RAY, BRIAN, Ph.D. Toward a Translingual Composition: Ancient Rhetorics and Language Difference. (2012)
Directed by Dr. Nancy A. Myers. 226 pp.

The purpose of this dissertation is to outline a pedagogy that promotes language difference in college composition classrooms. Scholarship on language difference has strived for decades to transform teaching practices in mainstream, developmental, and second-language writing instruction. Despite compelling arguments in support of linguistic diversity, a majority of secondary and postsecondary writing teachers in the U.S. still privilege Standard English.

However, non-native speakers of English now outnumber native speakers worldwide, a fact which promises to redefine what "standard" means from a translingual perspective. It is becoming clearer that multilingual writers, versed in flexible hermeneutic strategies and able to draw on a variety of Englishes and languages to make meaning, have significant advantages over monolingual students. My dissertation anticipates the pedagogical and programmatic changes necessitated by this global language shift.

To this end, I join a number of scholars in arguing for a revival of classical style and the *progymnasmata,* albeit with the unique agenda of strengthening pedagogies of language difference. Although adapting classical rhetorics to promote translingual practices such as code-meshing at first seems to contradict the spirit of language difference given the dominant perception of Greco-Roman culture as imperialistic and intolerant of diversity, I reread neglected rhetoricians such as Quintilian in order to recover their latent multilingual potential.

TOWARD A TRANSLINGUAL COMPOSITION: ANCIENT RHETORICS AND

LANGUAGE DIFFERENCE

by

Brian Ray

A Dissertation Submitted to
The Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2012

Approved by

Nancy A. Myers
Committee Chair

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of

The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair <u>Dr. Nancy A. Myers</u>

Committee Members <u>Dr. Kelly Ritter</u>

<u>Dr. Stephen Yarbrough</u>

<u>March 2, 2012</u>
Date of Acceptance by Committee

<u>March 2, 2012</u>
Date of Final Oral Examination

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

CHAPTER I

EVERYONE CAN CODE-MESH

Three years ago I was talking about Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee's textbook *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students* with a friend and fellow instructor. He had taught first-year writing courses but was working toward a PhD in history at Duke University. We had met up in nearby Chapel Hill for dinner with his fiancé and her friends. I was explaining the merits of the book, when he stated his own reasons for avoiding the use of Greco-Roman rhetorics when teaching writing. He said it was difficult for him to reconcile Crowley and Hawhee's use of classical rhetorics for democratic aims without a fuller historical acknowledgement of Greek and Roman attitudes toward others. "*Latinitas*," he said, "was the belief that errors in grammar were moral failings. If you didn't know grammar, you weren't a complete human being." He went on to conclude, "I'm a little skeptical of the whole concept. After all, the Romans were never our friends."

This project is the culmination of much thought about this conversation as well as my own work with students over the course of several years, students who are often described in rhetoric and composition as developmental, second-language, or mainstream—students who are not addressed by the works of Aristotle, Cicero, or Quintilian. One of the first courses I taught consisted of students who spanned these categories and whose linguistic backgrounds ranged from vernaculars to other languages,

such as Spanish or Korean, to Standard English. During this period I was only beginning to discover the vast amount of research on each of these populations, a cacophony of often conflicting views on how to mold writing instruction to their respective needs. I was committed to finding answers for my teaching but also for a way to synthesize these areas of writing pedagogy. The more I read, the more the field seemed to boil down to one central tension: the appreciation of deviation or difference, on the one hand, and the necessity of standard discourse on the other.

Two student papers from that course, nearly six years ago, have continued to illustrate this tension for me as a teacher. The first paper was a short personal narrative that I assigned in accordance with the official course guidelines, designed mainly for the acquisition of standard grammar. One student, from the Caribbean, told the story of a home invasion in her native country. The paper was approximately two pages and shot-through with deviations from Standard English. Some were arbitrary mistakes, but others were clearly influenced by the lexical and grammatical aspects of the local variety of English in which she had grown up speaking and writing. At the time I knew little about multilingualism or World Englishes, but I still actively resisted the advice from program supervisors and fellow-teachers to make such students rewrite every sentence of their papers in Standard English and not award a passing grade until they at least approximated the dominant code.

The second paper was an argumentative essay, written by a monolingual native speaker whom I would also classify as a developmental writer. Like the first paper, the writer often deviated from Standard English but did so in ways that I would, even today,

describe as witty and sometimes charming. The writing was not that polished and it possessed mistakes, but the student was also demonstrating a clear desire to blend the academic prose promoted by the course with figurative expressions as well as phrases from vernaculars, particularly African American English. The question that I could not resolve was how to reward the student for this risk-taking while also making clear the necessity of continuing to acquire the standard codes of English in the United States. To do one without the other seemed impossible. However, it also seemed impossible to do both.

In retrospect, the importance of these papers for me is not quite the same as what many scholars across the field have said about valuing language difference, or multiculturalism. What has become clear to me by writing this dissertation is *why* I was conflicted. I was an M.F.A student who had developed a significant sense of the relationship between form and meaning, or the canons of style and invention. I hesitated to demand standard academic prose from my developmental and second-language writers because their deviations, what they were trying to accomplish through them, was better than what they would have produced otherwise by trying to adhere slavishly to conventions. I valued academic writing and grammatical clarity, but I also saw how these students were trying to improve on or go further than what my mini-lessons on commas and conjunctions were giving them. I had read some of the work discussed in this dissertation, but it was my training in creative writing, in the use of stylistic devices and eloquence dating back to the Older Sophists, that had led me to the desire to protect the linguistic innovations of my students. In short, my appreciation of language difference

originates from a different source than that of many other scholars who discuss the hybridization of codes and rhetorical practices. Yet I wondered how I could have learned this appreciation from a culture that owed its language practices to *latinitas*, the idea of monolingualism as eloquence.

The final point I take from these two papers regards how they reflect the wide linguistic diversity of students in a single class. At several points in my career so far, I have taught courses comprised of students who are resident as well as international ESL, monolingual developmental writers, mainstream monolingual, and speakers of vernaculars or dialects. In other words, I have often walked into a room where students fitting into each of these categories sit awaiting instruction. And I have received stacks of papers from such courses and attempted to provide feedback attentive to their unique linguistic and rhetorical identities. A dilemma I see in the disciplinary division of labor, to borrow a phrase from Paul Kei Matsuda, is that it obliges teachers to consult journals as divergent as the *Journal of Basic Writing*, *TESOL Quarterly*, and *College English* as well as books in their respective fields in order to respond to these students' needs. This perhaps is possible, even expected of a dedicated teacher-scholar. However, becoming an expert in these various approaches and their theoretical foundations makes it difficult to attend to still other areas in the field including but not limited to classical rhetoric, historiography, feminist rhetorics, multimodality, and digital discourse.

What I have often envisioned is a theory and pedagogy attending to language difference that is elastic enough to accommodate a range of students and a range of pedagogical approaches. Hence this dissertation. It is an ambitious project, and perhaps

more than a single dissertation can reasonably accomplish. With this in mind, I have

limited myself as much as possible to an inclusive definition of linguistic diversity based

on the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin, and I have tried to bridge them with classical

rhetoric—which I see as a fruitful and profound synthesis with clear benefits to teachers

working with myriad populations.

Bakhtin and A Pedagogy of Difference

In my search for methods to embrace language difference when working with a

range of student populations, I turn to what many seem an unlikely source: ancient Greek

and Roman rhetorical pedagogies. Specifically, I argue for a revival of the

progymnasmata to strengthen pedagogies promoting language difference. Although

adapting ancient Western rhetorics at first seems to contradict the spirit of language

difference, given the dominant perception of Greco-Roman culture as imperialistic and

intolerant of diversity, I reread neglected rhetoricians such as Quintilian to recover the

latent dialogic, heteroglossic potential of ancient writings. This enables me to adapt the

progynmnasmata as tools to facilitate students' development of the rich, multi-voiced

writing and rhetorical dexterity they need in the twenty-first century.

My goal in this chapter is to outline the need for a coherent theory, pedagogy, and

set of composing strategies that promote language difference stemming from

multilingualism and that address all college students, including those presently defined as

monolingual native speakers of English. Specifically in this chapter, I articulate a theory

of translingual writing based on an interpretation of language difference through the work

of Mikhail Bakhtin, whose concepts of dialogue, heteroglossia, and speech genres are

foundational to an understanding of language as multi-voiced and never reducible to a single standard code. An understanding of language difference through Bakhtin's theories is also a central bridge to the pedagogical practices I adopt and adapt from the Greco-Roman tradition, which, again read through Bakhtin, become conducive to linguistic diversity and multilingualism.

Linguistic diversity has become an increasingly prominent topic in rhetoric and composition, a sign that teachers and scholars are open and ready to consider such reworkings of conventional pedagogies, including those directly informed by the classical tradition. Between 2004 and 2007, the field of rhetoric and composition witnessed a surge in attention to language difference and second language writing. The journals *WPA*, *College English*, and *Computers and Composition* all devoted special issues to these subjects, and a number of related articles appeared in other publications[1]. In the years since, scholars have frequently made calls for teachers and administrators to disrupt monolingual attitudes in their policies and teaching practices. Particularly, terms such as "translingual writing" and "code-meshing," defined as the use of at least two languages or codes in a single text,[2] have become widespread in this exchange (Canagarajah "Place"; Horner et al.; Young "Straight"). These projects have certainly raised awareness about the need to challenge dominant ideologies regarding Standard English and "English

---

[1] See *WPA Journal* 29.3 (2006), *College English* 68.6 (2006), and *Computers and Composition* 22.3 (2005). Articles on language difference by Suresh Canagarajah, Vershawn Young, and Min-zhan Lu also appeared during this time. Even more recently, *JAC* devoted a special issue to articles on language difference presented at the Thomas R. Watson conference. See *JAC* 29.1-2 (2009).

[2] Researchers in the field of contact linguistics have also explored bilingual practices through the term code-mixing. See linguist Carol Myers-Scotton's work, particularly *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes.* As I suggest in the conclusion to my dissertation, more cross-conversation between linguistics and rhetoric and composition could generate useful theoretical and pedagogical insights into global, translingual education. However, significant epistemological differences between these two fields place such an undertaking beyond the scope of this particular project.

Only" (Horner and Trimbur; Trimbur) in college writing instruction. But despite this increased attention to language difference, such scholarship has had a limited impact on the profession, evidenced by the continued marginalization of developmental and second-language writing in many institutions as well as perspectives on the shortfalls of the Students' Right movement (Matsuda "Disciplinary"; Mlynarczyk and Otte; Parks; Shuck; Wible). At best, it is unclear whether scholarly endeavors have led to more linguistically sensitive teaching or administrative policies.

Bakhtin's work has figured significantly in the field of rhetoric and composition; he is cited in no fewer than two hundred articles, sixteen of which are collected in the 1998 edited volume *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric, and Writing* that explore connections between dialogue and speech genres and various approaches to writing such as post-process theory, as in Thomas Kent's "Hermeneutics and Genre," feminist rhetorics and pedagogies, as in Kay Halasek's "Feminism and Bakhtin," WAC and WID pedagogies, as in Marilyn Cooper's "Dialogic Learning Across Disciplines," and collaborative writing, as in Geoffrey A. Cross's "A Bakhtinian Exploration of Factors Affecting the Collaborative Writing of an Executive Letter of an Annual Report." Additionally, Bakhtin's theories have informed approaches to second-language writing and multilingualism. Scholars working in the area of language difference frequently make references to the heteroglossic qualities of language, even when not citing Bakhtin directly, as well as to the diversity of voices within the self, which can be traced back to theories articulated by Bakhtin. Thus Bakhtin's work is ideally positioned as a medium between the different approaches and specializations within rhetoric and composition—

even such ostensibly opposed pedagogies as those informed by language difference and those informed by classical rhetoric, which is seen as antithetical to multilingualism for its emphasis on clarity and linguistic conformity (as discussed in the second and third chapters).

Joan Kelly Hall, Gergana Vitanoa, and Ludmila A. Marchenkova's edited collection *Dialogue with Bakhtin on Second and Foreign Language Learning* directly explores the implications of these same theories—dialogue, heteroglossia, and speech genres—for ESL instruction in U.S. and worldwide, mapping the various ways in which language learners have "continually appropriated features and imitated each other in their different ways of representing their social and cultural environments" (Iddings, Haught, and Devlin 37). Demonstrating the relationship between agency, dialogue, and heteroglossia, for instance, Angel M.Y. Lin and Jasmine C.M. Luk analyze the linguistic performances of adolescent students in a Hong Kong secondary school whose "everyday lifeworld discourses and social languages" manage to infiltrate and permeate the prescriptive exercises from a school textbook, the playful parodying of which during class demonstrates how they "have appropriated English for their own purposes" and "become owners and authors. . .through drawing on multiple social languages available to them in English and Cantonese" (79). This view of language as heteroglossic, or multi-voiced, recognizes the value of the diverse communicative practices that students bring to classrooms—whether describing the experiences of native speakers or second language learners.

These essays on second-language learning harness Bakhtin's theories as a way of responding to and critiquing more conventional approaches to ESL instruction informed by structural linguistics. The idea of language as social and multi-voiced, rather than an abstract and unitary system, becomes clearest when Gergana Vitanova narrates the process by which a Russian-American immigrant named Vera decides to abandon formal study of English and instead to learn through dialogic interactions with different genres:

> For months, to Vera, authoring her second language voice meant perfecting the grammar through going to evening in English as a second language classes [sic] and reading her grammar books. From a traditional second language acquisition view, Vera was the epitome of the good language learning (Rubind, 1975) [...] Vera's re-authoring process involved the assimilation of new professional discourses. For example, Vera abandoned the course in English as a second language [...] she decided to take a business course, in which she was acquiring terms such as *payroll*. She also subscribed to American magazines such as *Cooking Light* and started reading cookbooks in English so she could enrich her professional vocabulary. (150-151)

Vitanova goes on to read this experience, in which Vera goes on to open her own catering business, as one in which she "had abandoned the realm of pure, abstract linguistics. . .and had started to view her language acquisition as dialogic, as a process that is located not within herself and her linguistic knowledge but on the border between the self and the Other" (152).[3] Such a view of language, identity, and education directly corresponds to

[3] Marcia Moraes' 1996 *Bilingual Education: A Dialogue with the Bakhtin Circle* also draws on Bakhtin and his contemporaries to critique the structural approach to linguistics that, as she argues, has dominated bilingual education programs in the U.S. This is harmful to students because it views "language as a mechanistic composition that can be internalized by individuals independent of social contexts" (35). Readers may also be interested in Ofelia Garcia's 2008 *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century*, which makes similar arguments rooted in a view of language as heteroglossic. I want to avoid a full discussion of bilingual education here because its arguments rest on the availability of bilingual teachers and aims at bilingual fluency for either the language-minority population or both language-minority and language-dominant populations. The vast majority of writing programs in the U.S., as composition scholars widely acknowledge, are still operating under the privileging of English monolingualism or the division of labor

the social-epistemic view of language now dominant in the field of rhetoric and composition. My discussion of Bakthin's theories, through which I define multilingual writing strategies as dialogic and heteroglossic, offers an argument for why learning to compose in a variety of registers, dialects, and languages is not only beneficial for multilingual students but also a vital ability for students typically defined as monolingual native speakers.

In order to achieve this theoretical definition of translingual writing through Bakhtin's terms, I first examine the most recent effort of scholars to synthesize various approaches to language difference under the term "translingual writing" (Horner et al.). After giving an account of how these scholars define translingual writing, I discuss the disciplinary dilemmas of such approaches to language difference as a possible explanation for why they have yet to generate actual institutional reform (Wible). By doing so, I lay the foundation for my own definition of translingual writing in terms of Bakhtin's theory. In turn, that definition lays the groundwork for the pedagogy and composing practices I propose in the second and third chapters. Finally, I assert that finding common theoretical ground among the various approaches to translingual writing offers a way toward realizing the goals of language difference in an era characterized by a plurality of codes interacting in global contexts.

Scholarship promoting language difference has become increasingly self-aware of its own limitations, especially concerning the need for a unified theoretical foundation and pedagogy. Bonnie Lisle and Sandra Mano assert that "while the profession celebrates

---

between composition (writing in English-only) and ESL. See work by A. Suresh Canagarajah, Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Paul Matsuda, and John Trimbur, all of whom I discuss in this chapter.

heteroglossia and difference, most rhetoric instruction remains monologic and ethnocentric" (12). Kim Brian Lovejoy refers to teachers' "attempts to integrate our students' language differences into our pedagogy and teaching practices" as "sporadic" and declares that "[i]t is time to close the gap between what we say and what we do in today's classrooms" (90). In an afterword to the recent edited collection *Code-Meshing as World English*, Suresh Canagarajah also declares "we have a theoretical question to address. . .is code-meshing teachable?" (277). He concludes with "even the most radical alternative position statements in our profession do not come close to acknowledging code-meshing as a socially and educationally viable practice" (279). These concerns also extend to writing program administration. In the same volume as Canagarajah, Asao B. Inoue echoes Paul Kei Matsuda[4] when he asks how writing program administrators can begin to think about implementing language difference into writing assessment practices, asking where such efforts should focus: "a placement test, or an exit portfolio. . .is it as simple as putting some articulation of code-meshing on a rubric?" (96). A sense of urgency has arisen in these perspectives, although they stop short of offering plans for action.

The abundance of such provocative and open-ended questions suggests that scholarship on language difference is now struggling to enunciate a unified pedagogy and a set of adaptable teaching practices that can apply to students from a range of linguistic backgrounds. As I argue, part of the difficulty in doing so lies in theoretical and pedagogical fragmentation. The profession's conventional tendency has been to separate

---

[4] See WPA Journal 33.1-2. I engage more with Matsuda's exploration of possibilities for WPA work in the fourth chapter.

developmental writers, international ESL students, residential ESL students, and

mainstream composition students into different courses with different curricula and

sometimes conflicting pedagogies (Friedrich). A handful of scholars have questioned the

need for these taxonomies on the grounds that quarantining linguistically diverse students

does them a pedagogical disservice (Matsuda "Myth"; Shor; Soliday). But these same

scholars also admit that their assertions have yet to make a significant impact on actual

educational policies.[5] There appears to be a consensus among scholars who have

addressed language difference that rhetoric and composition needs to take a bold step in

order to change the status quo. However, the relative absence of common theoretical and

pedagogical ground has made taking bold steps difficult. As Stanley Corkin notes,

disciplinarity is "marked by the logical and internally coherent objects and methods it

characterizes" (175). Though approaches to language difference may not vie for

disciplinary status in the same way that rhetoric and composition has, they nonetheless

have struggled to form a sense of internal coherence that would enable wide-scale,

practical implementation in writing programs or individual classrooms. Attempts to

construct this common ground, which I discuss in the following section, need to

demonstrate a deeper appreciation of this fragmentation in order to begin to resolve it.

The Basics of Translingual Writing

The first appearance of the term "translingual writing" is in an opinion piece

entitled, "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach" in a 2011

issue of *College English*, in which it refers to a set of agendas or approaches found across

---

[5] Peter Dow Adams has had significant success with an acceleration model (1993). Ronda Grego and Nancy Thompson's studio model (2008) also advocated for the mainstreaming of developmental writers.

a range of areas including second language writing, developmental writing, sociolinguistics, postcolonialism, and World Englishes. My contention is that although a "translingual approach" may gesture toward an interdisciplinary understanding of language difference, it oversimplifies important distinctions between the above fields and shies away from grounding its philosophy in a single, unitary theory of language or discourse. In order to critically engage "translingual writing" and contest its current definition, I offer an analysis of the *College English* piece as well as the relevant background and context regarding these scholars' prior work. By situating this collaboratively written opinion within the relevant background and context of this prior work, I give a clearer view of what translingual writing seeks to accomplish regarding attitudes toward language difference.

The piece's co-authors, Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur, define a "translingual approach" to both writing and the teaching of writing as one that sees language difference as an opportunity to tap into, "not as a barrier to overcome" (Horner et al. 303). This approach acknowledges that "writers can, do, and must negotiate standardized rules in light of the contexts of specific instances of writing" (305). Such writing is characterized by multilingual writers' tendency to create new words and phrases through their negotiations of Standard English and other codes, sometimes weaving together two or more forms of English (e.g. African-American Vernacular English, Appalachian English) or other national languages (e.g., Spanish, German) in the same text. This act of textual weaving can include individual words and idioms as well as larger syntactical units, as when writers apply rules from the grammars

of their first languages to English. Writers value the rhetorical effects of difference in these cases over the conformity to conventions. In other words, whether a sentence conforms to Standard English is less important to translingual writers than creativity and expression, a notion contrary to the way instruction in second-language writing, for example, is typically approached. As the co-authors indicate, students most likely to practice translingual writing include speakers of nonstandard dialects and other languages (308). Thus translingual writing applies to writers typically defined as second-language or developmental. As I discuss later, this approach overlooks important differences between these populations that need addressing if we seek a common theory and pedagogy. We do not need to quarantine student populations, but we do need to appreciate their various linguistic needs.

Traditionally marginalized student populations receive the majority of the *College English* co-authors' attention, although they also do assert that a translingual approach does benefit "students who by some definitions might be English monolinguals" because these native speakers' peers, coworkers, employers, and other associates "are increasingly likely to know English as a second, third, or fourth language," and hence everyone will need a "disposition of openness and inquiry" toward language use that appears strange or unfamiliar (311). Nonetheless, the translingual conception of writing, like the majority of scholarship on language difference, emphasizes marginalized students in a manner that creates an obstacle to the realization of what Trimbur has envisioned as the "multilingual university" where all students develop a curiosity and level of sophistication regarding the use of multiple languages.

While the translingual approach gestures toward a method of composition for writers that takes advantage of other languages and vernaculars, it also encourages teachers to value such diversity. As scholars argue, this encouragement should manifest in comments on papers as well as class-wide discussions and individual conferences. Rather than interpret deviations like the phrase "stepping stool" from the idiom "stepping stone" as student-errors (305), teachers might consider their possible meanings and rhetorical significance. The hypothetical student might be using the phrase "stepping stool" to indicate something altogether different from a "stepping stone," and so teachers could raise questions about such students' communicative intentions before making assumptions about error (e.g., marking out "stool" and writing "stone" in the margins). As Lu and Horner argued nearly two decades ago in their book *Representing the Other*, teachers should ideally conference with students individually in order to determine with them which deviations qualify as errors in need of revision and which ones qualify as original expressions in need of preservation. Even the slightest change in what appears to be a surface-level error can dramatically alter the meaning of a student's paper, and so students should have some control over how to "fix" their errors.

Lu's scholarship in particular outlines a few such teaching practices and their rationale in the early 1990s. In her well-known essay, "Professing Multiculturalism," Lu critiques the dominant attitude that "until one can prove one's ability to produce 'error-free prose', one has not earned the right to innovative 'style'" (170). Her analysis of the "can able to" structure in a student paper remains one of the clearest and most-often cited examples of what some scholars now refer to as code-meshing, where students and

teachers negotiate what determines "error" and examine the possible rhetorical goals behind the blending of other codes with Standard English. As an illustration, Lu uses a Malaysian student's paper which contains the phrase "can able to" as an occasion to explore issues of language difference with the entire class. Initially, Lu's students assume the student simply conflated the verb forms "can" and "to be able to" by accident. But a discussion reveals that the Malaysian student created this phrase on purpose, blending Chinese and English grammars, in an attempt to imply an important distinction about the permission or will versus the physical means to do something. Lu then reflects with her students on differences between Western and non-Western attitudes about capabilities. As they conclude, having the freedom to do something does not mean having the means, whether financial or otherwise, to do something. Ultimately, the Malaysian student negotiates with the class to arrive at the phrase "may be able to."

More recently, Lu has offered another example of this pedagogy in her analysis of the phrase "money collecting toilet" on a public bathroom in China ("Fast Capitalism"). Lu finds an analogy to college education in the Chinese government's official campaign to eradicate such translation "mistakes" on all public signs in English. She argues for teachers and students to become sensitive close-readers and resist the tempting initial assumption that such peculiar phrases merely represent a failure to understand and use Standard English. In another article co-authored with Horner, Lu offers yet another example of U.S.-English hegemony in the collection *Code-Meshing as World English* in her discussion of the Chinglish word "rape," which has received a great deal of attention online the past few years because of its use in Chinese restaurant menus. U.S. Internet

users have largely assumed a translation error as the explanation for online Chinese restaurant ads boasting "Every form rape." But as Lu points out, the Chinglish word "rape" refers to the vegetable rapeseed, a common staple in Chinese cooking more commonly referred to as "canola" in the U.S. (109).

Building on Lu's work, Canagarajah has explored college writing as a form of academic literacy, which he sees as a two-directional process in which students not only acquire academic discourse but also develop the ability to change these dominant codes through their writing. In turn, it is a teacher's responsibility to help students by bringing about a new paradigm where "the academic community [will] accommodate alternative discourses" (14). Canagarajah has most notably argued for a pedagogy of code-meshing[6] or "merging the codes" (598) in varieties of English at the sentence-level, an area in which he notes that scholars in socio-linguistics have already made some headway (Delpit; Smitherman). He extends the work of these scholars to the realm of World Englishes, where not two or three but dozens of languages and codes interact in global rather than national landscapes. Whereas the advocates of hybrid academic discourse have permitted experimentation at the global level regarding tone and organization, code-meshing aims additionally at the negotiation of conventions regarding the local level of usage, spelling, and syntax.

Canagarajah's work attempts to apply Lu's handful of examples to every aspect of the writing course, not merely in-class discussion of student papers. His vision goes beyond the acceptance of language difference in "informal classroom activities" and

---

[6] Canagarajah acknowledges that some scholars, such as Anzaldua, use code-switching when they refer to strategies similar to what he calls code-meshing (598).

"'low stakes' written assignments such as peer commentary, e-mail, and online discussions" ("Place" 595). In his view, a pedagogy that truly values World Englishes should allow and encourage rhetorical experimentation in high-stakes graded work, rather than in drafts of papers as Peter Elbow has suggested ("Vernacular Englishes"). In this sense, Canagarajah's assertions conflict with prior versions of hybrid academic discourse in the work of Patricia Bizzell, Christopher Schroeder, and Helen Fox[7], whom he reads as allowing rhetorical experimentation at the level of structure and organization but ultimately "insisting on ME [Metropolitan English] for the sentential level of grammar, syntax, and spelling conventions" (595).

The notion of allowing students to mesh varieties of English raises a central question regarding discourse in general. On the one hand, work on language difference values writers' autonomy, placing responsibility for communication largely on readers. In other words, readers should exhaust all interpretative possibilities before determining that a deviation from expectation is "error." On the other hand, conservative teachers expect the reverse, placing the responsibility of communication on writers to be clear. In this sense, "error" results from a writer's inability to engage audience. While this polarization has obfuscated debates about language policy and education, my dissertation maintains a middle path. As Bakhtin argues throughout his work, language is always co-owned and thus requires cooperation between speakers or, in the case of composition, between writers and audiences.[8]

---

[7] See the authors' edited collection *Alt Dis: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*.

[8] The conception of discourse as co-owned also corresponds to symbolic interaction's framework of radical invention (Davidson; Yarbrough). Radical invention is a four-stage process through which two

Even Canagarajah has stressed the lack of effective pedagogies and teaching practices in this regard, and he concludes in "The Place of World Englishes in Composition" that he is "unsure how to practice what I preach" (613). Canagarajah's own limited set of practices include general notions of "patience, tolerance, and humility" as well as the efforts of students and teachers to "always make adjustments to each other as they modify their accent or syntax to facilitate communication with those who are not proficient in their language" (593). While admirable, virtues like "patience, tolerance, and humility" are relative terms. They are hard to define, harder to enact on a consistent basis as a teacher, still harder to inculcate in students in a meaningful manner, and almost impossible to use in building a comprehensive and distinctive theory or pedagogy of translingual writing. As he admits, they do not fully constitute a set of teaching practices. Furthermore, it is nearly impossible to design curricula and writing programs around the idea of tolerance and humility that will stand up to administrative and public scrutiny and assessment.

One Term, Many Audiences

A deeper dilemma, however, is that work on language difference has evolved across a wide array of areas within and beyond rhetoric and composition—namely developmental writing, second-language writing, sociolinguistics, poststructuralism, postcolonialism, and World Englishes. This diffusion of approaches to language difference makes the task of synthesizing a common approach for college writing teachers all the more necessary but also all the more difficult. For example, language

---

interlocutors share the responsibility of understandings and misunderstandings, anticipating and adapting to one another's use of symbols.

difference has been an important topic in the area of developmental or Basic Writing,

inaugurated by Mina P. Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations*, but teachers in this area

expressed a great deal of skepticism toward Lu and Horner's approaches to teaching

during the 1990s (see Gray-Rosendale; Laurence et. al). Scholars in this area largely

agreed at that time that attention to language difference promised to disorient students

rather than empower them. The pedagogical discourse of developmental writing has

generally resisted the kinds of teaching practices advocated by Lu, Horner, Trimbur,

Royster, and Canagarajah.

Meanwhile, efforts began in the broader field of rhetoric and composition to

accept language difference as early as 1974 with the publication of the "Students' Right

to Their Own Language" document. But this movement was largely influenced by

research in linguistics, and it evoked criticism from those who resisted what they saw as

naïve attitudes about language. As Ann Berthoff argued in a critique of the Students'

Right document immediately following its publication, "we do not need a declaration of

principles, no matter how high-minded or tough-nosed, but a definition and critique of

the pedagogical and curricular options" regarding language difference (217). Berthoff

went on to identify what she saw as "irrelevant linguistic conceptions, in the name of

cool" that dominated the document as well as the fact that "[t]here are no philosophers of

language listed" in the document's bibliography (216). Berthoff's critique is harsh, given

that the document does cite work in sociolinguistics, including William Labov and Noam

Chomsky. But her main point seems to be that theories alone justifying the value of

language difference, whether informed by linguistics or by philosophies of language,

have little chance of bringing about institutional reform. The fact that scholars have

continued to advocate for greater sensitivity to language difference, echoing each other in

their critique of institutional policies and dominant teaching practices, appears to confirm

Berthoff's critique.

Indeed, the Students' Right document has a reputation of being one of the most

promising yet ineffectual position statements CCCC has ever made. As Scott Wible

concludes, based on a review of scholarship on the position statement, "the most

consistently reached conclusion among compositionists is that the students' right to their

own language is a theory that rarely, if ever, has materialize in the writing classroom"

(443). Wible quotes Michael Pennell that the resolution and subsequent scholarship it

inspired are "rhetorical ghosts with no substance below the ink and paper that [they

embody]" (229). Wible points out furthermore that a recent survey conducted by the

CCCC Language Policy Committee showed less than a third of writing teachers in the

U.S. today are even familiar with the Students' Right document. While Wible refers to

the Students' Right as a theory, I resist that description for the same reasons I hesitate to

call translingual writing a theory. Wible seeks to recover historical evidence that the

position statement did have at least some physical effect, yet I see the evidence of the

Students' Right document's largely acknowledged failure as indicative of how

approaches to language difference have always struggled to gain momentum in rhetoric

and composition—precisely because they never venture beyond the "high-minded"

principles that Berthoff has described as ineffectual and because they often use theory to

justify language difference in student writing rather than to elaborate and explain ways to

enact that difference in institutional settings. Theory is a valuable tool, most productive when, as Shirley Rose and Irwin Weiser state, it is used to articulate frameworks for decision making and action.

Scholarship on language difference has in fact undergone a substantial theoretical fragmentation since the1980s and 1990s, similar to the paradigm shift that Brian Huot has explored regarding writing assessment and Paul Butler regarding stylistic pedagogies. Huot observes that "as the study of writing became an interest for researchers trained in the humanities-based disciplines of rhetoric and composition. . .issues that had originally been theoretical became pragmatic" (84). Rhetoric and composition scholars talked about writing assessment prior to the mid-1990s, but they neglected classical testing theory in a way that ultimately prevented them from devising new theories and thus new methods of assessment. As I see it, an analogous shift occurred regarding language difference. The same lack of common theoretical ground that stymied discourse on writing assessment now affects our ability to forward notions of students' right to their own language.

Following the Students' Right document, teachers and scholars in rhetoric and composition increasingly conceived of language difference in ways beyond its original linguistic origins. Although the decade witnessed linguistic studies such as Geneva Smitherman's *Talkin' and Testifyin'*, rhetoric and composition took up these issues through cultural studies approaches. Thus the idea of "contact zones" surfaced in the work of Mary Louise Pratt and in the publication of books such as Mike Rose's *Lives on the Boundary*. The 1990s saw even more of such work, including Min-Zhan Lu and

Bruce Horner's *Representing the Other*, Victor Villanueva's *Bootstraps*, Keith Gilyard's *Voices of Self*, and Lisa Delpit's *Other People's Children*.

The idea of language difference became reified through repeated references to the Students' Right document, and thus language difference has increasingly suffered the reputation in our profession—as Wible points out—as an ideal without a method for implementation. A commonplace began to develop around the inherent goodness of valuing students' difference, and scholars "trained in the humanities-based disciplines of rhetoric and composition" (Huot 84) have since explored this general concept in terms of their own discipline-specific orientations (e.g., literary studies, postcolonialism, feminism). For example, Lu has frequently contextualized her work on language difference through literary studies, justifying her approach at times through discussions of nonstandard forms in the work of W.E.B DuBois and Theodore Dreiser. The last few years in particular have seen language difference manifest in rhetoric and composition in a variety of theoretical adaptations from other disciplines (see Lunsford et al.; Young et al.).

Interdisciplinarity is a proven way of forming new knowledge in rhetoric and composition. Too much of it, however, can generate fragmentation and hinder our ability to identify common theoretical territory. Fragmentation thus leads to a situation in which "we talk about and compare practices which have no articulated underlying theoretical foundation" (Huot 81). Arguably, language difference has not formed an established pedagogy in the same way that process pedagogy, social-epistemic rhetoric, and post-process movements have. Each of these frameworks possesses a core set of principles

stemming from a common theoretical orientation about language and the production of knowledge. For example, process pedagogies mainly derive from the foundational work of Elbow, Linda Flower and John Hayes, Donald Murray, and Mike Rose; social-epistemic rhetoric draws from social constructionism (Berlin; Bizzell); and post-process pedagogy draws mainly on the work of Donald Davidson and interpretations of his work by Thomas Kent and Gary A. Olson. Can language difference be traced to a few key texts? It does not appear so.[9]

The aforementioned 2011 *College English* opinion piece on translingual writing, "Language Difference in Writing," provides a compelling case in point about the ambiguities and obstacles created by becoming overly interdisciplinary. Although the scholarly works cited at the end of this piece each have their own unique perspectives on language and knowledge production, the co-authors never make distinctions between these various disciplinary orientations. The piece actually contains few in-text citations, although it does provide an extensive bibliography that includes scholars ranging from Pierre Bourdieu to Deborah Brandt. It identifies works in World Englishes by Alastair Pennycook, Braj Kachru, Robert Phillipson, and Jennifer Jenkins, but it also includes edited collections on bilingual education such as *Latino/a Discourses: On Language, Identity and Education* (Michelle Hall Kells et al., eds). The authors draw on these works to make broad claims about language difference, but they leave unsaid exactly what

---

[9] Many would argue that the work of Lu, Horner, Trimbur, and Royster provide a central foundation for scholarship on language difference. Although I see their work as significant, I am also immediately obliged to see the work of a dozen other scholars as equally foundational. Additionally, disagreements between Canagarajah, Bizzell, and others could be more productive if they were more explicit about the particular theories of language, or interpretations of those theories, that would justify code-meshing during the drafting process only versus in final papers.

World Englishes as a linguistic field contributes to our understanding of language difference that cannot be found in scholarship on bilingual education. It also leaves unsaid what these two very different fields share that makes them relevant to a translingual approach. My reading of this bibliography yields dozens of other distinct topics, fields of inquiry, and disciplines that are nonetheless flattened under the broad term "translingual": African American English; Native American discourse; English as a Foreign Language; multiculturalism; globalization; and translation theory. Although a translingual approach may indeed have reasons for discovering similarities between these research areas, those reasons need clearer articulation.

The breadth of theoretical perspectives in "Language Difference in Writing" indicates how much work remains to be done in terms of articulating common theoretical ground. While we may share general opinions or attitudes about the importance of language difference, these alone constitute only the beginnings of a pedagogy. Although teachers and scholars need not agree on everything, they need to identify some shared theories in order to clarify their respective differences and to offer positions on the questions they have raised about viable teaching and administrative practices. Otherwise, this absence of core, universal principles can in fact lead to what Berthoff has described as "recipe swapping," in which teachers and administrators describe their best practices but fail to account for why they would work outside a particular teacher's local situation. Worse, it can also lead to a discourse of "theory swapping" where scholars exchange theoretical justifications of language difference that never lead to firm discussions about how these theories lead to different approaches to concrete-problem solving. For

example, little-to-nothing in the current scholarship outlines what it means to train teachers to not only value language difference but to actually teach it effectively. Different theoretical approaches to this question would mean different views on what readings to include in teacher training courses, what to require from their syllabi, what counts as an effective assignment, what to look for in classroom observations, and how best to ensure that language diversity is practiced in grading and other forms of assessment.

Current scholarship in language difference gestures at times to common theoretical ground, but it assumes a great deal of knowledge on the part of its readers. Canagarajah has asserted that "Everything from language socialization approaches to Bakhtinian theories of discourse to poststructuralist linguistics teaches us that to use a language meaningfully is to appropriate it and make it one's own" (597). But here Canagarajah does not explain what Bakhtinian theories of discourse or postructural linguistics shares with his stance on code-meshing. More importantly, he does not elaborate on what these might *not* be shared across these theories and his own viewpoints. While it may be true that all three theoretical paradigms point toward a pedagogy of language difference, I see the glossing over of common theoretical ground here as missing an important opportunity to develop new knowledge. Each theoretical approach evoked in this claim invites substantive and thorough engagements to explore all of the possible nuances and implications of one over another. A Bakhtinian approach to language difference is bound to yield a slightly different pedagogy than a Derridean one, a Kristevan approach still another.

My intention is not to assert the primacy of one theory over another. Rather, I hope to show how a thorough engagement with a single theory on language can provide the trajectory for a precise, comprehensive statement about language difference that includes pedagogical rationales and teaching practices. Toward this end, I explore in the next section how a single stance informed by Bakhtinian theories of discourse alone can help explain how and why translingual writing operates. This theory serves as my returning point for subsequent sections and chapters as I outline the implications of translingual writing for both writing instruction and writing program administration.

What a Theoretical Definition Can Offer

Drawing from Bakhtin, I define and explain translingual writing as a series of actions that deploy multiple codes, generic conventions, and languages within texts and single speech acts (e.g., sentences) in order to push against and reform the limits of any given language's inherent capacity and resources for diversity. This theory accounts for some of the teaching practices articulated in the current scholarship on language difference.[10] I draw upon the writings of Bakhtin to account for translingual writing for three reasons. First, because as both linguist and literary theorist, Bakhtin focuses on discourse and genre; second, because the discipline of rhetoric and composition has already appropriated his theories and adapted them for pedagogical purposes; and, third because he is one of the more ubiquitous theorists in the current scholarship on translingual writing.[11] The common theoretical ground offered by a Bakhtinian

---

[10] By articulating this theoretical definition, I mean to distinguish between applications of existing theories to translingual writing versus the synthesis of original theories based on empirical evidence or insights (Sanchez).

