

Appeals of Logic, Emotion and Ethics

Types of Logical Appeals (logos)

- Incorporate Inductive Reasoning
- Use Deductive Reasoning
- Create a syllogism
- Cite traditional culture
- Cite commonly held beliefs
- Allude to history, religious texts, great literature, or mythology
- Manipulate the style
- Employ various *modes of discourse* for specific effects
- Provide Testimony
- Draw analogies/create metaphors
- Order chronologically
- Provide evidence
- Classify evidence
- Cite authorities
- Quote research
- Use facts
- Theorize about *cause and effect*
- Argue from precedent

Emotional Appeals (pathos)

- Use language that involves the senses
- Include a bias or a prejudice
- Include an anecdote
- Include connotative language
- Explore euphemisms
- Use description
- Use figurative language
- Develop tone
- Experiment with informal language

Ethical Appeals (ethos)

- Show written voice in the argument
- Make the audience believe that the writer is trustworthy
- Demonstrate that the writer put in research time.
- Support reasons with appropriate, logical evidence.
- Present a carefully crafted and edited argument
- Demonstrate that the writer knows the audience and respects them
- Show concern about communicating with the audience
- Convince the audience that the writer is reliable and knowledgeable

Organization of Argument - The Classical Model

I. Exordium: Introduction

Quintilian claimed, "the sole purpose of the exordium is to prepare our audience in such a way that they will be disposed to lend a ready ear to the rest of our speech." Aristotle claimed that introductions should "make clear what is the end (telos) of the discourse." Other goals of the exordium include making the audience

- well disposed toward the rhetor and the issue and
- grabbing their attention.

A. There are five methods that can serve to introduce the audience to the topic:

- 1) Introduction Inquisitive - to generate interest in the subject by posing an interesting question, by suggesting that our subject is interesting or controversial
- 2) Introduction Paradoxical—to show that, although the points we are trying to establish seem improbable, they must after all be admitted.
- 3) Introduction Corrective—to show that our subject has been neglected, misunderstood, or misrepresented.
- 4) Introduction Preparatory—to explain an unusual mode of developing our subject; or to forestall some misconception of our purpose; or to apologize for some deficiencies.
- 5) Introduction Narrative—to rouse interest in our subject by adopting the anecdotal lead-in.

B. Ethos is also a useful introductory appeal, and can be accomplished by:

- 1) Ingratiating oneself with the audience (common ground)
 - * Show the importance of the issue
 - * Show how the issue affects the audience
 - * Show how the issue affects society at large
 - * Show how the issue affects the general good of the community
- 2) Convincing the audience that the author is qualified to present on the subject:
 - * Strengthen your ethos
 - * Weaken the ethos of your opposition
 - * Show respect for the audience
- 3) Counteracting the prejudices or misconceptions about the author or the subject
 - Deny the charges that have constructed the prejudices against them
 - Admit the charges but deny their alleged magnitude
 - Cite a compensating virtue or action
 - Attribute the discrediting action to an honest mistake on their part or to an accident or to an inescapable compulsion
 - Cite others who were guilty of the same thing but were not so charged.
 - Substitute a different motive or cause for the one alleged.
 - Protest malicious insinuation in general.
 - Cite the testimony of those who take a different view of the matter.
 - Rouse hostility toward the opposite point of view

Handwritten note: Heli talki - sang (weeds)

II. Narratio: Statement of the case at hand

The second part of a classical argument, following the introduction or *exordium*, is known as the "narratio." The speaker here provides a narrative account of what has happened and generally explains the nature of the case. State the issue clearly, concisely, and briefly. Consider omitting the narrative if the audience is familiar with the topic. If the audience does not know the topic, you may want to consider including a brief history so they can understand its importance. *For the purpose of our argument composition, you are required to give a brief history of your issue.*

III. Divisio [often called "Partitio"]: Statement of Arguments to be Used

In this section of your argument, list or outline the arguments you will use in the paper. This helps to clarify what will be covered and in what order. For our purposes, the divisio will be your thesis statement.

III. Confirmatio: Proof of speaker's argument

Construct a persuasive argument as to what should be believed and done. This is where the full power and methods of rhetoric are employed. Use various types of reasoning, create yourself an unassailable position. The appeal of logos is emphasized here. These types of logical reasoning include:

