Robert Prus
University of Waterloo, Canada

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting[1]

Abstract   The term "rhetoric" often has been maligned by those lacking familiarity with classical Greek and Latin scholarship. However, a more sustained, historically-informed examination of persuasive interchange is of fundamental importance for the study of human knowing and acting across the humanities and social sciences, as well as all other realms of community life.

While acknowledging several contemporary scholars who have reengaged aspects of classical Greek and Latin rhetoric, this statement gives particular attention to the works of Kenneth Burke and the linkages of Burke's writings with Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, as well as American pragmatist thought and the ethnographically, conceptually-oriented sociology known as symbolic interactionism (Blumer 1969; Strauss 1993; Prus 1996; 1997; 1999; 2015; Prus and Grills 2003).

Because scholarship does not exist as isolated instances of genius, even the productions of highly accomplished individuals such as Kenneth Burke are best understood within the context of a horizontal-temporal, as well as a vertical-historical intellectual community. Accordingly, Burke's contributions to the human sciences more generally and pragmatist social theory (along with its sociological extension, symbolic interaction) more specifically are best comprehended within this broader, historically-enabled scholarly context.

Kenneth Burke's dramatistic pragmatism is not the only missing link between classical Greek thought and symbolic interactionism, but Burke's work on rhetoric represents a particularly important medium for extending the conceptual and analytic parameters of contemporary symbolic interaction. Indeed, Kenneth Burke's scholarship has important implications for the fuller study of community life as implied in the most fundamental and enabling terms of human knowing and acting.

Keywords   Kenneth Burke; Dramatistic Pragmatism; Classical Greek Scholarship; Symbolic Interaction; Rhetoric; Dramatistic Sociology; Knowing and Acting; Aristotle; Cicero; Erving Goffman

Robert Prus is a sociologist (Professor Emeritus) at the University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. A symbolic interactionist, ethnographer, and social theorist, Robert Prus has been examining the conceptual and methodological connections of American pragmatist philosophy and its sociological offshoot, symbolic interactionism, with Classical Greek, Latin, and interim scholarship. In addition to his work on the developmental flows of pragmatist social thought in rhetoric, he also has been studying the flows of Western social thought in the interrelated areas of poetics (fictional representations), philosophy, ethnohistory, religion, education and scholarship, love and friendship, politics and governing practices, and deviance and morality. As part of a larger venture, Robert Prus also has been analyzing a fuller range of texts produced by Emile Durkheim (most notably Durkheim's later, but lesser known, works on morality, education, religion and philosophy), mindfully of their pragmatist affinities with Aristotle's foundational emphasis on the nature of human knowing and acting as well as Blumerian symbolic interactionism.

email address: prus@uwaterloo.ca / prus007@gmail.com

For rhetoric as such is not rooted in any past condition of human society. It is rooted in an essential function of language itself, a function that is wholly realistic, and is continually born anew; the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols. [Burke 1969 (1950):43]

Although well-known as a dramatist, rhetorician, public philosopher, and literary critic, Kenneth Burke's scholarship has been described as fascinating and brilliant, as well as obscure and disconnected. For our more immediate purposes, however, I will approach Kenneth Burke as a "medium of interchange" between the classical literary world of the humanities and the sociological study of human knowing and acting, as well as a conceptual bridge between classical Greek and Latin social thought of the past and the symbolic interactionist tradition of the present with its emphasis on the study of human knowing and acting.

Clearly, there is much more to Burke's scholarship than his involvements in rhetoric, but because classical Greek and Latin rhetoric has been so thoroughly and precisely articulated, Burke's dramatism represents a particularly valuable resource for connecting the scholarly productions of the present with the intellectual accomplishments of the past.

Some sociologists, particularly those in symbolic interactionism, may be aware of Kenneth Burke's "dramatism" through their attentiveness to Erving Goffman's (especially 1959; 1963a; 1963b; 1971) "dramaturgical sociology." Still, even most of those who have found Goffman's materials especially valuable for their own work are apt to have had little sustained familiarity with Kenneth Burke's scholarship. Although several scholars have attempted to draw attention to the sociologically enabling features of Kenneth Burke's dramatism prior to,

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

concurrently with, and beyond that more commonly associated with Erving Goffman's dramaturgical metaphor,[2] they have been only marginally successful in this venture.[3] However, virtually no consideration has been given to (a) the foundations of the analytic approaches that Burke represents or (b) the implications of Burke's works for connecting an interactionist study of human group life with classical Greek and Latin scholarship.

Still, it was only in tracing the flows of Western social thought that I became more mindful of the relevance of Burke's work for the sociological venture that extended beyond Erving Goffman's dramaturgical sociology. While highly mindful of the potency of Goffman's analyses of impression management for the study of human group life (e.g., Prus and Sharper 1977; Prus and Irini 1980; Prus 1989a; 1989b), my appreciation of the importance of Kenneth Burke's analyses of human group life developed largely as a consequence of my exposure to classical Greek thought while writing a book on power as a realm of intersubjective accomplishment (Prus 1999) and later (Prus 2003; 2004; 2007a; 2008a; 2013a; 2015) reflecting on the affinities of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Rhetoric* with the interactionist approach more generally.

It is in this way that I became more aware of Kenneth Burke as a missing link, a "medium of interchange" between present-day interactionist scholarship and classical Greek and Latin social thought. As such, a consideration of Kenneth Burke's role in this process represents an instructive instance of "the sociology of knowing"—denoting the historical, developmental flows and disjunctures of Western social thought. While drawing attention to the partial, marginal, and precarious nature of scholarly developments, this paper also indicates the importance of scholars explicitly acknowledging their sources. In addition to the advantage of "knowing the past," for more fully comprehending and assessing the productions of the present, references to the scholars and productions of the past represent important resources for thought and more sustained comparative analyses in the pursuit of more adequate conceptualizations of human group life. In attending to some of the sources with which Kenneth Burke worked, we begin to see promising ways of extending the interactionist tradition. Indeed, Burke's pragmatist-oriented texts provide a particularly important set of departure points for a more substantial voyage into the fuller, longer-term pragmatist study of human knowing and acting.

Given the issues at hand, this paper assumes some reader familiarity with Erving Goffman's dramaturgical sociology, as well as Blumerian or Chicago-style symbolic interactionism.[4] As well, because few social scientists are familiar with classical Greek scholar-

ship, it may be instructive to provide a preliminary introduction to classical Greek and Latin rhetoric.

In what follows, I first discuss (a) rhetoric as a realm of persuasive interchange from the classical Greek era to the present time, giving particular attention to (b) the major texts that Kenneth Burke developed with respect to the study of human group life more generally and rhetoric as activity more specifically. Then, following (c) a consideration of some other contemporary statements on rhetoric and their affinities with the work of Kenneth Burke, the pragmatist tradition and the symbolic interactionist emphasis on the study of community life, this paper (d) concludes with a statement that more fully recognizes the potent, uniquely enabling potential of Kenneth Burke's dramatism for extending the conceptual and methodological parameters of contemporary symbolic interactionism.

Engaging the Classical Greek and Latin Rhetorical Tradition

Whereas the term "rhetoric" often has been invoked in pejorative terms to refer to shallow instances of deceptive communication, those adopting this viewpoint typically are unaware of the highly detailed analytic accounts of persuasive endeavor that one encounters in classical Greek and Latin scholarship.[5] Relatedly, they generally also fail to compre-

hend the extended relevance of the analysis of rhetoric for the study of contested reality in all realms of human interchange.

While focusing on the contributions of Kenneth Burke to contemporary symbolic interactionism, rhetoric is envisioned as a realm of communication in which people attempt to shape (and resist) the ways that others define, think about, and act towards all manners of objects (denoting any shared point of reference). Instances of influence work and resistance may be directed towards a single person or small identifiable groups, as well as much larger, more diffuse groupings and possibly very vague categories of targets (as implied in the extended instances of the electronic mass media). Still, even in highly unilateral instances (affording no opportunity for interchange), communication endeavors inevitably involve the matters of interpretation and the potential for reflection, deliberation, and meaningful activity on the part of the target-recipients.

People may envision influence work as especially pertinent to political, legal, and other evaluative contexts, but rhetoric traverses all areas of human group life. This includes religion, work and management, marketing, family relations, love and friendship, entertainment, education, scholarship, technology, and science.

Approached in pragmatist terms, this paper acknowledges people's capacities for agency and strategic interchange—as suggested in the enabling features of linguistic communication, reflectivity, intentionality, interpretation, activity, assessment,

---

[2] In addition to the many publications that address Erving Goffman's dramaturgical sociology in *The Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* and *Symbolic Interaction*, readers are referred to the collected set of papers in Dennis Brissett and Charles Edgley's (1990) *Life as Theater*, Gary Alan Fine and Greg W. H. Smith's (2000) *Erving Goffman*, and Charles Edgley's (2013) *The Drama of Social Life* for more extended indications of the scope and applications of Goffman's dramaturgical metaphor within the sociological tradition.

[3] Those providing more notable commentaries on the sociological relevance of Kenneth Burke's work include C. Wright Mills (1940), Hugh Danziel Duncan (1951; 1953; 1962; 1969), Dennis Brissett and Charles Edgley (1990), Robert Perinbayagam (1985), Joseph Gusfield (1989), and Ann Branaman (2013).

[4] In addition to Blumer (1969) and Strauss (1993), see Prus (1996) *Symbolic Interaction and Ethnographic Research* for a more extended statement on symbolic interaction and an overview of Erving Goffman's dramaturgical sociology within the interactionist tradition. Prus (1997) provides an extended, activity-oriented ethnographic research agenda that was notably informed by Goffman's dramaturgical sociology.

[5] I offer the weakness of my own education as a case in point. Although I had been long interested in the study of influence (and resistance) as a social process (Prus 1975; 1976; 1989a; 1989b; 1993; 1994; 1996; 1997; Prus and Sharper 1977; Prus and Irini 1980), it was only as I was developing a text on power as intersubjective accomplishment (Prus 1999) that I first became aware of the pronounced relevance and exceptional analytic potency of classical Greek and Latin rhetoric for the study of human knowing and acting.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

and meaningful ongoing adjustment (see: Mead 1934; Blumer 1969; Prus 1996; 1997; 1999; 2007b; Prus and Grills 2003).

Like many areas of classical Greek and Roman scholarship, the exceptionally potent analyses of influence work (and resistance) developed by Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and others in the classical Greek and Roman eras have received notably limited, as well as uneven attention over the millennia (Prus 2004). Thus, whereas one encounters some explicit scholarly re-engagements of classical Greek and Latin rhetoric here and there in the historical flows of Western social thought, there has been a resurgence of attention directed towards this literature in the 20th and now 21st centuries.

Although the linkages of contemporary scholarship with Greek and Latin rhetoric have only marginally been restored in the 20th and 21st century literature, a number of scholars of whom Kenneth Burke is particularly consequential have contributed to this venture. Even though this material has had a more obvious presence in "literary studies" (and rhetoric as a subfield within), classical rhetoric has almost entirely been disregarded by those in the social sciences.

Still, since classical Greek and Latin rhetoric (especially that of Aristotle and Cicero) deals so directly, centrally, and precisely with the interrelated matters of human knowing and acting, the more recent attention given to this literature, along with the broader arena of classical scholarship in which it is embedded, has exceptionally important implications for the social sciences and the study of human group life more generally.

The present statement on Kenneth Burke and contemporary rhetoric emerged as part of a larger study of the development of Western social thought (and especially pragmatist philosophy). Focusing on the literature that attends to the nature of human knowing and acting from the classical Greek era to the present time (following my reading of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in 1998), I have been tracing the development of pragmatist scholarship (amidst varying perspectives, agendas, and disruptions) over the millennia and across a number of areas of community life.[6]

In addition to attending to the interconnectedness of rhetoric and pragmatist philosophy, I also have been mindful of developments (and disjunctures) in pragmatist thought as this pertains to religion, morality and regulation, education, history, poetics (i.e., fiction), interpersonal relations, politics, education, and science. Although I had not anticipated becoming involved in all of these areas of community life, especially on a more or less concurrent basis, these substantive areas are much more interfused than we are encouraged to think as social scientists.

As well, the classical Greek authors, of whom Plato and Aristotle are most central, have dealt with these

and other subject matters in extended analytic detail. Accordingly, whereas my preliminary interest was in rhetoric as a realm of influence work, I became drawn into a much fuller appreciation of classical Greek, Roman, and interim social thought as I learned more about the literature and the integration of people's activities across the broader realms of community life.[7]

It is often assumed that scholarship proceeds in an essentially cumulative, progressively sophisticated, and improved manner, with the best of the past being preserved to inform contemporary academic life. However, as history teaches us (see: Durkheim 1977 [1904-1905]; also Prus 2012), this often is not the case. Consequently, even though there may be considerable continuity and remarkable advances in some fields of study over extended time periods, one encounters major gaps and lapses of intellectual activity, as well as pockets of more intense scholarship in particular subject matters.

Relatedly, theories, concepts, and practices claimed to be "new and improved" often represent recycled, sometimes poorly construed versions of ideas, concepts, arrangements, and activities from the past. It is also the case that particularly valuable concepts and practices from the past may be neglected, if not more entirely lost, as a consequence of various human agendas, resistances, fads, fashions and unwitting disregard, along with the natural ravages of time.

More specifically, even though the names Plato, Aristotle, Cicero are often encountered in academic settings, the texts developed by these authors and others from the classical Greek and Latin eras are not particularly well-known—even among scholars in seemingly relevant disciplines. Indeed, a closer examination of the historical flows of Western social thought reveals that a scholarly attentiveness to these texts has been notably partial—subject to considerable divergence of thought, distortion, resistance, and willful destruction, as well as inadvertent neglect at various times and places.

Notably, even the widely proclaimed 16th century Western European Renaissance, with its artistic and expressive emphases, only partially resulted in a revitalization of classical rhetoric and philosophy. As a consequence of the 16th century Protestant Reformation and the 17th century scientific (so-called "enlightenment") dismissal, if not also denigration, of much of the historically-enabling past, even less attention would be given to rhetoric as a classically informed realm of study in the 17th-19th centuries.[8]

---

[6] An earlier, but still very viable overview statement of this agenda can be found in Prus (2004). Some more focused considerations of the literature I have been developing on the transhistorical features of pragmatist scholarship can be found in Prus (2003; 2004; 2006; 2007a; 2007b; 2007c; 2008a; 2008b; 2008c; 2008d; 2009a; 2009b; 2010; 2011a; 2011b; 2011c; 2011d; 2012; 2013a; 2013b; 2013c; 2014a; 2014b; 2015), Prus and Burk (2010), and Prus and Camara (2010). For a biographical account of the developmental flow of the evolution of this project within my broader involvements in sociology, see: Kleinknecht (2007).

[7] Those familiar with Emile Durkheim's *Moral Education* (1961 [1902-1903]), *The Evolution of Educational Thought* (1977 [1904-1905]), and *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (1915 [1912]) will likely appreciate the importance of this observation.

[8] To better locate the present statement relative to the longer term developmental flows and disjunctures of rhetoric as a field of study from the classical Greek era to the 19th century, I have provided an abbreviated list of the more consequential enablers of rhetoric as a realm of scholarship, along with a few particularly notable facilitators and detractors: Gorgias (485-380 BCE) Greece; Protagoras (480-411 BCE) Greece; Plato (420-348 BCE) Greece [Enabler & Detractor]; Isocrates (436-338 BCE) Greece; Aristotle (384-322 BCE) Greece; Cicero (106-43 BCE) Rome; Quintilian (35-95 CE) Rome; St. Augustine (354-430) North Africa [Enabler & Detractor]; Martianus Capella (text circa 410-429) North Africa; Alcuin (732-804) Britain/France; Charlemagne (742-814) France [Scholarly Facilitator]; Hrabanus Maurus (785-856) Germany; Al-Farabi, Abu Nasr (870-950) Iran; Notker Labeo (950-1022) Germany; Anselm of Besate (circa 1000-1060) Italy; John of Salisbury (1115-1180) England; Thierry of Chartres (1150) France; Brunetto Latini (1210-1294) Italy; Aegidius Romanus [Giles of Rome] (1243-1316) France; George of Trebizond (1395-1486) Greece/Italy;

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Envisioning rhetoric as denoting instances of influence work and resistance that permeate all realms of human group life, the material following addresses (1) the state of rhetoric in contemporary scholarship in the humanities and the social sciences, (2) the role that some present-day scholars have assumed in reengaging classical Greek and Latin scholarship, and (3) some of the implications of these materials for the broader study of human knowing and acting.

With little in the way of a 19th century classical rhetorical heritage on which to build, 20th century considerations of rhetoric are highly diverse and largely have lost connections with the works of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Still, there has been something of an intellectual revival in the study of rhetoric as a humanly accomplished realm of endeavor.

There also has been an increased awareness, through Aristotle's work, of the necessity of examining persuasive interchange within the context of "the act" on the part of some rhetoricians, philosophers, and social scientists.

Peter Ramus (1515-1572) France; Thomas Wilson (1525-1581) England; Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) Holland [Enabler & Detractor]; Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) England [Enabler & Detractor]; Gerhard Johann Vossius (1577-1649) Holland; Descartes René (1596-1650) France [Detractor]; Bernard Lamy (1640-1715) France; Francois Fénelon (1651-1715) France; Claude Buffier (1661-1737) France; Charles Rollin (1661-1741) France; Giambattista Vico (1668-1744) Italy; George Campbell (1719-1796) Scotland; Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) Germany [Detractor]; and Richard Whately (1787-1863) England.
Moving towards a consideration of rhetoric on a more contemporary plane, it may be instructive to acknowledge what has been termed a "19th century hiatus in rhetorical theory" (see: Stewart 1990; Johnson 1991). For more extended historical overviews of rhetoric from the classical Greek era to the present time, see: Murphy (1974), Conley (1990), and Kennedy (1999).

Whereas a number of contemporary scholars are acknowledged in this statement, Kenneth Burke represents a particularly consequential bridge between classical Greek thought and contemporary pragmatist scholarship.

