

TONE WORDS

Allusive: containing an indirect reference to another work that the audience is expected to know

Angry: rage; ire; vitriol, fume

Bantering: good humored ridicule; to tease good-naturedly

Benevolent: inclined to do good; charitable

Candid: honest, frank, genuine manner

Clinical: purely scientific; dispassionately detached

Colloquial: words, phrases used in conversation; informal language

Compassionate: to have sorrow for suffering with helpful intent

Complimentary: conveying or expressing praise, commendation or admiration

Concerned: troubled or anxious

Condescending: to deal with others in a proud way; looking down upon someone or something

Confident: self-assured, showing certainty about something

Contemptuous: expressing disdain or intense disgust

Contentious: tending to argument; quarrelsome

Cynical: distrustful of human sincerity or integrity;

Detached: separate or disconnected; aloof

Didactic: intended to teach, particularly in having moral instruction

Diffident: modest or shy because of a lack of self confidence;

Disdainful: showing lack of respect for an individual regarded as beneath oneself

Dramatic: arresting or forceful; powerful; filled with emotion

Effusive: expressing excessive emotion in unrestrained manner

Elegiac: having a mournful quality; sorrow for something long past

Facetious: lightly joking, usually at an inappropriate time;

Factual: concerned with what is actually the case

Fanciful: over imaginative and unrealistic; existing only in the imagination or fancy

Flippant: frivolous and disrespectful

Impartial: favoring none more than another; just; fair, unbiased

Incisive: sharp; keen; poignant

Indignant: feeling or showing anger or annoyance at what is perceived as unfair treatment

Inflammatory: rousing or likely to rouse excitement or violence; vehement, fiery

Informative: providing useful or interesting information

Inspid: not exciting or interesting; dull

Insolent: boldly rude or disrespectful

Ironic: happening in the opposite way to what is expected, and typically causing wry amusement

Irreverent: disrespect; lack of love or awe for something sacred

Learned: showing, requiring, or characterized by learning; scholarly

Lugubrious: looking or sounding sad or dismal; exaggeratedly glum and mournful,

Moralistic: adhering to a system of morals and imposing this system on others

Objective: not influenced by personal feelings or opinions in considering and representing facts;

Patronizing: to treat with an apparent kindness that betrays a feeling of superiority

Pedantic: one who makes needless display of his learning;

Pretentious: making claims to some distinction or importance

Restrained: characterized by reserve or moderation; kept under control,

Sardonic: characterized by bitter or scornful derision. Critical without the hope of correction

Satiric: use of ridicule, sarcasm, or irony to expose, attack or deride vices, follies, stupidities or abuses with the hope of correcting the problem.

Scornful: filled with extreme indignant contempt; disdain;

Sentimental: having or showing tender, gentle, or delicate feelings, but sometimes in an excessive or maudlin way; influenced more by emotion than reason

Somber: gloomy; oppressively solemn or sober

Sympathetic: looking upon with favor

Taunting: challenging or reproachful in a sarcastic, insulting or jeering manner

Turgid: inflated, overblown or pompous

Urgent: requiring immediate action or attention; pressing; earnest

Vibrant: throbbing with life; vigorous, energetic, radiant

Whimsical: playful in an appealing and amusing way;

RHETORICAL DEVICES

Ad hominem argument: an argument that intentionally appeals to emotion rather than reason.

Allusion: A reference to a person, thing, work of art, or historical/literary issue that the author expects the reader to know.

Analogy: A comparison that makes a concept clear by showing its similarity to a more familiar concept.

Aphorism: A short expression that often expresses a moral principle (the early bird gets the worm).

Colloquialism: a slang expression

Conceit: a comparison between two very different objects

Concession: An acknowledgement to a valid point made by the opposition.

Correction of erroneous views: Pointing out the flaws in the oppositions argument.

