AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Sarah E. Gallup for the degree of

Master of Arts in

English presented on

June 10, 2008.

Title: Learning by Imitation: The Scholarly Works of David Bartholomae

Abstract approved:

____

Anita Helle

This thesis examines the scholarship in pedagogical theory and practice of David Bartholomae over the past thirty-five years, in particular examining the role that the rhetorical construct of *imitation* has played in its development. Through my research, I trace the evolution of Bartholomae's pedagogical stances and practices, as these both reflect and build upon his academic predecessors. In particular, I trace the expansion of imitation and reading-writing connections in his major works, the co-authored *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts* and *Ways of Reading*. Doing this allows my readers to view Bartholomae's writing not only as an extension of trends in the field of composition, but as driving force of those trends. I ultimately conclude that, because of its impact on his learning, imitation is an indispensable aspect of Bartholomae's career that should not be overlooked.

Learning by Imitation:

The Scholarly Works of David Bartholomae

by

Sarah E. Gallup

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the

degree of

Master of Arts

Presented June 10, 2008

Commencement June 2009

© Copyright by Sarah E. Gallup

June 10, 2008

All Rights Reserved.

Master of Arts thesis of Sarah E. Gallup

presented on June 10, 2008.

APPROVED:

____

Major Professor, representing English

____

Chair of the Department of English

____

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

____

Sarah E. Gallup, Author

For my parents, who believed that I could.

And, of course, for Dave.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks go to many people throughout the writing of this project, and without all of them, this work would be incomplete. Thank you to Dr. Anita Helle, for her time and dedication to reading all of my drafts. To Dr. Lisa Ede for not only serving on my committee, but loaning me her office where I could work without distraction. To Dr. Vicki Tolar Burton for assisting me from the very beginning. To Chris Anderson, for helping me overcome the "clutter" in my writing that I had overlooked. To Sara Jameson, for her time, encouragement, and inspiration. To my colleagues, especially Natasha, for her time spent reading drafts. To Jessica, for her endless patience and encouragement. To my students, both past and future, who are the reasons I am writing. To the scholars who will come after me – may you find what you are looking for within these pages. And certainly, to Dave Bartholomae, whose work and scholarship has proven that I can be more than I thought I could be. Thank you for your assistance throughout this project – for meeting with me and for sharing ideas. This thesis is especially dedicated to you. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface: An Introduction to David Bartholomae……………………………………… 1

Introduction: A Brief Overview of the Tradition of Imitation…………………………5

Chapter One: David Bartholomae and Influence as Imitation……………………….. 12

Richard Poirier……………………………………………………………….. 15

Harold Bloom ………………………………………………………………...18

William E. Coles, Jr………………………………………………………….. 25

Edward Said………………………………………………………………….. 28

Mina Shaughnessy…………………………………………………………… 32

Anthony Petrosky……………………………………………………………..37

Final Thoughts……………………………………………………………….. 38

Chapter Two: Reading-Writing Connections in Bartholomae's Works……………... 39

Imitation in his scholarly works / articles……………………………………40

Reading and Writing in *Facts, Artifacts, Counterfacts*……………………… 46

Reading and Writing in *Ways of Reading*……………………………………52

Rhetoric of Addressing Students…………………………………….. 59

Praise and Criticism for *Ways of Reading*……………………………61

Conclusion………………………………………………………………………………69

Works Cited…………………………………………………………………………….. 72

Preface: Introduction to David Bartholomae

> *Tradition exists functionally for us through the presence of a single person, a person who cannot be ignored, whose speech we cannot help but imitate and whose presence becomes both an inspiration and a burden.*
>
> David Bartholomae, *Against the Grain* (197)

I was first introduced to the works of David Bartholomae nearly three years ago during my undergraduate program at Pacific University. As a mentor for the First-Year Seminar course at my *alma mater*, I (and my students) used the textbook, *Ways of Reading*, co-authored by Bartholomae and colleague Anthony Petrosky. From the beginning, the text fascinated me; included were essays and narratives written by John Berger, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Michel Foucault – most of which I had never read, but found that I enjoyed reading. These were difficult texts, and yet my first-year writing students seemed to be working well with them. They were able to hold intellectual conversations about cultural issues and linguistic allegiances, as Gloria Anzaldúa expressed in "How to Tame a Wild Tongue." They answered complex reading questions in their informal homework assignments, then compared, contrasted, and analyzed separate works in their formal essay writing. I was impressed with how well they responded to the texts and, subsequently, how well they analyzed those texts. Although I was studying French (and not composition) at the time, part of me wondered how this text worked, and why my students worked well with it.

The following year I arrived at Oregon State, enrolled in WR 511 (The Teaching of Writing), where I learned that *Ways of Reading* was originally intended as a basic writing textbook. Not having a basic writing program at Pacific, I was further intrigued by this idea. What was "basic writing"? I wondered. And how could a work be simultaneously difficult and

"basic"? I set out to find an answer and in doing so, I learned a great deal about the history of my chosen academic discipline: rhetoric and writing. I learned that composition had a far more complex history than I could have imagined, and I learned that the man behind *Ways of Reading* was, in fact, a prominent figure within that history. The more I studied his work, the more I realized that it would be impossible to examine the history of contemporary composition without coming across his research.

One of Bartholomae's most well-known essays was assigned to me in September 2006, during orientation week for new Teaching Assistants. I read "Inventing the University" as if Bartholomae were writing about me. From the first paragraph, I saw my high school and early college self in his writing: I was that 17-year-old student desperately trying to sound professional by using academic writer's jargon ("hitherto" and "albeit") and such complex phrases as, "One might have one's own personal belief that…" Without knowing it, I found myself a victim of overachieving verbosity in a vain attempt to imitate what I thought sounded academic.

Because of my background with *Ways of Reading* (henceforth *Ways*) and my newfound interest in "Inventing the University," I found myself profoundly attached to Bartholomae's writing, and thus intended to pursue a close study of his research. A conversation in the winter of 2007 with my professor Lisa Ede solidified my intention to study Bartholomae's work.

It was then that I returned to *Ways* with the intent of studying it in relation to Bartholomae's other texts. What I got from that study was an important insight into my field: that the act of writing is a discipline wrought with paradoxes. It is simultaneously difficult and complex, freeing and stifling, and somehow involves both reading and writing. The binaries here are many and thus cannot be ignored. This continues to intrigue me as I move further into my studies. Why must writing be such a complex and difficult task? Why does it become such a

burden? And, perhaps most crucial to my project, what can we learn from other writers who have come before us? For all of its mysteries, writing continues to intrigue and fascinate me, perhaps to a fault.

As he expresses in his essay "Against the Grain," David Bartholomae himself is both intrigued and turned off by writing. This was the essay that segued into my formal topic of "imitation." From the first time I read this piece, I was hooked. I admired how freely and honestly Bartholomae addressed his own writing struggles – much similar to my own – and how he overcame them. Moreover, I was particularly moved by Harold Bloom's citation: "You cannot write or teach or think or even read without imitation, and what you imitate is what another person has done, that person's writing or teaching or thinking or reading" (qtd. in "Against the Grain" 197). Based on my own experiences, I could relate to this statement. The thought haunted me, following me as I began a project on David Bartholomae's work until I knew that I had to follow up on those thoughts about imitation. I knew it wouldn't be easy, but I was entirely too intrigued by the thought of what I might get myself into.

The epigraph at the beginning of this preface offers what I believe to be the reason I am studying the works of one person. Instead of choosing a topic and researching many different scholars' work on that topic, I am writing about the work of one person "whose presence becomes both an inspiration and a burden." Such is what David Bartholomae's presence has been for me. His work has inspired me, and I have – much without his knowing – learned and grown from him as a result of my research. He has influenced my ways of teaching, writing, and even learning through his own work, and for that I am eternally indebted. At the same time, however, his presence becomes a burden for me, as it continually haunts how I learn. I will never be able to separate my own scholarship from that of Bartholomae, but that "burdensome"

load is not a negative one. Instead, I find it to be helpful that I can carry with me the presence of this well-known scholar for years to come. I only hope that one day I will be able to sufficiently thank him for all he has done.

Because of the invaluable role that David Bartholomae has played in my own scholarship, I intend to use this thesis as a means of expressing my thanks to him for his dedication and contribution to the field of rhetoric and composition. It is also my intent to offer this study as a tool for others who are interested in the works of David Bartholomae, in basic writing, and in current composition theory. I am continually learning from this great scholar, and it is my hope that others will, as well.

Sarah E. Gallup
Corvallis, Oregon
May 2008

Introduction: A Brief Overview of the Tradition of Imitation

> *Growth in writing ability is individual…Such a process begins not with the study of Writing in the abstract, but only when a student develops a way of seeing his own writing, and a way of seeing that his writing has meaning beyond its paraphrasable context, that it is evidence of a language and a style.*
>
> David Bartholomae, *Teaching Basic Writing* (157-8)

As I read the passage above, I see in it the scope of David Bartholomae's career and the major themes therein. There is evidence of struggling dichotomies: of writing being both individual and communal, of writing being both abstract and concrete, and of writers being first outside of a particular discourse and moving in until they finally have "evidence of a language and a style." This, for Bartholomae, is the goal of teaching writing: to assimilate writers into meaningful academic discourse. Certainly, this theme is evident throughout each of his works – from his scholarly articles to his book chapters to his textbooks – although it is not the sole focus of his work. But where did imitation originate, in both the history of rhetoric and in Bartholomae's education? This study will examine this question as it relates to the many authors who have helped shape Bartholomae's career over the past thirty-five years, and whose work he has imitated in that time. Therefore, this brief introduction will serve to orient readers to how I conceive the concept of imitation and how I will refer to it throughout the rest of my text.

As a result, this thesis has many attempts behind it: first, to reaffirm the importance of imitation in learning. Whether we admit it or not, much of what we know has been imitated by someone or something. From a young age, we learn to write by tracing letters that others have previously written. We learn to sing by

matching pitch to the sound of another singer's voice. We learn to play basketball by acquiring the basic skills that coaches teach us. This all seems natural, and yet in education, the value of imitation is vastly underestimated, in part because it is misunderstood. Often we think of copying as peering off of another student's test when we have failed to study hard enough.

Regardless of the situation, the concept of imitation carries with it many negative connotations. In her book *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*, author Mary Orr points out that "imitation is…highly pejorative, for it designates redundancy, stagnation, stasis, and inertia, everything that is the opposite of dynamic rejuvenation, energy and power" (95). As writers who aspire for dynamic writing, the infiltration of another author's thoughts and words – whether unintentional or intentional – is sometimes viewed as a detriment to the writing itself. In a postmodern view of authorship, the writer wishes to remain autonomous, instead of relying on predecessor's to dictate his or her words. This viewpoint problematizes the concept of imitation and creates a negative perspective on this potentially rewarding concept.

As we will see, imitating the work of another can prove to have numerous benefits. It is not always stealing someone else's work without notice (although it can be), but rather using their ideas as a springboard for thoughts. How would word processors have been invented without the typewriter to precede it? And how could cell phones have been invented without land lines? Innovative thought certainly begins with a preexisting idea; it is simply a matter of building upon the original idea in a new and productive way. As Seán Burke points out in *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern* (1995), "the imitative model generally sees the artist as a copyist of

reality but also can refer to the author's place within a literary tradition" (5). While the former aspect of imitation has roots in Classical Rhetoric, it is the latter element of imitation that will be the focus of this thesis.

David Bartholomae emphasizes imitation (as a literary tradition) repeatedly in his writing; it is this emphasis on imitation, therefore, that is the impetus behind my research. I will examine the idea of imitation as a tradition, and see how it can be applied to Bartholomae's works. In order to do this, I have divided this thesis into two distinguishable parts to better categorize my attempts. The first chapter examines where Bartholomae falls in a long tradition of imitation. I will look at five of his greatest influences – Richard Poirier, Harold Bloom, Bill Coles, Edward Said, and Mina Shaughnessy – and his encounters with each in order to see how his thinking has interacted with theirs. Working from a broader scale, this initial chapter will be a very broad overview of Bartholomae's education and career, while simultaneously interspersing his encounters with imitation therein.

The second chapter will examine "imitation in action" – more specifically, how Bartholomae's work has gone on to deepen issues in composition studies and inspire further research. I will pay particular attention to issues of literacy and reading-writing connections in his two textbooks: *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts* and *Ways of Reading*, both co-authored with Anthony Petrosky. This, I believe, will show how Bartholomae's work simultaneously grew out of a tradition and helped to direct it.