20th Century Rhetoric: An Overview

Although his review of the 20th century literature is helpful for situating rhetoric on a more contemporary plane, James Kinneavy's (1990) statement also indicates that the term "rhetoric" has lost much of its connectedness with classical scholarship.[9] Thus, "rhetoric" has often been used in ways that are indistinguishable from the broader concepts of speech, discourse, and persuasive interchange, where it is not more abruptly dismissed as superficially deceptive instances of communication. As well, most authors using the term "rhetoric" have failed to attend to the activities entailed in people engaging instances of persuasive communication.

---

[9] The neglect of classical rhetoric on the part of 20th century scholars reflects (a) the comparative disregard of rhetoric as a realm of scholarly analysis in the 19th century (see: Stewart 1990; Johnson 1991) and (b) a corresponding inattention to classical Greek and Latin scholarship more generally. This has been accompanied by emphases on (c) structuralism in the social sciences (as in psychological and sociological variable analysis, rational-deductive models, and marxist materialism), (d) moralism and activism (as in religion, Marxist ideology, and political correctness), (e) idealism (e.g., postmodernism, totalizing relativism, and dialectic skepticism), and (f) artistic creativity (as in people striving for diversity, display, and expression of persona).
Still, as Rosenfield (1971) and Vickers (1988) observe, the more contemporary disregard of rhetoric also (g) is partially the product of a much more enduring split between the fields of rhetoric and philosophy that can be traced back to Socrates and Plato. Nevertheless, present-day scholars have greater access (through translations, as well as extended print and electronic technology) to the classical literature than has been the case in earlier centuries. Thus, there is much potential for an intellectual renaissance.

In discussing contemporary rhetoric, Kinneavy identifies several realms of scholarly endeavor. These include (a) situated context emphases, wherein the focus is on the social-cultural settings in which instances of discourse are developed; (b) interpretive (also hermeneutics, semiotic, pragmatist) approaches; (c) argumentation themes and considerations of the rhetoric of science; (d) rhetorically-oriented theories of knowledge and philosophy of science; (e) depictions of technical writing, journalism, and information processing; (f) emphases on propaganda, politicized rhetoric, and commercialized advertising; (g) concerns with religious oratory (preaching, interpretation of text); (h) literary rhetorical criticism; (i) the development of women's and gender studies rhetoric; (j) self-expressive statements (as in catharsis, counseling, existentialism); (k) considerations of mass-media communications; (l) the analysis of symbols, as in semiotics, semiology, and pragmatism; (m) the depiction of rhetoric as metaphor; (n) rhetoric and the teaching of composition; and (o) computer use and rhetoric (as in technologies, word-processing, interactive mediums, information technology). Kinneavy's ordering has been maintained so that interested readers might more readily benefit from the bibliographies he provides for each of these themes.

Attempts to codify contemporary discussions of conceptual rhetoric in more systematic ways seem to have become increasingly problematic. Thus, in addition to the more distinctively conceptual material Kinneavy references in his subthemes (a-d) and (l), the other topics that Kinneavy identifies may be seen either as applications of influence

work to specific subject matters or as connoting particular modes of communication and realms of instruction intended to promote more effective communication.[10]

While there is a deep contemporary division between theory about rhetoric and communicative applications, there is a yet more consequential problematic. Thus, whereas those involved in developing applications (typically using whatever resources they can to pursue their objectives) have given little sustained attention to the study of the ways that human interchange is actually accomplished, most scholars involved in developing theory about persuasive endeavor also have neglected to study the ways in which instances of influence work are constituted (developed and experienced) as activity by the participants in any actual settings.

Relatedly, the more general analytic pattern has been to discuss rhetoric (and the somewhat related "philosophy of language") in terms that ignore

---

[10] Readers are referred to Gaillet and Horner's (2010) *The Present State of Scholarship in the History of Rhetoric* for further verification of the problematics of characterizing the broader contemporary literature on rhetoric. Still, whereas the contributors to the Gaillet and Horner collection of papers provide a valuable series of bibliographic materials pertaining to different historical eras from the Greeks to the present time, the entire set of papers presented within has been largely organized around substantive or topical fields. Thus, this collection of papers focuses on matters such as gender roles, race and ethnicity, and education rather than the conceptual, generic processual, and enacted features of rhetoric that so consequentially characterize the highly enabling analyses provided by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Likewise, very little comparative analyses and virtually no attention is given to either memory as a fundamental humanly engaged process (Prus 2007b) related to rhetorical ventures or the associated matters of interpretation, deliberation, and secondary interchange on the part of target-recipients (see: Prus 1999). Instead, rhetoric has been approached largely as a unilateral phenomenon in most of the contemporary literature. As well, there has been little sustained ethnographic examination of rhetoric as a socially enacted process.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

examinations of rhetoric as activity in the making—as actual instances of persuasive interchange. Notably, too, instead of examining actual instances of influence work, many contemporary rhetoricians have drawn heavily on existing literary (mostly fictionalized) sources for their "data" and/or studied rhetoric only from a distance via media materials (as in "content analysis" versus extended, open-ended interviews with speakers and/or audiences).

Sustaining the Tradition

A number of 20th and 21st century scholars (e.g., Richards 1936; Kennedy 1963; 1972; 1980; 1983; 1989; 1991; 1999; Murphy 1974; 1989; 2002; Erickson 1975; McKeon 1987; Vickers 1988; Brandes 1989; Conley 1990; 2000; Enos 1993; 1995; Murphy and Katula 2003) have helped maintain continuities with classical rhetoric through their careful reviews of scholarly involvements in rhetoric over the centuries. However, one finds comparatively little in the way of a direct, sustained analysis of *rhetoric as activity* on the part of most contemporary authors.

As well, with some notable exceptions, social scientists (including those who might seem to be particularly attentive to communication and persuasive endeavor) largely have been oblivious to *rhetoric as a fundamental feature of human group life*.

Although there seems to have been a revitalized interest in classical rhetoric towards the end of the 20th century, and this bodes well for subsequent scholarship, few contemporary rhetoricians have (a) discussed activity in more direct and sustained terms, (b) invoked more explicit pragmatist analyses

of rhetoric, or (c) acknowledged the profound integration of persuasive interchange with all arenas of community life (also see what Murphy [2002] references as "Aristotle's Metarhetoric").

Amidst considerations of some other contemporary authors who have dealt with rhetoric in more distinctive pragmatist terms, some extended attention will be given to the works of Chaim Perelman and (especially) Kenneth Burke. Still, readers are cautioned that one finds little coherence in the styles or emphases of 20th and 21st century authors.[11] Thus, before discussing the more particular contributions of Perelman and Burke, we briefly acknowledge the works of I. A. Richards, James Kastely, Jeffrey Walker, Frank DeAngelo, Enesto Grassi, Brian Vickers, and Eugene Garver.

Whereas I. A. Richards (1893-1979) is commonly recognized as a significant 20th century rhetorician, Richards' (1936) *Philosophy of Rhetoric* has a more pronounced poetic (versus more extensively analytical) emphasis.[12] Indeed, Richards' relevance as a pragmatist analyst is much more evident in Ogden and Richards' (1946 [1923]) *The Meaning of Meaning*.

Albeit focused on the centrality of language for thought rather than the development of rhetoric more specifically, Ogden and Richards' *The Mean-*

---

[11] It simply is not possible to consider all of the statements in "the philosophy of language," "theories of literary criticism," and other theories of speech and knowing that address matters pertinent to rhetoric in this statement.

[12] As with Richards' other works (e.g., *Principles of Literary Criticism* [1924], *Interpretation in Teaching* [1937], and *How to Read a Page* [1942]), Richards' *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1936) and his other statements on rhetoric are somewhat fragmented and unevenly mix abstract and applied matters. While his materials are insightful and overlap the fields of rhetoric, literary theory, education, and philosophy, one finds little in the way of a sustained theoretical viewpoint.

ing of Meaning represents a consequential contribution to the broader rhetorical enterprise. Providing a valuable commentary on the enabling and limiting features of language for humanly engaged definitions of reality (especially see: Ogden and Richards 1946 [1923]:1-23, 87-108, 109-138, 185-199),[13] but *The Meaning of Meaning* notably also parallels and engages the American pragmatists John Dewey, Charles Sanders Peirce, and William James' notions of language as a contextually engaged process.[14]

While also characterized by poetic emphases, the texts that James Kastely (1997) and Jeffrey Walker (2000) have developed also merit more attention than most works in this broader genre. Whereas Kastely (*Rethinking the Rhetorical Tradition*) attempts to revitalize classical rhetoric by showing how these texts could be used to engage Marxist and postmodernist positions, Jeffrey Walker (*Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*) argues that rhetoric initially developed from, and is best understood within the context of, poetic expression.[15] Still, neither

---

[13] Although Ogden and Richards make a number of very astute observations on the problematics and processes of symbolization and definitions (including the pragmatist notion that "A symbol refers to what it actually has been used to refer to" [1946 [1923]:113], readers familiar with Aristotle's *Categories* and *Interpretation* may note many parallels between Ogden and Richards' work on definitions and Aristotle's texts. Further, as Ogden and Richards (1946 [1923]:31-39) note in their preliminary considerations of Plato and Aristotle, these two Greek scholars were attentive to the arbitrary (i.e., established by convention) nature of the relationship between particular symbols and the things to which they refer.

[14] While acknowledging the works of Ludwig Wittgenstein and Edmund Husserl in their appendix, Ogden and Richards also present a fairly detailed pragmatist account of language development that was written by Bronsilaw Malinowski as an ethnographically-informed commentary on *The Meaning of Meaning* (1946 [1923]).

[15] Clearly, Walker (2000) is not the first to argue that rhetoric and other realms of classical scholarship have their roots in the poetic tradition. See, for instance, Philip Sidney's (1554-1586) *The Defense of Poesy* (1901).

Kastely nor Walker approaches rhetoric in more direct activity-based terms.

Frank D'Angelo's (1975) *A Conceptual Theory of Rhetoric* and Walter Beale's (1987) *A Pragmatic Theory of Rhetoric* represent two 20th century philosophic depictions of rhetoric. These texts are more analytically astute than is Richards' (1936) *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, but D'Angelo and Beale lack the pragmatist (humanly engaged) emphasis of Ogden and Richards' (1946 [1923]) *The Meaning of Meaning*.

Intended to contemporize classical rhetoric, both D'Angelo and Beale maintain a comparatively formal, more structuralist emphasis in their conceptualizations of rhetoric. Neither D'Angelo nor Beale (perhaps more ironically, given the title of his volume) attends very directly to the study of human knowing and acting within the context of persuasive communication.

Ernesto Grassi's (1902-1991) *Rhetoric as Philosophy* (2001) is more closely related to the present emphasis on rhetoric as activity. However, focusing on Italian humanist contributions to rhetoric and using Giambattista Vico (1668-1744) as his centering point, Grassi almost exclusively concentrates on Roman and Italian sources. Still, the consequential analytic and pragmatist-ethnohistorical contributions of Cicero and Quintilian are only marginally acknowledged.

Notably, too, in contrast to a more thoroughly pragmatically-informed approach to the study of rhetoric that encompasses all modes of persuasive communication (see: Aristotle, Cicero, Burke),

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Grassi emphasizes *ingenium* or the creative features of speech in his text. Thus, Grassi envisions rhetoric primarily as speech that acts on the emotions. Despite this rather restricted notion of rhetoric, Grassi's text represents a noteworthy critique of philosophy, especially the prevailing emphasis on logical, rationalist models of human thought.

In developing his statement, Grassi derives particular inspiration from Vico's criticisms of René Descartes' (1596-1650) rationalism. Consequentially, thus, Vico (a) objects to Descartes' insistence on reducing thought about human existence to rationalist, logically derivable, and mathematically sustained notions. Vico also (b) rejects Descartes' neglect of people's emotional, expressive, creative ways of knowing the world and (c) Descartes' disregard of the contributions that people have made in areas such as poetics, rhetoric, political science, and history, as well as (d) Descartes' inattention to the specific things that people do.

Like Vico, Grassi stresses the importance of human activity and the contexts in which people act. Rejecting distinctively rationalist or structuralist approaches to the study of human group life, Grassi echoes Vico's general plea that scholars develop a philosophy of language that is more attentive to human experience. Still, since Grassi so heavily emphasizes the emotional and creative aspects of human activity, his consideration of rhetoric is unduly limited as also is his methodology (Grassi primarily encourages scholars to invoke metaphors in developing analysis of the rhetorical venture and human experience more generally).

Overviewing the conflicts pertaining to the practice and virtues of rhetoric from the classical Greek era to his own time, Brian Vickers' (1988) *In Defence of Rhetoric* focuses attention on the differing viewpoints that people have adopted with respect to persuasive endeavor and the shifting emphases implied therein. Thus, Vickers instructively addresses the positions that various scholars have taken with respect to rhetoric over the centuries. Drawing attention to an assortment of theological and moralist agendas, as well as various intellectual disregards and other resistances pertaining to the study of rhetoric, Vickers argues for the necessity of sustaining a clear scholarly emphasis on the study of rhetoric as a humanly engaged realm of activity.

In what may be the only book length philosophic treatment on Aristotle's rhetoric written in the 20th century,[16] Eugene Garver's (1994) *Aristotle's Rhetoric* also has important affinities with the present text. Like the works of Kastely (1997) and Walker (2000), Garver's text has a distinctively erudite flow, and Garver engages the contemporary philosophical literature on rhetoric in extended terms. To his credit, as well, Garver develops *Aristotle's Rhetoric* mindfully of the broader corpus of texts that Aristotle has written.

Still, Garver's emphases are quite different from those of the present paper. Graver intends to provide a contemporary, philosophically-informed commentary on the character of morality implied in *Aristotle's Rhetoric*. While Garver fails to specify the more particular philosophic premises with which he works, he clearly desires to engage rhetoric as an ethical venture. Envisioning rhetoric as a highly enabling, as well as a notably dangerous art, Garver seems intent on seeing what contemporary practical, judgmental wisdom he can derive from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

Thus, whereas Garver explicitly acknowledges the centrality of activity in *Aristotle's Rhetoric* and pointedly recognizes the generic or transsituational, as well as the comparatively morally neutral position that Aristotle adopts with respect to rhetoric as an enabling art or technology, Garver does *not* approach Aristotle's works in these latter, distinctively more pragmatist terms.

Instead, Garver (1994:8) describes Aristotle as highly unreflective in his philosophic treatment of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Although cognizant of the highly reflective nature of Aristotle's analysis of rhetoric as activity, Garver takes issue with Aristotle for not engaging what he considers the critical issues of moral responsibility in today's society.[17]

Insofar as Garver, along with D'Angelo (1975), Beale (1987), and Grassi (2001) are among those who are more particularly attentive to the philosophical aspects of rhetoric, their texts suggest that a great many contemporary philosophers are still some distance from attending the actualities of human lived (and enacted) reality.[18]

Expressed in other terms, it appears that most philosophers (as suggested by Rosenfield [1971] and Vickers [1988]) are still "living in the shadows of Socrates' cave" (Plato, *Republic*, VII [1997]). They have yet to venture into and examine in some detail the world of human enacted reality.[19] The scholars discussed in the rest of this paper have made more substantial contributions to this latter pragmatist objective.

Kenneth Burke—Rhetoric as Activity

Whereas I. A. Richards, Ernesto Grassi, Eugene Garver, Chaim Perelman, and some other contemporaries have addressed aspects of classical rhetoric in more distinctive pragmatist terms, Kenneth Burke (1897-1993) emerges as the 20th century rhetorician who most thoroughly approximates the pragmatist emphasis on human knowing and acting that one associates with Aristotle (384-322 BCE), Cicero

---

[16] For two 20th century synoptic commentaries on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, see: Arnhart (1981) and Tejera (1996). Erickson (1975) and Brandes (1989) provide historical materials depicting the receptivity of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Western scholarship. Also see Prus (2008a).

[17] Although not denying the relevance of morality and deviance for all manners of group life (see: Prus and Grills 2003), it appears that Garver (as with many others in philosophy) largely disregards the study of human knowing and acting as this takes place in instances.

[18] Relatedly, despite the centrality of persuasive communication as an aspect of speech, one finds little direct or sustained consideration of rhetoric or influence work in philosophic considerations of language.
Thus, while Borgman (1974:32-34) in his *The Philosophy of Language* briefly acknowledges rhetoric and poetics in his discussion of Aristotle (wherein Borgman astutely emphasizes that language is the theme and the basis of Aristotle's investigations) along with a few other passing references to rhetoric, and Gilson (1988:1128-129) also makes passing reference to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in his text, *Linguistics and Philosophy*, others writing on the philosophy of language (e.g., see: Land 1986; Martinich 1990) often do not give even this much attention to rhetoric.

[19] Readers may appreciate that this is not intended as particular criticism of Plato's scholarship. Indeed, Plato (*Republic*, VII [1997]) insists that after being trained as philosophers (and dialecticians) these scholars—now about 35 years of age—should spend the next fifteen years in other, humanly engaged contexts *prior to* assuming roles as instructors of philosophy.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

(106-43 BCE), and Quintilian (35-95 CE). For this reason, it is appropriate to give Burke's works much more sustained attention both on their own and in conjunction with the authors whose materials he addresses in the process.[20]

Still, since Burke's writings cover an exceptionally wide array of topics and authors, it is advisable to consider his scholarship more generally before focusing more directly on Burke's relevance to the present project.[21]

Thus, beyond (a) his enduring interest in rhetoric (as persuasive communication), Kenneth Burke had long standing intrigues (b) with literature (as in poetics, criticism, and metaphoric analysis), (c) philosophy (on knowing, on language), (d) history (as in the developmental flows of community life), (e) religion (as in activity, symbols, ritual), (f) morality (as in notions of evil, condemnations, tolerances), (g) political science (as in governing, conflict, intergroup relations), (h) sociology (as in social order, cooperation, conflict, hierarchies, knowledge), and (h) psychology (as in Freudianism, theories of behavior).

Further, while engaging the literature from all of these fields in a more contemporary sense, Burke also has examined these subject matters across the range of Western social thought, from the classical Greek era (circa 700-300 BCE) to the present time.