Direct address: to speak directly to the audience by using “you” or “we”

Diction: Word choice

Emotional appeal: A speaker’s effort to engage the feelings in the audience

Euphemism: a less offensive substitute for an unpleasant word (management restructuring vs. firing)

Homily: a speech involving moral or spiritual advice

Hyperbole: deliberate exaggeration

Invective: An emotionally violent, verbal attack.

Irony: the opposite of what is expected (situationally or verbally)

Metaphor: a comparison using figurative language. (the front line is a brick wall)

Mood: the audience’s attitude toward the subject

Paradox: a statement that appears contradictory, but is actually true

Parallelism: the framing of words or phrases in a similar structure

Parody: a work that closely imitates another with the aim of ridiculing that work

Reduce to the absurd: to show the foolishness of an argument by taking it to its illogical conclusion

Satire: a work that pokes fun at a subject with the hopes of correcting it.

Specious reasoning: not logical but presented to appear logical

Syntax: the structure of a sentence

Tone: the author’s attitude toward his or her subject.

Wit: intelligent humor

GRAMMAR RULES

7 STEPS TO PUNCTUATION

1. Identify conjunctions if any (FANBOYS) or **BOLD WORDS**

***if none, skip to step 4**

2. Box either side and determine Independent or Dependent. ****If two independent clauses exist, separate them with a semicolon.**

3. Insert commas or semicolons near FANBOYS or BOLD WORDS if needed

4. Locate subject (close to major verb) of each independent clause

5. Label words before subject as best as you can.

6. Insert any necessary commas in boxes. If needed change 1st comma to semicolon.

7. CHECK FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- contractions
- the word “this”
- noun/pronoun agreement
- modifying phrases (often beginning with an “---ing” word, that, or which

UNDERSTOOD RULES

a. Do not use contractions

b. do not use “I” or “you”

Rule 1

Two independent clauses joined by a conjunction are separated by a comma.

Ex. I went to the store, and I bought a soda.

1. We went to the market and purchased a number of items that we needed for the party.

2. Jeff wanted to buy a new car, but his parents would not give him the money he needed.

Rule 2

Use a comma after a succession of introductory prepositional phrases

Ex. *At the end of the day*, I go home.

1. In the afternoon I leave school and go to work.

2. In the middle of the afternoon, I leave to school and go to work

Rule 3

*Use a comma after a dependent clause (adverb clause) when it comes before an independent clause. In other words, **if you have a verb before your independent clause**, put a comma before the subject*

Ex. Although the team lost the game, they were still able to make the tournament.

1. After the movie ended, we decided to get something to eat.
2. After the movie we decided to get something to eat.

Rule 4

*Use a semicolon between independent clauses in a sentence if they **are not joined by and, but, or, nor, for, yet.***

Ex. The president was concerned about the finances; he called a special meeting

1. The manager was concerned about the company; he decided to call a meeting.

Rule 5

*Use a semicolon between independent clauses joined by such words as **for example, for instance, that is, besides, accordingly, moreover, nevertheless, furthermore, otherwise, therefore, however, consequently, instead, hence, as a result.***

****Never start a sentence with any of the bolded words.**

Ex. We waited for an hour; however, the cab never arrived.

1. Jeff wanted to start working on the essay; however, he did not know where to begin.
2. The grill was out of propane; therefore, we could not begin the cookout.

Rule 6

A semicolon is needed to separate the independent clauses of a compound sentence if there are commas within the clauses.

ex. In the middle of the morning, I go to work; and I do not take a lunch break.

1. In the afternoon I have to go to work, but today is my day off.
2. At the end of the day, I have to go to work; but today is my day off.

Rule 7

Modifying phrases should be placed as near as possible to the words they modify

1. Tom started to yell walking off the basketball court in disgust.

Tom, walking off the basketball court in disgust, started to yell
Walking off the basketball court in disgust, Tom started to yell.

Rule 8

The word "this" must be immediately followed by a noun.

Ex. This book is very interesting.

