kirk W. Junker</b> .....	<b>15</b>
EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS IN RHETORIC BUILT COMMON LAW PRACTICE AS A LIBERAL ART, NOT AS A SOCIAL SCIENCE	
<b>Khomenko Iryna</b> .....	<b>16</b>
ARGUING-RELATED PROVERBS IN UKRAINIAN AND ANGLO-AMERICAN CULTURES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY	

<b>Mirjana Matea Kovač, Mariusz Urbański</b> .....	17
MEDIA MANIPULATION IN CROATIAN NEWSPAPERS – REALITY OR A MYTH?	
<b>Patrycja Kupś, Mariusz Urbański</b> .....	18
STRUCTURE FOR NARRATIVES	
<b>Sandra Lukšić</b> .....	19
KOMUNIKACIJSKO-STRATEŠKE METODE U MOTIVACIJSKIM GOVORIMA PREDSJEDNIČKIH KANDIDATA ZORANA MILANOVIĆA I KOLINDE GRABAR- KITAROVIĆ	
COMMUNICATION-STRATEGIC METHODS IN MOTIVATIONAL SPEECHES OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES ZORAN MILANOVIC AND KOLINDA GRABAR- KITAROVIC	
<b>Aleksandra Majdzińska-Koczorowicz</b> .....	21
AN AMALGAM OF THE VERBAL AND THE VISUAL IN CHOSEN WELFARE ANIMAL ADVERTISEMENTS	
<b>Christina Matthiesen</b> .....	22
TEACHING IMITATION AND ARGUMENTATION: CAUGHT BETWEEN PAST SIGNIFICANCE AND PRESENT EFFECTIVENESS	
<b>Piotr Mirocha</b> .....	23
TOPOI IN CORPUS-DRIVEN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS. CASE OF DISCOURSES ON MIGRATION AND EUROPE IN THE CROATIAN AND SERBIAN MEDIA AFTER 2012	
<b>Marina Pavlović, Jelena Vignjević</b> .....	24
PARENT-TEACHER MEETING AS A RHETORICAL CHALLENGE FOR EDUCATORS	
<b>Jagoda Poropat Darrer, Elenmari Pletikos Olof</b> .....	25
LEADING THE WINNING SYMPHONY: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF FIGURATIVENESS WITHIN CROATIAN PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHES	
<b>Anders Sigrell</b> .....	26
RHETORICA REDIVIVA – RHETORIC IN THE SWEDISH EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM	
<b>Agnieszka Szurek</b> .....	27
CONSTRUCTING THE SELF, CONSTRUCTING THE PLACE AND ITS HISTORY. AMATEUR MEMOIRS OF WOMEN AND MEN FROM SMALL MAZOVIAN TOWNS	
<b>Diana Tomić, Alma Vančura</b> .....	28
MALE AND FEMALE RHETORIC – ARE THERE ANY DIFFERENCES? THE ANALYSIS OF TED TALKS	
<b>Alma Vančura, Nera Martinović</b> .....	29
CROATIAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND THE SOCIAL MEDIA	

<b>Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić, Branka Šegvić.....</b>	<b>30</b>
MALE AND FEMALE RETHORIC IN POLITICAL INTERVIEWS	
<b>Ana Vlah .....</b>	<b>31</b>
PERSUASION AND/OR INFLUENCE IN GROUP DISCUSSION	
<b>Jelena Vlašić Duić.....</b>	<b>32</b>
OBRADA PROZODIJSKIH SREDSTAVA U NASTAVI HRVATSKOGA JEZIKA	
PROCESSING OF PROSODIC FEATURES IN CROATIAN LANGUAGE TEACHING	
<b>Janja Žmavc .....</b>	<b>34</b>
RHETORICAL EDUCATION IN PRIMARY SCHOOL – CLASSICAL TECHNIQUES AND PRACTICES IN A PROCESS ORIENTED APPROACH TO TEACHING RHETORIC	
<b>ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS, AFFILIATION AND EMAIL ADDRESSES.....</b>	<b>35</b>

KEYNOTE ADDRESSES/POZVANA PREDAVANJA

**Keith Lloyd**

College of Arts & Sciences

Kent State University at Stark, United States of America

**APPROACHING RHETORIC COMPARATIVELY TO REINTERPRET DEMOCRACY IN GLOBAL TERMS - PERSPECTIVES FROM INDIA PAST AND PRESENT**

In his talk dr. Lloyd will provide an overview of the emerging rhetorical subdiscipline called "comparative rhetoric," revealing its significance through engaging examples of contemporary Indian resistance to the Hindutva (right wing populist) agenda. To contextualize this resistance, Dr. Lloyd provides a portrait of ancient democratic republics in India, larger and longer lasting than the Greek versions, showing how traditions remaining from those republics shape contemporary rhetorical practice in modern India. These examples will show how comparative rhetoric can offer fresh alternatives to Western either/or thinking and argumentation, challenge and enhance our conception of what rhetoric is, and expand our knowledge of the history of democracy and what it means to live in a democratic society.

In the early 2000s, the author discovered an Indian Sutra (the Nyaya Sutra) that, though interpreted rightly as a philosophy, could also be interpreted as a rhetorical manual. After studying the sutra, learning some of its technical Sanskrit, and working with other colleagues trained in the philosophy, other authors emerged who had similarly discovered that rhetoric - habits, disciplines, unstated rules, conventions concerning how we say what we say - occurs all over the planet from ancient times. The Greeks may have invented the term, but rhetoric is a world-wide phenomenon, finding various forms in India, China, Africa, the Middle East, the Americas, etc. This is the world of "comparative" world rhetorics.

At some point in the history of any discipline, scholars realize that other parts of the world have responded to similar motives and circumstances in ways unique to those parts of the world. "Comparative" explorations begin, such as those in philosophy, religion, and anthropology. Recently, rhetoric joined this "family of comparative studies" (Lyon, "Manifesting"). The motive and foundations for comparative rhetoric began with Robert Oliver's 1971 book *Communication and Culture in Ancient China and India*. However, it was George Kennedy's 1998 *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction* that set an agenda and identity for this field of study. Kennedy's work provided the foundation for what is still an emerging field of study. In the 2000s, the field of comparative rhetoric expanded into many publications, including Lipson and Binkley's anthologies *2004 Rhetoric Before and Beyond the Greeks*, and *2009 Ancient Non-Greek Rhetorics*. More recently, Lu Ming Mao edited another anthology based on a special issue of *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *2014's Comparative Rhetoric: The Art of Traversing Rhetorical Times, Places, and Spaces*. The *Routledge Handbook of Comparative World Rhetorics (2020)*, edited by Keith Lloyd, will be the most comprehensive anthology of essays from over thirty comparative scholars from Master's to Emeritus in their careers.



**KOMPARATIVNI PRISTUP RETORICI U SVRHU NOVOG TUMAČENJA DEMOKRACIJE – POGLED NA PROŠLOST I SADAŠNJOST INDIJE**

U svom govoru prof. Lloyd će pružiti pregled novonastale retoričke grane nazvane „komparativna retorika“, otkrivajući njezin značaj kroz primjere suvremenog indijskog otpora prema Hindtuvi (populističko desničarska forma nacionalizma). Drevne demokratske republike u Indiji, koje su bile veće i trajale dulje od onih u Grčkoj, poslužit će kao primjer kako bi se bolje shvatio taj otpor, a također i da bi se ukazalo na to da tradicije naslijeđene od tih republika oblikuju suvremenu retoričku praksu u modernoj Indiji. Ovi će primjeri pokazati kako komparativna retorika može ponuditi nove alternative zapadnjačkom isključivom razmišljanju i argumentaciji, osporiti i poboljšati naše poimanje o tome što je retorika i proširiti naše znanje o povijesti demokracije i o tome što znači živjeti u demokratskom društvu.

Prije 20.-ak godina autor je otkrio indijsku sutru (Nyaya Sutru) koja se, iako ispravno tumači kao filozofija, može tumačiti i kao retorički priručnik. Nakon proučavanja sutre, učenja nekih dijelova sanskrta i rada s kolegama filozofima, pojavili su se i drugi autori koji su na sličan način otkrili da se retorika -običaji, discipline, neodređena pravila, konvencije o tome kako izričemo ono što izričemo - javlja diljem svijeta od davnina. Grci su možda izmislili taj pojam, ali retorika je svjetski fenomen koji se ponavlja u različitim obrascima u Indiji, Kini, Africi, Bliskom Istoku, Južnoj i Sjevernoj Americi itd. Ovo je svijet „komparativne“ svjetske retorike.

Kada govorimo o povijesti bilo koje discipline, dogodi se trenutak u kojem znanstvenici shvate da su i drugi dijelovi svijeta reagirali na slične motive i okolnosti, ali na način koji je jedinstven za taj dio svijeta. U tom trenutku započinju „komparativna“ istraživanja poput onih iz filozofije, religije i antropologije. Nedavno se i retorika pridružila ovoj „obitelji komparativnih studija“ (Lyon, “Manifesting”). Motiv i temelji komparativne retorike su započeli knjigom *Communication and Culture in Ancient China and India* Roberta Olivera iz 1971. godine. Ipak, možemo reći da je knjiga Georgea Kennedyja iz 1998. godine *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction* postavila temelj i identitet za ovu disciplinu. Kennedyjev rad je pružio temelj za disciplinu koja je još uvijek u nastajanju. U 2000.-ima se polje komparativne retorike počelo pojavljivati u mnogim publikacijama, uključujući Lipsonovu i Binkleyevu antologiju iz 2004. godina *Rhetoric Before and Beyond the Greeks* te *Ancient Non-Greek Rhetorics* iz 2009. godine. Lu Ming Mao je nedavno uredio još jednu antologiju temeljenu na posebnom izdanju časopisa *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* iz 2014. godine *Comparative Rhetoric: The Art of Traversing Rhetorical Times, Places, and Spaces*. Keith Lloyd uređuje knjigu u kojoj je sudjelovalo više od trideset znanstvenika koji se bave komparativnom retorikom pod nazivom *The Routledge Handbook of Comparative World Rhetorics* (2020) koja će predstavljati najopsežniju antologiju eseja na ovu temu.

