

STUDIES IN THE SYMBOLIC INTERACTION OF SPEECH DISCOURSE

STUDIES IN THE SYMBOLIC  
INTERACTION OF SPEECH DISCOURSE

# 演讲话语

## 象征性互动研究

演讲话语是由一系列象征性互动构成的，所以恰当而有效的解读方式应该是综合考虑其生产与消费，注重演讲者与受众之间的双向互动。

● 张玉芳 / 著

STUDIES IN THE SYMBOLIC

INTERACTION OF SPEECH DISCOURSE

吉林大学出版社

STUDIES IN THE SYMBOLIC INTERACTION OF SPEECH DISCOURSE

**Studies In**  
**The Symbolic Interaction of Speech Discourse**

**演讲话语象征性互动研究**

张玉芳 著

吉林大学出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

演讲话语象征性互动研究 / 张玉芳著. — 长春 :  
吉林大学出版社, 2009. 10  
ISBN 978 - 7 - 5601 - 4932 - 5

I. ①演… II. ①张… III. ①演讲学 - 研究 IV.  
①H019

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2009) 第 179389 号

书 名: 演讲话语象征性互动研究  
作 者: 张玉芳 著

责任编辑、责任校对: 朱 进  
吉林大学出版社出版、发行  
开本: 787 × 1092 毫米 1/16  
印张: 12 字数: 60 千字  
ISBN 978 - 7 - 5601 - 4932 - 5

封面设计: 陈丽华  
吉林省显达印务有限公司 印刷  
2009 年 11 月 第 1 版  
2009 年 11 月 第 1 次印刷  
定价: 24.00 元

版权所有 翻印必究  
社址: 长春市明德路 421 号 邮编: 130021  
发行部电话: 0431 - 88499826  
网址: <http://www.jlup.com.cn>  
E-mail: [jlup@mail.jlu.edu.cn](mailto:jlup@mail.jlu.edu.cn)

# 前言

学习外语十几年,我对语言的认识经历了三个阶段:中学时认为它是一种交流工具,为我们的生活和工作服务;大学时接受了英语专业的系统教育和训练将它看作是人类文明的载体,为了解使用相关语言人民的社会、文化和历史服务;研究生时修读了语言学、语言哲学、应用语言学、外语教学法、话语分析、文学批评、符号学、西方修辞学及修辞批评等相关课程与专著,意识到在某种程度上它是人类社会的创造者,指导人类在交流中不断发展。认识的不断深化使我不仅关注各种语言现象,而且关注现象背后的原因,进而探索它引导人们通过交流创造社会的途径与规律。正是这种思想引发我思考生活中广泛存在的一类话语(例如演讲、广告、新闻报道与社论等):作为交际事件,这些话语中的交际双方是如何进行交流、沟通并最终就某一议题或事件取得一致意见、达成临时协议的?回答了这个问题将有助于我们揭示人们为引导议题(正是不断解决各类议题才推动社会向前发展的)朝某一期望的方向发展而进行交流的某些内在规律,这有利于提高互动双方的交际能力,从而取得良好的交际效果,并最终促进社会发展。

经观察发现这类话语与修辞学研究的传统的公众演说是一脉相承的,有着内在的共性,即交际双方通过多维度、多层面的象征性互动来取得相互认同、达成暂时性的统一,并最终实现各自的交际目的。据此,为了方便研究这类话语,本书借用旧的命名法“演讲”来统指它们,但赋予它新的内涵,将它重新界定为:由各式各样象征性互动组成的特殊话语,它通过人们在特定情景中就面临的争议性问题进行相互致辞、互动来取得对相关议题的临时性意见一致。其实,在语言学、话语分析及新闻传播学界对类似的大众话语的研究已经很多,本研究就是站在这些巨人的肩膀上,发现从交际双方的互动来研究的还不多,因此希望能够从这个角

度做一些补充。这样,本研究就是致力于探索从演讲者与受众双方的象征性互动入手来分析这些演讲话语的恰当且有效的方法,从而取得更好的解读效果;同时反过来也能指导交际双方开展更有效的互动实践。

