R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 899 24 TE 000 199

INTRODUCTION TO CURRICULUM V--LITERATURE, LANGUAGE, RHETORIC. TEACHER AND STUDENT VERSIONS.

BY- KITZHABER, ALBERT R.
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE

REPORT NUMBER CRP-H-149-66
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0366-66
CONTRACT OEC-5-10-319
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.72 41P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COMPOSITION (LITERARY), *ENGLISH CURRICULUM, *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, *LANGUAGE, *LITERATURE, RHETORIC, CURRICULUM GUIDES, CURRICULUM RESEARCH, GRADE 11, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, LINGUISTICS, SECONDARY EDUCATION, STUDY GUIDES, TEACHING GUIDES, LITERARY GENRES, OREGON CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER, EUGENE, PROJECT ENGLISH,

A RATIONALE IS PROVIDED IN THIS INTRODUCTION FOR AN 11TH-GRADE ENGLISH CURRICULUM IN LITERATURE, LANGUAGE, AND RHETORIC. THE SECTION ON LITERATURE JUSTIFIES A SPIRALLY-DEVELOPED CURRICULUM, AN INDUCTIVE TEACHING METHOD, AND AN ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO PLAYS, POEMS, AND FICTIONAL WORKS AND EMPHASIZES THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF FORM AND CONTENT. IN ADDITION TO A DISCUSSION OF THE CHARACTERISTICS PECULIAR TO HUMAN COMMUNICATION, THE LANGUAGE SECTION INDICATES THE NEED TO LEARN HOW MAN ORGANIZES HIS CONCEPTS INTO A LANGUAGE SYSTEM AND HOW TOOLS OF THAT SYSTEM CAN BE USED TO CREATE AND UNDERSTAND SENTENCES. THE RHETORIC SECTION EXPLORES THE NATURE OF EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION, WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON THE ART OF PERSUASION. SEE ALSO ED 010 129 THROUGH ED 010 160, ED 010 803 THROUGH ED 010 832, TE 000 195 THROUGH TE 000 220, AND TE 000 227 THROUGH TE 000 249. (JB)

OREGON CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

Introduction to Curriculum V:

Literature
Language
Rhetoric

Student Version

OREGON CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

Introduction to Curriculum V:

Literature
Language
Rhetoric

Student Version

The project reported herein was supported through the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

LITERATURE CURRICULUM V

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDENT

In the eighteenth century the King of England asked Alexander Pope, the leading poet of the day, to compose a motto for the collar of his dog--a sort of identification tag should the Royal Pet be lost. Pope wrote the following (Kew was one of the royal estates):

> I am his Highness' dog at Kew;
> Pray tell me, Sir, whose dog are you?

What is the subject of this couplet? Identification of a royal dog? Yes, to the extent that it does serve to identify the animal, but not merely that. The subject is also human nature, or one aspect of it. But for complete appreciation of the couplet we must also consider the point of view. The speaker is the First Person, and hence the dog. To read the inscription one had to bend down, thus physically placing oneself on a level with the dog, by whom he was then addressed as an equal. So the technical consideration of the point of view supports the attitude of the couplet towards the subject. Subject and point of view support and reinforce each other in conveying a rather cynical estimate of human nature.

But even so, a full appreciation of the work depends on our use of the third approach to literature used in this curriculum: Form. For it is the form of the work that gives the subject and the point of view their impact. Pope could have done any number of things instead of what he did. He could have written "I am the Royal Dog, and you are no better than I am," or "People are dogs." Instead he selected the rhythm of verse, and the appeal of the rhymed couplet with its balanced lines. And he used the possibilities of metaphor. The first line deals with a dog in its primary meaning as a four-footed domesticated animal; the second deals with the insulting metaphorical definition of a man as a dog. The Form of the work, then, by the contrast between the innocent first line and the savage second line, built around metaphor and unified by rhyme, makes Pope's Point of View towards his Subject unforgettable. You need to consider all

All this is merely to remind you of something we said in an earlier introduction: "The way a thing is said is part of what is being said." In this year's work we will focus our attention on the way a thing is said. In the two years just past, the main concentration has been on Subject and Point of View; this year's work will concentrate primarily on Form.

We will base this year's course of study on two assumptions. The first is that you are familiar with the basic terms of this literature curriculum--Subject, Form, and Point of View--and with some of the possible refinements of those terms. The second assumption is that you have begun to realize that the full comprehension of a literary work of art depends on the use of all three of the terms, and that emphasis on one of them is a useful means of approach only, and that actually they are like the sides of a triangle: each attached to the other two, and all three necessary to make up the whole.

With this in mind, we will concentrate this year on a further study of the Form of a literary work. There are several reasons for this emphasis. A work of literary art, like any other work of art in any medium, is consciously shaped by the artist. The more we can understand about both the limitations and the possibilities of that medium, and the more we know about the restrictions and freedoms with which the author must deal, the better we are able to understand and evaluate his achievement. Remember Pope and the dog: it is the form which makes the idea (in itself common enough) unforgettable.

This year's exploration of Form will operate on two levels. The first level is in part a review. We will deal with the concept of form as it is applied to the various literary modes or kinds. "Mode" is the literary term we will use to designate the various types of writing. In earlier centuries much time was spent in trying to distinguish between a large number of modes, and very rigid rules were laid down for writing in each. Today, at least for our purposes, the problem is less difficult. The major modern modes are few: most people think of them as fiction, poetry, drama, and non-fiction. These of course are the same modes you have been reading for the last four years, and they are the modes you will be reading for the rest of your life.

Within each mode we find various genres, as a moment's reflection about the last four years' work will make clear. Thus in the mode of fiction you have read such genres as the short story and the novel, the fable and the parable. In the mode of poetry your reading has covered such genres as the ballad, the lyric, the dramatic monologue, and others. The mode of drama can embrace such genres as tragedy, comedy, and the history play.

What you will be doing in this year, then, is building on knowledge and distinctions you have already used. In earlier units you have dealt with "storied" and "non-storied" forms of literature, and this year's work is designed to build on that distinction. Thus Auden's "O Where Are You Going?" is a storied form in the mode of poetry and the ballad genre. Shakespeare's Julius Caesar is a storied form

in the mode of drama and genre of tragedy. Now, while the various modes have often much in common, they also have many distinguishing characteristics. One does not analyze a ballad in precisely the same way that one does a play, though both may be storied forms. So one of the concerns of this year is to help you understand the use of which writers put the conventions of the various modes.

You are already familiar with many of these conventions, as another moment's reflection will tell you. Over the last four years you have acquired a great many analytical tools and concepts used in dealing with various works of literature. You know some of the conventions of fiction: plot, character, setting, and the like. You know some of the conventions of drama: objective point of view, soliloquy, stage directions. You know some of the conventions of poetry: verse, rhyme, meter. You know some of the techniques of all forms of literature: symbol, metaphor, irony. One of the purposes of this year's work is to gather these various terms together for you, and see how they can be applied to the analysis of works representing various genres in the various modes. In other words, much of this year's work will be devoted to refreshing and extending your critical vocabulary, and to increasing your understanding of the various literary modes.

The second level of the year's curriculum grows naturally out of the first; indeed, it would probably be more accurate to say that it is just another way of looking at the first. For if what we have been talking about so far can be seen as dealing with the question "What is the form?" the other question we want you to consider is "How does the author use this form?" or, to put it another way, "How does the author adapt to the advantages and limitations of this form?"

We mentioned earlier Auden's poem "O Where Are You Going?" which you read last year. Take another look at it.

"O Where Are You Going?"

by W. H. Auden

(For text of poem, see The Collected Poetry of W. H. Auden; Random House, Inc., 1945.)

Now consider the following:

"O Where Are You Going?"