Those who examine Kenneth Burke's more analytic texts will find that he incorporates an exceptionally wide array of sources in developing his analyses of particular topics. Although this breadth of scholarship may have contributed to a more adequate appreciation of classical rhetoric, one that is more consistent with the analysis of rhetoric developed by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, Burke does not achieve the analytical depth or the clarity of focus that characterize considerations of rhetoric by these earlier authors. Thus, Burke's discussions tend to "bounce" unevenly as he moves from one theme to the next and from one author to another. Likewise, his documentation, as well as his consideration of the classical Greek and Latin literature on rhetoric is far from comprehensive, systematic, or sustained.

Nevertheless, Burke is typically attentive to the task of connecting his thoughts with the mind of the reader. Thus, while notably playful, as well as openly tentative at times, Burke typically strives to achieve a shared mindedness with his readers by more explicitly defining his objectives, terms of reference, and the emphases of particular components of his texts.[22]

Likewise, even though he addresses rhetoric within an extended range of scholarly fields, Burke is centrally concerned with the analysis of human knowing, expression, and acting in more generic, transdisciplinary terms. Hence, while engaging topics and authors in ways that are mindful of disciplinary boundaries, scholarly practices, and people's sacred beliefs, Kenneth Burke tends to emphasize the generic or pluralistic features of human community life.

Relatedly, whereas Burke (especially 1969a [1945]; 1969b [1950]) writes as an analyst of dramatic interchange in developing most of his analytic texts, those familiar with American pragmatism (especially Dewey and Mead) will recognize that Burke's dramatism is very much a variant of pragmatist philosophy.

Thus, while building on analytical materials developed mindfully of the theater, Kenneth Burke states that he is not a "dramatist" *per se*. Burke makes extended use of the theatrical metaphor in approaching the study of human knowing and acting, but his primary emphasis is on the actualities (versus metaphors or analogies) of human behavior as meaningful, purposive symbolically-mediated activity.

Further, although Burke appears to have considerable fluency with the American pragmatists (particularly the works of Dewey, Mead, and James), it

is Aristotle whose works are most central to Kenneth Burke's "dramatistic pragmatism."[23] Not only does Burke envision much of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* as epitomizing the dramatistic viewpoint,[24] but Burke also derives considerable inspiration from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics*.[25]

Following Aristotle, Kenneth Burke explicitly identifies people as "symbol using animals." Like other animals, humans not only have biological capacities for activity and sensations, but also live in a world of objects. However, in acquiring speech within the (existing, cultured) community, humans learn to think and act in symbolically-mediated realities. It is speech also that enables people to act in meaningful, purposive, and deliberative terms.

As with Aristotle, thus, Burke sees people as community-based and community-engaged creatures. People require others for association, language, thought, knowledge, senses of self, and all sorts of cooperative effort. Relatedly, people cannot be understood adequately apart from a science (i.e., a "political science") of the community (or *polis*).[26]

---

[20] Although I had some very general exposure to Kenneth Burke's dramatism through the works of Erving Goffman (1959) and Stanford Lyman and Marvin Scott (1970), it was only after developing familiarity with analyses of rhetoric from the Greek, Latin, and interim eras that I eventually engaged Burke's texts in more concerted terms. This background in classical rhetoric was extremely helpful for better comprehending Burke's work and its relevance for contemporary scholarship.

[21] For some other overviews of Kenneth Burke's works, see: Holland (1959), Heath (1986), Gusfield (1989), Brock (1995), Wolin (2001), and Blakesley (2002). However, as far as I can tell, only some of those (e.g., Holland, Heath, Blakesley) who have commented on Burke's texts appear sufficiently familiar with Aristotle's other works (e.g., *Rhetoric*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Poetics*) to acknowledge Burke's more thorough indebtedness to Aristotle and the broader pragmatist tradition.

[22] The matter of striving for clarity of comprehension with one's readers may seem a standard, commonsensical feature of academic writing. Still, those writing as "poets," "literary critics," and "postmodernists," among others, have often disregarded this fundamental feature of communication. While some read-

ers appreciate the intrigues associated with ambiguity, and certain authors have achieved prestige by being evasive or mystical, texts of these latter sorts generally are of little value to those genuinely interested in understanding some particular realm of human endeavor. Also see Prus (1996; 1999; 2008c).

[23] I have used the term "dramatistic pragmatism" in an attempt to capture the essence of Burke's position as he defines it.

[24] More explicit considerations of the affinities and connections between 20th century American pragmatist philosophy and classical Greek scholarship (especially the works of Aristotle) can be found in Prus (2003; 2004; 2006; 2007a; 2008a; 2009a; 2013a; 2015) and Puddephatt and Prus (2007).

[25] Indeed, when compared to the American pragmatists—Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, John Dewey, and George Herbert Mead, Kenneth Burke appears to have considerably greater familiarity with classical Greek and Latin rhetoric, as well as Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*.

[26] For a fuller elaboration of the relevance of language for humans becoming fuller participants in the life-worlds of the other, see: Durkheim (1915 [1912]); Mead (1934); Prus (2007b; 2007c).

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Like Aristotle, too, Burke observes that people (as community essences) engage in differentiations of all sorts, as well as embark on wide ranges of structuring practices and hierarchical evaluations. While both scholars are attentive to notions of equality, they are quite aware of differences in people's backgrounds, characteristics, circumstances, and abilities. Still, the importance of any differentiations between people, like other objects of human awareness, reflects a broader symbolizing process wherein people give meanings to all manners of things and act accordingly.

In addition to the generalized interest they share in fostering more viable (pluralist) community lifeworlds, Aristotle and Burke also are highly attentive to the diversity of human perspectives, desires, and objectives. Both are notably aware of the existence of conflict and competition amidst people's attentiveness to affinities and their cooperative quests for community order.

Importantly, like Aristotle in this way, Kenneth Burke will insist on *the centrality of activity* for comprehending the human condition and the necessity of examining activity in process terms. It is not apparent from Burke's texts just when and how he encountered Aristotle's works, how extensively he read these, in what order, and so forth, but Burke's dramatism is centrally premised in Aristotelian thought.

Given this emphasis on activity, Burke also exhibits fluency with the work of I. A. Richards (a rhetorician and philosopher of language) who, with C. K. Ogden (Ogden and Richards 1946 [1923]), wrote *The Meaning of Meaning.* Denoting a sustained consideration of language, symbols, and meanings, the Ogden and Richards text addresses core elements of human group life that parallel the, then, somewhat concurrently emergent American pragmatist tradition.

Although working with an essentially pragmatist base, Burke fuses his analyses with the works of a great many other sources. Since the introduction of these materials generates some significant diversities and disjunctures in Burke's works, it is important to acknowledge some of these sources.

In addition to Aristotle and the American pragmatists, Burke engages an incredibly wide set of literary sources. These include poets and critics of all sorts (from Homer [circa 700 BCE] to 20th century authors), but Kenneth Burke also builds on a wide array of other sources such as Cicero, Quintilian, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Francis Bacon, Niccolò Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, Baruch Spinoza, Immanuel Kant, Hegel, Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and Henri Bergson.

Whereas Kenneth Burke maintains an essential generic emphasis on human knowing and acting amidst this extended range of scholarship, it may be no less accurate to observe that it is Kenneth Burke's emphasis on the generic, enacted (activity-based) features of human group life that allows him to address (albeit unevenly) the instances of individually and collectively generated activity referenced within this comparatively massive literature. Thus, for example, while explicitly acknowledging the *realpolitik* of Machiavelli and the skeptical materialism of Hobbes and Marx, Burke also recognizes the heavy rhetorical base of Marxist so-cial thought and prefers the more pluralist sociology of knowledge proposed by Karl Mannheim.

Other aspects of Burke's notions of community life, particularly those dealing more directly with rhetoric, will become apparent as we address certain of his texts. Still, before proceeding further, it may be instructive to comment on Kenneth Burke's methodology lest this become a source of confusion.

Burke does not have methodological procedure of the sort that one might associate with surveys, experimental research, or ethnographic inquiry. Nevertheless, Burke has a methodological orientation. *Focusing on activity*, Kenneth Burke's emphasis is on what people do, the ways in which they do things, and how they, as symbol using essences, conceptualize, understand, and explain the things they do.

In developing his dramatistic pragmatist standpoint, Burke spends considerable time talking about "motives." However, instead of emphasizing the sorts of internal driving forces or external controlling structures that often characterize "motive talk" in the social sciences,[27] Kenneth Burke exam-ines the way that people assign motivations or give meanings to instances of human behavior (before, during, and after acting).

Relatedly, Kenneth Burke does not attempt to explain human behavior in reference to structuralist elements of a more conventionalist psychological or sociological nature. Instead, like Aristotle, Dewey, and Mead, Burke generally considers the way that people (as symbolic using essences) assign meanings to all matters of their awareness and act towards particular things in ways that make sense to them as knowing (and anticipating) agents.

An important aspect of this meaning-making process for Burke revolves around the concept of identification. It is through identification with the other, says Burke, that people define themselves in relation to others—thereby experiencing a variety of affinities with these others. Insofar as people identify themselves with specific sets of others, they seem more inclined to adopt perspectives, practices, and modes of interchange that are more characteristic of those with whom they identify. Viewed thusly, identification fosters integration and cooperation.

Still, whereas identification with others (a) may enable people to transcend realms of difference between themselves and the others and (b) holds the potential for more encompassing realms of congeniality, civility, and social order, identification typically also (c) is characterized by ingroup-outgroup divisions. These divisions or disidentifications (with some third set of others), in turn, commonly result in ambiguities, distancing practices, animosities,

---

[27] Because some sociologists are attentive to Marxist thought, it might be observed that Burke has a notably uneven regard (attraction towards and reservations about) for Marxism. Thus, whereas Burke insists on the importance of hierarchical tendencies in the human community, Burke envisions these rankings and orderings as occurring in all modes of human endeavor (vs. the class or material reductionism of Marx).
Likewise, although attentive to the inevitability of conflict and people's (uneven) quests for domination in this and that arena, Burke's notions of conflict are much more pluralist in emphasis, more closely paralleling Aristotle and Machiavelli than Marx. Further, whereas Burke (in more utopian moments) desires an extended, more equitable, universal form of social order, his hopes for a world order seem contingent on constitutional (vs. revolutionary) alignments.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

conflicts, and perhaps open hostilities involving others in the broader community.[28]

Burke is not entirely consistent when discussing matters of the preceding sorts, but this pragmatist theoretical standpoint also constitutes the foundational base of Burke's methodology. Most of the ambiguities in his "method" thus appear to revolve around the tasks of (a) defining "appropriate subject matters" in which to examine human knowing and acting, (b) dealing with these in more precise terms, and (c) developing an analysis of his materials in more extended comparative terms.

As well, whereas Burke's fundamental methodological stance most prominently may be defined by his theoretical position, his operational procedures are notably uneven. Thus, he more or less continually appears to be casting for more viable ways of approaching instances of his subject matter as he moves from one topic to another.[29]

Envisioning human life-worlds as symbolically-mediated, Kenneth Burke asks how people linguistically (and behaviorally) engage the world. While not venturing into the world in more ethnographic (e.g., Chicago interactionist) terms, Burke recognizes that people commonly adopt multiple viewpoints on things, and he encourages scholars to examine the ways in which particular features of people's viewpoints are articulated, resisted, and sustained over time.

Beyond his own experiences and reflections as an author (participant-observer) in the literary world, Burke's primary database comes from the literature he has read that deals with the humanly known and engaged world. In this regard, Burke considers wide ranges of rhetoric, poetry, literary criticism, and philosophic analysis.

In addition to developing more conceptually-oriented comparisons (similarities, differences, and inferences) in the course of addressing these literary sources, Burke also employs metaphors or analogies and deliberately invokes disjunctures (as in contrasts and ironies) in attempts to arrive at more discerning analyses.

As well, although centrally concerned about developing a theory of rhetoric or persuasive communication, it is essential to appreciate that Kenneth Burke does not propose a special theory for rhetoric. Instead (like Aristotle), *Burke envisions rhetoric both as an integral component of community life and an essence that cannot be understood apart from a fuller analysis of community life*. Still, because it denotes specific instances of *persuasive communication*, rhetoric is unique from many other aspects of human (symbolic) interchange and merits concerted attention on this basis.

Accordingly, even though it entails a somewhat unique subject matter, Burke emphasizes the point that rhetoric, like all other forms and instances of human interchange, denotes symbolic activity. Rhetoric is to be approached as instances of activity that are developed by specific participants in situated, meaningful, formulative terms.

Of Kenneth Burke's numerous texts and papers, the statements most relevant to the study of rhetoric (and the related matters of human knowing, expressing, and acting) are *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose* (1984 [1935]), *Attitudes toward History* (1959 [1937]), *A Grammar of Motives* (1969a [1945]), *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1969b [1950]), and *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology* (1961).

Whereas Burke's *A Grammar of Motives* and *A Rhetoric of Motives* are particularly central to the present statement, I first will briefly overview these other texts.

Permanence and Change (1984 [1935]) denotes a sustained consideration of the problematics of understanding human behavior and knowing. Here Burke grapples with notions of "motives as situated analyses of human conduct," "perspectives as metaphors for knowing things," and "continuities and disruptions of particular life-worlds" in the human community.

In *Attitudes toward History* (1959 [1937]), Kenneth Burke focuses on the problematics of cooperation in community contexts. Acknowledging the multiplicity of viewpoints that particular groups may adopt within community settings, Burke attends to the acceptance and rejection of differing theological and other moral diversities that groups develop in more situated instances and how these are squelched or are sustained over time.

In his 1959 edition of *Attitudes toward History*, Burke identifies "The Seven Offices" that epitomize community life on the part of the linguistically-enabled, technologically-engaged animals we know as humans. These seven base-line or generically enabling sets of activities of community life revolve around the matters of governing, serving, defending, teaching, entertaining, curing, and pontificating.[30]

Although written later, Burke's *The Rhetoric of Religion* (1961) is somewhat less developed than the preceding volumes and some of his other texts. Even though he emphasizes the centrality of language for all human considerations of religion in *The Rhetoric of Religion*, this statement is much more limited in scope. Utilizing Augustine's *Confessions* and the Genesis of *The Old Testament* as illustrative (prototypic) materials with which to engage in "the analysis of religious discourse," Kenneth Burke addresses the generic, linguistic embeddedness of rhetoric of being, acting, and knowing in theological accounts. Still, he very much leaves his analysis at a suggestive level.[31]

[28] Zappen (2009) provides a more extended consideration of the dialectical-rhetorical transcendence associated with Burke's conception of identification. Aristotle (see: *Rhetoric* and *Rhetoric to Alexander*, as well as *Nicomachean Ethics*) was highly attentive to these tendencies towards (and the effects of) people identifying and disidentifying with particular sets or categories of others.

[29] The matter of locating "an appropriate methodology with which to study human agency and interchange" has perplexed and eluded a great many humanist scholars from antiquity onward. For the symbolic interactionists, this fundamental problem was solved when Herbert Blumer (1969) synthesized Charles Horton Cooley's method of "sympathetic introspection" (ethnographic inquiry) with George Herbert Mead's "social behaviorism."
More generally, one might observe that scholars in philosophy, religious studies, and poetics have faced these same obstacles from antiquity to the present time. Relatedly, while the prospects of synthesizing pragmatist thought with ethnographic research can be located here and there, throughout the history of Western social thought from the time of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, it is not until the early 20th century that we have seen more sustained efforts along these lines (see: Blumer 1969; Strauss 1993; Prus 1996; 1997; 1999; Prus and Grills 2003).

[30] Although *Subcultural Mosaics and Intersubjective Realities* was developed without an awareness of Kenneth Burke's *Attitudes toward History*, some parallel conceptual materials (as well as a sustained agenda for pragmatist research) can be found in Prus (1997).

[31] It is not apparent that Burke had any direct familiarity with Cicero's *On the Nature of the Gods* (1951) or Durkheim's (1915 [1912]) *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Either of these texts would have provided Burke with considerable, largely congruent conceptual material on which to develop his analysis of religious discourse.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

A Grammar of Motives (1969a [1945]) is the text in which Burke presents the fullest version of his dramatistic pragmatist approach to the study of human knowing and acting. However, it is in *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1969b [1950]) where Kenneth Burke most explicitly discusses rhetoric as a social process. Whereas Burke's *Permanence and Change* and *Attitudes toward History*, along with *The Rhetoric of Religion*, merit more extended attention on the part of social scientists, Burke's *A Grammar of Motives* and *A Rhetoric of Motives* are particularly central to the present consideration of influence work.

A Grammar of Motives

In introducing *A Grammar of Motives* (*GM*), Kenneth Burke (1969a [1945]:x-xvi) says that his purpose in writing this book is to consider "what people do" and to explain the attributions of motives that people assign to human activities. As his primary enabling mechanism for explaining human motivation, Burke introduces five concepts (often designated the "pentad").

Thus, Burke's *pentad* includes (1) the act as some named or identified behavior; (2) the scene or setting in which some activity takes place; (3) the agent or person who performed the act; (4) agency or the way in which the act was conducted (utilizing what instruments); and (5) purpose or intent.

Burke contends that notions of these sorts are pivotal to any viable consideration of human conduct. Relatedly, the analytic task is to examine the ways in which these five elements come together in any given instance. After noting that the pragmatists may be inclined to

encompass purpose within agency, Burke (*GM*:xvi) explains that his term "dramatism" is derived from the analysis of drama wherein language and thought are envisioned as modes of action (Burke follows Aristotle [*Poetics*] in this emphasis on activity).

While noting that concerns with the matters demarcated within the pentad (act, scene, agent, agency, purpose) are rooted deeply in Western social thought, Burke also observes that these aspects of human activity have been taken for granted in a great many causal explanations of behavior and are strikingly absent in many academic analysis of human knowing and acting.

However, Burke contends, these elements are at the core of an authentic, informed analysis of human conduct. Thus, it is this conceptual scheme for examining "the act" that represents the basis on which Burke (rather simultaneously) intends to inform rhetoric with philosophy and inform philosophy with rhetoric.[32]

Emphasizing the centrality of the study of the act for a wide array of scholars, Kenneth Burke stresses the necessity of analysts examining instances of human behavior not only in contextually contained and culturally informed terms but also as knowingly and developmentally constituted processes.

Burke (*GM*:21-124) subsequently addresses a wide variety of topics pertaining to "definitions of contexts." These include considerations of substance,

tragedy, religion, money, and reductionism. While Burke's emphasis is notably pluralist (as in his commentaries on "Money as a Substitute for God" and "The Nature of Monetary Reality"), the ensuing discussions are rather fragmentary.