现有的演讲批评解读研究主要有两大领域:一个是修辞批评;另一个是话语分析。但是,它们的方法都没能满足从多维度、多层面象征性互动的视角对演讲话语进行有效解读的需要。在修辞批评方面,从现有的二十种方法中,本研究依据它们与象征性互动的关系归纳总结成五大类演讲修辞批评:“演讲者为中心型”,“意识形态或动机着迷型”,“效果驱动型”,“语境导向型”以及“批评者决定型”。在话语分析方面,本研究依据语言因素与非语言变量之间的关系概括了三类演讲话语分析的趋势:语篇内部的微观语言因素分析,语篇外部的宏观语境研究,以及两者相结合来研究语篇与社会语境的互动关系。虽然这些研究方法从不同角度为演讲话语的解读提供参考与指导意见,但是它们各自存在的倾向与不同程度的缺陷妨碍它们将注意力投向演讲者与受众的象征性互动上来。本研究正是为弥补这些缺陷、探索演讲中各个层面的多维互动而设置的。

对演讲要素与作用的剖析证实了本研究的假设:演讲话语是由一系列象征性互动构成的,所以恰当而有效的解读方式应该是综合考虑其生产与消费,注重演讲者与受众之间的双向互动。进一步考察演讲与修辞学和语言学在理论与实践上的关系,发现演讲与修辞是相互依存的,而语言则是演讲话语生产与解读不可或缺的重要因素,并且修辞学与语言学在演讲话语的解读与批评中的作用是互补性的。因此,在吸收前人研究成果的精华的基础上,本研究尝试着融合并发展修辞学与语言学的相关理论与方法从象征性互动的角度来解读演讲话语。

从修辞学中,本研究吸收并发展了古希腊 Sophists 的“辩证法”和 Aristotle 的三种“或然式论据”,古罗马 Hermagoras 与 Cicero 的“争议点理论”,以及现当代 Lloyd Bitzer 的修辞情景、Kenneth Burke 的认同理论、Chaim Perelman 和 Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca 的“普世受众”与“普世价值”、Wayne C. Booth 的“求同修辞”与“理想的修辞”以及 Stephen Toulmin 的“论辩模式”。之所以选择这些理论与主张是因为其中蕴含了丰富的象征性互动的思想、方法与策略,代表了“演讲者主导型”与“受众加权型”的互动思想,同时也展现了语篇内部的互动关系。此外,分析还表明现当

## II

代修辞学家 Burke, Perelman & Olbrechts - Tyteca, Booth 及 Toulmin 的思想是一脉相承的,共同揭示了修辞作为交际艺术其本质是一种由两个互为因果关系的认同过程组成的认同性互动。因此,他们的理论主张能从不同角度为人们提供解读演讲话语互动的方法。

从语言学中,本研究借鉴了 Beaugrande 和 Dressler 的四个语篇性并依据演讲话语的特点将它们发展成“话语性”,分别是目的性、可接受性、互文性及互语境性。目的性和可接受性有助于人们考察基于语篇的篇内互动,反映了在语篇建构中演讲者的目的及受众的期望与语境的象征性谈判与妥协;而互文性和互语境性则展现了基于语境的篇外互动,体现了演讲者与受众围绕语境展开的各种互动,包括语篇类型、语篇典故、前语境和后语境的选择与建构,以及这些语境因素与语篇建构的相互影响等等。

融合修辞学的理论与语言学的原理,即依据语言学的“话语性”提供的线索,运用修辞的理论与策略,本研究对演讲话语进行了多层面的探索,建立了三维框架为从象征性互动的视角批评解读演讲话语提供意识与方向指导。一,重建互动语境。这反映了演讲者与受众如何依据各自的目的,通过与相对自然的宏观语境的互动来共同建构演讲话语的特定语境,其中包含了三个层面的互动:语境与演讲者、语境与受众以及语境与演讲语篇。二,揭示权力关系。这种关系是象征性的:一方面受众是演讲成败的决定者,因而能够“迫使”演讲者在各层面的互动中迎合他们,顺应他们的特点及各种制约性变量;另一方面演讲者却有权决定受众的资格以及参加演讲互动的身份,是预期的理想受众、还是虚受众、亦或是非受众。演讲者的这种权力源于他/她诉诸修辞策略的能力,其中重塑并投射有利的修辞人格就是有效的手段之一。三,解构演讲语篇。利用 Toulmin 的论辩模式,从论辩的视角观察语篇中的各种互动关系。为展现这个框架在演讲批评中的具体运用,本研究分析了一些演讲话语,例如政策宣传、公众演说、报道、社论、声明、公告以及广告等等。