[11] See the collection *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric, and Writing*.

orientation to language difference also grounds my re-reading of classical rhetoric in chapter two and three. It is ultimately my re-reading of ancient rhetorical teaching practices and their underlying principles through Bakhtin that enables my proposal for complete pedagogy of language difference.

The specific Bakhtinian concepts of *hetereglossia* and *dialogized heterglossia* provide the roots of this common ground. As Bakhtin states in "Discourse in the Novel," *heteroglossia* refers to the centrifugal forces that constantly complicate any attempt to define a standard language, and so "[a] unitary language is not something given but is always in essence posited" (270). A single, unitary language always contains multiple "linguistic dialects" (271) as well as many different registers or social languages. Though institutions may try to form a unitary language from these many languages, it is always an idea on the horizon—something never fully achieved. The concept of *heteroglossia* thus describes the inherent heterogeneity of any language, meanwhile *dialogized heteroglossia* refers to the process that scholars have more recently termed code-meshing, or the practice of seeing "one language (and the verbal world corresponding to it) through the eyes of another language" (296). To illustrate dialogism, Bakhtin uses the example of a hypothetical peasant who initially uses different varieties of a language in separate social, religious, familial, and legal spheres (295-96). When these various languages come into contact, however, as when the peasant uses a religious register when speaking to family members or uses colloquialism when speaking to government authorities, these previously discrete language zones "interanimate" (296) one another. As Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson observe, "[t]his potentially endless process [of

interanimation] pertains not only to particular words but also to other elements of language—to given styles, syntactic forms, even grammatical norms" (143). A language's potential resources for expression are always expanding through the interanimation of dialects through one another.

Consequently, a Bakhtinian view of language sees difference, like the *College English* co-authors do, as a positive force—but for a broader reason, the continual expansion and reformulation of any one language. While a single writer rarely understands his or her own stylistic decisions from this broader view, it is this potential for expansion and reformulation that enables innovation and diversity in the first place. In other words, writers may not be writing with an eye to *heteroglossia*, but it is present. Therefore, any explicit pedagogical attention to code-meshing should take this into account when describing difference. Scholarship on language difference has prioritized a fairer treatment of "error" in student writing. But a Bakhtinian view stresses the importance of language not only for multilingual writers themselves but for the language in general and everyone who uses it. As Bakhtin emphasizes, any given language is always in "a process of heteroglot development, a process teeming with future and former languages, with prim but moribund aristocrat-languages, with parvenu-languages and with countless pretenders to the status of language," by which he refers to ways of speaking particularly to social groups that may not qualify as discrete dialects ("Discourse in the Novel" 356-7). Thus when someone realizes the interanimation of registers within a language, "the inviolability and predetermined quality of these languages [comes] to an end, and the necessity of actively choosing one's orientation

among them [begins]" (296). Thus the ideal of a uniform language, its centripetal forces, always compete against the centrifugal forces that drive the intermingling of many varieties within a language. When writers mesh codes, they are advancing the heterglot development of a language and expanding its ability to express beliefs, opinions, and worldviews of all users.

This view parallels perspectives occurring throughout scholarship in language difference, especially an assertion by Lu that "it is the work of resistant users (or active redesigners) of. . .Englishes that keeps English alive" by "help[ing] us to gain a firmer grasp of the structure and function of. . .what it [a form of English] can do or cannot do to and for individual writers with diverse contexts and purposes" ("Fast Capitalism" 38). In essence, an orientation to Bakhtin articulates a theory very similar to what Lu must pull together from a wide range of disciplines, including work by Stuart Hall, James Baldwin, Pierre Bourdieu, Jürgen Habermas, and Braj Kachru.[12]

As stated earlier, I define translingual writing as a series of actions that deploy multiple codes, generic conventions, and languages within texts and single speech acts in order to push against and reform the limits of any given language's inherent capacity and resources for diversity. We can see this theory at work in the Malaysian student from Lu's "Professing Multiculturalism" who writes the phrase "can able to." The student does not just mesh codes for the sake of self-expression when she tries to integrate Chinese and English grammars to make a new phrase; even if this is her intent, her actions have

---

[12] While some may object to the reification or personification of language as living or conscious, Lu appears to be speaking metaphorically. This is not problematic except when scholars unconsciously accept this view of language as literal, forgetting that by Bakhtin's definition language is the consequence of interaction among language users. Language is not so much "alive," as it is impossible to codify because it is nothing but interactions between people. Take away the people, and language no longer exists.

larger consequences. We can redefine the student's translingual practice of code-meshing as pushing the *heteroglossic* nature of English and forcing both the student in question and the audience of her classmates to probe all of the English language's available resources in order to make this new utterance of "can able to" meaningful. The student's "error" is not simply an occasion for negotiating the expression of her world view. It is also an occasion to realize the current limits of the English language to express the idea that the freedom to do something implied by "can" does not necessarily mean the physical or financial ability in "be able to," hence the need to blend them. In short, the Malaysian student seems to have run up against the limits of the language's resources. The subsequent class discussions between Lu, the student, and her peers constitute not only a negotiation of meaning but also a probing of the English language's heterglot potential. In the end, the student and the class determine that the phrase "may be able to" can convey the desired intention to express both permission and physical means to do something. The ability to test and search a language's available resources accounts for this compromise more so than the tolerance, patience, and humility that translingual writing of which scholars tend to extol the benefits. Patience, tolerance, and humility may constitute the general attitudes necessary to engage in these practices. But writers require the Bakhtinian tenacity to push a language's boundaries in order to achieve effective communication.

A Bakhtinian orientation to language difference also prompts additional attention to genre—an area that the scholarship in question has neglected. Translingual writers not only mesh codes and languages, but they also blend genres of writing. For example,

Anzaldua integrates poetry, memoir, and academic genres such as history in her essays

"Entering the Serpent" and "How to Tame a Wild Tongue." It follows that writing

between languages also involves writing between culturally-based genres such as the

testimonio, a Latin American genre that Anis Bawarshi has considered in relation to the

Western autobiography. Work in rhetorical genre studies can be traced back to Bakhtin's

"The Problem of Speech Genres," which informed Carolyn Miller's foundational essay

"Genre as Social Action." Bakhtin's original observations hold that language-use takes a

variety of forms in various situations. The same person may speak a single language, but

it is spoken differently in different environments such as church, state, family, and social

realms that each possesses its own conventions.[13]

Miller's subsequent definition of genre as typified communicative actions over

time offers a great deal to the generic aspect of my theoretical definition of translingual

writing as the use of various codes, common conventions, and languages within an oral or

written text. Attention to genre helps writers locate situations conducive to varying

degrees of translingual practices such as code-meshing. The problem of when and how to

create and employ language difference has vexed scholars such as Lu and Horner, who

were repeatedly criticized early in their careers for failing to attend to the "realistic"

needs of basic and second language writers. The typical complaint was that encouraging

language difference left college students ill-prepared to succeed in a capitalist world

dominated by the demand for clarity and precision. If basic writers lacked perfect

grammar, how could they get jobs?

---

[13] This general notion of language variation is also the foundation of dialectology, a subfield of sociolinguistics, as established by the work of William Labov (1969; 1972).

Translingual writing should always entail an assessment of typified conventions that determine the possibility of linguistic experimentation in a given situation. Some genres are characterized by low writer responsibility and are thus conducive to experimentation, others by high responsibility and thus less conducive (Bhatia and Gotti; Hyland). Additionally, translingual writing is a potentially subversive act that expands the discursive resources of a given language by remediating and blending its genres as well as borrowing genres from other languages. Attending to genre, translingual writers might determine through observation, for example, that professional genres like the resume or the cover letter do not provide much rhetorical opportunity for code-meshing because of the cultural logics of capitalism and Standard English informing them.[14] At the same time, writers might make an overt decision to test such genres by strategically using their conventions as resources to introduce words or ideas from other languages and cultures to achieve a specific purpose.

In addition to genre, Bakhtin's theoretical concepts of *heterglossia* and *dialogized heterglossia* can also help us articulate and understand important *differences* among various approaches to language difference. Specifically, the scholarship on language difference seems to overlook a tension between thinking about language difference within a single language, as practiced by Smitherman, and the kind of multilingual writing seen in the work of Anzaldua, who is often referenced as an inspirational figure

---

[14] Ken Hyland has explored the potential of genre theory for second language writing and admits that ESL writing instructors have not given adequate attention to the social contexts of composition. Hyland advises teachers to guide second language writers through micro-genres like exposition, argument, or rebuttal, and their relation to macro-genres such as the newspaper editorial or lab report. Matsuda has also suggested that genres operate within discourse communities that are shared by both writers and readers, and therefore writers must learn the conventions of those communities "regardless of their linguistic, cultural, or educational background" (54).See also Swales and Feak.

and a practical model for student writers. Currently these two approaches are discussed interchangeably. Canagarajah introduces code-meshing as a practice specifically for the negotiation of Englishes, referring to the work of Smitherman as an example of how "some African American scholars have already used AAVE [African American Vernacular English] in rhetorically compelling ways in academic texts that feature SWE [Standard Written English]" (598). But in the same paragraph, he also references Anzaldua's work as an example of code-meshing without accounting for the potential difference between mixing varieties of English and mixing altogether different languages.[15] Canagarajah later proceeds to conduct a close-reading of a text by Smitherman, analyzing her lexical borrowings from AAVE as well as her use of rhythm, repetition, and rhymes. Here, Canagarajah points out that part of Smitherman's rhetorical effectiveness lies in the intelligibility of her language use. In other words, she chooses AAVE words and phrases that a broad audience can understand.

In important contrast to Smitherman, however, Anzaldua writes entire phrases and sentences in Spanish. While most English speakers would understand Smitherman's use of vernacular in phrases such as "all I could think about was the dissin and doggin I had endured during the 'Students' Right' years," few would understand Anzaldua's sentence "*No se te vaya a mater algo por alla*" ("Serpent" 47). Anzaldua's rhetorical techniques continually account for a readership that cannot understand Spanish, and she often weaves in contextual cues and literal translations that help monolingual English

---

[15] In a similar vein, Lu's work primarily concerns mixed Englishes in the essays "Professing Multiculturalism" and "Living English Work," but in the second essay she addresses Chinglish as a World English while simultaneously incorporating Chinese words such as *jiao* into the text.

speakers without interrupting the flow of her narrative by giving dictionary definitions or excessive footnotes. Anzaldua's prose must deploy an altogether different set of textual strategies from Smitherman's, which raises the question of whether we can think about their respective practices in the same way.

We can observe the need to distinguish these two writers via Bakhtin's emphasis on mutual intelligibility for the significance of language. For Bakhtin, active understanding is required for communication to occur between two parties. As he states, "Understanding and response are dialectically merged and mutually condition each other, one is impossible without the other" ("Discourse in The Novel" 282). Communication is always a process between a speaker and a listener in which "The speaker strives to get a reading on his word. . .within the alien conceptual system of the understanding receiver" (282). As Morson and Emerson observe, "An utterance requires both a speaker and a listener (or a writer and a reader), who. . .have joint proprietorship of it" (131). The grammatical components of an utterance may belong to the writer or speaker "in the least interesting, purely physiological sense," but "meaningful communication" must "belong to (at least) two people, the speaker and his or her listener" (129). Bakhtin's attention to intelligibility and shared ownership of discourse prompts us to recognize that Anzaldua, because she frequently uses constructions from an altogether different language, cannot use the same code-meshing strategies as Smitherman to share ownership and understanding of her discourse.

Of course, while my analysis has introduced the need to think differently about different types of code-meshing, it does not rationalize the separation of student

populations that I have already critiqued in the beginning of this chapter. Rather, an understanding of different but related approaches to code-meshing may enable teachers to develop appropriate practices and rationales for diverse student populations in the same classroom environment. While I outline teaching practices in greater depth in the next two chapters, I offer this illustration: In classes composed of developmental, multilingual, and mainstream students, teachers would ideally scaffold assignments in meshing regional varieties of English, global varieties of English, and then other national languages. Alternatively, for high-stakes writing, teachers could allow students to choose between meshing Englishes and meshing national languages and then provide context-specific assignment guidelines and feedback on drafts. In this way, the academic focus on error becomes a site for investigation and experimentation, not correction.

The more varieties of English writers know, and the more languages they can draw on, the more strategically they can realize and improve their rhetorical repertoires. The wider the repertoire, the more prepared writers are for communicating their ideas to diverse audiences. In short, an awareness of and an ability to engage in language difference makes all writers better communicators. My translingual writing theory accounts for the general practices of actual authors identified as translingual in rhetoric and composition scholarship. As a series of actions that deploy multiple codes, generic conventions, and languages within texts and single speech acts (e.g., sentences) in a way that pushes against and reforms the limits of any given language's inherent capacity and resources for diversity, it provides a rationale for why all students, not merely second-language writers, should engage in translingual writing. Because Bakhtin defines

language as inherently polyvocal, using a single code for all rhetorical occasions is impossible. In the theory I have provided, navigating a language effectively does not mean merely writing and speaking according to prescribed rules, nor even learning to make those conventions one's own or negotiating them with a teacher or a small group of peers. Rather, effective use of language requires a writer's thorough knowledge and experience exploring that language's current capacity and resources in order to expand its potential. In other words, the more I can experiment with Standard academic English, the more I can make it accommodate my discursive purposes.

This fact may already seem apparent to multilingual writers because their shifting between languages, codes, and registers is overt and visible. Our allegedly monolingual, native-speaking college students in the U.S., on the other hand, have less developed understandings of themselves as polyglots because of their nation's socio-political history and current orientation to English Only. Students coming from less multilingual backgrounds will likely struggle or even resist the principles of language difference and translingual writing, but this creates the occasion to adjust our existing ideas about what exactly it means to encourage multilingual writing practices in academic settings. As Bakhtin writes of discourse in general, we derive our own use of language "not, after all, out of a dictionary" but rather "other people's mouths, in other people's contexts, serving other people's intentions" ("Discourse in the Novel" 294). All language "is populated— overpopulated—with the intentions of others. Expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one's own intentions and accents, is a difficult and complicated process" (294).

Just as developmental and second-language writers have struggled in the past to accommodate their voices to language norms, so too will native speakers when prompted to develop code-meshing strategies. Thus pedagogies and teaching practices stemming from Bakhtinian theories of discourse attune all students to translingual writing not *only* because it seems more ethical, but also because it provides a more accurate theoretical description of how language works. The use of language always entails acts of hybridization, and permitting native speakers to remain comfortable within the narrow, imaginary realm of Standard English goes just as heavily against Bakhtinian theories of discourse, as requiring multilingual writers to use only Standard English does.

A Pedagogical Definition: Everyone Can Code-Mesh

Scholarship advocating for a translingual approach does make minor concessions at times that valuing language difference benefits all students, not simply multilingual writers. Here I build on this partial acknowledgement to fully outline the need for a comprehensive translingual pedagogy for all students. A common theme across scholarship in language difference is the resistance to a "one-size fits all" pedagogy, which seems to have discouraged the enunciation of teaching practices—for fear of codifying or rigidifying the discourse. Indeed, we should realize the contingent, situational nature of teaching. On the other hand, my reading of the limited teaching examples on language difference show an equally reductive paradigm of recipe-swapping or "this fits me," without a much-needed "and this might fit for you for these reasons…" In response to this paradigm, my theoretical definition—in which a text is a mixture of

codes, conventions, and languages[16] that expand the privileged language and capture new means to express world views—pushes language difference further in order to declare the absolute necessity of translingual writing as a mainstream pedagogical practice that not only accepts language difference but requires it from all students, including those deemed monolingual native-speakers.

The few teaching approaches from Lu and Canagarajah's work take language difference for granted, as something that already occurs in all college classrooms. This may be true, but it does not mean that students are proficient at controlling the natural hybridity of their language use. Their examples mainly offer teachers a way of working with already sophisticated multilingual writers, not less adept writers and certainly not monolingual students. The pedagogical imperative I seek is not merely to value language difference when it occurs but to assign it a place in the writing curriculum and to evaluate and assess it as a learning outcome.

A pedagogy of translingual writing certainly has benefits for monolingual students, including enhanced abilities to communicate with a growing number of non-native English speakers worldwide. However, scholarship on language difference has yet to provide a thorough exploration regarding what particular teaching methods would facilitate the development of these abilities. Existing examples of classroom practices suggest that a single discussion regarding a single phrase like "can able to" in the course of a single semester is sufficient to develop these abilities. Of course, I doubt that

---

[16] I am using the word "code" throughout this dissertation in the broadest sense possible in order to include a variety of discourse practices at the sentence-level. When necessary, I specify particular authors and codes (such as African-American Vernacular English) when illustrating points.

scholars such as Lu, Trimbur, Horner, or Royster would concede that one exposure to language difference is sufficient to develop monolingual students' abilities to communicate with non-native speakers. On this point, the article nonetheless refers readers to a bibliography of sources that, in turn, locate monolingual native-speakers at the margins of any attempt to formulate a translingual writing pedagogy. The bulk of this scholarship asks teachers to simply negotiate code-meshing with multilingual students on an individual basis, either in low-stakes or high-stakes assignments.

The neglect of monolingual students also becomes apparent in the otherwise groundbreaking volume *Crossing Borderlands*. Anzaldua serves as a symbolic figure throughout this volume, and her metaphor of the new Mestiza offers a potent metaphor for language diversity. As she is often quoted,

> The new Mestiza copes by developing a tolerance for contradictions, a tolerance for ambiguity. She learns to be Indian in Mexican culture, to be Mexican from an Anglo point of view. She learns to juggle cultures. She has a plural personality, she operates in a pluralistic mode. (205)

This view informs and embodies translingual writing, but scholars have applied it largely to under-represented populations, with some afterthought about how to instill this consciousness in students who do not necessarily see themselves as existing on or anywhere near a border. In reality, all language users possess at least some of this tolerance for contradiction and uncertainty—even when the implicit language policies of public schools and universities try to suppress these normal aspects of discourse.

This marginalization of monolingual college students becomes a point of critique for Philip Marzluf, who disagrees with the scholarship's equation of language-use with an authentic, ethnic self:

> Though white students are not forced to 'prove' themselves through language, their African American, Latino American, and Native American classmates rarely have this privilege; they are asked to demonstrate their commitment to their vernaculars. (513)

In response to Marzluf, I say that "white students" are in fact asked to prove themselves through their use of standard codes.[17] Instead, then, I ask why teachers should not also expect "white students" to "prove themselves through language" not by demonstrating their knowledge of Standard English but through experimentation with the linguistic and rhetorical resources of other cultures. Whereas Marzluf asks why we expect non-white students to write in vernacular, I ask why we do not expect the largely white population of native English speakers to explore other vernaculars and languages in high-stakes writing.

The emphasis on non-mainstream students has resulted in a series of commonplaces about the value of language difference, creating a kind of circular discourse on the subject in which the universal benefit of translingual or transcultural education is often touted but seldom fleshed out through descriptions of teaching practices. For example, Louise Rodriguez Connal forwards the idea of transcultural rhetorics, briefly arguing that "all students can learn about different rhetorics, and

---

[17] In addition to his work on African American vernaculars, William Labov has notably conducted a number of studies on regional varieties of English, and his work also takes into account differences in socio-economic status and their affects on linguistic performance. See his book *The Study of Nonstandard English* and, more recently, *The Atlas of North American English*.

transcultural rhetorics can facilitate that understanding" (204). She admits that "[m]any students in first-year composition classrooms come from states where issues of diversity are alien concepts" (204), and so they might resist instruction in the linguistic and rhetorical features of other cultures both within the U.S. and abroad. However, this brief nod to teaching monolingual students constitutes the only sentence in the entire article addressing any possible resistance. Most of Connal's attention goes toward justifying and explaining the need for teachers to allow their multi-ethnic students voice in the classroom: "Teachers, whether in monolingual or bilingual classroom settings, unaware of the features of the particular Spanish and English spoken by Puerto Ricans, stigmatize them" (212). Yet, her article offers no insights for enacting a translingual writing pedagogy beyond the well rehearsed argument for valuing language difference.

The degree of over-emphasis on minority populations ranges from implicit to explicit but is always present. The most passionate advocates of translingual writing nearly erase the linguistically-privileged, monolingual student altogether—at the peril of their own agendas. As Aneil Rallin states,

> My instinct dictates that my primary allegiance in any classroom is to my colored students, my queer students, my working class students, my disenfranchised students, but then I immediately think of the colored Republican students and caution myself against assuming this essentialist position. As a teacher, my main goal is to radicalize my students. (144)

If by "my students" Rallin includes those from privileged backgrounds, and by "radicalize" she means instilling an attitude not only of tolerance but engagement of alternative voices, then I largely agree. But key questions once again surface—how do

we "radicalize" monolingual native-speakers of English, and to what end? Giving voice to marginalized populations is one component of what should be a comprehensive pedagogy of destabilizing the myth of English Only.[18] The students who have supposedly mastered Standard English, unfortunately, stand likely to earn positions of power and authority that determine or influence explicit and covert language policies at institutions of higher education, in government agencies, and in the corporate world—a world which still shows an unapologetic demand for Standard English. In order to truly de-center this demand, "radicalize" must also mean a commitment to asking linguistically-privileged students to recognize the principles of translingual writing and to enact and embody those principles in written and oral texts.

The current attempts at translingual pedagogy not only privilege multilingual writers over monolingual writers but also privilege advanced multilingual writers over less advanced ones. That is, the scholarship often assumes that multilingual students already possess a complete set of resources to experiment with codes, rarely addressing second-language writers who would be classified as developmental or "deficient" in their first languages. Translingual writing presents a picture of students already capable of the sophisticated prose we see in the work of Smitherman and Anzaldua. All they need is linguistically sensitive teachers who can appreciate their creativity and converse with them about their intentions—of which they already have a clear understanding. For

---

[18] An exception or two exists to the tendency of circular discourse about the need to develop linguistic diversity at the college-level. Scott Wible outlines possibilities of enactment at institutional levels, such as pairing sections of English courses with ones in linguistics or foreign languages and thereby "linking foreign languages and rhetorical education" (477). As he says, "A team-taught, multilingual approach to rhetorical education would help students develop the linguistic and rhetorical skills necessary to communicate across multiple language and cultural groups" (477).

example, Canagarajah's illustration of code-meshing draws on a student named Almon who is "tongue-tied" (591) in classrooms and yet, while outside the classroom, he "produces texts of a range of genres, uses the language actively, and learns collaboratively with his peers" in his face-to-face social interactions and online. According to Canagarajah, Almon is not tongue-tied in class because he does not know how to negotiate Englishes; he is tongue-tied simply because he is only allowed to write in a sterile Standard English. As Canagarajah argues, "it is outside the classroom that students seem to develop communicative competence and negotiation strategies for 'real world' needs of multilingualism" ("Place" 592).[19] If translingual writing only offers the validation of students who have learned to mesh codes outside of class, and not an actual approach to teaching, then it is not yet a complete pedagogical system.

Likewise, Lu's discussion of a Chinese-Malaysian student's phrase "can able to," a blend of the verb phrase "be able to" and the modal "can," focuses on the students' already-developed sense of agency and purpose. As Canagarajah reads this example, "[t]he Malaysian student is not blind to the differences in Chinese and English. She insists on using the peculiar structure because she is struggling to bring out certain ideas that are important to her" (*Critical Academic Writing* 54). The student's attempt to fashion a new grammatical structure may have needed additional guidance from the instructor, but her ability to draw on English and Chinese grammars demonstrates a highly developed awareness of both languages. Thus the pictures presented here simplify

[19] Canagarajah's critique is aimed largely at the idea or "myth" of standard language practices and homogeneity that keeps Almon from writing as eloquently in class as he does out of class. It is not what he is expected to do that inhibits his expression but, instead, the prevention of hybridity by teachers who think what we call Standard English or academic discourse exists in a vacuum from other discourse practices.

a vastly complex process in the development of multilingual writers. While some students may already demonstrate proficiency in code-meshing, many others may not.

If only all classroom experiences could produce the kinds of precise and sophisticated discussions and student-texts that Canagarajah and Lu use to illustrate their teaching approaches. A more likely student population would consist of multilingual and monolingual students with widely ranging abilities—many of whom do not yet fully possess the mature ability to conceive of surgical experimentations with language. In fact, they might even resist or struggle to understand the value of translingual writing practices, in particular code-meshing. Additionally, the code-meshing that Canagarajah and Lu describe also may not occur in manageable syntactic packets, as if ready-made for classroom debate. In reality, both teachers and students will likely lack the knowledge of complex grammar, or simply the time, to isolate instances of code-meshing and then harness them for productive engagement and negotiation. Although Canagarajah advises teachers to "spend time with students individually to explicate their assumptions and work out ways of expressing those interests in terms of the dominant system," this level of nuance requires incredible resources from teachers and students (57). It is often a more complex and chaotic process than scholarship gesturing toward translingual pedagogies currently acknowledges—a process in dire need of heuristics.

Conclusion: The Need for Heuristics

Even when speaking about multilingual writers, the existing scholarship has emphasized attitudes and perceptions over heuristic, experience-based teaching and learning strategies for discovery and problem solving. While true that descriptions of

teaching practices alone offer limited assistance, heuristics play a valuable role in the development of reflective teaching practices. If Greco-Roman rhetorical practices used imitation to foster a pupil's own unique voice, as I discuss in the next chapter, then the imitation and adaptation of others' successful teaching practices is vital to the development of pedagogies. Building common theoretical ground through a Bakhtinian reading of language difference facilitates the development of such pedagogies by normalizing practices such as code-meshing—making them a goal for all users of a language regardless of their prior linguistic experiences. Re-reading classical imitation exercises through Bakhtin's work (the project of the next chapter) opens them to possible adaptation for multilingual classrooms. Hence, it becomes possible to develop a set of heuristics.

That said, heuristics have become taboo in rhetoric and composition, and the discussion of teaching practices in scholarship is rare, especially on the topic of language diversity. For example, Canagarajah suggests teachers use his extended close-reading of Smitherman's "The Historical Struggle for Language Rights in CCC" in classroom discussions, noting Smitherman's gradual introduction of syntactic and stylistic deviations from conventional academic discourse. Canagarajah offers such essays as exemplary readings for writing classes. But close-reading alone can only serve as the beginning of one's teaching practices. As James F. Slevin states, developing one's unique discourse and "transcending constraints" requires that students "become not just readers of dominant signifying practices but also writers who can form—and make persuasive their own discourse," a goal that can never be reached "only from interpreting texts, no

matter how attentive that interpretation might be to larger contexts" (193). The remaining

questions for a pedagogy of code-meshing include: what types of assignments would

most appropriately facilitate practice in translingual writing; what specific guidelines

should exist for code-meshing; how teachers might define learning outcomes and

evaluate such work for grades; and how writing programs can design curricula, course

sequences, and assessment projects so that translingual writing engages larger

institutional agendas.

    A few scholars have begun to develop answers to these questions. Margaret

Himley outlines "invention heuristics" in support of language difference that ask students

to do research, engage in "*dissoi logoi*," and conduct close-readings of articles that use

conflicting definitions of supposedly universal words and concepts (459). Paul

Matsuda[20] offers "a few principles that can guide teachers who wish to help students

negotiate the complex push-pull relationship between standardization and diversification"

(371). His first principle concedes the need to conform to "dominant varieties" of

English that "prevail in public perception and teaching materials" in order to "make those

discursive resources available to students" so they "can appropriate them for their own

purposes" (372). But concession to the dominant forms is balanced by instruction in non-

dominant forms, as well as an orientation to "the perceived boundary—a fuzzy and

negotiable one—between what works (variations) and what does not (errors) in the

particular communicative context" (372). His third principle suggests a more rigorous

form of discourse negotiation for students in which "the appropriateness of usage is

---

[20] See Matsuda's article in the June 2010 issue of *TESOL Quarterly*.

judged according to the readers' perception of the rhetorical situation—purpose, audience, writer positionality and available discursive resources (i.e., genre)" (373). According to Matsuda, the success of translingual strategies like code-meshing hinges on the writer's ability to create credibility by establishing a recognizable pattern of deviations—like the repeated use of a Spanish phrase—and metadiscursive features such as parenthetical notes, end notes, and embedded clauses (373). Matsuda's brief discussion of strategies gives students and teachers a starting point. But a more elaborate set of teaching practices would integrate these principles within a range of assignments and activities to facilitate their acquisition.

My first chapter has synthesized scholarship in linguistic diversity since the formulation of the 1974 CCCC position statement entitled "Students' Right to Their Own Language" and has sought to articulate common theoretical ground through the work of Mikhail Bakhtin, whose well-known theories can serve as a bridge between such ostensibly incompatible pedagogies as multilingualism and ancient Western rhetorics. Drawing on Bakhtin's description of language as in constant flux due to centripetal and centrifugal forces, as well as the interanimation of dialects and speech genres, I have proposed a common theory of language that situates difference as the norm of communication. Normalizing language difference enables us to think about code-meshing as a standard for *all* students, including those who may not profess knowledge or interest in any language or dialect other than their native one.

In the next two chapters, my rereading of ancient rhetorical texts, especially Quintilian's *The Orator's Education*, show that instruction in style and imitation was

intended to develop a multi-voiced rhetorical dexterity. Although Roman socio-political culture itself was hierarchical, patriarchal, and ethnocentric, a close-reading of Quintilian's text shows his pedagogy to be otherwise. The ancient rhetorician frequently encouraged experimentation and covert resistance to *Latinitas* (pure Latin), acknowledging the political necessity of correctness and resisting the dominant cultural equation of grammatical error with moral vice. Using Bakhtin to reinterpret Quintilian's figures of thought and expression, I adapt the *progymnasmata* for use with multilingual texts and describe specific exercises for classroom use—for example, having students elaborate proverbs and maxims (*chreia*) from their first languages and revise them through intercultural peer-workshops. As students engage in hermeneutic activities to make meaning from these elaborated proverbs, the sayings themselves become co-owned and multi-voiced, and available for use by anyone. My third chapter continues this discussion with an emphasis on twentieth and twenty-first century adaptations of these classical models. Specifically, I make a case that arguments for the return or revival of style that have surfaced throughout the twentieth century would be stronger if they engaged more directly with language difference.

My fourth chapter specifically applies the concept of remediation to the *progymnasmata*, adapting them to address recent developments in new media composition. Drawing on Bakhtin's fusion of style and genre, I outline a sequence of class activities that allow students to investigate how generic constraints in social media sites call on and facilitate different linguistic codes and styles. Because so much of public, professional, and intercultural discourse now occurs online, college students need

to critically engage these digital genres and their relationships if they are to be successful, active citizens.

My fifth chapter presents the need to begin thinking about language difference more explicitly in administrative terms. Here I argue that administrative support increases the possibility of translingual writing's success. Following John Trimbur's ultimate goal of "multilingual universities" ("Linguistic Memory" 586) I explore scholarship on writing program administration to discuss how writing program administrators can revise learning outcomes and TA-training seminars in order to facilitate the movement of language difference from the margins to the center, from deviation to norm. I close this chapter with a statement about the implications of those moves in the larger field of rhetoric and composition.

The Greco-Roman rhetorical tradition offers a wealth of material and insights for the development of a translingual pedagogy and teaching heuristics. Although many teachers may find it hard to imagine the monolingual culture of the ancient Greeks and Romans as having anything to offer multilingual writers in the twenty-first century, I address these reservations through a historical re-reading of primary sources such as Cicero's *De Oratore* and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*. This re-reading, informed by a Bakhtinian orientation to language and discourse, provides the theoretical grounding for adapting ancient Greek and Roman conceptions of style and invention, as well as their accompanying imitation exercises and the *progymnasmata,* for a progressive, multilingual-multimodal pedagogy focused on rhetorical experimentation. This pedagogy explicitly encourages such experimentation at the level of genre and sentence-structure. It

prefaces complex, high-stakes assignments with lower-stakes exercises in imitation and

sentence-level composition that uses work by Anzaldua and Smitherman as stylistic

models. Students analyze and emulate, attempting and practicing translingual styles of

writing and developing a fine-tuned awareness of their various codes' capacities and

resources that they eventually can use in longer, more complex projects.

CHAPTER II

TRANSLINGUAL WRITING AS STYLE AND INVENTION

A major strength of the Greco-Roman tradition lies in its systematic approach to

education in rhetoric, an asset which can help structure a pedagogy of translingual writing

by making strategies such as code-meshing teachable to students. In particular, imitation

exercises on style and invention as described by Quintilian in *The Orator's Education*

provide the necessary scaffolding to help students and teachers negotiate Standard

English with other linguistic codes during class activities and writing assignments.[21] I use

the term *discovery* in the title and throughout this chapter as a means to treat style as part

of the invention process rather than as separate and less important. Elements traditionally

associated with both canons are working at the same time when translingual writers

negotiate content and form at the sentence level. In the comprehensive pedagogy of

translingual writing that I propose, students emulate the styles of multilingual authors

such as Geneva Smitherman and Gloria Anzaldua[22] as they work their way through the

progymnasmata, a series of twelve exercises by which rhetors in training "developed

their eloquence" (Quintilian 2.1.9). Although the term *progymnasmata* itself implies that

these exercises were the purview of grammar teachers, as preparation for more

sophisticated education, Quintilian elevated them to the domain of rhetoric, declaring that

---

[21] I have chosen Donald A. Russell's translation of this text because it is the most recent and reliable.

[22] In chapter one, I recognize the difference between multilingual writers such as Anzaldua and writers such as Smitherman who use vernacular, and I use it as a reason for my definition of translingual writing via Bakhtin's theories. Later in this chapter, I discuss stylistic devices as applicable to the emulation of both writers.

the discursive patterns embodied in each exercise "are, in a sense, weapons always to be kept ready, to be used as the occasion demands. Anyone who denies that these things [*progymnasmata*] are not relevant to oratory might as well believe that a statue is not begun when the limbs are being cast!" (2.1.9-13).

For the sake of clarity, I want to define my use of the terms invention and discovery up front, since this chapter discusses style as part of the invention process and uses discovery to refer to acts in which writers are inventing through their stylistic decisions. In *Rhetoric: Essays in Invention & Discovery*, Richard McKeon gives an account of invention in both the classical and modern eras, describing it as "the art of discovering new arguments and uncovering new things by argument" (59). I use this broad definition of invention because it is conducive to most rhetorical frameworks going back to Greco-Roman models. Aristotle may offer the enthymeme as a counterpart to the syllogistic reasoning of dialectic; Cicero and Quintilian may emphasize stasis theory; Toulmin may propose a model of warrants and backing; Burke may propose the pentad; and cognitive process models outlined by Flower and Hayes may describe invention as prewriting and brainstorming. Nonetheless, all of these various models may arguably be described in McKeon's terms, regardless of their differences in how such arguments are discovered, or whether invention is a cognitive or social process.

McKeon is acutely aware of slippage between terms such as "creativity, invention, discovery, recovery, and innovation," and he states that such terms "were as ambiguous in ordinary Greek as they are in ordinary English" (25). His thorough historical narration of these various terminologies since Plato leads to this definition of

invention as "the art of discovering," a definition which refers to facts, lines of argument, and strategies of conveying information (59). My intention is to use the terms "invention" and "style" when referring to the canons as rhetoricians have typically discussed them—as distinct from one another. When I refer to the use of style in the process of invention, I use the term "discovery."

The controversial success of Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein's *They Say/I Say* speaks to the need that many college writing instructors envision for the use of templates that facilitate writing instruction, including issues of style and more generally the acquisition of academic discourse. I evoke Graff intentionally here because the book has offended many writing instructors for the naivety it shows in suggesting such a simplistic framework for writing, neglecting complex debates in rhetoric and composition and ignoring it as a discipline. The reaction to Graff and Birkenstein's book perhaps illustrates the field's love-hate relationship with formulas. As William Thelin complains in an archived email to the WPA-L, Graff and Birkenstein "couldn't do any better than making vague allusions to those silly compositionists who think the 5-paragraph essay is a formula. It's as if B&G want to pretend the field of composition doesn't exist" (2008). Discussion on the list-serve continued for nearly two months. At one point, Charles Bazerman eventually chimed in with an observation that the range of informed opinions on writing and academic discourse represented by the debate was "not recognized by the authors, whether or not their book is useful" (2008).

Given the reception of this book, I see my discussion of Greco-Roman stylistic exercises as applying the idea of formalized instruction to translingual writing practices,

namely code-meshing, while also recognizing a formidable history in rhetoric and composition on the issue of style and invention. While many contemporary writing teachers may see a need for improvement in style and grammar, many more also feel that it is not their job to teach these subjects, that these are the domain of either developmental writing programs or secondary education. But as Quintilian argues, while the *progymnasmata* were originally intended to *precede* advanced training in oratory and develop one's stylistic dexterity, they can and should be adapted to work alongside other educational goals, since they belong to education in rhetoric as well as grammar. As he says, rhetoric "must not shirk its proper duties or rejoice to see burdens which belong to it [such as grammar and style] taken up by others; indeed, by surrendering some of the work, it has almost been driven out of its rightful possessions" (2.1.6). Quintilian could just as well be speaking about writing instruction today.

Although not without critics, the use of models and templates to develop style has a long tradition, going back to the first century C.E. with the first known handbook of *progynmnasmata* produced by Aelius of Theon, followed by similar works produced over roughly the next four hundred years by Hermogenes, Aphtonius, Nicolaus the Sophist, and John of Sardis (Kennedy *Progymnasmata*). In the edited volume *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Ruth Webb summarizes these collections of *progymnasmata* to state that "handbooks from Theon onwards present all the exercises together," which "does suggest that their authors and readers saw the exercises as parts of a unified system to be taught by one master, or at least within a single school" (297). Slight differences exist among these various handbooks, but they all contain the following exercises: fable

(the expansion or abbreviation of one of Aesop's stories); narrative (the retelling of a story taken from epic poetry or history); *chreia* (recounting and explaining an anecdote or pithy saying), proverb (a similar exercise explaining an anonymous saying); refutation (attacking the credibility of a myth or legend); confirmation (doing the opposite with a myth or legend), commonplace (elaborating on a virtue of vice); encomium (giving praise or blame to an historical figure); comparison (comparing two persons or things, a double encomium); impersonation (short speech delivered from the perspective of a character or historical figure); description (a vivid description of an object or person); and finally thesis or theme (analysis of a complex issue from two or more sides).