**Cornelia Ilie**

Strömstad Academy, Sweden

## **NAVIGATING THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE DIVIDE: AMBIVALENT MYTHS ABOUT GENDERED RHETORIC**

The dichotomy between the public and the private, which emerged and became entrenched during the patriarchal social system, has long served to legitimise the dominance of the public sphere represented by men at the expense of the marginalisation of the private sphere ascribed to women (Kerber 1988; Landes 1998; Freedman 2006). The very notion of separate spheres is fallacious because the public sphere has been created, after all, by individuals who instinctively carry over their personal values, principles, beliefs, etc. from the private sphere. Over time the terms 'public' and 'private' have acquired different meanings in different contexts, often leading to ambivalence and inconsistency (Peterson 2000; Squires 2003). To avoid a simplistic understanding of the public-private distinction in relation to gendering rhetoric, the aim of the talk is to reconsider and deconstruct three major myths regarding this distinction by applying a discourse-based rhetorical perspective to a highly polarised and confrontational discourse genre, i.e. the parliamentary debate. Starting from the assumption that the two concepts – public and private – are better understood as different modes of interaction rather than as separate spheres (Ilie 2018), this analytical scrutiny focuses on the rhetorical performance of parliamentarians' cross-gender verbal interactions and non-verbal behaviours.

The end-goal is to show to what extent the following three myths about gendering rhetoric at the public-private interface are being (in)validated by actual parliamentary rhetorical practice:

- (i) The myth according to which women and men differ fundamentally in the way they use language to communicate (Cameron and Shaw 2016): e.g., women's speaking style and rhetoric are wrongly associated with the language used in the private sphere, following the fallacious dichotomy "public man, private woman".
- (ii) The myth according to which women's verbal behaviour is accounted for in terms of their gender (Tannen 1990): e.g., women's readiness to talk and engage in verbal interaction is wrongly perceived and interpreted as a specific attribute of their gender, such as a presumed need to communicate and be more cooperative in order to develop relationships.
- (iii) The myth according to which women are stereotypically labelled as more emotional when compared to men, who are seen as more capable of using reason to harness their emotions (Gal 2002): e.g., women are often perceived as more inclined to exhibit emotions than men, which has turned out to be a false generalisation.

Such myths not only reflect existing stereotypes, but also impact the ways in which men and women define themselves, enact authority, and are treated by others, thereby perpetuating positive and/or negative connotations that we associate with gender in society. Their wider social and political impact on the construction of public-private gender identities in the context of the shifting balance of political power struggle will be discussed and illustrated based on the performance of rhetorical strategies and counter-strategies of cross-gender confrontation in parliamentary debates.

## PODJELA JAVNOG I PRIVATNOG: PROTURJEČNI MITOVI O RODNOJ RETORICI

Dihotomija između javnog i privatnog, koja se pojavila i ukorijenila za vrijeme patrijarhalnog društvenog sustava, dugo je služila kako bi omogućila muškarcima dominaciju u javnoj sferi nauštrb marginalizacije privatne sfere, koja se tradicionalno pripisivala ženama (Kerber 1988 ; Landes 1998; Freedman 2006). Sam koncept zasebnih sfera je pogrešan, budući da su javnu sferu, u konačnici, stvorili pojedinci koji u nju instinktivno prenose svoje osobne vrijednosti, načela, uvjerenja itd. iz privatne sfere. Tijekom vremena, pojmovi „javno“ i „privatno“ su poprimali različita značenja u različitim kontekstima, često vodeći do dvoznačnosti i nedosljednosti (Peterson 2000; Squires 2003). Kako bi se izbjeglo pojednostavljeno razumijevanje javnog i privatnog u odnosu na rodnu retoriku, cilj razgovora je preispitati i raščlaniti tri glavna mita o ovoj razlici. Autorica će analizirati parlamentarnu raspravu, žanr poznat po izrazito polariziranom i konfrontacijskom diskursu primjenjujući retoričku perspektivu temeljenu na diskursu. Polazeći od pretpostavke da se dva koncepta - javni i privatni - bolje razumiju kao različiti načini interakcije, a ne kao zasebne sfere (Ilie 2018), ovaj se analitički pregled fokusira na retoričku izvedbu članova sabora u trenucima verbalnog i neverbalnog komuniciranja s osobama suprotnog spola.

Krajnji je cilj pokazati u kojoj su mjeri sljedeća tri mita o rodnoj retorici na javno-privatnom razmeđu (ne) potvrđena stvarnom parlamentarnom retorikom:

- (i) Mit prema kojem se žene i muškarci bitno razlikuju u načinu na koji koriste jezik za komuniciranje (Cameron i Shaw 2016): npr. ženski stil govora i retorika pogrešno su povezani s jezikom koji se koristi u privatnoj sferi, slijedeći pogrešnu dihotomiju „muškarac je za javnu sferu a žena za privatnu“.
- (ii) Mit prema kojem se verbalno ponašanje žena objašnjava s obzirom na njihov spol (Tannen 1990): npr., spremnost žena da razgovaraju i sudjeluju u verbalnoj interakciji pogrešno se doživljava i tumači kao posebna karakteristika njihovog spola, što proizlazi iz pretpostavke da žene imaju potrebu za komunikacijom i suradnjom kako bi uspostavile odnos s drugima.
- (iii) Mit prema kojem su žene stereotipno označene kao emocionalnije u usporedbi s muškarcima, za koje se smatra da su sposobniji koristiti razum da bi obuzdali svoje osjećaje (Gal 2002): npr., žene se često percipiraju kao sklonije izražavanju emocija nego muškarci, što se pokazalo pogrešnom generalizacijom.

Takvi mitovi ne samo da odražavaju postojeće stereotipe, već utječu i na načine na koji se muškarci i žene definiraju, uspostavljaju autoritet te kako se prema njima odnose drugi, produžujući tako pozitivne i/ili negativne konotacije o rodnim stereotipima u društvu. Raspravljat će se o njihovom širem društvenom i političkom utjecaju na izgradnju javno-privatnog identiteta u kontekstu muško-ženskih odnosa i promjenjive ravnoteže za političku vlast. Borba za vlast će biti prikazana na temelju retoričkih strategija muškaraca i žena te njihove konfrontacije u parlamentarnim raspravama.

## Damir Horga

Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

### PROFESOR IVO ŠKARIĆ - FONETIČAR

Već kao student hrvatskog jezika i jugoslavenske književnosti te francuskog jezika na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu pedesetih godina prošlog stoljeća, Ivo Škarić bio je demonstrator u tadašnjem Institutu za fonetiku. Bili su to dani kada se zagrebačka fonetika znanstveno, nastavno i institucionalno konstituirala potaknuta znanstvenim i organizacijskim žarom i sposobnostima akademika Petra Guberine. Taj inicijalni zanos zagrebačke fonetike toliko je privukao mladog Ivu Škarića, da očaranost govornim fenomenom postaje i trajno ostaje njegov životni poziv i središte njegovog znanstvenog i pedagoškog rada sve do dostignutog statusa akademika i profesora emeritusa Zagrebačkog sveučilišta i njegovog preranog odlaska 2009. godine. Prateći razvoj zagrebačke fonetike od njenih početaka te bogato i neizmjereno doprinoseći njezinom razvoju, profesor Ivo Škarić uistinu se može smatrati vodećim hrvatskim fonetičarem u teorijskom i primijenjenom području u drugoj polovici prošlog i početkom ovoga stoljeća. Mogu se izdvojiti četiri područja njegovoga znanstvenog rada. U **fundamentalnim fonetskim istraživanjima**, on istražuje odnos emisije i percepcije govora, odnos fonološkog i fonetskog opisa hrvatskog govora i jezika, psihofonetsku prirodu glasova, razvoj dječjeg govora, pitanja normiranja hrvatskog standarda i njegove sociofonetske uporabe, pitanja prozodije i općenito ortoepije pa i statusa hrvatskog pravopisa temeljenog na fonetskim karakteristikama hrvatskog govora. Među prvima u nas profesor Škarić istaknuo je važnost **govorne komunikacije** u suvremenom elektroničkom i demokratskom vremenu u kojemu vladanje govorom, kulturom govora, govorništvom, dakle govorom oslobođenim pisanog jezika i ideoloških stega, omogućuje pravedno i efikasno odlučivanje o društvenim pitanjima na svim razinama. Sljedeće su područje bili **poremećaji slušanja, govora i glasa**, što mu je omogućilo sagledati dublje i potpunije prirodu zdravog i oštećenog govora, promatrajući ih s one druge strane. I u ovom području on se iskazuje kao teoretičar koji nastoji primijeniti teorijske postavke u praktičnim rehabilitacijskim postupcima svjestan u kojoj je mjeri govor sastavni dio osobnosti svakog čovjeka i koliko je ljudska osobnost pogođena ako je govor oštećen. Pitanjima **ortoepskog standarda u hrvatskom jeziku** profesor Škarić pristupa polazeći od sociofonetskih načela, mjereći stvarnu uporabu jezika govornika hrvatskog standarda. Oni su ujedno kreatori uporabne norme suvremenog jezika koja u nekim fonetskim parametrima odstupa od klasične kodificirane norme. Profesor Škarić hrabro otkriva napetosti koje se rađaju između uporabne i klasične norme, a koje postaju pokretačke sile jezičnih i govornih promjena tako da njegova stajališta ponekad postaju izvor polemičkih, ali istodobno plodnih, znanstvenih rasprava.

Posvećujući profesoru Ivi Škariću ovaj prikaz želimo izraziti duboku zahvalnost za njegov neprocjenjiv doprinos razvoju zagrebačke fonetike.