在探索批评解读演讲话语新途径的过程中,本研究发现了一系列的关系,涉及到演讲与修辞学、演讲与语言学以及修辞学与语言学,揭示了演讲的象征性互动本质以及修辞的双程认同性本质,探索了演讲者与受众之间的象征性权力关系,并在此基础上建立了一个系统的、可执行的、

综合了修辞学与语言学的三维框架从象征性互动的视角来解读演讲话语。希望这些能为今后演讲话语的创造性批评解读指明方向,为演讲话语的有效生产实践提供参考,为其它交际研究提供借鉴,也为写作与翻译、阅读与话语分析、交际与论辩的教学提供指导。因此,本书预设的目标读者是:中国学术界、教育界所有对交际研究有兴趣的学者、教师、研究生以及外语专业的本科高年级学生;西方修辞学、语言学、话语批评、语篇语言学等专业方向的研究生;正在实践各类演讲话语交际活动的相关人士,如政策的制订者及宣传者与他们的受众、各单位及公司的管理人员与他们的下属、从事跨文化交流与贸易的相关人员等。

本书是笔者在上海外国语大学攻读博士学位期间所做研究的成果。在此,我要感谢那些曾经给过我帮助和指导的老师和同学,特别是我的博导胡曙中教授,没有他的严格要求与不断鼓励、耐心指导与精心指点,我不可能在有限的时间里写成此书。同时,本研究还应归功于我的硕导福建师范大学的刘亚猛教授,是他引导并培养了我的学术兴趣,使我能够找到自己的研究方向。此外,我还要感谢家人与朋友,没有他们的支持、鼓励和帮助,我的求学之路不可能一帆风顺,也就完全谈不上有这项研究的开展与出版了。

当然,鉴于笔者知识与能力的局限性,本书的缺点与疏漏在所难免,恳请各位读者不吝赐教。

张玉芳

2009年4月于上海

# Contents

前言 .....	I
<b>Chapter One: Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 The Trigger of the Present Study: the Incongruity between         Speech Practice and Speech Criticism .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1.1 The Wax of Speech Practice .....	1
1.1.2 The Wane of Speech Criticism .....	2
<b>1.2 The General Purpose of the Present Research .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.3 Terminology, Theoretical Resources, and Methodology in This         Study .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.3.1 The Terminology in the Study .....	7
1.3.2 The Theoretical Resources for This Study .....	16
1.3.3 The Methodology in This Study .....	17
<b>1.4 The Organization of the Dissertation .....</b>	<b>18</b>
 <b>Chapter Two: Literature Review: Critical Study of the Rhe- torical Criticism and Discourse Analysis of Speech .....</b>	 <b>21</b>
<b>2.1 Rhetorical Criticism of Speech .....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1.1 Speaker-centered Criticism .....	24
2.1.2 Ideology-or-motive-fascinated Criticism .....	44
2.1.3 Effect-driven Criticism .....	52
2.1.4 Context-oriented Criticism .....	56
2.1.5 Critic-determined Criticism .....	58
2.1.6 General Summary of Rhetorical Criticism of Speech .....	61
<b>2.2 Discourse Analysis of Speech .....</b>	<b>62</b>
2.2.1 Intra-textual Micro-linguistic Analysis .....	62
2.2.2 Extra-textual Macro-linguistic Analysis .....	63



2.2.3	Combination of Intra-textual with Extra-textual Analyses: Critical Linguistic Analysis (CLA) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) .....	65
2.2.4	General Summary of Discourse Analysis of Speech .....	69
2.3	Summary .....	69

## **Chapter Three: The Theoretical Justification for the Present**

<b>Study</b>	72
<b>3.1 Why Can We Understand Speech through Symbolic Interaction?</b>	72
3.1.1 Symbolic Interaction Represented in the Constituents of Speech	72
3.1.2 Symbolic Interaction Demonstrated in the Functions of Speech	75
<b>3.2 The Theoretical Justification for Rhetorical Perspective</b>	76
3.2.1 The Relationship between Speech and Rhetoric	76
3.2.2 The Study of Symbolic Interactions in Rhetoric	77
<b>3.3 The Theoretical Justification for Linguistic Perspective</b>	81
3.3.1 The Relationship between Speech and Linguistics	82
3.3.2 The Study of Symbolic Interactions in Linguistics	83
<b>3.4 Summary</b>	86