In order to situate Bartholomae within the tradition of imitation, it is important to first understand the mechanism being examined. As I have briefly shown, imitation

is not a simple task, but is instead complex, with a history of its own. In the *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition*, Daniel Bender historicizes the concept of imitation, examining the various definitions from antiquity to the present day. Bender argues that imitation does not have a simple definition, noting that "the processes at work under the heading of 'imitation' are in practice less tidy and less conscious than the theoretical descriptions suggest" (345). Instead of a simple notion, Bender claims that imitation is "Reproducing the style, argument, tone, or purposes of earlier texts" (343). To reproduce another writer's style, argument, and tone, as we will see, is not self-evident. In fact, "imitation" as a concept has many different uses. As such, I am intentionally using it tropologically, and therefore, looking at a limited view of imitation as a multi-faceted and complex topic. A brief introduction (and therefore hardly comprehensive) to the many uses of imitation throughout the history of rhetoric will make explicit the connections between past and current uses of the term.

In classical rhetoric, orators such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian focused on integrating imitation into their pedagogy. To imitate the style and tone of a successful author, for students of these rhetors, was the first step to gaining successful skills. Plato's *Phaedrus*, for example, exemplifies imitation by showing an exchange between Socrates and his student Phaedrus in which the two show off their exemplary talents in discourse. Phaedrus begins with a story that does not please his teacher, and thus Socrates take it upon himself to recreate the story but improve upon it. Phaedrus agrees, asking Socrates to "promise to make another speech better than that in the book and no shorter and quite different" (Plato 143). In recreating the story with the

same elements, but improving upon it, Socrates imitates the preceding discourse and yet builds upon it to make the new version entirely his own.

Plato's student, Aristotle, continued many theories of imitation, noting in particular that it is pleasant to imitate what others have done. In fact, as Aristotle explains in his *Rhetoric*, "Again, since learning and wondering are pleasant, it follows that such things as acts of imitation must be pleasant – for instance, painting sculpture, poetry – and every product of skilful imitation" (Aristotle 204). For Aristotle, then, imitation was indeed something to aspire to and take pride in.

Later rhetoricians borrowed from Plato's and Aristotle's teachings of imitation, and modeled their own theories upon them. In particular, the Roman rhetorician Quintilian (ca. 35-96 C.E.) strongly believed in the importance of learning by imitation. In his classroom, beginning orators were asked to undergo a number of exercises, called *progymnasmata*, or "preparatory exercises." These activities, consisting of fourteen different acts of oration, focused on learning and memorizing various aspects of a speech in order to build upon what their predecessors had done before them and, once they achieved that step, to further build upon those thoughts. The exercises included the retelling of fables or proverbs, embellishing them properly in order to pass them off as new tales. In doing so, the student would gain a respect for those who had come before him and learn to imitate a useful and beneficial model.

Because of these exercises, imitation was a key to invention. Although a great deal of emphasis was placed upon imitating the works of others, Quintilian argued that imitation alone was not sufficient to produce innovative thought. In Book X of his *Institutes of Oratory*, he claims that

> Undoubtedly, then, imitation is not sufficient of itself, if for no other reason than that it is the mark of an indolent nature to rest satisfied with what has been invented by others. For what would have been the case, if, in those times which were without any models, mankind had thought that they were not to execute or imagine anything but what they already knew? Assuredly nothing would have been invented. (335)

Thus, Quintilian argues for the practice of imitation, but not of imitation alone – learners must build upon what has come before them, gaining insight from those who have come before and causing thought to evolve. The benefit of such learning can be seen in the outset of Quintilian's chapter: "For it cannot be doubted that a great portion of art consists in *imitation*, since, though to invent was first in order of time, and holds the first place in merit, yet it is of advantage to copy what has been invented with success. Indeed the whole conduct of life is based on the desire of doing ourselves that which we approve in others" (334-5).

As a concept, imitation is highly complex, and thus it is important to examine how I will be using the term throughout this work. However, because imitation is not merely copying other works, we also must examine the dichotomous notions of imitation for learning:

> As rhetorical practice, imitation has always had to negotiate a path between extremes of influence. On the one hand, excessive admiration for an author invites the attempt to follow the illustrious original too closely. The result is a loss – more precisely, an abdication – of the imitator's individuality…At the opposite extreme, imitation can be resisted as a contaminating influence, so

> that the student of language would be unreceptive to the tones, values, and rhetorical devices that could enrich the mind and the expression of that mind" (Bender 344).

From this passage, Bender accurately suggests that imitation has dichotomous perspectives. Notice also that, because there are various ways of looking at imitation, there are many ways of referring to it, as well. As this chapter unfolds, I will use different words to distinguish the type of imitation I am addressing – at times, "copying," others "borrowing from," and still others, "imitating." This will show the complex nature of the issue at hand, and will most accurately determine how Bartholomae is making use of such a complex rhetorical element.

Close encounters with great thinkers can only improve writing and research abilities, as Bartholomae's experiences have shown. He admits that his "own experience tells me that I have learned more, or perhaps learned more deeply, through these encounters than through a regular exposure to books and ideas and classes and so forth" ("Against the Grain" 197). Certainly, by looking at the tradition that Bartholomae has inherited throughout his education, we see the value of studying the works of another in order to improve one's own teaching or thinking or reading.

Chapter One: David Bartholomae and Influence as Imitation

> *You cannot write or teach or think or even read without imitation, and what you imitate is what another person has done, that person's writing or teaching or thinking or reading.*
>
> Harold Bloom, *A Map of Misreading* (1975)

There is a reason for studying imitation. As literary critic Harold Bloom has argued, imitation is imperative for teaching and learning and thinking. Although usually passed off as a rote form of learning, imitation instead has been used since the days of the Greek and Roman rhetoricians as a means of acquiring information, thinking critically about a subject, and generating new thoughts and writing. Thus, imitation has a long history in rhetoric and composition that precedes the definition given by Harold Bloom. Drawing upon that history, this study of David Bartholomae's scholarship serves two purposes: on the one hand, it is a close reading of the role of imitation in Bartholomae's well-known works, and on the other hand, it situates him within the long history of rhetoric.

In order to see how imitation plays out in Bartholomae's works, we must first look at its history. Bartholomae's approach, as we will see, borrows from many of these ancient practices. For instance, Roman rhetorician Quintilian (ca. 35-96 CE) believed that imitation was an important learning tool that enabled a student's intellectual success. In *The Institutes of Oratory*, Quintilian claims that very few students have natural talent to speak with conviction and ease, so they would model the words of their predecessors. He argues, in fact, that "Our minds must be *directed* to the imitation of all [early authors'] excellence, for it cannot be doubted that a great

portion of art consists in imitation…it is of advantage to copy what has been invented with success" (335, emphasis mine). From this passage, we can see that imitation itself is a learned act – one that is directed to the learner by the teacher – that holds great value. Indeed, Quintilian stressed that, "it is a universal rule of life that we should wish to copy what we approve in others" (Quintilian 400). And, if so, then there is still a reason for studying imitation and examining its implications today.

Two thousand years after Quintilian's wrote these words, the definition of imitation has become problematic, having simultaneously positive and negative connotations. On the one hand, it is seen as a beneficial way for helping underprepared students to understand a topic. On the other hand, it suggests rote learning, and the mere copying of another person's work. However, I claim that imitation does more than simply promote lax thinking. To prove this point, the first chapter of this work will show how imitation has been an instigator of critical thought for David Bartholomae, and how it has been an important focus in both his teaching styles and scholarship.

In fact, "imitation-as-borrowing" is at the heart of many of his well-known essays because, as he has put it, imitation "is how [he] has always learned" (Bartholomae "Interview"). His essay "Against the Grain" explores the idea of imitation as a self-reflexive process. Throughout this work, Bartholomae returns to the idea that the genesis of composition is looking to prior writers for guidance. He states that, "This is the most powerful influence and it is the influence of another writer, a person represented by a verbal, textual presence – a set of terms, a sound and a rhythm, a sensibility – that I cannot push out of my mind or erase from my own

writing" ("Against the Grain" 194). Additionally, in borrowing other people's writing, the writer appropriates the predecessor's language and adapts his or her linguistic style. The result is complex, in that it is both entering into a tradition of writing and working against it to distinguish one's own voice and style as a writer. Bartholomae likewise claims that, in his own writing, "the most powerful terms I can use to discuss the composing process are not prewriting, writing, and revision, but *tradition* and *imitation* and interference and resistance" ("Against the Grain" 194, emphasis mine). This statement, too, reads paradoxically, as Bartholomae leads his readers to believe on the one hand that writing works with the grain (in the sense that tradition dictates), and on the other hand, that it works against the grain (through interference and resistance).

As this brief introduction shows, imitation is salient for the ways that Bartholomae thinks about acts of composing. Because it is a rhetorical element of which he is conscious in his writing, then it certainly deserves to be recognized in his other, more prominent works. It is my intention, therefore, to examine the reasons why this rhetorical form are so crucial to his work – starting first with his own learning processes, and then moving on to his biography as a developing scholar.

As an undergraduate at Ohio Wesleyan University during the late 1960s, David Bartholomae struggled with his writing. Although he was praised for his ideas and critical thinking skills, Bartholomae's professors criticized his writing style. Years later, in "Against the Grain" (1987), Bartholomae reflects upon these writing experiences. He recalls that, "My teachers characteristically said that my papers were

full of interesting ideas but poorly written – turgid, difficult, disorganized" (195). Yet he had very little direction and guidance. He persisted through his undergraduate years, only to end up in graduate school with what his professors called excellent ideas but disorganized, weak writing.

Bartholomae entered graduate school in the early 1970s at a time when composition studies had not yet been recognized as a valid discipline. Instead, he pursued a doctoral degree in British Literature, focusing on issues of social class in Thomas Hardy's novel *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. While abroad in England for a year, Bartholomae produced a 350-page draft of his dissertation. However, when he returned to Rutgers, his adviser, Julian Moynahan, rejected his work. He did not read past page one hundred because the writing felt rough and stilted, so his advisor handed back the dissertation with instructions to rewrite. This event left a profound impact on Bartholomae, and caused him to *rethink* what he had written – not simply rewrite – which meant not only adopting a clearer writing style, but more importantly, recognizing his place in a tradition of writers.

Richard Poirier

While working with Moynahan, Bartholomae took a course with Richard Poirier, another professor from Rutgers whom Bartholomae would come to admire greatly. Poirier, a scholar of literary theory, studied what he called "performance theory," which placed a high emphasis on textual embodiment and enactment through imitation. Therefore, taking his cue from Poirier's works, Bartholomae would try to identify the essence of a word or a phrase his professor had written. Much like in

Quintilian's day, when boys would trace letters "in order to acquire skill in learning" (Quintilian 335), Bartholomae, too, would (figuratively-speaking) "trace" Poirier's writing. In "Against the Grain," Bartholomae recalls that:

> The first three years of my graduate career were driven by a desire to be able to do what [Poirier] did – to be able to read and speak and write like him. I would, for example, copy out difficult or impressive sentences he had written in order to get the feel of them. I can still feel them now in many sentences I write. I state it simply, but it was not simple at all…It was inspiring to feel that I could use his language and mimic, as I could, his way of reading and writing. (197-8)

Although the task was not easy, Bartholomae learned a great deal by studying the construction of his professor's writing. In one instance, Bartholomae recalls attempting to use the word "language" as Poirier had used it in a particular essay. However, he recalls that the experience was challenging, and took repeated efforts in an attempt to contextualize this one, solitary word. A whole semester later, Bartholomae was able to successfully use the word "language" as Poirier had. By closely examining Poirier's writing style, he acquired important skills that he needed in order to finish his dissertation. He revised his dissertation draft, cutting out many sections in order to rethink the entire project. In the end, by studying another writer's words, he was able to produce a successful dissertation that was substantially better than the first attempt ("Against the Grain" 195).