## PROFESSOR IVO ŠKARIĆ – THE PHONETITIAN

During the mid-20th century, Ivo Škarić was a student of French language, Croatian language, and Yugoslav literature and was working as an undergraduate assistant at the Institute of Phonetics of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. Those were the days when scientific, educational and institutional foundations of Zagreb phonetics were laid under the scientific knowledge, organizational enthusiasm, skillfulness and guidance of academician Petar Guberina. The initial fervor behind organization of Zagreb Phonetics captivated young Ivo Škarić so much so that his fascination with speech became and remained his life vocation and the central interest of his scientific and pedagogical work that spanned throughout his career, from his early days, following the time he became Academician and Professor Emeritus of Zagreb University, until his too early passing in the year 2009. Making headway together with the development of Zagreb Phonetics and with his priceless and undeniable contribution to the department, professor Ivo Škarić is considered the leading Croatian phonetician in both theoretical and applied phonetics of the second half of the twentieth and the beginning of the 21st century. We can distinguish four fields of his scientific work. In **fundamental phonetics** he investigated the relations between production and perception of speech, the relations between phonological and phonetic description of Croatian speech and language, psychophonetic nature of speech sounds, the development of speech in children, the problems of normalization of standard Croatian and its sociophonetics, the question of prosody and orthoepy in general, and the position of the Croatian orthography based on the phonetic characteristics of Croatian speech. He was among the first linguists who pointed out the importance of the **speech communication** in contemporary electronic and democratic age, where the culture of speech and rhetoric skillfulness, liberated from pressure of written language and ideological burdens, enables rightful and effective decision making in all aspects of the society. Professor Škarić also investigated the questions of **hearing, speech and voice impairments**. That enabled him to understand the problems of normal and impaired speech more thoroughly by looking at each of them from different angles. He applied his theoretical views in practical rehabilitation procedures, aware of the importance of speech in forming each person's individuality and how that individuality is affected by impairment of their speech. He investigated the problems of **Croatian orthoepy** on principles of sociophonetics and by measuring phonetic parameters in different Croatian speakers. He was aware that the speakers who use the language are at the same time creators of the contemporary speech norm. Very often contemporary usage differs from the classical, proscribed, norm and professor Škarić bravely detected those differences, considering them as the moving force of language and speech changes, and clearly distinguished between different types of norms, calling them proscribed/classical, accepted, and permissible norm. His attitudes were in some cases the reason of heated, but fruitful scientific discussions.

By dedicating this review to Professor Ivo Škarić we want to express our deep gratitude for his immense contribution to the development of Croatian phonetics.

ABSTRACTS BY ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS /  
SAŽECI PREMA ABECEDNOM REDOSLIJEDU AUTORA

**Petra Aczél**

Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary

**RHETORICAL ACTION AND POLITICAL CHANGE – A CONCEPTUAL  
FRAME FOR RHETORICAL ANALYSIS**

”Action, not rhetoric.” – as we often hear it these days. In our contemporary public and private discourses rhetoric seems to be the opposite of action. When something is (persuasively) delivered it is not action but the disguise of the lack of actions, as many would agree. It is common thought that rhetoric manipulates instead of making things clearer and entertains where serious thinking, responsible elaboration should be involved. Behind this distrust in rhetoric we may discover the fraction in the classical bond between the speaker, the word and the action brought by modernity. Even though rhetoric was built on the pragmatic assumption that the orator stands for and acts in accordance with her/his words, rhetorical speaking seems to have lost its capacity to be considered as a change agent since then. Rhetorical action, thus, needs academic and political rediscovery.

The present talk aims to reconceptualize rhetorical action by means of rhetorical criticism (Black 1965/1978) within the frame of the ‘rhetorical event’, ‘rhetorical transaction’ and ‘rhetorical movement’ (Catchart 1990). Rhetoric (discourse) as action will be categorized into three types in terms of the exigence the speech answers, the aim it wishes to fulfil and the perception of how the rhetorical effort succeeded. Applying the methods of case study, historically cornerstone speeches – that is, speeches that changed the course of politics and thus the life of many in the long run – from the era of the regime change in Central Europe (1979-1989) will be analysed in accordance with the tripartite categorization and their *active*, *reactive* and *proactive* rhetorical characteristics will be described.

With the reintroduction of the concept of the rhetorical action the talk endeavours to get rhetorical criticism and non-formal rhetorical analytical methods back in action.

**Keywords:** rhetorical criticism, change, proactive, active, reactive rhetorical action

**Boris Beck**

Faculty of Political Science University of Zagreb, Croatia

## **TRAVEL AND RACE METAPHORS: THE RHETORIC OF LIBRESSE COMMERCIALS**

The paper analyzes the rhetoric from two commercials of Libresse sanitary pads from the series "Fearless Women", made in 2019. They feature real persons: a naval officer Lonne van den Kieboom, and ultramarathon runner Rebecca Watson. Both commercials depict women that move through dangerous and inhospitable environment (the sea, a desert) and the difference between them is that we see Kieboom behind the ship's command bridge, while Watson runs showing great physical exertion. Sanitary towels allow Kieboom to focus on her officer duties (the slogan says "because we have more important things in mind than menstruation"), and Watson to run the race (the slogan "we need extra help to go the distance"). Kieboom literally holds the helm in her hand, thus creating a metaphor that conceptualizes life as a navigation. In contrast, Watson moves exclusively in companion of other women; runners move together, but fall apart and continue alone - in this case, life is conceptualized as a race that everyone leads for themselves and at their own pace. Both commercials come on the edge of breaking taboos when they show the insertion of a pad, and each pad plays a different role. Kieboom inserts her sanitary pad between errands to show that nothing can interfere with her daily routine. The marathon advertisement, however, shows Rebecca Watson before the race as she wakes up in a tent and adjusts the pad. If the start of the race is a metaphor for entering the life, the night sleep before it represents an intrauterine existence, and the menstruation between sleep and awakening substitutes the act of birth. An advertisement that has a female officer as a lead stands for a woman who is equal to the men on board - she's one of the guys; the sea that symbiotically envelops the swimmer's body is parallel to the woman's incorporation into male society. On the contrary, marathon advertisement represents a woman left to herself, who gives birth to herself. The reason for engaging real persons in advertisements is to conceal the metaphoricalness of a range of contents: amorphous environment that is very symbolic (a desert, the sea), taking control over fate ("to be at the helm"), conceptualization of life (travel, race) and creation of a complex imagery about women's body.

**Keywords:** Commercials, metaphor, menstruation, imagery

**Lilian Bermejo Luque**

Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, University of Granada, Spain

## **ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN VISUAL ARGUMENTATION AND OTHER TYPES OF VISUAL PERSUASIVE COMMUNICATION**

Images are rhetorically powerful; they are able to persuade and, sometimes, they do so by giving reasons and inviting addressees/spectators to draw inferences. By means of images we can argue for our claims and even justify them. However, not any image able to persuade and to trigger the making of inferences in its addressees/spectators should be considered as visual argumentation. The main goal of this paper is to distinguish between visual argumentation and other types of visual communication with such powers, and to show why this distinction matters. To this end, the author first analyses a few cases of political propaganda. This analysis suggests that we should distinguish between inferential and non-inferential persuasion, on the one hand, and between argumentative and non-argumentative persuasion, on the other.

Secondly, by means of this analysis, the research will show that, unless we have criteria to distinguish between argumentative and non-argumentative visual communication, it is difficult to avoid the temptation to put too much in our reconstruction of images' meaning. We argue that this is a problem because, among other things, it gives rise to uncharitable interpretations –that is, interpretations that turn the alleged argumentation into something argumentatively poor and too easy to criticise.

Finally, by means of the linguistic normative model of argumentation proposed in Bermejo-Luque (2011), which characterizes argumentation as a second order speech-act complex, and of Wharton's (2009) speech-act account of non-verbal communication, we provide a framework to deal with the distinction between argumentative and non-argumentative visual communication, as well as with the interpretation and the appraisal of visual argumentation.

**Keywords:** visual argumentation, persuasive device, speech-act of arguing, linguistic normative model of argumentation (LNMA)



**Zdravka Biočina**

Zagreb School of Economics and Management, Croatia

**Ivanka Rajh**

Zagreb School of Economics and Management, Croatia

### **STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF GRETA THUNBERG AS A SPEAKER**

The speech Greta Thunberg gave at the UN's Climate Action Summit sparked great attention as well as numerous controversies. The first controversy results from the dichotomy between the formality of the venue, the present audience and the seeming 'naivety' of the speaker, and the second one from the speaker itself: a young girl with the Asperger syndrome who is also a non-expert. She came to the UN Summit stage with an already established ethos. That is, she had been known in public for her activism before the U.N. Summit. First, we wanted to determine who G. Thunberg referred to during her speech. Therefore, an analysis of the used pronouns was conducted. Besides using many times the pronoun *I*, especially in the first part of the speech, the speaker uses *you* for the present audience, governments, corporations, *us* for everyone else, especially young people and herself, *we* for everyone (every living creature), young generation, and general public. Second, since she stands for young people, a survey was conducted among students of Zagreb School of Economics and Management in order to analyze their attitudes towards the speech. The research included students (N=99) from the first to the fifth year, studying Croatian and English language. The sample also included exchange students studying at ZSEM. Research questions (N=10) covered the role of the language, ecological awareness, age, and education in perception of quality, attractiveness of the speech, the use of ethos, pathos and logos, persuasiveness and the impact potential of the speech. Their attitudes to the selected questions were measured on a Likert scale. The results show that the speaker is evaluated more favorably for categories like naturalness, persuasiveness, consideration of the audience and speech attractiveness by the students studying English. However, they would not change their habits due to her speech. Paradoxically, when given a choice on a Likert- scale, students studying English showed higher score in ecological awareness than students studying Croatian. Both groups of students assess the speech equally for emotionality and persuasiveness. Third, as online media are the primary source of information for young people in Croatia (Zoričić, 2018), the survey results shall be compared to the image of Greta Thunberg in the most popular Croatian electronic media.

**Keywords:** Greta Thunberg, UN's Climate Action Summit, peer's perception survey, audience analysis

**Petar Bodlović**

Ph.D. student

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

### **HOW DOES THE BURDEN OF PROOF ARISE IN A DISCUSSION?**

People use the notion of “burden of proof” in academic and everyday parlance without giving much thought about its complexity. But what, exactly, does it mean that somebody has the *burden of proof*? Surely, a vague notion of burden of proof might function well in casual conversations where it simply means “that it is up to [some party] to bring in the evidence to make out the case” (Rescher 1977, p. 26), but this broad characterization is hardly suitable for academic purposes. For instance, should we construct the burden of proof as a dialectical *obligation* (based on the rules of critical discussion), or dialectical *responsibility* (based on rules of optimality) (see van Laar and Krabbe 2013, pp. 213-217)? Is this obligation/responsibility based on linguistic, dialectical, epistemic, or, perhaps, moral grounds? Which kind of “evidence” is the proponent obliged to present: are speculative reasons permissible or should the evidence be empirical? How strong must these reasons be, and should they be conceded by the opponent? And what does “the case” stand for? If the opponent, for example, only expresses doubt towards a proposition, does she nevertheless carry the burden of proof?