1. After reading the story, I thought, "This story is the best story I ever read."

Rule 9

Pronoun antecedent agreement

1. The individual is responsible for their own destiny. WRONG! SHOULD BE "HIS"
2. Everyone in the story decided to follow her own opinions instead of working together.

Rule 10

Active vs. passive voice

1. The final scene is filled with excitement. WRONG
The author fills the final scene with excitement.

PROCESS OF ANALYZING NONFICTION:

1. AFTER READING ONCE, CREATE A ROUGH ASSERTION:

-when you read a writer's essay you should be able to summarize it in one sentence (WHAT WE CALL AN ASSERTION). Identify the key words in that assertion

2. ACTIVELY READ:

A. LOCATE WORDS OF PHRASES THAT "JUMP OUT AT YOU"—THAT SEEM TO SIGNIFY SOME IMPORTANT IDEA OR COMPONENT OF AN IDEA. You may not understand why it "jumps out at you," but identify it regardless.

- it is a word or phrase or device that answers 1 or 2 things:

- a. How does it advance the writer's argument?
- b. How does it affect the audience?

-be sure to not only identify the device if you can; BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY, try to write notes in the margins answering one or both of the How and How questions

B. LOCATE SHIFTS IN: TONE, DICTION, SUBJECT

3. HOW TO BREAK AN ARGUMENT INTO SECTIONS AND IDENTIFY THE PURPOSE OF THE SECTIONS. USE THE PURPOSE OF THESE SECTIONS TO REEXAMINE YOUR ASSERTION AND POSSIBLY REVISE YOUR ASSERTION

a. How do I decide that it breaks there?

-the break occurs wherever there is a shift in:

SUBJECT, TONE, OR "SHIFT WORD"

- the break does not have to occur at the end of the paragraph. It can occur in the middle.
- there is no right or wrong place to break or amounts of breaks
- the sections do not have to be of equal length.

b. How do I determine the purpose of each section?

Process

1. Work Backwards and start with the last section

-start with the last section. Determine the argument of that section. What is the author trying to say in that section? What is the final idea he leaves the reader/audience with?

-put this purpose in a full sentence in the margin

You should consider the following questions in making your determination:

- What devices in that section jump out at me and how do they impact the argument?

-How does this section connect to some part of the assertion?

2. Look at the previous section.

- Answer all the questions from #1 above, but add the following:

“How does this section lead into the final section?”

“What is the writer doing to the audience to set it up for the final argument?”

3. Look at the first section

-Answer all the questions from #2 above, but add the following:

“ What is the writer doing to open up this argument and why is he doing it? In other words how does it begin the process to lead the audience to his final conclusion?

“How does the opening affect the audience and why?”

4. IDENTIFY TWO QUOTES WITHIN A SECTION AND EXPLAIN HOW THEY ACCOMPLISH THE PURPOSE OF THAT SECTION USING THE PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE BELOW.

BODY PARAGRAPH STRUCTURE FOR ANALYZING THE WRITER'S ARGUMENT

1. Topic sentence and Elaboration:

Clearly articulates the purpose of the section. Always articulate the purpose of the section in the first two sentences. What is the writer trying to accomplish in this section? What is the purpose of this section.

2. Introduce the quote/device, give the quote, and answer "how and/or how"

Hint at what the reader should be looking for in the quote. "Ehrenreich's fills her diction with religious overtones: "....."

Simply put:

Device/quote

How?

And/or

How?

3. Transition

4. Same as #2

Device/quote

How?

And/or

How?

5. Ending sentence that links content of this paragraph and segues into content of next paragraph.

a. Don't worry about identifying the "device." Look for words or phrases that "stick with you."—that convince you that the writer's argument is right. Even if you can't identify the clinical term for the device, you can always talk in this way:

The writer's phrase "_____ " convinces the audience that...

The word "_____" suggests a secretive act. The writer's diction shows that that the opposition secretly....

The word "_____" suggests a childlike behavior. This intentional language characterizes the opposition as childish.