A One-Act Play

Characters
Reader
Horror
Fearer
Rider (alias Farer, alias Hearer)

Time: The Present

Scene: A room in a house. The house is old, gloomy, and depressing. At right is an alcove lined with bookshelves. Next to it are a desk, chair, and couch, all strewn with books and papers. To the left is a full-length window, opening on a vista of a wood bare of leaves; beyond this a range of hills. The sun still hits the hills, but it is dusk in the woods and the house. During the action the light slowly fades. Next to the window is a door, with strong hinges and bolts. As the curtain rises, the four characters are seated in the room, with Reader at his desk bent over a large volume. Rider is seated, idly thumbing a magazine. He stops, and gazes a long time out the window at the hills. Suddenly he jumps up, walks to the door, opens it, and is starting to leave. He remains at the door during the play.

Reader (In alarm, looking up from his book): O where are you going? That valley is fatal when furnaces burn. The marsh gases on the heath can drive a man insane. That gap (pointing to a pass in the hills) is a grave where the tall return.

Fearer (Moves to couch next to Reader, obviously seeking moral support): Do you imagine that the darkness will hold off until you reach the pass? Will you be able to find your way in the dark? How can you feel your way over the rocks?

Horror (Cringing in his chair, knuckles to teeth. Suddenly looks out the window, screams, and points): O what was that bird? Did you see that shape in the twisted trees? Aren't you afraid something will follow you? Are you well enough to travel?

Rider (to Reader): Out of this house. (Turns to Fearer) Yours never will. . . (Turns to Horror): They're looking for you. . .

Exit Rider, stage right.

CURTAIN

Generally speaking, the Subject and the Point of View of the poem and the "play" are pretty much the same. But the Form is altered tremendously. In the poem, analysis and discussion of Form would be concerned with such things as rhyme, rhythm, alliteration, verse form, meter, and other factors that contribute to the form of the work. In the "play" you would deal with somewhat different problems. You would consider such things as the flow of dialogue, spacing of the actors on stage, the effect of movement, the use of scenery, and other factors that make the dramatic form different from the poetic form. These would be the sorts of things that you would consider on the first level.

On the second level you would be concerned with the implications that a choice of form has for the author. Each form has advantages and limitations, and an author must work with these in mind. If you look at Auden's poem, you will find that except for the furniture in the room, everything that is described in the stage directions of the "play" is there in the poem--the twisted trees, the room itself, the pass in the hills, the time of day, directions as to who is saying what to whom. In the poem, because of the form it takes, all these things are implied in the very texture of the poem itself. In the "play," because of the dramatic form, all the author can do is write dialogue; everything else must be in the form of directions for staging and acting the drama. The differences between these two "storied" forms, then, offer various advantages and limitations, and force the author to make very definite decisions.

What we want you to begin to see as you deal with this aspect of the meaning of the word "Form" is that while an author has a choice

of several forms, once he has made that choice the form imposes rules on him which permit him to do some things but which also forbid him to do others. We want you to become alert to these various options that the writer has, and see how he works within the various rules that his selection of a particular form has imposed on him.

What we hope you will do is begin to ask intelligent questions about Form--intelligent questions which are all the more difficult because there are not always definite answers. Let us take one more concrete illustration from the poem and the "play." Look at the ending of each. Auden's poem closes with the line "As he left them there, as he left them there." The "play," because of its form, must translate this into the stage directions "Exit Rider, stage right." Like Snagglepuss.

Your first consideration could well be with Auden's handling of his form. The expectations that he has aroused in the reader by his choice of form demand that he provide, at the very least, some metrical similarity between that line and the other lines of the poem. Also, at the end of something, we like to feel a sense of completeness, a sense that whatever has been started has been finished. Auden satisfies the second expectation by telling us that the character leaves. But why did he satisfy the first expectation by the repetition of the phrase "As he left them there?" Any number of options were open to him: he could, for instance, have said "He said in his scorn as he left them there," or "The door swung shut as he left them there." Either of these two possibilities would have satisfied the requirements. Why did Auden obey the rules in the particular way he did? What are the advantages to his way? What is the purpose of the repetition? Did you rules of the form force him into a clumsy repetition, or did he take advantage of the rules to use repetition in an effective way?

You might then go further and consider the "play." Obviously Auden's last line is much more effective than the flat stage directions. The line reverberates ominously in our minds, in a way that the stage directions do not. Thus the selection of the dramatic form here appears to have distinct disadvantages. Are there any compensations? What are the advantages of the dramatic form? Would the physical action, on the stage, of the character actually leaving, and the door shutting behind him, be any compensation for the use of this form? What about the possibilities of seeing an expression on the actor's face as he leaves, and on the faces of those who remain?

These are the kinds of questions we will want you to be dealing with this year. What are the characteristics of the form that the author is using? How does he use the requirements of the form he chose? And because, as we pointed out, you are dealing with a work of literature in

its totality, you will unavoidably find yourself dealing with other questions as well: Why did the author pick this form for this subject? How important are considerations of Point of View for an understanding of this form?

It has been said that much of the pleasure we get from reading a work of literature comes from our recognition of its relationship to other works and our exercise of the power of comparison. We hope that you will find this to be so as you read the selections for this year. Your deeper understanding of the conventions of the major literary modes will help you to see any individual work both as a member of a class and as a unique work of art. And such understanding is important. One of man's most basic needs is the need to find form or pattern in his experience. This year's work with the concept of Form is your next big step towards a fuller understanding of how that need finds its outlet in man's artistic shaping of that miraculous medium of his own invention--language.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDENT

LANGUAGE V

WHAT IS LANGUAGE? WHY STUDY IT?

Since most young people your age like to know why they are asked to do something, you have probably been wondering about the reasons for studying language again this year. And you have a right to ask. Perhaps you feel that because you are a native speaker of English and have no trouble using the language you know enough about it already. In one respect you would be right. Your ability to use English demonstrates that you do know a great deal about it, but, like a great many people you probably haven't stopped to realize either how important language is to you, nor what a complex activity it is.

You have been concerned with language all your life, though much of the time you were unaware of the fact. First you learned to speak it; then in the primary grades you learned to read and write it. For quite a few years now you have been learning <u>about</u> your language. You have learned about the sounds which make up the words of English; about how they go together to make sentences; about why they follow a certain order; and about how they are related. You have also learned something about the history of your language.

Moreover, you have been concerned with how language is used in writing and speaking and in literature. Language has enabledyou to learn about other things—history, science, math. None of these studies would really be possible without language. But even with all of this concern about language, what you have learned so far is a very small part of what there is to learn.

What, then, is language, and why is it so important that students are asked to study it every year of their school life? Language is one of the most obvious ways in which man is different from animals; certainly it is the most important way. Our ability to use language to give information to other people and to receive information from them is the thing, really, that makes us human. All of our "human" activities and all the tremendous achievements of the human race would not have been possible except for this ability to use language. But just what this ability is, is not easily explained. However, we can discover some of the characteristics which it has.

Language is a means of communication, but communication isn't limited to humans. Some animals have means of communicating with each other. For instance, bees go through an elaborate kind of dance to tell other bees where food can be found. They can indicate the direction and the distance by this means. Gibbon apes have a system of calls by which they communicate. They have one high-pitched call which they utter when they are surprised by an enemy. Another kind of call is used by young gibbons when approaching each other in a friendly manner. And they have a limited number of other calls which are used in specific situations and which result in a specific kind of behavior in other gibbons. Most people have observed something like communi-

cation in certain animals, particularly domestic animals which are kept for pets, or laboratory animals used in experiments. If you have a dog, for instance, you have undoubtedly observed that he has a certain noise which he uses to indicate that he is hungry, another when he is angry, and maybe another when he wants to go outside. Laboratory animals can be trained to respond to signals. They can learn to do certain things when a bell rings or when a light flashes. They even learn to push certain buttons to produce certain results. All of these activities have some kind of communicative properties, but we wouldn't call them language. What is the difference?

Exercise 1: Before you read further, try to jot down as many ways as you can think of that human communication (language) differs from any kind of communication you know of in animals. Then make a list of the things you can do with your language that animals can do with their means of communication.