In this talk, I define the burden of proof as (1) conditional (2) dialectical (3) obligation (4) to provide (5) sufficient (6) reasons, (7) that the opponent concedes, for one’s (8) (sub)standpoint (see, e.g., van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2002), and, then, focus on investigating its first element. Which dialogical conditions are sufficient or necessary to trigger or activate the burden of proof? For instance, should asserting a standpoint already be enough to acquire the BoP? Should the opponent’s challenge be necessary? Must this challenge be explicit (externalized), or it can somehow be “contextually implied?” Can the opponent’s denial (either strong or weak) activate the proponent’s BoP, and does the denial imply challenge? In discussing these questions, I rely on the work of pragma-dialecticians (2002), Ralph Johnson (2000), and van Laar and Krabbe (2013).

**Keywords:** burden of proof, critical reactions, dialectics, obligation

**Agnieszka Budzyńska-Daca**

University of Warsaw, Poland

**Kinga Rogowska**

Ph.D. Student

University of Warsaw, Poland

### **GENRES IN PRE-ELECTION DISCOURSE**

Pre-election discourse is characterized by the fact that it has a defined time and space framework and established groups of participants. Communication has clear persuasive directions and it is easy to define senders and recipients of the message. Their projected roles are also clear.

The identity of this discourse is easy to define within a stable description framework. We assume that the discourse is not a shapeless mass that flows from the source creating the message to the target, (which is the audience) and back, according to the transactional character of contemporary media communication. We assume that this discourse is filled with genres that are specific ideas of communication. These ideas are concretized in the form of specific actions and artefacts, connecting people who transmit and receive specific content. The aim of the research would be: firstly, an attempt to systematize the collection of genres forming the pre-election discourse, and secondly, to determine the rhetorical potential of these genres. Using a critical method to assess the power of influence and causality of, for example, genres such as pre-election debate or party convention, on the one hand, politics tweets on the other, and electoral leaflets or billboards on the third. This is not about the impact force measured by empirical research, but about the potential inherent of the structure of the genres themselves. Thanks to critical analysis, i.e. division of genres into basic rhetorical components in four communication-teleological, composition-stylistic, temporal-spatial and socio-anthropological dimensions, it will be possible to compare the persuasive potential of particular groups of genres in the pre-election discourse.

**Keywords:** genres studies, pre-election discourse, genre criticism

**Martin Hinton**

Faculty of Philology, University of Łódź, Poland

## **INFORMAL ARGUMENT SEMANTICS AND THE EVALUATION OF POLITICAL RHETORIC**

Political rhetoric poses particular problems in its evaluation, due to the wide range of means of persuasion employed and the uncertain relationship it enjoys with concepts such as truth and logic, but it also provides a variety of possibilities. There are a number of ways in which such a text can be assessed: for its style, its reasoning, its appropriateness or its effectiveness. One question of special interest at the intersection of studies into rhetoric and argumentation is the degree to which the employment of the figures of political discourse is in conflict with the hope that they express sound reasoning. The aim of this study is to apply an in-depth semantic analysis to examples of that discourse and illustrate how the presence of rhetorical devices may help or hinder the conveyance of good argumentation.

The Informal Argument Semantics (IAS) is an evaluative system used to assess the language employed in the expression of arguments in natural language texts (<http://filologia.uni.lodz.pl/hinton/ias>). It is based on five semantic principles of good language use: Clarity, Consistency, Coherence, Completion, and Conceptualisation - the 5 Cs. The IAS is operationalised through the use of a series of procedural questions which probe argumentative texts for possible areas of unacceptability of language use.

In this presentation, the author will briefly describe the IAS, its theoretical background and practical operation, as well as its role in CAPNA – the Comprehensive Assessment Procedure for Natural Argumentation. Then the system in action will be shown in the evaluation of certain examples of political communication. Those examples are drawn from both contemporary and historically important sources and show how the use of rhetorical devices can be useful in masking the weaknesses of an argument and can also be responsible for the introduction of flaws, referred to here as fallacies of expression.

**Keywords:** Political rhetoric, Informal Argument Semantics, argument evaluation, language fallacies

**Susan C. Jarratt**

School of Humanities, University of California, Irvine, United States of America

### **JULIA DOMNA: A WOMAN'S RHETORICAL LEADERSHIP IN THE THIRD-CENTURY ROMAN EMPIRE**

The second sophist Philostratus, author of an impressive intellectual biography, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, reports that he was encouraged to undertake this project by the empress Julia Domna (c. 160-217 BCE). Born in Roman Syria, Domna married Septimius Severus, a Lybian general, who became emperor in 193. Despite her youth, Domna accompanied her husband on campaigns, and after his death in 211, assisted her son, Caracalla, in managing the empire (Cassius Dio). She met with ambassadors, translated documents, and (some believe) conducted an intellectual circle for prominent figures in philosophy, rhetoric, religion, and arcane arts.

This presentation will offer an overview of scholarly approaches to Domna's life, focusing on her connections with sophistic rhetoric and the multicultural quality of her experience. Comparative rhetorical analytics are necessary for grasping the significance of a Greek sophist's engagement with the Roman imperial family and for assessing the meaning and influence of Syrian religious references within a text solidly lodged within a Greco-Roman context. The analysis suggests that a strict distinction between West (Greco-Roman) and East (Syrian) does not adequately address the complexities of Domna's intellectual, rhetorical, and religious investments. Likewise, her status as a woman leader requires a nuanced reading, given the compromises demanded by her situation.

**Keywords:** women's leadership, sophistic rhetoric, comparative rhetoric, history of rhetoric

**Kirk W. Junker**

Faculty of Law, University of Cologne, Germany

## **EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS IN RHETORIC BUILT COMMON LAW PRACTICE AS A LIBERAL ART, NOT AS A SOCIAL SCIENCE**

In the twelfth century, the idea of the European university took root in Bologna, Paris and Oxford. In the same century, William the Conqueror defeated Harald at the battle of Hastings and the body of law, known as the common law began. Until relatively recently, however, the common law was not taught at universities. A person wishing to train to be a barrister--or later, a solicitor--was trained in law through something more akin to the medieval guild system than the university lecture. Therefore, barristers attended trials in court to observe, in any way possible, practicing barristers, and later in the evening would confer with those barristers in the Inns of Court. The Inns themselves eventually institutionalized legal training, but it was still not recognized as university education. Records indicate that students felt inundated with disorganized lectures and texts and struggled to find a way to systematize their understanding of the law. They were therefore forced to use what they had learned in previous formal education—the trivium of logic, rhetoric and grammar—to organize their study of law, oral pleading and document drafting. There is little direct evidence of this application of rhetoric in practice, but persons trained in rhetoric, with an eye for its concepts and practices, can see rhetoric throughout the common law to this day.

This paper will present and analyze examples of rhetorical concepts and practices in the practice of the common law. The author concludes that rhetorical concepts and practices are of such quantity and quality, that we can best understand the difference between the common law and civil law families of Europe, not through the simple over-emphasis on sources of law, but through the practices of common law which were founded in the liberal arts. On the other hand, the civil law strives to be a social science.

**Keywords:** commonplaces, common law, trivium, dialexeis

**Khomenko Iryna**

Faculty of Philosophy, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

### **ARGUING-RELATED PROVERBS IN UKRAINIAN AND ANGLO-AMERICAN CULTURES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

The aim of this paper is to explore the proverbs expressing some attitudes to face-to-face arguing in Ukrainian and Anglo-American cultures [Khomenko, Hample 2018]. The author's interest in exploring this topic emerged within the cross-cultural research project focused on argumentation. Its empirical part included survey conducted in Ukraine and the USA. Finally, it collected data summarizing understandings of both argumentation and fundamental orientation to arguing in these two countries. Comparative analysis between Ukrainian and US respondents produced interesting findings. It was concluded that the Ukrainian results were generally quite conformable to the US results.

However, there were few exceptions. For example, Ukrainians, unlike US respondents, do not like to be involved in face-to-face arguing, because it is considered to be a hostile incursion into their personal world or conflict and aggressive activity that tends to destroy their life and aggravate the interpersonal relations. If they are obliged to participate in such form of communication they mainly will not behave aggressively and try to argue constructively. On the other side, perceiving face-to-face arguing solely as a destructive conflict tending to damage relationships may be considered as the reason why Ukrainians are less inclined to understand arguments as professionals do.

In order to explain such attitude to interpersonal arguing we set out (1) to explore the meaning of the English term “face-to-face arguing” in Ukrainian culture and language, (2) to examine Ukrainian predispositions and understandings regarding interpersonal arguing in folk culture, namely in numerous proverbs that function as a traditional saying that expresses a national attitude based on common sense or experience, and (3) to compare rhetorical features of Ukrainian and US folk traditions, expressed in proverbs.

The conference presentation will provide consideration of these research questions with a focus on comparison of Ukrainian and Anglo-American proverbs from a rhetorical point of view.

**Keywords:** arguing-related proverbs, comparative rhetoric, folk culture, interpersonal arguing

**Mirjana Matea Kovač**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split, Croatia

**Ana Mršić Zdilar**

Faculty of Science, University of Split, Croatia

## **MEDIA MANIPULATION IN CROATIAN NEWSPAPERS – REALITY OR A MYTH?**

In the world of rapid development of various technologies and the media, news has become the most sought-after commodity in the profit-generating market, as a result we are witnessing some sort of a (market) media competition for every available reader. Therefore, in the media domain, sometimes two different media sources convey the same news in different ways, which leads us to the initial hypothesis: is there really media manipulation in Croatian newspapers, where they shape the readers' perception and reality by specific language use? Williams (1975, as cited in D'Alessio and Allen 2000) states that: "media manipulation should be intentional ... should be effective, otherwise irrelevant ... and should be a frequent, not just an isolated case." Considering the easier access to news in the media environment, potential media bias can have significant consequences on the reader's perspective and thus their perception of reality. In this paper, applying the Critical Discourse Analysis (CAD) modelled by Norman Fairclough on a sample of texts from three newspapers with the highest daily circulation in Croatia (24 sata, Jutarnji list, Večernji list) that address the same current topics, we will attempt to determine if there are objective differences in their reporting that could question their neutrality. Fairclough (1995) believes that language should be analysed as a social practice through the prism of discourse. Fowler and Kress (1979, as cited in Podboj 2012) find that "social groupings and relationships within social groups have a direct influence on the behaviour of language users and that these socially determined patterns of linguistic behaviour also influence non-linguistic behaviours and the construction of worldviews, which mature through language use". CAD seeks to describe language as it is, i.e. language in practical use, how it is used and how it interacts with the social environment, as its active and living organism. In addition to the linguistic analysis, the paper will explain the results obtained from the three different newspapers that coexist in the Croatian media domain, as well as the theoretical background of CAD and the criticisms of this method.