Alfred M. Green delivered the following speech in Philadelphia in April 1861, the first month of the Civil War. African Americans were not yet permitted to join the Union army, but Green felt that they should strive to be admitted to the ranks and prepare to enlist. Read the speech carefully. Then write an essay in which you analyze the methods that Green uses to persuade his fellow African Americans to join the Union forces.

The time has arrived in the history of the great Republic when we may again give evidence to the world of the bravery and patriotism of a race in whose hearts burns the love of country, of freedom, and of civil and religious toleration.

It is these grand principles that enable man, however proscribed, when possessed of true patriotism, to say, My country, right or wrong. I love thee still.”

It is true, the brave deeds of our fathers, sworn and subscribed to by the immortal Washington of the Revolution of 1776, and by Jackson and others in the War of 1812, have failed to bring us into recognition as citizens, enjoying those rights so dearly brought by those noble and patriotic sires.

It is true that our injuries in many respects are great; fugitive-slave laws, Dred Scott decisions, indictments for treason, and long dreary months of imprisonment. The result of the most unfair rules of judicial investigation has been the pay we have received for our solicitude, sympathy and aid in the dangers and difficulties of those “days that tried men’s souls.”

Our duty, brethren, is not to cavil over past grievances. Let us not be derelict to duty in the time of need. While we remember the past and regret that our present position in the country is not such as to create within us that burning zeal and enthusiasm for the field of battle which inspires other men in the full enjoyment of every civil and religious emolument, yet let us endeavor to hope for the future and improve the present auspicious moment for creating anew our claims upon the justice and honor of the Republic; and, above all, let not the honor and glory achieved by our fathers be blasted or sullied by a want of heroism among their sons.

Let us then, take up the sword, trusting in God, who will defend the right, remembering that theses are other days than those of yore; that the world to-day is on the side of freedom and universal political equality; that the war cry of the howling leaders of Secession and treason is: “Let us drive back the advance guard of civil and religious freedom; let us have more slave territory; let us build stronger the tyrant system of slavery in the great American Republic.”

Remember, too, that your very presence among the troops of the North would inspire your oppressed brethren of the South with zeal for the overthrow of the tyrant system, and confidence in the armies of the living God – God of truth, justice and equality to all men.

“The Penalty of Death” (1926)

by H.L. Mencken

Of the arguments against capital punishment that issue from uplifters, two are commonly heard most often, to wit:

1. That hanging a man (or frying him or gassing him) is a dreadful business, degrading to those who have to do it and revolting to those who have to witness it.
2. That it is useless, for it does not deter others from the same crime.

The first of these arguments, it seems to me, is plainly too weak to need serious refutation. All it says, in brief, is that the work of the hangman is unpleasant. Granted. But suppose it is? It may be quite necessary to society for all that. There are, indeed, many other jobs that are unpleasant, and yet no one thinks of abolishing them--that of the plumber, that of the soldier, that of the garbage-man, that of the priest hearing confessions, that of the sand-hog, and so on. Moreover, what evidence is there that any actual hangman complains of his work? I have heard none. On the contrary, I have known many who delighted in their ancient art, and practiced it proudly.

In the second argument of the abolitionists there is rather more force, but even here, I believe, the ground under them is shaky. Their fundamental error consists in assuming that the whole aim of punishing criminals is to deter other (potential) criminals--that we hang or electrocute A simply in order to so alarm B that he will not kill C. This, I believe, is an assumption which confuses a part with the whole. Deterrence, obviously, is one of the aims of punishment, but it is surely not the only one. On the contrary, there are at least half a dozen, and some are probably quite as important. At least one of them, practically considered, is more important. Commonly, it is described as revenge, but revenge is really not the word for it. I borrow a better term from the late Aristotle: *katharsis*. *Katharsis*, so used, means a salubrious discharge of emotions, a healthy letting off of steam. A school-boy, disliking his teacher, deposits a tack upon the pedagogical chair; the teacher jumps and the boy laughs. This is *katharsis*. What I contend is that one of the prime objects of all judicial punishments is to afford the same grateful relief (a) to the immediate victims of the criminal punished, and (b) to the general body of moral and timorous men.