In the preface of Poirier's text, we can see how Bartholomae may have been introduced to the idea of imitation as active participation (or, as Poirier says, "performance") in a long line of writers:

> By performance I mean, in part, any self-discovering, self-watching, finally self-pleasuring response to the pressures and difficulties I've been describing…When a writer is most strongly engaged by what he is doing, as if struggling for his identity within the materials at hand, he can show us, in the mere turning of a sentence this way or that, how to keep from being smothered by the inherited structuring of things, how to keep within and yet in command of the accumulations of culture that have become a part of what he is. ("Preface" xiii)

As Poirier suggests in this passage, imitation involves a fair amount of struggle with predecessors, and finding the balance between imitating others' works and independently creating his own. Throughout the rest of this chapter, we will see evidence of this complexity, as Bartholomae struggled to find this balance of adhering to tradition and taking command of his own work.

Poirier does not simply note the importance of imitation, however; he enacts it. Drawing from the words of poet Gertrude Stein, Poirier suggests that literature itself encodes imitation as a complex way of thinking about representation. He tells us that:

> English literature doesn't exist independently of some mode of apprehending it. And what ideally should that be? 'What is poetry,' Gertrude Stein once asked, 'and if you know what poetry is, what is prose?' Since she was, as I am, raising questions as a restraint against passing beyond them to larger ones,

> she immediately adds that 'there is no use telling more than you know, no, not even if you do not know it.' (Poirier 66)

Because this passage from Stein impacted Poirier's research, he copied the title, modifying it to make it his own. And so, the passage above is taken from a chapter entitled, "What Is English Studies, and If You Know What That Is, What Is English Literature?" As a sign that he was impacted by Poirier's works, Bartholomae also copied the title (and thereby Stein's own syntax), modifying it to suit his own needs, just as Poirier had originally done. As a result, one of his later articles bears the title "What is Composition and (If You Know What That Is) Why Do We Teach It?" (1996) The tradition of this passage is passed down from one writer to the next: first from Gertrude Stein in the context of poetry studies, then to Richard Poirier about literature and English Studies, then finally to Bartholomae in regards to composition. This shows how one idea can be shared among many scholars, but each time, the context of the idea changes; it cannot stay the same.

Harold Bloom

In addition to learning from scholars with whom Bartholomae had direct contact, like Poirier, he was also able to learn from scholars who came to him through his literary research. In particular, as he studied Thomas Hardy and the works of other British poets, he came across the scholarship of Harold Bloom, a literary critic whose works had extended into literature departments around the nation during the early 1960s. Bloom not only had a strong interest in Hardy's poetry, but he also considered him to be one of the best poets of the early 20th century. In fact, as Bartholomae was

finishing his PhD, Bloom published *A Map of Misreading* (1975), which was a continuation of his earlier work, *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973). Both of these texts address how writers have predecessors who influence their work. For Bloom, imitation was a theory of how literary history worked, although Bartholomae would come to see it as a means of improving methods of composition, of learning, and of promoting thought.

Bloom's first chapter in *A Map of Misreading* addresses the connections between Thomas Hardy and his predecessor, the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley, as well as the importance of imitation. As a text that directly related to many issues at stake in Bartholomae's dissertation, he undoubtedly would have studied this work at length. It comes as no surprise, then, that references to this chapter in Bloom's text appear repeatedly throughout David Bartholomae's essays (including the epigraph at the beginning of this chapter) as he studies the relevance of imitation in his own scholarship.

Bloom's text, *The Anxiety of Influence*, was published in 1973 (nearing the end of Bartholomae's graduate school years), and was read by scholars in English departments around the country. Bloom's work was revolutionary and spread quickly, and helped to define the field of literary criticism. Bloom argued that all poets after Milton imitated a precursor, or one "strong poet" whose work they could not help but emulate. The novice would then struggle to create his own work all the while plagued by the poet he was influenced by. Although the basic premise behind *The Anxiety of Influence* deals with poetic criticism, much of the theories therein translate to other

sections of the humanities, such as music, art, literature, and – one might easily argue – composition.

The relationship between Bloom's text and composition studies is not far-fetched. In many ways, the concept of influence in *The Anxiety of Influence* and *A Map of Misreading* illustrates the ways that Bartholomae claims authority from other writers. In the preface to *A Map of Misreading,* Bloom explains how he conceives the idea of influence in the context of his research:

> Like my earlier book [*The Anxiety of Influence*], *A Map of Misreading* studies poetic influence, by which I continue *not* to mean the passing-on of images and ideas from earlier to later poets. Influence, as I conceive it, means that there are *no* texts, but only relationships *between* texts…The influence-relation governs reading as it governs writing, and reading is therefore a miswriting just as writing is a misreading. (3)

Here, Bloom focuses on the intertextuality of poems as they relate to the poets themselves. In relation to Bartholomae, he likewise establishes connections in the relationships between texts by encouraging reading and writing that goes against the grain. In this passage, Bloom introduces what he calls a "strong misreading," where the reader struggles to disconnect himself from the precursor in order to better understand the writer's meaning. Similarly, Bartholomae introduces in his later textbook *Ways of Reading* the idea of a "strong reader," in which the student strives to reexamine the texts and to read them in a new way. In other words, he asks students to step out of their everyday patterns and assume a new style of reading, and thus, as Bloom has suggested, they are learning to read by imitation. Bloom's concept of the

"strong reader" reappears throughout many of Bartholomae's works, and has become an idea that Bartholomae is well-known for.

By studying the works of Harold Bloom and his theories of imitation, Bartholomae would recognize his imitation of Richard Poirier as a type of "anxiety of influence." Bloom steps into the rhetorical tradition, recognizing what he calls "Six Revisionary Ratios," or six different types of imitation. These "ratios" are his interpretation of what Greek and Roman rhetoricians had taught about imitation over two thousand years prior. His terms bear Greek titles, showing the link between the Ancients and his contemporary research: *Clinamen, Tessera, Kenosis, Daemonization, Askesis,* and *Apophrades*. The first term, *Clinamen*, or a deliberate misreading of a prior text, was the catalyst for writing *A Map of Misreading*. Because each of these terms is so complex, I will only focus on *Apophrades*, or "the return of the dead" (Bloom *Anxiety* 15), which most directly applies to Bartholomae's methods of imitation. In this "revisionary ratio," the later writer holds his work up to the work of his precursor in order to study his thoughts and phraseology. And by doing so, it "makes us seem to us, not as though the precursor were writing it, but as though the later poet himself had written the precursor's characteristic work" (Bloom *Anxiety* 16). Later in "Against the Grain," Bartholomae makes a claim that closely echoes Bloom's words: "This is how I think a writer learns, by learning to write within and against the powerful writing that precedes him that haunts him, and that threatens to engulf him" (198). Although "Against the Grain" was written over twenty years ago, Bartholomae maintains the same beliefs today. As he told me, "imitation is complex because you

lose yourself in someone else's words – you adopt someone else's syntax – and you don't want to do that" (Bartholomae "Interview").

Like much of his writing on imitation, these passages by Bartholomae not only show the complexities of learning by influence, but show how his methods of learning have strong connections to the past. For example, by imitating the work of Richard Poirier and Harold Bloom, Bartholomae was able to conduct his research in the same writing and same theorizing as his predecessors, much like he would *as if* he were Poirier or Bloom. This phenomenon, then, makes his voice sound much like those of his precursors, and thus furthers his own research.

Bartholomae expounds upon the Bloom's concept of *Apophrades* in "Against the Grain." We see in this text how he has inherited a set of beliefs and pedagogies from his predecessors and from the history of rhetoric and writing:

> I find I cannot talk about how I write without talking about matters of belief and principle. I did not invent the principles that guide my writing. I suppose I could say that I inherited them. There is certainly a long Western tradition of writers, writing styles, and theories of writing…I have learned to be able to make allusions to ancient and modern texts to borrow authority for my beliefs. At the level of belief, however, or at the level of deeply felt experience, the tradition exists for me through my contact with strong teachers, the teachers who have influenced my writing. (197)

Throughout this essay, Bartholomae repeatedly invokes imitation in order to return to the idea of "tradition" and its importance in his learning and teaching. This passage shows how he is an heir to a long Western tradition of writing and an heir to the

tradition of strong teaching. By emphasizing this concept throughout his essay, he signals its importance to his reader. Likewise, he shows how his thinking is dependent upon his predecessors, as he takes his place in a long line of writers, readers, and scholars, much as Bloom emphasizes in his theory of *Apophrades*.

By intermixing his words and theories with those of his influences, Bartholomae enters into a paradoxical relationship with them. On the one hand, he emulates them in order to better his own writing and research, but on the other hand, there is a Freudian, Oedipal response to "kill" the father-figure. Bloom elaborates on this idea in his definition of *Apophrades*: "The strong poet peers in the mirror of his fallen precursor and beholds neither the precursor nor himself but a Gnostic double, the dark otherness or antithesis that both he and the precursor longed to be, yet feared to become" (Bloom *Anxiety* 147). In many ways, this passage represents much of how Bartholomae relates to his predecessors, as his work and the work of others is so deeply intertwined that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the various styles and ideas. Because of this, his scholarship can be seen as a sort of "Gnostic double" as Bloom mentions – a paradoxical blend of both his work and the works of others.

Bloom claims in *A Map of Misreading* that strong poets (or, in this case, strong scholars) achieve their success by facing up to the anxiety of influence instead of running from it. While Bartholomae could have shied away from studying the works of his predecessors, he instead spent extra time examining their works and using their research to further his own. In doing so, he becomes the "strong poet" that Bloom describes in his book. Bartholomae would later go on to adopt the concept of a "strong reader" or a "strong reading" in the classroom, where, instead of merely

accepting a surface-level interpretation of a text, the reader would face up to the challenge of delving beyond the surface to get a deeper understanding. Even teachers, as he explains in “Against the Grain,” can be “strong teachers”:

> I use the word “strong” to echo the way Bloom uses the word when he refers to strong poets or strong poetry and to the anxiety of influence. I think if we are lucky we come up against strong teachers, teachers whose presence, whose sensibility, whose manner of speaking and writing define almost completely our historical moment, the context within which we might think, speak, read, or write. (197)

What is intriguing about this passage is how it works “against the grain.” Essentially, Bartholomae is claiming that “strong teachers” are those who do not flow “with the grain” of everyday educators, but they are those whose academic presence creates an example for students – just as a “strong writer,” as Bloom notes, speaks “against the grain” to a community of readers. Thus, Bartholomae not only recognizes the importance that strong teachers and strong writers have upon their students, but in the act of writing about it, he pays homage to Bloom’s work and indirectly shows how he has imitated his work.

In the introduction to *Ways of Reading*, we see Bloom’s influence upon the ideologies of this textbook. Because of the difficult texts Bartholomae has chosen to include in the text, he must defend their appropriateness in a lower-level writing classroom and how they promote “strong readings.” Thus, he notes that, in order for students to appreciate the value of being challenged in their reading, they “must respect the difficulty and complexity of their texts and of the issues and questions they

examine. Little is to be gained, in other words, by turning [Adrienne] Rich's essay into a message that would fit on a poster in a dorm room: 'Be Yourself' or 'Stand on Your Own Two Feet'" ("Introduction" *Ways* 10). In this brief section, Bartholomae and co-author Tony Petrosky encourage their readers to have "strong readings" of the texts, and thus read against the grain of their normal patterns.

Bartholomae learned the benefits of influence (and thus, imitation) during his graduate years through the works of Harold Bloom. Because of Bloom's two well-known texts, *The Anxiety of Influence* and *A Map of Misreading*, he was able to see the profound impact that prior writers had upon their followers. By assuming a style of influence that closely resembled Bloom's theory of *Apophrades*, Bartholomae learned to lose himself in another author's words in order to find his own meaning and learn something new. He was then able to take that knowledge that he had gained and apply it to his own teaching and writing and thinking.

William E. Coles, Jr.

Another influential figure in David Bartholomae's early years of teaching was fellow University of Pittsburgh colleague William "Bill" Coles, Jr. Known for his extensive work in pedagogy and audience, Coles was instrumental in helping Bartholomae better understand the place of composition courses in the university. As the director of composition at Pitt, Coles also taught first-year writing courses and worked with the School of Education. In a personal email, Bartholomae specifically singled out Bill Coles as an important influence in his early career. He told me that Coles "really helped me to think about a course and about writing assignments"

(email) and "he gave me a place to begin as a teacher and a student of composition" ("Against the Grain" 198). For Bartholomae, Bill Coles helped him enter into a discourse that focused on situating himself in composition pedagogy.