In Part Two of *GM* (pp. 127-320), Burke engages a series of philosophic viewpoints along with some of their more prominent representatives. In turn, he discusses materialism, idealism, realism, pragmatism, and mysticism. Burke uses this material to compare (as in differences and similarities) his dramatist philosophic position with those of particular scholars adopting these other standpoints.

Although pointedly acknowledging the ongoing, inevitable, and often intense struggles that characterize the diversity of community life (regarding moralities, properties, hierarchies), Burke also is highly attentive to the cooperative features of human relations.

In overall terms, Burke's position is notably consistent with the pragmatist position that he associates with John Dewey (especially Dewey's emphasis on agency and instrumentalism). Relatedly, while rejecting Plato's overarching sense of purpose as highly mystical, Burke (*GM*:292-294) identifies Aristotle's analysis of human character (in *Nicomachean Ethics*) as strikingly dramatistic in emphasis.

Focusing more directly on his own notions of "means and ends," Kenneth Burke (*GM*:317-320) stresses the importance of scholars examining the ways that people know and experience the world linguistically. It is a mistake, Burke alleges, to at-

tempt to analyze reality apart from the human symbolizing process. Accordingly, he proposes that people's relations be studied in ways that are explicitly attentive to the *linguistically-informed* nature of human knowing and acting.

Burke's texts are sometimes intermingled with hopes for a more viable global order (amidst recognitions and fears of the large-scale self-destructive technologies that humans have developed). However, in Part Three of *GM*, Burke provides a more extended paradigm that he hopes will be useful for studying (and fostering) constitutional relations in the broader political arena. Burke attempts to develop this material in ways that are mindful of his earlier emphasis on activity, but this part of *GM* is notably more discursive and takes readers some distance from the study of action *per se*.[33]

Because most readers can relate so directly to Kenneth Burke's dramatistic approach in reference to their own behavior, many may think that Burke (like the pragmatists more generally) is merely restating the obvious. However, when one compares Burke's analysis of action and motive talk with most post 16th century philosophy (following Descartes) and most 19th-21st century statements in the social sciences (wherein the emphasis is on structures, forces, factors, and variables of sorts), the contrasts are striking, indeed.

---

[32] In contrast to Plato (and Socrates) who separates philosophy and rhetoric, Burke is one with Aristotle and Cicero in emphasizing the interconnectedness of rhetoric and philosophy.

[33] Like many in the broader humanist tradition, from Plato and Aristotle onward, Kenneth Burke hopes that a better understanding of human lived experience might enable people to attain a more harmonious life-world. While notably pluralist in his analysis of community life and aware of irreconcilable differences that characterize communities more generally, Burke still hopes, in some way, to facilitate constitutionally enabled tolerance and an enhanced social order.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Rather than reducing human conduct to mechanical, deterministic, or formulaic elements,[34] Burke attends to agency as a symbolically enabled, deliberative, adjustive process. Like Mead (whose works on "the philosophy of the act" are explicitly discussed in Burke 1973 [1941]:379-382), Burke envisions people as "objects of their own awareness."[35]

Expressed in other terms, it might be said that Kenneth Burke (1969a [1945]), in *A Grammar of Motives*, has restored an essential theory (philosophy) of the act within the study of rhetoric. Not only has Burke questioned the more idealized and structured notions of logic and epistemology that (following Plato and Descartes) have dominated philosophical thought, but Burke also has established the importance of influence work (and activity) for philosophy and re-engaged "the study of the act" within rhetoric.

A Rhetoric of Motives

In developing *A Rhetoric of Motives* (*RM*) which he (1969b [1950]) envisions as a "philosophy of rhetoric," Kenneth Burke addresses three major themes: the range of rhetoric; traditional principles of rhetoric; and order.

While using an assortment of poetic sources to introduce this volume, Burke intends that his text

on rhetoric not only would apply to all areas of community life (as in religion, politics, science, courtship, and poetics), but that it also would have a comprehensive cross-cultural relevance.

Some readers may be disappointed that Burke does not develop an extended statement on the practice of rhetoric (in the tradition of Aristotle, Cicero, or Quintilian, for instance), but Burke's primary objective is to establish the pervasive nature of rhetoric or persuasive endeavor in the human community and, thus, extend the boundaries more conventionally ascribed to rhetoric.

Emphasizing the widespread relevance of rhetoric for appreciating people's activities, choices, and attitudes, and assuming the dramatistic frame he develops in *GM*, one of Burke's major concepts in *RM* is "identification."

Following an introductory note on identification (*RM*:xiii-xiv) and a more general consideration of identification, Burke (*RM*:19-46) discusses the similarities or commonalities (as in properties, locations, and classifications) that people may associate with two or more instances of phenomena.

Attending to people's abilities to invoke conceptual linkages between things across a wide array of fields, Burke uses people's tendencies towards identification or notions of affinity as a means of engaging the more traditional features of rhetoric.

Building on the works of Aristotle (especially), Cicero, and Quintilian, Burke envisions identification as a primary element of persuasion. In devel-

oping identification, Burke explains, the objective is for speakers to establish a thorough connectedness with the mind of the other; to express one's ideas in ways that more completely correspond with the viewpoints and thoughts of the other. Still, while identification fosters acceptance or receptivity to subsequent speaker proposals, Burke also acknowledges the importance of speakers establishing "advantages" for their audiences (as in stressing matters of a timely relevance for the other) to act.

In discussing "traditional principles of rhetoric," Kenneth Burke introduces materials from Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and Augustine. However, Burke also mixes aspects of the works of these authors with discussions of Bacon, Kant, Marx, Machiavelli, Ovid, and Dante, among others. Because Burke does not deal with the classical Greek and Latin authors in a systematic manner, readers who lack familiarity with the works on rhetoric by Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and Augustine are apt to have considerable difficulty comprehending Burke's presentation of traditional principles.

While frequently citing Aristotle in *RM*, Burke also makes extensive use of materials on rhetoric from Cicero and Augustine in his presentation. Still, Burke deals with their texts in rather fragmented terms and in ways that (inadvertently) obscure the scope, detail, and analytical depth of these classical authors. As a result, readers relying more centrally on Burke's renditions would have little appreciation of the rich intellectual resources embedded in the works of these three authors.

Focusing "on order" in the last section of *RM*, Burke returns to the matter of establishing the strategic relevance of rhetoric for those spokespeople (e.g., political, religious, literary) who attempt to provide direction (and criticism) for various sectors of the human group.

After emphasizing the importance of envisioning rhetoric as a pervasive, generic feature of human group life, Kenneth Burke focuses primarily on "the traditional principles of rhetoric." [The material following attends to the overall flow of *RM*. However, because Burke mixes sources and topics rather freely, this often is not feasible. As well, mindful of the objectives of the present statement, I have been somewhat selective in representing Burke's considerations of the topics developed within.]

Burke (*RM*:49-55) begins his discussion of the principles of rhetoric by defining rhetoric as persuasive communication. While explicitly referencing Aristotle, Cicero, and Augustine, Kenneth Burke acknowledges a notably broader classical Greek emphasis on language and rhetoric.

Somewhat more particularly, then, Burke stresses the voluntary nature of human behavior and draws attention to the ways that Aristotle, Cicero, and Augustine have focused on the tactical features of rhetoric. After observing that Augustine discusses rhetoric more specifically with the intention of obtaining religious converts (On Christian Doctrine), Burke notes that Aristotle and Cicero deal with rhetoric in more distinctively generic terms and explicitly indicate the ways that people may resist, as well as persuade one another.

---

[34] For a fuller consideration of the limitations of structuralist or variable analysis in the human sciences, see: Blumer (1969), Prus (1996; 1999), and Grills and Prus (2008).

[35] In *Attitudes toward History* (1959 [1937]), Kenneth Burke explicitly describes the "comic standpoint," as contingent on people knowingly taking themselves into account. Envisioning the comic standpoint as fundamental to all critical analyses, Burke says that the comic standpoint requires that one explicitly reflects on one's own activities.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Citing identification as a consequential emphasis in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Burke (*RM*:55-59) subsequently addresses the foundational aspects of speakers achieving a more complete sense of connectedness with their audiences as the base on which to encourage acceptance of the more particular elements that the speakers wish their audiences to accept.

Still, Burke (*RM*:59-65) notes, persuasive endeavor involves much more than identification. Thus, after acknowledging Cicero's claims for the universality of rhetoric and Cicero's criticism of the split between philosophy and rhetoric (which Cicero attributes to Socrates), Burke says that the notion of "advantage" is highly consequential for rhetorical theory. Observing that most everyone would agree that humans strive for gains of some sort, Burke stresses this element of persuasion.

Then, in the midst of addressing advantage and the diversity of human interests and objectives that speakers may encounter, Burke turns more directly to a consideration of audiences. While stating that Aristotle and Cicero were both highly attentive to audience diversity and the importance of speakers adjusting their efforts accordingly, Burke notes that Aristotle did not address audiences with the same intensity or depth he directed towards those developing speeches.

Following a consideration of the (sometimes overly zealous) cataloguing of oratorical (and grammatical) mechanisms that have occupied the attention of many intervening scholars of rhetoric (*RM*:65-69), Burke (*RM*:69-72) distinguishes three major purposes

that audiences might have for listening to particular messages. These are to obtain advice; to make decisions; and to attend to existing matters of interest.

After briefly commenting on the corresponding parallels of these purposes with Aristotle's three realms of rhetoric (political, judicial, and demonstrative or ceremonial), Burke turns to Cicero's distinctions between grand, plain, and tempered styles or modes of presentation.

Subsequently, Burke (*RM*:78-90) deals somewhat generally with notions of imagination, images, and ideas as these pertain to rhetorical endeavors. Although his analysis meanders somewhat, Burke acknowledges Aristotle's observation that people cannot think without images. Burke also gives some attention to the processes by which people (symbolically) communicate images of things to others and the ways that people incorporate images into their sensations of, and ideas about, the things they experience.

Pursuing these thoughts further, Burke attends to some considerations of images that various other authors have developed. Thus, Burke (*RM*:90-101) appreciates Jeremy Bentham's observations that legal jargon often is embedded with poetic representations. Burke (*RM*:101-110) also addresses the rhetoric that underlies Marxist ideology (and the Marxists' concealment of their rhetorical practices).

Later in this volume, Kenneth Burke (*RM*:158-166) focuses on "the administrative rhetoric of Machiavelli." Observing that Niccolò Machiavelli's (1469-1527) work may be seen as activity intended to produce effects on the part of audiences, Burke deems it

appropriate that *The Prince* be viewed as a sustained consideration of rhetoric.

In developing his commentary on Machiavelli, Burke not only (a) presents an extended set of principles of persuasion that he has extracted from *The Prince*, but Burke also (b) identifies a series of accounts of human susceptibilities on which agents may develop their positions and (c) addresses some fundamental resistances with which agents may have to contend.

While noting that Machiavelli often is envisioned as the founder of modern political science and that Machiavelli explicitly emphasizes people's self-serving interests and their related potential ruthlessness in dealing with one another, Burke also observes that Machiavelli's work represents but another application of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

Then, broadening his base somewhat, even in the midst of his analysis of Machiavelli's *The Prince*, Burke (*RM*:159-161) draws parallels between the tactical emphasis of Machiavelli's text and the depictions of heterosexual interchange one finds in Ovid's *The Art of Love*.

Although Burke introduces an assortment of other themes that address aspects of rhetoric in one or other ways (as in grand narratives and utopian notions of society, courtship, and theology), his (*RM*:221-233) discussion of Baldassare Castiglioni's (1478-1529) *The Book of the Courtier* represents one of Burke's more sustained and informative illustrations of rhetoric as a realm of human endeavor. As Burke observes, Castiglioni not only was a contem-

porary of Machiavelli, but also was highly attentive to the affairs of state.

Like Machiavelli, Castiglioni does not explicitly address rhetoric as a technical venture. Nevertheless, Burke notes that Castiglioni provides considerable insight into the nature of influence work in the political arena.

Presented as a set of four dialogues involving an assembly of aristocrats, the speakers in Castiglioni's *The Courtier* first address the qualities of the ideal courtier or attendant to the sovereign. Most notably, this would include matters of an appropriate lineage, a substantial family fortune, and a wide array of physical, educational, and social skills, whereby one more readily would be accepted by more consequential others in the political arena.

Having addressed a base of preparation for the role of the courtier and the development of a style of relating to others in an accomplished and admirable fashion, Castiglioni's second book focuses on the ways that people might achieve reputations as particularly outstanding figures in the court. More centrally, this would involve courtiers displaying valor for God and intense dedication to their sovereigns, while maintaining more modest and congenial senses of self in the presence of others in the setting.

The third book of *The Courtier* deals with courtly love. In addition to identifying a series of more appealing characteristics of females in this setting, Castiglioni gives attention to the codes and graces that males and females of the court are expected to sustain relative to one another. He also discusses

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

the challenges of obtaining strategic advantage (paralleling Ovid in this regard) in personal matters of the heart.

Castiglioni's fourth discourse focuses on the ways in which courtiers might more directly serve their princes. Beyond providing other kinds of assistance to their sovereigns, courtiers are valued for their roles in educating (informing, advising, guiding) their sovereigns so that their governors might more successfully and nobly (virtuously) fulfill their roles as leaders.[36]

Kenneth Burke could have dealt with the traditional principles of rhetoric in more systematic and sustained terms. Nevertheless, he alerts readers to the importance of considering persuasive endeavor within the broader set of contexts in which people relate to one another. Thus, while Burke understates the (extended) relevance of classical rhetoric for the study of influence work, he does maintain Aristotle's emphasis on the importance of studying rhetoric as activity.

Somewhat more generally, too, Burke's depictions of the tactical features of Machiavelli, Ovid, Castiglioni, and Marx instructively encourage scholars to consider the contexts in which, as well as the

ways in which, people invoke rhetoric in pursuing their objectives in the broader human community.

Indeed, *this is at the core of Kenneth Burke's entire works on rhetoric*. It is analytic folly to try to comprehend rhetoric (and logic) apart from a more sustained study of human activity, and human activity is to be understood within the context of ongoing community life. However, it is no wiser to claim to study human group life without a more sustained examination of influence work and the study of the ways in which persuasive endeavor as meaningful, deliberative activity is accomplished.

Because of the exceptional diversity of topics and sources that Burke incorporates into his texts, there are many other aspects of human knowing and acting that one could consider in his works. Minimally, though, we can be grateful for the attention Burke has given to rhetoric in a more comprehensive sense and for his ability (through his wide-ranging scholarship) to foster a reintegration of the human sciences around the matter of persuasive communication.[37]

Dramatism, Rhetoric, and the Human Sciences

Of those more commonly envisioned as 20th century rhetoricians, it is Kenneth Burke who most conse-

quentially has taken rhetoric into the human sciences.[38] As just noted in the preceding discussion of Kenneth Burke's work on rhetoric, he does this through a pragmatist (dramatist) attentiveness to the "philosophy of the act" and through his dialogues with an assortment of materials from the humanities and social sciences that pertain to human knowing and acting in more general terms.

As well, some sociologists, more particularly those working in the symbolic interactionist tradition—notably including Erving Goffman (1959; 1963a; 1963b; 1971), Joseph Gusfield (1963; 1981; 1989; 1996), Stanford Lyman and Marvin Scott (1970), Dennis Brissett and Charles Edgley (1990), and Charles Edgley (2013)—have derived considerable inspiration from Kenneth Burke in developing variants of "dramaturgical sociology." Thus, albeit in varying degrees, they have recognized affinities with Kenneth Burke's text and aspects of pragmatist thought, particularly that pertaining to the theatrical metaphor, impression management, reputations, and the shaping of images and people's definitions of situations.

Given the exceptional attention that Erving Goffman's portrayal of the dramaturgical metaphor and impression management, along with his emphasis on agency and reflectivity, has received, his work may be seen to foster a heightened receptivity to the classical Greek and Latin rhetorical tradition.

However, rather than locating Goffman's contributions within the broader rhetorical or dramaturgical tradition suggested by Kenneth Burke's works, most sociologists (including myself earlier on) have taken Goffman's texts as providing a unique, highly enabling starting point for their own analyses of social life rather than a starting point for re-engaging the conceptually articulated accounts of community relations and interpersonal exchange found in the classical Greek and Latin literature.

Accordingly, while using aspects of Burke's and Goffman's scholarship as departure points for their own work, there has been little in the way of a more extended re-engagement of the classical Greek and Latin literatures on rhetoric on the part of those in the interactionist community. This includes Joseph Gusfield (1989) who has edited a collection of Burke's writings, as well as emerged as the primary commentator of Burke's works in sociology. In part, Burke's references to classical Greek and Latin scholarship are sketchy at best and obscure the exceptionally thorough and detailed conceptual analyses of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian.

Whereas Kenneth Burke's works and his connectedness with classical Greek and Latin scholarship merit much more attention than they have received in sociology and the human sciences more generally, the material more immediately following acknowledges some other authors who have incorporated aspects of classical rhetoric into the human sciences.

Albeit unevenly cognizant of Kenneth Burke's dramatism, as well as pragmatist scholarship, these authors have been developing important connections

---

[36] Relatedly, while Aristotle discusses the background of the speaker as a foundational aspect of rhetoric in *Rhetoric* and even more extensively situates the practice of rhetoric within the affairs of state in his *Rhetoric to Alexander*, one gains other appreciations of the relevance of people's life-world contexts for comprehending rhetoric in the works of Cicero (especially his comparisons of Greek and Latin styles of developing rhetoric), Quintilian (and his consideration of the education of the orator), Augustine (in his emphasis on the persuasive role of the Christian speaker), and Alcuin (wherein he develops his consideration of rhetoric in ways that more specifically address Charlemagne's role as a governor).

[37] Although their materials are not as attentive to the social production of activity or the ways in which human group life is accomplished as is Kenneth Burke, a number of other 20th and 21st century rhetoricians also have contributed more generally to a pragmatist/Aristotelian analysis of rhetoric through their considerations of classical and interim literatures. This would include Kennedy (1991), Enos and Agnew (1998), Gross and Walzer (2000), Nienkamp (2001), Blakesley, (2002), Murphy (2002), and Newman (2002).