How does human language differ from the communication of animals? One of the most obvious ways is that in animals the ability to communicate is limited to situations right at hand. A dog cannot tell you that he was hungry last night or that he didn't like the meal you set out for him three days ago, nor that he will be hungry again tonight. The bees who want to communicate the location of nectar perform their dance as soon as they have returned to the hive. They don't dance about nectar they found last week. The gibbon calls mentioned above are responses to immediate situations. Animals seem to have no means of communicating information about things or situations which are not present in space or time. Whether they think about such things we don't know because they can't tell us. You, however, can talk about things that have happened as far back as you can remember, and also about things that have happened thousands of years before. You can talk about things that may never happen, that you imagine or dream. And you can do this because you have a language.

A language implies that the communication is a two-way activity and that the users of the language can both produce the messages and can understand them when they are produced by someone else. Humans are both speakers and hearers. This is called interchangeability. The bee dance has this property. The bees can both indicate where the nectar is by the proper dance, and can understand where it is when they observe some other bee dancing. But most animal communication lacks this quality.

And not only can humans both create messages and understand them. They can produce new messages which have not been produced before and they can understand messages they have never heard before. This is called the creative or productive aspect of language. What is it about language that gives it this quality? All communication makes use of signals of some kind--words, cries, the dance routine--signals which carry meaning (stand for something else) and which bring about some response in the one being communicated with. The system of signals in human language is tremendously more complex in many ways than signals used by the animals which communicate. With the gibbons one cry means one thing. It is not combined with another cry nor varied to

produce new meanings. And though bees can use the steps of the dance to indicate new sources of nectar, the steps cannot be used to indicate other kinds of information.

The signals of human language are the utterances we call words, which in themselves are complex since they consist of combinations of distinct sounds. Though the sounds have no meaning in themselves when they are combined in various ways, they indicate meaning to us. The sounds /m/ and /æ/ and /n/ have no meaning by themselves, but when they are combined / mæn/ they do indicate meaning to speakers of English. These meaningful combinations of sounds, which we sometimes call morphemes, can be combined with other morphemes in a variety of ways to create new meaningful combinations. We not only have the word man by itself; we find this unit occurring also with other units where it may carry different, though often related, meanings—manly, workman, etc. And the same group of sounds, when combined with other groups of sounds has an entirely different meaning—manifest, for example. The fact that human language is made up of sounds which can be combined and that the combined units can themselves be recombined is the reason we can use our language to produce new messages. It increases the complexity but also increases the possibilities. You can demonstrate for yourself why this is so by doing the following exercise.

Exercise 2: Assume you have three colored discs, one red, one blue, and one yellow. Suppose they represent sounds and that when they are combined they make up a meaningful unit which we might call a morpheme. How many different ways can you arrange the three?

Example: | red + yellow + blue |

Now assume that you can combine each of the arrangement of three with one of the other arrangements. How many possibilities are there? If you can combine each of them with two others how many new arrangements could there be?

Example: | red + yellow + blue | + | blue + yellow + re

You can see that if we were limited to combining single sounds we would have a limited language, but because we can combine groups of sounds the possibilities become unlimited. It should, of course, be pointed out that not all combinations of sounds are possible in English. We can have / mæn/ but not / mnæ /. But still the possibilities are unlimited, especially when we remember that not only are the morphemes combined in various ways, but the words which are made up of morphemes can themselves be combined in various ways in sentences. This is an aspect of language you will learn more about later this year.

We must remember that these groups of sources in human language are

symbols. Understanding what a symbol is is very important if you are to understand what language is. One thing to understand is that a symbol stands for something apart from itself. And there is nothing in the nature of the symbol itself to indicate what it stands for. We say that a flag is a symbol of a country. But there is nothing about a flag--a piece of cloth with a design on it--to show its relation to a nation. A flag has only the meaning that human beings assign to it. Words are symbols. Of all symbols they are the most remote from the thing they stand for. There is nothing in words to show what they stand for or to give them meaning. The people who use them do that. For example, there is nothing about the word boy to indicate that it stands for a young human male. If there were it might occur in all languages with that meaning. If there were something about words to indicate what they stand for, learning a foreign language would be much easier. But the young human male is called boy in English, garçon in French, and Junge in German, and the words have meaning only to the native speakers of those languages or to those who have studied these languages.

One final characteristic of human language should be mentioned. That is the fact that humans can not only learn a language, but they can teach it to their young. A language is passed on from one generation to another and as a language changes the changes are passed on. Man is apparently born with the innate ability to learn a language, but the language itself has to be acquired. No particular language is innate. So far there is no evidence that any animal system of communication is learned in this way or changes in the way human language does. Bees are using the same dance they did thousands of years ago; gibbons are uttering the same cries. We don't have evidence that one generation teaches the next.

Exercise 3: With your class discuss the following questions:

1. What relation can you see between the fact that human language is learned rather than innate to the fact that there are various languages in the world and that languages change?
2. What relation can you see between the fact that humans can communicate about situations remote in time and space and the development of human civilization and culture?
3. Do you feel there is any relation between the fact that man is the only creature with a real language and that he is the only creature which has evolved beyond the animal state?

Now we can return to the question of why we are studying language. We have pointed out a variety of characteristics of language, a few of which are shared by animals, but no animal communication has them all. We have seen that animals use certain signals or symbols, but that these symbols are not organized into a system. Animals communicate in a limited sense. They use symbols. But they have no grammar, no complex organized system for putting the symbols together. Man, on the other hand, has an ability to attach

symbols--words--to concepts of the world he lives in and then to organize these symbols into a system with which he can communicate. Putting the symbols together in a system is the important part of human communication and it is the way in which he puts them together that makes up the grammar of a language.

What you have been studying in your language classes for several years now is the kind of system which exists in one of the human languages, English. The purpose of this study has not been just to learn the names of the parts of the sentence and how they are ordered, nor just to be able to describe the structure of a sentence of English. A broader purpose has been to give you the tools for thinking about the much more important question of how man organizes his concepts into a system, what that system might be, and how he is able to use it to create sentences and to understand sentences. In a way we can say that you have been studying language--and will continue to study it--because it is important in helping you to understand something about what it means to be a human being.

This year your study of language will be of two sorts. In the beginning you will be adding to your knowledge of the structure of the sentence. In other words, you will be analyzing some more of the structures of our language which you have not analyzed before. You will be finding out, for instance, how to describe and explain the underlined parts of the following sentences.

(1) I found the key <u>where you put it</u>.

(2) I will be glad <u>when you go</u>.

You will also be learning why the following sentences are grammatical:

(3) I discovered a purring cat on the shelf.
I discovered an interesting book on the shelf.

but that only one of the following is grammatical.

(4) I discovered a very purring cat on the shelf.
I discovered a very interesting book on the shelf.

Though you haven't yet worked with parts of sentences like those underlined in (1) and (2) and haven't yet found a way to describe the difference between <u>purring</u> and <u>interesting</u>, you will discover that they can be explained by means of rules you are already familiar with. You will see how they are related to sentences you already know how to analyze. In other words you will be discovering more about the order and simplicity that underlies the complexity of our language.

In the second part of your language work this year you will be thinking not about how to analyze sentences, but about some of the characteristics of our complex system. You will be using your knowledge of the structure of language to try to explain how it is that we can use this complex system

to communicate--how we can understand sentences we haven't heard before and how we can create new sentences. We will be exploring the question of how we can best describe this language we all use in a system that will explain something about it. You will be finding an answer to why some sentences can mean more than one thing. You will, in this part of the year, be concerned not just with <u>what</u> are the parts of your language, but <u>why</u> they are the way they are.

Rhetoric Curriculum V

Student's Introduction

An American writer, whose name you have probably heard, jotted down these three notes at different times:

> To show the effect of gratified revenge. As an instance, merely suppose a woman sues her lover for breach of promise, and gets the money by instalments, through a long series of years. At last, when the miserable victim were utterly trodden down, the triumpher would have become a very devil of evil passions--they having overgrown his whole nature; so that a far greater evil would have come upon himself than on his victim.
>
> A man who does penance in what might appear to lookers-on the most glorious and triumphal circumstances of his life. Each circumstance of the career of an apparently successful man to be a penance and torture to him on account of some fundamental error in early life.
>
> Sketch of a person who, by strength of character or assistant circumstances, has reduced another to absolute slavery and dependence on him. Then show, that the person who appeared to be the master, must inevitably be as much a slave, if not more, than the other. All slavery is reciprocal, on the supposition most favorable to the rulers.[1]

What was this writer's intention in writing these notes? He wanted to put his ideas down, while they were fresh in his mind, so that he could have them on paper to mull over. Perhaps someday they would become the seed of a short story or a novel. Did he intend these notes to be read by the public? No, he did not. Often, as you can see, he didn't even bother to write in complete sentences. These jottings were intended for no eyes but his own. The author was Nathaniel Hawthorne, and, as you will discover, he eventually put these notes together, reworked them, expanded them with details, and expressed them fully for other people to read in his novel, The Scarlet Letter.