Although he learned much from Coles, Bartholomae and his mentor differed in many of their pedagogical approaches. Bartholomae, for instance, insists that his students adopt the discourse of the Academy, as evidenced in his well-known essay, "Inventing the University," where he claims that, "The student has to appropriate (or be appropriated by) a specialized discourse, and he has to do this as though he were easily and comfortably one with his audience, as though he were a member of the academy or an historian or an anthropologist or an economist; he has to invent the university by assembling and mimicking its language" (61).

On the other hand, Coles is known more for his work in helping students improve their writing by establishing their own voice, as seen in his book *Composing: Writing as a Self-Creating Process* (1983):

> But to understand the activity of writing in such a way as to develop a consciousness of oneself as a manipulator of language and of his experience as arranged, defined, and evaluated by the languages which shape it, is to have the chance to discover also the ways in which one's identity as a person is dependent upon the languages he commands…It can provide you with the chance to understand, in whatever language you work with, at least the significance of creating a voice of your own. ("To the Student" 1-2)

Unlike Bartholomae, as this passage exemplifies, Coles places a stronger importance on an expressivist notion of "personal writing" in order to enter into academic

discourse, a concept that Bartholomae has strongly opposed in his years of scholarship.

However, despite their differences, Bruce Horner argues in his article "Resisting Traditions in Composing Composition" (1994) that the two scholars may have shared more similarities than expected. He claims that while Coles is usually viewed as an "expressionist" (much like scholar Peter Elbow), "Bartholomae is often denounced (and sometimes praised)…as the enemy of 'personal voice,' an advocate of the conformity of students' writing to the conventions of academic discourse" (Horner 497). And yet, at as Horner continues to argue (and I would agree), "the rhetoric [that both authors] employ as writers and teachers thus marks their tradition as resistant to the usual sense and practice of a tradition as an explicitly stated and promulgated set of beliefs and methods about writing and the teaching of writing" (498). To further expand this idea, both Bartholomae and Coles add to the complexities of resistance because they encourage their students to read against the grain of their own lives – to question their assumptions about the world and to produce "strong readings" of the texts they are offered. Arguably, then, both Bartholomae and Coles approach the concept of imitation in a similar way, by simultaneously adhering to and challenging the traditions set before them.

Unlike Poirier and Bloom, Bartholomae's work with Coles was focused not on improving himself as a writer, but improving himself as a thinker, teacher, and intellectual entering a new career. In Bartholomae's words:

> I knew about composition and work in composition before I met [Coles], but I never really entered the field until I met him, felt the force of his presence as a

> teacher, and read his prose. I could never have imagined his eloquence or his wisdom on my own…There is nothing that I have written that I could have written without that starting point. ("Against the Grain" 198)

The ways that he learned from Coles helped propel him as a new professor at the University of Pittsburgh, and helped solidify him in the field of composition studies as he began to take control of his own scholarship.

Edward Said

Another figure of great interest to literary studies is Edward Said, the creator of postcolonial criticism and theory. A doctoral graduate of Harvard University, Said studied the works of Joseph Conrad and, in doing so, uncovered the profound influence that colonialism had upon their conquered countries. Because of Said's life-long interest in Western works and his criticism of colonial influence, Bartholomae encountered literary Said throughout his graduate work when studying British literature. Although Bartholomae did not directly study postcolonial theory, through his writing we see that Said's scholarship directly impacted Bartholomae's learning. In two of his articles, "Released into Language: Errors, Expectations, and the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy" (1986) and "Wanderings: Misreadings, Miswritings, Misunderstandings" (1986), he makes connections between Said's view of contemporary critics and basic writers. Both, he claims, are "deprived of a set, 'knowable' cultural tradition...[Said's metaphor] describes the basic writer, wandering between the old neighborhood and the university, belonging to neither, and left to invent academic expertise every time he sits down to write" ("Released into

Language" 41-42). In both of Bartholomae's essays, he uses the same citation by Said, thereby noting its importance through repetition. This is obviously a section that he finds particularly relevant, which supports the connection he has made.

Said's text *Beginnings* is often quoted in Bartholomae's research. A book on the beginnings of both literary texts and histories, Said describes his work as "the community of language and history – *from* the beginning, *despite* any one beginning" (xiii). Because Bartholomae carefully examined the intertextual nature of both culture and literature, Said's work was certainly important to him. Earlier in his preface, Said notes that he has "concentrated on beginnings as something one does and as something one thinks about. The two sometimes go together, but they are always necessarily connected when language is being used" (xi). This sounds much like Bartholomae's words in "Against the Grain," when he claims that "tradition exists functionally for us through the presence of a single person, a person who cannot be ignored, whose presence becomes both an *inspiration* and a *burden* ("Against the Grain" 197, emphasis mine). While the subject matters of the two passages differ, Bartholomae's idea that one figure can make such an impression upon another learner echoes Said's thought that a beginning (a learner starting out on his or her own) is something that one does (being inspired by the predecessor) and something that one thinks about (being burdened by the predecessor).

In regards to pedagogy, Said and Bartholomae share many similar ideas. Continuing in *Beginnings*, Said notes that a "Beginning is not only a kind of action; it is a frame of mind, a kind of work, an attitude, a consciousness. It is pragmatic – as when we read a difficult text and wonder where to begin in order to understand it, or

where the author began the work and why" (xi). Certainly, Bartholomae emphasizes the importance of beginning the reading of a difficult text. As Said mentions in the passage above, the beginning is an essential point of departure for any reader. Bartholomae emphasizes this point in his textbook, *Ways of Reading*, when he sets his readers at ease by saying:

> What strong readers know is that they have to begin, and they have to begin regardless of their doubts or hesitations. What you have after your first reading of an essay is a starting place, and you begin with your marked passages or examples or notes, with questions to answer, or with problems to solve. Strong readings, in other words, put a premium on individual acts of attention and composition. ("Introduction" *Ways* 8)

This passage, focused on a student's rough beginning of a difficult text, easily mirrors Said's earlier thought. Both examples show that a beginning is pragmatic and both have pedagogical implications. While Said is not directly speaking to his students as Bartholomae is, many later readers of Said's work have indirectly become his followers, his students.

In "Wanderings: Misreadings, Miswritings, Misunderstandings," Bartholomae cites Said's work in *Beginnings* because "Edward Said gives an account of the problems facing the modern writer that reminds me of the problems facing my students" ("Wanderings" 107). Said's citation reads:

> The problem we face today when we study Joyce, or when, untrained in classics or religion, we read Hooker, or when we deploy psychology in the study of a literary text, is a problem of irregularity, or discontinuity. That is,

> less background, less formal training, less prescribed and systematic information, is assumed before one begins to read, write, or work. Thus when one begins to write today one is necessarily more of an autodidact, gathering or making up knowledge one needs in the course of creating. (qtd. in "Wanderings" 107)

Here, Bartholomae builds upon Said's words because he sees parallels between the scholar's thoughts and his students' actions. When reflecting upon this thought, Bartholomae claims that

> The power of this metaphor is the way it enables us to frame the work of a student writer. For me it is poised against the metaphor of the student with a purpose or a controlling idea. It is important to know, as a teacher, that when a student is making it up as he goes along he may very well be carrying out the essential work of imagination, the very work that will enable him to move from one end of the block to another, from the outside in. ("Wanderings" 107)

Bartholomae is not overlooking the relation to basic writing in this passage – certainly he is using Said's thoughts in order to further his own theories of basic writing pedagogies. We see that, in citing Said, he indirectly refers back to "Inventing the University" with the idea that the student will be moving "from one end of the block to another, from the outside in" (107). This refers to the basic writer making the move from marginalized writing to a more sophisticated, academically-sound discourse.

The fact that Bartholomae copied many of Said's theories and ideas is ironic, in that Edward Said does not appear to hold imitation in high regard. Citing Harold Bloom as a culprit for the anxiety-producing effects of imitation, Said observes that:

> It is less permissible today to imagine oneself as writing within a tradition when one writes literary criticism. This is not to say, however, that every critic is now a revolutionist destroying the canon in order to replace it with his own. A better image is that of a wanderer, going from place to place for his material, but remaining a man essentially *between* homes. (Said 8)

Here, Said claims that a writer does not write in the stead of a precursor, nor does he purposefully misread a text as Bloom insists, but he simply conducts *research*, borrowing bits and pieces from what other authorities have written, wandering between ideas, between ideologies, in order to come up with a conclusion that is entirely his own.

Even the title of this particular article, "Wanderings: Misreadings, Miswritings, and Misunderstandings" makes reference to many of the scholars who have influenced Bartholomae's work. As I read it, "wanderings" as a subtitle refers to Said's work, where the writer/reader wanders between two homes in order to gather his work. "Misreadings" could refer to Harold Bloom's work on anxiety, more specifically to his book, *A Map of Misreading*. The last two phrases, I believe, were variations of these terms. For example, "miswritings" could be based upon Bloom's concept of a "misreading," and a "misunderstanding" could possibly be related to Shaughnessy's work.

Mina Shaughnessy

Once Bartholomae finished graduate school and began his appointment at the University of Pittsburgh, he turned his attention to another figure of interest to the

field of composition. Mina Shaughnessy was a common name in English departments around the country during the 1970s. Her work to reclaim value in basic writing programs had impacted the field in ways that had not yet before been imaginable. While before, basic writing programs often only had workbook exercises and mundane routines for "hopeless" students, Shaughnessy created a discipline that was both challenging and preparatory for other collegiate courses.

In 1975, Bartholomae was offered two different teaching positions, which would decide the fate of his future scholarship. The first was at his *alma mater* of Rutgers University, teaching the British Literature that he had been studying for years. The other was at the University of Pittsburgh, leading a basic writing program; he chose the program at Pitt, claiming that he would have more of a chance to make a difference in that setting. That move would prove to be beneficial to the field of composition and rhetoric, as Bartholomae's influence has remained strong over the past thirty years.

Although he accepted the position at Pitt, Bartholomae looks back and recalls that he really had little experience in the area in which he was hired. It was then that he turned to the work and expertise of Mina Shaughnessy. Much of her work appears in Bartholomae's early work, as the backbone of many of his theories. For instance, in "Teaching Basic Writing: An Alternative to Basic Skills" (1979), he discusses basic writing programs before Shaughnessy began her work at the CUNY system in New York:

> These basic skills are defined in terms of sequences – "words, sentences, paragraphs, essays" or "description, narration, exposition, persuasion" – that,

> in turn, stand for a pedagogy…Such a pedagogy meets the needs of teachers who are frustrated by an almost complete inability to understand what could be happening in the heads of students whose writing seems to be so radically different from their own, or from the writing they've learned to read. (158-9)

Like Shaughnessy, Bartholomae recognized that prior basic writing programs were not doing enough to meet the needs of their students. He recognized that a sequential method of learning (like he names above) was not sufficient to move "remedial" students into mainstream classes. Instead, they would need to be subject to material that would prepare them for more challenging courses, instead of simply repeating simple tasks. He continues in the same essay, noting that

> Mina Shaughnessy's brilliant study of the writing of basic writers in *Errors and Expectations* shows the fallacy behind the thinking that equates signs with causes…Her work defines both the theory and the method of analysis that can enable us to see student error as other than an accident of composing or a failure to learn…Errors, then, can often be seen as evidence of competence, since they are evidence of deliberate, coherent action. (159)

This early passage in "Teaching Basic Writing" shows Bartholomae's exploration of Shaughnessy's work. As he studied her scholarship in the years just after Shaughnessy's death, Bartholomae began developing the basic writing program at Pitt in conjunction with Shaughnessy's work.

The year after "Teaching Basic Writing" was published, Bartholomae wrote a follow-up article that continued Shaughnessy's work even after her death. His essay, "The Study of Error" (1980), was published in *College Composition and*

Communication and went on to receive the prestigious Braddock Award in 1981. Even today, over twenty-seven years later, "The Study of Error" remains an oft-cited source in many composition theory anthologies and studies of writing. The work centers on Shaughnessy's theories of error of competence and error of performance. Like his predecessor, Bartholomae argued that students' errors did not show a particular deficiency, as previous instructors had claimed, but they instead showed a level of competency because the errors they made had particular repetitions. Often, they were purposeful in their error-making, repeating certain mistakes in a sequential or predictable pattern ("The Study of Error" 21). This undoubtedly followed Shaughnessy's scholarship, and certainly Bartholomae placed a high value on his predecessor's work.