[38] In using the term "human sciences," I am distinguishing (a) the focused study of human knowing and acting from materials that (b) are more centrally invoked with entertainment, activism or other applied agendas or (c) would reduce human knowing and acting to structures, variables, and processes largely void of human agency and interchange.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

between classical rhetoric and the social sciences. Ironically, thus, the importance of Burke's contributions to the social sciences becomes more apparent only when we begin to more fully comprehend the vast array of conceptual resources that he was introducing (albeit only partially) to the human sciences.

Each of the following authors only partially introduces us to the conceptual potency of the classical Greek and Latin analysis of persuasive interchange. However, when their materials are connected more directly with Burke's dramatism, we gain a notably greater sense of the foundational relevance of classical Greek and Latin scholarship for comprehending Western social thought and extending contemporary scholarship in conceptual and analytic terms. We also find valuable resources for the broader quest for learning about the nature of human knowing and acting that Burke so intensively pursued.

Mindful of these matters, we turn to Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca's (1969) *The New Rhetoric*, Michael Billig's (1996) *Arguing and Thinking*, Cooper and Nothstine's (1992) *Power Persuasion*, Thomas Farrell's (1993) *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*, Robert Danisch's (2007) *Pragmatism, Democracy, and the Necessity of Rhetoric*, and Robert Prus' (1999) *Beyond the Power Mystique*. Whereas each of these texts is developed in comparatively extended, conceptually focused manners, it is possible to provide only a brief overview of each.

Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca—Philosophic Engagement

Although the philosophers Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca appear only marginally familiar

with the American pragmatist tradition (via William James) and tend to envision sociology more exclusively in functionalist terms, *The New Rhetoric* (1969) co-authored by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (hereafter P&OT) is distinctively pragmatist in overall thrust and strives to restore philosophic contact with classical scholarship. Thus, as P&OT observe, *The New Rhetoric* represents an attempt to contemporize classical rhetoric.[39]

Following Aristotle in key respects, P&OT re-engage the pragmatist emphasis on human knowing and acting in developing their text on rhetoric. [As with other materials of more consequence, I have endeavored to follow the overall flow of P&OT's text. Still, readers may be cautioned that the P&OT text has a somewhat uneven quality.]

In *The New Rhetoric*, P&OT take direct issue with the philosophers (most pointedly the logicians and epistemologists) for their longstanding neglect of the persuasion process. Objecting to the narrow, mechanistic style of reasoning encouraged by René Descartes (1592-1650) and those who conceptually have followed him, P&OT point to the necessity of scholars examining people's sense-making activities rather than insisting that human thought conforms to logical (as in factual, formal, or mathematical) structures.

P&OT do not intend to dispense with scientific inquiry or formal logic as viable modes of analysis

in other contexts, but instead insist on an explicitly broader, more encompassing, humanly-engaged notion of reason (including logic and argumentation) in philosophic analysis of the human condition.

It is because of this more enduring neglect of human thought on the part of philosophers that P&OT (1969:1-10) envision a return to classical scholarship as "the new rhetoric." While acknowledging the rhetorical insights that Plato provides in *Phaedrus*, as well as Plato's condemnations of rhetoric in *Gorgias*, it is Aristotle's *Rhetoric* that P&OT will use as the base in attempting to redirect and revitalize the philosophical relevance of logic and epistemology for the study of the human condition. In addition to the explicit and consequential challenges that P&OT's work poses for conventionalist philosophers, P&OT introduce a number of themes that have been overlooked in most scholarly considerations of rhetoric in the intervening centuries.

Using Part One to set the frame for their analysis, P&OT (1969:14-17) observe that rhetorical interchange requires a common language. They also emphasize the point that the capacity for people to achieve a "community of minds" is contingent on the willingness of the participants to attend to one another in more concerted ways.

Defining audiences as those whom speakers attempt to persuade, P&OT (1969:17-26) add that the rhetoricians' interchanges with their audiences are to be understood as ongoing constructions. Thus, not only are speakers to adjust to their auditors on an

ongoing basis, but they also are encouraged to recognize that audiences are variable and often assume composite dimensions (as in mixed characters, loyalties, and factions).

Likewise, when addressing "one person" audiences, P&OT (1969:34-40) stress the value of speakers adjustively focusing on the other. Solitary auditors may acknowledge speaker materials in more universal (general community) terms, but since individuals often view things from the standpoints of the more particularized groups with which they identify, it is important that speakers be prepared to adjust to these more specific viewpoints.

Attending to the broader parameters of rhetoric, P&OT (1969:40-45) also address the matter of people "deliberating with themselves" and convincing themselves to adopt particular arguments in manners that parallel encounters with other speakers in many respects.

Then, in an attempt to further indicate the relevance of rhetoric for understanding human behavior, P&OT (1969:45-62) subsequently consider the matters of argumentation, ceremonial (epideictic) rhetoric, education and propaganda, violence, and commitment.

Part Two of *The New Rhetoric* addresses three broader topics: the foundational features of agreement, the matter of interpretation, and rhetoric as instances of an engaged technology. P&OT's considerations of the objects of agreement and the problematics of interpretation are particularly instructive for analysts who attempt to attend to the frames with

---

[39] Even so, it should be noted that P&OT (1969 [original French version P&OT 1958]) have not benefited from the pragmatist insights of Charles Sanders Peirce, John Dewey, George Herbert Mead, or Charles Horton Cooley.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

which speakers *and* audiences work as they engage particular instances of rhetoric.

In considering "the objects of the agreement," P&OT (1969:65-79) stress the importance of acknowledging people's existing notions of mutuality as the base on which persuasive interchange (and all meaningful communication) is founded.

P&OT (1969:80-114) next outline some of the differing emphases that speakers may tactically assume (as in focusing on matters of quantity vs. quality or ordering the priorities of things under consideration) while also attending to the variable (relativist) appeals of particular positions for the audiences at hand.

As well, whereas speakers may introduce all manners of materials or "data" for their audiences to consider, P&OT (1969:115-141) emphasize that all of these things are subject to interpretation. Noting that people may envision the same items in highly diverse manners, P&OT focus on the roles that speakers may assume in qualifying and clarifying, as well as blending and obscuring the particular materials that they or other speakers have introduced to the audiences at hand. Thus, P&OT stress the importance of analysts attending centrally to the "plasticity of the interpretational process" with respect to any items audiences may consider.

Seeking to avoid the bifurcation of "rhetoric as a formal art" and "rhetoric as enacted instances of argumentation," P&OT (1969:142-183) subsequently attempt to illustrate how people may engage rhetoric in artistically (technically) informed terms.

However, while introducing a wide assortment of historical and cross-cultural illustrations in discussing some more formalistic aspects of rhetoric, P&OT recognize that they can be only partially successful in aligning theory about rhetoric with actual instances of rhetoric in the present formulation.[40]

Part Three of *The New Rhetoric* focuses on the particular (rhetorical) techniques of argumentation. Although P&OT's discussions are apt to be instructive for those lacking familiarity with classical scholarship; those who are more fluent with the rhetoric of Aristotle, Cicero, or Quintilian will find little in P&OT's considerations of rhetorical devices that is new or better articulated overall.

In concluding the volume, P&OT emphasize the necessity of examining people's reasoning practices in ways that extend philosophic understandings of human behavior well beyond conventional uses of formal logic and the rational-reductionist epistemological emphasis fostered by René Descartes.

Still, even though they envision an activity-centered approach to rhetoric as the key for achieving the transition to a more accurate, viable, and relevant philosophic approach to the study of the human condition, P&OT seem unable to offer a more explicit, sustained set of procedures for studying rhetoric as a realm of activity.

Michael Billig—Revitalizing Social Psychology

In developing *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*, Michael Billig (1996) recounts his disaffection with the one-sided and excessively structuralist emphases of mainstream psychology. He contrasts the current state of affairs in psychology with the enabling vitality of language, purpose, and interchange that he has encountered in "discovering" the works of the classical Greek and Roman rhetoricians.[41]

Noting that rhetoric as a field of study has been much neglected in Britain over the past century, Billig (who had been trained in experimental social psychology) provides an extended commentary on both the advantages of classical rhetoric and the necessity of recasting psychology in ways that are more attentive to the processes by which people actively influence and resist one another's attitudes or views on things.

After differentiating the classical rhetorical emphasis from more recent postmodernism and gender-based notions of rhetoric, Billig more fundamentally addresses the inadequacies of modern psychology with respect to (speech-enabled) rhetoric. While acknowledging the contributions of Chaim Perelman on rhetoric, Erving Goffman's dramaturgical (life as theater) emphasis, and

a somewhat related "life as game" metaphor, Billig subsequently centers much of his analysis on Protagoras' (circa 480-410 BCE) notion that "two positions may be taken on any matter under consideration."

In developing his text, Billig makes few references to the pragmatist theories of Kenneth Burke and G. H. Mead. Relatedly, even Aristotle and Cicero are given little attention in Billig's volume. Still, in the process of engaging a number of scholars who have dealt with rhetoric over the millennia, in both analytic and more poetic terms, Billig astutely identifies a series of major shortcomings in theory and research in the broader discipline of psychology. He also argues, in some detail, for the necessity of studying human knowing and acting in ways that are centrally attentive to human interchange.

It would be difficult for readers who are more familiar with the rhetorical tradition not to be struck by the clarity and relevancy of Billig's observations for the field of psychology, particularly his critical consideration of the social psychology of attitudes. Still, if there is a weakness to Billig's venture, this revolves around his lack of a clear alternative methodology and research agenda.

Relatedly, because the practices of most psychologists are so deeply entrenched in quantitative research, analysis, publication, and funding, it would be unreasonable to expect that Billig's argument for a more sustained consideration of human agency and interchange will have much impact on the discipline of psychology or even social psychology more specifically.

---

[40] As with most other rhetoricians and philosophers of language (and human knowing), P&OT (1969) seem unaware of the potential of ethnographic research for connecting (and assessing) theoretical notions with instances of human activity in the making.

[41] As someone (see: Kleinknecht 2007) whose experiences in sociology largely paralleled those of Michael Billig in psychology, I have very much appreciated Billig's efforts to reintroduce a humanly engaged element into the social sciences, as well as his dilemmas about how best to proceed in doing so.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Nevertheless, as part of a more extended set of commentaries on the failure of psychologists and other social scientists to examine their human subject matter in more genuine and situated terms,[42] Billig encourages a comprehensive reconceptualization of the ways in which the living interfusion of human thought and behavior takes place. No less consequentially, Billig alerts social scientists to the value of classical rhetoric for the study of human behavior.

Martha Cooper and William L. Nothstine—Striving for Synthesis

Like Billig's *Arguing and Thinking*, Cooper and Nothstine's (1992) *Power Persuasion: Moving Ancient Art into the Media Age* is developed primarily within a psychological frame. However, in contrast to Billig, who identifies a series of fundamental flaws in contemporary psychology, Cooper and Nothstine appear more intent on synthesizing classical rhetoric with contemporary psychology.

Although their text is marked by a more distinctive emphasis on the moral (evaluative) aspects of rhetoric, Cooper and Nothstine rely on Aristotle and Kenneth Burke in developing their position on rhetoric. Thus, Cooper and Nothstine acknowledge the symbolic, as well as the enacted features of rhetoric.

Another valuable aspect of the Cooper and Noth-

stine text is its more sustained attempt to broaden the scope of topics to which classical notions of rhetoric may be applied in the field of social psychology. Thus, for example, Cooper and Nothstine draw explicit attention to the relevance of rhetoric for people's varying modes of thought, as well as studies of emotion, motivation, charisma, symbolic (linguistic) realities, and compliance gaining practices.[43] Cooper and Nothstine also attempt to blend notions of classical rhetoric with broader organizational matters such as propaganda, social movements, and persuasion.

Still, relying more extensively on the resources of contemporary psychology, Cooper and Nothstine offer little in the way of an alternative methodology for more directly examining the influence process in any of these contexts. Also, because Cooper and Nothstine have mixed the more distinctively pragmatist (activity focused) emphasis of Aristotle and Burke with the generally more abstract, structuralist emphases on factors, typologies, and motivations that one finds in the psychological literature, Cooper and Nothstine not only have lost much of the centering emphasis that Billig places on the humanly engaged processual study of human interchange, but they also have unproductively let Aristotle's and Burke's concerted focus on *rhetoric as activity* slide away from their analysis.

---

[42] For more extended considerations of "the structuralist-pragmatist" or "positivist interpretivist" divides, see: Blumer (1969); Harré and Secord (1972); Gergen (1982; 1985); Carlson (1984); Billig (1996); Prus (1996; 1997; 1999; 2007c); Prus and Grills (2003); Grills and Prus (2008).

[43] Although noteworthy for the scope of its inclusions, the Cooper and Nothstine text has not benefited from some kindred conceptual materials. Thus, while attentive to "the symbolist perspective" (from Burke), Cooper and Nothstine do not appear familiar with symbolic interactionism (Blumer 1969) or the American pragmatist tradition more generally. Likewise, although Cooper and Nothstine discuss "image management," they have drawn no links to the sustained treatment of impression management in Erving Goffman's (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*.

Thomas B. Farrell—Rhetorical Culture and Practical Reasoning

In developing *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*, Thomas B. Farrell (1993) provides a particularly instructive account of rhetoric as an enduring, highly consequential feature of human group life.

Adopting a pluralist, anthropological/sociological approach to the study of communication, Farrell assumes three tasks in developing this text. First, he approaches rhetoric as a developmental field of cultural interchange. Second, he considers the historical and philosophical study of rhetoric in classical Greek scholarship. Third, Farrell endeavors to connect classical Greek rhetoric with contemporary pragmatist thought regarding community life.

Reacting against the inabilities of structuralist and rationalist approaches to deal with the dynamic, humanly engaged nature of community life (as signified by meaningful, purposive activity, interchange, and adjustment), as well as the ill-informed postmodernist tendency to reduce human group life to arbitrary, disembodied text, Farrell contends that rhetoric represents an essential aspect of community life wherever people (as living, acting, interacting symbol using creatures) might be found.

Thus, whereas the forms, expressions, emphases, rationales, and emotional features of rhetoric, as well as the contexts of their application can be expected to vary across and within societies relative to the specific life-worlds and associated conceptions of reality with which particular groups of

people may operate, persuasive interchange represents a fundamental feature of community life.

Farrell defines "rhetorical culture" as denoting historically developed realms of situated interchange that constitute collective (and individual) instances of reasoning and decision-making activity in humanly accomplished life-worlds.

In developing his text, Farrell presents readers with a particularly valuable statement on the development of classical Greek rhetoric and its relevance for the broader study of human knowing and acting. Rhetoric, Farrell contends, is central to the active, humanly engaged constitution and reconstitution of reality (as in people's conceptions of "that which is" and "that which is not").

Building on classical Greek scholarship, Farrell seeks to establish the connections between rhetoric and philosophy. Thus, in contrast to those who view rhetoric primarily as a technique or procedure, a mode of deception, or a more peculiar set of time-culture bound practices, Farrell shows how classical Greek scholarship contributes to our understanding of rhetorical culture. He does this by discussing the works of Protagoras, Plato, Isocrates, and (especially) Aristotle from the classical Greek era.

Not only is rhetoric to be understood as (a) denoting aspects of human knowing and acting of relevance across the entire set of historical-cultural arenas that constitute community life—as in law, politics, religion, history, and poetics—and (b) modes of interchange that not only have shaped the practices of

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

the past and present but also (c) situated instances of interchange that enable people to come to terms with the challenges, ambiguities, and limitations of their present circumstances. As well, Farrell observes, (d) the ways that these problematic, often negotiated interchanges take place in the here and now serve to help define the rhetorical culture of an ever-emergent future.

Attending to Aristotle's considerations of human knowing and acting, Farrell not only acknowledges wide ranges of persuasive endeavor and associated interchange, but he also stresses the unity (i.e., practical, functional inseparability) of rhetoric as humanly engaged activity with other realms of community life (e.g., poetics, ethics, politics). Whereas most rhetoricians (including those who had a good working familiarity with Aristotle's *Rhetoric*) have generally disregarded Aristotle's other texts that address matters of human knowing and acting (as in *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Poetics*, *Politics*, *Categories*, and *Topics*), and most philosophers (including those who have a good working familiarity with the broader corpus of Aristotle's texts) have largely ignored Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Farrell shows how important Aristotle's philosophic texts are for comprehending rhetoric as a humanly engaged, community-oriented process and how instructive Aristotle's analysis of rhetoric is for comprehending his approach to the broader study of human knowing and acting.

The key, in part, revolves around the recognition of rhetoric as a realm of practical reasoning. It is through active interchange that rhetoric enables people to come to terms with the problematic features of community life—wherever these may be found.

Rhetoric does not replace people's existing stocks of knowledge or the associated matters of cultural understandings, organizational practices, inquiry, logic, or subsequent instances of collective deliberation and more solitary reflectivity. Nevertheless, rhetoric both reflects the historically/culturally understood realities and practices of the groups at hand and represents a foundational element in their construction and reconstruction. As Farrell stresses, rhetoric represents an essential aspect of the reasoning practices that characterize all realms of human group life.

The third task that Farrell assumes is that of developing connections of classical rhetoric and contemporary pragmatist considerations of communication. Thus, while using Aristotle's scholarship as a base, Farrell attempts to establish some affinities of classical rhetoric with Habermas' (1975; 1987) pragmatist theory of communication (with its emphasis on legitimation practices in the public sphere). Still, given the broader nature of Habermas' theorizing, this latter material lends itself to more discursive modes of analyses and, as such, has notably less relevance for the more focused emphases on "rhetoric as activity" in the present text.

Fortunately, Robert Danisch, the next author considered here, directly addresses some of the missing connections of rhetoric and 20th century pragmatist thought.

Robert Danisch—The Interlinkages of Pragmatism and Rhetoric

Although Robert Danisch (2007) does not address influence work with the empirical emphasis of a so-

cial scientist, his text provides another important linch-pin for the present project since Danisch explicitly draws linkages between the rhetorical tradition and American pragmatist philosophy.