**Keywords:** discourse, critical discourse analysis, media manipulation



**Patrycja Kupś**

The Faculty of Psychology and Cognitive Science, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland

**Mariusz Urbański**

The Faculty of Psychology and Cognitive Science, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland

**STRUCTURE FOR NARRATIVES**

The aim of this paper is to propose a 3-dimensional model for narratives' structure, focusing on the in-depth representation of the content of the given narrative. We claim that 3-dimensions, namely: linguistic surface, propositional content, and logical relations are present in every narrative. By linguistic surface we understand a set of expressions in the natural language that constitute a narrative. The story, delivered by the linguistic surface, so the chain of situations conducted by some (given) characters in some (given) setting is what we call the propositional content. The logical relations are links between at least two entities in the propositional content, of the form  $x$  explains  $y$  or  $x$  causes  $y$  (including all possible weak understandings of the causation) and possibly others. These layers are interrelated, yet it is beneficial to analyse them separately, since each one of them is of different characteristics, and models which attempt at uniting them lose certain explanatory power.

Subsequently, we argue that anchoring logical relations in propositional content of the narrative has explanatory advantages with regards to in-depth reasoning processes involved, while also it enables to minimise the impact of linguistic surface on the logical construct. Our hypothesis is straightforward: the sheer fact of using robust vocabulary and skilful phrasing, does not guarantee a stronger logical relationships within a given narrative, and relatively ineloquent expressions can hold logically sound propositions. Therefore, in models resembling Inference Anchoring Theory, so in those which analyse linguistic surface which directly hold illocutionary acts, some of the relationships can be undermined or overstated, depending on the linguistic quality of the data. Our approach is supported by our research on abductive problem solving, in which the process of producing elaborated hypotheses, in a narrative form, is examined.

**Keywords:** narratives, structure, IAT

**Sandra Lukšić**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split, Croatia

## **KOMUNIKACIJSKO-STRATEŠKE METODE U MOTIVACIJSKIM GOVORIMA PREDSEDNIČKIH KANDIDATA ZORANA MILANOVIĆA I KOLINDE GRABAR-KITAROVIĆ**

U radu se u okviru retorike političkoga diskursa, pragmalingvistike i kritičke analize diskursa kontrastivno istražuju motivacijski govori predsjedničkoga kandidata Zorana Milanovića i aktualne predsjednice Republike Hrvatske Kolinde Grabar-Kitarović. Govori su održani u studenome 2019. u Tvornici kulture i u restoranu Globus u Zagrebu u sklopu predsjedničke kampanje za izbor predsjednika/predsjednice Republike Hrvatske u novome mandatu (2020. – 2025.). Imajući na umu važnost jezika i govorničkih vještina, osobito u vrsti političke komunikacije kakva je predizborna predsjednička kampanja, u radu analiziramo različite tehnike argumentacije i manipulacije kao što su uvjeravanje i promidžba, u sklopu kojih istražujemo primjenu ideološki obojena leksika i eventualne govorne figure te obrazložimo njihove pragmatičke implikacije. Istraživanje navedenih dimenzija retoričko-pragmatičke analize u skladu je s općim funkcijama svakog oblika političke komunikacije, uključujući konativnu, referencijalnu, emotivnu, metajezičnu kao i poetsku funkciju jezika u uporabi. Budući da pojam retoričke analize političkoga diskursa podrazumijeva brojne aspekte analize jezika, smatramo da je odabir navedenih dimenzija (identifikacija tehnika argumentacije, analiza stila i obrazloženje pragmatičkih implikacija) dostatan okvir za iscrpnu analizu specifična oblika političkoga diskursa. Cilj je istraživanja utvrditi retoričke značajke motivacijskoga govora kao posebna oblika političke komunikacije na granici između izborne (političke) i komercijalne reklame. Rezultati analize pokazuju da je riječ o personaliziranom, a time i emocionalno nabijenom obliku političke komunikacije koja ima monološki karakter i u kojem se naglasak stavlja na različite strategije „uvjeravanja“ primatelja. Istraživanje komunikacijsko-strateških metoda i njihovih kombinacija pokazuje da predsjednički kandidati nastoje pridobiti publiku (potencijalne glasače) na nekoliko različitih razina (intelektualna razina, razina imaginacije i emocionalna razina) uz preduvjet postojanja konsenzusa o temeljnim društveno-političkim pitanjima. Oboje kandidata u svojem se motivacijskom govoru koristi tehnikama manipulacije u obliku tzv. „bije“ i „sive“ promidžbe: s jedne se strane žele prikazati „ljudima poput tebe i mene“, „jednim/jednom od nas“ s glavnim naglaskom na domoljublje, dok s druge strane nastoje reduciranjem relevantnih informacija ili naglašavanjem nekih strateški dobro odabranih aspekata relevantnih informacija difamirati političkog suparnika.

**Ključne riječi:** retorika, politički diskurs, motivacijski govor, predsjednički kandidati, retoričke značajke

## **COMMUNICATION-STRATEGIC METHODS IN MOTIVATIONAL SPEECHES OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES ZORAN MILANOVIĆ AND KOLINDA GRABAR-KITAROVIC**

The paper explores the motivational speeches of the potential presidential candidates, Zoran Milanović and the current President of the Republic of Croatia, Kolinda Grabar Kitarović, within the framework of the rhetoric of political discourse, pragmalinguistics and critical discourse analysis. The speeches were held in November 2019 at Tvornica kulture and Globus Restaurant in Zagreb as a part of the presidential campaign for the election of the President of the Republic of Croatia in the new term (2020-2025). Bearing in mind the importance of language and rhetorical skills, especially in the type of political communication such as the election campaign, we analyze various techniques of argumentation and manipulation, such as persuasion and promotion, exploring the use of ideologically loaded vocabulary and possible figures of speech and explain their pragmatic implications. The exploration of the specific dimensions of rhetorical-pragmatic analysis is consistent with the general functions of every form of political communication, including the conative, referential, emotional, meta-linguistic, as well as the poetic function of language in use. Since the notion of rhetorical analysis of political discourse implies many aspects of language analysis, we consider the selection of the three dimensions (identification of argumentation techniques, analysis of style and explanation of pragmatic implications) a sufficient framework for a detailed analysis of a specific form of political discourse. The aim of the research is to identify the rhetorical features of motivational speech as a special form of political communication at the border between the electoral (political) and commercial advertising. The results show that it is a personalized, emotionally charged form of political communication that has a character of a monologue and that emphasizes different strategies of "persuading" the recipient. The study of communicative-strategic methods and their combinations shows that presidential candidates seek to reach the audience (potential voters) at various levels (intellectual level, imagination level and emotional level), with the precondition for a consensus on basic socio-political issues. Both candidates use manipulation techniques in the form of so called "white" and "gray" promotion, either by wanting to present themselves as "people like you and me", "one of us", or by trying to reduce the relevant information or to emphasize some strategically well-selected aspects of the relevant information, in order to defame a political rival.

**Keywords:** rhetoric, political discourse, motivational speech, presidential candidates, rhetorical features

**Aleksandra Majdzińska-Koczorowicz**

Institute of English Studies, University of Łódź, Poland

## **AN AMALGAM OF THE VERBAL AND THE VISUAL IN CHOSEN WELFARE ANIMAL ADVERTISEMENTS**

Social campaigns aim at raising people's awareness about certain current problems and triggering given motion. In the thicket of information and multimodal content fighting for our attention, marketers need to be creative and innovative to successfully get their message across. Advertisements seem to be concise, rich and sometimes even dense, as their authors have a limited space or time for their presentation which further amplifies their creativity. To be effective, social marketing, in opposition to the commercial one, faces more challenges as it promotes ideas – not products. Influencing the society's recognition of certain (mostly invisible at first glance) areas such as the environment, health care, or the wildlife calls for the usage of efficacious persuasive techniques, stirring of emotions, and skillful combining of text with image. The verbal and the visual intertwine, intentionally complementing each other as signs in advertisements are replete and designed to be emphatic (Barthes 1986/1964). This completeness makes them a particularly good subject for analysis, allowing for multi-dimensional linguistic exploration.

The presentation will focus on campaigns addressing animal rights, the endangerment of the wildlife, and the abuse of animals. Apart from discussing the functions of images in terms of visual arguments (Birdsell and Groarke 1996, 2007) and persuasive language (e.g. marketing techniques), it will discuss particular levels of the advertisements' bimodal expression with reference to the theory of metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and pictorial metaphor (Forceville 1996). Since campaigns are undoubtedly complex forms, the conceptual blending theory (Fauconnier and Turner 2002) will also be applied to discuss certain cognitive mechanisms behind their presentation.