Later in his career – though still greatly affected by Shaughnessy's theories – Bartholomae dedicated an entire essay to her legacy. Entitled "Released into Language: Errors, Expectations, and the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy" (1986), Bartholomae reexamines both Shaughnessy's overall work, as well as her signature text, *Errors and Expectations*. The beginning of the piece recalls Shaughnessy's speech at the 1975 MLA Convention where she gave her now-famous message entitled, "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing." Bartholomae admits to being strongly moved by her speech, recalling the impact that it had upon him almost fifteen years after the convention. He remembers that her speech was particularly powerful to him, as he began to design a basic writing program at Pitt. As he recalls her work, Bartholomae also alludes to his own work in "The Study of Error" in the passage below:

> By studying errors in the context of students' actual performance, Shaughnessy allows us to see basic writers as writers rather than as a group lacking skills that are somehow acquired prior to writing. This perspective acknowledges the place of error in all writing (including our own), and it provides a way of seeing error in the context of attempts at communication and understanding, where writing is an attempt to approximate a discourse and not just another way of taking a test. (39)

Here we see the basic message of Shaughnessy's studies: that basic writers *do* have skill and that basic writers *do* deserve respect for their efforts. Bartholomae acknowledges this sentiment in this passage. The essay further explores Shaughnessy's research and the impact that it had upon composition studies as a whole.

In "Released into Language," we see a crossroads between Bartholomae's study of Shaughnessy and the importance of imitation. When discussing methods of improving his students' error mistakes, Bartholomae notes that "Students can learn to observe and appreciate the range of our behavior by learning to analyze and *imitate the styles of texts*. They can learn, that is, to look both 'at' and 'through' the texts we assign them to read" (55, emphasis mine). This thought later becomes the overriding premise of his textbook with co-author Anthony Petrosky. In *Ways of Reading*, the authors emphasize, as Bartholomae mentions here, the importance of analyzing and imitating a variety of challenging texts. In this way, the students can improve their own writing by looking at what successful writing looks like. Often, students do not recognize the faults in their writing until they closely examine the work of a successful

author, such as Adrienne Rich or Mary Louise Pratt. And these are precisely the authors that are introduced in *Ways of Reading*, among others.

By closely examining Shaughnessy's work with basic writers, Bartholomae was not only able to learn from a great thinker of the time, but he was able to better understand basic writing pedagogies, as well. His studies gave him the opportunity to improve upon Shaughnessy's methods in order to build an even stronger program at Pitt. And with the foundation set before him, Bartholomae used his background in error analysis as a starting point for the rest of his scholarship in literacy theory and composition studies. In other words, by imitating Mina Shaughnessy's work, Bartholomae was able to specialize in areas that otherwise would have been unavailable to him.

Anthony Petrosky

One scholar who has been undoubtedly influential throughout Bartholomae's career has been his long-time University of Pittsburgh colleague and collaborator, Anthony Petrosky. Although Bartholomae and Petrosky have written together since the early 1980s, the two have an undisclosed collaborative authorship. Whereas other scholarly duos – such Andrea Lunsford and Lisa Ede, or Kathleen Blake Yancey and Michael Spooner – have written extensively about their collaborative efforts, Bartholomae and Petrosky's collaboration is relatively unknown. Suffice it to say for the sake of this project that, because of their longtime co-partnership, Bartholomae has certainly learned from Petrosky's background in education to further his own pedagogy and, certainly, his own scholarship.

Final Thoughts

With each encounter with a prominent scholar, David Bartholomae was able to take something away from his studies of that person and apply it to his own scholarship. As Harold Bloom's *Anxiety of Influence* insists, Bartholomae did not simply copy the works of others, but he built upon them in order to further not only his predecessors' original thoughts, but his own, as well. From Poirier, he exaggerated this theory by literally copying out by hand the words and phrases his professor used. From Said, Bartholomae learned a great deal of literary theory which he successfully applied to the study of writing. And from Mina Shaughnessy, he learned about basic writing, which would be the catalyst of his career in composition. Many other figures have inspired Bartholomae along the way, such as Michel Foucault, Kenneth Burke, and Pat Bizzell, and it is essential to make reference to the profound impact that each of them have had upon this important scholar. Bartholomae and co-author Anthony Petrosky repeat their thanks to colleague Bill Coles, saying that "Whatever we have learned about writing assignments and using them to define a sequence of instruction began with the rich and compelling example of our colleague, William E. Coles, Jr." (Bartholomae and Petrosky).

In Bartholomae's own words, what he has learned from his predecessors has greatly affected his ways of writing and teaching and thinking and reading. Of this, he states, "As for my teachers, I resume what they have told me when I move to speak in turn. But never willingly and only sometimes with the most difficult grace" ("Against the Grain" 200).

Chapter Two: Reading-Writing Connections in Bartholomae's Works

> *Reading, then, requires a difficult mix of authority and humility. On the one hand, a reader takes charge of a text; on the other, a reader gives generous attention to someone else's (a writer's) key terms and methods, commits his time to her examples, tries to think in her language...*
>
> Bartholomae and Petrosky, *Ways of Reading* (10)

Because he saw the impact that imitation had upon his own learning processes, Bartholomae, as we have seen, places an important emphasis on learning by example in both his scholarship and his teaching. At the start of his career, he relied on his predecessors to set the stage for his work, and thus he borrowed from the research of Mina Shaughnessy, Bill Coles, and Richard Poirier. Later, as his research matured and began to impact composition programs around the nation, Bartholomae began putting his theories into practice. Even in his later works and textbooks, imitation is a common theme throughout, as he often looks to what others had written, and builds upon their words and ideas in order to further his own work and see "real" reading in action – a concept that is seen throughout all of his scholarly work. This chapter will explore points of congruence in Bartholomae's essays, from his early articles to his textbooks, from his personal scholarship to his pedagogical practices. Unlike the first chapter, which examined the place of imitation in Bartholomae's learning processes, this chapter will explore the lines of sight that cut across and connect each of his major works. I will, in other words, not only continue to show how imitation was a beneficial practice in the theories he put worth, but also how Bartholomae both

deepened and enriched historical theories of *belles-lettres*, as well as theories of reading-writing connections, in basic writing pedagogy.

Imitation in his scholarly works / articles

When Bartholomae first accepted a teaching position at the University of Pittsburgh in 1975, he was asked to institute a basic writing program to serve students who were entering the university with less-than-ideal writing skills. At the time, the contemporary discipline of composition was just beginning to emerge, and basic writing studies were still being researched. Previously, basic writers were assumed to be students with a deficient level of writing and thinking. Instead, top scholars in the field, such as Mina Shaughnessy, Andrea Lunsford, and others, quickly helped to establish basic writers as underprepared students who needed extra assistance to assimilate into "mainstream" college courses.

The end of the 1970s showed the beginning of a strong interest in basic writing studies. Following the scholarship of Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* (1977), many basic writing instructors searched for a practical solution in the classroom. Most scholars agreed that the basic writing curriculum held many negative connotations. Before Shaughnessy's research, it was labeled "remedial" writing, which, according to Lynn Troyka in "Defining Basic Writing in Context" (1987), implied an "illness or deficiency" (4) on the students' behalf. In "Politics and Practices in Basic Writing" (1987), Andrea Lunsford describes the "bad practices" that occurred during the era of remedial education (and beyond):

> Class sizes averaging 25 to 35 students, which is a growing trend…the failure to emphasize reading and speaking and thinking in the basic writing classroom; the use of ineffective diagnostic or testing procedures; inflexible course structures and teaching styles; and the failure to house basic writing within an academic discipline. All of these practices, I need hardly to point out, fail to make basic writing a legitimate academic enterprise and send the implicit message that what we and our students are doing is of little importance. (254)

To counter this negative outlook on the discipline, scholars in the field first examined the errors that basic writing students were making – and why they made these errors.

It was at this point that David Bartholomae became interested in joining the scholarly conversation on the study of error. At the 1975 MLA Convention, Bartholomae recalls listening to Mina Shaughnessy deliver her now-famous opening message entitled "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing." Because he was at the beginning of his career and asked to work with students with whom he had little experience, Shaughnessy's message was particularly inspiring to Bartholomae. In his 1986 work, "Released into Language: Errors, Expectations, and the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy," Bartholomae remembers that he attended the conference at

> a time when I was struggling to come to terms with the new direction in my professional life imposed by my first full-time appointment as a basic writing teacher and administrator in charge of a basic writing curriculum. I had committed my career to the students she called Basic Writers and to the task of easing their precarious entry into the world of the university. At the same

> time, however, I was painfully aware that my ability to understand or alter their actual performance as writers was severely limited. (37)

Because he felt "severely limited" in the area in which he was called to be an expert, Bartholomae began to enact the pedagogies Shaughnessy called for and relied on her expertise to guide him as he started a basic writing program.

As a result, much of his early research reflects Shaughnessy's own work with basic writing; much of her language became his language for research. For instance, "The Study of Error" (1980) opens with an excerpt from Mina Shaughnessy's book *Errors and Expectations*, showing up front that he is borrowing from the work of an important icon in the field. Throughout his essay, Bartholomae defines "basic writing" much as Shaughnessy did in her text: "Basic writing, I want to argue, is a variety of writing, not writing with fewer parts or more rudimentary constituents. It is not evidence of arrested cognitive development, arrested language development, or unruly or unpredictable language use" ("The Study of Error" 20). This definition matches the ideas suggested in *Errors and Expectations*, when Shaughnessy notes that:

> The writer, as we have said, inherits the language out of which he must fabricate his own messages. He is therefore in a constant tangle with language, obliged to recognize its public, communal nature and yet driven to invent out of this language his own statements. But invention is difficult at these early stages when the clichés and conventions of the formal style are fresh to the writer and before he is confident or knowledgeable enough to translate more freely into language that is closer to his thoughts. (Shaughnessy 53)

In this passage, Shaughnessy recognizes that basic writers do not have "arrested" skills, as Bartholomae recognizes, but instead that they produce a variety of writing in which they draw upon the language around them and make sense of it as best as they can. In essence, they, too, draw upon a complex notion of imitation in their writing. Bartholomae agrees, citing in "The Study of Error" that "There is a style, then, to the apparently bizarre and incoherent writing of a basic writer because it is, finally, evidence of an individual using language to make and transcribe meaning" (21). This statement is, essentially, the entire premise of Shaughnessy's book. Therefore, we can see evidence of her legacy in one of Bartholomae's earliest works, which sets the framework for his evolving theories.

Also at issue in the late 1970s and early 1980s was the concern that "remedial" writing courses were not emphasizing the importance of critical reading. Scholars such as Thomas J. Farrell (1977), Andrea Lunsford (1987), and Mariolina Salvatori (1983) argued that reading should have a higher emphasis in basic writing classes, as it is through reading that students have effective prose models for writing. Further on in "Politics and Practices in Basic Writing," Lunsford mirrors this claim, noting that "Good practice in basic writing integrates speaking, reading, listening, and writing. Articles in this volume [*A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers*] by Lynn Troyka, Lisa Ede, and David Bartholomae stress the connections between these communicative arts, connections that are especially important for basic writers" (254-5). Here, Lunsford singles out Bartholomae as a pioneer in the field who took the initiative to study these areas in need of research. His early works, "Teaching Basic Writing: An Alternative to Basic Skills" (1979) and "Writing Assignments: Where

Writing Begins" (1982), both place high value on teaching students to read *in order* to write. In "Teaching Basic Writing" (1979), Bartholomae describes the course designed by him and Anthony Petrosky, in which – frustrated by the ineffectiveness of paragraph-level reading exercises for basic writing students – they:

> Decided not to model our curriculum on the study skills approach to reading, which is, more or less, instruction in how to read a textbook, and which becomes, given the ethos of such survival courses, instruction in how to avoid reading by learning to read only topic sentences or tables of contents. Our goal was to offer reading as a basic intellectual activity, a way of collecting and shaping information. (169)

The approach to teaching in this early point in Bartholomae's career helped him become known as an innovative and controversial scholar of basic writing studies. His theories were fresh in a field that demanded new ideas. This initial essay, therefore, allowed his research to become known as he worked to contribute further to ongoing debates about how literacies of underprepared students develop.

By entering the field at a time that needed considerable research, Bartholomae was able to not only learn from past scholars who had come before him, but he built upon their ideas, as well. In his studies of the works of Mina Shaughnessy, as we have seen, Bartholomae saw basic writers not as deficient writers, but as students who struggled to enter a scholarly discourse. His first major works, then – "The Study of Error" (1980) and "Inventing the University" (1985) – sought to deepen this understanding within the field, and solidify the need for specialized teaching in basic writing studies.