Attending to the longstanding division of rhetoric and philosophy generated by Socrates and Plato, Danisch makes an extended case for the intellectual realignment of these two realms of scholarship. Cogently addressing the affinities of the philosophies of William James and John Dewey with the rhetorical venture, Danisch emphasizes the mutual benefits of a more sustained intellectual synthesis of these two fields of endeavor.[44]

Notably, thus, whereas Danisch is (justifiably) critical of the disregard of pragmatist social thought by the rhetoricians and the parallel neglect of rhetoric by James and Dewey, Danisch astutely builds on texts from William James and John Dewey in establishing some vital philosophical foundations for those working in the rhetorical tradition.

Accordingly, thus, Danisch draws attention to (a) the importance of pragmatist considerations of activity, meaning, objectives, procedures, reflectivity, interchange, ambiguity, emergence, creativity, and strategic adjustment as central features of the human condition for more fully comprehending rhetoric as a socially engaged process and (b) the potency of persuasive interchange for more comprehensive

---

[44] Also building on the pragmatism of John Dewey, Scott Stroud (2009) considers the enabling qualities of pragmatist thought for the comparative analysis of rhetoric. In particular, Stroud draws attention to the matters of habit, purpose, interpretation, and the importance of attending to similarities and differences in developing process-oriented cross-contextual analyses of rhetoric.

and authentic pragmatist considerations of people's lived experience. Whereas instances of rhetorical interchange may represent more focused realms of strategic interaction, the matters of influence work, cooperation, and resistance are basic to communication in all sectors of community life.

Danisch may not be aware of the theoretical, methodological, and substantive resources associated with Chicago-style symbolic interaction as a sociological extension of American pragmatism (via George Herbert Mead [1934] and Herbert Blumer [1969]), but Robert Danisch may be commended for his efforts to more systematically and explicitly foster intellectual bridge-making between these two scholarly disciplines.

Robert Prus—Power as Intersubjective Accomplishment

This literature has been subjected to one primary criterion—does it attend to power as a matter of intersubjective accomplishment; does the approach (theoretical viewpoint, conceptual scheme, methodology) under consideration enable us to envision and study the ways in which human interchange is worked out in the ongoing instances of the here and now in which community life takes place?...Power does not exist as "something out there," as an objective phenomenon unto itself. And, power does not drive society or community life. People may engage all manners of [physical objects] in relating to one another, but power most fundamentally is a social or meaningful enacted essence. It is dependent on people for its conceptualization, contextualization, implementation, resistance, adjustment, and impact. Power is not the key

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

to understanding society. Instead, only as we develop more indepth understandings of the ways in which people accomplish community life more generally, will we be better able to appreciate power as a (social) essence. [Prus 1999:272]

In contrast to the Billig (1996) and Cooper and Nothstine (1992) texts that were developed out of an earlier emphasis on rhetoric, the material on classical rhetoric in Prus' (1999) *Beyond the Power Mystique* [*Power Mystique*] was only incorporated into (what primarily is an interactionist statement on power) this text at a much later stage of development.[45] Paralleling Billig's project somewhat, this statement takes issue with scholars in the social sciences for failing to examine power as a humanly enacted process.

Although I subsequently would become more aware of the division between contemporary rhetoric and the American pragmatist philosophy that Danisch (2007) discusses, *Power Mystique* encourages a more sustained consideration of influence work and resistance of the part of social scientists. More specifically, thus, *Power Mystique* presents a pragmatist theoretical standpoint, an associated

methodology, and a fairly detailed, process-oriented research agenda for studying the ways in which people may endeavor to influence, cooperate with, and resist one another in the course of ongoing community life.[46]

After an introductory statement that establishes the premises of symbolic interaction and the focus on power as intersubjective accomplishment (as denoting a humanly formulated, enacted, or engaged process), chapters 2 and 3 of *Power Mystique* consider a variety of approaches that social scientists have taken to the study of power. Developed mindfully of the remarkable contributions of the classical Greek scholars to rhetoric, chapter 4 discusses power (influence work, cooperation, and resistance) as an enduring feature of human group life.

Envisioning power as contingent on instances of human definition and enterprise, chapter 5 establishes a theoretical approach (symbolic interaction), a methodology (ethnographic research), and a conceptual frame (generic social processes) for ordering and assessing research on power as a humanly enacted matter.

While chapter 6 ("Engaging in Tactical Enterprise") considers the more basic ways in which people may embark on instances of influence work, chapter 7 ("Extending the Theater of Operations") deals with influence work as this may be pursued in a broad array of collective contexts, ranging from people's encounters with third parties to the enacted features of political agendas.

Chapter 8 ("Experiencing Target Roles") not only gives concerted attention to the multiple ways in which people may become focal points of activity, but also considers people's capacities (as agents) to act back on those endeavoring to influence them.

Maintaining a sustained interactionist emphasis on the things people do and addressing these broader sets of activities in more precise terms, the materials developed in chapters 6-8 provide a great many departure and comparison points for subsequent research and analysis of the influence process.

Envisioning power as denoting realms and instances of intersubjective accomplishment, *Power Mystique* is intended as a research agenda for engaging the study of influence work in direct, situated, and humanly engaged terms.[47] Relatedly, the

works of Billig (1996), Cooper and Nothstine (1992), and Danisch (2007) also attest to the potential of the classical literature on rhetoric for focusing scholarly attention on the study of human knowing and acting in philosophy as well as the human sciences more generally.

In Perspective

Approaching rhetoric as realms of communication in which people attempt to shape and/or resist the definitions, practices, and viewpoints of others, this paper has located Kenneth Burke's scholarship within (a) the contextual flows and pragmatist qualities of classical Greek and Latin rhetoric and (b) some explicit pragmatist emphases within 20th and 21st century considerations of rhetoric. This statement also has addressed (c) the affinities of Burke's work with symbolic interaction and (d) the implications of Burke's scholarship for the more sustained conceptual and methodological study of human knowing and acting.

Rather than review the latest variants of "rhetoric" that one finds in contemporary scholarship or provide an overview of the fuller range of materials generated in 20th and 21st century academia, this statement has considered persuasive interchange mindfully of the pragmatist features of classical Greek rhetoric and American pragmatist philosophy, particularly as mediated through the scholarship of Kenneth Burke.

Given his attentiveness to the broader study of human knowing and acting, Kenneth Burke represents a particularly important medium in the

---

[45] At the time I encountered Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the manuscript *Beyond the Power Mystique* was in the last stages of the publication process. However, on reading Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, I realized that there was much to be learned about persuasive endeavor from Aristotle and his associates. Although my familiarity with the classical literature was limited to what I could quickly absorb at that time, the material I encountered was so good that I decided it was necessary to replace a chapter from that text with another ("Enduring Tactical Themes") wherein consideration was given to the works of Plato, Aristotle, and Isocrates, among others. While I had not anticipated that this would be the start of a much more sustained inquiry to see what else to be learned from the classical Greek and Latin scholars, the present paper (along with some interim publications) is very much a product of that quest.

[46] Whereas *Beyond the Power Mystique* was centrally informed by the American pragmatist and interactionist scholarship, much also was gained from the ethnomethodological and constructionist' literature and the broader array of realist ethnographic inquiry in sociology and anthropology, *Power Mystique* also benefitted from some earlier examinations of the influence process through some ethnographic research in which I was directly involved. See, for instance, Prus (1976; 1989a; 1989b; 1993; 1994), Prus and Sharper (1977; 1991), Prus and Irini (1980). Although the findings from these studies paralleled many aspects of rhetoric as discussed by Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and others in the rhetorical tradition, none of the ethnographic inquiries I had earlier developed benefited directly from exposure to the classical literature on rhetoric.

[47] Focusing on (a) definitions of deviance and deviants, (b) people's involvements and continuities in subcultural life-worlds, and (c) the processes and problematics of regulatory endeavors from the standpoint of both agents and their targets, Prus and Grills' (2003) *The Deviant Mystique* also has extended relevance to matters addressed in classical Greek and Latin considerations of rhetoric (e.g., Plato, Aristotle, Cicero). Examining the implementation and problematics of the "deviance-making" process in the community, this text gives concerted attention to the identity-making process, as well as associated notions of agency and culpability amidst people's involvements in deviance and the problematic nature of community concerns with morality and regulation.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

interim series of links between classical Greek scholarship and the contemporary interactionist study of human knowing and acting. Whereas most interim and contemporary scholars have discussed rhetoric without regard to the broader study of human group life, Kenneth Burke contributed to the study of human knowing and acting both (a) directly through his own scholarship on classical Greek and Latin analyses of persuasive interchange and (b) as an intermediary of sorts through the subsequent works of Joseph Gusfield, Erving Goffman, Dennis Brissett, and Charles Edgley, and some others in the interactionist tradition who have yet more indirectly engaged aspects of Burke's dramatism.

The rhetoricians, George Kennedy, James J. Murphy, and Thomas Conley, have assumed notably important roles in maintaining present day continuities with classical Greek rhetoric. However, one of the earliest 20th century considerations of classical rhetoric and pragmatist philosophy (American pragmatism) is C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards' (1946 [1923]) *The Meaning of Meaning*. Notably, Ogden and Richards explicitly attend to language and the symbolization process as central aspects of human knowing and acting.[48]

Even so, of the contemporary scholars who have addressed rhetoric it is Kenneth Burke who brings the broadest array of historical and transdisciplinary sources into pragmatist considerations of rhetoric. Notably, thus, whereas Burke relies heavily on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, and *Poetics* in developing his analysis of influence work, activity, and explanations of human group life more generally, Burke's discussions of rhetoric also are informed by his exposure to Cicero, Quintilian, Augustine, Machiavelli, and Castiglioni.

Addressing (a) Aristotle's extended analysis of human knowing and acting in *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Rhetoric*, *Poetics*, and *Politics*, (b) the long-standing (since Plato) tradition of literary criticism and the philosophic condemnation of rhetoric, (c) the works of the classical Greek playwrights, and (d) other considerations of human relations, interchange, and emotionality in classical Greek and Latin scholarship more generally, Kenneth Burke's attentiveness to *dramatism*—as in the social production of images, symbolism, identities, and group relations— has much to offer pragmatist philosophers, symbolic interactionists, and other students of the human condition.[49]

Amidst (a) his emphasis on dramatism as a distinctively consequential feature of community life, Burke also is mindful of the importance of (b) examining activity as practical realms of accomplishment, (c) attending to the historical flows and contingencies of human knowing and acting, and (d) focusing on collective interchange, as well as (e) stressing the necessity of developing transsituational (transcontextual and transhistorical) comparative analyses. Relatedly, Burke stresses (f) the importance of studying rhetoric for comprehending *all* instances, realms, places, and eras of community life.

In developing this paper, I have addressed some other contemporary scholars who have engaged aspects of classical rhetoric in pragmatist-related terms. Even though Kenneth Burke has served as a much more consequential conduit than these other sources, the latter are noteworthy for more explicitly connecting rhetoric with philosophy, psychology, anthropology, and sociology.

While paralleling Burke in some ways, the philosophers Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (*The New Rhetoric* [1969]) are only marginally familiar with American pragmatism. Likewise, they have minimal familiarity with ethnographic inquiry. Nevertheless, like Burke, P&OT also envision human societies as constituted through meaningful, strategic interchange.

Building directly on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, P&OT are especially attentive to the processual, humanly accomplished features of persuasive interchange. Accordingly, for P&OT, rhetoric reflects human

capacities for purposive activity, planning, interpretation, strategic interchange, and minded adjustments on the part of those involved in the settings at hand. In addition to emphasizing the broad-based significance of rhetoric for comprehending all aspects of community life, P&OT also consider the fundamental relevance of rhetoric for understanding people's reasoning practices in both collective and solitary contexts. Still, P&OT display little connectedness with either the ethnographic study of human group life more generally or symbolic interactionism more specifically. In what is another indication of the procedural limitations of present-day philosophers, P&OT offer no methodology for any research along these lines.

In developing *Arguing and Thinking*, Michael Billig (1996) introduces rhetoric to the field of psychological social psychology as a conceptual emphasis of fundamental importance for comprehending the human condition. Billig also uses rhetoric as a point of departure for reframing the ossified, narrow, mechanistic approaches to the study of human knowing and acting that so centrally epitomize psychology as a discipline. Thus, Billig stresses the necessity of using rhetoric to develop a psychology that is more genuinely attentive to human lived experience. Still, Billig also is largely inattentive to more sustained instances of ethnographic inquiry and comparative analysis.

In a somewhat related statement, Martha Cooper and William Nothstine (1992) in *Power Persuasion* encourage the synthesis of rhetoric and conventional (factors-oriented) psychology. Nonetheless,

---

[48] I am not disregarding the development of American pragmatist social thought associated with Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, John Dewey, and George Herbert Mead (e.g., see: Prus 1996; 2003; 2004), but rather addressing a somewhat parallel chronological development wherein Kenneth Burke emerges as an "integrative medium" for these two conceptually related approaches to the study of human knowing and acting. While building on the classical Greek and Latin literature on rhetoric, Burke also has been attentive to aspects of American pragmatist scholarship in developing his analysis of human relations, symbolic interchange, and the nature of desired and cooperative, as well as more oppositionary and conflictual interchanges.

[49] Whereas the concepts that Burke has derived from these classical Greek and Latin sources have maintained relevancy over the millennia, most commentators on Burke's texts have disregarded these foundational sources and missed the more extended relevancy of these earlier scholars for the study of human knowing and acting. Thus, beyond the more immediate potency of the materials Kenneth Burke has to offer to students of the human condition, readers who return to the classical Greek and Latin literature (especially Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian) that Burke used will find a great deal of material of contextual, conceptual, and comparative-analytic value in the study of human group life. For more sustained indications of the conceptual, analytic, and substantive value of this literature, see: Prus (2007a; 2008a; 2009a; 2010; 2011a; 2011b; 2011c; 2011d; 2013a; 2013b; 2015), Puddephatt and Prus (2007), Prus and Burk (2010), Prus and Camara (2010).

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

even though Cooper and Nothstine more directly build on Aristotle and Burke than does Billig, they lose the emergent, activity-oriented features of human group life that Aristotle and Burke bring to the analysis of human interchange in their attempted synthesis of rhetoric and (structuralist) psychology.[50]

Thomas Farrell (1993) provides a broader, more enabling statement on the relevance of classical rhetoric for contemporary scholarship in *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*. Approaching rhetoric in historical-developmental, as well as anthropological-comparative terms, Farrell envisions rhetoric as a central and enduring feature of community life. Denoting realms of the purposive and minded interchange that transcend all cultures and all areas of community life, Farrell stresses the importance of studying rhetoric for comprehending people's reasoning practices in all instances of interchange, as well as in (linguistically enabled) instances of solitary reflection, deliberation, and decision-making activity.

Farrell also provides a particularly valuable analysis of the development of Greek rhetoric and

more explicitly illustrates the conceptual affinities between philosophy and rhetoric as realms of human endeavor. As well, and much more explicitly than Kenneth Burke, Farrell develops his text by addressing the broader corpus of Aristotle's works that pertain to the study of human knowing and acting. Farrell may have a limited familiarity with contemporary pragmatist scholarship, but his volume is notably informative in historical, philosophical, and anthropological terms.

Focusing more specifically on the conceptual connections of rhetoric and philosophy, Robert Danisch (2007) provides an instructive consideration of the inattentiveness of scholars in the fields of both rhetoric and American pragmatist philosophy to the rich conceptual resources that each field offers the other. Whereas Danisch seems unaware of symbolic interaction as a sociological extension of American pragmatism, he astutely alerts readers to consequential conceptual parallels between rhetoric and pragmatist philosophy. Thus, he stresses the importance of scholars from these two fields of study systematically and comprehensively incorporating aspects of the other into their respective programs of study. Still, given the "sociological attentiveness" to community life embedded within Burke's dramatism, it is apparent that Kenneth Burke much more effectively bridges this gap than does Danisch. Nevertheless, Robert Danisch explicitly encourages a more sustained, mutually encompassing venture between the study of rhetoric and pragmatist social thought.

Despite their general value for connecting classical Greek rhetoric with contemporary scholarship, the

20th-21st century scholars just addressed offer little in the way of a methodological alternative for the study of influence work as a humanly engaged process. As with most contemporary scholars working within the rhetorical tradition, they have been only marginally attentive to the potential that pragmatist sociological standpoints and ethnographic inquiry offer for research on strategic interchange as realms of activity.

Incorporating aspects of classical Greek scholarship only in the later stages of the development of his volume on power, Robert Prus (1999) also considers the linkages of rhetoric and pragmatist philosophy. Bringing the conceptual, methodological, and analytic resources of Chicago-style symbolic interactionism (Mead 1934; Goffman 1959; 1963a; 1963b; 1971; Blumer 1969; 1971; Prus 1996; 1997) to his examination of classical rhetoric, Prus (1999) provides a particularly systematic analysis of "influence work as intersubjective accomplishment." Building on pragmatism, ethnography, and comparative analysis, along with an emphasis on developing generic social processes associated with Blumerian symbolic interactionism, this text offers an ethnographic research agenda for studying influence (and resistance) as socially accomplished processes.

Like Burke and the other students of rhetoric who have followed the developmental flows of persuasive endeavor from the classical Greek era to the present time, the 20th and 21st century authors considered here are valuable not just for the more particular connections and applications of rhetoric they introduce, but also for the more sustained

linkages they encourage between classical scholarship and the contemporary social sciences.

As with the classical and interim sources on which he built, Kenneth Burke recognized that the study of rhetoric is much more than a set of manipulative procedures that people might invoke in their dealings with others. Because rhetoric is so thoroughly interfused with people's activities, perspectives, identities, emotionality, ongoing collective events, and interchanges, rhetoric is best understood more comprehensively—as a realm of endeavor that permeates *all* realms of social life.

Relatedly, Burke realized politics, religion, education and scholarship, science and technology, fiction and entertainment, as well as other central features of community life would be more adequately comprehended when analysts attend to the fuller range of human activity and interchange that one encounters within and across all other realms of community life.

Moving beyond the long-standing Socratic and Platonist division of rhetoric and philosophy, the scholarship of Kenneth Burke, with its emphasis on the (enacted) dramatism of everyday, has served as a distinctively enabling "medium of interchange" between classical Greek thought and American pragmatist philosophy and its sociological offshoot, symbolic interactionism. Our task, more modestly, is to build conceptually, methodologically, and analytically on the remarkable sets of resources embedded within these scholarly traditions.