## **Chapter Four: Symbolic Interaction from Rhetorical**

<b>Perspective</b>	87
<b>4.1 Interaction by Means of Identification</b>	87
<b>4.2 Interaction on Account of Universal Audience and Universal Value</b>	97
<b>4.3 Interaction as a Result of “Rhetoric of Assent” and Rhetorology</b>	102
4.3.1 Booth’s Ethical View on Rhetoric	104

4.3.2	Rhetoric of Assent .....	105
4.3.3	Listening Rhetoric (LR) and Rhetorology .....	107
4.3.4	Inspiration for Speech Understanding .....	110
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Interaction by Virtue of Argument .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>117</b>

## **Chapter Five: Symbolic Interaction from Linguistic**

<b>Perspective .....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>5.1 Intra-textual Interaction .....</b>	<b>121</b>
5.1.1 Interaction in the Intentionality .....	121
5.1.2 Interaction in the Acceptability .....	123
5.1.3 General Summary .....	125
<b>5.2 Extra-textual Interaction .....</b>	<b>126</b>
5.2.1 Interaction in the Intertextuality .....	127
5.2.2 Interaction in the Inter-contextuality .....	130
5.2.3 General Summary .....	135
<b>5.3 Summary .....</b>	<b>135</b>

## **Chapter Six: The Integrative Framework of Rhetoric and Linguistics for Understanding Speech as Symbolic Interaction 137**

<b>6.1 The Relationship between Rhetoric and Linguistics in Speech Criticism .....</b>	<b>137</b>
<b>6.2 An Integrative Three-dimensional Framework for Speech Understanding .....</b>	<b>140</b>
6.2.1 Recovering the Context .....	141
6.2.2 Uncovering the Symbolic Power Relations between Speaker and Audience .....	148
6.2.3 Deconstructing the Speech-text .....	155
<b>6.3 Summary .....</b>	<b>156</b>

<b>Chapter Seven: Conclusion .....</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>7.1 Major Findings .....</b>	<b>159</b>
7.1.1 Four Key Pairs of Relation .....	160
7.1.2 The Nature of Rhetorical Art: A Dual-process Identifying .....	162
7.1.3 Symbolic Power Relations between Speaker and Audience .....	164
7.1.4 Coined Terms: “Superspeaker,” “Pre-text” and “Post -text,” “Inter-contextuality,” “Discursivity,” and “CON- TEXT” .....	165
<b>7.2 Theoretical and Practical Contributions .....</b>	<b>166</b>
7.2.1 Theoretical Contribution: The Integrative Three-dimensional Framework of Rhetoric and Linguistics for Understanding Speech as Symbolic Interaction .....	166
7.2.2 Practical Contributions: Speech Criticism, Audience Awareness, and Pedagogy .....	169
<b>7.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research .....</b>	<b>170</b>
 <b>Works Cited .....</b>	 <b>172</b>
<b>List of Tables and Figures .....</b>	<b>182</b>

## Chapter One

# Introduction

Attracted by the ubiquity of speech practice in our world, but unsatisfied with the status quo of speech study, we attempt to offer a new way to study speech from the perspective of symbolic interaction. This chapter opens our research with the trigger of the present study, then presents our general purpose followed by the terminology, theoretical resources and methodology in this study, and finally outlines briefly the organization of this book.

## 1.1 The Trigger of the Present Study: the Incongruity between Speech Practice and Speech Criticism

### 1.1.1 The Wax of Speech Practice

As a dynamic mode of symbolic communication for inducing cooperation, speech is pervasive, with its shadow almost in every walk of life, affecting political, economic, intellectual, and social fields, concerning individual, national, and international affairs. First, speech remains an important medium for powerful politicians and celebrities to exert their public influence. Second, it becomes an effective means for ordinary people to carry out self-expression and interpersonal communication in their daily and professional lives. Take businessmen and scholars as example: for businessmen, it is an efficient way of trade negotiation; and for scholars, it is an active style of academic discussion (eg. keynote speeches in various conferences or forums). This indicates that speech has enhanced its status; instead of restricting itself in the hands of a few superior men, it serves the masses. To some extent, this makes more sense than its traditional part as the first one does. Third, thanks to the

marvels of electronic media, for instance radio, television, internet as global information network, and advanced traffic systems, such as convenient airline system, it has been an efficient vehicle for cross-cultural communication. For example, in diplomacy, it is an ideal way for countries to deal with the bilateral and international relations and keep peaceful and stable circumstances for development so that it is indispensable for every state visit.