- **Circumstances:** Look for material based upon observations in nature, government, or society to prove the possibility of a specific outcome:
 - *Possible and Impossible:* Look for material that allows you to argue that if X is possible, then so is Y, or that if X is impossible, then so is Y.
 - *Past Fact:* Consider ideas suggesting that, given all the known conditions, X probably happened in the past.
 - *Future Fact:* Consider ideas that allow you to argue that X will probably happen in the future.
 - *Greater and Less:* Argue that since X happened, so will Greater-Than-X, or if Y happened, so will Less-Than-Y.
- **Definition:** Generate material by defining key terms, providing for each term its genus (class of things to which it belongs) and species (the features that distinguish the thing being defined from other items in its class).
- **Comparison and Contrast:** Generate similarities (comparisons) or differences (contrasts) about aspects of your subject matter. This topic also deals with the degree to which your subject matter satisfies criterion
- **Relationships:** Generate material that shows different kinds of relationships between aspects of your subject matter:
 - *Causal Relationship*
 - *Antecedent-consequence Relationship*
 - *Contradictory Relationship*
- **Testimonial:** Generate material by investigating what authorities or people with extensive experience with your subject matter say about it. In addition, you can generate material by consulting documents, laws, or precedents pertaining to your subject. Statistics, maxims, and examples are other types of evidence that serve as testimonials to the truth of your claims.

IV. Refutatio: Refutation of opposing views

After building up your own castle, the next stage is to attack the stronghold of any opposing arguments. Using similar reasoning methods, you now take apart any alternatives to your *confirmatio*, one brick at a time. When opposing arguments are but rubble, nothing else left to believe but your original argument. Expose any visible fallacies in the opposition. Take care also to avoid fallacies in your own confirmation. These fallacies can be any of the following:

Affirming the Consequent	Argument ad Misericordium
Affirmative Conclusion from Negative Premise	Argument ad Populum
Conclusion from Two Negative Premises	Bandwagon
Denying the Antecedent	Circular Reasoning
Either/Or Fallacy [False Dilemma]	Begging the Question
Equivocation	The Complex Question
Hypothesis Contrary to Fact	Dicto Simpliciter
Non-Sequitur	The Labored Hypothesis
Undistributed Middle Term	The "Red Herring"
Faulty Analogy	Syntactic Ambiguity
Faulty Causal Generalization	Transfer
Hasty Generalization	Tu Quoque
Slippery Slope	Name Calling
Special Pleading	Glittering Generalities
Appeal to Force	Plain Folks Appeal
Argument ad Hominem	Unwarranted Testimonials [False Authority]

[See handout on *Fallacies of Logos, Ethos, and Pathos*]

You may also attack your opposition as being:

- obscure
- incredible
- impossible
- illogical
- unfitting, and
- unprofitable.

You may even need to make a *concession* [give in slightly to the truth of an opposing viewpoint] to a smaller opposing point for the purposes of attacking the main points of opposition. Refuting other arguments need not mean being unkind or unpleasant. You can show how much you accept and respect the other person or people involved. You can start with appreciation of them as people and their reasoning of their case. Then show how they are sadly mistaken. If possible, show how they can better achieve their needs through your preferred choices.

V. Peroratio: Conclusion

Following the *refutatio* and concluding the classical oration, the *peroratio* conventionally employed appeals through pathos, and often included a summing up of previously stated ideas as well as appeals to pathos and reinforcement of ethos.

The following are common topics for the peroratio:

- **Summarize:**
 - Review the issues.
 - Briefly recall how each issue was supported.
- **Make Emotional Appeals:**
 - Invoke authority
 - Point out positive/negative effects of audience's decision
 - Show negative effects if situation remains unchanged
 - Show that an undesirable decision can't be reversed
 - Show whether a state of affairs is intentional or unintentional
 - Demonstrate that the current state of affairs violates societal values
 - Compare / contrast current state of affairs with societal values
 - Paint a vivid picture of the effects, possibly using narrative/anecdote
 - Depict the state of affairs as insulting and injurious
 - Arouse anger at the opposing position
 - Imply ignorance in the opposing perspective
- **Enhance Ethos:**
 - Show how the state of affairs has deteriorated
 - Show that the state of affairs will continue
 - Show the audience how they are harmed by the state of affairs
 - Paint vivid pictures of current misery caused by the state of affairs
 - Demonstrate how your position is the solution to said misery

Sources:

Bean, John C. and John D. Ramage. "Introduction." Writing Arguments Ed. Eben Ludlow. Massachusetts: Simon & Shuster, 1995.

Burton, Gideon O. "Arrangement." Silva Rhetoricae: The Forest of Rhetoric. 2004. Brigham Young University. 28 November 2005. <<http://humanities.byu.edu/rhetoric/silva.htm>>

Jolliffe, David A. and Hephzibah Roskelly. Everyday Use: Rhetoric At Work in Reading and Writing. New York: Pearson Education, 2005.

Rodrigo, Shelley PhD. "The Six Parts of Discourse." Classical and Contemporary Arrangement. 2001. Mesa Community College. 28 November 2005. <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/~rrodrigo/lessons/arrangement/arrangement_cover.htm>