Now, you may never have kept a diary or a journal, or done any other kind of writing designed just for your own eyes, and not for others. But it is true that in one way, the writing you have been doing in past years is somewhat like Hawthorne's notes: You, and your rhetoric lessons so far, have been most concerned with what you want to say, rather than with who is reading what you write. Like Hawthorne, we have been concentrating on ideas first.

Review: Earlier Problems in Writing and How You Solved Them

This is the first problem of rhetoric for you as speaker-writer--to decide what you have to say and then to express it as clearly and accurately as you can. In your seventh and eighth grade work, therefore, you were mainly concerned with discovering in your own experience and observation the sources of your ideas. You learned to select the details that described events, people, things, and illuminated their meaning for you. You examined the words and contexts that conveyed your responses and feelings. You learned to distinguish between simply reporting your observations and interpreting them to suggest an attitude and evoke a sympathetic response to it in the reader or listener.

From looking at experience as the source of ideas you next moved to looking at ideas themselves; in the ninth and tenth grade program your emphasis shifted to examining ideas. The lessons in those years were designed to show you that ideas have patterns; for example, the way one narrates an experience (one thing after another) can be used to describe a process (how to do something). You learned to put details together to form a conclusion from them in a pattern you recognized as generalization. You discovered that accepted generalizations form assumptions like "all men are created equal" or "people tend to avoid what they dislike," and you saw that different people may have different assumptions about the same subject. Some people, for example, may believe that nobody should have to do anything he dislikes; other people (teachers, for instance) may assume that doing things one dislikes is necessary for learning and for building character. You have seen also that people use ideas in various deductive patterns to reach conclusions or to arrive at decisions. You have discovered, too, that putting similar ideas together is a valuable pattern of reasoning by deduction--either in literal comparisons or in patterns of metaphor and analogy. Hawthorne uses a metaphor when he says the triumpher becomes a "very devil."

The Next Step: Problems in Writing to Examine and Solve this Year

In all your study of experience and idea patterns so far, you have thought chiefly of the problem of defining and expressing your own opinions as clearly and accurately as you could. You have tried to do justice to yourself by writing and speaking honestly, and you have tried to do justice to your subject by looking carefully at ideas themselves and seeing how they work--reviewing your reasoning critically to be sure it made sense. But, though all this is extremely important, and must always be done, it is not the end of the process of conveying thoughts in language. Here, for example, is a profound idea that makes very good sense, and it is sincerely expressed by a careful writer saying something he believes:

> Tant i est difficile de s'entendre, mon cher ange, et tant la pensée est incommunicable, même entre gens qui s'aiment!

If you do not understand this thought, it is not because the writer is not expressing his experience clearly, or because he is insincere. It may convey no meaning to you simply because it is not written in your own language. Many people could and do understand it--if they can read French--and the author was a Frenchman writing for people who knew his language. If he had wanted to communicate with you, he would have needed to write in language you could understand. If Beaudelaire's line is translated into English you can grasp its meaning at once:

> How difficult it is to understand each other, my dear angel, and how incommunicable thoughts are, even between people who love each other!

The problem is not so simple, of course, as writing in English instead of in French. Here is a sentence you may find as hard to understand as Beaudelaire's, though it is written in your own language:

> The canons of reputability or decency under the pecuniary culture insist on habitual futility of effort as the mark of a pecuniarily blameless life.

This sentence may convey an idea clearly to some readers, but a good many people have thought it difficult to follow. Even though it is in English it may not be in language you can understand, since the words and the word combinations are unusually complicated. For a specialist in sociology or cultural history the language might be appropriate, but if the author hoped to reach a broad general audience, he might better have worded his idea in simpler terms. One possible translation of the sentence is that among people who consider wealth of primary importance, the only respectable work is the kind that serves no useful purpose. But the obscurity of the language makes it impossible to tell which of several meanings the author may have intended.

These are extreme examples, but they point out as well as examples can the importance of the writing and speaking problem you will be concentrating on in this year's work--how to convey your ideas effectively to an audience--to listeners and readers. Effectively is a key word in that sentence, for it implies that you are thinking about the audience; effect must be on the readers or listeners. The emphasis this year is on effectiveness--persuasion--not in the narrow sense of inciting others to take specific action (vote for Jim; sign the petition; support the Junior Prom), though some attention will be given to this purpose, but persuasion in the broader sense of making the best possible statement of the idea in language the audience can understand and will respond to as you intend that they should. If Hawthorne had left his ideas in note form and not turned them into public expression in The Scarlet Letter and his other published works, we would never have heard of him today.

Advance Notice: What to Expect

Exploring ways to convey ideas effectively will lead you into various kinds of problems, which your rhetoric program this year will help you understand. An obvious starting point is the subject--how to develop and present a subject about which your ideas may be unexplored, or vague, or, in other words, how to develop an opinion that goes beyond a platitude and becomes worth expressing because it is yours, and you have thought about it and believe that it is true.

Obviously it is wrong to put effectiveness ahead of honesty and truth. Anyone who does this has selfish motives which we must be on guard against. The best persuasion is still the most honest, the truest persuasion. But the truth, as you have noticed, is not always easy to determine. On the important problems of our lives it is never easy to determine. That, as historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. says, is why they are important problems. Thus, we have to learn to live with uncertainties, which means learning to understand when to persuade, and when not to persuade, and when to be persuaded, and when not to be persuaded.

If you are to express opinions effectively you will also need to consider your readers and listeners and how they are likely to respond to various kinds of ideas. Part of your work will help you analyze audiences--how an audience of parents, for example, might differ from an audience of students; how an audience vitally interested in a subject might differ from an audience to whom the idea was completely unfamiliar--and how such differences affect the problem of the speaker-writer. From considering the audience you progress logically to considering what to do when you plan for specific audiences--how to lead into your subject so that the reader or listener will be willing to follow you, and how to present your ideas so that readers will agree with you or at least understand your point and see the justice of your reasons. You will explore ways to make your ideas convincing, and ways to judge the value and effectiveness for your purpose.

Since your emphasis this year is on reaching the audience, special attention will be given to speaking assignments, where the presence of the audience before you helps you to realize the importance of considering how your ideas will sound to the listener. You can also apply the same principles to writing in theme assignments. This year, too, you will begin to learn basic principles of research writing--evaluating sources, exercising your judgment about the materials you read, and drawing generalizations and interpretations. You will work with a source book, a collection of essays and articles, on a subject familiar to you, the American High School. Your assignments in it will bring together the abilities you have developed throughout the year. By the end of the year you should be reading and listening more critically than before, and you should be more deeply aware of the possibilities for influencing your audience. In short, the intention of this year's work in rhetoric is to make you a more effective person when you speak or write.

OREGON CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

Introduction to Curriculum V:

Literature
Language
Rhetoric

Teacher Version

The project reported herein was supported through the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

OREGON CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

Introduction to Curriculum V:

Literature
Language
Rhetoric

Teacher Version

The project reported herein was supported through the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TEACHER VERSION

INTRODUCTION TO LITERATURE CURRICULUM V: MODES AND GENRES

I. THEORETICAL

A. The Place and Function of "Types" in the Literature Curriculum

The design of our curriculum in literature, looking back upon it now from the vantage-point of the eleventh grade, has been shaped by four broadly conceived principles.