In particular, Bartholomae's "Inventing the University" was highly praised for its innovative approach to looking at student texts as attempts to navigate the discourse of academics. Bartholomae explains that a beginning writer must, upon entering the university, learn to write

> as though he were a member of the academy or an historian or an anthropologist or an economist; he has to invent the university by assembling and mimicking its language while finding some compromise between idiosyncracy, a personal history, on the one hand, and the requirements of convention, the history of a discipline, on the other. He must learn to speak our language. ("Inventing the University" 61)

Following trends of the time, this passage exemplifies pedagogies surrounding students' methods of cognition in writing, paying attention in particular to the ways that students are reacting psychologically to composition. John Trimbur, in "Articulation Theory and the Problem of Determination: A Reading of *Lives on the Boundary*" (1994), also claims that "Inventing the University" could be read as an exemplum of social constructionist theory (239); however, he also argues that "this conventionalized view may actually ignore or suppress expressionist or cognitivist currents in Bartholomae's writing" (239). While true, these "currents" are not the focus of Bartholomae's writing; instead, this work is intended to promote a fresh outlook on students' writing, while helping to drive the trends of social constructivism during the 1980s.

In sum, these texts show how Bartholomae not only followed the trends in the field during the late 1970s and early 1980s, but that he helped pioneer them, as well.

In fact, the major theme throughout each of his major works (such as "The Study of Error" and "Inventing the University") seems to not only follow these rhetorical trends, but also solidifies them. The following section will examine this theme in regards to Bartholomae's co-authored text, *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts*, and will show how this text evolved from his initial study of basic writers, how it strengthened the conception of basic writing studies, and how it reinforced ideas of literacy and reading-writing connections within the field.

Reading and Writing in *Facts, Artifacts, Counterfacts*

After nearly a decade of working with basic writers at the University of Pittsburgh, Bartholomae began designing a writing pedagogy with colleague Anthony Petrosky – a member of the University of Pittsburgh's School of Education – which originated from their daily classroom experiences. Together, they created a classroom dynamic that incorporated imitation into the everyday life of the classroom – in formal and informal writing assignments, in group work, and in the works that the students read. Drawing from his own pedagogical practices, Bartholomae emphasized the importance of students learning from each others' works.

In 1987, Bartholomae and Petrosky published *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts* (henceforth, *Facts*), a guide for writing teachers which outlined their processes in the classroom. Countering what had been used in basic writing courses before Mina Shaughnessy's research, the book encourages teachers to use difficult, complex readings for their students in order to widen the scope of reading to include literary, as well as non-literary, prose. Prior to Shaughnessy's work, some writing

teachers had claimed that difficult texts would not be effective in a writing classroom because not only would students not be able to read them well, but teachers might not be able to teach them well. Bartholomae and Petrosky argued, however, that simple readings would not assist basic writers enter into academic discourse, but would instead further marginalize them. By offering challenging texts that had legitimate value in academia, Bartholomae and Petrosky's method emphasized the fact that basic writers were competent students who had a legitimate place in the university. By treating these "remedial" students as graduate students, they had more confidence in what they were learning and took the class more seriously.

The text is constructed around the central argument that students improve their writing by sharpening and challenging their critical thinking skills. Because *Facts* deviates from the traditional writing teacher's manual, the introduction provides an overview of the pedagogy, explaining its conception and evolution. The core idea of "counterfactuality" – as the authors put it, "the motive to alter [the] facts, to reject their apparent inevitability" (8) – encourages students to reexamine texts in a new way. Bartholomae and Petrosky note particularly that, "The purpose of the course is to bring forward the image of the reader and writer represented in our students' *textual performances* (what some would take as their inevitable roles) so that they can reimagine themselves as readers and writers" (8, emphasis mine). Here, I emphasize the importance of the "textual performances," as it is a concept that underlies the work of Richard Poirier.

In this context, these performances involve a certain amount of struggle (as does the very concept of imitation itself), which appears to be a common theme

throughout the text. The authors go on to say that "In the course, and in this book, we are presenting reading and writing as a struggle within and against the languages of academic life. A classroom performance represents a moment in which, by speaking or writing, a student must enter a closed community, with its secrets, codes and rituals" (8). The struggle they refer to here is multi-faceted; on the one hand, it refers to the difficult texts included in their pedagogy – texts such as Adam Phillips' "Houdini's Box" or Richard Rodriguez's "Hunger of Memory." On the other hand, it makes explicit the fact that students will struggle at first to enter into an academic discourse, and that they may try to resist the complexities therein before finally assimilating into that "closed community." By acknowledging these complexities, Bartholomae and Petrosky make explicit their attempt to deepen reading-writing connections in a way that most other guides in composition studies did not.

What Bartholomae and Petrosky were able to accomplish through *Facts* was to create a milieu in which reading was made visible. In other words, reading – which is a typically silent and therefore "invisible" act – became a communal experience, in which student-produced works were brought forth and used as the primary texts of the class. As Bartholomae and Petrosky explain:

> The world we know and the texts that we know are compositions that we write…stories buried in and making up our consciousness. It is for this reason that we choose to represent our student readers as composers rather than decoders. And it is for this reason that our course begins, rather than ends, with the texts our students write…We want them to see readings…that

> represent readers (perhaps confused, perhaps many-minded), in order to begin to talk about the stories those readings tell). (15)

Although usually viewed as "silent" and responsive works, Bartholomae and Petrosky wished to bring student texts into view, as evidence of learning-in-action.

Moreover, reading became a performative act, in which everyone in the classroom (both students and teachers alike) engaged in reading difficult materials and challenged them. The authors explain in the introduction to *Facts* that "There is a strong textual bias in this approach to reading, one that ignores the rhetorical nature of reading, where a 'main idea' is as much a function of a reader's prior experience with a subject (his way of speaking about that subject and representing it to himself) and his reason for reading as it is a function of anything 'coded' in the text" (*Facts* 11). Here, Bartholomae (who is the author of this particular passage) acknowledges that students bring their own biases and backgrounds to a reading, and he capitalizes on that in a way that other anthologies do not. Instead, he explores what students actually bring to a classroom that informs their reading.

Following this line of thought, Bartholomae and Petrosky recognize that each basic writing student carries a specific background in literacy that forms their methods of thinking and writing. To account for these differences, the authors constructed their writing exercises to accommodate different levels of literacy. For example, one particular exercise prompt reads as follows:

> For Monday, you are to read *The Catcher in the Rye*…Once you finish *The Catcher in the Rye*, we'd like you to sit down and write a response to the book in your journal…In this entry, we'd like you to tell us what you found in the

> book that seems most interesting or useful, given the discussions we've had about growth and change so far in class…We'd like to see more *illustration* of the things you choose to talk about in this entry. We'd like you to cite examples (to include examples) from the text and, if appropriate, from your own prior thinking and experience. Your explanations, that is, should take more than a single sentence and they should be more than a bald statement ("Maya liked her brother Bailey."). Again, however, give us as little summary as possible. We've all read the book. We know what happened to Holden. We want you to help us better understand him. (58-59)

This excerpt shows how Bartholomae and Petrosky capitalize upon their students' past experiences in order to better understand the texts at hand. More than mere summary, as they point out, they are looking for engagement with the text. And, more importantly, the instructors place themselves at an equal level with the students, as evidenced by the final sentence of the excerpt above. Instead of playing the role of All-Knowing Teacher, they submit themselves to being taught by their basic writing students – a task that many traditional instructors would oppose.

After its publication in 1986, *Facts* became a useful teaching tool for basic writing instructors around the country because this fresh approach had ideas that most teachers had not considered. It was innovative – a new way of looking at teaching the "outcasts" of the university system – and incorporated actual classroom notes and materials used by Bartholomae and Petrosky's colleagues, such as Mariolina Salvatori, Susan V. Wall, Glynda Hull, and others. Because of these other voices, readers were allowed to see how the text worked within a community of teachers, and to emulate

the elements of the text that they liked and appreciated – and to ignore those elements that they did not.

What separates *Facts* from other writing pedagogy texts is its indirect focus on imitation. Throughout the text, we see references to Bartholomae's earlier works, including "The Study of Error" and "Inventing the University," as a sort of self-generating process. In other words, he builds upon his prior work like stepping stones, using his earlier pieces as the foundation of his methods. But these subsequent works are more than mere revision. Instead, Bartholomae not only constructs his evolving texts around the central ideas in prior texts, but he re-imagines them in order to suit the evolving needs of the field. In *Facts*, of course, the pedagogy derives from Bartholomae's work, but also from Anthony Petrosky's scholarship, as well. The very notion of encouraging students to read and write against the grain of their own work refers back not only to "Inventing the University," in which Bartholomae recognizes the challenge that students face when assimilating into academic discourse, but also to "Against the Grain," also published in 1987. These references are not merely copied, but (as Bartholomae asks his students to do in class) they are further developed in order to fit the context.

Students' papers are likewise used for a similar purpose. Bartholomae and Petrosky use real essays (with names omitted) as examples for strong readings and writings. Not only are these student texts designed to offer examples of what "good student writing" should look like, but they are used "as evidence of readers or writers at work" (31). In other words, the texts stand as an example of students' developing cognitive processes of difficult works. As the semester progresses, the authors note,

the examples become increasingly articulate (in part) because the students learn from each others' examples of what makes a strong reading.

Overall, *Facts* was celebrated as an innovative (albeit controversial) text on engaging basic writers with reading and writing. In the more than twenty years since its publication, *Facts* has been used and altered in composition courses around the country to suit the needs of first-year writing courses. Although the concept of imitation is not explicitly singled out in this text as it is in other works by Bartholomae, it is inherently intermixed throughout. More importantly, however, is the tie to reading-writing connections that is made explicit through this work. What this text successfully modeled was a classroom that allowed students to *envision* those reading-writing connections in a new way and to see writing as a *performance* in action.

Reading and Writing in *Ways of Reading*

Perhaps the work that stands out the most in Bartholomae's career is his controversial textbook called *Ways of Reading: An Anthology for Writers*, which was first published in 1987. In this anthology, which was again co-authored with Anthony Petrosky, Bartholomae sets forth a pedagogy that grew from his use of *Facts*. Like their previous text, *Ways* sought to deepen reading-writing connections in students and to challenge traditional views of literacy in basic writing studies. Much like *Facts*, this new textbook sought to put Bartholomae and Petrosky's pedagogical practices into action.

The text itself is comprised of complex essays that are typical of graduate-level work – not that of basic writers. Bartholomae and Petrosky intentionally chose essays that were important to academia, including texts from other disciplines, such as the social sciences, history, and philosophy. They were texts that were chosen, in part, based upon their difficulty. The editors offer their reasons as follows:

> When we chose the selections for this book, we chose them with the understanding that they were difficult to read. And we chose them knowing that students were not their primary audience…We chose them, in other words, knowing that we would be asking you to read something you were most likely not prepared to read. But this is what it means to be a student and it was our goal to take our students seriously. ("Working with Difficulty" 12)

This passage points to remnants of post-Shaughnessian pedagogy, which recognized the importance of "taking students seriously" and offering them material that would show that their work was important and that their learning was important. And thus, Bartholomae and Petrosky intended to challenge and stimulate their students' thinking with their choices of texts.

But, in a more evident way, the text is comprised of essays that Bartholomae and Petrosky generally enjoy reading and find challenging. In fact, they note that "We're each convinced that the essays are ours in that we know best what's going on in them, and yet we have also become theirs, creatures of these essays, because of the ways they have come to dominate our seeing, talking, reading, and writing" ("Introduction" 5). Perhaps because of this, every edition of *Ways* has continued to reprint several of the same texts because they are the editors' favorites – texts such as

Paulo Freire's "The 'Banking' Concept of Education," Harriet (Brent) Jacobs' "Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl," Walker Percy's "The Loss of the Creature," Edward Said's "States," and others. These are the voices that are repeated throughout each edition.