**Keywords:** metaphor, blending, advertisement, persuasive language

**Christina Matthiesen**

Department of Media, Cognition and Communication, University of Copenhagen, Sweden

### **TEACHING IMITATION AND ARGUMENTATION: CAUGHT BETWEEN PAST SIGNIFICANCE AND PRESENT EFFECTIVENESS**

The classical rhetorical tradition has a long history of recognising language as a creative power by which we build cities and laws, and dispute and “confute the bad and extol the good” (Isocrates, 1980, *Antidosis*, 253–257). Therefore, language training was, at least in the acclaimed school of Isocrates, father of humanities, inseparably tied to thinking and judgement, oriented towards character formation and the common good, towards *phronesis*, practical wisdom, as opposed to “hard and fast rules” and “meddlesomeness and greed” (Isocrates, 1980, *Against the Sophists*, 13 + 4). Central to Isocrates’ teaching was his own tailormade written examples and the practice of imitation. The concept of imitation, including its various types of written exemplars and practices, is stressed as an important stepping stone in civic education by many scholars, past and present (Isocrates, 1980; Matthiesen, 2016). Yet, empirical evidence on instructional strategies, as well as on the transfer value within the concept of imitation and the use of text models, is relatively poor and point to low effectiveness (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1984, see also Myhill et al, 2018). This reflects a need in research for greater attention towards the various approaches and goals of imitation. Indeed, little attention is given to the choice, and hence quality, of exemplars in research. Often, they are simply mentioned as ‘model texts’ without their nature being characterised and discussed, despite the specific choice of exemplars reflecting perceptions of both genres and skills, teaching and character formation of students. This presentation provides an overview of approaches to imitation in the rhetorical tradition and insight into empirical studies of our time on the effectiveness of imitation in teaching writing. Taking this tension between values and effectiveness (cf. Biesta 2012) as point of departure the presentation will outline a way to reinvigorate imitation in today’s research and teaching practices, focusing especially on teachers’ know-how and quality of exemplars.

**Keywords:** rhetoric in education, imitation, argumentation, *kairos*

**Piotr Mirocha**

Institute of Slavonic Studies, Jagiellonian University, Poland

## **TOPOI IN CORPUS-DRIVEN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS. CASE OF DISCOURSES ON MIGRATION AND EUROPE IN THE CROATIAN AND SERBIAN MEDIA AFTER 2012**

Starting point of this presentation is constituted by an empirical research of discourses on Europe in Croatian and Serbian media between 2012 and 2017 and, more specifically, its subsection on migration and Europe – a relevant question given that inside the temporal limits of the analysed corpus the so-called refugee crisis of 2015 occurred.

The study employs a corpus-driven discourse analytical approach (cf. e.g. Baker et al. 2008) to identify main trends in a large corpus of ca. 20,000 articles, originating in newspapers from both countries and representing diverse ideological profiles (*Večernji list*, *Novi list*, *Politika*, *Danas*). Basing on the quantitative collocation analysis (i.e. repeatedly neighbouring words that contribute to each other's meaning) and topic modelling (i.e. sort of abstraction of collocation analysis, grouping co-occurring collocates into topics), most representative sample texts were selected, on which qualitative discourse analysis was performed.

At this point corpus-driven discourse analysis – especially this derived from the tradition of discourse-historical approach – tend to look for recurring linguistic phenomena and link them to higher-level structures, such as metaphors, topics, but also argumentative strategies, often labelled as topoi. This presentation will try to examine few questions connected to the above-mentioned problems. Firstly, it will delineate what are the most common topoi used for representing relation between Europe in migration in the analysed corpus. Then it will be examined whether the recurring topoi can be traced in quantitative analyses of complete large corpora. However, the central place – next to the empirical analysis – will be occupied by investigations whether the revealed argumentative strategies can be called topoi at all. To solve this controversy (cf. Žagar 2010; Reisigl 2013), noticed in relation to the discourse analytical approaches to rhetoric strategies, the examples excerpted from the empirical analysis will be confronted with the body of knowledge produced in the German tradition of applied rhetoric (Kopperschmidt 1973; Kienpointner 1996).

**Keywords:** corpus-driven discourse analysis, topos, discourses on migration, Southeastern Europe

**Marina Pavlović**

Kindergarten “Bajka”, Zagreb

**Jelena Vignjević**

Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, Croatia

## **PARENT-TEACHER MEETING AS A RHETORICAL CHALLENGE FOR EDUCATORS**

Education is a process which is based on rhetorical skills. They are important in all educational aspects – in communication with children, parents, local community, public, and associates. This is why communicational and rhetorical competences are a prerequisite for creating a good cooperation with all participants of the educational process, as well as for successful work which brings satisfaction and feeling of professional accomplishment. Communication of educators with parents in everyday situations, especially in parent-teacher meetings, is a very challenging part of educators' profession.

This paper questions the communication of educators in parent-teacher meetings in institutions for early and preschool education, i.e. in kindergartens. Attention is focused on the rhetorical challenges and difficulties which educators encounter in parent-teacher meetings, especially on the feeling of fear and discomfort. Those are the feelings which educators single out the most as the ones which cause difficulties in public speaking. This information leads to question preparedness of educators for public speaking and their formal and informal rhetorical education. In order to have a better insight in the aforementioned problems we collected data about the rhetorical aspects of educators' activity in parent-teacher meetings. A research study was conducted to get insights into communicational competence of educators. Twelve parent-teacher meetings in kindergartens in the wider area of Zagreb were used as a sample. The research was conducted by attending the meetings and recording the chosen communicational and rhetorical features of educators' speech. Communicational and structural features of educators' speeches in parent-teacher meeting show that the speeches are usually carefully prepared and structured, have appropriate content, and emphasize two-way communication. They are also linguistically correct and clear. On the other hand, active listening turned out to be insufficiently developed and a significant deficiency. Educators very often interrupt parents when they encourage them to speak. The differences in individual communicational skills of educators were also detected. Despite the limitations, the results of this research contribute to the further development of pedagogical practice in the area of early and preschool education, especially when it comes to the subject of rhetorical challenges in educational practice.

**Keywords:** communicational competence of educators, parent-teacher meeting

**Jagoda Poropat Darrer**

Umijeće Govora Limited Company, Zagreb, Croatia

**Elenmari Pletikos Olof**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

## **LEADING THE WINNING SYMPHONY: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF FIGURATIVENESS WITHIN CROATIAN PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHES**

Executive function of Croatian presidents is a restricted one due to parliamentary political system established in the year 2000, and is mostly just protocolary. Nevertheless, presidents have a certain power when it comes to public opinion and can persuade the public according to their ability to speak publicly. According to Windt (1986) presidential rhetoric is a study of how presidents gain, maintain, or lose public support. Rhetorical figures are common devices in structuring a political discourse and are widely used by politicians in order to persuade their audience. They are intentional deviation from ordinary language, chosen to produce rhetorical effect. Wording, on the other hand is defined as particular choices and meanings of the words used when talking or writing. As Osborn (1997) suggests, metaphor motivates the audience and that's where the persuasive power lays. The aim of this research is to examine the use of rhetorical figures and wording within the speeches of four Croatian presidents: Franjo Tuđman, Stjepan Mesić, Ivo Josipović and Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović in order to determine and describe the rhetorical figures and wording specific for each president as well as the rate of expressiveness of their rhetoric. The hypothesis of this paper is that the rhetoric of individual presidents is specific and recognizable according to the semantic field of metaphors they use in speeches. The corpus for the analysis includes transcripts of selected speeches of four Croatian presidents, delivered in various rhetorical situations from 1991 to 2019. The topics of the selected speeches follow the main topics that Bebić and Volarević (2016) suggest as crucial in the Croatian presidential agenda: economy, domestic policy, democracy, regional relations, national history, national elements, international relations, the European Union and the NATO as well as ceremonial speeches and holiday greetings. The methodology applied in this research is based on the Critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the authentic presidential speeches. Preliminary results show that metaphors used by Croatian presidents, such as dream, journey, path, house, battle, etc. can be seen as a part of a common political jargon, while some metaphors, such as symphony, etc. are specific and derived from individual presidential biographies.

**Keywords:** presidential rhetoric, Croatian presidents, figurativeness, wording



**Anders Sigrell**

Department of Media and Communication, Lund University, Sweden

## **RHETORICA REDIVIVA – RHETORIC IN THE SWEDISH EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM**

In the latest high-school state curriculum in Sweden (GY11), rhetoric has re-emerged explicitly in the mother-tongue education. Why has it re-emerged? How is this shown in the state education acts, in hand-books – for students and teachers - and in practise at schools and teacher education? An answer to these questions will give us clues to a perhaps even more interesting and important question: What is rhetoric as a subject, both theoretical and practical, considered to be?

A quotation from the first item under “Central goals” for third cycle in Swedish high-schools states that one of the central goals is: “Oral skills in presentation with deepened application of the rhetorical process (the canons of rhetoric), as support in planning and execution, as well as a tool for analysis”. The triad ethos, logos and pathos is mentioned.

From this quotation you could see that rhetoric is understood both as a tool for reflecting over the terms and as an outcome of a communicative situation, i.e. both as sender and as receiver (the analysis part). However, preliminary interviews with teachers and classroom observations show that teachers tend to see rhetoric foremost as a communicative skill. They understand rhetoric in the “rhetorica utens”, and not the “rhetorica docens” sense. That is not totally surprising. If they have not had any explicit rhetorical training in their teacher education or later classes (which very few have), their understanding of rhetoric could be coloured by the media use of the term, such as: “The Prime minister had nothing but the same old rhetoric to offer”. Such an understanding is at odds with the view of rhetoric as a tool for conscious reflection on how to communicate – both on the sender and the receiver part, both as speaker (writer) and listener (reader), and before and after a communication situation.

In the paper the author will try to show how a deepened understanding of rhetoric as a subject could help the teachers reach the high goals of the curriculum and at the same time help them achieve the explicit goal i.e. to teach democracy.

**Keywords:** rhetoric, high-school education, democracy, rhetorica utens/docens

**Agnieszka Szurek**

Institute of Applied Polish Studies, University of Warsaw, Poland

### **CONSTRUCTING THE SELF, CONSTRUCTING THE PLACE AND ITS HISTORY. AMATEUR MEMOIRS OF WOMEN AND MEN FROM SMALL MAZOVIAN TOWNS**

Memoirs are one of the most popular genres in amateur writing. In recent decades historians have rediscovered the value of such sources for studying the history of everyday life, or the ‘from below’ perspective on grand events. Until recently, however, amateur memoirs have rarely been investigated by rhetorical scholars.

Drawing on both published and unpublished texts (written mostly, but not exclusively, by women), this presentation will examine in what ways the authors create their ethos and the vision of local history. Amateur memoirs are addressed to a small and usually friendly audience, nonetheless an author has to assume the role of a storyteller, which is not an easy task for a person with no experience as a writer and no desire to acquire writing skills. The events narrated cover the years of World War 2 and the communist era, so the authors had to find ways in which to tell about painful and difficult matters – from losing their loved ones to moral dilemmas. To deal with these challenges, they often sought for well proven patterns of hero or victim narratives. This presentation will focus on the ways in which the memoirs' authors talk about their agency and their attitudes towards history and change – from passive to active, from acceptance to rejection.