One is a principle of analysis: the individual work--poem, story, play, etc.--is examined in terms of its subject, the form through which it is communicated, and the point of view which, along with form, helps to determine the feeling about, the attitude toward, the subject. The analytical approach is, or should be, simply a means for leading the reader into the heart of the matter, the total aesthetic experience with the specific concrete object. It tends to be a-historical (although it can never be completely so in practice) and is associated with the so-called "New Criticism" that first came into being in England and the United States in the late 1920's and flourished notably in the 1940's.

The analytical approach is closely associated with a second principle, that of the inductive method of teaching. Although the phrase is borrowed from the field of scientific inquiry, it should go without saying that literary study can never achieve, and perhaps should not even try for, the rigor of science. For us, "inductive method" means simply a way of teaching, which, so far as possible, depends more on leading than on telling; allows, so far as possible, the student to make his own discoveries about the matter at hand; and encourages him to move, so far as possible, not from the general to the particular but from the particular to the general. "Inductive method" in the literature classroom is emphatically not intended to mean that the teacher should never "tell" nor that the student should never read introductions or guides to the work under consideration.

Analytical approach and "inductive method" lead more or less logically, then, to the third principle, Jerome Bruner's concept of the "spiral curriculum." Take this to mean simply that as the student moves upward through the six-year program his literary experience broadens as it rises. Literature is the constant, it remains the fixed center of the spiral; but literature as a play or poem or novel becomes plays and poems and novels, and in accumulating plurality a concept of "literature" emerges, based firmly on the inductive-analytical experience. Experiences similar in nature are repeated in increasing depth (to violate the spiral metaphor). By returning to different works by the same author and to new examples of the same literary type, the student begins to develop a vision of at once the infinite variety and the underlying coherence of the creative imagination at work in different times and different places. Here the teacher has a special responsibility. Using his own imagination, he must make the spiral work, and in order to do so he must make himself

familiar with what has gone before lower down in the spiral, so that he can, by deliberate effort, stimulate in the student reconsideration of works read in the earlier grades when such reconsideration is relevant to the matter at hand. Without this the study of literature becomes simply a series of unrelated episodes, and the mind at the end of it a muddle of bits and pieces. With it, the study of literature begins to assume some sort of order on a larger scale, as the student begins to perceive some connection between individual works.

The idea of "connecting" leads finally, then, to our fourth principle, one that may present itself first simply as a principle of organization: the principle of types (kinds, modes, genres), generally understood as a convenient expedient authorized by common sense: literature is plays, poems, novels, essays, so it is surely obvious that in each year students should study examples of all these modes. It is a principle that has achieved respectability: recommendations of the "types" organization began to appear as early as 1903.* It is doubtful, however, that the types approach has ever been much more than a means of organization more or less mechanically applied, an orthodox convenience for anthology editors; whereas, properly understood and imaginatively applied, it can be made a fruitful challenge to literary thought.

The use of our fourth principle should, even at the most elementary level, engage the mind with problems peculiar to literature and of fundamental importance. Basically it is an approach to the problem of form. We live and become human through communication, and the various literary kinds are specialized forms of communication. A play is one way of saying something, a narrative another, an essay ("non-storied form") still another. And the way of saying affects the meaning of what is said; or it may determine what is to be said; or the way of saying may be chosen because what is to be said can be transmitted in no other way. So it is that the concern with kinds or modes may be seen as a corollary of our first principle, the analytical study of the single play, poem, or novel. So also, as we shall see, this fourth concern is naturally related to the inductive method of teaching and the spiral curriculum. Why is work A to be associated with work B under the heading of a type name? Where do works C, D, and E, read last year or the year before, belong; and why?

This approach to literature is a useful principle of organization. At this point in the curriculum, putting the emphasis on this approach provides an opportunity for a review and consolidation of the work that has gone before, a review and consolidation that many students will welcome. Further, the approach through the study of modes and genres should promote the ultimate aims of all literary study: sensitivity to form, increasing awareness of how form and subject and all the other aspects of play and poem and story are organically fused, appreciation of the rich complexity of the artistic imagination, aesthetic pleasure intensified as it only can be--through understanding.

---

* For a history of the types approach see Irvin Ehrenpreis, The "Types" Approach to Literature, King's Crown Press, 1945, the most comprehensive single work on the whole subject.

B. A Note on Terminology

The study of literature, no matter how it is approached, will never be a precise science. One of the consequences of this fact (or possibly one of the causes) is that the terminology of the discipline is imprecise, overlapping, and vague. Most of the more impressionistic terminology is metaphoric. Thus we speak of the "tone" of a work, a musical metaphor; or we call a poet's meter "rough" or "smooth," tactile images; or we will say that an author "paints" a scene.

Our more precise terminology is, though not metaphoric, nonetheless still far from scientific exactness. One need only consider the confusion surrounding attempts to discriminate precisely between "image," "metaphor," "simile," "symbol," "myth," and "allegory."

This curriculum makes no attempt to resolve the confusion to which great minds have only added. Quite arbitrarily, and realizing the dangers involved, we have selected the term "Mode" for the major categories of literary expression (fiction, poetry, drama), and the term "Genre" for the subdivisions within the Modes (short story, novel, ode, tragedy, etc.). While this is obviously not a complete or satisfactory scheme, it has the advantages of simplicity and the use of respectable terminology. If the purpose of the year is for the students to begin to recognize and deal with certain family resemblances among literary works, then it is to their advantage to be able to discuss The Rivals as the Genre "comedy" in the Mode "drama." Further refinements of classification can wait.

C. A Caveat

While this discussion remains on the more or less theoretical level, it might be well to point out some of the dangers and shortcomings of the "types approach" to literature.

The main danger is that such an approach tends towards empty formalism and mindless labelling. As we have observed, literature is not and quite certainly never will be as precise as, say, biology. But a "types approach" encourages the critic to treat it as if it were. Subdivisions of modes and genres proliferate, each is defined as an absolute prescription, and the study of literature is reduced to external identification and classification as with butterflies and beetles. Man's rage for order tempts the "types" critic to envy the biologist, and he ends up with some arbitrary system such as the following:

Phylum	Writing
Class	Literature
Order	Prose
Family	Narrative
Genus	Fiction
Species	Short Story
Variety	Allegory
Individual	"The Masque of the Red Death"

Anything that doesn't fit is either a biological sport or not literature at all. The construction of such systems is tempting; but literature will not permit itself to be so pigeonholed, and all such systems eventually either break down or become so complex as to be valueless.

The question of the imprecision of literary terminology raised above implies another danger that must be recognized. For the Modes treated this year--fiction, drama, poetry, and the essay or discursive prose--are themselves incapable of precise definition or demarcation. Try to devise a definition of fiction that includes War and Peace, Pilgrim's Progress, and Heart of Darkness; or a definition of poetry that includes Paradise Lost, "Song of Myself," and "Les Fleurs de Mal." Or, to put the problem another way, why do the famous Shakespearian soliloquies frequently appear in anthologies of poetry, and yet "The Miller's Tale" and "The Corsair" never appear in collections of fiction?

Such considerations define the danger at the other end of the scale. The "types approach" can lead on the one hand to unrealistic schematism; on the other hand, consciousness of its limitations can make the critic so hesitant and conditional that all useful distinctions are destroyed.

It is with full awareness of the Scylla and Charybdis of such an approach that we venture to design a curriculum built around the study of Mode and Genre. For it is possible to steer a course not only safe but profitable between them. Most of the students in the classroom will not go on to be English majors, let alone theorists of literature. They will concern themselves for the rest of their lives with what are the generally accepted Modes of contemporary literary expression: fiction, drama, poetry, and discursive prose. They have been studying a large number of works in various Modes and Genres over the past few years. It is time for them now to begin to deal with family groupings, no matter how loosely defined. Familiarity with the conventions of the major Modes and Genres, as well as recognition of those aspects of literary expression which cut across modal groupings, is a necessary next step for all students. Those who can and want to go on to penetrate the limitations of such an approach will not be permanently crippled; those who do not will be exposed to a convenient and honest (though, to the theorist, limited) method of identification, comparison, and hence insight and evaluation. It is incumbent on the teacher to be aware of the dangers of the approach and avoid them.

