EXAMPLE OF SUPPORTING PARAGRAPH

This paragraph exemplifies a clear claim, helpful clarification, and ample textual evidence. Note, too, how the writer uses the terminology she cites from Aristotle and Bennett.

Note how she guides the reader by simultaneously combining her claim and the theorist's concepts and terms.

Note how she clarifies her claim by citing, not just paraphrasing, Aristotle and Bennett. Note the level of detail.

She clarifies the passages she cites.

Once we have a clear idea of the concepts, she then provides textual evidence, **citing** key passages along the way.

She continues to use theoretical terms throughout her analysis. She "owns" the theory now by making it a part of the way she speaks. She is not a ventriloquist ("Aristotle would say..."). Instead, she "speaks Aristotle" or the language of tragedy.

O'Connor's story also seems to fail Aristotle's concept of error—the *hamartia* or "flaw"— because the tragic hero's character should be tightly bound to a specific kind of recognition or *anagnorisis* (Greek for "revelation" or "coming to self knowledge") that comes out of the error itself. Or as Andrew Bennett puts it, "Anagnorisis refers to the idea of a moment of revelation or recognition, especially the moment when a protagonist experiences a sudden awakening to the truth or to self-knowledge" (104). Aristotle claims that the tragic hero's error has to follow a strict structure of incidents. What he means by this is that the error has to unfold in such a way that it leads to the necessary emotional response that comes at the end of a tragedy, in fact, for Aristotle the most important fact that "the end is everything" (65). He means that the end is achieved through actions, or in this case for the sake of argument, through the error, not just character alone. In fact, the actions (errors) themselves represent the characters (66). Although grandma makes a mistake, it is not quite the same error in judgment that Aristotle describes. For example, if the grandmother did not known that traveling to Florida was dangerous, and she went along out of the pure love of travel, adventure, and to spend time with her dear family, and then made an error and caused them to run into a murdering felon, this would evoke "fear and pity," hence be a tragedy. However, if the grandmother knew that the "Misfit" was out there and that he was a possible danger, and then she made an error in judgment that lead the family right into the barrel of his gun, then the deed might be met with anger rather than pity and fear. Perhaps the most important issue Aristotle raises concerning the effectiveness of the error is when the character knows full well the facts and that they should be revealed yet fails to do so (75). The grandmother makes errors on a multitude of levels; however, the later seems to be the grandmother's greatest failure. The grandmother's error in judgment comes the moment she withholds the truth of her mistake, that "horrible thought she had had before the accident was that the house she had remembered so vividly was not in Georgia but in Tennessee." (12) yet she makes a decision to withhold the fact that they are continuing to travel down the wrong road. There is no proof that she acts out consciously, as Aristotle argues "in full knowledge of the facts" (75) but she does avoid telling the truth that horrible moment she realizes she has made a mistake. We do not know for sure why she chooses to hide this fact, maybe out of fear, maybe out of ignorance of what might be lurking around the corner, but one thing is for sure, the reader or audience already knows the grandmother's character is failing as a tragic hero and cannot help but to resent her for keeping her *hamartia* a secret.

Again, note how she makes a claim but simultaneously invokes Aristotle's terminology.

She cites a key passage from Aristotle.

She clarifies the passage she cites.

She provides textual evidence, citing key passages along the way.

Note, too, how she organizes her insights from least important to most important, and she uses a transitional phrase to guide the reader.

Note that these terms echo phrases she uses in the previous paragraph.

The closest O'Connor's heroine comes to fitting the definition of a tragic hero is at the point of recognition or *anagnorisis*, when she realizes that she and the Misfit are not so different. Aristotle describes this recognition as the moment when the "sight of something leads to the required understanding" (78). In other words, there is recognition that rises from the moment itself when the character comes to terms with a truth that he or she was previously blind to—for grandma, that she and the Misfit are not so different and this reflection, as Aristotle argues, most often leads to good, or in this case, bad fortune (71). This reflection first appears when the narrator describes the grandmother's run-in with the misfit: "his face was as familiar to her as if she had known him all her life" (13). In fact, in her final moments, she sees him as one of her own, recognizing their similarities: "Why you're one of my babies. You're one of my own children!" (22). Most importantly, her epiphany is that she is as contaminated and fallen as the "Misfit, that she is as common as he is, that their mistakes or sins are the same. Perhaps she realizes the gravity of her words "maybe he didn't even raise the dead" (21) as a momentary rejection of Christ and her faith. In short, the Grandma does experience a kind of self-knowledge, for she recognizes her relationship with others. Rather than maintaining her distance, she instead awakens to the fact that she and the Misfit share a common humanity.