The analysed memoirs were written in the years 1986-2018 by the residents of small towns near Warsaw (Grodzisk Mazowiecki, Milanówek, Pruszków). Some of them were published by local societies or institutions, but, with one exception, these books didn't enter the ‘normal’, commercial circulation – they were not sold in bookshops, but were exclusively sold or given away during local events.

**Keywords:** memoirs, amateur writing, ethos, local history

**Diana Tomić**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**Alma Vančura**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia

**MALE AND FEMALE RHETORIC – ARE THERE ANY DIFFERENCES? THE ANALYSIS OF TED TALKS**

The difference between male and female language use was first described in the book by R. Lakoff (1975) noting major gender stereotypes in language. Further research focused on political discourse and the content of the political messages, strengthening stereotypical differences in male and female communication. Major differences between male and female rhetoric were related to the emotional content of the messages, which was more evident in female discourse. The most significant conclusion of those studies was that if women used “male” forms in communication, they would be perceived as dominant, masculine, unkind, mean or even cruel. Both, the content and the delivery, can hardly be compared within the dominant research paradigms, since the context (political discourse and the analysis of male/female political statements), as an important parameter of communication, significantly differs.

The aim of this study is to compare male and female rhetoric within similar context. TED talks present prestigious contemporary public speaking context and are thoroughly prepared by all speakers and therefore seemed to be an appropriate context such comparison. The analysis in this study included 25 most popular TED talks of all time. Since the list included 15 male and 10 female speakers, it was expanded with additional five female talks analyzed in the book by C. Anderson (2016). The analysis included both the content and the delivery. The content does not differ significantly between male and female speakers. The only slight difference between female and male speakers was found in the way they used story as a supporting material. The story was coded either as a general story or a personal story. Female speakers included slightly more personal stories in their talks, however, they were topic related, and similar examples could be found in some of the male talks if the topic of their talks required such examples. The major difference was found in the modes of delivery. Both paralinguistic and non-verbal elements included in the display of emotions were more expressed among female speakers. This could support the stereotype about female discourse being more emotional, and it, undoubtedly, confirms the gender differences in communication styles based on different cognitive organization and learned communicative behavior. To conclude, contemporary rhetorical analysis should move away from the linguistic and discourse stereotypes and explore particular patterns in public speaking context. This study has shown that the differences in content do not support the difference in male and female public speaking forms, however, a research area from which we can attempt to pinpoint different and universal male and female communicative patterns are the vocal elements in delivery, leaving the bombastic, but very tentative, conclusions about differences in male and female rhetoric aside.

**Keywords:** TED talk, male and female rhetoric, story, stereotypes

**Alma Vančura**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia

**Nera Martinović**

Student

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia

**CROATIAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND THE SOCIAL MEDIA**

For a long time, newspapers and television have been the dominant media for introducing the electorate with candidates' program, as well as with their image, beliefs and opinions. At the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century they were slowly replaced by content on the Internet, known as 'digital era', followed by the 'era of social media' that started from 2010s onwards (Gunn, 2017). Social media has become an increasingly important source not only of news in general, but of political news in particular. It has facilitated sharing and diffusion of information, allowing the candidates to directly communicate with potential voters without using the previously mandatory editorial media.

This paper will analyze posts and tweets used by the prospective front-runners for presidential candidates on social media during their presidential runs. The analysis will include the current president Kolinda Grabar- Kitarović, as well as the candidates Zoran Milanović, Miroslav Škoro and Mislav Kolakušić. The coding scheme for their use of social media will be based on Gunn's (2017) *traditional* (professionalized and in line with the established stylistic standards for posts on social media) versus *non-traditional* (amateurish) and neutral categories. Furthermore, we will analyze the contents of their posts/tweets, as well as discuss their rhetorical strength. By rhetorical strength we mean comments on post, forwards and retweets of candidates' posts/tweets that can potentially show a sign of trending. Trending implicitly signifies popularity and influence through more visibility, whereas visibility hopefully leads to election victory. So far, five dominant trends in presidential candidates' social media accounts have emerged: political messages, emotional messages (to thank, compliment, or commiserate with the voters), critical (of their opponents, usually by attacking them), motivating (to vote for this particular candidate) or humorous messages.

President K. Grabar-Kitarović is the most active on social media, has the largest number of followers and is using social media mostly in traditional way. Just like M. Škoro, she is primarily focused on Facebook, but unlike Grabar-Kitarović, M. Škoro has much more untraditional posts. M. Kolakušić left almost all of his digital campaign to be led by his supporters, and similarly like M. Škoro, focused on his followers to promote him. Z. Milanović is the least active of all the candidates, but is using Facebook, Instagram and Youtube channel in a very productive way, trying to depict himself as a 'normal' candidate, which is his campaign's slogan.

**Keywords:** social media, election campaigns, Croatian presidential candidates

**Gordana Varošaneć-Škarić**

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**Branka Šegvić**

STIP, Split, Croatia

### **MALE AND FEMALE RETHORIC IN POLITICAL INTERVIEWS**

Early linguistic research has shown that some of the greatest differences between male and female speech style can be found at the discourse level. Different linguistic strategies depend on different social roles or different social positions of men and women. Furthermore, strategies used at a discourse level are often associated with power and solidarity. This paper focuses on political discourse or, more precisely, on rhetorical conversation (dialogue) form of a political TV interview. Considering the importance of social context and power relations in political speeches, two different aims have been set: 1) to research the manner in which speakers (journalists) communicate with men and women in the position of power (Prime Minister Andrej Plenković and President of the Republic of Croatia Kolinda Grabar Kitarović); 2) to investigate whether there are any differences in the argumentation depending on the speaker's gender. The research results have shown that the speaker's attitude towards the person in the position of power differs depending on the gender of that person as regards to interruptions and overlaps. Furthermore, it has been determined that the Prime Minister and the President use different argumentation methods and different logical fallacies when talking about same subjects referring to their mutual communication. The President uses fallacies such as phantom distinction, appeal to postponement or ad socordiam, exemplum in contrarium and argumentum ab utile. On the other hand, the Prime Minister uses appeal to postponement and sophisms, together with the priority argument (competition per importance), antiperistasis, and humour including irony. The Prime Minister's choice of fallacies supports narrative expressing dominance.

**Keywords:** political discourse, interview, male and female rhetoric, fallacies, speech interruptions

**Ana Vlah**

Ph.D. student

Utrecht University, Netherlands

**PERSUASION AND/OR INFLUENCE IN GROUP DISCUSSION**

Reasoning about everyday choices is the main domain of practical/informal reasoning, and it coincides with rhetorical argumentation settings. Because there are more agents, more goals and ways to go about them, interlocutors have to weigh options and be aware of the context in order to harmonize. In group discussion each interlocutor can have more than one position, which could lead to higher chance of misunderstanding, and at the same time passionate and unpredictable polylogue.

In groups of three and four, students (majoring in Education and Rhetoric) had to argue and agree on practical matters to make decisions. Short stories, that were starting points for their decision-making, were formed as “messy problems”, regarding teaching scenarios (“what should a teacher do in this situation?”), political resolutions (in local and state politics) and personal life examples (finding a job, moving houses). Before they were given the tasks half of the participants had a short introduction to rhetorical argumentation (RA).

Group discussions of six different student groups (N=3x6) were video recorded, transcribed and analysed to see how interlocutors persuaded and influenced each other while working together to achieve greater specific goals. Four aspects of persuasion and influence were looked: 1) rational persuasion, analysed as practical argumentation, 2) persuasion in the theory of interpersonal relations, 3) rhetorical concepts (i.e. ethos, logos, pathos) and 4) multimodality. Some of the questions in analysis were the use of and referring to the context, and how students managed to support their standpoints and arguments. It was interesting to see whether the seating plan influenced whose idea seemed the strongest, and how participants used non-verbal cues to regulate the communication.

Discussions differed in length and settings; from those formed as a series of short monologues to interlocutors who were only asking questions, without stating their opinions, or completely changing the topic. Students’ results were compared between them (students of rhetoric vs. students of educational majors; studentuzs who were familiar with concepts of RA and those who were not) and to professional decision-makers working for the Government. The biggest difference among these two groups was not the quality of their decisions, but roles in which they placed themselves when arguing.

**Keywords:** small group discussion, persuasion, influence, video analysis

**Jelena Vlašić Duić**

Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Hrvatska

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**OBRADA PROZODIJSKIH SREDSTAVA U NASTAVI HRVATSKOGA JEZIKA**

Termin *vrednote govornoga jezika* u stilistiku je uveo Petar Guberina (1952), a dijeli ih na akustičke: intonacija, intenzitet, tempo i pauza te vizualne: mimika, geste i stvarni kontekst. Definira ih kao izvanleksička sredstva izraza koja svoju vrijednost ostvaruju na osnovi zvuka i pokreta te nam omogućavaju da se izrazimo kraće i/ili ekspresivnije. U suvremenoj fonetskoj i lingvističkoj terminologiji uvriježili su se izrazi prozodija i prozodijska sredstva, a Guberinin se termin upotrebljava rijetko i uži je od spomenutih dvaju termina. Prema Škariću (1991) prozodijska su sredstva ton i intonacija; glasnoća i naglasak; boja glasa; spektralni sastav govornog zvuka; stanka; govorna brzina; ritam; govorna modulacija; način izgovora glasnika te mimika i gesta. U govoru, koji čine dva sloja – sloj glasa i sloj teksta, tim se zajedničkim prozodijskim sredstvima ostvaruju slojevi teksta: prozodija riječi i prozodija rečenice te slojevi glasa: izražajnost i govorni krik. Analiza udžbenika i radnih bilježnica za hrvatski jezik za sedmi razred osnovne škole te za prvi i treći razred gimnazije, u kojima se nastavna jedinica o prozodijskim sredstvima obrađuje (*Hrvatska krijesnica 7*, *Riječi hrvatske 7*, *Volimo hrvatski! 7*, *Hrvatski jezik 7*, *Fon-fon 1*, *Učimo hrvatski jezik 1 i 3*), upućuje na različite načine na koje je ta tema obrađena, ali i na probleme u terminologiji te u popisu i opisu. Analiziraju se i uspoređuju pristupi u pripadajućim priručnicima za nastavnike i učitelje hrvatskoga jezika u kojima shtre nalaze operacionalizirani ciljevi i zadaće. Problem je i u samome nazivlju (vrednote govor(e)noga jezika, govorne vrednote, intonacijska sredstva). U samo jednom od sedam analiziranih udžbenika navodi se definicija govornih vrednota, i to neprecizna (definiraju se kao različite mogućnosti kazivanja i razlikovanja značenja u govoru). Popis govornih vrednota vrlo je raznolik i svim su udžbenicima zajedničke tek četiri govorne vrednote. U zadatcima za vježbu velika se pozornost posvećuje pisanome tekstu, a premala govornome izražavanju i uvježbavanju prozodijskih sredstva (u čitanju naglas, recitiranju, dramatizaciji, javnome govoru). Iznijet će se načini na koje bi se obrada te nastavne jedinice mogla unaprijediti, moguća rješenja terminoloških nejasnoća te će se predložiti načini uvježbavanja pojedinih govornih sredstava.