These exercises were carefully scaffolded to build upon one another, like a series of ladder rungs, so that students would mature from levels of basic proficiency to levels of sophisticated dexterity. The use of *progymnasmata* also encouraged strategic and disciplined yet creative use of language while also developing students' abilities to invent and craft arguments. Moreover, once learned, these strategies could be individually chosen and combined into one text to more successfully persuade the audience. Used to encourage dexterity and skill rather than linguistic conformity, these exercises can enable students and teachers in the twenty-first century to practice code-meshing in small, manageable units, followed by more complex assignments incorporating more than one strategy. The exercises are ideally designed and structured to create controlled textual environments where students can experiment with multiple codes at the sentence-level, as scholars such as Smitherman, Min Zhan Lu, A. Suresh Canagarajah, and Vershawn Young have envisioned. As chapter one shows, scholars who articulate the need for more

sensitivity to language difference and multilingualism nevertheless acknowledge that

translingual writing needs a more developed set of teaching practices. To echo

Canagarajah's question, "is code-meshing teachable?" this chapter presents the

progymnasmata as one way of making such translingual practices a reality in college

writing classrooms.

In spite of my claims, the common disciplinary perception of such rhetorical

treatises as Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* is that it is preoccupied with superficial

correctness and inattentive to the relation between style and invention (Knoblauch and

Brannon; Miller). This view may discourage many scholars and teachers from

considering what Greco-Roman rhetorics have to offer a pedagogy of translingual

writing. Even more recently, work by Rebecca Dingo, Wendy Hesford, Byron Hawk,

Kristie Fleckenstein, and Jessica Enoch also have articulated the need to rethink the old

systems of rhetoric and citizenship in light of trends in new media, globalization, and

transnationalism. These scholars question Greco-Roman rhetorical systems' suitability

for the increasingly diverse landscape of higher education, in which students now bring a

variety of literacies as well as cultural and linguistic backgrounds to their classrooms. As

Shirley Wilson Logan states in a 2006 *College English* article, rhetorical education

informed by the classical tradition is valuable but it must move beyond the

"sentimentalized good old days of oratory before computers and television and mass

media" (110). Moreover, Dingo describes the global flows of information that

characterize the twenty-first century and "presents a conundrum for rhetorical analysts"

because they defy what she sees as the simplistic framework of "traditional rhetorical

concepts of place, time, speaker/writer, and audience" (494). Other scholars such as

Collin Brooke, Stephen Fraiberg, and Sidney Dobrin have redefined rhetoric in terms of

ecologies that consist of chains of interlinked rhetorical situations rather than discrete

events that can be analyzed in isolation from one another.[23]

Although the Greco-Roman tradition has not been fully displaced, and in fact

remains quite entrenched at some institutions and bodies of scholarship, scholars now

inhabit a climate that is more skeptical toward the classical tradition than even ten years

ago. Teachers who assign essays and books by multilingual, non-Western writers may

indeed resist concepts such as the proofs, stasis theory, or figures of style and expression

based on the impression that Smitherman, Anzaldua, Chenua Achebe, Derek Walcott, or

Salman Rushdie themselves were either not trained according to these precepts or not

interested in following the full spirit of their prescriptions.[24]

My aim is not to completely discount this skepticism, nor to redeem the Greco-

Roman tradition in its entirety. Instead, I present an alternative reading of this tradition to

show that it is less preoccupied with superficial correctness than scholars such as Cy

Knoblauch and Lil Brannon and Susan Miller have argued, and it is also more attentive to

---

[23] Readers may be interested in work on actor network theory, as represented by Wertsch (1991; 1998). For example, Wertsch seeks to "explicate the relationship between human action and the cultural, institutional, and historical contexts in which this action occurs" (24). His argument is that social sciences often discuss individual human activity, language, and larger social phenomena as discrete rather than accounting for how they interact.

[24] While true to a large extent that postcolonial authors have resisted Western literary and rhetorical forms, it should also be recognized that works such as Aristotle's *Rhetoric* would not have been available to Western scholars if not for their translation and preservation by non-Western, Arabic scholars such as Ibn Rushd (Borrowman). In fact, while histories of rhetoric such as George Kennedy's and James J. Murphy's generally acknowledge Boethius as the figure who introduced Aristotle to Medieval Christian Europe, "Ibn Rushd's knowledge of Aristotle [was] greater and more complex" (354). Such historical accounts complicate the very idea of a binary between Western and non-Western rhetoric, and they further support the argument that classical stylistic figures are not antithetical or antagonistic to other rhetorical traditions.

the relation of style and invention than it appears.[25] In this sense, I echo J. David

Fleming's argument for the revival of the *progymnasmata* with one crucial difference.

Fleming acknowledges that the central benefit of these exercises "was not the specific

tasks assigned but the way that program provided students with the subcomponents of

expert rhetorical performance," and how they "broke each component down into

teachable patterns or topics," while also placing them "into a thoughtful developmental

sequence" (117). Thus he consciously stops short of proposing "a new *progymnasmata*

for our time" (117). In this chapter, I am interested in adapting some of these specific

exercises and in seeing translingualism as a positive means to counter the "heavy-handed

prescriptiveness of the exercises" (116) that even their defenders in H. I. Marrou, James

J. Murphy, and add Bonner found so confining.

The next section of this chapter prefaces the rest of my discussion by driving

home the importance of the classical tradition for current conversations in the field of

rhetoric and composition regarding style. Afterward, I outline some of the older though

still-influential critiques of Greco-Roman rhetorics, and I then discuss more recent

perspectives on the relationship between invention and style in the Greco-Roman system.

I then present an alternative account of Quintilian's work and its historical contexts in

order to recuperate the Greco-Roman orientation to style and thus the use of the

progymnasmata. This argument builds on the previous chapter's discussion of Mikhail

Bakhtin's notion of dialogue and speech genres, using these concepts as lenses to

---

[25] Although these critiques of Greco-Roman rhetoric have certainly not prevented continued interest in pedagogical use of classical rhetoric since their publication two and three decades ago, the concerns they raise are still among the sharpest criticisms of the Greco-Roman tradition available—and the points they raise are still echoed throughout the field.

consider Quintilian's orientation to style. Finally, I illustrate this pedagogy by describing

my own teaching experiences and adapting the *progymnasmata* for translingual writing.

The Relevance of Style Today

Although scholarly attention to style has increased over the past few years with

the publication of T.R. Johnson and Tom Pace's 2005 *Refiguring Prose Style*, Paul

Butler's *Out of Style* as well as Chris Holcomb and Jimmie Killingsworth's *Performing*

Prose, this canon has previously nonetheless been devalued in contemporary approaches

to writing, a fact which all of these authors discuss at length. The defense of style in these

books indicates that their readership is still skeptical of sentence-level concerns and is

likely to associate style and grammar with current-traditionalism. Butler's re-examination

of contemporary style briefly touches on the relation between invention and style in the

classical tradition, where he interprets Aristotle's definition of the canon of style as

helping "to discover and generate ideas through the improvisation of written language"

(62), not merely the expression of those ideas. In other words, style can accomplish with

figures of thought and expression at least some of what invention does with the *topoi*,

enthymemes, and proofs. As Butler interprets Aristotle, the canons of invention and style

are not in opposition. In fact, they overlap with one another regarding the production of

ideas. Although Butler's direct engagement with Aristotle is less than a paragraph, I see it

as reason to look closer into the classical tradition—especially in order to recover its

latent multiligualism, something which neither Butler nor Pace nor Johnson discuss.

Additionally, such scholars have argued for attention to style in composition for

decades without much success. There is something odd about the continued anticipation

of a resurgence of style in composition that never comes, somewhat akin to continual

predications of the second coming or the apocalypse. Elizabeth Weiser makes this point

in her historical consideration of stylistic pedagogies in "Where is Style Going? Where

Has It Been?" Weiser begins with a reading of articles on stylistic pedagogies published

during the late 1980s, just before their complete obfuscation by social-epistemic

approaches. In these articles Weiser notes a sense that style "was on the cusp of

developing the two things it most needed to regain its prominent role in the field: a theory

that positioned style within a generative process model of composition. . .and textbooks

that employed a generative model in their approach to style to disseminate the theory-

driven practice" (24). And yet, she acknowledges, this never occurred.

Weiser poses one answer to the question of "What happened?" to style (24). Her

reading of 118 articles on the subject, published in *CCC* between 1973 and 2003, shows

that a "de-emphasis on the text, both in preferred research methodology and in rhetorical

orientation, has led to a tremendous downturn in publishable articles on style" (35). What

Weiser suggests, if style will indeed return from the margins of the field, is to "emphasize

learning 'style for' a rhetorical purpose rather than 'style of' a studied rhetorical or poetic

text" (36).

My aim in this dissertation is different from apologists of style such as Butler,

Connors, Holcomb and Killingsworth, and Johnson and Pace. Whereas their work makes

the case for style as an end in itself in writing instruction, in the sense of style as

aesthetically pleasing prose in a single code or series of linguistic habits, I am interested

in what a pedagogy centered on language difference can take from this tradition for the

sake of promoting students' metalinguistic awareness, which A. Suresh Canagarajah

defines in *Critical Academic Writing and Multilingual Students* as the ability of a writer

to "negotiate the best way in which his or her purposes may be achieved through the

range of grammatical resources available" (52). As discussed in my last chapter via

Bakhtin, these resources do not reside only within a standard variety of English but

within its ability to adapt and accommodate other dialects and other languages.

The idea of metalinguistically aware students, who have control over their use of

languages, also echoes the WPA Outcomes Statement's expectation of students to

"Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling," albeit with

the important recognition that controlling these features means not merely the ability to

reproduce Standard English but the knowledge to know when, where, and how to mesh it

with other linguistic codes or styles for rhetorical effectiveness.

A significant problem in arguments in favor of style is that they pass over

scholarship on multilingualism. As I discuss later, this is true of both Corbett's textbook

as well as Holcomb and Killingsworth's book, which is addressed to both scholars and

students. For instance, Holcomb and Killingsworth discuss the stylistic excellence of

monolingual writers such as Ernest Hemingway (79), Robert Burns (86), Walt Whitman

(90), William Shakespeare (100), Tim O'Brien (112), and Mark Twain (119). Although

their discussion of individual tropes, figures, and schemes is admirable in its

thoroughness, there is no indication here that style can accommodate anything other than

Standard English. Although I agree with these authors' views regarding the relevance of

style in contemporary writing instruction, I fear that its representation as monolingual is a significant undercut to their intentions.

For the above reasons, it is important to develop a view of style as both inventional and multilingual in order to harness its resources for a translingual writing pedagogy. My aim over the next two chapters is to give a thorough exploration of style with attention to the classical tradition as well as contemporary composition pedagogies. This chapter in particular focuses on Roman style and interpretations of it by scholars of classical rhetoric. Here I also stress that despite Roman attitudes toward other cultures and languages, evidence from Quintilian's *The Orator's Education* as well as some of Cicero's work shows that Romans themselves were more multilingual than they were willing to admit. This alternative understanding prepares me to extend this view of style as both inventional and multilingual into a closer engagement with contemporary composition instruction in chapter three.

Style and Invention Reconsidered

A major critique of the Greco-Roman tradition is that it separates content from form, emphasizing the latter. As Knoblauch and Brannon observe, this became especially true "after Boethius installed logic as the principle discipline in medieval education" (42) and rhetoric as mere ornament, a split further reinforced by Peter Ramus during the Renaissance and perpetuated by subsequent generations of rhetoricians thereafter. But Knoblauch and Brannon hold that this separation of invention and style go back even earlier than the medieval period to Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. For all three rhetoricians, they claim, "[t]he order of [rhetorical] activities was presumed to be fixed:

find ideas, arrange ideas, express ideas" (34). In this perception of rhetoric, "language . . . is not yet implicated in the very shaping of . . . ideas, nor is the process of articulation as yet substantially related to the process of conception" (41). Knoblauch and Brannon's view is that the expression of ideas during the classical period through the Renaissance had no bearing on content, except to make ideas clear or unclear for a homogenous audience.

Based on this interpretation, the use of Greco-Roman rhetoric would appear to pose a threat to college writing classrooms because of its emphasis on correctness and clarity—a view which I contest in this chapter as well the next chapter. As Knoblauch and Brannon assert, "Classical writing instruction exaggerates formal and technical awareness . . . with little regard for the potentialities that make composing a valuable activity in the first place: its power to make new meaning and to convey meaning to others" (46). Thus rhetoricians such as Quintilian have become synonymous with correctness and propriety, as the antithesis of meaning-making.

Knoblauch and Brannon go on to discuss other negative influences of Greco-Roman rhetorics on contemporary writing instruction, arguing that such a view of discourse confines students. As they state, "Teachers continue to separate thought from language, knowledge from articulation, content from form" as they practice "their own limited roles as guardians of superficial expressive decorum" (45). These critiques are echoed by other scholars in the field. As Miller argues in her ambivalent discussion of Quintilian, "His treatment of 'writing' is a manual for impeccable transcription, not for prose composition" (23). She goes on to argue that "Far ahead of, or behind, later

assumptions about the relation of grammar to morality, Quintilian's barbarians were only foreign speakers and authors whose usage it was sometimes appropriate to adopt" (23). Moreover, Miller expresses skepticism about historical narratives that locate contemporary composition as the inheritor of ancient rhetoric, a discourse that "imposes unity and transferability on supposedly halcyon ancient days of instruction in public speaking that was designed for a discrete ruling elite" (39). Michael Halloran's "On the End of Rhetoric," goes so far as to declare the "the futility of trying to resurrect the classical ideal[s]" promoted by Cicero and Quintilian (624). Halloran's reservations also include the separation of form from content, but also the inability of Greco-Roman rhetorics to engage other modes of discourse than information or persuasion. He cites Kenneth Burke's concept of identification as one example of discourse that Aristotle, Cicero, nor Quintilian can account for.

I agree with these scholars that a separation of style and invention or "thought from language" is damaging to students, especially when it leads to classroom instruction devoted exclusively to correctness and form. It is true that first-year writing courses at many universities have long moved away from this kind of emphasis on correctness (a point explored in the next chapter with consideration to contemporary scholarship). Of course, it is certainly surviving in smaller institutions and community colleges, where there are fewer rhetoric and composition faculty. The result is that while many college writing teachers at large universities still incorporate invention devices such as the proofs (ethos, logos, and pathos) that bear remnants of the classical tradition, the canon of style has been largely neglected.

However, recent perspectives on rhetorical treatises have challenged the view that rhetoricians such as Cicero and Quintilian separated invention and style, showing that Roman rhetoric in particular devoted considerable attention to the relation between the two canons. As Cicero himself writes in the section on style in *De Oratore*, style and invention "cannot exist separately" (III, 19, p. 230). Rather, "eloquence forms a unity, into whatever realms or areas of discourse it travels," and "discovering words for a distinguished style is impossible without having produced and shaped the thoughts;" conversely, "no thought can shine clearly without the enlightening power of words" (III, 24, p. 231). For both Cicero and Quintilian, the rhetorician was responsible for producing knowledge as well as communicating that knowledge clearly but also compellingly.

As a canon, style played an important role in Greco-Roman rhetorical treatises, including Quintilian's synthesis of Cicero and Aristotle, as well as in the methods of the sophists (Jarratt; Poulakos). In the Greco-Roman tradition, one's unique style was first developed through the imitation of others. Although imitation has negative connotations in contemporary culture, especially in the U.S. academic culture where fears of plagiarism loom large, for the Romans it was the primary path to dexterity, or what we might call metalinguistic awareness.[26] Roman imitation and memorization exercises aimed ultimately at individual expression and novelty rather than conformity to dominant codes (Minock; Muckelbauer; Purcell). Students copied and imitated famous poets and orators in order to develop their own distinctive voice, not to simply learn decorum and

---

[26] Rebecca Moore Howard's work on plagiarism in *Pluralizing Plagiarism* has contested narrow definitions of authorship in U.S. academic settings, particular in writing programs. Also see Caroline Eisner and Martha Vicinus' editing collection *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism*. I discuss Howard's historical explorations of authorship later in this section.

propriety as critics such as Knoblauch and Brannon and Miller have suggested. It was

through these exercises that orators in training developed a unique rhetorical dexterity,

the ability to see how different words and sentence patterns enabled different shades of

meaning, and the knowledge of how different situations and purposes required different

combinations of stylistic devices.

The key to understanding Roman imitation and style exercises lies not in looking

merely at what students imitate or produce, but *how* they reproduce. As John Muckelbaur

shows, Roman imitation takes three forms: repetition of the same, repetition of

difference, and inspiration. Even the first form, repetition of the same, conventionally

seen as alien to invention and an individual style, "must not only account for novelty, but

actually encourage it" by "conceiving of variation as an external supplement to imitation

proper, as a necessary complement to, or, in the most intriguing case, as a natural side-

effect of the reproductive force of imitation" (68). In short, the Roman rhetoricians

realized the impossibility of exact copies. The object of imitation passes through—

becomes ingested—by the student who imitates. The copy is always naturally different

from the original, just as any utterance—according to Bakhtin—always bears traces of its

source in another's words. Thus, discovery through imitation ties to both classical canons

of invention, finding the "available means," and style, employing language and figures

appropriate to the audience.[27]

Throughout *The Orator's Education*, Quintilian encourages the imitation of not

one model but several. By copying and imitating a range of models, the writer would "be

---

[27] For historical definitions of invention, see work by Janice Lauer. For historical definitions of all the
canons, including style, see George Kennedy's comprehensive histories.

a unique amalgam composed of different parts of the tradition" (Muckelbaur 75).

Muckelbaur quotes Seneca as another example, that "we should so blend those several

flavours into one delicious compound that, even though it betrays its origin, yet it

nevertheless is clearly different from that whence it came" (Seneca 84.6). Here, invention

arises naturally from stylistic imitation exercises, because students themselves ultimately

decide how to mesh the various authors, styles, and conventions they use as models.

Invention occurs through "an instinct to creatively recombine" and to "place bits of

language already in relation into new relation" (Hooley, "On Relations" 92). Therefore

stylistic novelty results from "multiplying" (75) the practice of imitation, by following

the Roman educational exhortation to develop many influences rather than one.

Discovery's view of style as involved in the invention process also occurs in a

more formal understanding of inspiration, which Muckelbaur contends "involves a very

definite and very real practice" (84) in contrast to its conception in process-based

pedagogies. For instance, Peter Elbow speaks of inspiration in *Writing Without Teachers*

as opposed to, and different from, an actual writing process. Elbow describes inspiration

as "a lucky mess, or as a disaster" and goes on to state that "When you start out trying to

write X and it comes out Y—and it happens quickly and you like Y—you are apt to call it

inspiration. . .an extreme case of the words, thoughts, and images cooking and growing

according to their own plan" (70). In this conception, inspiration has no definite source.

According to Elbow, it is unplanned and chaotic.

The understanding of inspiration that Muckelbaur is capturing is distinct from

Elbow's. And it is still different from the notion of inspiration by a Muse, as in the

beginning of the *Odyssey* or *Paradise Lost* in which the poet merely represents or relates stories from a deity. What Muckelbaur means by inspiration is a form of imitation in which the autonomous author meshes with the source of imitation. To be inspired by an author means, in a real sense, the loss of both the self and the model into a state of hyper-sensitivity involved in the desire to own or compete through imitation. In other words, classical inspiration here refers to the temporary identity transformation occurring when writers emulate or imitate their models. The process works both ways, changing the model through its reproduction. This understanding derives from the Platonic dialogue *Ion*, in which the poet Ion describes a state of possession marked by the entangling of his identity with Homer's when he recites the epics. The process of inspiration "transmits a force of self-overcoming that is neither Ion nor Homer, but the loss of both selves," and so "to be inspired by Homer does not mean to write like Homer or even to think like him" (Muckelbaur 86). It means to reach a state of rhetorical discovery in which the rhetor produces a work that is paradoxically an imitation of an earlier work and yet wholly new. As Longinus observes, imitation becomes the best and perhaps only way to enact the kind of inspiration that transforms both the self and the model.[28] Again, this is in contrast to the conception Elbow offers. In fact, as my next chapter discusses, he was highly critical of stylistic and imitation exercises proposed by scholars such as Corbett and D'Angelo because they stifled student's *individual* creativity.

In Book X of *The Orator's Education*, Quintilian outlines the dialogic purpose of imitation exercises in discovering one's individual voice when asserting that "I shall not.

---

[28] See "On the Sublime" in Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg's *The Rhetorical Tradition*.

. .advise a student to devote himself entirely to any particular author, so as to imitate him

in all respects" (10.2.22-26). Instead, students should imitate a range of authors in order

to draw from the strengths of each. In this sense, each rhetor's individual voice comes

into existence from appropriation of another's words. Quintilian illustrates this point

further when he writes, "what disadvantage would it be to assume, on some occasions,

the energy of Caesar, the asperity of Caelius, the accuracy of Pollio, the judgment of

Calvus?" (10.2.22-26). In this section he goes on to extol the benefits of imitating

multiple authors, developing a facility in style that enables the rhetor to deploy an

appropriate mixture of styles, channeling their influences for each situation in the legal,

political, familiar, and social occasions that comprised Roman life. In many ways, this

view anticipates Bakhtin's observations about the inherent heteroglossia of languages as

well as the connections between style, invention, and genre.

Thus teachers do not have to accept the conventional idea that classical rhetorics

necessitate a split between stylistic expression and meaning or that imitation assists only

in the development of surface-level correctness.[29] As William Purcell explains in his

account of the medieval rhetorician Gervasius of Mekley, Quintilian's successors also

synthesized invention and style. Purcell says of Gervasius' "*stasis* of style" that far from

seeing the two canons as calcified in a one-way process, "the inventional search for the

devices of style moves continually and systematically until it comes to rest on the device

---

[29] As numerous scholars have shown, classical rhetoric as a category breaks down into the distinct
approaches to rhetoric by the Sophists, Plato, Aristotle, Isocrates, Cicero, Quintilian, and so on. See work
by Susan Jarratt, John Poulakos, and George Kennedy.

that best suits the rhetor's purpose and the genre in which it is to be uttered" (90).[30] In

other words, Gervasius' work illustrates how subsequent generations of scholars have

read classical rhetorics and presented theories that unify style and invention, rather than

seeing style simply as an ornament of thought. As Purcell concludes, "[t]he merging of

stasis and figures clearly places stylistic composition as a strategic process of invention"

(90). Gervasius' work demonstrates the larger fact that stylistic amplifications of the

same enthymeme or opinion can change its meaning. All of this work suggests that

Romans understood very well that different stylistic choices alter the meaning and

perception of one's discourse. By developing a distinctive style, a rhetor became more

persuasive and also more versatile as he was able to choose stylistic devices appropriate

for different places and occasions.

Such understandings of style and imitation have been at odds with rhetoric and

composition pedagogies throughout much of the twentieth century. In *Standing in the*

Shadow of Giants, Rebecca Howard Moore narrates the evolution of the

mimesis/originality binary from antiquity through contemporary times with the aim to

destabilize the Western, capitalist conception of proprietary authorship in favor of one

that values imitation and collaboration. In classical times, as Moore observes along with

Muckelbaur, "imitation was not just a way of learning; it was a way of being" (62). For

the Greek orator, "Imitating classical writers merged his identity with theirs and elevated

the general tenor of his own times" (62). The idea of being "original" or "the primary

---

[30] Stasis theory is defined most explicitly by Cicero in *De Oratore*, where he outlines questions of conjecture, definition, quality, and policy. These were meant as invention devices to discovery avenues of argument on a given topic.

author" of a text existed, but not with the importance it did in the eighteenth centuries and onward. Moore also considers other cultures' orientation to authorship, such as Chinese writing traditions that "value a writer's ability to incorporate the words and ideas of canonical sources" without citing them explicitly, which would be "a crass insult to the readers' erudition" (118). Noting that "authorship in the West is once again changing, again beginning to value mimesis and collaboration," she asks "What about a Western composition curriculum that encouraged students to adopt the voices of authoritative texts, thus enlarging their stylistic and conceptual repertoires?" (119). In such a curriculum, patchwriting or "blending [one's] words and phrases with those of the source—with or without acknowledgment" would serve as one of many different strategies for students to adopt for their own writing.

Style, then, was about originality and the development of thought and not merely about the decoration of thought or conformity to existing norms. This understanding makes a discussion of style and the Greco-Roman exercises that developed stylistic dexterity not only conducive to positions on language difference but a possible means of advancing their goal of empowering students' expression of their voices and enhancing their metalinguistic awareness. Additionally, students categorized as monolingual native speakers of English would begin, during a first-year composition course, to develop more multilingual practices and awareness of language under the guidance of stylistic exercises that I introduce later in this chapter. Before describing specific adaptations of the *progymnasmata* for translingual teaching, however, it is necessary to make a stronger case for why the Greco-Roman tradition, in particular, is well-suited for developing such

translingual teaching practices and how the rhetorical framework of style—namely the four virtues of style—gives additional strategies for choosing the appropriate stylistic figures for given circumstances. In other words, Greco-Roman rhetoric not only provides the means of developing multilingual dexterity but also a means of deploying that dexterity effectively in different circumstances. The next section in this chapter draws on Bakhtin's theories of dialogue, heteroglossia, and speech genres in order to account for the everydayness of classical style. Thus Bakhtin is the bridge between translingual writing and the rich resources of Greco-Roman rhetorics.

Dialogue and Speech Genres

Even accepting that imitation generates the discovery of ideas and of voice and that style facilitates invention, skeptics may still object that the specific stylistic devices employed by rhetors during Cicero and Quintilian's eras have uncertain utility for contemporary times. In other words, how useful is it to teach students devices such as polysyndeton, alliteration, metonymy, or synecdoche? If we wish to help students code-mesh as Smitherman and Anzaldua do, then turning to stylistic figures from a seemingly monocultural, monolingual tradition such as Latin or Greek seems counterintuitive. In this section, I draw on Bakhtin's concepts of dialogue and speech genres in order to resituate these devices as common, everyday textual strategies that all writers can use regardless of their cultural or linguistic backgrounds. Because the concepts of dialogue and speech genres stem from Bakthin's broader conception of language as inherently heteroglossic and multivoiced, and as extension multilingual and multicultural, they are

well-suited to help understand Greco-Roman language practices in terms that are

conducive to a pedagogy of translingual writing.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Bakhtin describes language as inherently

polyglot, as consisting of a range of registers, vernaculars, and genres that intermingle or

interanimate one another. He argues, "[t]he utterance is filled with dialogic overtones. .

.our thought itself—philosophical, scientific, and artistic—is born and shaped in the

process of interaction and struggle with others' thought, and this cannot but be reflected

in the forms that verbally express our thought as well" ("Speech Genres" 92). Drawing

on Bakhtin, Don Bialostosky explores the extent to which the formal rhetorical figures of

thought and expression can be harnessed to analyze the works of authors who did not

receive formal stylistic training, either in contemporary periods or because they were

denied access to such education during the Greco-Roman eras:

> What implications do our answers to this last question [about the relevance of
> classical style to modern authors] have for criticism of writers of the past century
> or so who learned to write without reference to formal rhetorical training, or at
> least to formal rhetorical training linked to classical education? And to writers
> from all centuries, women, and others not given access to such formal training?
> To what extent have they, nonetheless, learned what we can call rhetorical moves,
> from their everyday availability, from study of earlier authors who were formally
> schooled in them, or from modern versions of rhetorical education conducted
> under other names? (224).

To answer these questions, Bialostosky conducts a brief re-reading of Quintilian's figures

of thought from a Bakhtinian perspective.[31] As he argues, "[i]f we use Bakthin's account

of speech genres to articulate a derivation of figures of thought from primary types of

---

[31] Bialostosky refers to and distinguishes his work from Fahnestock's previous efforts to understand figures
of thought and expression in terms of J.L. Austin's version of speech-act theory.

utterance, then the use of those 'figures' need not be a sign of knowledge of the art. The discursive moves to which the art has given technical names can be used by writers innocent of those names and innocent of the art itself" (224). In other words, rhetorical figures described by the ancient treatises are not artificial inventions but phenomena that occur naturally in all discourse, what Bakhtin names "the chain of speech communication" ("Speech Genres" 94). Thus a Bakhtinian framework for understanding stylistic moves in classical rhetoric emphasizes their everyday-ness and makes them available for describing any writer's style, including those who deviate from the classical prescriptions of pure Greek or Latin. Incorporating these devices into classroom instruction gives teachers and students a shared vocabulary for negotiating creative meshings of codes in writing. Furthermore, if students have access to this terminology, then they might be able to expedite their linguistic experimentation and avoid some of the grueling trial and error that precedes the development of an effective style.

Bakhtin's notion of speech genres enables this recasting of ancient rhetorical figures as everyday occurrences and, therefore, capable of accounting for work produced by writers not necessary considered as part of the Greco-Roman tradition. Bakhtin defines primary speech genres as types of simple speech acts such as commands, questions, and statements of fact that people express in everyday, ordinary circumstances. Secondary genres are complex sites of dialogic interaction that incorporate these simpler, primary genres. For example, secondary genres such as "scientific, business, political, military, and literary communication" appropriate primary speech genres in addition to genres that occur in written communication such as letters, diaries, and conversations

(222). In order to create texts in these more complex, secondary genres (e.g., novels), authors and speakers must deploy a range of stylistic strategies to integrate the other primary genres.[32] Bialostosky highlights the ancient terms that correspond to these strategies. For example, the various ways of appropriating another's word fall under the ancient rhetorical figure of *prosopopeia* or the "attribution of words to another of which quotation is a literal species" (222). Furthermore, figures of thought and expression such as *prosopopeia* add a performative layer to discourse, enriching a text's meaning by enacting that meaning. In contrast to a summary or paraphrase, the quotation literally performs the point an author wants to convey when introducing others' opinions into his or her own text. For example: "I echo Shakespeare when I say, 'To be or not to be…'" The use of the quotation performs the very act that I announce.

Bakhtin's secondary speech genres contain many such discursive moves described and defined by Quintilian as figures. As he states, "within the boundaries of his own utterance the speaker (or writer) raises questions, answers them himself, raises objections to his own ideas, responds to his own objections, and so on" (72). These moves occur in primary genres, but as Bakhtin goes on to say, "other secondary genres . . . also use various forms such as this to introduce primary speech genres and relations among them" (72-73). The stylistic moves that ancient rhetoricians honed and perfected, described by Quintilian in Book IX of *The Orator's Education*, thus occur naturally in

---

[32] Despite Bakhtin's reservations about rhetoric as monological, as opposed to the dialogic novel, his theories have informed much work in the field and has contributed to alternative readings of the classical tradition, and rhetoric more generally, as dialogical. See Kay Halasek's *A Pedagogy of Possibility* for foundational interpretations of Bakhtin through the lens of composition studies.

the intermingling of speech genres as speakers and writers evoke their opponents and audiences in their texts as if they were actually having conversation.

True, formal instruction in these stylistic devices has often sought the eradication of difference for the sake of eloquence, especially during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when American colleges, influenced by Scottish rhetoric, made style an integral part of literary taste and social mobility (Ferreira-Buckley and Horner; Horner). By contrast, a Bakhtinian understanding of Greco-Roman style and the *progymnasmata* stresses their use as tools available to all, for a range of purposes. Through this lens, we can see the precise terms and taxonomies in Greco-Roman rhetorical systems not as impositions onto other texts or writers from non-western cultures, but as tools for the study and teaching a range of discursive strategies that exist in everyday communication, including situations between speakers of different dialects and languages.

Although authors make their utterances distinct through particular stylistic figures and their manner of selecting and arranging primary genres, their decisions are always based on the "types of relations between the speaker and other participants in speech communication (listeners or readers, partners, the other's speech, and so forth)" (64). Genre accounts for these relations by organizing them into stabilized patterns that in turn aid the invention process. In classical terms, as Bawarshi has noted, the *topoi* served many of the same purposes to direct invention as genre does today. As Bawarshi argues, both genres and *topoi* are "the conceptual realms within which individuals recognize and experience situations at the same time as they are the rhetorical instruments by and through which individuals participate within and enact situations" (*Genre and Invention*

of the Writer 113). Rhetors used *topoi* that were specific to different rhetorical occasions—such as forensic, epideictic, and deliberative. Bawarshi sees genres as performing a similar role today. What writers argue and how they express their opinions is determined by whether they are producing an obituary, an opinion column, a blog post, a poem, or a speech.

While genre has played a prominent role in scholarship on second-language writing, it has not explicitly informed scholarship on language difference. I argue that Bakhtin's theory of genre, as I have applied it to classical rhetorics, offers a path forward. For instance, he points out that "not all genres are equally conducive to reflecting the individuality of the speaker in the language of the utterance, that is, to an individual style" (63). While artistic genres like the novel encourage creativity and individuality, other genres "require a standard form" (63), genres such as letters in business and legal communication. Historically, and particularly in the U.S., innovation in these genres is possible, but not encouraged. Thus attention to genre, or *decorum* in the Roman tradition, can help teachers and students study the possibilities of risks of performing language difference in various situation. Rather than attempting to realize such difference in all academic, professional, and socio-political spaces simultaneously, we can encourage students and colleagues to transform individual genres.

Historicizing Quintilian on Style

Roman oratorical practices, even as described by Quintilian, possess conceptions of language and communication that seem to go against the spirit of translingualism and require attention. Rather than ignore aspects of the Greco-Roman rhetorical tradition that

contradict my central argument, my aim in this section is to historicize and address these incongruities. In particular, this section provides a more nuanced view of Quintilian as well as Cicero, in order to argue that Roman rhetors did in fact deploy a form of code-meshing or code-switching in their discourse. Despite an account of classical style based on speech genres and dialogue, we still cannot ignore the socio-political circumstances that informed an undeniable anxiety in Greco-Roman treatises regarding "barbarisms," or the invasion of Greek and Latin by foreign words. Quintilian, especially, had little choice but to embrace the superiority of Latin over all other languages.[33] To dissent on an issue like this would have posed significant political risks given attitudes about Rome's place in the world. As J.N. Adams observes in *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, even Cicero was once chastised for using Greek when addressing the senate at Syracuse (309). Greek, the language most likely studied in Rome in addition to Latin, was in fact reserved for private correspondence in letters and intimate conversations because only pure Latin was seen as appropriate for public discourse. As Adams notes, "If one were not on close terms with the addressee of one's letter, or if alternatively the subject of the letter were highly serious and the tone formal, one would inevitably use the 'public' language, that is Latin without any (or much) code-switching" (309). In fact, as my later discussion of Cicero's letters will show, the presence of such code-switching suggests that whereas Roman culture possessed a kind of linguistic xenophobia, Roman style itself did not. It was simply a matter of whether code-switching was appropriate for the particular genre

---

[33] My reading of The Orator's Education is based in part on George Kennedy's *Quintilian*, which provides a very basic outline of Quintilian's theories on style.

and occasion. In letters written to certain audiences, it was permitted. In public speeches, it was not.

Language and dominance went hand in hand in the Roman Empire, because communication was heavily invested with politics and authority. As Laura Pernot observes, "The two verbs meaning 'to speak' in Latin, *fari* and *dicere*, belong to two strong roots (*fatum,* fate) and (*deik, dike*, justice)" (85). For the Romans, language itself did not mean to communicate on an equal footing with others but "to decree, foretell, or promulgate rules" and "[w]hen poorly used, it [was] dangerous, creating deadly innovations. That is why communication, especially that which takes place in the public space, [was] regulated, controlled, subordinated" (85). Roman culture valued linguistic purity so strongly that its "corruption was also thought to be part and parcel of moral vice" (Kirchner 291). The Romans saw Latin as the difference between humans and all other forms of life—including slaves.

Quintilian does indeed advise orators and writers against barbarisms, which fall into three kinds: when the author 1) "inserts an African or Spanish term in Latin composition" (1.4.8); or 2) is "said to have spoken like a barbarian" by making threatening or cruel remarks (1.4.9); or 3) is guilty of "adding a letter or syllable to any word he pleases, or taking one away, or substituting one for another, or putting one in place where it is not right for it to be" (1.4.10). These passages support readings of ancient rhetoricians as highly intolerant of difference and experimentation. However, to stop here risks a limited and acontextual reading of Quintilian. Much later, Quintilian

expounds on the *political* (not moral) necessity of pure Latin when recounting an

anecdote in which an

> Athenian old woman called Theophrastus, a man otherwise of great eloquence, a
> stranger, from observing his affected use of a single word, and being questioned
> on the subject, replied that she had discovered him to be a foreigner only from his
> speaking in a manner to Attic. (8.1.2)

In fourth-century Greece, when Theophrastus lived, power and influence depended on the

ability to show oneself a native and patriot, if not by hereditary citizenship then at least

through eloquence. Quintilian draws from this story the lesson that one's language should

"declare us to be natives of this city [Rome]" and "that our speech may appear truly

Roman, and not merely to have been admitted into citizenship" (8.1.3). Himself a

foreigner from Spain, Quintilian appears to address the political necessity of embracing

the host culture and of blending in to partake as fully as possible in the prestige of

citizenship. Yet even in his concessions, he speaks back to that homogeneity and

language privilege.

Despite contemporary understandings of Quintilian as an opponent of rhetorical

innovations (Lopez 2010), his work frequently appears to resist standard forms in a

variety of ways. Throughout the chapters on style in *The Orator's Education*, typically

read as ultra-conservative, Quintilian refers to the unfortunate consequences of Rome's

Latin Only policy. For example, he speaks almost favorably of the Greek language's

openness to new words, stating that "[m]any new words are formed on Greek models"

and that "I see no reason why we should spurn these, except that we are unreasonable

critics of ourselves, and consequently suffer from poverty of language" (8.3.33). He

returns to this notion of Latin's poverty when complaining that the stylistic device *onomatopoeia*, regarded "as one of the major virtues by the Greeks," is nonetheless "hardly allowed us at all" (8.6.31). Specifically, speakers of Latin "do not venture to generate any words ourselves, though many old coinages are daily dying out" (8.6.32). Here Quintilian departs somewhat radically from an endorsement of Latin Only, anticipating Bakhtin's theories on the evolution of language when he notes twice the poverty of Latin's linguistic resources. Not only does he critique the size of Latin's lexicon, but he attributes it to the very *Latinitas* that Romans prided themselves on. Such statements on style suggest that Quintilian's rhetorical system itself may have been open to linguistic innovation through multilingual practices, though he knew his own readers would have little use for these methods in their particular socio-political circumstances.

Elsewhere, Quintilian subtly resists universal rules and encourages attention to contingency. As early as Book II, he advises rhetors that "if expediency shall suggest anything at variance with [rules], we shall have to follow it, deserting the authority of teachers" (2.8. 7). This advice is followed by another assertion that "it is frequently expedient, and sometimes becoming, to make some deviations from the regular and settled order" (2.8.9) and yet another assertion that rhetorical figures can "depart in some degree from the right line, and exhibit the merit of deviation from common practice" (2.8. 11). Also, Quintilian did not oppose "barbarisms" in all occasions. As he says later in Book I after denouncing them, "Ennius, when committing a like double fault" to Tinca of Placentia's transposition of a Latin word, "is defended on the ground of poetic license" (1.4.12). In fact, immediately following his discussion of propriety and pure Latin in

Book VIII, Quintilian goes on to suggest that "a word which is not proper will not necessarily be chargeable with the fault of impropriety" because "there are many things, both in Greek and Latin, that have no proper term" (8.2.4). For example, no Latin term exists for hurling a lance as opposed to a javelin or for throwing clods rather than stones. Quintilian goes on to point out that "[m]etaphor, too, in which much of the ornament of speech consists, applies words to things to which they do not properly belong" (8.2.1). As he concludes, "[h]ence the propriety of which we are speaking relates not to a word absolutely, but to the sense in which it is used" (8.2.6). Thus, Quintilian suggests that even the purity of Latin could benefit from expansion of its language in order to better represent current ideas and experiences.

