

The Uncut Method Vocab List

VEXING WORDS

WHAT THEY MEAN

qualify / qualified

to limit a claim, a qualified claim has been limited in its scope to make it more reasonable

implicit premise

assumption

(general) principle

general rule, usually presented to guide a specific example

counterargument

an argument against a given point, usually presented by the author to discredit something that “some people claim...”

a given conclusion

not necessarily the conclusion of the stimulus overall

could be referring to the overall conclusion, but be on the lookout for it to refer to another conclusion discussed by the author in the course of the stimulus

provide evidence

give reasons for something

counter assertions

make an argument against something

**suggests its
conclusion is
incorrect**

says the facts of the conclusion are not true

**questions the
adequacy of a
conclusion**

says the conclusion being discussed has not been proven, this is different than saying the conclusion is untrue

**phenomenon
(singular) /
phenomena (plural)**

a thing! do not make this more complicated than a “thing”

a distinction

a difference between two things, usually pointed out by someone

drawing a distinction

pointing out a difference between two things

an instance

a specific example of something being discussed

refute

tear down someone else’s argument

appeals to

looks to something to support their point

clarify

make clearer

purported

something that is claimed to be true, but might not be true (usually throws shade)

VEXING WORDS

WHAT THEY MEAN

a principle does not apply

a rule is not relevant, cannot use the rule in this specific situation

something applies

something is relevant, can be used in this specific situation

sole

only one

offer a

provide a

corresponding

something in another situation is similar to something in this situation

if X corresponds to Y, X acts similarly to Y, but they are in different contexts

corresponds to

acts similarly to something else in a different situation

on the basis of comparisons

using how two things are the same or different to prove your conclusion

as a basis for

as a foundation to argue from

disanalogous

not similar

contending that

arguing that

supposition / presupposition

assumption

supposes / presupposes

assumes

infers a

assumes something based on evidence

guarantee the truth / falsity

prove something 100% true or false

question the sufficiency of evidence

question whether there's enough evidence to prove the point

remains unexplained

we still don't know about something

merely

only

implies that the thing it's attached to is probably not enough to do what we need

inconsistent statements

the two statements contradict one another



VEXING WORDS

proposition

supposed

*(pronounced
suppose-ED, like
the word “suppose”
+ the beginning of
“education”)*

demonstrating that

restates

treats an X as a Y

a property

scope

reasoning from X to Y

analogy

WHAT THEY MEAN

statement

poorly assumed, usually used as an adjective to throw shade

“the supposed cause” = the pretend cause

using evidence to show that

repeats

pretends that X is Y to try to prove their conclusion, this is a shady thing to do

a quality or characteristic of a thing

the world of whatever you’re talking about

if you go outside the scope of an argument, you’ve gone too far off the deep end into irrelevancy

“from” introduces a premise

“to” introduces a conclusion

“reasoning from X to Y” means the answer choice is claiming X is a premise and Y is a conclusion

saying X is like Y, then claiming a property of X applies to Y as well