



**RHETORICAL
STRATEGIES**

ANALOGY

RHETORICAL STRATEGIES

a.k.a.:

“Resemblance
Arguments”

DEFINITION
of the ANALOGY

ANALOGY

I. DEFINITION:

- In short, an analogy is a *form of argument*
- in which you are discussing the *resemblances*
- between *Subject X and Subject Y*
- in order to make a *larger point* concerning Subject X.

ANALOGY

I. DEFINITION:

- *a form of argument:*
 - analogy is a rhetorical device – a tool, a weapon in your argumentative arsenal
 - you could argue for/against something through comparison-contrast *or* illustration *or* definition *or* classification *or* description
 - instead, you could choose to argue for/against something by *connecting* (*linking, associating, relating*) it to another topic via analogy

ANALOGY

I. DEFINITION:

- *a form of argument:*
 - to make an analogy, an analogy is like an alternate driving route –
 - you could drive from Nanticoke to Wilkes-Barre by going left up Kosciusko St. to Main St. and then to the Crossroads
 - or by going right to Middle Road and down South Main St.
 - Either way, both get you to Wilkes-Barre.
 - the same is true with argument; the **rhetorical strategies** represent **alternate routes** critical thinkers can take to *arrive* at their point

ANALOGY

I. DEFINITION:

- *resemblances*
 - shared traits
 - similarities
 - likenesses
 - correspondences
 - not reasons, examples
 - not differences, contrasts

ANALOGY

I. DEFINITION:

- *Subject X and Subject Y*
 - two UNRELATED topics
 - from different categories, classes
 - X = the UNKNOWN, what you are arguing about
 - Y = the KNOWN, precedent

ANALOGY

I. DEFINITION:

- *a larger point concerning Subject X*
 - *much more than the fact that it shares traits with the other subject*
 - What are you trying to say about **Subject X**?
 - What do readers gain (@ X) from the connection?
 - Do they understand **Subject X** better or appreciate it more?
 - What is the argument behind your analogy?
 - What point or position are you arguing?
 - What is your point or position?
 - **“So what?!”**

ANALOGY

I. DEFINITION:

- *a larger point concerning Subject X*
 - Subject X is bad and should be stopped, so you demonstrate how it is analogous to Subject Y, something else that most agree is bad and should be stopped or already has been stopped.
 - To argue against pornography (*her Subject X*), *Brownmiller* demonstrates how it is analogous to rape, racism, anti-Semitism, propaganda.

ANALOGY

II. FORMULA:

o X = Y (*X is like Y*)

- X = new item, situation, problem
- Y = known, old, previous, understood, with consensus
- Y = precedent: past event with a moral, legal, or political decision (requires prior knowledge)

PURPOSE
of the ANALOGY

ANALOGY

III. PURPOSES:

- o to **clarify** complex ideas or processes
- o to **persuade** audiences
- o to *help* make a point
 - **merely a means to an end**
 - not the only support or grounds or “proof”
- o to **relate unfamiliar to familiar (metaphor/simile)**
 - compare the new to the known
 - children with schemata (how we learn)
 - poets with metaphors

ANALOGY

III. PURPOSES:

- ❖ **to transfer** feelings/emotions *or* ethical stance of “Y” onto “X”
- ❖ **to transfer** the understanding of the issue, problem, subjects
- o to create a sense of urgency, threat, seriousness of the issue
 - (what’s at stake)
- o to create a sense of identification with the “victims”
- o to clarify the writer’s argument, claim
- o to get readers to see things from a new perspective
 - (Romantic Poets)

WEAKNESSES
of the ANALOGY

ANALOGY

IV. FLAWS:

o ** analogy =

- *not* proof (facts, logic)
- *but* figure of speech

o ** collapses when critically examined

- more differences than similarities

o “transferring” feelings, ideas, reasons

ANALOGY

IV. FLAWS:

o ** False Analogy:

- more important/significant differences exist:
- “**disanalogies**”
- false relationship, comparison, impression
- fools reader/audience into assuming important similarities exist
- when, in actuality, more differences exist

ANALOGY

IV. FLAWS:

o **** Card Stacking:**

- focuses on only those points of comparison that support its claim
- **fails to mention the differences**

ANALOGY

IV. FLAWS:

o ** Ad Misericordiam:

- an abuse of Pathos
- through the *manipulative* transference of emotions attached to “Y”
- all emotion, no proof
- persuades, does NOT *prove*

ANALOGY

IV. FLAWS:

o ** Loaded Language:

- related to *ad misericordiam*
- uses **emotionally charged** words, events, or precedent

ANALOGY

IV. FLAWS:

- o an end in itself
- o **oversimplifies** subject
- o cannot be verified
- o relies upon imagination & emotion
 - *(instead of logic)*
 - **more Pathos** than Logos or Ethos
 - no proof – transference of feelings, opinions
- o more “descriptive” than “explanatory”

ANALOGY

DESCRIPTIVE (-)

- o no facts, no proof,
- o colorful (not precise)
- o short cut to persuasion
- o *metaphorical*
 - o (life=bowl of cherries)
- o undeveloped, short (sentences)

CLICHES!

EXPLANATORY (+)

- o more than imagery
- o offers facts, statistics, proof
- o extended, developed
- o longer (paragraphs)

SUITABLE
ANALOGIES

ANALOGY

V. SUITABLE analogy:

❖ EXPLANATORY

- o **relates to the mind, heart, senses**
 - makes readers think, feel, see about the idea/subject
 - uses specific, concrete description
 - *no loaded language*
 - *no ad misericordiam*
 - *no ad hominem*

Can get a full **essay** out of it
not just a paragraph

ANALOGY

V. SUITABLE analogy:

o *Admits the Differences:

- admits that differences do exist
- demonstrates how these are minor or insignificant
 - otherwise, if more significant differences than similarities exist, then = “false analogy”
- follows the Rogerian Method

ANALOGY

V. SUITABLE analogy:

o *One among Many:

- one of the best uses of an analogy is to **combine** it with other forms of legitimate proof : *examples, statistics, facts*
 - it's not the only means of “proof” or support
 - o (*although our Analogy Essay will focus solely on the analogy & no other means of support*)

o *Mutual Enrichment:

- the best metaphors add something of value to both X & Y

ANALOGY

V. SUITABLE analogy:

o *Deduction:

- major premise:
 - some generalization involving what you are going to compare this to
- minor premise:
 - your subject (which relates to major premise)
- conclusion:
 - therefore, your main idea (should be banned)
 - Because X is like Y, therefore your point

WHAT TO AVOID

ANALOGY

What to Avoid:

- ❖ **Avoid clichés** as your analogy**
- **Avoid “descriptive” analogies**
 - that sound cute but have no depth
- ❖ **Avoid writing a Comparison Essay****
 - comparing 2 subjects from the same class
- ❖ **Avoid writing an Example Essay****
 - merely listing reasons for/against Subject X
 - with no mention of Subject Y or its shared resemblances to Subject X

FINAL THOUGHTS

FINAL THOUGHTS

ANALOGY:

- An analogy is a *form of argument*
- in which you are discussing the *resemblances*
- between 2 *unrelated* subjects (X&Y)
- in order to make a *larger point* concerning Subject X.
 - avoid clichés & ready-made/pre-built analogies
 - don't Google analogies (come up w/your own)
 - admit the obvious differences to shore up weaknesses
 - follow the pre-writing process →

THE END