Even where Quintilian advises against the use of archaic words, he nonetheless concedes that "such expressions must either be avoided. . .or must be explained" (8.2.12). Thus he gives authors the freedom, at least, to use alternative words and phrases when they feel they can justify such deviations. He gives the example of the word *Taurus*, which "cannot be understood, unless it be specified whether it signifies a mountain, a constellation in the heaves, the name of a man, or the root of a tree" (8.2.13). The author in this case need not abandon the word *Taurus* but must contextualize it in the text for the sake of specificity. Similar notions arise about ambiguity in which "the speaker would have put his words badly together," illustrated by extreme cases where "a teacher in his day exhorted his scholars to obscure what they said and maintained that "[s]o much the better; even I myself cannot understand it" (8.2.8). As these passages indicate, Quintilian objects to stylistic deviations only when they pose direct obstacles to communication or

jeopardize one's socio-political status. In situations where creative license can excuse

deviations, or when expediency supersedes propriety, then the rules no longer apply.

Discovery displaces conventionality. Additionally, these passages at least call into

question whether Quintilian himself would have insisted on the use of Pure Latin if his

socio-political circumstances did not necessitate it.

Studying the complex uses of "code-switching" (309) in the letters of Cicero, J.N.

Adams finds that the blending of Greek and Latin served a variety of purposes that

support a view of style as inventive in the sense that it conveys meaning. Cicero's

multilingualism has particular social motivations that are worth noting for the sake of

recuperating Roman style for translingual writing. For Cicero and his contemporaries,

code-switching was a way of both asserting one's own social status as well as

recognizing that of others, since only "a self-conscious ruling elite" (312) would have

enjoyed the privilege of instruction in Latin and Greek.[34] According to Adams, Cicero

indeed switched into Greek both to assert his mastery of Greek philosophy but also in

order to accommodate the addressee of his letters. For instance, a letter from Cicero to

Varro "has social intention, in that it is meant to flatter Varro for his philosophical

expertise" (316) by integrating passages from Greek into his prose without translation,

and thereby acknowledging that Varro was well-educated enough to translate for himself.

This type of code-switching occurs throughout Cicero's letters, especially those to

Atticus.

---

[34] As Adams notes in an earlier chapter, a less sophisticated code-switching occurred in the writings of those of lower social status, such as Greek immigrants and slaves who reverted to their first language when lacking the Latin vocabulary or grammar to communicate.

Code-switching also served another important purpose in Roman letter writing, to perform what Adams refers to as emotional "distancing" (332) and euphemism, as when referring to bodily acts such as bathing or, in the case of one letter Cicero wrote to his wife Terentia, the "vomiting of undiluted bile" in order to "spare her sensibilities" (332). In addition to describing physically or emotionally unpleasant acts, code-switching also had the effect of softening criticism. Adams notes that criticism "might be rendered more polite by a switching into Greek," evidenced in letters between Cicero, Varro, and Caesar (332). Ironically, however, such code-switching was regarded as inappropriate for more serious situations. For Adams, this is indicated by the complete absence of code-switching in Cicero's letters during the "period of gathering crisis" that led to his exile in 58 B.C.E. Here "Cicero avoids code-switching entirely," although "within a month of his return to Rome he is falling back into his old ways" (343). Additionally, the death of Cicero's daughter Tullia in 45 B.C.E. brings about a similar cessation of code-switching. Adams gives a detailed count of the number of Greek words Cicero used in his letters during this period, dropping to nearly zero the week following Tullia's death but gradually increasing back to its usual thirty to forty per ten pages over the course of six months (334).

The evidence that Cicero code-switched for different purposes on different occasions with different audiences, and the fact that he used Latin-only for other purposes and occasions, shows that Roman rhetorical style does possess a complex view of language and codes as performative and open not only to experimentation but the very code-meshing that many rhetoric and composition scholars see as vital to college writing

instruction today. It is true that Cicero and Quintilian both are products of their time, in which ethnocentricity and phallocentrism went largely unquestioned. However, the system of rhetorical education itself demonstrates a strong enough sensitivity to the dynamics of style, invention, and languages to make it relevant for contemporary conversations about multilingualism and transnationalism.

Finally, Adams recognizes that code-switching between Greek and Latin also entailed a certain social risk, given that Romans "could not view Greek in neutral terms as merely another language, but associated it with the long-standing Greek cultural superiority" (322). Thus "To some educated Romans a switch into Greek might smack of cultural subservience, whereas to others it might display as assured mastery of an admired language (and culture)" (322). This complexity further demonstrates that a genuine attention to style was meant to prepare Roman citizens for more than simple conformity to a standard code, or to add flourishes to a speech or letter whose content was determined before any attention to individual word choice. Adams' analysis shows that Romans were highly aware that choosing between one language or code and another conveyed different meanings to different addressees and audiences.

This understanding of Roman code-switching also shows that even the Romans, who publically considered themselves superior to other cultures in every way, could not extricate themselves from the sociolinguistic realities that Bakhtin sees as affecting all language users. As I have quoted Bakthin earlier, "not all genres are equally conducive to reflecting the individuality of the speaker in the language of the utterance, that is, to an individual style" (63). Cicero's letters demonstrate this perfectly. Romans viewed letters

sent between friends and family as an appropriate genre for code-switching between Latin and Greek for purposes such as emotional distancing, humor, softening criticism, and flattery. However, in public occasions and formal communication Romans expected one another to use pure Latin. They understood this fact that certain situations and genres—though they would not have used this specific term—tolerated different levels of individual style and creativity.

In this sense, Roman code-switching is not so different from the decisions that multi-voiced students must make in the twenty-first century regarding the consequences of using words from their various languages or varieties of English in different professional, academic, and social contexts. Although a translingual writing pedagogy, as I have defined it, would not seek the replication of social hierarchies that existed regarding Greek language in the Roman world, this awareness of style and language as performative does situate Roman rhetorical theory for adaptation. In short, teachers and students would not be conforming to Roman rhetorical ideals so much as appropriating them for their own purposes.

Ornament as Difference: Rethinking the Four Virtues

The previous sections have addressed critiques of Greco-Roman rhetoric and analyzed stylistic devices through Bakhtin's concept of speech genres in order to advocate for the use of classical writing exercises in a translingual writing pedagogy. Ever since scholars such as Miller, Knoblauch and Brannon, and Halloran have explicitly dismissed classical rhetoric's usefulness for contemporary writing instruction, contemporary scholars promoting multilingualism have remained skeptical of any

framework—including classical rhetoric—that appears to privilege the notion of one linguistic form, such as Standard English, over other languages and varieties of English. Scholars such as Lu, Horner, Trimbur, and Canagarajah who have argued most adamantly for translingual writing instruction raise objections to the same emphasis on correctness in writing pedagogies that earlier critics such as Miller found to be dominant in the works of Greek and Roman rhetoricians—especially Quintilian.

As I continue to argue in this section, such skepticism of the Greco-Roman tradition is misplaced. This chapter's alternative reading of Quintilian's *The Orator's Education* now extends to the four broader aspects of style, known as the four virtues. Topics that scholars in support of language difference refer to in terms of code-meshing or code-switching, classical rhetoricians discussed in terms of the four virtues. Here I will define and interpret the four virtues—correct usage (*latinitas*), clarity (*perspicuitas*), ornament (*dignitas*), and appropriateness (*decorum*)—in terms of language difference in order to recuperate them for assistance in helping students determine when, where, and how to blend different codes for a range of purposes. I emphasize that ornament, the virtue that contains the use of individual figures of thought and expression, enjoyed an elevated position in Roman rhetorical systems—a fact which creates space for creative license in a variety of occasions. If ornament enjoys a privileged status over clarity, then writers can use it both to choose their genres as well as to innovate genres when they can determine (and be prepared to justify) the appropriateness of doing so.

For the Romans, effectiveness mattered more than mere correctness. Effectiveness is also the central goal of translingual writing even as it transforms and

expands the privileged language. Although the virtues of correct usage and clarity appear to pose significant obstacles to the appreciation of linguistic difference and experimentation, they are kept in check by the other two virtues of appropriateness and ornament. Because "the virtue of ornament [*dignitas*] surpasses those of *Latinitas* and *perspicuitas*" in Roman rhetoric (Kirchner 183), variation and difference arguably become the rhetorician's chief concern. In this sense, we can define correctness merely as what functioned as appropriate most of the time—in contrast to the virtue of *decorum*, which defined what was appropriate at a single time. What passes as appropriate changes according to time and place, and therefore correctness becomes relative—even in the Roman rhetorical system. As the last section discussed, Quintilian's case against barbarisms and solecisms (1.5-7 and 8.1.2-3.), anticipated by Cicero (see *De Oratore* 3. 3.38-48), spoke to particular socio-historical circumstances about what counted as correct—namely, sounding like a native citizen. Tempering this kind of standardization, however, both Cicero and Quintilian maintained that ornament, or uniqueness, mattered the most in rhetorical expression. In fact, Quintilian went so far as to proclaim that "[i]f one always uses the same figures and word order, one will offend against the rule of variety" (8.3.41).

For the sake of illustration, consider Holcomb and Killingsworth's discussion of the rhetorical device known as anastrophe (inversion of syntax). In anastrophe, a sentence such as "A wooden silence comes in response" is inverted to state, "In response comes a wooden silence" (117). Another example of anastrophe might be the popular saying "Something wicked this way comes," first uttered in Act IV scene I of Shakespeare's

"Macbeth." As Holcomb and Killingsworth state, such "Departures from conventional or usual word order are, by themselves, invitations enough for readers to pause," at which point the inversion conveys meaning by "highlight[ing] important words" (118).

Anastrophe is a stylistic device, but it has inventional qualities that show the role of style in the invention process. In the process of using such a device, a writer becomes aware of word order and thus which words he or she wants to direct readers toward. This necessitates thought (invention) about which words are the most important. In turn, the writer also engages in a process of thinking about what ideas signaled by these words are central to his or her main rhetorical agenda. In this sense, such an allegedly simple act of determining word order actually has the potential to inspire a rethinking of one's views in the first place. This corresponds to at least one issue of style that many writing teachers still employ: the difference between active and passive voice, which is ultimately a question of word order. Understanding the difference between a statement like "I was fired by the state government" and "the state government fired me" in a paper has possible implications for the writer's conception of agency (related to ethos) as well as whether the hypothetical paper should be about the state government's short comings or the writer's own personal struggles. Many writers, including myself, can attest to how pausing over a simple arrangement of words in a sentence can lead to radical reorientations of a research project.

These classical stylistic devices are indeed useful for classrooms seeking to develop multilingual style and metalinguistic awareness. When Min-Zhan Lu narrates a Malaysian student's struggle to combine the phrases "can" and "be able to" for complex

rhetorical purposes ("Professing" 452), she is very nearly discussing what classical rhetoricians would call anthimeria, or the substitution of one part of speech for another (Holcomb and Killingsworth 103). In terms of classical rhetoric, this student is searching for a way to integrate parts of speech from two different languages in order to express an idea that she cannot articulate in English. This idea is that someone might have the personal mental and physical capabilities to do something, but that external circumstances make it impossible.

In the student's native language, Chinese, the "translation for both 'can' and 'be able to' is the same" (451). Moreover, Lu says that "Most of the students I have encountered" also "tend to see 'can' as interchangeable with 'be able to'" in English (451). However, the Malaysian student sees the phrase "I can" and "I'm able to" as different, and she wrestles with primary and secondary definitions of these words in English dictionaries, as well as their Chinese translations, because she wishes to find a phrase that conveys this distinction. Lu explains in greater detail why the student sees the need to use both "can" and "able to in the same phrase. The reasons include "the attitude towards 'ability' promoted in the particular neighborhood in Malaysia where she grew up" as well as "her difficulties persuading her parents to let her rather than only their sons go abroad for college" (454). In short, the student encounters a conflict between the word "can," which for her refers to external circumstances, and the ability assumed in a phrase like "be able to," which involves personal attributes. Unlike the other monolingual students that Lu describes, the Malaysian student believes she needs both phrases to describe someone having both the personal ability and the external permission. To put it

very bluntly, the student means to suggest a difference between someone who is physically or mentally handicapped versus someone simply broke or out of luck.

Here, style and invention are both operating in discovery. The Malaysian student's thought process in this case is moving back and forth between sentence-level concerns and the larger rhetorical agenda of conveying worldviews informed by prior experiences. The inevitable decision to use "can able to" is indeed using the classical device of anthimeria by substituting one part of speech with one of her own invention. It is also important to acknowledge that here this student is also enacting the theory of translingual writing I have articulated in the first chapter of this book: the expansion of a given language's linguistic resources in order to convey new ideas. This student investigated English through the use of dictionaries, and used the language in an inventive way based on her knowledge of both Chinese and English.

Here I would like to re-emphasize that what I have been proposing does not challenge the methods that Lu and others have described in prior scholarship. Instead, what I am expressing is the need for a system, informed by classical rhetoric, that allows teachers to replicate these practices and helps students achieve more multilingual, metalinguistic awareness. Understanding the "can able to" structure as the adaptation of anthimeria suggests that the hundreds of other such devices in the Greco-Roman corpus can offer students a variety of tools with which they can experiment with English and other languages when writing. Furthermore, it is often the case that monolingual native speakers of English also struggle, in their movement between invention and style, to adjust their ideas and words to each other. Although stylistic devices alone can help them

at least somewhat in this regard, a pedagogy of translingual writing would encourage them to tap their knowledge of other languages and varieties of English—however expansive or minimal—in this process. A native English speaker who possesses some familiarity with Spanish, or AAVE, may draw on both as resources to help generate and convey ideas.

My reading of Lu's essay demonstrates that ornament and appropriateness account for deviation in a manner similar to the principles of language difference. Not only did Roman rhetoric address the importance of variation, but "the system employed by ancient grammarians and rhetoricians to describe barbarisms was also applied to figures" (Kirchner 185), which means that ornament and creative license permit the author to decide for him or herself when and what deviations seem necessary or expedient. This means that the stylistic devices and exercises, even by Roman rhetorical principles, would not try to stamp out difference but simply ensure that it is used at the opportune place and time. This explains why, nearly two thousand years after Quintilian's time, a device such as anthimeria can provide an account for the linguistic choices of a multilingual writer.

Just as uses of code-meshing intend to create alternative meanings through their deviations from standard forms, so too do the figures of thought. The virtue of ornament contains all Greco-Roman stylistic devices. They fall into two categories, figures of expression (*lexis*) and figures of thought (*dianoia* or *sententiae*). The figures of thought particularly reflect the fusion of invention and style discussed earlier, because they are performative, meaning they provide "ways to address. . .[one's] audience and to arrange.

. .[one's] thoughts" (Kirchner 189). Whereas figures of expression merely enhance meaning through artful use of words and grammar, figures of thought make meaning to "produce a change in thought" (9.1.16) by making meaning outside of the literal interpretation. For example, Quintilian includes maxims (succinct universalism) in his list (8.5.25).[35] The phrase "a bird in hand is worth two in the bush" conveys a metaphorical meaning but it also conveys meaning in its simple existence as a metaphor rather than a literal statement such as "Be pleased with what you have rather take unnecessary risks." The figure of thought performs its own meaning by illustrating a situation to which the maxim applies. The Roman system possessed hundreds of these figures, many of them borrowed from Gorgias and Isocrates in the Greek tradition, and catalogued in the following treatises: Rutilius Lups' *Schemata Lexeos*; Aquila Romanus *De Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis*, and Alexander Numeniu's *On Figures*.

Supported by Bialostosky's understanding of classical style through Bakhtin as a means of integrating multiple genres for everyday communication as well as special occasions, this chapter's perspective on Greco-Roman rhetoric reveals it as more conducive to the advancement of multilingualism than contemporary scholarship has explicitly recognized. Many figures of thought exist in the Greco-Roman tradition that offer rhetorical possibilities for multilingual writing, though Quintilian limits his discussion in Book IX of *The Orator's Education* to a handful: prolepsis, doubt, communication or pretense of consultation with the audience, permission, modes of simulation, personification, parody, fictions of persons, apostrophe, narration and

---

[35] Kirchner notes that Aristotle differed from Quintilian on the point of maxims, including them as a kind of proof (2.21.1).

description, irony, aposiopesis, imitation of others' manners, and emphasis. As Bialostosky has discussed, these figures all possess a dialogic nature because they all involve the appropriation of others' words into one's own discourse or, conversely, they highlight the active relationship between speaker and audience where the rhetor actively anticipates and responds to an audience or opponent's questions and objections. Thus the figures of thought always prompt a speaker or writer to think and communicate dialogically. Because these classical stylistic devices facilitate dialogue, they can be used to blend varieties of English and other languages even if rhetoricians such as Quintilian were cautious of, though not opposed to, multilingualism. (The last section of this chapter illustrates specific figures of thought in the context of exercises from the *progymnasmata*.)

Moreover, the understanding of style as tied to genre and circumstance offers an additional guide that teachers can introduce to students who are learning how to weave many linguistic codes into a single piece of writing. Contemporary scholarship on language difference and code-meshing, as represented in particular in the work of Young and Canagarajah, makes few clear statements about what particular aims code-meshing accomplishes in different rhetorical occasions. Conversely, the Greco-Roman virtue of *decorum* (appropriateness) helped ancient orators determine exactly when and how to deploy ornament. Cicero's *De Oratore* (3.2.10) identifies four factors to consider when deciding what is appropriate: the type of speech or genre (*causa*); the audience (*auditor*);

the author (*persona*); and the surrounding circumstances (*tempus*),[36] and these four major

factors have remained central to twentieth-century adaptations of ancient rhetoric. As

Quintilian indicates, ultimately orators could choose to use a plain, middle, or grand style

depending on the degree of ornament they considered appropriate for the genre (forensic,

epideictic, deliberate) and occasion (Quintilian 6.1). Quintilian elaborates further on the

importance of appropriateness in Book VIII when he outlines the degree of stylistic

innovation appropriate for the senate, popular assembly, public court cases, and private

litigation. Summing his views up bluntly, he asks, "Would you not blush to claim

repayment of a loan in formal periods, to show deep feeling on the subject of a water

gutter, or to work yourself up into a sweat over the return of a defective slave?" (8.3.15).

One may think of the framework I propose here in light of my earlier reference to

Gerald Graff's popular writing handbook, *They Say/I Say*. Whereas Graff offers

templates demonstrating the typical moves of academic discourse that students first learn

to imitate on their path to crafting their own voices, this chapter is articulating how the

Greco-Roman tradition possesses similar guidance for translingual writing and in

particular the practice of code-meshing. As students learn to compose in multiple codes,

teachers can introduce the four virtues of style during class discussions in order to attune

novice writers to the complex interplay between the desire for creative and unique

expression (*ornatus*), on the one hand, and the need to be clear (*perspicuitas*) as well as

appropriate (*decorum*) on the other. Of course, many teachers already focus on the

---

[36] This model does bear some similarity to Matsuda's framework in *TESOL Quarterly*, though he still leaves teachers with much to work out regarding its implementation in their practices, aside from the individual conference.

general need to balance creative expression with the need for clarity. However, what the classical tradition offers is a wealth of stylistic resources (e.g., tropes, figures, schemes) and exercises such as the *progymnasmata* for students to actually achieve this balance in accordance with the four virtues. In particular, my own reading of Roman Rhetoric is intended to harness these devices and exercises for helping students develop a multilingual, metalinguistic awareness.

Thus whenever a student considers the use of two or more linguistic codes within a single text, he or she will be prompted to balance the benefit of creative expression with the degree of stylistic invention (figures of thought and expression) afforded by the given occasion. Although scholarship on language difference and translingual writing has consistently made a compelling case against the dominance of correctness (*latinitas*), this argument has tended to come at the expense of a pedagogy grounded in the practical recognition of the constraints that genres place on the writer's discovery through invention and style, through the intersection of ideas, language, and creative expression.

Adapting the *Progymnasmata* to Develop Translingual Style

Opening translingual writing to the Greco-Roman tradition means that students will have a ready supply of stylistic devices to deploy, making the actual practice of code-meshing more manageable. As Bialostosky's use of Bakhtin's concepts of primary and secondary speech genres suggests, these classical devices already occur in human discourse, as the means by which we appropriate the expressions of others in the process of articulating of our own ideas. If studied and practiced, students can harness these devices in order to maximize their rhetorical effectiveness when they perform

translingual writing—which, when defined in terms of Bakhtin's concepts of dialogized

heteroglossia and speech genres, is an organic act of meaning-making that is central to

the function of language itself. To varying degrees, all writing is translingual and all

languages have an inherent capacity to expand and evolve as their individual users

integrate and test their boundaries. Teachers can present classical conceptions of style

and invention as a means to individual discovery, embodied in frameworks such as the

progynmasmata and the four virtues, as tools to help students practice and perfect the

dialogic acts of language, blending languages, dialects, and genres rather than rehearsing

and perpetuating the norms of dominant codes like Standard English.

In this section I show how an adapted *progymnasmata* assists in the development

of sentence-level, multilingual teaching practices that have surfaced only rarely in

scholarship on language difference, enabling students to work their way up to the level of

stylistically sophisticated students evoked in the work of Lu and Canagarajah. These

exercises are not intended to supplant or displace written feedback on student writing.

Instead, these exercises work *alongside* such feedback as well as more conventional

mini-lessons on grammar and style that aim at the acquisition of academic discourse. The

benefit to students is an awareness of how they can use nonstandard varieties of English

and their own languages in addition to forms of Standard English and academic

discourse. In my own teaching, I have begun to integrate these exercises and have

witnessed their ability to facilitate the interanimation of dialects and languages that

Bakhtin describes as a natural part of discourse. One of the *progymnasmata* I have used is

the elaboration of a proverb or maxim, in which students briefly introduce a maxim,

explain its meaning, and illustrate it with an example from either experience or works of literature. In the Greco-Roman tradition, these maxims were always taken from the student's own culture and language. Because only the white, male elites of these cultures were allowed to learn or practice rhetoric, the exercise tended to reinforce monoculturalism. By contrast, when I ask my own second-language students to elaborate and present on maxims from their own languages and cultures, they must translate them into English for an international audience.

For example, in the process of producing their elaborations of maxims such as the Spanish saying "Those who sleep with children wake up pissed," students first share their maxims with the entire class. We then deliberate together the various ways of *paraphrasis*—of phrasing, rephrasing, and explaining those maxims for an international audience. In contrast to the largely homogenous audiences of Greek and Roman assemblies and senates, the immediate audience of the classroom is composed of a wide range of nationalities and cultures: Arabic, Icelandic, German, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Spanish, Latin American, and North American. Because each student responds to each maxim through the filter of his or her own linguistic backgrounds, their elaborations of maxims constitute an especially transnational or translingual dialogue.

Other teachers and scholars might select some of these figures for use in multilingual classrooms and present them to their classes for exercises. In turn, they might also pull stylistic figures and techniques from other cultures' rhetorical systems and ask students to blend them in short exercises or more in-depth projects. Such adaptations and exercises would prompt students to draw either on their non-English

languages or non-Standard vernaculars for source material. For example, every culture

possesses unique maxims that students can incorporate into their writing or even rephrase

through other figures. For instance, they might rewrite a maxim as a rhetorical question.

When incorporating maxims in other languages or vernaculars, students would consider

how to translate them as well as which words and idiomatic expressions would have a

greater rhetorical impact if left in their original languages, translated in parentheses or

footnotes or perhaps only implicitly through the use of other rhetorical strategies, as when

Anzaldua uses repetition of words and phrases to provide non-Spanish speakers with

implicit or impressionistic meanings of Spanish words.

      The benefits of this exercise are significant. First, as empirical studies of

sentence-combining during the 1970s and 1980s indicated, students do acquire an

enhanced ability to construct sentences, and the frequency of surface-level errors

decreases (O'Hare; Combs; Morenberg, Daiker, and Kerek). Second, students become

aware of how using two or more languages or dialects when writing helps generate ideas.

My students and I expand our own discursive resources as we develop a storehouse of

new maxims to communicate in cross-cultural settings. Maxims such as "Those who

sleep with children wake up pissed," adapted to say something like "Dating drama queens

and kings is like staying up all night with wailing babies," offer new ways of conveying

ideas and experiences in our personal, academic, and social circumstances. Though such

maxims originate from various national languages and cultures, the exercise democratizes

them and makes them available and meaningful to everyone for use. In Bakhtin's sense

of the utterance, these maxims become co-owned and they illustrate the inherent ability

of languages and dialects to evolve through their interaction with one another.

These short exercises are ideal for introducing the particular stylistic devices that

can be useful in translingual writing. For instance, teachers can introduce devices such as

metonymy, defined as "substituting a thing with a closely associated or contiguous thing"

(Holcomb and Killingsworth 103), or antonomasia, defined as "substituting a descriptive

word or phrase for a proper noun, or using a proper noun as a generic label" (103). When

Roman rhetors code-switched, as Cicero did when writing letters to friends and family,

they frequently employed these kinds of substitutions of Greek words for Latin ones to

achieve various purposes that included emotional distancing, flattery, softening, and

humor. In a multilingual context, students would substitute words from other languages

of their own choosing into English with the understanding that they still need to make

these code-meshed texts accessible to other readers. Whether analyzing Smitherman or

Anzaldua, it is evident that writers using two or more codes make frequent use of both

strategies. For instance, Anzaldua begins her essay "Towards a New Consciousness" with

such substitutions:

> Jose Vasconcelos, Mexican philosopher, envisaged *una raza mestiza, una mezcla de razas afines, una raza de color—la primera raza sintesis del globo.* He called it a cosmic race, *la raza cosmica*, a fifth race embracing the four major races of the world. . .his theory is one of inclusivity. (100)

These substitutions are carefully structured so that even non-Spanish speakers can rely on

Anzaldua's accompanying uses of other stylistic strategies, such as parallelism or

"grammatically equivalent items (words, phrases, or clauses) in coordinated pairs or

series)" to deduce a level of meaning from the text (Holcomb and Killingsworth 124). This meaning may not be literal, but it is still approximate. Throughout her work, readers find that Spanish words used in one part of a sentence are balanced by approximate English substitutions elsewhere in the same sentence.

When my students engage in these *progymnasmata*, they are gaining exposure to the devices that constitute rhetorically effective writing in multiple situations. They are learning to use them not merely for the acquisition of academic discourse, although that is part of the goal. The larger goal is to give them these tools to draw on in times of struggle, when they are trying to generate and convey ideas that come to them from languages that are not the language of Standard English or academic discourse. These tools, which they experiment with through the completion of these shorter exercises, provide them a way to mesh the various codes in which they think and write. To this end, I now present three exercises adapted from the *progymnasmata* that teachers can use to help students begin to develop the multilingual, metalinguistic awareness that translingual writing calls for. The first is *maxim*, the second *ethopoeia,* the third *echphrasis*.

Maxim

Mirroring my earlier discussion of maxims, teachers can present a passage from Anzaldua's *Borderlands* or another work and then guide their students through the production and elaboration of a similar maxim. For example, consider a passage where Anzaldua writes:

> *En boca cerrada no entran moscas.* "Flies don't enter a closed mouth" is a saying I kept hearing when I was a child. *Ser habladora* was to be a gossip and a liar, to talk too much. *Muchachitas bien criadas*, well-bred girls don't answer back. *Es una falta de respeto* to talk back to one's mother or father (42).

In the first step, teachers may discuss with students how Anzaldua quotes this maxim from Spanish in order to work *against* its alleged wisdom and show how it was used to silence young women. Teachers can then ask students to find a proverb or maxim from a language they have studied or a vernacular they are familiar with and free-write for 5-10 minutes on its relevance to their personal life experiences. Afterward, they would use these experiences to write a paragraph that either praises or critiques the wisdom of the saying and its author. Following the description of this exercise in classical handbooks of *progymnasmata*, they would then paraphrase the meaning of the maxim, as Anzaldua has done above, and then give 2-3 reasons to support or resist its implications.

The next step in this exercise requires students to then introduce an analogy. For example, a saying similar to "Flies don't enter a closed mouth" in English vernacular is "It's better to remain quiet and be thought a fool than to open one's mouth and remove all doubt." This step in particular can lead to class discussions about why it is significant that multiple cultures have maxims with similar meanings. Finally, this particular exercise requires students to give an example of the maxim. As Anzaldua illustrates her own experiences with the maxim above, students can use brief stories they have heard or read about to make this proverb more vivid.

When they complete this short exercise, students can ultimately share their elaborated maxims with one another for the purposes of peer critique, either in class or

through an online discussion board or wiki. Teachers might require students to read and respond to several of their peers' elaborations, thereby exposing them to many of the inventive uses of meaning and language that occur through the completion of the exercise. These short compositions also present excellent opportunities for students to take risks with various figures of thought and expression, using them to fulfill the six different steps. Incorporating several such exercises into a writing class introduces language difference and translingual practices to students as an active process. Through these exercises, students learn not only how to analyze and appreciate language difference, but also how to produce it—testing and expanding the available resources of their own language abilities to generate new meaning.

Ethopoeia

This exercise is defined as "an imitation of the character of a person supposed to be speaking," such as when a student writes a composition imagining what Andromache would say to Hector (Hermogenes 84). It is particularly conducive to translingual writing because the main goal is to "preserve what is distinctive and appropriate to the persons imagined as speaking and to the occasions; for the speech of a young man differs from that of an old man, and that of one who rejoices from that of one who grieves" (85). Additionally, the exercise calls on students to deploy various stylistic figures of thought and expression, so that "figures and diction contribute to the portrayal" (85).

During the classical era, of course, this exercise required students to speak in the voice of epic heroes and heroines or historical figures from a narrow range of Greco-Roman culture. Adapted for a more diverse culture and student population, numerous

possibilities emerge. Students might write short compositions in the voice of multilingual authors selected from course texts, characters from novels or films who speak nonstandard varieties of English or mixes of languages, or historical figures such as Malcolm X who demonstrated a wide linguistic register in his speeches. Teachers may expand this exercise into a larger project in which students must choose a character or figure and conduct research by reading the given novel or listening to several speeches to develop an awareness of their subject's diction and the figures of thought or expression used most frequently. This research would then inform the student's composition.

Echphrasis

This exercise is defined as "a descriptive speech" that takes special advantage of the rhetorical strategy referred to in classical Greek as *enargeia* [vividness] or "bringing what is shown before the eyes," through vivid, specific description (Hermogenes 86). This exercise stipulates that "word ought to correspond to the subject," meaning that "If the subject is flowery, let the style be so too" or "if the subject is dry, let the style be similar" (86). Students are permitted to describe persons, places, or things. Adapting this exercise for translingual writing, it follows that if the subject is taken from a multilingual or multicultural environment that the diction and style should itself reflect multiple languages or varieties of English. For instance, a student may choose to describe the sound of a campus dining hall where various conversations occur in multiple languages and dialects of English.

As with *ethopoeia,* teachers can also expand this exercise beyond the classroom by asking students, especially those who are monolingual, to deviate from their day-to-

day habits by inhabiting more multilingual, polyvocal spaces. Such physical spaces may include international residence halls, second-language classrooms, or neighborhoods with multi-ethnic demographics. The student's agenda in this case would be to explore this space and then write a vivid description for fellow classmates, not merely a visual description but one that is also a "bringing before the ears." Completing this exercise, again, would require the application of specific figures of thought and expression in order to weave these other dialects and languages into one's prose.

The Remaining *Progymnasmata*

By outlining three adaptations of rhetorical exercises, I have illustrated their potential for facilitating the development of a translingual prose style and have laid a foundation which teachers may use to develop exercises based on the remaining *progymnasmata,* which can be located in Book II, chapter I of Quintilian's *The Orator's Education*, or in George Kennedy's 2003 translations of several collections of *progymnasmata.*[37] The exercises of fable, narrative, and chreia are conducive to an array of various stylistic figures, though rhetorical questions and asyndeton are directly cited by Hermogenes (76). Teachers may find the final exercises of thesis and the introduction of laws more difficult to adapt and less conducive to translingual writing since they place more emphasis on content and expect students to supply more of their own argument— and thus are closer in structure to conventional argument-based essays. However, this is

---

[37] These exercises and stylistic devices are available online through various websites. In particular I recommend Brigham Young University's website *Silvae Rhetoricae,* having incorporated it into my teaching for nearly four years now.

largely the point of the *progymnasmata*, to gradually increase the level of difficulty and expect more originality from students.

Teachers may incorporate these final two exercises into their curricula by asking students to write on the virtues and risks of multilingual education, in contrast to standard topics in the Greco-Roman versions of the thesis that ask, "whether a king should marry" or "whether one should engage in athletics rather than farm the land" (Hermogenes 87). Likewise, for the final exercise, students may write on the ethical dimensions of English-only laws that have been proposed in various cities as well as at the national level. Excerpts from scholars such as Smitherman, Young, and Canagarajah could provide models for these final exercises, which would serve as transitional projects into larger, more complex projects.

This past semester, students in both my second-language course and freshmen seminar completed a series of short writing exercises similar to the ones I have described in preparation for final essays and presentations asking them to research and write about World Englishes while integrating vocabulary and grammatical patterns from these nonstandard codes into the presentations themselves. These exercises played a vital role in orienting them to the stylistic and rhetorical circumstances needed to blend varieties of English, even different languages in many cases, into work that also demonstrated an understanding of standard linguistic forms expected for success in college. Although my students performed at a variety of levels, and few of them managed to achieve the dexterity of celebrated multilingual authors, most of them have acquired a level of language awareness that I anticipate will continue to mature. In other words, each in his

or her way achieved discovery—the intersection of the canons of invention and style, new meanings through unique uses of language, and expanded the boundaries of the privileged language through their incorporation of non-Standard English either through dialect or other language expressions.

Conclusion

My reading of Roman rhetorical practices in this chapter has offered an interpretation of style for linguistically diverse classrooms. Rather than reject Quintilian's *The Orator's Education* for its alleged intolerance of difference and rigid prescriptions, I have historicized aspects of this treatise that are incompatible with an appreciation of difference and resituated them in order to enable their adaptation for instruction that encourages stylistic experimentation with different languages and varieties of English. In particular, the elevation of ornament (*dignitas*) over clarity (*perspicuitas*) provides space even within the ostensibly prescriptive pedagogy of Quintilian to view difference as a strategic tool and resource rather than an obstacle. Thus novice multilingual students as well as students often described as monolingual can develop the abilities that scholars of language difference have presented as critical for survival in the increasingly transnational social, political, and professional environments where knowledge of Standard English alone will be insufficient for successful communication.

Like any system, Greco-Roman rhetoric is not without faults. Critiques of its conception of audiences as static are easily categorized, or the devaluation of *pathos* (as in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*) provide valuable remediation of such older approaches. However, critiquing older rhetorics does not mean we must discard them because we think they

have no insights for contemporary situations. Bialostosky's re-reading of Quintilian's figures through Bakhtin's notions of speech genres and dialogue shows that newer frameworks do not replace older ones so much as they offer lenses through which to re-interpret them.

The next chapter builds on the adaptation of the *progymnasmata* by focusing on more contemporary exercises based on the Greco-Roman tradition, including imitation pedagogies as well as the sentence-combining pedagogies of the 1970s and 1980s, which scholars such as Robert Connors, T.R. Johnson, Tom Pace, and Paul Butler describe as having been superseded by expressivist, cognitivist, and social-epistemic approaches to composition. Critiqued for their mechanist approach to writing, sentence-level pedagogies, especially those proposing imitation, offer another helpful tool to be used in conjunction with the methods sketched here. My contention that discovery is the intersection of the canons of style and invention and that imitation enables students to more fully realize the meaning-making and language expression/novelty in both also grounds my discussion of twentieth-century pedagogical approaches to imitation. Ultimately, I offer specific exercises in multilingual imitation as another way that teachers and students can begin to develop writing in a variety of languages and Englishes, in order to assist their immersion into the transnational communicative practices that are reshaping our political, social, and professional realities.

CHAPTER III

TOWARD TRANSLINGUAL IMITATION EXERCISES

Often when people think of the word *imitation*, they think of a cheap copy and immediately devalue the object, such as the reproduction of a famous painting as opposed to the original. Jean Baudrillard's *Simulacra and Simulations* claims that images have become so dominant in consumerist culture that it is no longer possible to distinguish between reality and image. One may think of "The Most Photographed Barn in America" scene from Don DeLillo's *White Noise*, in which Jack Gladney ponders whether or not the barn he stands in can actually be experienced as a barn if its sole purpose is to be photographed by tourists. In the writing classroom, such a term as imitation used in the same sentence with *style* may still incorrectly suggest that students' attempts at mimicry and replication are far removed from the integrity or authenticity of the original textual model. College writing courses often implicitly forward the idea of original writing or original thought, meanwhile college students themselves are evermore in the world of Baudrillard, remakes, and sampling—less and less sensitive to what qualifies as original and what does not.

However, classical rhetorical theories focus on textual imitation as a means toward creativity and individuality, rather than originality in the modern sense. This process is useful in teaching and practicing translingual writing. In this chapter, I build on arguments in the preceding two chapters regarding translingual writing's need for

concrete teaching strategies, a need which results from a larger privileging of invention over style (Berlin; Crowley; Fogarty) in the field of rhetoric and composition during the 1980s and a subsequent stigma now attached to sentence-level instruction as synonymous with current-traditionalism. Recent work recognizing the overlap between invention and style as well as imitation and novelty (Butler; Holcomb and Killingsworth; Johnson and Pace; Muckelbauer) can inform scholarship on language difference and generate assignments that further assist a set of translingual *progymnasmata*, that I articulated in chapter two.

Both sets of exercises ultimately advance my definition of a translingual writing pedagogy as helping students acquire the discursive moves involved in deploying multiple codes, generic conventions, and languages within texts and single speech acts (e.g., sentences). Developing these abilities expands their linguistic resources and thus makes them more effective communicators in global contexts. This pedagogy is based on my articulation of translingual writing via Bakhtin's concepts of dialogue, heteroglossia, and speech genres. As discussed in chapter one, this understanding is carefully articulated so that it enables teachers in mainstream composition classrooms to present writing as *inherently* multilingual and multidialectal in a way that eases the tensions between instruction in Standard English, on the one hand, and harnesses linguistic difference as a resource on the other. The central benefit lies in preparing all college students for the discursive demands of working and living in multilingual societies.

Although rhetoric and composition has traditionally drawn distinctions between teaching native speakers and second-language students, more and more scholars have

acknowledged the blurring of these populations as well as the need to prepare both of

them for multilingual communication in the era of globalization. For instance, David

Crystal asserts that:

> The student who goes out into the world thinking that the only kind of English he is ever going to encounter is the Received Pronunciation and British Standard English he has learned in the classroom is in for a shock, because you don't even have to go abroad. . .you just have to walk down Oxford Street in London and you will hear a hundred different accents and dialects that are *nothing* like the RP and the British Standard English that has just been learned. […] It's absolutely essential in my mind to expose the student to as wide a variety of nonstandard variations as possible. (2011)

Whereas Crystal's comments pertain specifically to his views on instruction in reading

and listening comprehension in Britain, they are relevant for college writing teachers in

any country, including the U.S., where statistics continue to show that non-native

speakers of English are becoming a sizeable population and either challenging or

overturning the native-speaker majority. In a 2010 *World Englishes* article entitled

"Linguistically Privileged and Cursed?" Christof Demont-Heinrich cites the 2000 U.S.

