

Name_____

Improving Your Commentary

Tips

- Demonstrate comprehension of chosen lines. (ie: make sure you understand a particular line before trying to analyze it.)
- Commentary should thoroughly discuss the appeal (ethos/pathos/logos) and why it was effective *on this particular person*. (Keep the recipient of the argument in mind! ie: Brutus or Caesar.)
- Aim for 3-5 lines of commentary. Remember to try and have a 1:2 ratio of evidence to commentary.
- Answer the question “so what??” Why is this technique effective on Brutus/Caesar? What do you know about these characters and their desires/motivations that will help you figure out why they were persuaded?

Common Mistakes

- Only summarizing
- Don't summarize at all or don't understand the lines they've chosen
- Misunderstanding ethos
- Mismatching an appeal to its example

Model (Do This)

Device: Pathos (Assertion: Cassius uses pathos to convince Brutus that others would have fought to preserve democracy.)

Example: O, you and I have heard our fathers say,
There was a Brutus once that would have brook'd
The eternal devil to keep his state in Rome
As easily as a king.

Intended Effect on Brutus:

Brutus is a man who believes it is extremely important to act for the good of many, even if this means acting against Caesar, his former friend. This is why when Cassius says this, he does it with the direct intention of appealing to Brutus's sense of honor and duty. Cassius is telling him how their parents have said that another Brutus, his ancestor, would have let the devil himself rule Rome before having a king. Having a king will trample on the freedoms on the people. Brutus would accept this argument because he wants only the best for Rome and will not let Caesar disrupt what his ancestors have worked so hard for.

At the end of class (so don't do this yet): Self reflect on your 1st body paragraph by filling in the chart below.

Item	Yes/No
Demonstrates comprehension of chosen lines. (ie: make sure you understand a particular line before trying to analyze it.)	
Commentary thoroughly discusses the appeal (ethos/pathos/logos) and why it was effective <i>on this particular person</i> . (Keep the recipient of the argument in mind! ie: Brutus or Caesar.)	

Aim for 2-3 lines of commentary. Remember to try and have a 1:2 ratio of evidence to commentary.	
Answers the question “so what??”? Why is this technique effective on Brutus/Caesar? What do you know about these characters and their desires/motivations that will help you figure out why they were persuaded?	