Because of their literary and theoretical backgrounds, Bartholomae and Petrosky chose difficult essays for *Ways* so that their students would have to re-read the works in order to understand them and grapple with them. Bartholomae and Petrosky wanted *Ways* to stand out as a text that encouraged independent thinking. The editors note that:

> Introductory textbooks (like biology or business, for example) are good examples of books that ask little of readers outside of note-taking and memorization. In these texts the writers are experts and your job, as novice, is to digest what they have to say. And, appropriately, the task set before you is to summarize – so you can speak again what the author said, so you can better remember what you read. ("Introduction: *Ways of Reading*" 276)

Again, this is the reason for the complex choices of readings. Instead of simple meanings, where the ending is tied up neatly for the reader, the works of Foucault, Griffin, and Said are not as easy to digest. They require time, persistence, and "mulling over" before they can be better understood. Bartholomae continues, claiming that "Student readers, for example, can take responsibility for determining the meaning of the text. They can work as though they were doing something other than finding ideas already there on the page and they can be guided by their own impressions or questions as they read" (277). The independence referred to in these

two passages dictates the basic premise behind the text. The authors want to make students ready for real-life reading situations that they will face in a university setting. And thus, to better equip them for the challenge, the anthology uses complex readings and forces the students to face up to that challenge.

The readings are organized by sequence, which provides a unique contribution to the text. While many anthologies organize texts around rhetorical themes (such as "compare and contrast," "persuasion," etc), *Ways* groups texts around complex thematic (and theoretical) issues, which have specific goals; for example, one sequence – entitled "The Arts of the Contact Zone" – includes texts such as Mary Louise Pratt's "The Arts of the Contact Zone" (obviously the fountainhead text of this particular sequence), Gloria Anzaldúa's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue," James Baldwin's "Stranger in the Village," Edward Said's "States," and more. What this sequence offers students (and teachers) is a theoretical approach to a group of difficult texts. By starting the sequence with Pratt's text, Bartholomae and Petrosky set their readers up with a specific literary "through-line" to follow: the idea that texts "talk back" to one another and challenge preconceived ideas. From Pratt's essay, we see the example of an Andean man named Guaman Poma who wrote a letter to King Philip III of Spain in the early 17th century. Here, Guaman Poma "talked back" to a Christian culture by "rewriting the Christian history of the world from Adam and Eve, incorporating the Amerindians into it as offspring of one of the sons of Noah" (Pratt 519). In this case, Guaman Poma challenges the norm of historical conventions in order to further his case against King Philip III. What this provides, according to

Pratt, is a story about how two cultures collide in a "contact zone," through their "copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices" (Pratt 516).

What this theoretical background offers for the other texts is a way in which to read the remainder of the sequence. The other pieces in the sequence, by Anzaldúa, Jacobs, Said, and others, share similar themes of the "contact zone." In Anzaldúa's "How to Tame a Wild Tongue," for example, the author describes her experience growing up along the Texas-Mexico border, speaking a hybrid dialect of Mexican Spanish and American English. Throughout her writing, she examines the struggles of living in a physical "contact zone" while simultaneously experiencing a linguistic "contact zone."

The selected assignments that pertain to this sequence all incorporate Pratt's text as a basis for writing. The titles read as follows:

Assignment 1: *The Literate Arts of the Contact Zone* [Pratt]
Assignment 2: *Taking a Position* [Pratt, Rosaldo]
Assignment 3: *Borderlands* [Pratt, Anzaldúa]
Assignment 4: *Autoethnography* [Pratt, Jacobs]
Assignment 5: *Writing from Within* [Pratt, Baldwin]
Assignment 6: *A Dialectic of Self and Other* [Pratt, Said]
Assignment 7: *On Culture* [Pratt, Rosaldo, Anzaldúa, Jacobs, Baldwin, Said]

These assignments serve to deepen theoretical reading-writing connections for basic writing students in a way that, much in line with Pratt's essay, seeks to challenge cultural norms and examine the "contact zones" evident in academia.

Although this is merely one sequence in *Ways*, other combinations prove to have as many theoretical implications. Other titles of sequences include "The Aims of Education," "Autobiographical Explorations," "Writing with Style," "Truth and

Method," "On Difficulty," and others. As evidenced by the titles alone, the texts included in each sequence tend to overlap, which broadens the scope of the readings.

The purpose of these sequences, according to the editors, is to provide building blocks for students. The first piece of the sequence functions as a fountainhead text, and the others (and their subsequent "Questions for a Second Reading") build upon each of the previous works. According to Bartholomae and Petrosky:

> the sequences allow you to participate in an extended academic project, one in which you take a position, revise it, look at a new example, hear what someone else has to say, revise it again, and see what conclusions you can draw about your subject…This is the closest approximation we can give you of the rhythm and texture of academic life, and we offer our book as an introduction to its characteristic ways of reading, thinking, and writing. ("Reading and Writing" 23)

This pedagogical approach is very closely related to Bartholomae's own methods of writing and revision. It is only logical that he would adapt his own scholarship to suit the needs of his students. The various sequences designed for *Ways*, along with the complexity of the different texts therein, offer a fresh approach to composition courses that has been used in writing classrooms of all levels since the first edition in 1987.

When the text was first published, the field of composition was immersed in a pedagogy of "social-epistemic rhetoric" – a belief in which, according to Jim Berlin in his well-known essay "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class" (1988), "the real is located in a relationship that involves the *dialectical* interaction of the observer, the discourse community (social group) in which the observer is functioning, and the

material conditions of existence" (Berlin 19, emphasis mine). Here, I emphasize the importance of "dialogue" as it pertains to *Ways* for two closely-related reasons: first, because of the scholarly conversation that Bartholomae and Petrosky wish to initiate between their basic writers and their *texts* (a conversation which, likewise, corresponds to Berlin's initial scholarship); and secondly, because of the assimilation into academic discourse as a sort of dialogue between the basic writer and the *academy*.

Berlin continues, describing the foundations of social-epistemic rhetoric: "this dialectic is grounded in language: the observer, the discourse community, and the material conditions of existence are all verbal constructs…This means that in studying rhetoric – the ways discourse is generated – we are studying the ways in which knowledge comes into existence" (20). Again, Berlin's observation closely mirrors Bartholomae and Petrosky's attempt in both *Facts* and *Ways* to make reading visible, and to make this knowledge "come into existence." Thus, at a time when this pedagogy was being promoted by other important scholars, such as Pat Bizzell, Karen Burke LeFevre, and others, *Ways* was a text that embodied the principles that the pedagogy demanded: historical relevance, discourse communities, intertextuality.

While these principles help to distinguish *Ways* from other composition anthologies, it was, moreover, the complex reading-writing connections the text offers that truly set it apart. With essays such as Michel Foucault's "Panopticism" and Mary Louise Pratt's "Arts of the Contact Zone," *Ways* does not hide the fact that the readings are challenging or that the essay assignments are complex. In fact, Bartholomae and Petrosky explain in the introduction that this is something that the

book intends to do: "When we chose the essays, we were looking for 'readable' texts – that is, texts that leave some work for the reader to do. We wanted selections that invite students to be active, critical readers, that present powerful readings of common experience, that open up the familiar world and make it puzzling, rich, and problematic" ("Preface" vi). This passage, however, is directed at teachers of writing – not the students. We see this by such references to "our students" (v) and "as expert readers, we…" (vi). In this case, it is the editors' hope that the instructors would first notice these connections and emphasize them in the classroom.

Rhetoric of Addressing Students

One feature that distinguishes *Ways* from other anthologies is the visibility of the editors throughout. They do not attempt to remain invisible throughout the text, as many texts do, but interrupt the students' working and reading. In fact, the introduction explicitly offers a student-centered approach, as evidenced by the use of a more informal "you," referring to a student reader: "we'd like *you* to imagine when you read the works we've collected here…" ("Introduction" 1, emphasis mine) and "we do not think of *you*, the reader, as a term-paper writer" ("Introduction" 2, emphasis mine). Here, the emphatic "you" clearly is one who lacks the experience of the "expert reader" mentioned earlier. This is someone who is starting the initiation process into academic writing.

In this introduction, Bartholomae and Petrosky explain how their approach to reading might be different from other approaches students may have encountered. Instead of reducing reading to a central idea – one that could easily become a

philosophical cliché – the authors encourage reading that "talks back" to the text and that goes against the grain of the author's original intentions. As they put it, "When you stop to talk or write about what you've read, the author is silent; you take over – it is your turn to write, to begin to respond to what the author said" (2).

The methods implied in *Ways* invite students to work "with and against the grain of a text, reproducing an author's methods, questioning his or her direction and authority" (10). When they work with the grain, students accept the authors' intent, exploring common themes and drawing conclusions. When they work against the grain, they talk back, they question, and they challenge a text. The essays the editors have chosen, they tell us, encourage such readings because of their complexity. Whereas other anthologies have implicitly called for such readings, *Ways* makes its intention explicit.

The text also asks students to *re*-read each of the texts, and includes "Questions for a Second Reading" at the end of each essay, which focus on working both with and against the grain of the assigned readings. As such, they are a crucial aspect of the pedagogy the editors put forth. As Bartholomae and Petrosky explain, the questions and assignments "are written to resist that reading, to forestall a writer's desire to simplify" (21). And further, "Our questions are meant to suggest ways of questioning, starting points" (21). Because of their inherent complexity, these questions offer students a chance to look beyond basic plot summary or grasp at cultural allusions and to challenge themselves to make theoretical connections. In keeping with scholarly research in basic writing studies, *Ways* offers its readers a

chance to make connections between the text and their own lives, and to challenge ingrained cultural norms.

Praise and Criticism for Ways of Reading

Because of the nature of the text, *Ways* has been immensely successful in English departments around the country. In "The Essay Canon," scholar Lynn Z. Bloom examines a wide range of composition readers, and hails *Ways* as "innovative" (413) and an exception to almost every composition anthology, as it includes none of Bloom's listed "canonical" texts. Instead, Bloom credits this to the fact that *Ways* veers from typical college essays and offers complex readings in order to stimulate discussion and analysis in the classroom.

Reviewers of the text typically associate *Ways* with "complexity," "challenge," and "critical thought," but these are used in a positive manner, showing again how the text deviates from other anthologies. Also distinctive of this text is the impact that it has not only upon students using it, but upon many teachers who teach from it. In the past, reviewers have praised Bartholomae and Petrosky's work for its ability to improve instructors' teaching and ways of thinking about challenging texts. In a textbook advertisement, *Ways* publisher Bedford/St. Martin's claims that the text "helps students develop the necessary intellectual skills for college-level academic work while engaging them in conversations with key academic and cultural texts…it bridges the gap between contemporary critical theory and composition so that instructors can connect their own scholarly work with their teaching" ("About This

Book"). This shows the unique way that the text appeals to both students and instructors alike.

Despite its many pedagogical insights, critics have found fault in *Ways* for everything from the choice of texts to the types of writing assignments to the apparent "manipulation" of students by Bartholomae, Petrosky, and the anthology itself. A primary refutation of the text concerns the level of students, and maintains that *Ways* is simply too difficult for basic writers to use. In her article, "Resisting the 'Ideology of Certainty,'" Bonnie L. Kyburz admits the difficulty of the text for beginning writers, but notes moreover that she finds fault with the editor's approach to "guidance" (Kyburz 585). She claims that the text tends to dominate students and impress upon them a sense of inferiority; instead of offering students the tools to make connections between texts and their lives, Kyburz believes that *Ways* takes over the conversation, limiting what students are truly able to get out of the experience. As she notes, "their textbook leaves little room for a problem-posing pedagogy in which *students* generate questions and problems for exploration and thought, dialogue, and writing" (585), and instead "[forge] ahead in their approach, self-assured in their assumption that students want to be 'saved' and that 'we' are the ones to save them" (585). While it is true that Bartholomae and Petrosky offer structured (and particular) questions for response after each reading selection, they acknowledge the difficulty that the questions pose in the *Instruction Manual for Ways of Reading*:

> Most of the questions are designed to turn against what we have taken as the flow of the assignment, to open it up and to suggest a new direction…we don't want students to think of writing as following a series of orders…[The

> questions] *aren't* a series but a set of interruptions. They are designed to frustrate the very patterns the assignment has set into play. ("Questions" 7)

Here, Bartholomae and Petrosky partially answer Kyburz's concerns, as they point out that the reading questions are intended to be open-ended and not pushing a particular agenda. The editors want their students to recognize the inherent complexities in writing and to push them to challenge their own reading of the texts, instead of merely accept them – a feat that, perhaps, basic writers may not be able to accomplish on their own, without the assistance of critical guidance.