These persons, and particularly the first group, are concerned only indirectly with deterring other criminals. The thing they crave primarily is the satisfaction of seeing the criminal actually before them suffer as he made them suffer. What they want is the peace of mind that goes with the feeling that accounts are squared. Until they get that satisfaction they are in a state of emotional tension, and hence unhappy. The instant they get it they are comfortable. I do not argue that this yearning is noble; I simply argue that it is almost universal among human beings. In the face of injuries that are unimportant and can be borne without damage it may yield to higher impulses; that is to say, it may yield to what is called Christian charity. But when the injury is serious Christianity is adjourned, and even saints reach for their sidearms. It is plainly asking too much of human nature to expect it to conquer so natural an impulse. A keeps a store and has a bookkeeper, B. B steals \$700, employs it in playing at dice or bingo, and is cleaned out. What is A to do? Let B go? If he does so he will be unable to sleep at night. The

sense of injury, of injustice, of frustration will haunt him like pruritus. So he turns B over to the police, and they hustle B to prison. Thereafter A can sleep. More, he has pleasant dreams. He pictures B chained to the wall of a dungeon a hundred feet underground, devoured by rats and scorpions. It is so agreeable that it makes him forget his \$700. He has got his katharsis.

The same thing precisely takes place on a larger scale when there is a crime which destroys a whole community's sense of security. Every law-abiding citizen feels menaced and frustrated until the criminals have been struck down--until the communal capacity to get even with them, and more than even, has been dramatically demonstrated. Here, manifestly, the business of deterring others is no more than an afterthought. The main thing is to destroy the concrete scoundrels whose act has alarmed everyone, and thus made everyone unhappy. Until they are brought to book that unhappiness continues; when the law has been executed upon them there is a sigh of relief. In other words, there is katharsis.

I know of no public demand for the death penalty for ordinary crimes, even for ordinary homicides. Its infliction would shock all men of normal decency of feeling. But for crimes involving the deliberate and inexcusable taking of human life, by men openly defiant of all civilized order--for such crimes it seems, to nine men out of ten, a just and proper punishment. Any lesser penalty leaves them feeling that the criminal has got the better of society--that he is free to add insult to injury by laughing. That feeling can be dissipated only by a recourse to katharsis, the invention of the aforesaid Aristotle. It is more effectively and economically achieved, as human nature now is, by wafting the criminal to realms of bliss.

The real objection to capital punishment doesn't lie against the actual extermination of the condemned, but against our brutal American habit of putting it off so long. After all, every one of us must die soon or late, and a murderer, it must be assumed, is one who makes that sad fact the cornerstone of his metaphysic. But it is one thing to die, and quite another thing to lie for long months and even years under the shadow of death. No sane man would choose such a finish. All of us, despite the Prayer Book, long for a swift and unexpected end. Unhappily, a murderer, under the irrational American system, is tortured for what, to him, must seem a whole series of eternities. For months on end he sits in prison while his lawyers carry on their idiotic buffoonery with writs, injunctions, mandamuses, and appeals. In order to get his money (or that of his friends) they have to feed him with hope. Now and then, by the imbecility of a judge or some trick of juridic science, they actually justify it. But let us say that, his money all gone, they finally throw up their hands. Their client is now ready for the rope or the chair. But he must still wait for months before it fetches him.

That wait, I believe, is horribly cruel. I have seen more than one man sitting in the death-house, and I don't want to see any more. Worse, it is wholly useless. Why should he wait at all? Why not hang him the day after the last court dissipates his last hope? Why torture him as not even cannibals would torture their victims? The common answer is that he must have time to make his peace with God. But how long does that take? It may be accomplished, I believe, in two hours quite as comfortably as in two years. There are, indeed, no temporal limitations upon God. He could forgive a whole herd of murderers in a millionth of a second. More, it has been done.