What we are primarily concerned with, then, at the 11th grade, is solidifying the students' understanding of one of the major factors of literary study--what has been called the means of presentation. As the 11th grade Introduction to the students points out, this means of presentation is a primary consideration in further refining the earlier distinction between storied and non-storied forms. After all, as Virginia Woolf's "Common Reader" would probably be the first to point out, no one yet has included "Lochinvar" or "The Prisoner of Chillon" in a collection of fiction, or "The Cask of Amontillado" in a collection even of narrative poetry.

The means of presentation, then, though not the ultimate refinement in genre-theory, is a fundamental consideration in determining the characteristics of the major Modes familiar to most readers today. Everyone knows the distinction between animal, vegetable, and mineral; it is only the biochemist who, when faced with certain chemicals that seem capable of reproduction and self-determination, realizes the grossness of the larger distinctions. Similarly, every "common reader" knows a story from a poem; it is only the literary theorist who, when faced with "To Be or Not To Be" and "My Last Duchess," realizes the limitations of modal distinctions. Our 11th graders will profit from increased familiarity with the conventions of the major Modes.

D. Convention and Originality

A further corrective to the tendency towards rigidity that is the danger of the "types" approach is the recognition that Modes and Genres are not static forms. Since much of this year's work will study how the individual artist manipulates the conventions of the various means of presentation, it is well to emphasize here this aspect of tradition and the individual talent, or convention and revolt.

It is hard to say to what degree a knowledge of the conventions of a genre exist in a writer's mind as he writes, or to what degree he is consciously extending, modifying, or violating those conventions. Certainly in many cases the process is a deliberate one. Thackeray, for instance, in designating Vanity Fair as "a novel without a hero," was fully aware that he was violating the conventions of the novel as they existed at that time. In his preface to Paradise Lost, Milton clearly and deliberately repudiates the conventions of rhyme, that "invention of a barbarous age," and "Lycidas" is a miracle of the fresh reworking of conventions hundreds of years old. And Shakespeare's sonnet "My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun" has become a commonplace of literary history as an example of the rejection of tired conventions.

Ernest Hemingway's sport metaphor for the art of writing perhaps has some justification; for conventions are after all felt by the writer as the rules of the game, with the difference that the writer, unlike the athlete, can modify or change the rules in practice. Norman Holmes Pearson uses the word "imperatives" instead of "rules" or "conventions," and puts it this way: "forms may be regarded as institutional imperatives which both coerce and are in turn coerced by the writer." The imperatives are formidable: "Over lesser writers, as over lesser critics, form exists as a tyranny which defies revolution." To bow to a tyranny is always safe, if also nearly always stifling. **

** The 12th grade curriculum approaches this problem from a slightly different angle. There we will take up the question of what makes one work trite and another fresh. We try to make a distinction between a convention using a writer, and a writer using a convention. Familiarity with some of the conventions of the various genres, gained in the 11th grade, will lay the necessary groundwork for the next year's study.

In one sense, then, the true creator can be seen as a rebel--a literary enrage. It is his function to break ikons. This energy was called by Blake the "Poetic or Prophetic character," without which art and life itself would "stand still, unable to do other than repeat the same dull round over again." His was the true revolutionist's voice, and his contempt for the conventions of literary expression that were derived from 18th century neo-classical theory is unambiguous and complete. To the unquestioned and unquestioning asiom of Dr. Johnson that the business of the poet was to give "just representations of general nature," Blake responded with curt asperity: "To generalize is to be an idiot."

And Blake and his approach have much justification. When conventions become imperatives, when tyranny becomes solidified, the radical revolutionist is needed. But there are other ways of viewing the "imperatives." It is perhaps too simple to throw conventions overboard. Frequently the result may be only a spurious originality, with a new set of imperatives rapidly becoming as ossified as the old ones they replaced. Often the great writer finds a special challenge in a deliberate submission to the established form. There is a creative value in freely accepting limits, in what Robert Frost called "moving easy in harness." As writers from Chaucer down to the present have demonstrated, there is as much creative opportunity in the modification or rejuvenation of established forms as there is in radical originality. Chaucer used traditional forms--fabliau, romance, legend. Shakespeare wrote 154 poems in the sonnet form. The Rape of the Lock is a mock-epic. Keats and Wordsworth wrote odes and sonnets. "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" is a dramatic monologue. "Leda and the Swan" is a classical sonnet in form. Auden's "In Memory of W. B. Yeats" is a fresh reworking of the conventions of the elegy, a genre that goes back to Theocritus.

The history of the English sonnet itself can be thought of as a story of the unfolding creative genius as it collaboratively extends itself through time. It arrived in England from Italy with a form (octave-sestet) and subject (sexual love spiritualized) already conventionalized, but almost immediately the form was modified in the translations of Surrey, who "Englished" it into the 3-quatrain-couplet pattern that 50 years later became dominant in the 1590's. The transformation was probably in part suggested by the linguistic circumstance--there are simply fewer available rhymes in uninflected English than there are in inflected Italian. Shifting the rhyme sounds from quatrain to quatrain to couplet surely relieved that strain. Shakespeare bowed to the rhyme form but played many syntactical variations on it, and countered the conventional "conceited" style with the plain talk of "My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun." The creative coercions of Donne, who returned to the Petrarchan rhyme scheme, were in part metrical (for example, the "rough meter" of the first line of Holy Sonnet XII--"Why are we by all creatures waited on?"), in part an "intellectualizing" of the conceit ("At the round earth's imagin'd corners"), and, most radically, the introduction of the new subject matter, the profundities of religious experience. Milton, who chose the Italian way, made the sonnet political, giving it at times a savage satirical bite, as in the second sonnet "On the Detractions, etc.":

I did but prompt the age to quit their clogs
By the known rules of ancient liberty,
When straight a barbarous noise environs me
Of owls and cuckoos, asses, apes, and dogs. . . .

So it went, these challenges thrown in the face of convention. When we reach the Hopkins sonnets it may seem almost as though innovation itself had become conventional.

In the twentieth century, coercions of the imperatives have seemed the rule rather than the exception, often appearing to represent an almost heroic indifference in the writer to any need to make himself "comprehensibl to the society which is habituated" to the conventions, suggesting indeed a determination to confuse his audience "by wholly unexpected patterns." The reasons for this really radical iconoclasm are too complex to go into here; but it is a fact that in coercing the conventions the modern writer has often succeeded in coercing his audience as well; he has educated it, that is, has broadened its range of acceptance. Joyce's interpreters became his publicists, became teachers who created an audience for him; and very soon the startling and for a while almost incomprehensible innovations of Ulysses became, through their creative adaptations by other novelists, themselves new conventions, patterns that liberated the imaginations of writers like Virginia Woolf and William Faulkner.

Innovation, then, can flourish either through the radical rejection of existing forms, or through creative evolution within those forms. In either case, a knowledge of some of the formal conventions of literary expression is essential to a fuller understanding not only of the individual work but also of what Kenneth Burke calls "the philosophy of literary form." For any work of literature, be it the most radical departure or the most traditional expression, is in essence an imposition of form or pattern on the chaotic welter of experience. Through selection and emphasis, the artist imposes on his material his perception of the nature of reality, and it is this form or pattern which we, the audience, ultimately perceive. Without form, there can be no work of art (which is why those who fail to see any pattern in the theatre of the absurd deny, quite rightly, its claim to be art.)

It is probably too much to hope that any but the brightest students will begin to perceive the philosophical necessity of literary form which underlies the conventions. But familiarity with the conventions is the first step. And if most of them stop at the first step, much will still have been achieved. To recognize the constituents of the various Modes; to perceive the nature of an artist's modulation of a convention; to discuss a work as a unique member of a larger class; in other words, to perform the act of recognition and intelligent comparison; this is sufficient justification for the approach to literature through genre study.

"Man's pleasure in a literary work is compounded of the sense of novelty and the sense of recognition." This year's curriculum is designed to increase the student's capacity for such pleasure.