Census, pointing out that 47 million Americans (18 percent) now speak a language "other

than English at home," a fact which "reflects the complexities and paradoxes of an

American linguistic culture in which linguistic diversity and multilingual capability are

simultaneously cast as assets and as threats" (287). Speaking to this context, Demont-

Heinrich goes on to describe the typical U.S. college student as the "'tongue-tied

American' who simply does not (and cannot?) measure up to the rest of the world when it

comes to foreign language capabilities" (295). Although English has become the *lingua*

franca of global commerce, it is increasingly used by non-native speakers who have

different communicative strategies which include code-meshing as both the blending of

Englishes and other languages in the use of English.

Catharine Prendergast also addresses this need explicitly in her essay, "In Praise

of Incomprehension," in which she introduces the idea of incomprehension as

characteristic of discourse in global, multilingual environments. Prendergast best

illustrates this through a classroom activity in which she shows students a scene from the

2007 Irish film *Once* in which the protagonist's Czech girlfriend answers the question of

whether or not she loved her former husband. The woman's response, "answering both

the central question of the film as well as that of their relationship—is given in Czech

with no accompanying subtitle or verbal translation" (233). As Prendergast notes, "the

Irish busker doesn't understand what she said and neither do most of the movie's

viewers, but those viewers equally understand that what they've missed is the key to

unraveling the meaning of the film" (233).

Incomprehension is not an end goal of communication, obviously, but teachers

and students could benefit from overcoming a phobia of initial misunderstandings or

failure to communicate that drive an immediate stigmatization of discursive difference

and deviation from expectation, the kind that leads to reactionary "error" correction and

insistence on "purity" of language. For Prendergast, global discourse is becoming

increasingly composed of moments in which the use of many varieties of codes prevents

immediate comprehension and, in fact, leads to frequent moments of *incomprehension*.

The problem of standard classroom practices in the U.S. is that the burden of

communication is placed on writers and speakers to use only English or to use English in

a way that prevents such incomprehension. After all, most writing teachers would agree that comprehension is a good thing. In contrast, Prendergast asks her students to meditate on how spaces such as a movie theater itself "becomes the classroom" in such cases, "when no native speaker [of Czech in the case of *Once*] is in easy range, either physically or sociologically, and the question is sent over the Internet—as multiple confused English-speaking viewers actually did to the *Yahoo! Answers* Web site" (234). The main point here is less about obtaining the translation, more about what happens as these situations become more and more commonplace, when they involve more than movies, when they involve daily interactions between native English speakers and those who speak much more to communicate. The day has already arrived in many U.S. cities where the native English speaker cannot rely on his or her privileged socio-economic status or implicit English-only policy to get by. This may not entail learning other languages so much as learning that the Standard English he or she has grown up with is in fact a living, porous language that takes on dialects and other languages and will in fact be incomprehensible at times.

Thus college students who hope to be competitive in a global marketplace, or who wish to become active global citizens, or perhaps even hope to simply enjoy world cinema, need to develop a metalinguistic awareness. They need an awareness of language that is comfortable with these types of incomprehension, the ability to work through them to eventually take meaning from them, as well as the ability to adapt and appropriate these other codes and strategies for effective communication. This does not mean

students have to learn Spanish or Chinese, anymore than Prendergast suggests that movie goers need to learn Czech to understand *Once*.

By learning to blend codes themselves in such ways, these students can become linguistic agents. A student who has thought through a decision to incorporate words from other codes into their own discourse is all that more prepared to engage in the global, multilingual spaces where "incomprehension is not simply lack, the absence of comprehension," but rather "generative—of longing, of effort, of meaning" (Prendergast 234). It is true that the problems articulated by critics of English monolingualism pertain to higher education at large, and that they cannot be addressed by rhetoric and composition alone. However, a first-year writing course that exposes students to composition as inherently translingual, in the sense that I have defined through Bakhtin, is in a better position to prepare them for the realities described so vividly by Crystal and Prendergast.

Saying that composition courses should help students become more multilingual seems like an overwhelming and burdensome task, which is why this dissertation looks to imitation and stylistic exercises for teaching strategies. Shorter assignments based on imitation expose students to linguistically-diverse writing and prompt them to generate such writing themselves according to effective models. Thus first-year writing students, whether ESL or native speakers, can learn to both comprehend and produce multilingual compositions for the sake of becoming more versed in the kind of discourse they will encounter in their professional, academic, and social lives.

Such instruction is designed to instill in students a degree of what Canagarajah "metalinguistic awareness" (*Critical Academic Writing* 52) that makes them more sensitive to the micro-level aspects of language that constitute such multilingual strategies as code-meshing. These exercises are adaptable to multiple classroom environments, including ESL, though they are designed specifically for classrooms where students bring together not only multiple languages but also multiple dialects that include what teachers and scholars refer to as Standard English.[38] What I am offering in this chapter, and throughout my dissertation, is a pedagogy flexible enough to accommodate and work alongside existing approaches to writing and language difference as articulated in the areas of mainstream composition, developmental writing, and second-language writing.

My continued attention in this chapter to the intersection of invention and style moves forward from a consideration of Greco-Roman rhetorics, as represented by Quintilian, to a focus on the sentence-level pedagogies of imitation appearing in the field of rhetoric and composition during the 1950s through the 1980s. In this chapter, I openly acknowledge reservations that may derive from the perception of sentence-level instruction as a product of the current-traditionalist paradigm to eradicate "error," deviation, and with it students' voices. As I demonstrate through a careful and historicized distinction between current-traditionalist rhetorics and those informed by classical imitation, however, these exercises do not merely impose standards but rather

---

[38] Chapter one of my dissertation, pages 28-32, goes into more detail regarding the use of Bakhtin's notion of the shared utterance for an integrated approach to language difference through vernaculars and languages.

provide replicable strategies that attune students to the appreciation of micro-level rhetorical features in texts—all for the sake of originality and difference rather than conformity to norms. These same micro-level qualities of language are in fact the very aspects of a translingual style that scholars such as Suresh Canagarajah, Bruce Horner, and Min-Zhan Lu have argued for. Thus, this chapter argues for a translingual writing pedagogy based on twentieth-century adaptations of classical theories of imitation, combined with the *progymnasmata*, as a means to help students develop a wider stylistic repertoire for composing in multiple languages and varieties of English.

Once I have distinguished pedagogies of imitation from current-traditionalism, I go into greater detail regarding classical, Greco-Roman origins of these imitation pedagogies of the twentieth century and elaborate on the second chapter's discussion of invention and style as inter-related rather than oppositional. In particular, I discuss Bakhtin's conception of imitation as a natural function of language that occurs through the appropriation of others' words—points that he makes in the "The Problems of Speech Genres," *Problems in Dostoyevsky's Poetics*, and *The Dialogic Imagination*. This enables an understanding of pedagogies that promote imitation, based on Greco-Roman rhetorics, as not imposing an unnatural or artificial set of exercises on students but instead as expediting and strengthening an aspect of language use that, according to Bakhtin, occurs naturally. These pedagogies of imitation, if taught in conjunction with the approaches recommended by scholars of language difference, can promote language difference as a resource and help situate translingual writing an attainable goal for college writing courses.

Imitation as Not Current-Traditional

Briefly defined, imitation exercises involved exact copying, paraphrase,

translation, and transcription of model texts for the sake of exposing students to a variety

of rhetorical styles. The act of imitation was highly revered as a pedagogical tool

throughout the classical tradition, and from "Isocrates in 390 B.C. to St. Augustine in *ca.*

400 A.D. belief in the value of imitation was undeviating," and advocates of this practice

have always maintained that "when it is intelligently used, as it was for the most part in

Greco-Roman schools, imitation will continue to be a great aid to anyone who sets about

learning to practice the art of rhetoric" (Clark 12). Although imitation may be

misappropriated for purposes of simply reducing surface-level errors in writing, this

section aims to distinguish such misappropriations that forward the most reductive and

prescriptive aspects of current-traditionalism from adaptations of classical imitation that,

although still reverent of Western authors, nonetheless intended to foster originality in

voice rather than conformity to norms. This more nuanced understanding liberates

imitation and enables its use for the goals of multilingualism and difference.

Because such sentence-oriented approaches to writing instruction have received

less direct attention in rhetoric and composition journals in the last twenty years than

during the mid-twentieth century (Butler; Connors; Johnson and Pace), it may be easy to

conflate them with current-traditional methods that are antagonistic to the valuing of

dialects and other languages central to translingual writing. Scholarship on imitation in

the twentieth century did emerge during roughly the same time that communication skills

courses in the U.S. revived some of the prescriptivist teaching attitudes of the Harvard

model designed by A.S. Hill during the late 1800s and early 1900s. However, this section aims to understand the adaptation of classical imitation exercises during the twentieth century in a different light from the current-traditional rhetoric first described by James Berlin in *Rhetoric and Reality,* which while remaining entrenched at many smaller liberal arts colleges and community colleges is no longer a part of mainstream discourse in the field. According to Berlin, for instance, Frances Christensen's transformational grammar and the sentence-combining activities he promoted "could serve the current-traditionalist's emphasis on superficial correctness and patterns of arrangement," although such appropriation is "not inevitable" (137).

Nevertheless, pedagogies such as those of imitation that attend to style have indeed become synonymous with current-traditionalism. According to Paul Butler, this perception owes mainly to a handful of influential works that devalued style and set it in opposition to invention. Butler outlines this trajectory beginning with Daniel Fogarty's 1959 *Roots for a New Rhetoric*, in which he represented then current approaches as dominated by correctness and "style qualities" such as "clearness, force, coherence, interest, naturalness, and other devices" (118) in opposition to a "new or improved teaching rhetoric" based on the theories of I.A. Richards and Kenneth Burke, and include Richard Young's "Paradigms and Problems," in which he characterizes current-traditional rhetoric as preoccupied with "usage (syntax, spelling, punctuation) and with style (economy, clarity, emphasis)" (31), Sharon Crowley's *Methodical Memory*, which explores current-traditionalism's over-emphasis on style rather than invention, and Maxine Hairston's "The Winds of Change," in which she states that teachers who focus

on "style, organization, and correctness" (7) often overlook the need for instruction in invention. The field of rhetoric and composition still tends to privilege invention over style, a trend that has hindered attempts in work on language difference to recognize the diversity of student voices. The result is a paradox: the appreciation and encouragement of linguistic diversity necessitates sentence-level focus, yet the pedagogical approaches that offer such focus suffer from a reputation of being reductive, simplistic, and prescriptive.

In his narrative on the rise of the current-traditional paradigm at Harvard and Columbia universities from 1900 to 1920, Berlin observes not only how A.S. Hill and Barrett Wendell "placed truth in the external world, existing prior to the individual's perception," but also how their approach dwelt on "superficial correctness (barbarisms, solecisms, and improprieties)" (37). Hill's composition textbook *Principles of Rhetoric* as well as Charles Sears Baldwin's *College Composition* both demand surface-level correctness in order to avoid the stylistic errors that Quintilian describes in Book I of *The Orator's Education*. Baldwin was himself "an authority on ancient rhetoric," though "his composition texts displayed little of the influence of the dominant tradition of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian" (42) aside from the use of modes of discourse and distinction between expository and poetic prose. The conservative element of current-traditionalism also influenced the communication skills courses between 1940 and 1960, "emphasizing skills and the practical modes" as well as "correctness and effectiveness of expression" (97). Beginning at the State University of Iowa and "repeated in programs throughout the country" these courses again focused on short compositions as preparation for longer

ones but ultimately served as occasions to train the growing student population in the correct usage and mechanics becoming of middle-class citizens.

This account is supported by Janice Lauer's reading of this time period that "most common types of traditional Freshmen English were 'the composition-readings course,' with no inventional component" (72). Lauer refers readers to a range of sources including her own 1967 study of more than fifty composition textbooks, Harold Dean's overview of communication courses in a 1959 issue of *CCC*, as well as Albert Kitzaber's 1963 study showing that Freshmen English courses were concerned mainly the study of writing through literature with no direct attention to invention.

One dilemma with such an historical account is that it does not give a full explanation of how approaches to style evolved along with shifts away from the current-traditional paradigm. Although Berlin celebrates the revival of rhetoric in American composition beginning in 1965, he mainly discusses the return of the classical tradition, led by Edward P.J. Corbett, in terms of its reclaiming of invention. Re-interpretations of classical rhetoric from 1965 to the late 1980s become part of Berlin's category of transactional rhetorics, which locate truth not in the material world like objectivist rhetorics but in social interactions. However, Berlin leaves unsaid how such transactional rhetorics regard stylistic aspects of language, thus implying that style is exclusively the concern of current-traditional pedagogies informed by objectivist rhetorics. Lauer supplements this reading to some extent, also marking 1965 as a significant turning point away from current-traditionalism at that year's annual Conference on College Composition and Communication, whose organizing members including Wayne Booth,

Edward Corbett, Kitzhaber, and Richard Young—all of whom were doing research into the resurgence of communication as more than correct usage (75). But Lauer's work also focuses clearly on the role of invention in the return of classical rhetoric to the field, with style as more of an afterthought.

Robert J. Connors has noted the decline of sentence-level pedagogies in "The Erasure of the Sentence," focusing on Christensen rhetoric and other formalist pedagogies of the 1960s and 1970s that rested on the ancient tradition of imitation exercises. Connors adeptly traces the rise and fall of Christenson rhetoric and other sentence-level approaches despite their repeated success in large-scale studies throughout the 1970s and 1980s. The decline of sentence-based pedagogies owed largely to anti-formalist movements spearheaded by scholars such as James Moffett and Peter Elbow. Moffett's critique dwelled on the point that "the sentence within its broader discursive context" (186) should receive more attention than the sentence in isolation. Meanwhile Elbow's critique rejected "the push-button, fast-food expectations in our culture" (233) that sentence-combining pedagogies facilitated, as well as their tendency to allegedly rob students of their authentic voices and thus their identities. Composition's turn to theory during the 1980s also brought charges that, although based on Chomsky's Transformational Generative Grammar, sentence-level instruction was overtly practical and non-theoretical in its orientation to language and thus not worth further scholarly attention.

A number of scholars have referred to a more general skepticism toward the teaching of grammar and style in first-year writing courses. For instance, in a chapter in

the 2005 edited collection *Refiguring Prose Composition*, Tom Pace recounts his first

graduate seminar on composition pedagogy in which "our instructor introduced us to

Corbett's method of analyzing prose style" (14), which consists of activities such as

identifying sentence types and measuring sentence length in order to discuss its

effectiveness and recommend revisions. Pace remembers "most of us—budding

composition and rhetoric scholars—resisting this exercise by rolling our eyes, grumbling

under our breaths—in general, not taking it very seriously," and in fact "during our break,

one of my class colleagues complained bitterly in the hallway that the exercise was a total

waste of time, that it was too hard" (15). Pace, who completed his PhD in 2002, uses this

personal anecdote to vividly illustrate the sometimes outright hostility with which such

pedagogies have been treated by rising generations of teachers and scholars. The type of

graduate students that Pace describes in his anecdote as representative of the field is now

teaching composition and also likely training future teachers.

A. Suresh Canagarajah speaks of this same hesitation to teach sentence-level

issues in *Critical Academic Writing and Multilingual Students*, in which he addresses

second-language teachers, as well as mainstream composition teachers who have ESL

students in the classes. Canagarajah points to what he sees as the erroneous assumption of

"current pedagogical wisdom" that "form will take care of itself when students undertake

the process of writing appropriately," observing that "Many instructors [mistakenly]

accept that their feedback on student writing features only matters related to idea

development" (46).

Nicole Amare traces the aversion to grammar and style all the way back to the

Braddock Report of 1963, which she describes as having "told us that formal grammar

instruction not only does not improve our students' writing but in fact may have an

adverse affect on their compositions" (154). As Amare states, "We remain in the shadow

of the Braddock study" (155). Such acknowledgments of this resistance to grammar and

style appear throughout the essays in *Refiguring Prose Style*, in Connors' "The Erasure of

the Sentence," Paul Butler's *Out of Style*, and Chris Holcomb and Jimmie Killingsworth's

Performing Prose: The Study and Practice of Style in Composition. As Holcomb and

Killingsworth state, "The consensus has it that in the field of English composition, style

was a casualty of the process movement," which preceded the later social-epistemic turn

that completely relegated sentence-level issues to "a minor part of an already minor part

of the composing process: editing and proofreading" (viii). While attention to style and

grammar does remain in place at many community colleges and smaller liberal arts

schools, arguments in favor of revitalizing style do rightly observe that a majority of

college students at large institutions are now unlikely to receive explicit instruction in

style.[39]

I agree that this general hesitation to teach grammar and style stems from the

historical decline of sentence-level pedagogies, due to the belief by both process theorists

such as Elbow and social epistemic theorists such as Berlin that they stifle creative and

critical thought. My own reading of such pedagogies emphasizes their focus on invention

---

[39] ESL students are still likely to receive grammatical feedback. Dana Ferris in particular has offered several frameworks for error feedback. However, the treatment of error in second-language instruction is often aimed only at the acquisition of Standard English and academic discourse. While certainly an admirable goal that does show respect for student writing, these approaches are different from the metalinguistic awareness required for code-meshing.

and creativity. Arguments for the revival of classical style have existed since the 1950s,

and they have never been the same as arguments for the mere correctness called for by

the Harvard model and current-traditionalism. Illustrating the effectiveness of imitation

exercises in a 1957 issue of *College English*, Winifred Lynskey states that:

> Students are more original, more vivid, more lively when they imitate than when they write otherwise. Often the best themes of a semester are written on the imitative assignment. . .My experience has been that the student feels free when he imitates. . .than when. . .he is forced into the narrow confines of his own personal knowledge of what constitutes style. (400)

Although we may object to the somewhat condescending attitude of students having

"narrow" notions about style, Lynskey nonetheless stresses originality and creativity over

and above correctness. Even the models that Lynskey chooses, including Swift's "A

Modest Proposal" seem progressive for the 1950s as they encourage students to

experiment with irony, satire, and subversion. An earlier article by Donald Clark in a

1951 issue of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* makes the case that "When it is

intelligently used, as it was for the most part in Greco-Roman schools, imitation will

continue to be a great aid to anyone who sets about learning to practice the art of

rhetoric" (13). Clark in particular draws heavily on the classical tradition, tracing the

practice of imitation back through the Renaissance to Augustine, Quintilian, Cicero,

Isocrates, and finally to Plato's *Phaedrus*, which he reads as an account of how Socrates

wins over a young pupil from his rival Lysius by imitating and improving upon one of his

speeches.

Pedagogical applications of classical imitation exercises continued to appear throughout the 1970s and 1980s, most notably by Corbett and Frank D'Angelo.[40] A 1977 *College English* article by William E. Gruber attests to the "stunning" results of student writing when they are given models to imitate over the course of a semester. Gruber goes on to say that "The act of imitation became a tool to achieve individual freedom; instead of stifling individual personalities, it liberated them" (491). The classroom methods Gruber lays out follow closely the classical tradition, in which the teacher analyzes the literary devices that various authors deploy and the rhetorical affects they have on audiences. The in-class analysis prepares students to imitate these and other essays of their own choosing for a range of compositions including short descriptive passages as well as longer, expository essays. Gruber explains that studying and imitating models also enables teachers and students to become more familiar with stylistic devices and aspects of language such as sentence-length and parts of speech:

> Students quickly perceive that certain highly specific devices tend to produce definite results: that, say, the nostalgic tone of a particular essay derives from a regular and balanced mingling of verb tenses that combine to portray past, present, and future as a single reality. And once students have isolated the shaping principles of an essay, they are usually eager to experiment with those principles in their own work. Also, throughout the semester, we try to catalogue different linguistic devices according to the various ends they can serve. Juxtaposition of incongruous elements, for example, can be used to create humor or irony, while juxtaposition of long and short sentences can often create the illusion of rapid pace. (494)

---

[40] I discuss Corbett and D'Angelo in more detail after giving a broader idea of how proponents of imitation in the twentieth century intended teachers to deploy such exercises and how exactly students would benefit

Another article in a 1974 issue of *College Composition and Communication* by Penelope

Schott Starkey describes imitation exercises used over a period of four years, including

one specific activity asking students to rewrite prologues to the *Canterbury Tales* in

contemporary English to describe student's own experiences "at Newark airport" or

"passing the time at a local dental surgeon's office" (435). In other in-class activities, "we

impersonated Petrarchan lovers" before going on to emulate "short-sentence

Hemingway" and "rotund Dickens, where passages lend themselves to phrase-by-phrase

transformation" (436). Phyllis Brooks, writing in a 1973 issue of *College English*,

describes an imitation exercise she names the "persona paraphrase" (162), in which

students closely imitate selected passages in order to convey a particular author's voice

by appropriating grammatical and stylistic patterns such as parallel structure,

modification, statement and predication, and appositive clauses. Still another article in a

1973 issue of *College Composition and Communication* by Frank D'Angelo describes a

pedagogy of imitation and proceeds to analyze a short passage in terms of sentence

length, sentence types (simple, complex, compound), and parts of speech (clauses,

modifiers, adverbs, verb phrases and tenses), in thorough detail—as well as stylistic

figures such as asyndeton (285). The writing assignment following such a close analysis

requires students to produce imitations using the same stylistic devices and grammatical

structures that make the model rhetorically effective. All of these various adaptations of

classical imitation extol the virtues of originality and style, making few if any references

to correctness.

Many twentieth-century pedagogies focusing on sentence-level concerns are
based on classical models, as the previous section demonstrated when illustrating articles
published in *College English* and *College Composition and Communication* during the
1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Butler's history on style synthesizes several decades of rhetoric
and composition scholarship in order to demonstrate how attention persisted to
pedagogies of imitation despite their eventual association with surface-level correctness.
According to Butler, several theories during the 1970s and 1980s elevated style above the
simple expression of ideas. These various theories constitute for Butler an "organic view"
of style as inventional, in which "a difference in style is always a difference in meaning"
(Beardsley 1967, 199). Although scholarship during the late 1970s and 1980s was turning
toward cognitive and social approaches to writing, and away from overt instruction in
grammar, Butler recuperates a latent fusion of style and invention during this period. As
he observes, Young, Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike's 1970 book *Rhetoric:
Discovery and Change* offered an "inventional style" in which "a particular style is a
characteristic series of choices throughout the entire process of writing, including both
discovery (invention) and linguistic selection and grouping" (107). Richard Lanham's
work also stressed the importance of "opaque style" over transparent style that readers
could look through to an underlying meaning. For Lanham, decisions about diction,
syntax, and tropes affected more than the ability to transmit ideas but had the ability to
impact how they were formulated in the minds of both authors and audiences.

Despite the problem that the models themselves are largely literary and Western
in origin, the larger goal of imitation exercises as described in these works demonstrate

the clear difference between the correctness and clarity demanded by current-traditional rhetoric and the originality and effectiveness sought by pedagogies of imitation. Translingual writing, as defined in the first chapter, resists pedagogies reliant on Standard English and encourages a greater degree of stylistic experimentation drawing from other varieties of English and other languages. The teachability and viability of translingual writing as an academic endeavor, still an open issue for scholars such as Canagarajah, depends on concrete teaching practices that address rhetoric at the level of the sentence.[41] Whereas the mechanical exercises and theme writing dominant in current-traditional instruction contradict the creative and egalitarian principles of translingual writing, the use of imitation to help students acquire stylistic proficiency poses fewer impediments. Articles published during the 1950s through the 1980s on imitation represent this process as a freeing one, not aimed at conformity, making style and grammar available to students for the development of their own voices.

Imitation was an alternative to the kind of grammatical instruction and error correction that originated with the Harvard model and persisted into the communication skills courses of the 1940s through the 1960s. As Brooks explicitly states, "If we give a certain number of workbook exercises in detecting errors in parallel structures and correcting them, we still have no assurance that the student will actually go out and try to use the structure he has been laboring over," but with imitation exercises "there is a chance that by building up his own sentences on this model he will gain the confidence to experiment further with the arcane skill he has proved he can handle" (162).

---

[41] See my central argument in chapter one.

Invention and Imitation in the Twentieth Century

In order for the canon of style to support a pedagogy of translingual writing, it must be understood as inventional rather than as a mere ornament or presentation of thought. As inventional, style provides the choice from a variety of means of expression, offers the possibility for originality and individuality, and influences the ways rhetors and audiences perceive ideas. Because translingual writing is defined largely by its ability to appropriate and deploy the discursive features of many varieties of languages, as articulated in my first chapter, then imitation becomes a key tool for the appropriation and internalization of syntactic and stylistic features. The previous chapter explored Roman rhetorical theory on the relationship between style, imitation, and invention, and now this section connects the classical tradition to twentieth-century perspectives on style to highlight the inventional qualities of both classical and twentieth century pedagogies. The work of Mikhail Bakhtin, in particular his conception of language as co-owned ("The Problem of Speech Genres"), provide the bridge between imitation as a learned practice in classrooms and a normal process of language use. Pedagogies of imitation, whether classical or contemporary, help students do what happens regularly in language use. As this section argues, imitation becomes a vehicle through which translingualism operates in languages, not an impediment that reinforces static norms.

Postmodern pedagogies of imitation and originality have also recognized a debt to the Greco-Roman tradition. Writing in a 1995 issue of *JAC*, Mary Minock describes classroom practices based on her theoretical reading of Quintilian and Bakhtin, in which students re-read difficult texts as many as "seven times as homework over the course of a

week and respond each time for at least a full single-spaced page" (503) in order to facilitate what she calls "unconscious imitation" (500). In unconscious, as opposed to intentional imitation, students still demonstrate "traces of syntactic imitation" (505) in their writing as they intuitively appropriate the voices of the authors they work with throughout the semester. Minock's pedagogy derives from Bakhtin's definition of "any gifted, creative exposition" as "always a free stylistic variation on another's discourse" (*Dialogic Imagination* 347).

Minock's use of Bakhtin does not directly address language difference or multilingualism, but her pedagogy is certainly conducive to the goals that Canagarajah, Horner, Lu, and Vershawn Young have articulated regarding the need to encourage students to blend conventional academic writing with their own languages and dialects. A theory and pedagogy of translingual writing is not opposed to imitation, even if scholars who have discussed code-meshing have not formulated or identified the ways in which imitation and mimicry occurs in ordinary, everyday language use. In fact, imitation is just as ordinary a linguistic act, according to Bakhtin, as stylistic figures of thought and expression. What rhetoricians such as Quintilian developed as a learned activity in fact already occurs spontaneously in language, which is also already translingual in the sense that it is heteroglossic and dialogic. Minock points out that Quintilian recognized this to some extent, saying that "his discussions of imitation" in Books I and X of *The Orator's Education* "also raises an extremely relevant point about the spontaneous unconscious imitation that comes from constant exposure" (500). The very idea of instruction in imitation rests on the Greco-Roman premise of *mimesis*, that because words already

imitate reality then learning occurs at least partly through this process of mimicry.[42] The unconsciousness of mimicry and parody (ironic mimicry) becomes even clearer as Minock attributes the inspiration for her pedagogy to discovering "quite accidently" that "all of my students. . .could spontaneously write spot commercials" despite the fact that "none of my students ever claimed they admired or had studied the spot commercial" (500). She goes on to say that "[t]heir ability to generate the rhetoric and syntax of the genre was based on their unwritten dialogues with particular spot commercials that had been repeated with subtle shifts of context" (500).

The central import of Minock's pedagogy is that if students can instinctively learn the stylistic and generic features of any text through constant exposure and internalization in ways that Bakhtin has theorized as the imitative nature of dialogue and interaction in speech genres, then this commonplace ability to produce the new through imitation can be harnessed according to more formal teaching methods as those proposed by Quintilian. This means that students can acquire translingual proficiency on their own over time, if given enough exposure to multilingual textual performances. On the other hand, carefully planned exercises in imitation can expedite this otherwise normal process. Such methods, as described by scholars during the mid-twentieth century, are thus not confining but freeing. They merely take what language does in ordinary circumstances according to Bakhtin—the imitation and appropriation of others' words—and turns it into an object of study in order to give students more control over that process.

---

[42] The Greco-Roman notions of *mimesis* is at odds with postmodern critiques of a stable reality, namely by Baudrillard (1977). However, since none of the scholars I discuss here have grappled with the paradox of the competing epistemologies of the Greco-Roman and postmodern eras, I see attempts to reconcile this contradiction as a distraction from my argument about translingual writing and beyond the scope of this project. Nonetheless, it is an important difference to recognize for future work.

The co-ownership of utterances that makes languages dialogic—always multi-voiced—also makes all speech acts a form of imitation. Bakhtin defines originality (the product of invention) as always involving the process of borrowing and imitating other prior discourses, whether they are works of literature or speech utterances. Only "extremely subtle and sometimes imperceptible transitions" exist between the development what we would call an original style and the imitation of someone else's style, and a form of "unconscious imitation" or appropriation of style always tints the interactions between speakers of everyday language" (*Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics* 190).

Bakhtin's concept of the multi-voicedness of discourse also informs later postmodern positions on style, such as Jacques Derrida's, in which one's style is not developed by servile imitation but by "listening to the other and trying to produce your own style in proportion to the other" ("On Rhetoric" 125). In this sense, imitation is not "mimetic behavior" in a strict sense but rather a step in the process of crafting a "signature in relation to the signature of the other" (125). Additionally, John Muckelbauer, drawing on Greco-Roman rhetorics to question the modern premises of authorship in the vein of Derrida, Foucault, and Barthes, also lays out the implications of the imitation-novelty dynamic for teaching in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. As he argues in an adaptation of his work on imitation and invention in *The Future of Invention*, the place of invention as a "necessary component of the repetitive translation from model to copy" (71) makes imitation a tool for the development of originality. This recognition leads Muckelbauer to an endorsement of Corbett's pedagogical use of

imitation (1971), which is in turn an adaptation of Quintilian's advice to students and teachers to develop rhetorical skill by emulating model texts.

Corbett's reading of ancient texts notes a triadic theory of education consisting of imitation, practice, and theory. Students first desire to imitate (*imitatio*) certain arts or sports, acquiring basic skills. Then they engage in practice (*exercitatio*) in order to improve those basic skills, and finally set out to learn the theories (*ars*) that enable mastery.[43] Although noting that "not many records of imitative practices in Greek and Roman schools are extant" (245), Corbett manages to construct a set of teaching practices for imitation by turning to sixteenth–and-seventeenth-century texts describing imitation exercises. These exercises consisted of Analysis and Genesis. First, the instructor led students through "a close study of the model to observe how its excellence follows the precepts of art" (245), an activity sometimes referred to as prelection.[44] The close analysis could move sentence-by-sentence, similar to the explication conducted in rhetorical analysis or close-readings today, or it could focus more explicitly on a single key feature of a model (figures of thought, for example) that students would emulate. Afterward, students moved to the Genesis stage in which they memorized or copied the passage exactly, emulated a model's form, paraphrased it, or set out to write something more loosely inspired.

The practice of copying and paraphrasing can begin developing translingual practices in less experienced multilingual and monolingual writers because it situates

---

[43] Add note explaining that all quotations are from the 1st edition of *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* and why not the later 3 editions.

[44] Quintilian describes the process in *The Orator's Education* at length (2.5.6-16).

them on a continuum from imitating multilingual texts to producing their own.

Originality begins to surface in minute increments as students first copy passages from

experienced or published multilingual authors and then imitating, making small but

intentional deviations that grow in magnitude as they progress in confidence and ability.

In my teaching, I have had students imitate and paraphrase passages from multilingual

authors as well as more conventional academic models. To begin these activities, we first

discuss Erasmus' well-known paraphrase of the simple sentence "'Your letter pleased me

greatly,'" which he made into 150 unique versions "by substituting different words, re-

arranging the syntax, or re-writing the same sentiment through figures of thought and

expression" (Corbett 248).[45]

During the Renaissance, particularly, such exercises actually took for granted that

students knew Greek and Latin. In some ways anticipating Horner and Trimbur's critique

of English Only ("English Only"), Corbett bewails the essential monolingualism present

in U.S. colleges that he sees as an obstacle to incorporating the full range of ancient

imitation exercises. In this sense, his interpretation of imitation exercises not only appears

conducive to translingual populations of the twenty-first century but also in need of

linguistically diverse populations to achieve its full realization. Dismissing the possibility

of incorporating translation exercises into writing pedagogy, Corbett observes "we rarely

have available in any one class a group of students who are in command of another

common modern language," with the exception of small pockets of Puerto-Rican or

Mexican-American populations (248). Although the bilingualism Corbett describes when

---

[45] As Corbett notes, Erasmus proposed this exercise for St. Paul's School, although it was rejected on the grounds that form should never be separated from content lest it violate the original author's intentions.

referring to educational practices of the renaissance era served an elitist agenda intended to steep boys and young men in the classical tradition of Greek and Latin (247), bilingualism and multilingualism serves different, democratic agendas in the twenty-first century.

It follows that classical imitation exercises, adapted to serve students' global communicative needs, would not prompt them to translate between Greek, Latin, and English but rather between variations of local and World Englishes, as well as other global languages such as Spanish, French, and Arabic. Additionally, mastery of languages constituted the old paradigm of elite bilingualism. By contrast, work on global language difference (Canagarajah "Shuttling"; Young et al.) indicates that most multilingual speakers of English and other languages do not achieve mastery but rather a kind of contingent proficiency to accomplish their various professional and social goals. Hence, students would not need to have mastered Arabic or Spanish in order to learn how to incorporate words and phrases from these languages into their own writing for stylistic purposes. Furthermore, the benefits of doing so lie less in the particular words they use, but in the textual strategies they develop—strategies they can transfer to numerous rhetorical situations in their academic, professional, and social spheres.

Corbett's textbook *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* contains an entire chapter guiding students through a series of imitation exercises. The exercises occur in three stages: first the students copy passages either from their own selection or from a selection of models provided in the textbook; second they imitate the patterns of model sentences provided by the text; third they introduce variations on these sentences by

recombining clauses. Echoing Quintilian, Corbett warns students about "servile imitation" and issues a series of cautions about these exercises regarding "spend[ing] too much time with any one author" which would inhibit developing one's own style by getting the 'feel' of a variety of styles" (510). The ideal for Corbett is to copy a passage a day for a month or more. Examples of the second and third exercises especially contest the notion that imitation did not engage invention. For example, the sentence imitation exercises only require students to imitate the form. Students must supply the *content* of the sentences:

> Model Sentence: I went to the woods because I wished to live deliberately, to front only the essential facts of life, and see if I could learn what it had to teach, and not, when I came to die, discover that I had not lived.

> Imitation: I greeted him politely, although I planned to challenge him repeatedly, to assess his reduction, to test whether he could discriminate what was expedient in each situation, and, after I had probed him thoroughly, to announce that we had no place for him in our organization. (555).

The difference in content between these two sentences indicate an encouragement of students to engage in wordplay while conveying their own ideas—far from the "push-button" culture that Elbow critiques. Corbett's models are only guilty of perpetuating a kind of monolingualism that arises from a surface-level reading of classical authors. The models of imitation provided in this textbook include mainly authors from the Western Canon—Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Washington Irving, Ralph Waldo Emerson, John Stuart Mill, Mark Twain, Henry James, Ernest Hemingway. The most contemporary authors provided are Susan Sontag, Tom Wolfe, James Baldwin, and James Dickey.

A first and crucial revision to these composition exercises for language difference would require a vast expansion of the models of imitation. These revisions would also need to account for linguistic and cultural diversity via Bakhtin. Most of Corbett's models derive from literary authors and poets, and they therefore serve as largely unreliable models for code-meshing. Students would instead copy authors like Geneva Smitherman, Chinua Achebe, Helena Cixous, and Gloria Anzaldua. Teachers could also assign their students the task of seeking out their own models of imitation.

Controlled Composition and Language Difference

Donna Gorrell's work and the reception of the pedagogy it promotes embody the tension between teaching methods informed by the Greco-Roman tradition as well as by current-traditionalism and its preoccupation on correctness. Gorrell's "controlled composition" is a culmination of various sentence-level pedagogies that include imitation and sentence-combining (Christensen "Generative Rhetoric") and bears some similarity to the *progymnasmata* discussed in the previous chapter, in the sense that controlled composition's roughly twenty exercises are carefully scaffolded and designed to evolve from simple imitations and compositions to more complex ones (309). Her controlled composition is important to discussions of translingual style because, as she indicates, it draws heavily from techniques "used successfully for many years in teaching English as a second language"[46] while also directly acknowledging the influence of Mina P. Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* (308). Gorrell's textbook *Copy-Write: A Basic*

---

[46] The controlled composition texts used in ESL that Gorrell references include Linda Ann Kuntz and Robert R. Viscount's *Write Me a Ream* (1973) and Christina Bratt Paulston and Gerald Dykstra's *Controlled Composition in English as a Second Language* (1973). Gorrell also cites Vivian Horn's 1974 *TESOL Quarterly* article "Using the Ananse Tales' for Composition" as well as Dykstra and Paulston's 1967 *English Language Teaching* article "Guided Composition."

Course was intended for the Basic Writing students, a population comprised of linguistically diverse students that sometimes included second-language writers, whose writing Min-Zhan Lu and Bruce Horner would later discuss as repressed by such approaches.

Gorrell explains controlled writing as a series of short compositions of roughly 150-200 words that are first copied word-for-word and then "rewritten with certain prescribed changes" (309). Each assignment in the series must be completed with absolute accuracy. As she explains, "if the first assignment is not copied exactly, it is returned to the student with errors circled" (309), which the student consults while redoing the transcription or transcribing another short composition. Subsequent assignments in the sequence involve "various lexical and syntactic manipulations," such as "changes in person, number, and tense, with heavy emphasis on effective use of the third person" (310). For example, she provides one passage written in the first person with verbs in the appropriate, singular tense that students must rewrite in third-person—a change which necessitates a change in verb form. Teachers can combine these various exercises with direct instruction in grammar, Gorrell explains, but they do not necessarily have to do this if they see it as unnecessary. The final assignments in this sequence closely follow a Christensen model in which students are asked to rewrite passages by "combining sentences in any way that seems appropriate and that leads to better-sounding, less choppy sentences" (311). To work their way through the entire sequence of exercises, students must "average about two or three controlled writings per week" (310).

Gorrell's exercises and instructions illustrate the fact that, although advocates of imitation and other sentence-level pedagogies were intended for both mainstream and linguistically diverse students. In fact, Gorrell's appeals to "error-free writing" (313) as the central benefit certainly seems to reinforce the dominance of Standard English, and nowhere in the thorough discussion of grammatical forms does she acknowledge the socially-constructed nature of correctness articulated in the 1974 CCCC Position Statement " Students' Right to Their Own Language." Although Gorrell criticizes the inability of explicit instruction in grammar and workbook exercises, she nonetheless seems to equivocate on the issue of Standard English in a way that leaves open controlled composition, and the other sentence-level pedagogies it amalgamates, to critique from scholars of language difference.