---

[50] Although it is apparent that the psychologists have more recently "discovered" impression management as a concept (from Erving Goffman [1959], who generally is *not* cited in the psychological literature), there is little indication that even the social psychologists in psychology (most of whom still function as structuralist determinists) have much understanding of the pragmatist-oriented study of human knowing and acting or much awareness of the conceptually and analytically enabling resources associated with symbolic interaction and ethnographic research. There is also little indication that psychological social psychologists appreciate the centrality of the developmental flows of community life for comprehending human knowing and acting. Relatedly, see: Carlson (1984), Harré (1986), Harré and Secord (1972), Prus (2007b; 2007c; 2012).

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Appendix: Shortcomings and Potentialities of the Contemporary Analysis of Rhetoric

Having engaged some of the more distinctively pragmatist-oriented authors addressing rhetoric over the past century, it seems appropriate that we discuss the contemporary literature on rhetoric more generally relative to the pragmatist-oriented analyses of persuasive interchange that one encounters in the classical Greek and Latin literature, the dramatism of Kenneth Burke, and the sociological tradition of symbolic interactionism. This appendix is not intended to instruct people on how to more effectively strategize, develop compelling arguments, or win cases as rhetoricians,[51] but instead suggests ways of developing more sustained conceptual analyses of rhetoric as realms of persuasive interchange—with the broader implication of attending to, as well as learning more about the nature of, human group life and people's lived experiences therein. Thus, as we move through this appendix, it is important to keep in mind the distinction between "the analyses of rhetoric as persuasive interchange" and "rhetoric as engaged instances of persuasive interchange." The two often become distractingly conflated conceptually, particularly in advocacy-oriented "analyses."

When one uses the materials from Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, along with Kenneth Burke and symbolic interactionism as reference points, we become aware of the pronounced weaknesses of many contemporary considerations of rhetoric. Whereas 20th and 21st century discussions of rhetoric have addressed a wide array of substantive fields, including religion, education, ethics, women and gender roles, race and ethnic relations, home-front politics and international relations, a great many of these ventures (see, as illustrative, the Gaillet and Horner [2010] collection) have only loosely pursued the study of rhetoric in conceptual and methodological terms.

First, because the terms "rhetoric" or "oratory," along with particular techniques and other aspects of persuasive interchange, have been employed in a great many contexts with analysts pursuing highly diverse agendas, personal intrigues, and emotional mindsets and greatly varying degrees of scholarly interest, it is not surprising to find that a great many contemporary discussions of rhetoric have an overall "hodge-podge" quality. Further, the terms rhetoric or oratory often are employed in vaguely defined ways—seemingly with the presumption that these terms would have one meaning to the analyst/author and reader/assessor, along with any other audiences.[52] Thus, despite the considerable enterprise one encounters in the contemporary literature, there is relatively little definition of analysts' terms of reference or more sustained analyses of human knowing, acting, and interacting. Instead, because they are more extensively focused on the challenges or intrigues of the day, few analyses of rhetoric have benefited from *the foundational conceptual materials* developed by Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian or the dramatism of Kenneth Burke.

While there is a commonplace tendency to focus on "the message" and associated objectives, words, phrases, representations, and styles of delivery, as well as particular media formats, there is much more to rhetoric than the great many "one-way" depictions of rhetoric one encounters in the literature. Thus, whereas speakers typically "frame situations," frequently expressing "encouragements to act" directed towards target audiences, little attention is given to *actual speaker* viewpoints, intentions, preparations, dilemmas, and related experiences or the minded adjustments that speakers might make along the way. Even less consideration is directed towards *actual audience* viewpoints, dilemmas, interpretations deliberations, activities, interchanges, reinterpretations, resistances, and adjustments.

Relatedly, much contemporary analysis of rhetoric has a *presumptive quality* wherein authors/analysts not only *impute motives* to speakers, but also assume that audiences will interpret messages in ways consistent with the authors/analysts' own definitions of the situations under consideration. They seldom interview or otherwise directly consult with speakers, audiences, or other involved parties in more sustained ways regarding their concerns, intentions, tactics, activities, dilemmas, adjustments, and so forth.

Typically, as well, minimal consideration is given to (a) the activities and background circumstances in which instances of persuasive communication emerge, (b) the subsequent activities, interchanges, and the ongoing adjustments that people make as they relate to others, and (c) the activities in which people engage following one or other sets of interchanges with others in the setting. There also is little recognition of (d) the possibility of subsequent interchanges, assessments, adjustments, and so forth on the part of speakers and their audiences.

Further, rather than addressing rhetoric in more consistently analytic ways, some authors (e) impose the rhetorics of "morality," "vilification," and "dissent" on the speakers and/or audiences under consideration in developing their analyses. Disregarding the importance of sustained inquiry, comparative analysis, and conceptual development, spokespeople adopting advocacy-related agendas effectively obscure, if not more directly obstruct, the more careful study of persuasive interchange and human relations more generally.[53] Indeed, in dramatizing particular standpoints of morality, denigration, and activism, they miss the essential, humanly engaged features of Kenneth Burke's dramatism.

Given these tendencies, one finds relatively few contemporary discussions of rhetoric that focus

---

[51] Being a successful rhetorician (as most completely epitomized by Demosthenes [384-322 BCE]) and analyzing developments in specific cases is *not* synonymous with a more generic analysis of rhetoric as a humanly engaged social process (as so astutely articulated by Aristotle [384-322 BCE]).

[52] Indeed, rhetoric is frequently presumptively presented in much the same way that many analysts discuss "power" as a generalized, "catch-all" concept to account for particular outcomes *instead of examining and explaining* power *as a socially accomplished process* (see: Prus 1999). Likewise, little attention has been given to the premises that undergird analysts' approaches. Notably thus, most analysts have been notably inattentive to the matter of addressing rhetoric within *overarching action-oriented* pragmatist conceptual frames of the sort addressed by Aristotle and Kenneth Burke.

[53] For somewhat parallel sets of criticisms directed towards some sectors of contemporary sociology, see: Prus (1999; 2007d).

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

in detail on actual *instances* in which human interchange (i.e., definitions, persuasion, acceptance, resistance, assessment, and adjustment) as these are *mindfully engaged from the standpoints of the participants*. Very little attention is given to the matters of interpretation, deliberation, resistance, and other kinds of minded adjustments that the participants (speakers, targets, judges, others) as *living, acting, thinking, and adjusting essences actually make* within the dynamic sets of human theaters in which persuasive interchange takes place.

Likewise, and in contrast to actual human experience, there is almost no recognition of people's *adjustive learning processes* (and situated strategic adjustments) as those involved in related (previous, ongoing, or parallel) instances of persuasive interchange reflect on these earlier associated matters.[54] Similarly, there is little cognizance of the relevance of longer-term *group related memories* regarding the particular matters at hand in more extended cultural-historical terms (see: Farrell 1993; Prus 2007b).

Surprisingly little consideration also is given to *the fuller range of participants* in the settings under consideration. Thus, in addition to (a) initial speakers (and any supporters, assistants), this could include: (b) oppositional or competitive speakers (and their supportive associates); (c) judges and/other audiences/assessors; (d) particular targets (of negative, as well as positive

claims) as central participants, co-participants, and other "implicated" associates; (e) plaintiffs and/or victims and their associates; (f) witnesses and other sources of testimony; and (g) outside audiences (interested parties, media representatives, organizational or government representatives, moralists and activists) who also may enter into the broader, more extended sets of interchanges characterizing some instances of influence work and resistance.

Relatedly, despite the particular emphasis that Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and Burke place on developing generic or transsituational conceptions of rhetoric or oratory as "something in the making," most analyses of contemporary rhetoric have not been extended much beyond immediate applications and specific subject matters. Not only is there little consideration of the broader implications of particular focal points for understanding the interchanges characterizing community life more generally, but even less attention is given to the articulation of the transsituational (trans-contextual and transhistorical) processes or *the generic social features* of rhetoric as these might be derived from more *sustained comparative analyses* of instances of persuasive interchange within and across particular substantive contexts.

Whereas rhetoric (as *persuasive interchange* in a more comprehensive sense) is extremely important for comprehending human relation more generally, rhetoric as a realm of human interchange (as Kenneth Burke so appropriately stresses) is best comprehended within the broader parameters of human relations—within the context of the

fuller array of people's activities that enable community life in practical living terms.

Moreover, and in contrast to Burke's scholarship, much of the contemporary literature is poorly informed about the *historically developed and situationally invoked interfusions* of rhetoric with poetics (fiction and theater), politics and law, historical events, religion, education, and pragmatist philosophy (knowing, acting, relating, assessing, and adjusting). While rhetoric can be discussed as a realm of endeavor on its own, it is to be recognized that the modes of influence and resistance that developed in particular societies are best understood in conjunction with the broader, somewhat congruent flows of human knowing and acting across the broader fields of activity that constitute community life in the making (also see: Farrell 1993).

There may be little that specific individuals or even more extended sets of scholars might do to quickly or effectively change more general tendencies in any realm of studies.[55] Still, one may still contrib-

ute to a more enduring, more vital social science as well as achieve a more genuine awareness of community life by pursuing the study of persuasive interchange in historically-enabled, participant informed, conceptually articulated, and pluralistically-oriented analytic terms.

I begin by encouraging a greater overall attentiveness to classical Greek and Latin scholarship. While mindful of (a) the importance of the works on rhetoric developed by Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian in this paper, so much more insight can be gained through familiarity with the broader literature on community interchange developed by (b) Plato (particularly *Republic and Laws*; but his dialectic [sustained comparative] analyses of various aspects of human knowing and acting also merit study), (c) Aristotle (especially his work on ethics, poetics, and politics),[56] and (d) the ethnohistorians Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon (Prus and Burk 2010).

Although Plato provides some extremely valuable insight on people's religious viewpoints and practices (Prus 2013c), Plato does not directly engage

---

[54] Consider, for example, the ways that parents and children, teachers and students, physicians and patients, guards and prisoners may engage one another over time as they pursue their respective objectives and interests. See: Prus (1999) for an extended discussion of "the interchangeability of the roles of interactants as targets and tacticians" as their exchanges unfold.

[55] As Emile Durkheim (1915 [1912]; 1977 [1904-1905]) would remind us, both *the humanly known present and any future state are emergent, collectively achieved essences*. There is no doubt that the future is highly enabled by the past, including the ever fleeting present. However, the actual "whatness" that will be carried forward and in what ways things from the past might be accepted and rejected, expressed, modified, or transformed are matters that typically extend well beyond the concerns and efforts of particular organizations and governments, as well as any individuals within. For this reason as well, like Lucian (120-200 CE) who provides an exceedingly thoughtful analysis of the problematics of people developing ethnohistorical accounts of community life in the classical Roman era, one may express guarded optimism regarding the quality of future scholarship on rhetoric as persuasive interchange. Still, if one considers a conceptually and methodologically informed pluralist scholarship to be of value for the longer term study of community life, then this can be a worthwhile endeavor, even within the context of an uncertain, ever unfolding present.

[56] I particularly stress the conceptual and analytic potency of the works of Plato and Aristotle. Indeed, their contributions are so foundational and extensive that I often tell my students that, "If you know the works of Plato and Aristotle, you will be familiar with virtually every major concept (including totalizing skepticism) encountered in Western social thought for the past 2500 years and, most likely, the great deal of the future scholarship in the humanities and social sciences. You may not know exactly how and in what ways future scholars will portray aspects of the works of Plato, Aristotle, and others from the past, that is, how extensively and explicitly they will be represented, what will be lost, what will be maintained, emphasized, badly misconstrued, arrogantly denigrated, and so forth, but you will have an incredible array of resources with which to comprehend and engage the broader study of human knowing and acting."

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

religion in sustained dialectic terms. Moreover, because Aristotle's (presumably pragmatist rather than divinely inspired) texts on religion have been lost or destroyed, we do not have these as analytic resources. Accordingly, (e) Cicero's work on religion (Prus 2011d) is especially consequential for more adequately acknowledging the interfusions of rhetoric and religion—not only in the classical Greek and Latin eras but also during the intervening centuries to the present time.

Given their enduring relevance to Western conceptions of entertainment, as well as significant portions of the conceptual imagery that more broadly permeates Western social thought, (f) the epic poems of Homer and the theatrical productions of the tragedians (Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides), as well as the "comic poets" (Aristophanes and Menander) also merit consideration for a fuller appreciation of rhetoric. Although these fictionalized representations of community life may seem removed from rhetoric as a humanly engaged process, the classical Greek poets are remarkably well informed about human knowing and acting as commonly contested realms of persuasive interchange.

Still, it is to be appreciated that Western social thought did not develop in a systematic cumulative way but rather reflects an extended series of disruptions, losses, and renaissances of various sorts. Thus, (g) various authors from the classical Roman era, including Terence, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Quintilian, Plutarch, Lucian, Augustine, and Martianus Capella, are particularly noteworthy for fostering classical Greek and Latin social thought over the duration and demise of the Roman Empire

and the intellectual limitations of the Western European "dark ages" (circa 500-900).[57]

A second suggestion for the development of a more scholarly analysis of rhetoric revolves around focusing on "what is" rather than "what should be." A related matter is to examine and delineate all components or aspects of a situation—to see "where and how" the particular matters under consideration do *and* do not fit together. This will require sustained comparative analysis wherein one attends in processual terms to similarities, differences, connections, and the conceptual implications thereof.

In the analyses of persuasive interchange, as with other realms of human knowing and acting, one also would ask how people as agents mindfully (both causally and casually) *enter into* the ongoing flows of activities, interchanges, and other collective events through their observations, interpretations, intentions, behaviors, assessments, and adjustments. In this regard, it is important to attend to the ways that the things take place in the particular theaters at hand—to attend to the things that people experience, think, say, and do *before, during, and after* specific activities and interchanges with others.

As well, since human group life involves many matters that people cannot fully anticipate or control in either individual or collective terms, human life-worlds

_____
[57] A detailed overview of "the Greek project" and a listing of some other scholars contributing to the developmental flows of Western social thought over the intervening centuries can be found in Prus (2004). Focusing on education and scholarship from the classical Greek and Latin eras to his own time, Emile Durkheim's (1977 [1904-1905]) *The Evolution of Educational Thought* provides an exceptionally important, conceptually informed historical overview of the developmental flows (transitions and disjunctures) of Western social thought.

are characterized by "realms of emergence" as people (as agents) encounter instances of uncertainty and ambiguity in coming to terms in more satisfactory ways with the situations in which they find themselves.

Further, because rhetoric is *social activity* in the most basic terms, the analysis of persuasive interchange is not just about rhetoric in abstract terms. It is about human group life much more fundamentally and comprehensively. The subject matter of rhetoric revolves around culturally-enabled life-worlds and human relations. It revolves around people talking, remembering, acting, interacting, observing, defining, anticipating, generating, performing, cooperating, contesting, and making adjustments *within the theaters of the other*. To ignore these matters is to restrict the authenticity of one's analyses of rhetoric.

Third, whereas much analysis of the human condition focuses on people as individual psychological entities, it is much more productive to focus on people as *socially engaged* (i.e., group-enabled, group participating, and group attentive) agents. Because "human life so fundamentally is group life," it is only in becoming active, linguistically-enabled participants in the community that people (as individual beings) achieve a comprehensible, meaningful "oneness with the reality of the community." Like other animals, people are physiologically-enabled and have capacities for sensation and motion. However, meaningful realms of knowing and acting are possible only because of the activities, language, concepts, practices, conventions, moralities, and memories that people acquire within the context of ongoing group life (Durkheim 1915 [1912]; Mead 1934; Blumer 1969; Prus 2007b; 2007c).

Because human group life revolves around activity, it is especially instructive to attend to the things that people do and the ways in which they do these things. To better comprehend rhetoric as humanly accomplished activity, it is essential to provide detailed accounts of people's anticipations, deliberations, acts, interchanges, obstructions, and adjustments. This means questing for openness and authenticity, as well as emphasizing pluralist inquiry and analysis. Like other conceptually informed aspects of human group life, the analysis of rhetoric is to be understood as a collectively-enabled *emergent process* with the scholars thusly involved endeavoring to be comprehensive, thorough, and detailed in their conceptual formulations.

As much as possible, it is also desirable to examine instances and realms of persuasive interchange from the viewpoints of all of the parties in the setting without imposing political, religious, or other moral evaluations on particular people and/or their lifestyles. Relatedly, it is important to ensure that these matters are not compromised or reshaped to suit one's own more immediate moralities and preferences or those of particular others.

Consistent with Thucydides' (circa 460-400 BCE) remarkable account of *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, analysts are encouraged to "write things to last forever"—to strive for more encompassing, long-term relevance rather than just addressing the more immediate problems and/or intrigues of the ever fleeting present. While pursuing clarity and authenticity, as well as detail and the fullness of representation, this also is facilitated by comparative analysis wherein one attends to similarities, differences, and conceptual implications.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Still, since even highly responsible analysts cannot be expected to have access to as much background and participant-based information as they might desire, it is particularly important that scholarly-oriented analysts exercise caution in any claims they might make about people's viewpoints, definitions of situations, plans, intentions, attentiveness to outcomes, assessments, adjustments, concerns with others, and the like. Otherwise, in yielding to speculation, their analyses are more apt to assume misleading or otherwise inauthentic dimensions.

Recognizing not only that "the truth" (in pragmatist terms) is whatever audiences accept as authentic or viable, but that people also act mindfully of their knowledge of situations, Plato (following Socrates) openly and extensively condemns the practice of rhetoric. He does so as a consequence of the creativity, selective concealment and revelation, dramatizations and strategic misrepresentations, deliberate fabrications and other inauthenticities that speakers may introduce in the process of promoting their positions. Plato's student, Aristotle, also is highly mindful of the potency of persuasive interchange for shaping and reshaping people's definitions of situations. However, in contrast to Plato, Aristotle systematically, thoroughly, and nonjudgmentally takes rhetoric apart piece by piece to display its components, tactical endeavors, and strategic interchanges, as well as address at some length the associated emotionally-engaged nature of human knowing and acting. Whereas Isocrates, Cicero, and Quintilian, like Aristotle, are primarily intent on developing instructional analyses of rhetoric, they encourage speakers to pursue more virtuous or noble agendas whenever possible in pursuing their causes. Still, like Kenneth Burke, all of these analysts are highly aware of the discrepancies between what may be termed "known authenticity" and "the strategic misrepresentations" that speakers may invoke in their pursuits of more desired outcomes.

