For this week's chapter, the focus is centered on rhetorical situations. The concept of rhetoric was championed by philosopher Aristotle, who defines rhetoric as an ability to see the available means of persuasion on a case-to-case basis (225). A rhetorical situation is defined as "a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if the discourse, introduced into the situation can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence" (227). An exigence is defined as an imperfection marked by urgency, or an obstacle (227). In simpler terms, a rhetorical situation is made up of a rhetor, and issue (or exigence), an audience, and a series of verbal discourse.

In the textbook, we are given three different types of discourse that can be found within a rhetorical situation. First, there is deliberate discourse, which is rhetoric that addresses a broad public audiences about future actions (226). The next type of discourse is forensic discourse in which the audience judges on events from the past, usually this type of discourse has a defensive or apologetic tone (226). The third type of discourse from the book is Epideictic discourse, which are types of speeches that consist of praise or blame in a ceremonial setting (226). This type of discourse focuses on praise and celebration. The biggest takeaway I obtained from this reading was that every rhetorical situation is different, and therefore different approaches need to be taken according to who the audience is.

In this link, [https://www.cnn.com/videos/politics/2017/05/26/gianforte-apology-sot-speech.cnn (Links to an external site.)Links to an external site.](https://www.cnn.com/videos/politics/2017/05/26/gianforte-apology-sot-speech.cnn) there is an example of forensic discourse. In the video, republican Greg Gianforte addresses an audience and apologizes for an earlier assault on a reporter.