### 1.1.2 The Wane of Speech Criticism

Fascinated by the omnipresent practice and diverse roles of speech, we notice that the nature of speech is symbolic interaction through visible, overt, explicit, and verbal signs or invisible, covert, implicit, and nonverbal symbols. Therefore, we wonder how each speech fulfils its function in a given case, that is, how it helps to solve the issue under consideration, what kind of relation exists among the participants, and how to understand speech as a kind of symbolic interactive communication. We look up the answers to these puzzles in the literature of speech study, but are unsatisfied.

In the West, there is an abundant resource of speech study, of which the most important and influential one is rhetoric. It was for the guidance of public address that rhetoric came into being in ancient Greece, flourished in Rome, and revived in the early twentieth century (Conley 4; Herrick 34; Kuypers 2; Brock, Scott, and Chesebro 14; Andrews, Leff, and Terrill 6-7). However, accordingly it was predominantly designed for facilitating speech production—delivering rather than speech consumption—understanding, though speech criticism was once highlighted by the rhetorical criticism initiated and represented by Herbert A. Wichelns and his followers who were inspired indirectly by the implied insight from various handbooks on speaker's art, especially Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Nevertheless, this kind of indirect inspiration is inadequate and infeasible for speech understanding because it seldom concerns the audience's standpoint.

What Wichelns had remarked in disappointment in his 1925 landmark essay that "We have not much serious criticism of oratory" (2) was lamented again in 1972 by Donald C. Bryant:

What is lacking in the province of rhetoric today [ ... ] is any considerable body of sophisticated *rhetorical* criticism of public address. The critical activity that has occurred [ ... ] has failed systematically to apply the accumulated inheritance of rhetorical theory and principle to the phenomena, the processes, the artifacts of public address; nor has rhetorical criticism ventured into new areas of theory and principle. (32, emphasis original)

And he regretted that “graduate departments of rhetoric and public address for several decades have been cultivating rhetorical criticism with earnest redundancy” (ibid. 32-33), that “our critics have not gone much beyond their forebears” (ibid. 33), and that “we have [ ... ] nothing really philosophical and comprehensive [ rhetorical criticism of public address ]” (ibid. 34).

Today, 35 years later, it may be safely said that this situation has not been improved and has become even worse to some extent. Speech has gradually lost its privilege in rhetorical study, because rhetoricians have paid less attention to speech but have been busy in expanding rhetoric to other communication<sup>①</sup> and in developing New Rhetoric.<sup>②</sup> This can be justified by the rhetorical theories developed in the twentieth century and the published monographs and essays

---

① This is proved by the change of the meaning of speech, from its original meaning of “speaking,” “address” to “speech communication.” And for more evidence, see our discussion about the concept of rhetoric in the section on terminology about “rhetorical criticism.”

② New rhetoric was created in the critique of traditional néo-Aristotelian rhetoric in the early twentieth century, and has flourished since 1960s, symbolized with Edwin Black’s book, *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study of Method*. It is a general concept to cover diverse schools of rhetorical studies, including Richards’s study of meaning and misunderstanding, Burke’s dramatic rhetoric and rhetoric of motive, Scott’s epistemic rhetoric, Griffin’s rhetoric of social movement, Perelman’s and Toulmin’s rhetoric of informal argument, feminist and ideological rhetoric, and so on.

on rhetoric in journals. ①

Frustrated in rhetoric, we turned to another main resource of speech study—discourse analysis. By virtue of linguistic orientation, approaches and principles of discourse analysis show more interest in intra-textual micro-linguistic details of speech-text than in extra-textual macro-linguistic elements of speech discourse as symbolic interactive communication. Therefore, from discourse analysis those puzzles can only be partly answered rather than completely solved (we will discuss this in detail in Chapter Two, Literature Review).