II. PRACTICAL

The Introduction to the students outlines for them in fairly simple terms what we hope to accomplish this year. As we point out there, the 11th grade curriculum can best be conceived as dealing with two inter-related problems: the first, "What are the characteristics of this form?" and the second, "How does the author use the demands and the opportunities presented to him by his choice of form?"

The year's work is built around units dealing with the major Modes in use today, and the most important Genres within the Modes. Thus there are units on fiction treating both short story and novel; on poetry, treating such still relevant Genres as the dramatic monologue, the sonnet, and the lyric; on drama, dealing with tragedy and comedy; and on the essay or discursive prose, dealing with the wide range of subject matter and of organization covered by that term.

The nature and purpose of the year's work make the units largely self-contained. We have, in writing the units, assumed a certain order, namely short story, drama, novel, poetry, and essay. Thus there are references in the unit on the novel to certain ideas of tragedy which appear in the unit on drama. But such references have been kept to a minimum, in an effort to give the teacher as much latitude as possible in arranging the course. Our primary concentration has been on intra-modal considerations; questions of inter-modal relationships are best left to the teacher to be handled when they arise.

It should be pointed out here that inter-modal relationships will be primarily of two kinds. The first kind will probably deal with larger patterns. Thus, while the means of presentation can be seen to differ between play and novel, it will be obvious to many of the students that the same tragic pattern of rise and fall is being followed in both Macbeth and The Mayor of Casterbridge; and not only that, but in many ways the responsibility for the tragic outcome of the narrative is to be found in both works in the character of the protagonist. The second kind deals with smaller components or conventions. The students should see, for instance, that the "convention of withheld information" operates in both Oedipus and The Great Gatsby. They should further see what is so obvious that they may not be aware of it: that certain characteristics of literary expression--symbol, allusion, metaphor, image patterns, and the like--are not confined to any one Mode or Genre but are common to all.

Not all the units have been designed in the same way. We recognize that it is the rare class which will be able to read a dozen short stories, three novels, five plays, half a dozen essays, and umpteen poems in one year. There is far more in the curriculum than most classes will be able to cover, but it should be rare that any class will run out of material. Thus we have designed the units to enable the teacher to cut down on the amount presented with the least possible structural damage to the total intent of the curriculum. Tragedy can be taught and comedy ignored in the drama unit, for instance--or the reverse--and the students will still have been exposed to the form and conventions of drama and to the pattern

of comedy or tragedy. A judicious selection of poems may better achieve the purpose in a particular class than will consideration of them all. Not all the stories and novels need be taught to cover the conventions of fictional forms.

To preserve the integrity of the whole and yet permit the teacher to tailor the curriculum to the individual needs of the classroom, the units are varied. The unit on the short story is divided into two parts. The first deals with the conventions of fictional narrative: plot, character, setting, dialogue, atmosphere, mood, tone, conflict, resolution, and the like. The second part deals with the combination of these ingredients into a unique recipe. The range of expression from realism to allegory and symbolic narrative is presented. Here, as throughout the year, it is the teacher's decision as to how much should be covered how deeply.

The unit on the novel assumes familiarity on the part of the students with the main characteristics of fictional narrative, and considers the more extended development and broader palette available to the novelist, as compared with the short story writer. The novels--The Scarlet Letter, The Mayor of Casterbridge, and The Great Gatsby--are considered both as to their internal structure and as to their relationship to one another. Again the range of expression and technique within the Genre is explored: from Hawthorne's semi-allegorical near-romance to Fitzgerald's tragedy of manners with its strong overtones of contemporary social criticism.

The drama unit treats three tragedies--Oedipus, Macbeth, Ghosts--and two comedies--The Rivals and Major Barbara. The tragedies permit the students to observe the classic Aristotelian tragedy and subsequent modifications of the tradition. Not only can they observe the continuity of the tradition from the formalized ritual of the Greek to the domestic tragedy of Ibsen, they can also watch the modification of the conventions of the theatre from the symbolic costumes and masks of the classic theatre to the three-sided room of Ibsen's realism. The tragedies are treated separately from the comedies, as mentioned above, to permit the teacher as much choice as possible.

The poetry unit follows the pattern of the short story unit in being divided into two parts. The first part treats the conventions of poetry, with many of which the students are already familiar. After what is to a large extent review, the second part deals, in much the same way as the short story unit, with the individual use of these components.

The unit on discursive prose has had perforce to be highly selective. It repeats with more sophisticated selections and more extended treatment of the relation of form to subject, the considerations introduced in the 8th grade. To illustrate the range of subject matter we have chosen selections from the areas of history, journalism, popular science, nature-writing, and reflective essay.

It should be pointed out that the study questions which follow the selections should be used judiciously. They have been supplied as aids to both students and teacher; slavish adherence to all of them would

undoubtedly be deadly to both parties. While they cover the points we think important, they too will have to be adapted to the needs of the particular classroom. Here, as elsewhere, we have put together materials which, we hope, can be readily and coherently adapted to the particular classroom situation. It should go without saying that questions will arise which are not covered here, and that more is covered than many classes will be able to absorb. The design of the curriculum--as well as its success or failure--rests, as it ultimately always does, with the individual teacher in the individual classroom.

Teacher's Introduction

Language Curriculum V

Before discussing the language curriculum for the 11th grade, it may be helpful to take a look back to see what your students have studied and what attitudes and knowledge they may bring with them to your class.

The language curriculum of the 11th grade is based on the assumption that the student has had a substantial amount of experience with transformational grammar in the previous four years. However, it is not essential that he have had all of the material in the curriculum for those years. What is important is that he have an understanding of the difference between Phrase Structure (rewrite) rules and Transformational rules--not only how they are formed but what they mean--and that he understand what is meant by underlying structure. He should know, for instance, that a rewrite rule simply says that one symbol can be replaced by one or more other symbols. VP can be replaced by Aux + Verb. This is a notational device which enables us to describe what is included in the set of a given constituent. VP includes Aux and Verb. Rewrite rules also enable us to show how one symbol dominates another; it is higher up in the hierarchy. This gives us a device for showing the relationship of various constituents of a sentence, and for analyzing these constituents. A Transformational rule, on the other hand, operates on a whole string. It says that when a given string (perhaps a whole sentence or just a part of it) is made up of a set of constituents arranged in a given order (as described by the rewrite rules) then a given transformation can take place. Given the string Q + NP + tns + M + . . ., a transformation can change it to tns + M + NP + ... This is the yes-no question transformation. The underlying structure is described by the rewrite rules. Transformations change this structure to surface structure.

The work of the previous years, then, should have given the student considerable insight into the basic structure of the English sentence. Moreover, as a by-product of his experiences with the language curriculum prior to the 11th grade, he should have developed an attitude toward language which should be encouraged again this year. That is, he should have some appreciation for language as an essential part of what it means to be human and a realization that it is closely related to his ability to interpret experience. Thus it is worth studying for its own sake. At the outset the curriculum tries to make the student aware of the fact that a study of language is simply an attempt to explain and make explicit something which he already has an implicit knowledge of: his native language.

He should by now realize that although much is known about language, there is much more to learn. Language study is not a closed system, and discoveries tomorrow may make somewhat obsolete what is being taught today. Scientists manage to live with this attitude. It is such an attitude, in fact, which has made possible the spectacular discoveries in the sciences. Scientists are constantly seeking answers to questions. And when answers

are found, they in turn usually create new questions. The student of language must have the same attitude. And today we have the tools for studying language in a precise way, which should enable us to find answers to our questions about language.

The curriculum of earlier years, concerned though it was with describing some of the structure of the English sentence, was not simply an attempt to give the student a body of knowledge or to teach him only how to "parse" a sentence. Based on the theory of transformational grammar, it was an attempt to "explain" the structure of sentences by showing how they are formed and the relation that exists between the parts. Working with the underlying structure and the transforms that change this structure into the sentences we use, the student should have gained some insight into what a sentence is. He should also have gained some notion of the underlying order that governs even the most complicated sentences. In addition he should have acquired the terminology to talk about sentences and some understanding of what the terminology means. He should know, for instance, not only that there are such things as nouns, but that nouns have different formal characteristics which determine how they may be used. He should be aware not only that there are adverbs, but that there are many kinds and that there are certain syntactic restrictions on their use. He should know that the noun phrase which follows the transitive verb has an entirely different relation to the sentence than the NP which branches from S. He will add to this knowledge early in Language V with a unit on adverbial clauses and one on derived adjectives. Both will illustrate how a rule learned as far back as the eighth grade--the one describing the embedding of relative clauses--can also be used to account for adverbial clauses and for certain kinds of adjectivals derived from verbs. This should tell him something about the simplicity underlying the complexity of our language.