As she admits in her *College Composition and Communication* article, "controlled composition does have elements of behaviorism" and is aimed at "becoming conditioned to produce acceptable lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical forms" (314). Gorrell even appears frustrated with an ability to articulate a more convincing rationale for exercises in imitation when she says, "How else could one describe a system that requires students to copy someone else's writing, making certain assigned changes, and then give it to an evaluator for reinforcing approval for an error count—one that spurs repeated efforts to achieve the '0 Errors' reward?" (314). The "one" in Gorrell's rhetorical question suggests that her position is not so far from later critiques of Basic Writing pedagogies by Horner and Lu.

However, such admission also highlights the larger fact that neither advocates of sentence-level pedagogies during the late 1970s and early 1980s nor their critics paid sufficient attention to the inventional qualities of style and imitation that scholars from the 1950s through the early 1970s, including Corbett, had foregrounded. Although critiques of current-traditionalism by Fogarty, Young, Crowley, and Berlin combined with critiques of sentence-level pedagogies by Moffett and Elbow in the devaluing of stylistic approaches to writing during the 1980s and 1990s, somehow scholars lost sight of the close link between imitation and novelty and style and invention. Thus the value of sentence-level teaching strategies to work on language difference was never fully articulated, and the connections with scholarship critiquing the dominance of Standard English were never forged (Labov; Smitherman). As Connors and Butler both point out, sentence-level pedagogies reached their peak during the late 1970s, dropped off during the mid 1980s, and then faded into the margins of the field.

Butler, Johnson and Pace, and Holcomb and Killingsworth have all recently made a case for the reanimation of style in composition studies, tracing developments in its history from the Sophists through contemporary debates on the relation of style to invention. As Butler argues, greater attention to style in writing instruction will bring forth "a real renaissance of stylistic discovery" for "composition theory, practice, and pedagogy" (84). A major part of that renaissance, I argue, involves the articulation of connections between classical style and multilingualism to revolutionize prior versions of stylistic exercises for college writing courses. Because translingual writing expands the

boundaries and resources of Standard English, then prompting all students to develop *copia* across language lines presents a new frontier for stylistic expression.

Even Butler's recuperation of style for composition only makes a few suggestions in this regard. Butler briefly recognizes that a definition of style as "variation from a norm" (108) can aid scholars working in language diversity, and he briefly discusses Jacqueline Jones Royster's analysis of Alice Walker's essay on Zora Neale Hurston to suggest that "a more formal stylistic analysis" of such texts would benefit composition scholars "with excellent rhetorical skills" who are nonetheless "not exploiting the full range of stylistic—and thus analytical—options that would allow a more complete understanding of textual objects" (112).

It is strange that while Butler cites Royster, he never mentions Lu's influential essay "Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone," and none of Lu's work appears in his references. In addition to the reference to "style" in the essay's title, Lu articulates at multiple points her desire to "illustrate how I would actually go about teaching a multicultural approach to style" (448). I do not say this to fault Butler but in order to propose that his brief discussion of language diversity might be extended to include Lu as one scholar who, despite her valuable contributions to the field, might still be considered as someone who is "not exploiting the full range of stylistic. . .options that would allow a more complete understanding of textual objects" (Butler 112). However, I would also like to drive home the point that while Butler focuses on style as a way to understand or analyze textual objects, I am arguing for style as performance and specifically as a pedagogy. As my last chapter showed, classical

stylistic devices provide a kind of repertoire for students like the Malaysian writer whose writing Lu discusses in this same essay. This is a connection worth making for anyone interested in arguing for the relevance of style to the field of rhetoric and composition. Having concluded this excavation of style in both antiquity and in twentieth century, I now turn to specific adaptations of imitation for first-year composition classrooms.

Adapting Imitation Pedagogies for Translingual Writing

This section adapts imitation exercises as a tool for the development of translingual style. The almost exclusively Western and American nature of the models offered by pedagogies of imitation, both classical and modern, imposes dominant codes on students not by method but by example. If students imitate only Western authors, then they will internalize and reproduce only those stylistic forms. Broadening the range of possible models for interpretation, however, can transform what may seem to many scholars as an outdated teaching practice into a valuable tool for forwarding the goals of translingual writing that include the view of language difference and deviation from norms as a positive stylistic trait to be replicated, not reduced. Imitation exercises aimed at preparing students for translingual, transnational environments would thus draw from a much more diverse array of writers—Gabriel Marquez, Salman Rushdie, Isabel Allende, Sandra Cisneros, Chinua Achebe.

Of course, another possible objection to pedagogies of imitation is that they almost exclusively rely on literary works. Since many college writing courses at land-grant universities now focus on the acquisition of academic discourse, the models provided for imitation would ideally include a mix of academic, nonfiction, and literary

texts. The authors cited above are known for their fiction, for instance, but they have also published more academic essays that teachers can excerpt for use in imitation activities. Teachers and students should ultimately decide on the models they want to imitate; therefore, I do not offer an authoritative list of authors.

Contemporary writing teachers can certainly find even more dynamic and creative ways to deploy imitation exercises. Although Greco-Roman rhetoricians might balk at the idea of using student writing as a model for imitation, since imitation was meant to internalize the styles of only the most highly-regarded poets and orators, a definite democratization of these exercises would encourage students to write paraphrases of one another's short compositions. Such an exercise would work especially well in cross-cultural composition classrooms, in which students working in a variety of languages and dialects would copy one another's works in pairs or small groups. The various linguistic backgrounds that each student brings to the classroom, whether it is a variety of English or another language, would enable groups of students to copy, paraphrase, and translate a single passage in order to produce several multilingual versions of a single source text.

For the sake of illustration, imagine a typical second-language writing classroom that consists of students whose native languages range widely: Spanish, German, Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic. Each language possesses its own stylistic, rhetorical, and grammatical elements that, as native speakers of that language, students are unofficial experts on and that they can introduce as resources to the class. Beginning with conventional paraphrasing exercises described by Corbett, these students would first compose imitations of an author of their choosing in English. (For this first assignment,

both model and imitation would be in English.) Upon completion of the first assignment, teachers might then ask their students to exchange these initial imitations and then translate or paraphrase them into their own native languages, then present these translations to small groups or the entire class while explaining what stylistic changes they have made while shifting from the language of the model to their first language.

For example, a student composes a paraphrase of the opening of Canagarajah's "World Englishes and Composition," then gives this paraphrase (in English) to a student whose native language is Spanish. This student translates this paraphrase into Spanish, and then is responsible for explaining what differences in grammar and style are necessary to convey Canagarajah's ideas to a Spanish-speaking audience. These changes might also include idiomatic language, metaphors, and stylistic devices unique to the Spanish language that, while conveying the meaning of the original passage, do not possess a one-to-one correspondence in other languages.

A third step in this sequence might involve yet another paraphrase in which students work together to filter Canagarajah's ideas through another language—perhaps Chinese or German. Once students have worked in groups to complete several paraphrases of the same passage in several languages, teachers may finally ask them to translate or paraphrase the final product back into English and compare it to Canagarajah's original words. Discussion and reflection questions may include: What differences do the students notice? What has remained the same? How can they trace the evolution of stylistic traits from the original passage through the final paraphrase?

Finally, what aspects of the final paraphrase are potentially better (at least in the students' eyes) than Canagarajah's original words?

The most substantial benefit of this activity would be the recognition that the final paraphrase of this passage back into English is a multilingual text. Although the final paraphrase will technically be English, it will bear the cumulative influence of several languages and thus the stylistic and rhetorical imprint of those languages. Such an imitation activity would lay a foundation for further experimentation. For example, teachers may then ask the students who collaborated in the series of translations to produce a hybrid version of their particular passage, in which they use various stylistic devices to integrate one or more languages into their text. Such an exercise, completed in class or out of class, would serve as a useful transition from exercises in imitation to either the *progymnasmata* or longer academic papers.

Such a series of activities might appear to be a radical departure from the imitation exercises described in prior scholarship, but it is, nonetheless, in line with the intention of imitation as outlined from Quintilian through the twentieth century. The main difference is that the inventional characteristics of style are expanded to include multiple languages and varieties of English. An inventional style advanced by my imitation exercises highlights the importance of moving between dialects and languages in order to develop and expand students' rhetorical dexterity and linguistic resources. Thus, instruction at the sentence-level does not have to perpetuate static views of style or endorse an English Only educational policy.

Conclusion

The Greco-Roman tradition, with its repertoire of stylistic figures and accompanying pedagogical methods to facilitate their acquisition, possesses a wealth of resources that teachers can harness to prepare students for communicating effectively in increasingly global, translingual environments where several varieties of Englishes and languages interact at once. My goal in the last two chapters has been to reconcile some of the ostensible differences and disconnects between the Greco-Roman tradition as well its adaptations in the twentieth century and approaches toward language difference in order to reveal their usefulness.

The most central element of the Greco-Roman tradition I want to revive for use in translingual writing is the connection of style and imitation to invention. Just as scholars of language difference have stressed the importance of linguistic variation from norms as productive of meaning, not simply errors, my reading of rhetoricians such as Quintilian emphasizes originality. This is even evident in Quintilian's discussion of imitation. Quintilian outlined three different forms of imitation exercises: memorization (2.7.2-4), translation (10.5.2-3), and paraphrase (10.5.4-8).[47] While each these exercises were used as far back as classical Greece, Quintilian placed special emphasis on paraphrase as a creative and even competitive enterprise rather than one of simply perpetuating the stylistic tastes of the establishment. As he states,

---

[47] In Cicero's *De Oratore*, the character Crassus expresses skepticism regarding the exercise of paraphrase, preferring translation instead because the authors of prior works "had already used such words as were most appropriate to the subject and were the most elegant and altogether the best" (154).

> I would not have our paraphrase to be a mere interpretation, but an effort to vie with and rival our originals in the expression of the same thoughts. . .I therefore differ from those who disapprove of paraphrasing Latin orations on the pretext that, as the best expressions have already been used, whatever we express differently must of necessity be expressed worse. (10.5.4-8)

Furthermore, he adds that "many roads leading to the same goal. . .something to be praised in conciseness as well as copiousness, in metaphorical as well as literal, in direct as well as figurative expression" (10.5.4-8). In this sense, Quintilian's advice here and in other sections of *The Orator's Education* run counter to the dominant tendency in Roman culture toward conservativism and tradition. To incorporate writing exercises such as imitation into a pedagogy of translingual writing, as it is explained and defined in rhetorical treatises, does not necessitate importing their cultural baggage, in this case the monolingualism, patriarchy, and ethnocentricity of Imperial Rome. As Clark observes, "Experiment and innovation were frowned on in the schools. . .Indeed as long as there were Roman schools. . .these schools taught rhetoric pretty much as it was taught when Cicero was a boy" (21). Quintilian's treatise is as much a critique of common practices as it is a study of Roman rhetoric.

The classical tradition sees such paraphrase activities, and imitation exercises in general, as more than simply a way to avoid plagiarism, but as a path toward discovery (where style is involved in the process of invention). Terms such as paraphrase and summary have become ubiquitous in discussion of research-based writing as the proper way to represent the ideas of a source without committing intellectual theft. Moore explains that "Such fears [of plagiarism] arise in Quintilian's and Dionysius of Halicarnassus's treatment of imitation, and they lurk in the heart of every undergraduate

who is today faced with the task of writing a library research paper" (84). However, the celebration of diversity in Quintilian, the "many roads leading to the same goal" corresponds to a distinction that Moore draws between "originality" and "creativity" (84). Her historical reading of autonomous authorship, a concept which did not fully emerge in Western culture until the spread of the printing press, problematizes the very idea of plagiarism in the academy. As Moore argues, publishing and distribution networks created for writers "the possibility of making an independent living at their writing, without the constraints of patrons" (69) that contributed largely to the development of autonomous authorship and, later, to copyright laws to protect authors.

My notion is not to argue against the common understanding of paraphrase as a way to integrate sources, but to expand it. If teachers want to promote both "creativity" as well as "originality," then paraphrase becomes more than just a way to avoid plagiarism and integrate sources according to the rules of academia and academic integrity policies of universities. Discussing concepts of paraphrase in French secondary education and college, Christiane Donahue has also called for "copying as one strategy along a continuum of strategies" that include "reproducing, quoting, tracing, imitating, shadowing miming, paraphrasing, summarizing, referring to, linking outward from a single word, indirectly suggesting, referring to through connection to a cultural commonplace . . .and so on" ("Copying" 95). Thus paraphrase becomes a path to developing students' awareness of language and their experimentation with stylistic devices, including their use in code-meshing. Students may still learn paraphrase for

conventional academic purposes, but they also use it as a way to control other aspects of their writing.

My argument for the use of Greco-Roman instructional methods depends on a definition of translingual writing through Bakhtin's theories of dialogue, heteroglossia, and speech genres as a mode of composition that requires an ever-evolving set of discursive practices drawn from a range of registers, genres, dialects, and languages that are always in constant interanimation. This definition of translingual writing through dialogue and speech genres also foregrounds Bakhtin's concept of language as always co-owned and the use of language as always an act of appropriation and imitation of others' words. The writing and teaching practices recommended by Quintilian do not inhibit this inherent function in language. In fact, they are informed by these properties of language and thus are in line with a theory and pedagogy of translingual writing.

Pedagogical applications of translingual writing are an important step toward making multilingualism and language difference a norm at universities and part of mainstream composition practices. However, they are only one component of a broader reframing of rhetoric and composition. What scholars such as Lu, Horner, Canagarajah, Trimbur, and Young conceive of in their recent work on transnationalism and language policies at U.S. universities constitutes nothing short of a significant paradigm shift, one that promises to reshape classroom practices as well as writing program administration. In the next two chapters, I articulate the implications of translingual writing for multimodality and writing program administration. Both areas represent areas in rhetoric and composition and are vital aspects to consider in the formulation of a comprehensive

approach to language difference that recognizes the realities of globalization and its impact on higher education. These chapters do not propose final answers or opinions on the dynamics of globalization, digital discourse, and administrative issues in higher education. Rather, they carve out necessary work for the field at large and pose difficult though specific questions while gesturing toward the theoretical frames where we may find the beginnings of answers.

CHAPTER IV

REMEDIATING THE *PROGYMNASMATA*

A comprehensive pedagogy of translingual writing calls for further elaboration of language difference in terms of scholarship on digital discourse and multimodality. Accepting the premise that language difference is a resource rather than an obstacle to meaning-making, teachers and students still need a full theoretical and pedagogical explication regarding how to best take advantage of such a resource in local classroom environments that are now permeated by technology and connected to global networks. Although the Greco-Roman *progymnasmata* provide a valuable set of teaching strategies to develop translingual style, it is only one part of a pedagogy that defines translingual writing as a series of actions that deploy multiple codes, conventions, and languages within texts and single speech acts (e.g., commands or promises) in order to push against and reform the limits of any given language's inherent capacity and resources for diversity. In order to fully understand and teach the implications of this definition, we need to give an account of how digital discourse affects the deployment of these codes, genres, and languages.

Digital discourse certainly facilitates the evolution and cross-pollination of Englishes and other languages, also increasing the degree and frequency of college students' exposure to linguistic diversity in their social, academic, and professional lives. Advances in technology have globalized the daily activities of most college students,

allowing them to interact across linguistic, cultural, and national boundaries to a degree that exceeds prior generations' abilities to do so. This chapter applies Bakhtin's notion that "where there is style there is genre" (66) to ongoing conversations in our field about globalization and digital literacies, especially their tendency to remediate or renew prior modes of communication such as letters, memos, and books. I outline ways of tapping new digital genres such as the tweet and the Internet meme, as well as transmedia storytelling, to further renew style and imitation exercises derived from the ancient Greeks and Romans, which ultimately prepare students for writing that blends linguistic codes as well as modes of composition.

Scholars in multimodal composition and digital rhetoric have shown increasing interest in genre theory since John Trimbur's redefinition of the rhetorical canon of delivery as "circulation," a concept which has led to further developments by Andrea A. Lunsford and Kathleen Blake Yancey. Bakhtin's concept of genre and interanimation has served as a foundation for this work, as well as other related scholarly projects exploring how digital genres renew or remediate older ones (Bolter & Grusin; Brook et al; Barta-Smith & DiMarco; Basgier). This process of remediation occurs when newer genres, such as email, take up the purposes and conventions of older genres such as letters and memos, while adding conventions of their own. In short, the process of remediation is one of transformation. Other genre theorists have used this concept to trace the historical evolution of genres like the blog in order to contextualize their contributions to public discourse (Bauman; Miller & Shepherd,). For instance, Miller has described the blog as a remediation of the daily journal or diary, with the notable transformation of the public-

private dynamic. The blog serves many of the same purposes as the diary regarding the discussion of personal matters, and yet the blog is much more public.

Building on the previous chapter's adaptation of the *progymnasmata*, this chapter repurposes writing exercises so they assist students' development of translingual style in these digital, multimodal environments. The first section of this chapter explores work in multimodality and digital rhetoric that has offered a wealth of pedagogical approaches to integrate textual, visual, and aural modes of composition, though not necessarily to the translingual stylistic possibilities that such new digital genres offer. The rest of this chapter proposes increasingly popular modes of discourse—transmedia storytelling, Internet memes, and tweets—as ways to identify and harness these stylistic possibilities by digitizing or remediating Greco-Roman writing exercises. I argue that developing short exercises prompting students to analyze and compose short digital narratives, tweets, and memes prepares them to participate in global, multimodal spaces.

Just as any print genre encourages varying degrees of experimentation, such as the use of figures of thought and figures of expression, the same applies to digital genres. As one genre takes up, remediates, or interanimates another, the two come to exchange not only structural conventions but also stylistic ones. In fact, our increasingly convergent culture (Jenkins) means that a greater number of genres—print, digital, visual, and aural—are now interacting than ever before. This degree of interaction offers numerous opportunities for stylistic experimentation that produces language difference, as composers mix and mesh languages, dialects, and mediums for a variety of rhetorical agendas.

Overview: Multimodality and Language Difference

Research on multimodality appears to be gradually turning toward language difference, genre, and civic discourse. This section articulates those connections, exploring how language difference can serve as a tool for teachers and students as they compose in different modes (textual, aural, visual) and genres when participating in public discourse. Because so much of public discourse now occurs online, it is important for students to understand the rhetorical dynamics of online genres such as blogs and social media sites such as YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook. Furthermore, the classical understanding of style through imitation, appropriation, and shared utterances is mirrored in discussions of the remix paradigm that is overtaking the field. As Adam J. Banks states, the idea of remix in rhetoric and composition itself derives from the nonstandard rhetorical practices of African-Americans, in particular the D.J., whose practices of mixing and sampling have led to the field's current understanding of "selection, combination, and arrangement in writing" (117). Banks goes on to assert that "Every scholarly book or article we write is read as much for the selection, arrangement, mixing, and interpretative moves scholars brings [sic] to their engagement of other voices and ideas as much for any brilliant, innovative—even original—argument or thesis they might forward" (138). However, the notion of "remix" can be traced back even further to the theories of style and imitation discussed in the past two chapters. This does not make Banks even slightly wrong to portray the D.J. as a rhetorician, but it shows that the nonstandard rhetorical traditions and their linguistic practices are converging with the Greco-Roman tradition, in ways that the field can benefit from if explored.

Code-meshing typically refers to the use of multiple linguistic codes in a single text or conversation. However, some scholars have also begun applying this concept to what Canagarajah has referred to in passing as "polyliterate orientations to writing" (587). According to Kevin Roozen, these approaches to composition "go beyond blending linguistic types to include weaving together diverse texts and textual practices" (203), such as visual and aural mediums (203). In a similar vein, Stephen Fraiberg has synthesized a range of research on language difference and new media to offer a revision to Canagarajah's term "code-meshing," which he calls "code-mashing," or "the complex blending of multimodal and multilingual texts and literacy practices in our teaching and research" (102). To put this another way, translingual writing is but one of many available rhetorical resources in a digital environment.

Code-mashing is an apt phrase to describe what multilingual writers do in online environments, one that directs attention to the linguistic dimension of online discourse more so than the idea of "remix," and in turn stresses the multimodal contexts in which code-meshing occurs. Until recently, in fact, multilingualism has been seen as largely a textual practice. According to Fraiberg, however, it is but "one resource in a more complex semiotic repertoire distributed across local and global contexts" (102). Only a handful of studies have situated multilingualism within the contexts of new media scholarship. Lee, Ito, and Sun have each studied text messaging in global spaces. Selfe and Hawisher have narrated the technology-mediated literacy experiences of Chinese international students, indicating in general how technology has impacted their acquisition of English. In "Globalization and Agency: Designing and Redesigning the

Literacies of Cyberspace," Selfe and Hawisher emphasize the multiple forces that students navigate between their local and global environments, asserting the need for pedagogies that attend to "the interdependent relationship between learning English(es), learning digital literacies, and acquiring the means of success in an increasingly technological world" (634). In the twenty-first century, students are developing complex language abilities through their interactions with others in these spaces.

In *Code-Meshing as World English*, Elaine Richardson analyzes the use of African-American English in global hip-hop movements to show how they blend codes in online environments in order to "resist their local situations and identities" (231). Richardson specifically observes the circulation of *content morphemes*, or "singly occurring nouns that reflect…cultural borrowing" (241) and *system morphemes*, or the "mixing of various linguistic units" between lending and borrowing languages (245). For example, words from African-American hip-hop culture such as "brutha" become transliterated into German online hip-hop discourse as "brüdah," and "you dissin'" becomes "zu dissen" (247). Despite this handful of articles, a great deal of unexplored territory remains regarding the role of language difference and linguistic style in digital discourse.

The increasing awareness of new media's potential to encourage rhetorical agency creates a fruitful space to think about language difference in digital environments. Just as a Bakhtinian or generic perspective on language difference can enhance our teaching practices, approaching new media composition and digital discourse through style and language difference provides greater possibilities for pedagogical innovation.

Furthermore, students are able to acquire greater rhetorical agency if they become acquainted with the stylistic constraints of online genres as well as their ability to facilitate heteroglossia. In addition to considering which "modes and media are best suited to the kinds of change [they] are trying to effect and to [their] intended audience and purpose" (Sheridan et al., p. 818), teachers and students also need to consider, as Bakhtin has observed, the varying levels of linguistic creativity tolerated by different digital genres. Stylistic constraints and possibilities have a direct relation to the "kinds of change" that students are interested in promoting. Anyone who intends to use social media to access public discourse must negotiate digital delivery and circulation, but they also must contend with digital style.

If students can begin to practice language difference through the use of *progymnasmata*, then it follows that adaptations of these exercises for multimodal and digital discourse can provide scaffolding for the wealth of pedagogical material. Digital *progymnasmata* will also assist in laying the foundation for further connections between digital rhetoric, multimodality, and language difference. I take up where these projects leave off and offer pedagogical use of memes, Twitter, and the media they converge with in order to tap the valuable insights made by scholarly explorations of digital genres.

Using Transmedia to Teach Fable and Narrative

Adam Banks describes the D.J. as a digital griot—in his terms someone who is a "master of both words and music who is a storyteller, praise singer, and historian in many of those West African cultures. . .sometimes an entertainer, sometimes a counselor to chiefs and leaders, but regardless of the range between playful and serious, the griot is

absolutely central to the life of his or her society" (22). The literate practices digital griots

engage in consist of "rich verbal play used in every possible function, from introducing

songs to selling precuts, promoting events, and even preaching sermons to rapping,

rhyming, and signifyin" (24). In short, the digital griot is a digital storyteller who blends

codes as well as genres. I agree with Banks' main argument, that students and scholars

should aim to take on some of the griot's roles in their own discursive performances. And

yet near the end of his book, he is at a loss for how to achieve this in the classroom,

asking "What does it look like to teach students in school and out to become like Papa

LaBas and to have that approach define how they view writing with technologies and in

the ever-changing environment that marks writing in digital spaces?" (161). These two

initial exercises—the fable and the narrative—begin to answer this question.

Aelius of Theon defines fable as "a fictitious story giving an image of truth," after

which "we add the meaning of which it is an image" (23). Fables are useful in and of

themselves as well as when woven into larger arguments because "The whole point [of a

fable] is useful instruction" (24). Theon references Aesop's fables in particular as

examples of moral teachings or ethical lessons delivered via fiction. Completing these

exercises and imitating examples by such figures as Aesop thus instilled moral virtues, in

addition to serving as opportunities to hone the basics of style. As Theon says, they

"should be inflected. . .in different grammatical numbers" and figures of speech (25).

Teachers may be justly cautious of instilling "moral virtues" into their students these

days, but style is a manageable goal.

Before illustrating my remediation of the fable, I also want to define the narrative for the sake of describing a twenty-first exercise that combines both of these *progymnasmata*. Theon defines the narrative in a similar fashion to the fable, as "language descriptive of things that have happened or as though they had happened" (28). The difference is that narratives are typically longer and possess a more complex pattern of organization. Structurally, the narratives consist of a number of elements that include "person, action, place, time, manner, [and] cause" (41). The student uses these elements to describe a series of events and then proceeds to the topics of clarity (what happened), possibility (whether it could have happened), plausibility (how likely it is to have happened), factuality (if it indeed happened), order (whether the plot does justice to the event), and propriety (how it benefits listeners). Thus the student narrates the event and then presents a short argument on, essentially, how believable and socially useful it is as a story.

In addition to training in how to organize discourse, these exercises also oriented students to matters of language and style. Here the need to remediate this exercise becomes clearest, since Theon espouses a monolingual preference when declaring that "[a]s for style, in aiming at clarity one should avoid poetic and coined words and tropes and archaisms and foreign words and homonyms" (31). Additionally, Theon advises students to "not stick digressive phrases or clauses in the middle of sentences, especially not long ones" (32). Because the narrative is devoted to explaining an event clearly, "one should employ styles that are natural for the speakers and suitable for the subjects and the

places and the occasions" (33). Using these exercises to develop multilingual metalinguistic awareness would obviously necessitate diverging from these prescriptions.

My remediation of this exercise has two distinct agendas. First, students would not follow Theon's instructions to avoid "foreign words" but rather select two or three figures of speech, as discussed in the last two chapters, to experiment with as they construct their multilingual narratives. Second, students would engage in what digital media theorists have begun to refer to as "transmedia" storytelling (Jenkins 2010) as an additional resource for inflecting and developing their narrative. One of the key weaknesses of stylistic and imitation exercises is that they engage at the text-only level, rather than prompting students to navigate multiple modes of composing. Incorporating transmedia storytelling dialogizes these *progymnasmata,* transforming them into exercises attuned to the interplay between textual, aural, and visual genres.

Henry Jenkins first introduced the concept of "transmedia storytelling" in his 2006 book *Convergence Culture* but has subsequently discussed its potential for teaching in a 2010 article in *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, where he defines it as "a process where integral elements of a fiction get dispersed systematically across multiple delivery channels for the purpose of creating a unified and coordinated entertainment experience," in which "each medium makes its own unique contribution to the unfolding of the story" (944). Giving a very accessible example, Jenkins describes the plethora of television shows, web series, novels, graphic novels, and computer games that fill in the back stories and futures of both major and minor characters in the *Star Wars* mega-franchise. Transmedia, by Jenkins' view, includes anything that elaborates on the

central narrative. Yet this concept excludes common merchandise such as cereal, since the "idea that Storm Troopers might be made of sugar sweet marshmallow bits probably contradicts rather than enhances the continuity and coherence of the fictional world that George Lucas was creating" (945). Of course, transmedia is becoming a prominent aspect in the development of television, games, films, and novels. The *Star Wars* example makes transmedia seem almost happenstance, whereas the producers of games like *Year Zero* are applying this notion to projects from their inception—with the end goal being that fans will *have* to purchase items in multiple platforms and delivery channels in order to attain a complete experience.

These shifts have a direct impact on composition. Narratives are powerful rhetorical tools because they shape lived experiences, and in the twenty-first century college students' lives are unfolding across multiple media in a way that parallels the various platforms used now to craft and promote forms of entertainment. Students interact with certain friends via social networking, some face-to-face, with their peers through Blackboard and in class, and with a variety of other people through online discussion boards, YouTube, email, and chat sites. The narrative of college students' lives is dispersed across these mediums, or genres, which means that their language practices are also dispersed and determined by them. Furthermore, arguments are increasingly unfolding across multiple scenes and situations. Rhetorical theorists such as Collin Brooke and Sidney Dobrin have offered the term "genre ecology" for what I would describe as the expository version of transmedia storytelling.

Especially important is how these genres give rise to their own discursive

practices, such as text-speak, which blend with their other languages. For instance,

students use vernaculars alongside abbreviations when texting friends, family, and

coworkers. These abbreviations, used in textual interactions via phones but also online,

feed back into their oral discourse. My own students have often observed that they and

their friends use terms such as "BRB" and "LMAO" during oral conversations, and that

they frequently mix text-speak with their other varieties of English. This is also true of

second-language students, who sometimes code-mesh English with their first languages

in addition to inserting phrases and abbreviations that they have learned from their online

discourse. In this light, transmedia becomes a way to think not only about multimedia

entertainment but also the very fabric of students' rhetorical interactions. It follows that

writing assignments can enhance their awareness of this phenomena and help them

mobilize this multimodal code-meshing, or what Fraiberg calls "code-mashing" as a

resource for more than simply communicating in social circumstances.

Jenkins acknowledges some of these benefits, mainly in terms of enhancing

students' creative abilities, and it bears pointing out that he is technically a scholar of

media studies and not rhetoric and composition. Nonetheless, the difficulties he admits in

teaching transmedia speak to the need for basic exercises such as the *progymnasmata*. As

Jenkins states, "Trying to deal with transmedia texts in a classroom was more daunting

than first imagined. Teaching a film or book is straightforward but the sheer scale of

these texts made it impossible to teach the work as a whole," an obstacle which played

out further in his syllabus, which "included some specific media texts as examples [for

them] to look at together," though "often discussions faltered, staying at a fairly superficial level: the class lacked the background to deal with the texts on anything other than a highly abstract level" (947). Perhaps part of the dilemma lies in the absence of such scaffolded exercises. Jenkin's syllabus, included in the article, lists two research-based papers and one final project to be completed in groups, with no explicit mention of smaller-scale activities in the assignment descriptions or the course schedule.

Utilizing transmedia, a remediated version of the fable or narrative exercise would ask students to select a brief story, such as Aesop's fable of "The Tortoise and the Hare" or another of their choosing, and then proceed to amplify and adapt it through their use of other codes and literacy practices. In the traditional exercise, such amplification included the addition of descriptions and dialogue. Students might incorporate these in order to give these fables meaning for contemporary contexts. The fable of "The Wolf in Sheep's Clothing" often serves as a cautionary tale for children, akin to "Don't take candy from strangers." However, the moral of the fable, "appearances can be deceiving" has a variety of applications to students' lived experiences.

Students can also parody or "signify on" (via Henry Louis Gates) these fables and their morals through inventive wordplay and the manipulation of digital genres. Imagine a student who retells the "The Wolf in Sheep's Clothing" fable not by simply summarizing and elaborating in the conventional sense, but also by creating a fictitious narrative that unfolds over social media through Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and E-harmony. As a transmedia story, this remediated fable might serve as a satiric reworking of the moral about deceptive appearances as applied to the perils of online dating. The

plausibility or believability of this tale would be enhanced through the incorporation of different linguistic codes used to express the types of utterances appropriate to dating situations—pick up lines, flirtations, compliments, boasting, pea-cocking, promises, and so on.

A newer type of narrative than the fable, of course, is the fairytale—a truly international genre that lends itself especially well to multilingual, transmedia storytelling. Consider Snow White, hundreds of versions of which derive from countries ranging from Spain to China (Tartar 74). In retelling and amplifying such a tale, students would need to research several versions and make decisions regarding the languages they might want to incorporate as they negotiate different cultural versions. This kind of exercise would work especially well in groups, in which students would pool their various linguistic backgrounds in order to produce a multilingual retelling that code-meshes, using different stylistic devices, to convey the story through prose and dialogue. Students would need to consider what languages and varieties of English they want to incorporate and for what purposes. For instance, taking a cue from the Czech dialogue in the Irish film *Once* that Prendergast describes in "In Praise of Incomprehension," students may decide to attribute certain lines in Mandarin to the Evil Queen if they mean to reference motifs and plot elements from Chinese versions.

In making these decisions, students would be practicing the inventive aspects of style outlined in chapters two and three. They would need to think through the potential emotional impacts, such as humor and suspense, that code-meshing would generate in their narrative, given that certain members of their audience would not immediately

understand non-English utterances. Just as the director of *Once* anticipates the momentary suspense in which viewers are deprived of the film's central meaning by the use of a different code, student writers could conduct similar rhetorical experiments in order to become familiar with how code-meshing can affect meaning and audience reception, especially as they present their retellings to the class and engage in workshop-style discussions.

Integrating transmedia opens additional possibilities for rhetorical experimentation. As opposed to the conventional "remix" or "mash-up" that has become popular in the field, in which students produce multimodal texts through programs like iMovie or Windows Media Player, students might instead narrate their multilingual version of Snow White through a series of status updates or tweets—some in English, some in other codes or languages. Success would depend on students' ability to code-mash for a specific rhetorical purpose, rather than simply shifting randomly between English and, say, Chinese depending on their genre. For example, a retelling of Snow White might begin in first person via Facebook. The heroine's status updates might narrate a series of events leading up to the first confrontation with the Queen, at which point the Facebook profile goes "silent," except for wall posts in which other "characters" inquire about what may have happened to her. The students might use one such wall post to direct audiences to a blog run by one of the seven dwarves, describing a peculiar incident where a young woman shows up in their cabin in the woods. In this case, the students would be using a shift in digital genre to punctuate a change in perspective.

Such transitions in person, verb tense, case, word order, and number were hallmarks of the *progymnasmata*. They were designed to steep students in the minutia of language and build a copiousness and versatility, so that they were able to compose and deliver speeches on any occasion at a moment's notice. Adapted for the twenty-first century, a digital and multilingual set of exercises would prepare students not only for the agility needed to communicate in one medium or language, but across several. This first exercise in fable and narrative addresses these needs. Although it may seem naïve or simplistic, I want to issue the reminder that these particular exercises were the first in a sequence of fourteen. Additionally, I am not suggesting that these activities take up a great deal of class time. Instead, I see them as supplemental and supportive of larger assignments oriented to academic, research-based writing. In fact, students could conceivably complete the retelling of Snow White described above in a single weekend. The larger goal is experimentation and orientation to multimodal language difference as a *first step* into the indefinite process of acquiring a translingual style that, while not demanding fluency in languages, does encourage an openness to other codes to generate meaning or "incomprehension" that eventually leads to meaning. This same disclaimer extends to my discussion in the following sections that propose Internet memes and Twitter feeds as remediations of other classical exercises.

Memes as Impersonation

Here I discuss how the meme, used as a short composition exercise, remediates the older Greco-Roman exercise of *prosopopoeia* (impersonation) in which students write short monologues in the voice of fictional characters. Theon describes this exercise as

"the introduction of a person to whom words are attributed that are suitable to the speaker and have an undisputable application to the subject discussed" (47). As an example, Theon asks "What words would a man say to his wife when leaving on a journey? Or a general to his soldiers in time of danger?" (47). This kind of imagining involves generic situations as well as very specific moments in history and literature, as when "Cyrus. . .marching against the Massagetae" or "Datis. . .when he met the king after the battle of Marathon" (47).

As a cultural studies term, the meme was originally coined by Richard Dawkins, who borrowed the concept from evolutionary biology to describe the circulation of ideas, images, and phrases in popular culture. Popular sayings or images evolve over time as they circulate through discourse, and others die off. More recently, the meme has been used to refer to template images that Internet users can "caption" and then embed on their blogs or Facebook pages or share through Twitter. These memes range from the trite to the socio-politically significant, as users add their own captions that can refer to their own personal lives or to larger political events and trends.

In a sense, the meme operates as a kind of digital *progymnasmata*, similar to the specific exercise of *prosopopoeia* (impersonation) in which students can write short monologues in the voice of fictional characters using a variety of stylistic devices to navigate the different linguistic codes that characterize discourse in multilingual spaces. Some important differences exist that illustrate how the meme remediates this older exercise. The *prosopopoeia* called for compositions of at least a paragraph, while the meme allows for sentence-length compositions at most. Additionally, such exercises

enjoyed a small audience, at most a pupil's instructor and peers. By contrast, memes can reach larger, evolving audiences since they are posted and shared through convergent media. One of the recent popular memes, featuring Ryan Gosling captioned by paraphrases of feminist theory, gathered at least a national audience that came to include the actor himself, who recited particular captions during television interviews.

One of the more popular memes, "philosoraptor," provides an excellent case in point. The phrase itself dates back at least thirteen years, when numerous Internet users independently yet simultaneously found a child's juxtaposition of the words "philosopher" and velociraptor" humorous and began to use it on discussion boards. The popular web series "Know Your Meme" attributes the first known use of the term to a ten-year old who posted on an educational website that "I like the philosoraptor because it spits an acidy type of substance in its victims' eyes. . .this dinosaur is da bomb" (knowyourmeme.com).

It is worth noting that this particular meme is itself a product of code-meshing, given that its first recorded appearance is an "error." Thus even unintentional occurrences of language difference can spawn a cultural phenomenon. Moreover, a classical rhetorician would describe the invention of the word "philosoraptor" as a kind of metaplasm, specifically antisthecon, which a rhetor uses when substituting a syllable or letter for another in a word to achieve an effect. The emergence of the "philosoraptor" illustrates very well how a simple stylistic device can spawn a process of invention and create new unique meaning. Nearly a decade later, an online artist by the name Sam Smith designed an image inspired by the phrase, consisting of a screen print of a dinosaur

portrayed in deep contemplation. Since then, users on various meme generator sites have uploaded the image, allowing thousands of users to add captions expressing what the dinosaur is pondering.

As a genre, the meme generator site imposes a number of stylistic constraints and conventions that inform users' rhetorical decisions. First, the physical size of the image only accommodates so many characters. Thus whatever message a person wants to convey must fit into the space provided. Second, the thousands of pre-existing memes have determined the syntactic structure of the caption, which consists of a conditional phrase from analytical philosophy, the "If p, then q" construction. To some extent, the syntactic structure of the sentence, used to caption an absurd character, both reflects and mocks academic discourse. Moreover, the thoughts attributed to this meme character usually pose riddles or audacious questions intended to ridicule or satirize a particular issue or viewpoint. As an example, a recent meme caption demonstrating particularly memorable stylistic play reads, "If guns don't kill people, people kill people, does that mean that toasters don't toast toast, toast toast toast?" This particular caption promotes gun control through an ironic analogy with something mundane, one that also toys with language by using the same word as a subject, verb, and object. The unexpected repetition is all the more effective because it is memorable.

Such use of memes qualifies as a direct example of how an online rhetor uses generic conventions and constraints to convey a political message, in this case one about gun control, through a less conventional channel, possibly increasing his or her chances of evoking a response. Moreover, meme captions often display an acute awareness of and

willingness to toy with and subvert language expectations—as the user in question has done.

