

# 7 Sophisticated commentary and revising a reading – Part 2

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Vocabulary 词汇

Write each word three times. 把每个单词抄写三遍。

| English                     | 中文   | Write it 3 times (English) |
|-----------------------------|------|----------------------------|
| alternative interpretations | 其他解读 | _____                      |
| revision                    | 修正   | _____                      |

## Recall

- You have defended an answer you had already stopped believing.
- You know an essay that considers the other side sounds stronger.
- You have found a passage that contradicted your whole argument.

## New ideas

Read these first. Each idea has a short worked example. Then do the Practice below.

### ■ 1 Three sophisticated moves

Stronger arguments explain an interpretation’s significance in a broader context, discuss **alternative interpretations** 其他解读, or use relevant analogies. All three make the argument clearer, not more ornate.

*Worked example.* Naming a rival reading and showing why yours accounts for more shows the claim has been tested.

### ■ 2 Evidence may require revision

Textual evidence may require **revision** 修正 of an interpretation if it does not sufficiently support it. Revision is built into the process, not a failure of it.

*Worked example.* If defending a claim means explaining away what a character plainly does, the claim needs changing.

### ■ 3 Relevance of an analogy

An analogy must be **relevant** - it must make the interpretation easier to grasp. One that needs its own explanation has cost more than it gave.

*Worked example.* A comparison to something the reader knows well illuminates; one to something obscure does not.

**Watch out:** Holding an interpretation against the evidence is not loyalty to a reading. It is a refusal to read.

## Practice

2.1 Name the three sophisticated moves. [3]

2.2 Explain what discussing an alternative interpretation shows. [2]

2.3 State when textual evidence requires revision. [2]

2.4 Name two signs that a claim needs revising. [2]

2.5 State what makes an analogy relevant. [2]