In a second criticism of *Ways*, author Jeffrey P. Cain, in his text "Thinking Along with Foucault," argues not that the text is too difficult for basic writers, but that it is "benevolently manipulative" (564) because it "purported to empower students even as it lured them into the inescapable web of assimilation into academic discourse" (564). In other words, Cain suggests that Bartholomae and Petrosky's pedagogy is contradictory; on the one hand, it seeks to help students find their voice, and on the other hand, it helps them to lose it. He further compares the purpose of *Ways* to Foucault's "Panopticism." Here, Cain asserts that Bartholomae and Petrosky's pedagogy functions much like the prison in Foucault's text: like the Panopticon, the students are constantly monitored by the "all-knowing teacher" (571). While this is a valid analogy, Cain overlooks the fact that the "teacher as authority figure" is ingrained in the nature of all composition classrooms, and is not limited to Bartholomae and Petrosky's. Instead, all teachers monitor their students to a particular degree in order to achieve their pedagogical goal. For the editors of *Ways*,

the goal aims to acculturate students to academic discourse, providing them with textual resources to serve as a guide while they "try on" a new, sophisticated language.

Still other critics claim that Bartholomae and Petrosky are subtly pushing a liberal political agenda upon their students. Tom Kerr suggests in "*Ways of Reading* as Signifying Regime of Signs" (2001) that the difficult essay selections forced upon the students

> resolves into a kind of postmodern tough love, and the pedagogical processes and classroom consequences of the book amount, more or less, to a fourteen-week multicultural boot camp for students who have been too long isolated in the 'burbs, have watched too much TV, have swallowed too many mainstream pronouncements about everyday life in America, and need a good jolt in the brain – at least if we want them on our side, if we want them eventually to become good critical thinkers, good writers, and all-around good intellectual eggs. (Kerr 575-6)

Kerr's primary critique of the piece is that it includes texts that are far too politically-charged for the average college student, such as Edward Said's "States" and Bordo's "Hunger as Ideology," to name only two. Kerr insists that these texts are not universally appealing; in his experience, *Ways* was well-received by the students at Virginia Tech (who were primarily white), while it was poorly received at Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus, where the students were primarily multicultural and international students. According to Kerr, he saw the text as operative for the students at Virginia Tech because it was "a way not only of reading but also of proselytizing and subverting the mind-numbing, consumer/capitalist/fascist/sexist/racist/classist

ideologies that surrounded us in the form of American mythologies and mass culture" (Kerr 578). This critique mirrors what other critics (such as, for example, Joshua Prober of *Campus Watch*) have argued about the text. As a retort to these claims, Bartholomae and Petrosky have noted that, while political brainwashing is not a goal of the course, engaging critically in texts that have importance to Academia is.

The pieces used throughout *Ways* offer students not only a challenge to their writing abilities, but a challenge to the way they view the world. Criticized by many (like Kerr) as an over-politicized text, I believe that instead Bartholomae and Petrosky's text teaches students to grapple with difficult readings while simultaneously taking a closer look at society and culture as a whole. Although the pieces are difficult, the authors say,

> Not everything a reader reads is worth that kind of effort. The pieces we have chosen for this book all provide, we feel, powerful ways of seeing (or framing) our common experience. The selections cannot be quickly summarized. They are striking, surprising, sometimes troubling in how they challenge common ways of seeing the world…The essays have changed the ways people think and write. In fact, every selection in the book is one that has given us, our students, and colleagues that dramatic experience, almost like a discovery, when we suddenly saw things as we had never seen them before and, as a consequence, we had to work hard to understand what had happened and how our thinking had changed. ("Introduction" 275)

Many of the texts do indeed challenge the ways of seeing the world. Mary Louise Pratt's essay "The Art of the Contact Zone" not only examines the world through a

multi-disciplinary lens, but it deals with the important issue of confliction – the "contact zone" – when two or more groups collide. This idea is useful and powerful not only in anthropological studies, but in other disciplines, such as writing and composition, as well.

Because of its innovation in the field, *Ways* is among the rare composition anthologies to inspire other scholarly research. After its original publication in 1987, scholars became increasingly interested in the ways in which the text explored issues of literacy in basic writing studies. As Andrea Lunsford prophetically pointed out in "Politics and Practices in Basic Writing," literacy and "higher education in America is at a serious crossroads, that important and perhaps irreversible changes will occur in the next decades" (257). Indeed, the study of literacy grew remarkably in the late 1980s and early 1990s, as scholars began to closely examine the relationship between reading and writing and its place in composition classrooms. In this way, Bartholomae and Petrosky's text (and the readings therein) not only partook in the trend of studying literacy, but it helped to initiate it.

Moreover, because of the texts chosen for the anthology, the study of "difficulty" became an increasingly-popular topic. Bartholomae's fellow colleague Mariolina Salvatori began a long-lasting interest in the study of difficulty after the first edition of *Ways* was published. Her articles and chapters, including "Towards a Hermeneutics of Difficulty" (1988), "Conversations with Texts: Reading in the Teaching of Composition" (1996), "Difficulty: The Great Educational Divide" (2000), and "Understanding Difficulties: A Heuristic" (2003) have caused her to become a

leading scholar in this area, along with other names such as Patricia Donahue and Ellen Quandahl.

Much like Bartholomae and Petrosky's work shows, Salvatori makes explicit the ability to make reading "visible" – or, as she terms it, "voiced." In "Conversations with Texts," she points out that:

> in contrast with these notions about reading are theories that posit the possibility and the advantages of exploring the complex processes by which 'reading' gives a voice to an otherwise mute 'writing'; theories that turn texts and readers into 'interlocutors' of each other…Such theories make it possible to claim not only that reading can be taught, but also that it can be taught as an opportunity to investigate knowledge-producing practices. (166)

At this point, Salvatori implicitly returns to Bartholomae and Petrosky's pedagogy, and furthers it to incorporate the element of difficulty in learning. Struck by the premise that complex readings can lead to improved writing abilities, Salvatori began closely examining these reading-writing connections put forth by both *Facts* and *Ways* in her own research, which has, in turn, deepened the study of hermeneutics and literacy within the realm of composition studies.

As a textbook, *Ways of Reading* was able to promote research in the field as many other anthologies did not. Its innovative and controversial methods of teaching students helped to perpetuate a mode of thinking about literacy and reading in composition classrooms that resonated in the years that followed. Now in its eighth edition, *Ways* has proven itself to be an effective and successful method of teaching composition to students of all levels. No longer viewed as "only" a basic writing text,

it has gone on to be used – as intended – in first-year writing courses to graduate-level courses in colleges and universities around the country. Likewise, it continues to be hailed by critics as an engaging text that connects students and instructors in a way that no other anthology attempts to do. Not content to merely follow the trends of the field, Bartholomae and Petrosky's text has instead become an innovator and instigator of trends that would follow.

Conclusion: Final Thoughts and Looking Forward

> *If I think of my own experience as a writer, the most powerful terms I can use to discuss the composing process are not prewriting, writing, and revision, but tradition and imitation and interference and resistance.*
>
> David Bartholomae, "Against the Grain" (194)

Throughout David Bartholomae's thirty-five year career, he has returned time and again to the same complex themes: error, literacy, reading-writing connections, and – perhaps unintentionally – imitation. Not surprisingly, then, these themes are evident in each of his major works, from his scholarly articles to his textbooks to his formal presentations, as they become reworked and revised with each successive publication.

As we read his works, we must pay attention to the inescapable fact that – while he has fostered an important place in composition's history – these innovations in the field could not have occurred without the presence of scholars who came before him. Harold Bloom, Edward Said, Richard Poirier, Bill Coles, and Mina Shaughnessy – each of these figures helped instill in Bartholomae a sense of groundedness in the field that served as the basis for his research. That research, then, went on to become an essential component of the trends that have defined contemporary composition studies as a complex, multivocal, ever-changing, living entity.

What I have not done in this work is present Bartholomae's work in its entirety; instead, I have shown a limited scope of his research, from approximately 1979 to 1987. I have limited myself intentionally, showing primarily his contributions to pedagogy, so as to examine this aspect of his career in depth. In doing so, I have omitted major components of Bartholomae's scholarship, which includes many

retrospective overviews of the profession. These include important texts, such as "The Tidy House: Basic Writing in the American Curriculum" (1993), "What is Composition and (If You Know What That Is) Why Do We Teach It?" (1996), and "Composition, 1900-2000" (2000), to name only a few. My intent was not to overlook these important texts, but to instead closely examine Bartholomae's works on basic writing studies.

Just like the pedagogy he promotes, Bartholomae's work is complex and evolving. While his scholarship began as the result of increasing awareness about issues in basic writing studies, his work has continued to evolve and incorporate new ideas about both reading and writing. For instance, from the late-1980s to the mid-1990s, Bartholomae concentrated his work on issues of reading and literacy, composing articles such as "Writing on the Margins: The Concept of Literacy in Higher Education" (1987), "The Reading of Reading: I.A. Richards and M.J. Adler" (1990), and "The Argument of Reading" (1996), among others.

Today, Bartholomae's work has returned to the literary foundation he received in graduate school. He is currently working on a project that examines poet Robert Frost's approach to the teaching of writing. Although the work is still unfinished, the roots of his previous works and scholarly interests are evident in the very nature of the research. In this research, we will undoubtedly see a return to reading/writing connections as Frost would have taught them, and we will surely see imitation continuing to be evidence in Bartholomae's writing.

***

Bartholomae's ever-present research over the past thirty years has helped to define composition studies as we know it today. From the study of basic writing and error to issues of literacy to the study of literature, David Bartholomae's work has helped to reframe his career – and the field of composition – in a way that continues to challenge, direct, and inspire.

Works Cited

"About this Book." Ways of Reading. 7th ed. Boston; New York; Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005.

Bartholomae, David. "Against the Grain." Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 192-200.

---. "Inventing the University." Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 60-85.

---. Personal Interview. Hilton Riverside Hotel. New Orleans, Louisiana. 4 April 2008.

---. "Released into Language: Errors, Expectations, and the Legacy of Mina Shaughnessy." Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 36-59.

---. "Teaching Basic Writing: An Alternative to Basic Skills." Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 157-176.

---. "The Study of Error." Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 19-35.

---. "Wanderings: Misreadings, Miswritings, Misunderstandings." Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 86-110.

---. "Writing Assignments: Where Writing Begins." Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 201-216.

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. Facts, Artifacts, Counterfacts. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc., 1986.

---. "Introduction." Ways of Reading. 7th ed. Boston; New York; Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. 1-24.

---. "Preface." Ways of Reading. 7th ed. Boston; New York; Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005. v-xii.

---. Resources for Teaching *Ways of Reading*. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005.

---. Ways of Reading. 7th ed. Boston; New York; Bedford/St. Martin's, 2005.

Berlin, James. "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class." The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. 4th ed. Eds. Edward P.J. Corbett, et. al. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 9-25.

Bloom, Harold. A Map of Misreading. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

---. The Anxiety of Influence. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Bloom, Lynn Z. "The Essay Canon." College English 61.4 (Mar. 1999): 401-430.

Cain, Jeffrey P. "Thinking Along with Foucault." Pedagogy 1.3 (Fall 2001): 564-573.

Coles, William E. "To the Student." Composing: Writing as a Self-Creating Process. Hayden Book Company Inc., 1983.

Horner, Bruce. "Resisting Traditions in Composing Composition." Journal of Advanced Composition 14.2 (Fall 1994): 495-519.

Kerr, Tom. "*Ways of Reading* as Signifying Regime of Signs." Pedagogy 1.3 (Fall 2001): 574-583.

Kyburz, Bonnie L. "Resisting the 'Ideology of Certainty.'" Pedagogy 1.3 (Fall 2001): 583-589.

Lunsford, Andrea. "Politics and Practices in Basic Writing." A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers. Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Random House, 1987. 246-258.

Poirier, Richard. "Preface." The Performing Self. Rutgers University Press, 1992.

Quintilian. "Institutes of Oratory." The Rhetorical Tradition. 2cd ed. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston; New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 364-428.

Said, Edward. Beginnings. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975.

Salvatori, Mariolina. "Conversations with Texts: Reading in the Teaching of Composition." The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. 4th ed. Eds. Edward P.J. Corbett, et. al. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 163-174.

Shaughnessy, Mina. Errors and Expectations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Trimbur, John. "Articulation Theory and the Problem of Determination: A Reading of *Lives on the Boundary*." Journal of Advanced Compsosition 13.1 (Winter 1993): 33-50.

Troyka, Lynn Q. "Defining Basic Writing in Context." A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers. Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Random House, 1987. 2-15.