Many of the memes available through various websites facilitate stylistic experimentation closely affiliated with code-meshing, as well as a similar linguistic act that linguists refer to as calquing, or "loan translations" of words and phrases from one linguistic code to another (Richardson 250). The meme "Crafty Interpreter" features hundreds of captions in which users blend English, Russian, Spanish, Chinese, and French in order to make puns or highlight and parody the difficulties of intercultural communication. The meme "Joseph Ducreux," a character based on a portrait artist from the court of King Louix XIV, serves a similar purpose. The character is explicitly described as someone who "translates current sayings [often from vernacular dialects] into the verbiage of his time" by "rewording current slang, sayings, or catchphrases into ye olde speak" of the eighteenth century (memgenerator.net). Examples include the rephrasing of song lyrics such as "Who let the dogs out?" into multi-syllabic, Latinate, and often wordy expressions meant to both parody and celebrate linguistic diversity. The users who generate these memes are both code-meshing and "signifyin" when they use a parodic version of the linguistic code of a privileged European to convey maxims and commonplaces from an entirely different class and culture. The result may be humorous, but it is also sociolinguistically significant.

Figure 1. Examples of anonymously posted memes from memegenerator.net

At first, memes may appear to possess only entertainment value. However, they fulfill a number of pedagogical goals in support of the multilingual-multimodal framework proposed by Fraiberg. Foremost, they provide a dynamic but simple way of introducing the complex concept of rhetorical and genre ecologies to first-year college students—many of whom are also unfamiliar with basic rhetorical concepts such as the appeals and the five canons, and thus need a great deal of attention to scaffolding in order to integrate conventional and digital rhetorics. Similar to the example of Betty Crocker's appropriation by an Israeli technology firm, Internet memes provide discrete units of discourse and stable-for-now genres that teachers and students can "trace global flows of language and culture" and discuss "the ways that texts position the actors and are knotted into wider social, cultural, national, and global ecologies" (Fraiberg 116). One may think

of a Biology teacher who assigns students the task of tracing the path of oxygen or nitrogen through an ecosystem consisting of the atmosphere, living animals, plant-life, and decaying organic matter. Understanding such complex networks becomes manageable when students focus on a single molecule.

In my own teaching, I have introduced students to the idea of rhetorical and genre ecologies and then illustrated it by discussing the Internet meme, showing a brief video clip from "Know Your Meme," and then asking them to select and analyze several captions of a particular meme for their stylistic elements. Students work separately as well as in small groups to study the ways users adapt these memes for a variety of socio-political agendas. I encourage students to consider the relationship between the content and stylistic aspects of the captions, how diction and figures of expression animate the messages expressed, and how the spatial dimensions of the macro image template have a bearing on these decisions. For instance, meme writers do not have much freedom regarding how the text appears on the template. The font size and words-per-line shift depending on the length of the upper and lower captions. This means that a meme writer who wants the bottom caption to read as one line, rather than two, must revise it in order to meet the meme generator's dimensions. As students observe, writers often have to incorporate abbreviations and text-speak to convey longer messages in fewer characters. However, such use of style inspires creativity as well as generic interanimation, bringing together many genres and modes of discourse.

After analyzing a particular meme's generic conventions, my students then decide on a particular political or cultural issue they feel strongly about, choose a meme, and

then compose their own captions. Once they do this, I ask them to post reflections to our course discussion boards, considering their manipulations of language and style in relation to content. Additionally, I ask them to at least speculate regarding the aspects of rhetorical delivery or circulation of their caption through social media sites. Other issues we discuss include how the use of humor, like in the philosoraptor meme, can affect their ethos and thus make various audiences either more or less receptive to their message. Thus students encounter and wrestle with these sophisticated conceptions in an isolated, clear fashion before moving on to larger, harder-to-trace ecologies.

Figure 2. Ryan Gosling meme.

Although such memes do not always blend languages like Spanish and English or dialects such as Standard English and AAVE, they do qualify as hybrid discourse to the degree that they mix vernacular phrases such as "Hey girl" with dense academic terminology such as "heteronormativity," similar to the Joseph Ducreux meme. Memes that employ the style of theorists renown for their obscurity, as the example above shows,

can serve as particularly productive models of code-meshing. On an ideological level, various captions of the Rylan Gosling meme also foreground and satirize the tense co-existence of competing worldviews, in this case the desire to either resist or embrace commonplaces about heterosexual relationships. Teachers can defamiliarize these common, everyday instances of multimodal-multilingual discourse during class discussions and exercises as a way of building up to the more complex discussions of code-mashing and genre ecologies.

Like Helen of Troy, Achilles, or Hercules (all frequent subjects of the impersonation exercise) meme characters prompt students to consider specific aspects of diction, sentence-length, and syntax as they write captions that reflect the voices of those characters. Meme characters such as philosoraptor or Joseph Ducreux each possess a unique voice, which has accumulated and evolved over the course of numerous captions, and which must be recognized and imitated in order for students to write effectively. In all of these ways, then, meme analyses and exercises can begin to orient students' attention to the interconnections between invention, style, language difference, and delivery through online discourse, as well as civic discourse. Furthermore, in-class activities and short exercises adapting various *progymnasmata* highlight the function of genre in determining the available stylistic resources and limitations that evoke creativity. Additional assignments might even ask students to do research on intercultural issues and create their own meme characters based on figures from literature or popular culture, which several websites allow users to do.

Lunch with Qaddafi, Cancelled: Twitter as a Proverb

On the one hand, Twitter has received criticism for encouraging superficiality in discourse, giving its users a platform to share their most inane passing thoughts. On the other hand, it has created new ways of communicating creatively that have aided protests in Iran, Syria, Libya, as well as New York and elsewhere as part of the recent Occupy Wall Street movement. Writing teachers may also find that it offers another means of remediating the *progymnasmata.* The tweet remediates the *progymnasmata* by reversing the composing process, from amplification to abbreviation, while still calling for attention to style. A majority of the Greco-Roman composition exercises ask students to amplify and elaborate rather than condense. For example, the *gnome* (proverb) lays out a rigid series of steps in which the writer is asked to state a particular saying, praise it, paraphrase its theme, explain its reasoning, introduce a contrast followed by a comparison, illustrate the saying with an example, provide support by discussing who has quoted the saying, and then end with a pithy conclusion. In contrast, tweets often boil down expressions to their most essential elements without sacrificing essential meaning. In essence, the tweet asks writers to produce original sayings or proverbs from the lengthier narrations of news articles and other texts.

The 140 character-limit in particular forces its users to employ creativity in conveying information or opinions, be they in the form of news flashes, anecdotes, or complaints. For instance, a number of celebrities have utilized Twitter as a way of commenting on current events in unique ways. Upon recent news of Libyan dictator Omar Qaddafi's death, the comedian Steve Martin posted a tweet saying, "Lunch with

Qaddafi, cancelled." This particular tweet may appear tasteless and irreverent to some,

but it possesses a number of ulterior readings—such as the implication that, on the

contrary, Qaddafi is not the kind of figure someone would imagine lunching with

Western celebrities, and is furthermore someone whose death is not likely to elicit more

than a few words of remorse. The tweet may also be read as an implication that despite a

great deal of current media attention, Qaddafi is ultimately but one of dozens of cruel

dictators who will ultimately fall to the periphery of the ever-anxious Western attention

span, much like a cancelled lunch date.

Such short, perfunctory responses to dramatic political events are reminiscent of

an older genre, the one-sentence novel, made famous by Ernest Hemingway's line, "For

sale: baby shoes, never worn." Asking students to compose similar lines—though

perhaps with less cynicism than Martin's—can help attune them to the potency of

stylistic devices and the intermingling or interanimation of genres within larger ecologies.

An interesting aspect of tweets such as "Lunch with Qaddafi, cancelled" or "For sale:

baby shoes," is the manner in which they take up other genres. Martin's tweet takes up

and parodies the daily planner or to-do list. The matter-of-factness of this genre and its

mundane language is what makes its use to describe significant political events ironic,

even humorous. Likewise, the bland tone of for-sale ads juxtaposed with the implication

of a tragedy constitutes novelty.

Although many of the thousands of tweeters online often use Twitter without

much regard for inventive style, this does not make the service itself the antithesis of

eloquence. It is worth noting that William Carlos Williams' poem "The Red

Wheelbarrow" meets Twitter's character-limit. As Chris Vognar writes for the *Dallas Morning-News*, "I've found that paring down my tweets has made my prose leaner. I chop out more adverbs than I used to." Vognar interviews a range of authors and poets who have used Twitter for literary purposes, praising its influence on their style. The memoirist and poet Mary Karr tweets lines from famous poets while meshing them with her own voice:

> Shelley on Keats, dead at 25: "Clasp with thy panting soul the pendulous earth." Like earth's a bauble swinging from a chain, keeping time.

This tweet becomes interesting from a Bakhtinian perspective, given Karr's ability to seamlessly blend Shelley's voice with her own and thus appropriate a line from his poetry as an utterance. Karr navigates Twitter's character limit by drawing on at least three genres—the newspaper headline, the poem, and the casual remark. The statement "Shelley on Keats, dead at 25" plays on famous headlines such as "Ford to New York: Drop Dead," conveying a complex set of relations between the poets Percy Shelley and John Keats in just a few words. Karr then selects a representative line from Shelley that conveys the sentiment. She then integrates that line into her own metaphor by beginning the next sentence with the word, "Like," which smoothes over the period and forges a connection between these two utterances, making them virtually part of the same statement. Just as the Bakhtinian utterance transcends grammatical units, so does Karr's meditation.

Teachers may devote a class period or more to the discussion of these issues—including how a poem or a line form a novel changes meaning when taken up by another,

digital genre. What does the poem or line gain, and what does it lose? For example,

tweeting Williams' poem forecloses the possibility of spatial elements such as

enjambment and caesura, which are crucial to the production and interpretation of poetry.

At the same time, having students read the poem in both forms—printed and tweeted—

can more effectively demonstrate the importance of composing in multiple genres and

voices. Understanding short poems or meditations like Karr's through Twitter illustrates

all the meaning one can make with 140 characters.

In addition to fostering attentiveness to style, students can also use Twitter

critically in order to examine rhetorical ecologies and media convergence in manageable

ways. The tweet acts as a kind of Bakhtinian super-utterance, not only blending voices,

genres, and styles, but also linking pathways to other texts and spaces through hyperlinks,

hashtags, and retweets. The hashtag, for example, enables users to quickly search and

survey hundreds of tweets on the same topic. Typing #Occupy or #Libya into Twitter's

search box generates pages of results showing politicians, celebrities, and ordinary

citizens worldwide who have shared information or opinions on the given topic, so long

as they add that hashtag to the end of their tweet. Users can also gather information such

as date and time of posts, as well as how many times a post has been re-tweeted, as an

indicator of audience reception.

These same functions also allow for the study of language difference in public

spheres. A variety of hashtags exist for hybrid languages, including #Spanglish,

#Frainglas, and #Chinglish. Searching these hashtags generates pages of tweets through

which students can encounter such blended discourse online, following links that users

have included to YouTube videos, Flickr photos and albums, Facebook pages, online news articles, blogs, and other web content about hybrid languages.

Studying and analyzing the variety of tweets using or responding to Spanglish, for example, teachers and students can begin to map a living digital public or counterpublic on language difference, one that grows and evolves as ordinary citizens tweet their personal and public experiences and observations. As one user recently tweeted her own reasons for using Spanglish, it's useful for "that feeling when you no *sabes como expresarte* when somebody is asking you *como te sientes*." Echoing Anzaldua, this user appears to mean that hybrid languages provide access to knowledge and feelings that one language alone cannot. Another user tweets about "My gramma & her spanglish lol," when "she comes in here says 2 sentences in english 3 in spanish 2 in english 5 in spanish, lmao." At once public and private, such tweets can give students access to language difference as a lived phenomenon, possibly supplementing reading and discussions of essays. As this particular example demonstrates, students also gain exposure to how languages *and* genres interact, given this user's meshing of Spanish, English, and text-speak. Studying aggregates of these tweets provides a snapshot of everyday discourse. Furthermore, students can tweet their questions or comments arising from class discussions on these topics, thus participating in the public discourses as they study them.

A variety of short assignments can spring from the use of Twitter as an avenue of studying language difference. Teachers may even ask students to tweet their own micro-poems in which they integrate lines from Anzaldua or other multilingual writers into their

own meditations, as Karr has done with Shelley. Such writing exercises would be a particularly fruitful way to encourage an appreciation of translingual writing while developing a proficiency in code-meshing. These types of exercises do not necessarily replace the original *progymnasmata* so much as they expand them by applying their fundamental purpose—stylistic fluency—to digital public discourse. In the multimodal-multilingual classrooms that Fraiberg and Canagarajah envision, the use of tweets and memes can be valuable scaffolding activities to lay foundations for larger projects.

From The *Progymnasmata* to Beyond

While rhetoric and composition has devoted a great deal of attention to multimodal composition, more work is needed to explore the role that language difference and multilingual writing serve in new media. Some students undoubtedly already demonstrate the ability to code-mesh online, as scholars in language difference have noted. Some of my own second-language students who speak two or three languages have a keen awareness of global public discourse and participate in it actively. Other students, particularly those who would be classified as monolingual native speakers, often express a peculiar combination of ambivalence, apathy, and anxiety about global digital discourse. In class discussions they reference the increasingly competitive and international nature of job markets. They sometimes confess a lack of knowledge about other cultures and languages, though they are unsure about where the development of a more transnational disposition should begin. I argue that it begins at the level of the shared utterance.

This chapter uses a definition of translingual writing as expanding the available resources of a language to integrate multilingual, generic, civic, and multimodal approaches to discourse. The synthesis of these approaches within a single pedagogy is facilitated by the adaptation of the *progymnasmata* through discrete digital genres such as the meme and the tweet. The lessons and assignments introduced here offer scaffolding that students and teachers can use in order to engage style and language in complex, global ecologies.

The original series of exercises employed by the Greeks and Romans served as an initiation into the complex world of political, judicial, and ceremonial discourse that governed community relations among citizens. It follows that future citizens of the world need similar training in order to develop an awareness and sense of control over multiple texts and the ways they circulate in global cultures. Students are more likely now than ever to find jobs that require that kind of interactions that Fraiberg describes in which entrepreneurs from myriad nations and cultures come into contact through verbal, written, visual, and digital modes of communication. Furthermore, they are most likely already enmeshed in global discourse communities even if they do not fully realize it. Given these circumstances, college writing courses have an interest and responsibility to raise awareness and offer at least some preparation.

CHAPTER V

REDEFINING THE NORM

Even a pedagogical framework for translingual writing, as outlined in the

previous chapters, requires practical thinking at the institutional level in order to make

attention to language difference a part of mainstream teaching practices. Every aspect of

writing program administration (hereafter WPA) has the potential to promote language

difference as a resource not only to be valued but developed. Yet the administrative and

larger institutional aspects of writing instruction have received passing attention in

scholarship on language difference. Meanwhile, WPA scholarship itself has become

increasingly aware of the need to address linguistically diverse student populations,

evident in a 2006 issue of the *WPA* journal and a subsequent symposium in 2009.[48] This

chapter explores the existing body of scholarship on language difference and writing

program administration in order to pose necessary steps toward administering

translingual writing in line with John Trimbur's vision of "multilingual universities"

("Linguistic Memory" 586) and toward thinking in administrative terms that conceive of

"linguistic diversity as the norm rather than the exception" (Nero 156) in the twenty-first

century, thereby promoting multilingual writing as a competence for *all* students.

Near the end of "Linguistic Memory and the Politics of U.S. English," Trimbur

outlines the need to recast English from "the center" of writing instruction to more of a

---

[48] See *WPA* 30.1-2 and 33.1-2.

"linking language in multilingual writing programs, multilingual universities, and a multilingual polity" in which "a range of languages are involved as the medium of writing, as the medium of instruction across university curriculum, and as the medium of deliberation in the public sphere" (586). Trimbur even addresses the role of blended languages, conveying the hope that students will "speak, write, and learn in more than one language. . .code-switching as appropriate to the rhetorical situation" (587). To many teachers and writing program administrators (hereafter WPAs) who already inhabit multilingual environments, such as the University of Miami (585), the dream of the multilingual universities seems not only ideologically sound but also practical.

But to many others, Trimbur's ideal may seem extremely idealistic, given the predominant status of the "tongue-tied American" in U.S. student populations as well as faculty. Trimbur's article itself is not a practical "how-to" piece on enacting the multilingual university, but rather a thorough history of how U.S. culture has engaged in a "systematic forgetting" (577) of its multilingual roots for the sake of an unofficial national language. Despite its poignancy and effectiveness in exposing this forgetting, Trimbur's argument does not suggest how anyone might initiate practical steps in overturning the powerful ideology of English monolingualism.

Nonetheless, WPA scholars who work with linguistically diverse populations are beginning to take up Trimbur's call, increasingly articulating the need for *all* WPAs to become familiar with at least some of the methods and strategies that inform multilingualism and translingual writing. For instance, Wendy Hesford, Edgar Singleton, and Ivonne M. Garcia discuss a grant project at Ohio State University meant to address

issues of multiculturalism and multilingualism in both curricula and the experiences of international graduate teaching assistants. The reforms include a permanent peer mentoring group that consists of international and resident graduate students, who meet to discuss "their teaching, their graduate work, and their personal lives" (123). As the authors describe the mentoring groups' activities, the participants mainly discussed ways of "improving their understanding of how to teach in multicultural contexts" (123). Other reforms included "syllabi with more transnational context. . .made available to all incoming GTAs [graduate teaching assistants], so they can choose to teach classes based on this material;" an expansion of the GTA handbook to "include a section that specifically addresses the challenges of international and nonnative-speaker GTAs;" as well as "workshops on multicultural issues in the composition classroom. . .offered on a yearly basis" (124).

Despite these modest successes at fairly progressive research-based universities, many institutions still implicitly accept the disciplinary division of labor that Paul Matsuda has critiqued in his earlier work, and which Gail Shuck has also addressed while recounting her experiences as a WPA. The entrenched view of multilingualism as a separate domain of concerns that require specialists does tend to work against the larger goals that WPAs such as Trimbur and Hesford outline. Those few teachers and administrators trained to work with linguistically diverse student populations themselves tend to carry the sole responsibility of "fixing errors" and maintaining institutional quarantines around ESL students and Basic Writers. The role of the specialist, as proscribed by many institution's large ideologies, further complicates matters. Tom Fox

identifies these ideologies and the way they script WPAs in his essay "Standards and

Purity," which begins by recounting an interaction between Fox and a social work major

from Thailand, named Billy, who has failed a university proficiency test six times despite

having a B average. As Fox states,

Billy's struggle is paradigmatic. The university defined him in a series of

negatives:

nonwhite, nonnative speaker of English, nonresident. A writing test stopped his
progress. No one involved with the test consciously wished to stop nonwhite,
nonresident, nonnative speakers of English from making progress on their
degrees. They just wished to maintain what came to be called 'a common
minimum standard' for literacy. (15)

The test that Billy had failed six times, Fox says, was the Writing Effectiveness Screen

Test (WEST), which "screened students out of a required writing course in their major,

supposedly identifying those students who need more work on their writing before they

finish their major requirements" (17). The test was timed at 90 minutes and thus, like any

timed-writing assessment, biased against anyone who came to Standard English as a

second language or dialect. Fox describes the "excruciating" (24) eight-year process of

multiple meetings and proposals that finally culminated in overturning the WEST,

concluding that institutional ideologies favoring standards and centralization can seem

nearly impossible to overcome. At one point Fox even enlisted the help of Trimbur as a

WPA consultant, albeit to little avail.

Such narratives illustrate the immense challenges awaiting those wanting to

promote translingualism as a norm, but they also demonstrate the commitment that many

WPAs are demonstrating on the issue of language difference. Defining translingual writing as a competence for all students, including monolingual native speakers, means that WPAs do not necessarily need to be experts in second-language theories or language difference in order to elevate these issues to a level of importance similar to their other responsibilities—as Fox's story indicates. The internationalization of composition, and of higher education in general, entails that "good writing" or "effective communication" is taking on a multilingual, transnational dimension that cannot be ignored or relegated to the margins. Many universities may need to adopt a policy based on the translingual writing theory and pedagogy I have described in previous chapters, not necessarily for ethical or ideological reasons, but simply to address the "tipping point" (Preto-Bay and Hansen) in which multilingual students are beginning to become a sizeable population, increasingly difficult to accommodate in separate ESL classes. Translingual writing opens an opportunity for WPAs to "shape the discourse by changing the rhetorical context" in order to revise and reconceive their relationships to linguistic diversity and translingual writing (Matsuda 171). This reframes WPA responsibilities and makes the realization of language difference through both long-term program visions and day-to-day practices more feasible.

Globalization has already begun to challenge conventional concepts such as accuracy or correctness, which frequently appear in WPA discourse. Jay Jordan declares that "Given the current flux of English as an international language and of associated rhetorical practices, the assumptions that people who need to learn English do so in predictable settings and that they use it in predictable ways is untenable" (289). Jordan

cites figures from David Graddol that 750 million people, or nearly half of all English users, are now non-native speakers. Both emigration and the internationalization of U.S. universities means that more and more students served by college writing programs use English far differently from then prior populations. As A. Suresh Canagarajah has recently observed while surveying sociolinguistic studies, multilingual speakers and writers rarely resort to terms like "error" or "correctness" when communicating across dialect and language barriers—even during professional business exchanges. Rather, they employ hermeneutic strategies such as the "let it pass principle," in which interlocutors relinquish their own notions of correctness and often appropriate each other's words and phrases during conversation to facilitate meaning-making.

According to Matsuda, the gap in administrative approaches to language difference lies in a disciplinary bind. In an era of increasing professionalization and specialization, Matsuda argues, it has become difficult to discuss or conceptualize pedagogies in universal terms that cut across labels such as post-process, social epistemic, classical, mainstream, developmental, and so on. As he observes, "linguistic diversity is seldom included" in WPA scholarship because "it is a broad-based issue that applies to various aspects of WPAs' intellectual work—a situation resembling Phaedrus' dilemma in justifying rhetoric as an area of expertise" ("Linguistic Diversity" 169). The pervasive quality of language difference thus creates a paradox. While it is true that linguistic diversity infuses all aspects of WPA work, the ideology of specialization discourages WPAs from implementing policies on an issue when they feel they lack the requisite expertise.

The dominant view, Matsuda argues, is that "the ESL person" or the "developmental writing person" is more qualified to make such claims. However, this rarely happens, with the result being that no one makes them. Although articles presenting new directions or approaches to aspects of writing administration "have implications for multilingual writers," these articles nonetheless "do not address them because they are 'beyond the scope' of the project" (Matsuda 170). WPAs may not often discuss or implement policies with an eye to multilingual writing because they think they lack the necessary expertise to do so. Because of this, they might hesitate to take the risk of thinking through the multilingual dimensions of program policies. The anxiety that WPAs sometimes feel toward administering L2 courses, or courses containing L2 writers, often leads to one of the myths that Susan Miller-Cochran identifies: that having an L2 specialist at one's schools means that said person "can handle any language challenges that students might face" (214). On the contrary, Matsuda and Miller both stress the need to abandon such myths if language difference is to become a mainstream concern.

Toward Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Translingual writing is more likely to become a mainstream teaching practice if language difference scholars and WPAs collaborate to re-focus the first-year writing course and then design learning outcomes documents that reflect the importance of metalinguistic awareness. The previous three chapters have provided concrete examples of short writing assignments and the kind of translingual writing that they are intended to help foster. Such activities have a better chance of catching on with other teachers if WPAs can advocate for them through official documents. While documents such as the

WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition may benefit from explicit attention to multilingualism and linguistic diversity, simply adding a section on multilingualism to the Outcomes Statement would fall short of fully rearticulating the goals of a first-year composition course from the perspective of translingual writing. The addition of a section to The Outcomes Statement that identifies and describes the translingual dimensions of several individual outcomes would open a space for discussing translingual writing as a normal aspect of first-year writing. A separate addition to the Outcomes Statement would read similarly to the one on "Composing in Electronic Environments."[49]

I want to illustrate what I mean when asserting that several individual outcomes possess a translingual dimension to promote metalinguistic awareness. The document's first section on "Rhetorical Knowledge" expects students to be able to "Respond appropriately to different kinds of rhetorical situations," to "Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation," to "Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality," and to "Write in several genres" with an understanding as to "how genres shape reading and writing." Nothing here expressly contradicts the agenda of translingual writing. However, none of the outcomes explicitly call on students to understand or engage in translingual practices like code-meshing in a way that can facilitate their acquisition of concepts such as "voice," "tone," and "genre." Hence it is somewhat possible for instructors to teach to these outcomes without ever acknowledging

---

[49] This section holds that the pervasiveness of electronic discourse necessitates separate outcomes for first-year writing courses that nonetheless affect other outcomes. For instance, the first outcome states that students should be able to "use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, revising, editing, and sharing texts." See http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html.

the existence of other varieties of English or the rhetorical potential of integrating them along with other languages into dominant codes.

The section on "Knowledge of Conventions" in particular could benefit from a translingual perspective. The last individual outcome listed here requires that students be able to "Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling." Conservative teachers and WPAs can interpret this through the lens of monolingualism. But as more progressive teachers know, controlling grammar and syntax does not have to mean always writing in Standard English. In fact, language difference insists that true control over "syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling" requires the ability to choose between and blend varieties of English and other languages to suit one's rhetorical purpose. From my own theoretical stance outlined in the first chapter, controlling grammar and syntax means drawing on other Englishes and languages strategically in order to enrich a writer's repertoire and also to expand what Standard English is capable of achieving. Thus, effective code-meshing certainly qualifies as control of surface features.

Students can satisfy most of these outcomes through compositions that demonstrate an understanding of rhetorical situations with regard to nonstandard varieties of English and multiple languages. For instance, consider expectation that students "Adopt appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality." This outcome forwards at least some implicit tenants of translingual writing, since we might interpret words such as "voice" and "tone" to refer to a range of different qualities in student writing, including its use of multiple codes. Likewise, the expectation that students "Respond appropriately

to different kinds of rhetorical situations" certainly permits the use of multilingual strategies and even the strategic use of non-English words in order to achieve rhetorical agendas in different situations, as when students wish to convey ideas that push the rhetorical limits of Standard English.

Revising student learning outcomes provides a start to program reform, nothing more. As Scott Wible reminds us, position statements such as the document on "Students' Right to their Own Language" have had a questionable impact on teaching.[50] At the same time, important documents such as the Outcomes Statement must reflect our values if we are to promote them in our daily actions. A section that emphasizes these alternative readings of existing outcomes can help reframe the aims of first-year writing in a manner that trickles down into other aspects of the program design including assessment, course design, and teacher-training. Thus, I present my proposal for an addendum to the WPA Outcomes Statement:

Developments in composition studies over the last four decades have shown that effective writing in the 21st-century increasingly requires not only the ability to move between discursive conventions and genres but also to understand how texts can be composed of multiple genres and varieties of English or other languages. In a global era, meeting the above outcomes listed in the "Rhetorical Knowledge" and "Knowledge of Conventions" sections require all students to become multilingual writers to varying degrees:

---

[50] See my discussion of Wible in chapter one.

By the end of their first year, students should:
1. Understand that certain expectations such as appropriate use of tone and control of grammar vary according to genre and context and that they can include the strategic use of other varieties of English and other languages to enrich meaning.
2. Be able to identify and respond to rhetorical situations where the use of multiple linguistic codes can help students generate more rhetorically effective writing, as well as communication in general.

Faculty in all programs and departments can help students learn:
1. How to value varieties of English and texts that deploy multiple codes.
2. How to development the mindsets and abilities to read and write texts that effectively use multiple Englishes and languages.

This re-interpretation of traditional learning requirements in first-year composition prepares students for increasing attention to globalization and diversity within their larger universities. Reworking the goals of composition calls on teachers to prepare students for these shifting course requirements by integrating readings, assignments, and exercises similar to those I have outlined in the preceding chapters.

A text can draw on multiple forms of English as well as other languages and still communicate clearly if the student has learned to use existing generic and stylistic features of Standard English in conjunction with other codes. Furthermore, as articulated in chapter one, "effective" writing and speaking in the twenty-first century increasingly require all students to move beyond monolingualism and develop a kind of rhetorical proficiency in multilingual writing and speaking. The notion of what counts as "correct" English in global environments, as Canagarajah has pointed out, is determined on a contingent basis between speakers. The notion of a codified language would strike many international students in the twenty-first century as archaic.

This does not mean students have to become experts in multiple languages or forms of English. Rather, it means that students are evaluated for their ability to use rhetorical strategies to negotiate *some* aspects of these codes. Students can fulfill these objectives in assignments as simple as writing essays that integrate quotations from Spanish phrases used by Anzaldua.

Reframing the outcomes for first-year writing courses also brings attention to the need for assessment methods so that we can measure the extent to which a translingual writing pedagogy is able to achieve such goals. Although scaffolding more complex assignments with stylistic imitation exercises and the *progymnasmata* makes these outcomes a reasonable addition, a carefully structured assessment can provide crucial information as to whether and how such exercises fulfill their full potential.

Assessment always carries ideological assumptions, however accurate or inaccurate, about what qualifies as effective academic writing. WPA scholarship has thus increasingly recognized the need for teachers and scholars to play a more active role in the design of assessment tools, ranging from portfolios to timed essays. Although composition researchers have developed a range of different assessment devices for use in second-language contexts (Crusan "Assessment"), they are understandably different from the assessment devices used for the mainstream composition courses that Bruce Horner, John Trimbur, and Matsuda have critiqued as monolingual**.** The current notions of assessment make it difficult to evaluate such multilingual strategies as the "let it pass" principle. As many perspectives have shown (Gold; Gunner; McLeod; Trimbur "Introduction"), the WPA position has traditionally been forced to serve a conservative

function within universities, suppressing difference for the sake of standardization, expediency, and accountability. The very idea of assessment itself implies a standard, and thus in some ways assessment and difference or deviation are irreconcilable.

Defining translingual writing as a part of normal language use, as a set of practices that are becoming dominant and thus necessary for success, can help WPAs navigate through the tension that Miller-Cochrin describes: "We want to honor. . .students' home languages and cultures, but we are expected to teach them 'Standard Academic English'" (212). The promise of translingual writing is that it situates Standard English as informed and improved by multilingual practices such as code-meshing.

The current discourse on assessment has seen a turn toward the inclusion of multiple perspectives in deciding how to evaluate student writing, as opposed to much of the twentieth century, which was dominated by testing theorists who undervalued or ignored input from teachers. As William Condon asserts in a comprehensive review of books on writing assessment in the last thirty years, assessment cultures are now realizing "the hard-won expertise of writing teachers and writing program administrators in the theory and practice of writing assessment," without which "those assessments simply cannot be valid" (174). Forwarding Brian Huot's historically important essay "A New Theory of Writing Assessment," Linda Adler Kassner and Peggy O'Neill propose that more attention to assessment models "can help us connect to the larger frames about education and assessment that operate in the public, which can help shift these larger frames so that they reinforce—or at least accommodate—compositions' values, theories,

and pedagogies" (71). Introducing language difference to the reframing of assessment is a crucial, largely overlooked step in validating its use in classrooms.

Administrators interested in promoting linguistic diversity should take advantage of these new approaches to assessment in order to exercise greater control when deciding multilingualism's role in writing programs and universities. In a response to the 2009 *WPA* Symposium on difference, for example, Asao B. Inoue traces some of the relationships between assessment and diversity, linguistic and otherwise. As he argues, "Discourses of othering are used and (re)produced in writing assessment technologies, and are often the most present discourses of othering to our students in the classroom" (135). True, the stigma attached to nonstandard varieties of English and other languages is always potentially reproduced in program policies. Inoue, whose perspective aligns with those who have argued in favor of language difference as a resource, asserts the need for "changing writing programs and their relations to the Englishes already being used successfully in the world by many people" (138). But what specific actions regarding assessment would accomplish this? It is important to at least tentatively illustrate specific methods of altering English-only ideologies on this front.

Training Teaching Assistants

A growing body of discourse exists on teacher-training, but little of it addresses the need to educate teachers about language difference. As Maria Preto-bay and Kristine Hansen observe, "There is little reason to assume that graduate students or adjunct faculty are learning more than a few basics about how to teach writing in general, and may, consequently, have an even greater lack of knowledge of how to address issues of

linguistic and cultural diversity in their classrooms" (45). The authors go on to examine

teaching guides such as Erika Lindemann's *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*, a book

which "lacks any mention of the unique needs of L2 students" (46), in order to conclude

that only one or two teacher-training books have begun to devote any attention to

language difference. An exemption to this trend lies in Irene Clark's *Concepts in*

Composition, which offers five chapters on such issues.

In "Language Diversity in Teacher Education and in the Classroom," Arnetha F.

Ball and Rashidah Jaami' Muhammad assert that "at least one course dealing with

language variation, bilingualism, and global linguistic diversity should be required of all

students in teacher education programs" (81). The course they describe for pre-service K-

12 teachers indicates that training on these issues does lead to greater degrees of

awareness among newer teachers and helps to mitigate the typical "zero tolerance policy"

(77) toward language difference in public schools. The course in question requires future

teachers to tutor language-minority students while completing written assignments

ranging from conventional reflective essays and reading responses to case studies on

adolescent language learners.

The typical teacher-training course for TAs in rhetoric and composition appears,

at first, to be ill-suited to more than a class session or two to ESL issues. However, if

WPAs begin to define translingual writing as a theory and method of composition that

benefits all students, then language difference becomes an ever-present subject in

teacher-training courses. Thus WPAs are freer to make linguistic diversity an issue every

week, even if it is not always the central focus. This is not as radical or difficult a goal as

it may sound and is not at odds with the more pressing, ostensibly practical concerns of new teachers such as drafting assignments or grading papers. Language diversity scholarship does not need to manifest as a collection of readings discussed only once or twice during a semester. In fact, doing so may only forward the quarantine paradigm that Matsuda has critiqued.

Incorporating translingual writing into teacher-training necessitates some consideration of the four main models these courses are based on, according to Duane Roen, Mary Daly Goggin, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon's "Developing Writing Teachers and Writing Communities." These models include the functional approach (explicitly practical); the organic approach (mentoring and observations); the conversion approach (TAs must adhere to program philosophy); and the multiphilosophical approach (TAs develop their own philosophies and practices). Of course, as the authors acknowledge, a fair deal of overlap across these models best characterizes teaching practica at many institutions. However, the functional approach to teacher-training still tends to preoccupy new teachers. This model is sometimes even demanded by graduate students who "arrive with a burning desire for the practical advice they will need as writing teachers" (13). The apparent opposition between functionality and theory may portray translingual writing as a less immediate topic than, say, "dealing with the belligerent student, or with sleepy students in a 7:40 a.m. class" (Stancliff and Goggin 20). A "common complaint among new TAs" is in fact that "theory isn't helpful in the classroom," when Monday morning looms (20).

Part of making language difference an everyday concern relevant to Monday morning, and not simply another theory or set of theories, is highlighting the ways in which it manifests even in the functional aspects of writing instruction. Moreover, defining theory as the bedrock of practice makes it practical. As Sidney Dobrin recognizes in the introduction to the collection *Don't Call It That*, teacher-training courses are perceived of largely as the space where practical matters take precedence over larger theoretical concerns, even if this is not entirely true. As Dobrin asserts, "The fact is that the emphasis on theory. . .has existed since the inception of the idea of composition practice" (17), and in fact the teaching practicum is "one of the most important locations in which composition's 'theory wars' or theory/practice debates are played out with very material ramifications" (3). Such an argument may portray new teachers as the grass that suffers beneath fighting elephants. However, what Dobrin suggests here is actually the opposite: that future generations of teachers will be the ones who decide which theories survive in the field of rhetoric and composition and that their decisions will be influenced heavily by their interactions with students in classroom environments. For instance, process theory has enjoyed a relatively long existence even despite critiques from the post-process movement, largely because teachers have found it to be useful or "functional" in their classrooms.

An argument that I have made throughout this dissertation is that approaches to language difference have remained marginalized because they rarely articulate the functional aspects of teaching that teachers feel they need. Building on Dobrin's argument, I would add that theories informing teaching practica always trickle down into

discussions of even the most ordinary, everyday aspects of teaching. Consequently, I see a role for teacher-training courses in presenting language difference as an everyday part of the composition classroom, as part of the functionality. Such a course would show how every major approach to teaching writing, from social-epistemic and critical pedagogies to process and post-process perspectives, can take on a translingual dimension and thus positively affect the practical aspects of teaching, whether it is in drafting assignments or in dealing with belligerent students.

Dissolving the theory/practice binary in this sense might simply entail assigning a piece of scholarship on translingual writing or language difference every week related to the topic at hand. For example, professors would include an article such as Canagarajah's "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued" when assigning scholarship on process and post-process pedagogies. Here, class discussions can highlight Canagarajah's critique of Peter Elbow's argument in "Vernacular Englishes in the Writing Classroom?" to allow vernaculars and home languages only in the drafts of papers, rather than in the final versions as Canagarajah argues. Thinking in this sense reframes Canagarajah's argument in terms of the process and post-process debates in the field. New instructors would read it as less about teaching multilingual students, per se, and more about debates seen as central to teaching writing to *all* students. Discussion questions would engage the actual benefits that students, including monolingual native speakers, would experience in their drafting and understanding of the writing process given an enhanced metalinguistic awareness that takes into account other varieties of English and other languages. Ultimately, teachers-in-training would be guided toward the

very view of style as inventional that I have outlined in chapters two and three, and thus see the expanded linguistic repertoire that Canagarajah's work gestures toward as integral to the writing process.

In this approach, work on language difference is diffused into the composition practicum and advanced as a resource for the field, not simply a topic for its own benefit. As another example, imagine reading excerpts from Paul Butler's *Out of Style*, Robert Connors' "Erasure of the Sentence," Min-Zhan Lu's "Professing Multiculturalism," and Edward Corbett's "The Theory and Practice of Imitation in Classical Rhetoric" during a week devoted to stylistic issues in composition pedagogy. Approaching style through the lens of linguistic diversity may indeed stem the bitter criticism that Tom Pace recounts from his graduate teaching seminar, discussed in chapter two, by making it relevant to both teachers and student populations who are interested in expressing their linguistic identities through code-meshing.

Ideally, every class session would include a question or two about how to conceive of common pedagogical topics from a multilingual point of view. For instance, asking questions about various cultural attitudes toward collaboration can enrich existing perspectives on groupwork such as the consensus (Bruffee) and difference (Trimbur) models. A class session devoted to essays on collaboration by these authors in addition to Andrea Lunsford and Lisa Ede would also include Neomy Storch's 2005 article "Collaborative Writing: Product, Process, and Student Reflections" in the *Journal of Second Language Writing*. Knowing in advance that cultural background and prior language experiences can influence a students' collaboration not only helps instructors in

immediate intercultural situations but can also provide an impetus to experiment with other, non-Western conceptions of peer interaction. The simple fact that students from Pakistan or Indonesia resist group-work (Kachru and Smith 2010) can prompt both new and experienced teachers to reconsider the basic premise of collaboration itself. Finally, WPAs might assign portions of Xiaoye You's *Writing in the Devil's Tongue* as a counterpoint to institutional histories of writing instruction in the U.S. by Robert Connors, Sharon Crowley, or James Berlin. You's thorough historical account of Chinese universities' struggles to incorporate Western conceptions of writing and rhetoric throughout the twentieth century can provide new TAs with a crucial, transnational sense of the work they do. Thus a more diverse orientation to the teacher-training course can challenge commonplace pedagogies and help reform them in ways that produce new approaches that benefit all students.