**Ključne riječi:** prozodijska sredstva, govorne vrednote, nastava, usmeno izražavanje

## PROCESSING OF PROSODIC FEATURES IN CROATIAN LANGUAGE TEACHING

The term *values of the spoken language* was first introduced to stylistics by Peter Guberina (1952). He divides them into acoustic: intonation, intensity, tempo and pause; visual: facial expressions, gestures, and real context. Guberina defines them as features that are beyond lexical and that get their value only together with sound and movement, allowing us to use less words and /or to be more expressive. In modern phonetic and linguistic terminology, the terms prosody, prosodic and paralinguistic features are commonly used. Guberina's term is rarely used and has narrower meaning. According to Škarić (1991), prosodic features are tone and intonation; loudness and stress; timbre; spectral composition; pause; tempo; rhythm; speech modulation; mode of consonant and vowel pronunciation, as well as facial expressions and gesture.

In speech, which consists of two layers - the voice and the text, these common prosodic features are part of the layer of text: word prosody and sentence prosody, but also of voice layers: expressiveness and speech noise. Analysis of textbooks and workbooks for Croatian language for the seventh-grade students in elementary school and for the first and third grade students in grammar school, in which the teaching unit prosodic features is processed (*Hrvatska krijesnica 7, Riječi hrvatske 7, Volimo hrvatski! 7, Hrvatski jezik 7, Fon-fon 1, Učimo hrvatski jezik 1 i 3*) shows the different ways of addressing the topic, but also points to problems in terminology, listing and description. The approaches in the related handbook for teachers, which contain operationalized goals and tasks, are analyzed and compared. The problem lies in the terminology itself (values of spoken language, spoken values, intonation features). Only one out of seven analyzed textbooks imprecisely defines speech values (as different possibilities of saying and distinguishing meaning in speech). The list of spoken values is very diverse and only four spoken values can be found in all textbooks. A lot of attention in exercises is attributed to written text, and very little to spoken language and practicing of prosodic features (reading aloud, reciting, dramatizing, public speaking). This paper will outline the ways in which the processing of these units could be improved. It will also present possible solutions to terminological ambiguities and propose some ways of practicing certain values of the spoken language.

**Keywords:** prosodic features, speech values, teaching, oral expression



**Janja Žmavc**

Educational Research Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia

## **RHETORICAL EDUCATION IN PRIMARY SCHOOL – CLASSICAL TECHNIQUES AND PRACTICES IN A PROCESS ORIENTED APPROACH TO TEACHING RHETORIC**

In the paper, we shall present the characteristics of teaching rhetoric as a compulsory subject in the ninth grade of elementary school in Slovenia. It represents a unique education feature, since in other European educational systems (as well as elsewhere in the world) at elementary level they are not familiar with an independent subject, where pupils could systematically learn the principles of successful public persuasion. After a brief presentation of the circumstances surrounding the placement of the subject of rhetoric in the Slovenian elementary school curriculum, we shall outline its pedagogical characteristics and present some particularities of its practical carrying out from 1999 to the present day. The main focus in the second part of our paper shall be the presentation of the results of the project “Developing of theoretical bases and practical guidelines for teaching rhetoric in the primary and secondary school” which is taking part at the Educational Research Institute Slovenia from 2018. We will demonstrate the main (content and didactic) directions of the developing a new version of the curriculum for teaching rhetoric in the primary school. Thus trying to show that rhetoric seen as an integral part of the elementary education does not represent an additional ballast or burden, but precisely because of its unique (i. e. classical) features, it enables a critical reflection of knowledge and promotes democratic processes within the school environment, which represent one of the key elements in development of students' competences for effective participation in modern democratic cultures.

**Keywords:** rhetorical education, primary school, classical rhetoric, process oriented planning

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF AUTHORS, AFFILIATION AND EMAIL ADDRESSES

- Aczél, Petra. Corvinus University of Budapest, [petra.aczel@uni-corvinus.hu](mailto:petra.aczel@uni-corvinus.hu)
- Beck, Boris. University of Zagreb, [boris.beck@fpzg.hr](mailto:boris.beck@fpzg.hr)
- Bermejo Luque, Lilian. University of Granada, [lilianbl@ugr.es](mailto:lilianbl@ugr.es)
- Biočina, Zdravka. Zagreb School of Economics and Management, [zbiocina@windowslive.com](mailto:zbiocina@windowslive.com)
- Bodlović, Petar. University of Groningen, [pbodlovic@gmail.com](mailto:pbodlovic@gmail.com)
- Budzyńska-Daca, Agnieszka. University of Warsaw, [a.budzynska@uw.edu.pl](mailto:a.budzynska@uw.edu.pl)
- Hinton, Martin. University of Łódź, [Martin.hinton@uni.lodz.pl](mailto:Martin.hinton@uni.lodz.pl)
- Horga, Damir. University of Zagreb, [dhorga@ffzg.hr](mailto:dhorga@ffzg.hr)
- Ilie, Cornelia. Strömstad Academy, [cornelia.ilie@gmail.com](mailto:cornelia.ilie@gmail.com)
- Jarratt, Susan C. University of California, Irvine, [sjarratt@uci.edu](mailto:sjarratt@uci.edu)
- Junker, Kirk W. University of Cologne, [kirk.junker@uni-koeln.de](mailto:kirk.junker@uni-koeln.de)
- Khomenko, Iryna. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, [khomenkoi.ukr1@gmail.com](mailto:khomenkoi.ukr1@gmail.com)
- Kovač, Mirjana Matea. University of Split, [mirjana@ffst.hr](mailto:mirjana@ffst.hr)
- Lloyd, Keith. Kent State University at Stark, [ksslloyd@kent.edu](mailto:ksslloyd@kent.edu)
- Lukšić, Sandra. University of Split, [sluksic@ffst.hr](mailto:sluksic@ffst.hr)
- Majdzińska-Koczorowicz, Aleksandra. University of Łódź, [aleksandra.majdzinska@uni.lodz.pl](mailto:aleksandra.majdzinska@uni.lodz.pl)
- Martinović, Nera. J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, [nmartinovic@ffos.hr](mailto:nmartinovic@ffos.hr)
- Matthiesen, Christina. University of Copenhagen, [cm@hum.ku.dk](mailto:cm@hum.ku.dk)
- Mirocha, Piotr. Jagiellonian University, [pamirocha@gmail.com](mailto:pamirocha@gmail.com)
- Pavlović, Marina. Kindergarten „Bajka“, Zagreb, [marina-911@hotmail.com](mailto:marina-911@hotmail.com)
- Pletikos, Olof Elenmari. University of Zagreb, [epletikos@ffzg.hr](mailto:epletikos@ffzg.hr)
- Poropat Darrer, Jagoda. Umijeće Govora j.d.o.o., Zagreb, [umijece-govora@darrer.hr](mailto:umijece-govora@darrer.hr)
- Rajh, Ivanka. Zagreb School of Economics and Management, [irajh@zsem.hr](mailto:irajh@zsem.hr)
- Rogowska, Kinga. University of Warsaw, [kj.rogowska2@uw.edu.pl](mailto:kj.rogowska2@uw.edu.pl)
- Šegvić, Branka. Udruga STIP, Split, [abm.prijevodi@gmail.com](mailto:abm.prijevodi@gmail.com)
- Sigrell, Anders. Lund University, [anders.sigrell@kom.lu.se](mailto:anders.sigrell@kom.lu.se)
- Szurek, Agnieszka. University of Warsaw, [agnieszka.szurek@uw.edu.pl](mailto:agnieszka.szurek@uw.edu.pl)
- Tomić, Diana. University of Zagreb, [dtomic@ffzg.hr](mailto:dtomic@ffzg.hr)
- Urbański, Mariusz. Adam Mickiewicz University, [murbansk@gmail.com](mailto:murbansk@gmail.com)
- Vančura, Alma. J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, [avancura@ffos.hr](mailto:avancura@ffos.hr)
- Varošaneć-Škarić, Gordana. University of Zagreb, [gvarosan@ffzg.hr](mailto:gvarosan@ffzg.hr)
- Vignjević, Jelena. University of Zagreb, [jelena.vignjevic@ufzg.hr](mailto:jelena.vignjevic@ufzg.hr)
- Vlah, Ana. Utrecht University (NL), [ana.vlah@outlook.com](mailto:ana.vlah@outlook.com)
- Vlašić Duić, Jelena. University of Zagreb, Croatia, [jvduii79c@ffzg.hr](mailto:jvduii79c@ffzg.hr)
- Žmavc, Janja. Educational Research Institute, [janja.zmavc@gmail.com](mailto:janja.zmavc@gmail.com)
- Kupś, Patrycja. Adam Mickiewicz University, [patkup1@st.amu.edu.pl](mailto:patkup1@st.amu.edu.pl)

CONFERENCE SUPPORTERS 2020/SPONZORI KONFERENCIJE 2020

SVEUČILIŠTE JOSIPA JURJA STROSSMAYERA U OSIJEKU

**FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET**



Općina Postira

**POSTIRA**