In China, our ancestors have a long history of practicing and studying speech. The first recorded speech is “Gan Shi,” ② a war speech made by Xiaqi, an ancient king living in about 21st century BC. (Li and Zou 14). Similar to the ancient Greece and Rome, Chinese speech study emerged in the axial age (600-400 BC.) in the works of pre-Han philosophers and disputers, such as Confucius, Mencius, Mozi, Laozi (Lao-tzu), Zhuangzi, Han Feizi (Han Fei Tzu), and so on (Zhang Yufang, “Power Relations between Speaker and Audience” 25-39). After thousands of years’ development, although nowadays lots of Speech Associations have been established throughout the country, especially in colleges and universities, and numerous textbooks and articles on speech, oratory, oral communication, and the like, have been published, we seldom find any satisfactory and convincing monographs or essays dealing with speech criticism, to say nothing of the symbolic interaction in speech.

It is obvious that, as Wichelns has stated long before,

human nature being what it is, there is no likelihood that face to face persuasion will cease to be a principle mode of exerting influence,

---

① For example: Quarterly Journal of Speech, Philosophy and Rhetoric, Rhetoric Review, Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Rhetorical Society Quarterly, Speech Teacher, Rhetorica, and Speech Communication. Though sometimes these journals also publish some articles about speech criticism, this is declined compared with the situation in the twentieth century.

② The story was recorded in one of the classics of ancient China, Shangshu [The Book of History].

whether in courts, in senate-house, or on the platform. It follows that *the critical study of oratorical method* is the study, not of a mode outworn, but of a permanent and important human activity. (2, emphasis added)

Here “the critical study of oratorical method” should be treated as critical study of the interactive method between speaker and audience. If we keep the imbalance between speech practice and speech criticism, what will be damaged is not only the status of speech in our world, but also the means and effects of our communication, and further the quality of our life, because “to disparage eloquence is to depreciate mankind” (Morley 1903: 593) (qtd. in Wichelns 1). It is to avoid this undesirable tragedy that we set out with this study.

## 1.2 The General Purpose of the Present Research

We want to change the inadequate situation of speech criticism by filling in the blank of understanding speech from the perspective of symbolic interaction. Different from conventional views of speech, the ongoing study seeks to understand speech as *a special kind of discourse with various symbolic interactions, so as to pursue temporary agreement on the issue under consideration*. Our discussion will focus on the process as well as the product of speech interaction by probing into the following questions:

- 1) What does symbolic interaction mean? Why can we understand speech through symbolic interaction? And what is the relationship between speech practice and its nature as symbolic interaction?
- 2) How does one part address the other in terms of symbolic interaction? How many kinds or dimensions of symbolic interaction are potentially involved in a speech?
- 3) How does each symbolic interaction work?
- 4) What does temporary agreement as the purpose of speech mean? And how does it illustrate itself in the speech?
- 5) What is the relationship between each interaction and the given



speech's purpose? That is, how does each interaction facilitate or hamper the achievement of temporary agreement? And why?

And thus the present study attempts to explore speech from diverse levels and dimensions of symbolic interaction, explicit as well as implicit, concerning process as well as product, involving the interactions between context and speaker, context and audience, context and text, and speaker and audience, with the last pair as the key around which the others revolve. This study will show us:

- 1) how to discover the speech's function and position in a given issue and in the broader social and historical context, reflected in the range, degree and nature of temporary agreement achieved by the interactions between context and speech;
- 2) how to appreciate the role of speech-text as the site and product of interactions through various textualities, which, with the guidance of rhetorical theories and on account of context, become discursivities;
- 3) how to detect the speaker's intelligence, motive and strategies through the interactions among speaker, context, and audience;
- 4) how to decode the audience's power, expectation and re-action through the interactions among audience, context, and speaker.

Of course, it is not for the sake of demonstrating interactions but for revealing the process of producing and consuming a speech that we center on these rhetorical-linguistic interactions, so that we can provide certain theoretical and methodological orientation for the production and consumption of speech in the future.

### **1.3 Terminology, Theoretical Resources, and Methodology in This Study**

For better understanding of this research, first of all we should explain some key concepts and relevant theoretical and methodological resources.