New teachers may resist such approaches to composition pedagogy, as Sally Barr Ebest explores in her 2005 *Changing the Way We Teach; Writing and Resistance in the Training of Teaching Assistants*, which is exactly why repeated exposure to new or controversial theories and pedagogies is necessary. Resistance may arise for many reasons, but Ebest attributes most forms to the fact that theories of writing presented to first-time teachers often contradict what they think they have learned intuitively, by experience. As Ebest recommends, faculty who lead teacher-training courses should "instantiate. . .pedagogical changes in every class," since new teachers "need sufficient time and opportunities to recognize and understand why change is necessary" (97-98).

Perhaps language difference has not become part of mainstream practices precisely because it is always seen as ancillary to the long-standing debates between process, post-process, cognitive, social, and cultural approaches to writing instruction. But the shifting dynamics of student populations and the ratio of native to non-native speakers of English may be culminating in a need to see "change [as] necessary" (97-98) not only regarding the way writing instructors teach but also in the way that WPAs and other faculty prepare new teachers. Language difference is already becoming a norm in the interactions of everyday language users and student populations, a trend which means that the common topics of teacher-training courses need to also make language difference a norm—so that teaching keeps pace with student needs.

Integrating language difference as a more ubiquitous topic in teacher-training does not mean that new teachers ought to whole-heartedly endorse such views. Rather, what I propose follows closer to a multiphilosophical model, in which training teachers should "create a teaching philosophy consistent with his or her practice and beliefs about teaching and which [draw] upon the strengths each [bring] to the program from her or his own previous training and disciplinary interests" (McKinney and Chiseri-Strater 12). Although most WPAs would not permit their TAs to dredge up current-traditionalism under the multiphilosophical model, it is important to give them agency and space to synthesize readings and discussions without fear of policing or reprisal. For instance, new teachers might avoid a full incorporation of classical stylistic exercises in their own teaching but nonetheless design similar assignments drawn from their own disciplinary knowledge in sociolinguistics or creative writing than can accomplish some of the same

goals I have outlined here. Stancliff and Goggin describe experiences similar to this at their own institution, where "many [TAs] challenged and adapted our theoretical model" (18) based on social-epistemic and critical pedagogies. As they go on to say, "Among the new teachers, the opinion that we were in earnest about power-sharing was evident as they submitted their first ENGL 101 syllabi, most of which looked little or nothing like our own, and we approved every one of these for ENGL 101 that fall," albeit after careful reviews and requests for minor revisions (18). The import of Stancliff and Goggin's account of teacher-training for my own project is that the importance of negotiation—a hallmark of language difference scholarship itself—will work against any temptation to dictate that teachers simply "make" their classes more multilingual.

Ultimately, the issue of teacher-training lies at the intersection of many other concerns for WPAs. As Patricia Suzanne Sullivan states in a 2007 review essay of books on TA-training, "If graduate students resist the theories or practices of a practicum, we should not only consider the students but also consider our pedagogies, as well as where the goals of our students and the goals of our institutions, and even our field, as manifested in our practicums, meet or diverge" (W42). What and how WPAs and rhetoric composition faculty teach new generations of teachers is at least partly determined by the institution's larger goals and student populations and informed by current conversations at the scholarly level. Although they do diverge at times, as Sullivan notes, the past few years have seen an alignment at many institutions between these various factors on the issue of language difference. More and more students, teachers, scholars, and administrators want to implement policies and practices that foster linguistic diversity.

This does not mean that translingual teaching practices would uproot or displace what institutions of higher education value. WPAs and new instructors have a stake in embracing translingual writing that goes beyond meeting the needs of increasingly diverse student populations. Attention to translingual issues strengthens existing pedagogical approaches, which, as Lisa Ede has argued in her 2004 *Situating Composition*, tend to co-exist in actual teaching practices. Although we often think of social-epistemic pedagogies as replacing cognitive and current-traditional ones, Ede illustrates how all three still inform our daily teaching. If post-process pedagogies do not displace process-based pedagogies from writing instruction, then neither should anyone fear that greater efforts to develop translingual perspectives on all aspects of instruction would completely displace current practices. On a broader note, this approach to teacher-training courses might also have a positive side effect on scholarship in translingual writing. Future generations of teachers are also future generations of scholars. Just as teacher-training courses should use available articles and books to explore how translingual writing can alter our assumptions, so too should future scholarship. Such arguments would only strengthen the case for mainstreaming multilingual writers and accompanying theories and teaching approaches.

Finding institutional and public support has presented one of the biggest challenges to language difference, which is often seen by outsiders as a lowering of standards and a threat to a university's legitimacy. However, difficulty should not lead to despair, but rather to a diversification of coalition building strategies. Adler-Kassner and O'Neil assert the importance of using values and interests in building local alliances to

implement change at institutions. By "cultivating shared values" (93) and interests that

motivate actions, specifically by listening to stakeholders, WPAs can build support for

their own initiatives by aligning various needs with their own. Additionally, the authors

distinguish between short-term, issue based goals and long-term, ideological goals that

can generate lasting relationships with various figures within and outside the university—

public relations departments, university publications, student organizations, newspapers,

and local businesses. Soliciting support from these areas can alter perceptions toward

language difference.

In particular, it is important to work with faculty across the entire university in

order to ensure that what students learn in their writing courses, whether first-year

composition or an upper-level course, does not put them in academic jeopardy elsewhere

in the academy. This type of anxiety is commonplace among composition teachers and

WPAs because we are often seen as the gate-keepers and grammar fixers of higher

education. It is therefore crucial to establish lines of communication and to convey to the

university that flexible hermeneutic strategies, including an embrace of language

difference, is a key outcome and one that all faculty need to consider. WPAs can harness

inter-departmental networks to foster these interdisciplinary connections and build

coalitions among foreign language and comparative literature departments, writing

centers, and composition programs that emphasize writing between languages.

WPAs can host teaching workshops on campus about language difference open to

all faculty. This would provide information about how other departments construct the

value of Standard English and ideally help create an environment at the university that

does not negate or reverse the sensitivity to and appreciation of language difference. As Shuck (WPA 2006) observes, faculty outside the English department all too often hold ideas and expectations about language that hamper student agency. Although the task of redirecting these misperceptions sounds unpleasant or even impossible, such interdisciplinary conversations must take place. Otherwise, students can encounter severe opposition to language difference outside their writing courses.

Finally, WPAs could consult with other faculty and students to design websites, Facebook pages, and Twitter feeds that demonstrate to students and university officials the rich, lively discourse that occurs online between speakers of different Englishes and languages. We can drive home the point that social media creates multilingual environments in which students can and will participate in as part of their social, academic, and professional development. The dynamics of global social interaction in digital environments make students answerable to their peers in other cultures and countries.

WPAs do have a responsibility toward language difference that goes beyond serving multilingual students in conventional ways. Rather, writing programs need to create environments in line with twenty-first century paradigms regarding communication, which means de-privileging the myth of a standard language and exposing all students to the realities of a world where the rules of English and the power to determine correctness does not necessarily belong to native speakers any longer. Writing programs have served a philosophical position that language can be codified, an ideal which is increasingly challenged by the proliferation of Englishes and strategies

such as the "let it pass" principle. WPAs can institute language difference in their policies and outcomes. They might develop assessment mechanisms based on flexible communicative strategies and experimentation. They could raise issues in multilingualism and language difference throughout teacher training courses, and finally they may ensure they are offering courses that help multilingual and monolingual students by encouraging their collaboration. Doing all of this may seem above the call of duty to some WPAs who are used to language issues as the purview of ESL specialists. However, as higher education globalizes, WPAs also need to globalize in order to keep pace and remain answerable to their stakeholders.

Conclusion

The practices of translingualism, as well as the term, are becoming normal aspects of discourse, though to a large extent they have always been normal. Language practices such as code-meshing have remained at the margins of rhetoric and composition not because the field still adheres to an outdated notion of Standard English but precisely because work on language difference has seldom moved beyond critiques of standardization and English Only. Likewise, an appreciation of language difference has yet to become widespread in teaching practices because it is difficult to build a curriculum solely on the idea of difference as a resource, rather than an obstacle, to making meaning. Although valuable as a guiding principle, this recognition is only a beginning that should be followed by discussions of how to realize linguistic diversity in classrooms and how to help students gain more control over the many varieties of languages they practice in their daily interactions with others.

The scholars cited throughout these five chapters have stressed the need for college students to learn communicative practices that prepare them for spaces where standards and rules themselves give way to incomprehension and difficulty, to blended discourses comprised of more than one code. In their 2006 book *English in the World*, Rani Rubdy and Mario Saraceni make this argument via a paradoxical statement when describing global discourse practices in which "variation from the norm in lingua franca communication is itself likely to be 'the norm'" (12). In the December 2011 issue of *CCC*, Bruce Horner, Samantha NeCamp, and Christiane Donahue extend this idea of difference as the norm and all but inaugurate translingualism as a new frontier of the field. As they declare, "Features of bilingual practice such as code-switching, code-meshing, borrowing, and blending of languages, rather than being seen as instances of language interference or incomplete mastery of discrete languages, would from this translingual perspective be understood as the norm" (287). However, as chapter one of my dissertation has pointed out, such a conception of language has already been operating in rhetoric and composition for decades. This much alone can be seen by the prevalence of Bakhtin's work in our field's scholarship, not to mention the presence of other poststructuralist approaches to language.

Bakhtin's theories do not stand alone in their critique of Standard English, however, which serves as further evidence for translingual writing as a productive project—yet not necessarily a brand new frontier. As briefly referenced in my first chapter, post-process theories of composition have also resisted the notion of conventions and codes. The concepts of triangulation, linguistic charity, and passing and prior theories

(Davidson; Kent; Olson) cohere into a larger assertion that language is never a system but instead an accumulation of interactions between speakers. There is no such thing as a "standard" code or an "error" in post-process conceptions of language, only hypotheses about what works in present and future discourse situations based on what worked in prior circumstances. This orientation to communication, like Bakhtin's, shares a resistance to the invention of rules and conventions by a dominant group and imposed on all users of a language. In all of these approaches, language is a consequence of shared interaction—not a precondition, and certainly not a system determined and policed by authorities.

Thus a translingual turn in rhetoric and composition would not introduce new theoretical insights so much as it would help teachers and scholars practice more fully what they have always envisioned. If language is always multi-voiced and if writers always engage in a process of appropriation of another's words, as my discussion of Bakhtin holds, then it becomes logical and necessary that multilingual writers such as Anzaldua will serve as exemplars for our students. In Bakhtin's terms, translingualism simply means an even stronger view of linguistic codes as always in a process of interanimation, as opposed to conventional multilingualism, defined as "fluency in each discrete language" (Horner et al. 287). Because developmental writers and ESL students already code-mesh in ways that are more visible and perhaps more complex than monolingual native speakers, then a goal of translingual writing is for monolingual students to write more like their multilingual peers—not less.

Seeing ESL and developmental writers as models for composition sounds like a radical idea, which is why I have devoted such considerable time to working through the conceptual as well as pedagogical implications of the translingual project. My intention has been to lay the groundwork for composition exercises that possess a strong theoretical foundation but which teachers can use to change attitudes but, more importantly, to change daily habits. If students are prompted by sentence-level activities to test and explore the boundaries between their language practices and those of others, and to appropriate these other habits as part of their own, then their actions have become more translingual.

The teaching strategies I have outlined, stemming from a reconceptualization of Greco-Roman rhetorics, certainly fit into the wider "sea change" (Horner et al. 292) evoked by scholars on language difference. If the study of rhetoric and writing is becoming global, then this necessarily means rethinking such foundational figures as Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian in light of what their works may offer regarding the preparation of college students for translingual, multimodal discourse. Greco-Roman stylistics become revitalized if considered from the perspective of translingualism, as defined through Bakhtin's terms of heteroglossia, dialogue, and speech genres. An understanding of Quintilian and Cicero as bilinguals who indeed code-switched or code-meshed opens style and imitation exercises to appropriation for twenty-first century pedagogies that attend to multilingual-multimodal discourse. It also further illustrates that while Roman rhetoric in particular may have adhered to the virtue of *latinitas* on the

surface, the notion of pure Latin as a moral issue was not subscribed to as fully as scholarship in the field has assumed.

Even as more articles and books appear announcing the transnational or translingual turn in the field, it remains important to think through implications for the everyday teaching of writing. Hence I have worked through some of the ostensible contradictions between the classical tradition and the approaches necessitated by a global, multilingual discourse. I have done this to make a case for the carefully-scaffolded exercises in imitation and the fourteen *progymnasmata*, which if taught effectively can help students develop their metalinguistic awareness, facility with language, and an appreciation of deviation from the norm as the norm.

REFERENCES

Adams, J.N. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
 Press, 2003. Print.

Adams, Peter Dow. "Basic Writing Reconsidered*." Journal of Basic Writing* 12.1 (1993):
 22-36. Print.

Adler-Kassner, Linda and Peggy O'Neil. *Reframing Writing Assessment to Improve
 Teaching and Learning*. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2010. Print.

Anzaldua, Gloria. *Borderlands*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 2007. Print.

Austin, J.L.. *How to Do Things with Words*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.
 Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. Caryl Emerson and Michael
 Holquest, eds. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. Print.

---. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, eds. Austin:
 University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Ball, Arnetha F. and Rashidah Jaami' Muhammad. "Language Diversity in Teacher
 Education and in the Classroom." *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From
 Intention to Practice*. Geneva Smitherman and Victor Villaneuva, eds.
 Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003. Print.

Banks, Adam J. *Digital Griots: African American Rhetoric in a Multimedia Age*.
 Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2011. Print.

Basgier, Christopher. "The Author-function, the Genre Function, and the Rhetoric of

      Scholarly Webtexts." *Computers and Composition* 28.2(2011): 145-159. Print.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press,

      1994. Print.

Bauman, Marcy Lassota. "The Evolution of Internet Genres." *Computers and*

      Composition 16.2 (1999): 269–282. Print.

Bawarshi, Anis. *Genre and Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention*

      in Composition. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2003. Print.

Berlin, James. *Rhetoric and Reality*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press,

      1987. Print.

Berthoff, Ann. 1974. "Responses to 'The Students' Right to Their Own Language.'"

      College Composition and Communication 26.2(1975): 216-217. Print.

---. *The Making of Meaning: Metaphors, Models, and Maxims for Writing*. Montclair:

      Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1981. Print.

Bhatia, Vijay Kumar and Maurizio Gotti. *Explorations in Specialized Genres*. Bern:

      Peter Lang, 2006. Print.

Bialostosky, Don. "Rhetoric in Literary Criticism and Theory." *The Sage Handbook of*

      Rhetorical Studies. Andrea A. Lunsford and Kirt H. Wilson, eds. Thousand Oaks:

      Sage Publications. 215-226. Print.

Bizzell, Patricia. *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburgh: University

      of Pittsburgh Press, 1992. Print.

Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*.

Boston: MIT Press, 2000. Print.

Borrowman, Shane. "The Islamization of Rhetoric: Ibn Rushd and the Reintroduction of

Aristotle into Medieval Europe." *Rhetoric Review* 27.4 (2008): 341-460. Print.

Brooke, Collin. *Lingua Fracta*. Hampton Press, 2009. Print.

Brooks, Phyllis. "Mimesis: Grammar and the Echoing Voice." *College*

English 35.2(1973): 161-168. Print.

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" *College*

English 46.7(1984): 635-652. Print.

Butler, Paul. *Out of Style: Reanimating Stylistic Study in Composition and Rhetoric*.

Logan: Utah State University Press, 2008. Print.

Canagarajah, Suresh. *Critical Academic Writing and Multilingual Students*. Ann Arbor:

University of Michigan Press, 2002. Print.

---. "Multilingual Strategies for Negotiating English: From Conversation to Writing."

Journal of Advanced Composition 29.1-2 (2009): 711-743. Print.

---. "The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued. *College*

Composition and Communication 57.4 (2006): 586-619. Print.

---. "Toward a Writing Pedagogy of Shuttling between Languages: Learning from

Multilingual Writers." *College English* 68.6 (2006): 589-604. Print.

---. "Afterword: World Englishes as Code-Meshing." *Code-Meshing as World English*.

Vershawn Ashanti Young and Aja Y. Martinez, eds. Urbana: National Council of

Teachers of English, 2011. Print.

Christensen, Francis. "A Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence." *College Composition and Communication* 14.1 (1963): 155-161. Print.

---. *Notes Toward a New Rhetoric*: New York: HarperCollins, 1978. Print.

Cicero, *On the Ideal Orator*. Trans. James M. May and Jakob Wisse. Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.

Clark, Donald Lemen. "Imitation: Theory and Practice in Roman Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 71.1(1951): 11-22. Print.

Clark, Irene. *Concepts in Composition*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Combs, Warren E. "Sentence-Combining Practice: Do Gains in Judgments of Writing 'Quality' Persist?" *Journal of Education Research* 70.1 (1977): 318-21. Print.

Connors, Robert. "The Erasure of the Sentence." *College Composition and Communication* 52.1 (2000): 96-128. Print.

Cooper, Marilyn. "Dialogic Learning Across Disciplines." *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric, and Writing*. Frank Farmer, ed. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998: 81-96. Print.

Corkin. Stanley. "AFTERTHOUGHTS . . . When Is an English Teacher Not an English Teacher?" in English as a Discipline. Ed. James C. Raymond. University of Alabama Press, 1996: 175-77. Print.

Cross, Geoffrey A. "A Bakhtinian Exploration of Factors Affecting the Collaborative Writing of an Executive Letter of an Annual Report." *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric, and Writing*. Frank Farmer, ed. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998: 159-186. Print.

Crowley, Sharon. *Methodical Memory: Invention in Current-Traditional Rhetoric*.

Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990. Print.

Crusan, Deborah. "An Assessment of ESL Writing Placement Assessment." *Assessing*

Writing 8.1(2002): 17-30. Print.

Crystal, David. Pearson. "Should English be Taught as a 'Global Language?" 2 January

2012. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tLYk4vKBdUo

Davidson, Donald. *Essays on Actions and Events*. Oxford: Oxford University

Press, 2001. Print.

---. *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University

Press, 2001. Print.

D'Angelo, Frank J. "Imitation and Style." *College Composition and Communication*

24.3 (1973): 283-290. Print.

DeLillo, Don. *White Noise*. New York: Penguin, 1986. Print.

Delpit, Lisa. *Other People's Children*. New York: New Press, 1995. Print.

Demont-Heinrich, Christof. "Linguisitically Priveleged and Cursed? American

University Students and the Global Hegemony of English." *World Englishes* 29.2

(2010): 281-298. Print.

Dingo, Rebecca. "Linking Transnational Logics: A Feminist Rhetorical Analysis of

Public Policy Networks." *College English* 70.5 (2008): 490-505. Print.

Dobrin, Sidney. *Don't Call It That: The Composition Practicum*. Urbana: National

Council of Teachers of English, 2005. Print.

Donahue, Christiane. "When Copying is Not Copying: Plagiarism and French

Composition Scholarship." *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age*. Ed. Martha Vicinus and Caroline Eisner. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008. Print.

Dykstra, Gerald and Christina Bratt Paulston. "Guided Composition." *English Language Teaching* 21.1 (1967): 136-141. Print.

Ebest, Sally Barr. *Changing the Way We Teach: Writing and Resistance in the Training of Teaching Assistants*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005. Print.

Ede, Lisa. *Situating Composition: Composition Studies and the Politics of Location*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004. Print.

Elbow, Peter. "Vernacular Englishes in the Writing Classroom? Probing the Culture of Literacy." *Alt Dis: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*. Ed. Christopher Schroeder, Patricia Bizzell, and Helen Fox. New York: Heinemann, 2002. 126-139. Print.

---.*Writing Without Teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Enoch, Jessica. "Composing a Rhetorical Education for the Twenty-First Century: TakingITGlobal as Pedagogical Heuristic." *Rhetoric Review* 29.2 (2010): 165-185. Print.

Fahnestock, Jeanne. *Rhetorical Style: The Uses of Language in Persuasion*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. Print.

Ferreira-Buckley, L. & Horner, W. B. Writing Instruction in Great Britain: The

Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. Ed. James J. Murphy. *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001. 173-212. Print.

Fleckenstein, Kristie. *Vision, Rhetoric, and Social Action in the Composition Classroom*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2009. Print.

Fleming, David J. "The Very Idea of a Progymnasmata." *Rhetoric Review* 22.2 (2003): 105-120. Print.

Flower, Linda and John Hayes. "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 32.4 (1981): 365-87. Print.

Fogarty, Daniel. *Roots for a New Rhetoric*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. Print.

Fox, Tom. "Standards and Purity: Understanding Institutional Strategies to Insure Homogeneity." *The Writing Program Interrupted*. Eds. Donna Strickland and Jeanne Gunner. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2009. 14-17. Print.

Fraiberg, Steven. "Composition 2.0: Toward a Multilingual and Multimodal Framework." *College Composition and Communication*. 62.1 (2010): 100-16. Print.

Friedrich, Patricia. "Assessing the Needs of Linguistically Diverse First-Year Students: Bringing Together and Telling Apart International, Resident ESL and Monolingual Basic Writers." *Writing Program Administration* 30.1-2 (2006): 15-36. Print.

Gilyard, Keith. Voices of the Self: A Study of Language Competence. Detroit: Wayne

State University Press, 1991. Print.

Gleason, Barbara and Mary Soliday. "From Remediation to Enrichment: Evaluating a Mainstreaming Project." *Journal of Basic Writing* 16.1 (1997): 64-78. Print.

Gold, David. *Rhetoric at the Margins: Revising the History of Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1873-1947*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008. Print.

Gorrell, Donna. "Controlled Composition for Basic Writers." *College Composition and Communication* 32.3(1981): 308-316. Print.

Graddol, David. *The Future of English?* London: British Council, 1997. Print.

Graff, Gerald. *They Say/I Say*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007. Print.

Gray-Rosendale, Laura A. *Rethinking Basic Writing*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1999.

--- . "Inessential Writings: Shaughnessy's Legacy for a Socially Constructed Landscape." *Journal of Basic Writing* 17.2(1998): 1-37. Print.

Grego, Rhonda and Nancy Thompson. *Teaching/Writing in Thirdspaces: The Studio Approach*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008. Print.

Gunner, Jeanne. "A Needed Space for Critique in Historical Recovery." *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration*. Eds. Barbara L'Eplattenier and Lisa Mastrangelo. West Lafayette: Parlor Press, 2004. 263-278. Print.

Halloran, Michael. "On the End of Rhetoric." *Landmark Essays on Rhetorical Invention in Writing*. Eds. Richard Young and Yameng Liu. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Halasek, Kay. "Feminism and Bakhtin: Dialogic Reading in the Academy." *Landmark*

Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric, and Writing. Ed. Frank Farmer. Mahwah: Lawrence

Erlbaum Associates, 1998. 51-62. Print.

Hall, Mark R. and Mary Rosner. "Pratt and Pratfalls: Revisioning Contact Zones."

Crossing Borderlands: Composition and Postcolonial Studies. Eds. Andrea A.

Lunsford and Lahoucine Ouzgane. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press,

2004. 95-109. Print.

Hawisher, Gail E. and Cynthai L. Selfe. "Globalization and Agency: Designing and

Redesigning the Literacies of Cyberspace." *College English* 68.6 (2006): 619-

636. Print.

Hawk, Byron. *A Counter-History of Composition: Toward Methodologies of

Complexity*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007. Print.

Hesford, Wendy, Edgar Singleton and Ivonne M. Garcia. "Laboring to Globalize a First-

Year Writing Program." *The Writing Program Interrupted*. Eds. Donna Strickland

and Jeanne Gunner. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2009. 113-125. Print.

Himley, Margaret. "Interchanges: Response to Marzluf's 'Diversity Writing: Natural

Languages, Authentic Voices.'" *College Composition and Communication* 58.3

(2007): 449-463. Print.

---. "Writing Programs and Pedagogies in a Globalized Landscape." *Writing Program

Administration* 26.3 (2003): 49-66. Print.

Holcomb, Chris and Jimmie Killingsworth. *Performing Prose: The Study and Practice of

Style in Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2010. Print.

Horn, Vivian. "Using the Ananse Tales' for Composition." *TESOL Quarterly* 8.1 (1974):

37-42. Print.

Horner, Bruce and Min-Zhan Lu. *Representing the Other*. Urbana: National Council of
Teachers of English, 1999. Print.

---."'Students' Right," English Only, and Re-Imagining the Politics of Language."
College English 63.6 (2001): 741-758. Print.

---, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur. "Opinion: Language
Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English* 73.3
(2011): 303-321. Print.

---and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College
Composition and Communication* 53.4 (2002): 594-630. Print.

Horner, Winifried Bryan. *Nineteenth-Century Scottish Rhetoric: The American
Connection*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993. Print.

Howard, Rebecca Moore. *Standing in the Shadow of Giants: Plagiarists, Authors,
Collaborators.* Stamford: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1999. Print.

Huot, Brian. *(Re)articulating Writing Assessment for Teaching and Learning*. Logan:
Utah State University Press, 2002. Print.

Hyland, Ken. "Genre Pedagogy: Language, Literacy, and L2 Writing Instruction."
Journal of Second Language Writing 16.1 (2007): 148-164. Print.

Inoue, Asao B. "Structuring Code-Meshing into Educational Policy." *Code-Meshing as
World English*. Eds. Vershawn Ashanti Young and Aja Y. Martinez. Urbana:
National Council of Teachers of English, 2011. Print.

Ito, Mizuko, Daisuke Okabe, and Misa Matsuda, eds. *Personal, Portable, Pedestrian.*

Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005. Print.

Jarratt, Susan C. *Re-reading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*. Carbondale:

Southern Illinois University Press, 1998. Print.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture*. New York: New York University Press,

2006. Print.

Jenkins, Henry. "Transmedia Storytelling and Entertainment: An Annotated

Syllabus." *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 24.6 (2010): 943-

958. Print.

Jordan, Jay. "Revaluing Silence and Listening with Second Language Users." Eds.

Cheryl Glenn and Krista Ratcliffe. *Silence and Listening as Rhetorical Arts*.

Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2011. 278-292. Print.

Kachru, Braj and Larry E. Smith. *Cultures, Contexts, and World Englishes*. New York:

Routledge, 2008. Print.

Karr, Mary. "Shelley on Keats." https://twitter.com/#!/bumbleward/status/16254608563

Kells, Michelle Hall, Valerie M. Balester, and Victor Villanueva, eds. *Latino/a*

Discourses: On Language, Identity and Education. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook,

2004. Print.

Kennedy, George A. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and*

Rhetoric. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. Print.

Kent, Thomas. "Hermeneutics and Genre: Bakhtin and the Problem of Communicative

Interaction." *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric, and Writing*. Ed. Frank

Farmer. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998. 34-50. Print.

---. *Post-Process Theory: Beyond the Writing-Process Paradigm.* Carbondale: Southern

Illinois University Press, 1999. Print.

Kirchner, Roderich. "Elocutio: Latin Prose Style." *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric.* Ed.

William Dominik and Jon Hall. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2010. Print.

Knoblauch, Cy and Lilian Brannon. *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing.*

Montclair: Boyton/Cook, 1984. Print.

Kuntz, Linda Ann and Robert R. Viscount. *Write Me a Ream: A Course in Controlled for*

Job Training and Adult Education. New York: Teachers College Press of

Columbia University, 1973. Print.

Labov, William. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular.*

Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973. Print.

---. *The Study of Nonstandard English.* Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English,

1978. Print.

---. *The Atlas of North American English: Phonetics, Phonology and Sound Change.* New

York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005. Print.

Lanham, Richard. *Style: An Anti-Textbook.* New York: Paul Dry Books, 2007. Print.

Lauer, Janice M. *Invention in Rhetoric and Composition.* West Lafayette: Parlor Press,

2004. Print.

Laurence, Patricia, Peter Rondinone, Barbara Gleason, Thomas J. Farrell, Paul Hunter,

Min-Zhan Lu. "Symposium on Basic Writing, Conflict, Sturggle, and the Legacy

of Mina Shaughnessy." *College English* 55.8 (1993):879-903. Print.

Lee, Carmen K. "Affordances and Text-Making Practices in Online Instant Messaging."

Written Communication 24.3 (2007): 223-249. Print.

Lin, Angel M.Y. and Jasmine C.M. Luk "Local Creativity in the Face of Global

Domination: Insights of Bakhtin for Teaching English for Dialogic

Communication." *Dialogue with Bakhtin on Second and Foreign Languag*e

Learning. Eds. Joan Kelly Hall, Gergana Vitanova, Ludmial Marchenkova.

Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005. Print.

Lindemann, Erika. *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press,

2001. Print.

Lisle, Bonnie and Sandra Mano. "Embracing a Multicultural Rhetoric." *Writing in*

Multicultural Settings. Eds. Carol Severino, Juan C. Guerra, Johnnella E. Butler.

12-26. Print.

Logan, Shirley Wilson. "Why College English?" *College English* 69.2 (2006):107-110.

Print.

Lovejoy, Kim Brian. "Practical Pedagogy for Composition." *Language Diversity in the*

Classroom. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003. 89-108. Print.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "Professing Multiculturalism: The Politics of Style in the Contact Zone."

College Composition and Communication 45.4 (1994): 442-58. Print.

---and Bruce Horner. "The Logic of Listening to Global Englishes." *Code-Meshing as*

World English. Eds. Vershawn Ashanti Young and Aja Y. Martinez. Urbana:

National Council of Teachers of English, 2011. 99-114. Print.

---. "An Essay on the Work of Composition: Composing English against the Order of

Fast Capitalism." *College Composition and Communication* 56.1 (2004): 16-50.

    Print.

Lunsford, Andrea and Lisa Ede. *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on*

    Collaborative Writing. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990.

    Print.

---. "Writing, Technologies, and the Fifth Canon." *Computers and Composition* 23.1

    (2006):169-177. Print.

Lynskey, Winifred. "Imitative Writing and a Student's Style." *College English*

    18.8 (1957): 396-400. Print.

Marrou, H.I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Madison: University of Wisconsin

    Press, 1982. Print.

Marzluf, Philip P. "Mainstreaming Diversity Writing." *Writing Program Administration*

    31.1-2 (2007): 196-213. Print.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition."

    College English. 68.6 (July 2006): 637-651. Print.

---. "Embracing Linguistic Diversity in the Intellectual Work of WPAs." *Writing*

    Program Administration 33.1-2 (2009): 168-171. Print.

---. "World Englishes and the Teaching of Writing." *TESOL Quarterly* 44.2 (2010): 369-

    374.

McKeon, Richard. *Essays in Invention & Discovery*. Ox Bow Press, 1987. Print.

McKinney, Jackie Grutsch and Elizabeth Chiseri-Strater. "Inventing a Teacherly Self:

Positioning Journals in the TA Seminar." *Writing Program Administration* 27.1-2 (2003): 59-74. Print.

McLeod, Susan H. *Writing Program Administration*. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Miller, Carolyn. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70.1 (May 1984): 151–167. Print.

--- and Dawn Shepherd. (2004). "Blogging as Social Action: A Genre Analysis of the Weblog." Eds. Laura J. Gurak, Smiljana Antonijevic, Laurie Johnson, Clancy Ratliff, and Jessica Reyman. *Into the Blogosphere: Rhetoric, Community and Culture of Weblogs.* June 2004. <http://blog.lib.umn.edu/blogosphere/visual_blogs.html>.

Miller-Cochran, Susan. "Language Diversity and the Responsibility of the WPA." In Cross-Language Relations in Composition. Eds. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2010. 212-220. Print.

Miller, Susan. *Textual Carnivals*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993. Print.

Minock, Mary. "Toward a Postmodern Pedagogy of Imitation." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 489-509. Print.

Mlynarczyk, Rebecca and George Otte. *Basic Writing*. West Lafayette: Parlor Press, 2010. Print.

Moraes, Marcia. *Bilingual Education: A Dialogue with the Bakhtin Circle*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996. Print.

Morenberg, Max, Donald Daiker, and Andrew Kerek. "Sentence-Combining at the

    College Level: An Experimental Study." *Research in the Teaching of English*

    12.1 (1978): 245-56. Print.

Morson, Gary Saul and Caryl Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*.

    Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990. Print.

Muckelbaur, John. "Imitation and Invention in Antiquity: An Historical-Theoretical

    Revision." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 21.1 (2003): 61-88.

    Print.

Murray, Donald. *A Writer Teaches Writing*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1985. Print.

Murray, James J. *A Short History of Writing Instruction*. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical*

    Outcomes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Print.

O'Hare, Frank. *Sentence Combining: Improving Student Writing without Formal*

    Grammar Instruction. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1973.

    Print.

Olson, Gary A and Sidney I. Dobrin. *Composition Theory for the Postmodern Classroom*.

    Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994. Print.

Pace, Tom. "Style and the Renaissance of Composition Studies." *Refiguring Style:*

    Possibilities for Writing Pedagogy. Eds. T.R. Johnson and Tom Pace. Logan:

    Utah State University Press, 2005. Print.

Parks, Stephen. *Class Politics: The Movement for the Students' Right to Their Own*

    Language. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 2000. Print.

Paulston, Christina Bratt and Gerald Dykstra. *Controlled Composition in English as a Second Language*. New York: Regents Publishing, 1973. Print.

Pennell, Michael. "Implementing 'Students' Right to Their Own Language': Language Awareness in the First Year Composition Classroom." *The Hope and the Legacy: The Past, Present, and Future of 'students' Right' to Their Own Language*. Bruch and Marback, Ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2005. 227-244. Print.

Pernot, Laurent. *Rhetoric in Antiquity*. Trans W.E. Higgins. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2005. Print.

Poulakos, John. *Sophistical Rhetoric in Classical Greece*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008. Print.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession* 91 (1991): 33-40. Print.

Prendergast, Catherine. "In Praise of Incomprehension." *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Eds. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2010. Print.

Preto-Bay, Ana Maria and Kristine Hansen. "Preparing for the Tipping Point: Designing Writing Programs to Meet the Needs of the Changing Population." *Writing Program Administration* 30.1-2 (2006): 37-58. Print.

Purcell, William. "Identitas, Similitudo, and Contrarietas in Gervasius of Melkley's 'Ars Poetica': A Stasis of Style." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*. 9.1 (1991): 67-91. Print.

Rall, Aneil. "(Im)migrant Crossings." *Crossing Borderlands: Composition and*

Postcolonial Studies. Eds. Andrea A. Lunsford and Lahoucine Ouzgane. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2004. 143-156. Print.

Richardson, Elaine. "African American Language in Online German Hip-Hop." *Code-Meshing as World English*. Eds. Vershawn Ashanti Young and Aja Y. Martinez. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 2011. 231-256. Print.

Roozen, Kevin. "Polyliterate Orientations: Mapping Meshings of Textual Practice." *Code-Meshing as World English.* Eds. Vershawn Ashanti Young and Aja Y. Martinez. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 2011. 203-230. Print.

Rose, Mike. *When a Writer Can't Write*. New York: Guilford Press, 1985. Print.

---. *Lives on the Boundary*. New York: Free Press, 1989. Print.

Rose, Shirley K. and Irwin Weiser. "Theorizing Writing Program Theorizing." *The Writing Program Administrator as Theorist*. Eds. Shirley K. Rose and Irwin Weiser. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2002. 183-196. Print.

Roen, Duane, Maureen Daly Goggin, and Jennifer Clary Lemon. "Teaching of Writing and Writing Teachers through the Ages." *Handbook of Writing Research*. Ed. Charles Bazerman. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2007. 343-64. Print.

Rubdy, Rani and Mario Saraceni. *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles*. New York: Continuum, 2006. Print.

Sanchez, Raul. *The Function of Theory in Composition*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008. Print.

Seneca. *Epistulae Morale* 84.6. Trans. Richard Gumere. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.

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

Shor, Ira. *When Students Have Power: Negotiating Authority in a Critical Pedagogy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997. Print.

Shuck, Gail. "Combating Monolingualism: A Novice Administrator's Challenge." *Writing Program Administration* 30.1-2 (2006): 59-82. Print.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1986. Print.

Soliday, Mary. *Politics of Remediation: Institutional and Student Needs in Higher Education*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002. Print.

Stancliff, Michael and Maureen Daly Goggin. "What's Theorizing Got do Do With It?" Teaching Theory as Resourceful Conflict and Reflection in TA Preparation." *Writing Program Administration* 30.3 (2007): 11-28. Print.

Starkey, Penelope. "Imitatio Redux." *College Composition and Communication* 25.5 (1974): 435-437. Print.

Storch, Neomy. "Collaborative Writing: Product, Process, and Students' Reflections." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14.3 (2005): 153-173. Print.

Sun, Huatong. "The Triumph of Users: Achieving Cultural Usability Goals with User Localizations. Technical Communication Quarterly 15.4 (2006): 457-81. Print.

Swales, John M. and Christine B. Feak. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*. 2nd edition. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004. Print.

Trimbur, John. "Linguistic Memory and the Politics of U.S. English." *College English*

68.6 (2006): 575-578. Print.

---. "Consensus and Difference in Collaborative Learning." *College English* 51.6 (1989): 602-616. Print.

---.Foreword. *The Writing Program Interrupted: Making Space for Critical Discourse*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 2009. vii-x. Print.

Villanueva, Victor. *Bootstraps*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1993. Print.

Vitanova, Gergana. "Authoring the Self in a Non-Native Language: A Dialogic Approach to Agency and Subjectivity." *Dialogue with Bakhtin on Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Eds. Joan Kelly Hall, Gergana Vitanova, Ludmial Marchenkova. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005. Print.

Vognar, Chris. "Twitter's Character Limit Sparks New Style of Short-Form Writing." *Dallas Morning News*. June 27, 2010. Print.

Webb, Ruth. "The Progymnasmata as Practice." *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Ed. Yun Lee Too. Boston: Brill, 2001. 289-316. Print.

Weiser, Elizabeth. "Where is Style Going? Where Has It Been?" *Refiguring Style: Possibilities for Writing Pedagogy*. Eds. T.R. Johnson and Tom Pace. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2005. 23-41. Print.

Wible, Scott. "Pedagogies of the 'Students' Right' Era: The Language Curriculum Research Group's Project for Linguistic Diversity." *College Composition and Communication* 57.3 (2006): 442-478. Print.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. *Delivering College Composition: The Fifth Canon*. New York:

    Boynton/Cook, 2006. Print.

You, Xiaoye. *Writing in the Devil's Tongue: A History of English Composition in China*.

    Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2010. Print.