For readers or other audiences attending to specific instances of persuasive interchange as well as analysts' presentations, the challenge is to consider particular instances of rhetorical interchange, as well as any broader analyses of rhetorical endeavor in more discerning, skeptical terms—to recognize that instances of more compelling persuasive interchange in either specific rhetorical ventures or people's analyses need not be synonymous with speakers' known definitions of "situational authenticity."

It is for this reason that those studying and developing analyses of persuasive interchange, as well as those assessing these productions are encouraged to pursue all opportunities to learn about human relationships and people's interchanges therein and approach these in comparative analytic terms—rather than judging, moralizing about, or prescribing lines of action for others. Relatedly, it seems most productive that those in the human sciences spend as much time as possible "listening to, learning from, and striving to understand people" wherever and whenever they might encounter others. Likewise, it is important for scholarly-oriented analysts and audiences to be inquisitive, questing for more detail and fuller, process-oriented, participant informed instances of data in pursuing their humanly engaged subject matters.

References

Arnhart, Larry. 1981. *Aristotle on Political Reasoning: A Commentary on "The Rhetoric."* DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.

Beale, Walter. 1987. *A Pragmatic Theory of Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Becker, Howard S. 1963. *Outsiders*. New York: Free Press.

Billig, Michael. 1996. *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Blakesley, David. 2002. *The Elements of Dramatism*. New York: Longman.

Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interaction*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Blumer, Herbert. 1971. "Social Problems as Collective Behavior." *Social Problems* 18:298-306.

Borgman, Albert. 1974. *The Philosophy of Language: Historical Foundations and Contemporary Issues*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Branaman, Ann. 2013. "Dramaturgical Thought: Drama as Life: The Seminal Contributions of Kenneth Burke." Pp. 15-25 in *The Drama of Social Life: A Dramaturgical Handbook*, edited by Charles Edgley. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Brandes, Paul D. 1989. *A History of Aristotle's Rhetoric with a Bibliography of Early Printings*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Brissett, Dennis and Charles Edgley. 1990. *Life as Theater: A Dramaturgical Sourcebook*. New York: Aldine DeGruyter.

Brock, Bernard L. 1995. *Kenneth Burke and Contemporary European Thought: Rhetoric in Transition*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Burke, Kenneth. 1959 [1937]. *Attitudes toward History*. Second Edition. Los Altos, CA: Hermes.

Burke, Kenneth. 1961 *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology*. Boston: Beacon.

Burke, Kenneth. 1969a [1945]. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, Kenneth. 1969b [1950]. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, Kenneth. 1973 [1941]. *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. Third Edition. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, Kenneth. 1984 [1935]. *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*. Third Edition. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Carlson, Rae. 1984. "What's Social about Social Psychology? Where's the Person in Personality Research?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47:1304-1309.

Cicero. 1951. *De Natura Deorum* [*On the Nature of the Gods*]. Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Conley, Thomas M. 1990. *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Conley, Thomas M. 2000. "Greek Rhetorics after the Fall of Constantinople: An Introduction." *Rhetorica* 18:265-294.

Cooper, Martha D. and William Nothstine. 1992. *Power Persuasion: Moving an Ancient Art into the Media Age*. Greenwood, IN: The Education Video Group.

D'Angelo, Frank J. 1975. *A Conceptual Theory of Rhetoric*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Danisch, Robert. 2007. *Pragmatism, Democracy, and the Necessity of Rhetoric*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Duncan, Hugh Dalziel. 1951. "Review of *A Rhetoric of Motives* by Kenneth Burke." *The American Journal of Sociology* 56(6):592-594.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Duncan, Hugh Dalziel. 1953. *Language and Literature in Society: A Sociological Essay on Theory and Method in the Interpretation of Linguistic Symbols*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Duncan, Hugh Dalziel. 1962. *Communication and Social Order*. New York: Bedminster Press.

Duncan, Hugh Dalziel. 1969. *Symbols and Social Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Durkheim, Emile. 1915 [1912]. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Translated by Joseph Ward Swain. London: Allen and Unwin.

Durkheim, Emile. 1961 [1902-1903]. *Moral Education*. Translated by Everett K. Wilson and Herman Schnurer. New York: Free Press.

Durkheim, Emile. 1977 [1904-1905]. *The Evolution of Educational Thought*. Translated by Peter Collins. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Edgely, Charles. 2013. *The Drama of Social Life: A Dramaturgical Handbook*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Enos, Richard Leo. 1993. *Greek Rhetoric before Aristotle*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Enos, Richard Leo. 1995. *Roman Rhetoric: Revolution and the Greek Influence*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Enos, Richard Leo and Lois Peters Agnew. 1998. *Landmark Essays on Aristotelian Rhetoric*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Erickson, Keith. 1975. *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Five Centuries of Philological Research*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Farrell, Thomas B. 1993. *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Fine, Gary Alan and Greg W. H. Smith. 2000. *Erving Goffman*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gaillet, Lynée Lewis and Winifred Bryan Horner. 2010. *The Present State of Scholarship in the History of Rhetoric: A Twenty-First Century Guide*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Garver, Eugene. 1994. *Aristotle's Rhetoric: An Art of Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gergen, Kenneth. 1982. *Toward Transformation in Social Knowledge*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gergen, Kenneth. 1985. "The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology." *American Psychologist* 40:266-275.

Gilson, Etienne. 1988. *Linguistics and Philosophy: An Essay on the Philosophical Constants of Language*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor.

Goffman, Erving. 1963a. *Behavior in Public Places*. New York: Free Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1963b. *Stigma*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Spectrum.

Goffman, Erving. 1971. *Relations in Public*. New York: Harper Colophon.

Grassi, Ernesto. 2001. *Rhetoric as Philosophy*. Translated by John Michael Krois and Azizeh Azodi. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Grills, Scott and Robert Prus. 2008. "The Myth of the Independent Variable: Reconceptualizing Class, Gender, Race, and Age as Subcultural Processes." *The American Sociologist* 39(1):19-37.

Gross, Alan and Arthur Walzer. 2000. *Rereading Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gusfield, Joseph R. 1963. *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Gusfield, Joseph R. 1981. *The Culture of Public Problems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gusfield, Joseph R. 1989. *On Symbols and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gusfield, Joseph R. 1996. *Contested Meanings: The Construction of Alcohol Problems*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1975. *Legitimation Crises*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1987. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Volume 1 and 2. Translated By Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Harré, Rom. 1986. *The Social Construction of Emotions*. Oxford: Basil Blackwood.

Harré, Rom and Paul Secord. 1972. *The Explanation of Social Behaviour*. Oxford: Basil-Blackwell.

Heath, Robert L. 1986. *Realism and Relativism: A Perspective on Kenneth Burke*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Holland, Virginia L. 1959. *Counterpoint: Kenneth Burke and Aristotle's Theories of Rhetoric*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Johnson, Nan. 1991. *Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Kastely, James L. 1997. *Rethinking the Rhetorical Tradition: From Plato to Postmodernism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kennedy, George. 1963. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kennedy, George. 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kennedy, George. 1980. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Kennedy, George. 1983. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kennedy, George. 1989. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, George. 1991. *Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. New York: Oxford.

Kennedy, George. 1999. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Second Edition. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Kinneavy, James L. 1990. "Contemporary Rhetoric." Pp. 186-241 in *The Present State of Scholarship in Historical and Contemporary Rhetoric* (revised edition), edited by Winifred Bryon Horner. Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press.

Kleinknecht, Steven. 2007. "An Interview with Robert Prus: His Career, Contributions, and Legacy as an Interactionist Ethnographer and Social Theorist." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 3(2):221-288.

Land, Stephen K. 1986. *The Philosophy of Language in Britain: Major Theories from Hobbes to Thomas Reid*. New York: AMS.

Lyman, Stanford and Marvin Scott. 1970. *Sociology of the Absurd*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Martinich, A. P. 1990. *The Philosophy of Language*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

McKeon, Richard Peter. 1987. *Rhetoric: Essays in Invention and Discovery*. Edited by Mark Backman. Woodbridge, CT: Ox Bow.

Mead, George H. 1934. *Mind, Self and Society*. Edited by Charles W. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 1940. "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive." *American Sociological Review* 5:904-913.

Murphy, James J. 1974. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Murphy, James J. 1989. *Medieval Rhetoric: A Select Bibliography*. Second Edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Robert Prus

Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Pragmatism: A Missing Link between Classical Greek Scholarship and the Interactionist
Study of Human Knowing and Acting

Murphy, James J. 2002. "The Metarhetoric of Aristotle: With Some Examples from His *On Memory* and *Recollection*." *Rhetoric Review* 21(3):213-228.

Murphy, James J. and Richard A. Katula. 2003. *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Newman, Sara. 2002. "Aristotle's Notion of 'Bringing-Before-the-Eyes': Its Contributions to Aristotelian and Contemporary Conceptualizations of Metaphor, Style, and Audience." *Rhetorica* 20:1-23.

Nienkamp, Jean. 2001. *Internal Rhetorics: Toward a History and Theory of Self-Persuasion*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards. 1946 [1923]. *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language Upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Perelman, Chaïm and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. 1969. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Perinbayagam, Robert S. 1985. *Signifying Acts: Structure and Meaning in Everyday Life*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Plato. 1997. *Plato: Complete Works*. Edited by J. M. Cooper. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Prus, Robert. 1975. "Resisting Designations: An Extension of Attribution Theory into a Negotiated Context." *Sociological Inquiry* 45(1):3-14.

Prus, Robert. 1976. "Religious Recruitment and the Management of Dissonance: A Sociological Perspective." *Sociological Inquiry* 46(2):127-134.

Prus, Robert. 1989a. *Making Sales: Influence as Interpersonal Accomplishment*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Prus, Robert. 1989b. *Pursuing Customers: An Ethnography of Marketing Activities*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Prus, Robert. 1993. "Shopping with Companions: Images, Influences, and Interpersonal Dilemmas." *Qualitative Sociology* 16(2):87-110.

Prus, Robert. 1994. "Consumers as Targets: Autonomy, Accountability, and Anticipation of the Influence Process." *Qualitative Sociology* 17(3):243-262.

Prus, Robert. 1996. *Symbolic Interaction and Ethnographic Research*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Prus, Robert. 1997. *Subcultural Mosaics and Intersubjective Realities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Prus, Robert. 1999. *Beyond the Power Mystique*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Prus, Robert. 2003. "Ancient Precursors." Pp. 19-38 in *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism*, edited by Larry T. Reynolds and Nancy J. Herman-Kinney. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira.

Prus, Robert. 2004. "Symbolic Interaction and Classical Greek Scholarship: Conceptual Foundations, Historical Continuities, and Transcontextual Relevancies." *The American Sociologist* 35(1):5-33.

Prus, Robert. 2006. "In Defense of Knowing, In Defense of Doubting: Cicero Engages Totalizing Skepticism, Sensate Materialism, and Pragmatist Realism in *Academica*." *Qualitative Sociological Review* 2(3):21-47.

Prus, Robert. 2007a. "Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*: Laying the Foundations for a Pragmatist Consideration of Human Knowing and Acting." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 3(2):5-45.

Prus, Robert. 2007b. "On Studying Ethnologs (Not Just People, 'Societies in Miniature'): On the Necessities of Ethnography, History, and Comparative Analysis." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 36(6):669-703.

Prus, Robert. 2007c. "Human Memory, Social Process, and the Pragmatist Metamorphosis: Ethnological Foundations, Ethnographic Contributions and Conceptual Challenges." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 36(4):378-437.

Prus, Robert. 2007d. "The Intellectual Canons of a Public Sociology: Pragmatist Foundations, Historical Extensions, and Humanly Engaged Realities." Pp. 195-235 *Public Sociology: The Contemporary Debate*, edited by Lawrence T. Nichols. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Prus, Robert. 2008a. "Aristotle's *Rhetoric*: A Pragmatist Analysis of Persuasive Interchange." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 4(2):24-62.

Prus, Robert. 2008b. "Producing, Consuming, and Providing Instruction on Poetic Texts in the Classical Roman Era: The Pragmatist Contributions of Horace (65-8 BCE), Longinus (100 CE), and Plutarch (46-125 CE)." *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* 30:81-103.

Prus, Robert. 2008c. "Writing History for Eternity: Lucian's (c120-200) Contributions to Pragmatist Scholarship and Ethnographic Analysis." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 37(1):62-78.

Prus, Robert. 2008d. "On the Pragmatics and Problematics of Defining Beauty and Character: The Greek Poet Lucian (120-200) Engages Exacting Portraitures and Difficult Subjects." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 4(1):3-20.

Prus, Robert. 2009a. "Poetic Expressions and Human Enacted Realities: Plato and Aristotle Engage Pragmatist Motifs in Greek Fictional Representations." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 5(1):3-27.

Prus, Robert. 2009b. "Reconceptualizing the Study of Community Life: Emile Durkheim's Pragmatism and Sociology." *The American Sociologist* 40:106-146.

Prus, Robert. 2010. "Creating, Sustaining, and Contesting Definitions of Reality: Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BCE) as a Pragmatist Theorist and Analytic Ethnographer." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 6(2):3-27.

Prus, Robert. 2011a. "Defending Education and Scholarship in the Classical Greek Era: Pragmatist Motifs in the Works of Plato (c420-348 BCE) and Isocrates (c436-338 BCE)." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 7(1):1-35.

Prus, Robert. 2011b. "Morality, Deviance, and Regulation: Pragmatist Motifs in Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 7(2):1-44.

Prus, Robert. 2011c. "On the Processes and Problematics of Representing Divinity: Dio Chrysostom (c40-120) and the Pragmatist Motif." Pp. 205-221 in *History, Time, Meaning, and Memory: Ideas for the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Barbara Jones Denison. Leiden: Brill.

Prus, Robert. 2011d. "Religion, Platonist Dialectics, and Pragmatist Analysis: Marcus Tullius Cicero's Contributions to the Philosophy and Sociology of Divine and Human Knowing." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 7(3):1-30.

Prus, Robert. 2012. "On the Necessity of Re-Engaging the Classical Greek and Latin Literatures: Lessons from Emile Durkheim's *The Evolution of Educational Thought*." *The American Sociologist* 43:172-202.

Prus, Robert. 2013a. "Generating, Intensifying, and Redirecting Emotionality: Conceptual and Ethnographic Implications of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 9(4):6-42.

Prus, Robert. 2013b. "Love, Despair, and Resiliency: Ovid's Contributions to an Interactionist Analysis of Intimate Relations." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 9(3):124-151.

Prus, Robert. 2013c. "Representing, Defending, and Questioning Religion: Pragmatist Sociological Motifs in Plato's *Timaeus*, *Phaedo*, *Republic*, and *Laws*." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 9(1):8-42.

Prus, Robert. 2014a. "Engaging Love, Divinity, and Philosophy: Pragmatism, Personification, and Autoethnographic Motifs in the Humanist Poetics of Brunetto Latini, Dante Alighieri, and Giovanni Boccaccio." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 10(3):6-46.

Prus, Robert. 2014b. "Encountering Nature, Experiencing Courtly Love, and Romance of the Rose: Generic Standpoints, Interpretive Practices, and Human Interchange in 12th-13th Century French Poetics." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 10(2):6-29.

Prus, Robert. 2015. "Aristotle's Theory of Deviance and Contemporary Symbolic Interactionist Scholarship: Learning from the Past, Extending the Present, and Engaging the Future." *The American Sociologist* 46(1):122-167.

Prus, Robert and C.R.D. Sharper. 1977. *Road Hustler: The Career Contingencies of Professional Card and Dice Hustlers*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Prus, Robert and C.R.D. Sharper. 1991. *Road Hustler: Hustlers, Magic and the Thief Subculture*. New York: Kaufman and Greenberg.

Prus, Robert and Styllianoss Irini. 1980. *Hookers, Rounders, and Desk Clerks: The Social Organization of the Hotel Community*. Salem, WI: Sheffield.

Prus, Robert and Scott Grills. 2003. *The Deviant Mystique: Involvements, Realities, and Regulation*. Westport, CN: Praeger.

Prus, Robert and Matthew Burk. 2010. "Ethnographic Trailblazers: Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 6(3):3-28.

Prus, Robert and Fatima Camara. 2010. "Love, Friendship, and Disaffection in Plato and Aristotle: Toward a Pragmatist Analysis of Interpersonal Relationships." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 6(3):29-62.

Puddephatt, Antony and Robert Prus. 2007. "Causality, Agency, and Reality: Plato and Aristotle Meet G. H. Mead and Herbert Blumer." *Sociological Focus* 40(3):265-286.

Richards, I. A. 1924. *The Principles of Literary Criticism*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.

Richards, I. A. 1936. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Richards, I. A. 1937. *Interpretation in Teaching*. London: Kegan Paul.

Richards, I. A. 1942. *How to Read a Page*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Rosenfield, Lawrence. 1971. "An Autopsy of the Rhetorical Tradition." Pp. 64-77 in *The Prospect of Rhetoric*, edited by Lloyd F. Ritzer and Edwin Black. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sidney, Philip. 1901. *The Defense of Poesy [An Apology for Poetry]*. Edited by Albert S. Cook. Boston: Athenian.

Stewart, Donald C. 1990. "The Present State of Scholarship in Historical and Contemporary Rhetoric." Pp. 151-185 in *The Present State of Scholarship in Historical and Contemporary Rhetoric* (revised edition), edited by Winifred Bryon Horner. Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press.

Strauss, Anselm. 1993. *Continual Permutations of Action*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Stroud, Scott R. 2009. "Pragmatism and the Methodology of Comparative Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 39:353-379.

Tejera, Victorino. 1996. *Aristotle's Organon in Epitome: The Poetics, The Rhetoric, The Analytics*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen.

Vickers, Brian. 1988. *In Defense of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Walker, Jeffery. 2000. *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolin, Ross. 2001. *The Rhetorical Imagination of Kenneth Burke*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Zappen, James P. 2009. "Kenneth Burke on Dialectical-Rhetorical Transcendence." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 42:279-301.