With these attitudes and this knowledge, then, the student in the 11th grade should be ready to consider larger--and perhaps more important--aspects of language, aspects which are in a sense universal, applying not only to English but to the nature of language itself. The introduction to the year's work, in fact, will be concerned with a discussion of what language is and something about how it is acquired. In two later units--one on deep structure, one on recursiveness--the individual parts of the grammar which have been developed in earlier years will be integrated and related by discussions of their significance. For instance, the student's knowledge of how sentences are structured should enable him to consider the question of the creative aspect of language, the ability to create sentences and to understand (interpret) sentences we have never heard before. He will be considering how and why we can describe, with a limited number of rules, a language which is potentially infinite. And this should lead him to some understanding of how his mind works. In dealing with the implication of what he has learned about his own language, he will be able to learn something about an important principle governing the scientific study of any body of knowledge--that the desire to find broad generalizations can lead us to far-reaching explanations and understandings. For instance, the desire to form a single rule which shows the relation we feel exists between the active and

the passive form of a sentence can lead us to an explanation of why we intuitively feel that these two are forms of the same thing and why we interpret them in that way.

Therefore, the language program of the 11th grade will be concerned with the question of what the knowledge that the student has about his language means. A study of deep structure will be developed, not just for its own sake, but in an attempt to show the student how he is able to understand sentences. A study of the recursive nature of language and what it is will give the student an understanding of how man is able to learn a language and also of how it is possible to describe it. He should already have a good understanding of what is meant by transformations. Now he can consider why transformations can add to our understanding of our language, of how they can explain many things about language. The curriculum in language of the early years tried to describe what a sentence is. Some attention was paid to the significance of the underlying structure, but the emphasis was on finding and describing it rather than on showing its significance. Now the student should be ready to examine what he has learned about the sentence and to consider what this knowledge means.

The teacher who tries to conduct a class through a systematic study of the English language should realize that this kind of study is very new in American schools. It is in a real sense a discipline in its own right and should not be thought of simply as an adjunct to the regular English curriculum. It seems likely that a sound study of language will open areas of understanding in disciplines which use language--literature, rhetoric, as well as history, sociology, etc. Alert teachers, as they become more familiar with the subject, will find significant relationships. But this should not be the justification for teaching it. The justification is that without language we are not human, and it is important to know something about such a major part of our human condition. It is important also in that now, through the study of language with the means which modern linguistic science is putting at our disposal, we can begin to understand how man organizes the concepts of his world. Language is the most important clue we have as to what goes on inside the mind.

TEACHER'S INTRODUCTION

Rhetoric Curriculum V

When the writers of this curriculum chose the word "rhetoric" to stand for the activities more commonly referred to as composition, they were taking a calculated risk. They knew that "rhetoric" suffers from a connotative split personality. In many ways it seems linked with such departed institutions as the Chautauqua and Fourth-of-July oratory, and for many, its meaning today is only in its suggestion of a suspicious fluency with words, a trait of the hucksters, the pitchman, and the less scrupulous sort of politician. "Rhetoric," regarded thus with hostility and suspicion, hung with pejoratives like "false," or "empty," or "inflated," seems, then, almost unpatriotic. It conflicts somehow with our traditional, idealized apprehension of ourselves as active Americans--clear-eyed, purposeful folk of deeds, disdainful of fancy talk and palaver.

And yet, at the same time, the term "rhetoric" has a certain venerability, a staying power which we cannot ignore. As teachers and scholars we remember its roots in the writings of Aristotle, twenty-three hundred years ago. We recall that training young men in rhetoric, in devising subjects for presentation, in preparing and delivering them to an audience, was the central educational process in the city-states of ancient Greece. We know that rhetoric stood at the heart of the curriculum of the great universities for two thousand years. Even today the word retains its viability, not only as a synonym for composition, and as a focal point for the study and criticism of literature, but, through what has been termed "New Rhetoric," as a study of the means for inducing cooperation among human beings.

Knowing all of this, and keeping in mind our need for a term which expressed the notion of effective communication, both written and oral, we have chosen "rhetoric" to describe our curriculum in the art or skill of discourse. But the same inherent danger in such a term (or rather in the concept for which such a term stands), which leads us to see it in such an odd double way, must sooner or later be faced by teacher and student alike. It is this confrontation which takes place in the eleventh grade. It is here, within the implications of the word "persuasion," that we meet the paradox, the worth and the worthlessness of rhetoric, head-on.

Briefly, the problem is this: rhetoric, since Aristotle originally defined it as the discovery, in any given case, of the available means of persuasion, has been amoral. Since it is a skill, or an art, rather than a verifiable body of knowledge, it exists apart from fact, from the

raw stuff of experience, from truth. It may be used for good or evil purposes and it may be devoted to the destruction of the right or the virtuous, as well as to their propagation. The assumption held by Aristotle and others before and after him that the skillful rhetorician would also perforce be a good man was not enough of a safeguard to convince Plato, who deplored the existence of rhetoric, this activity which deals with opinion rather than fact. Plato attacked rhetoric in his Phaedrus by quoting Socrates as saying,

> a man who is going to be competent as a speaker need not possess the truth at all in questions of justice or of goodness with respect to actions, or indeed to men, so long as men are what they are by nature or through education. In the courts, they say, the truth about such questions is of absolutely no concern to anyone. The thing that counts there is what will be believed. . . .

Plato's fears have proved to be well-founded. His is one of the first expressions of the age-old complaint of logic against rhetoric. Were he alive today, he would doubtless be inveighing against the fearfully sophisticated techniques of the rhetoricians of modern mass-persuasion, the "image-makers" of Madison Avenue who counsel their clients that "it doesn't make any difference whether or not the product is any good, as long as you can make people want it," and who seek not to improve the product but to improve the image of the product in the public mind. The essential falseness of over-adapting to one's audience may be seen in a recent magazine article (Life, July 16, 1965) describing the rollicking success of American International Pictures, producers of such widely heralded films as Beach Blanket Bingo, Frankenstein and the Teenage Caveman, and How to Stuff a Wild Bikini. The producers of these pictures claim that they give the kids only what they want to see. In these movies, says one executive,

> there are no parents, no school, no church, no legal or government authorities, no rich kids or poor kids, no money problems--none of the things that plague young people today. For a kid who's been harangued by parents and who's been told to put out the garbage or do the dishes before going out to the movies, this is Never-Never Land. . . . Kids don't like to be held up to the mirror of life. And so we present a picture of kids as they would like to see themselves. . . . In every film Frankie (Avalon) or one of the supporting players tells off the adult censor in a speech to this effect: "Your time is past, Dad. You've had your moment, but now it's our day in the sun." And the adult censor realizes that there's nothing basically wrong with these kids. . . . The adults reform, not the kids. . . . They (the films)don't have to make sense if they move fast enough--so long as nobody stops to analyze until he's on his way home.

Presumably, such fantasies do come to an end, the teen-ager does stop to analyze at some point, and, hopefully, does realize that he has been feeding upon a diet of transparently false escapism. On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that, more and more, all of us are being subjected to techniques of mass persuasion more subtle but no less false than those in the world of the teen-age movies, and that, as a nation we are being increasingly manipulated by such techniques, which lead us to believe, say, that the car we buy is not a means of conveyance, which it is, but a "way of life," which it is not. Against this sort of organized un-reason we--as Americans and as a people peculiarly comfortable in a world of pleasant illusions--need to remind ourselves constantly of Plato's claim that good rhetoric, if there is such a thing, cannot be primarily a matter of inducing belief, but is rather a matter of making the best of the most truthful case.

This, then, is a central point of the eleventh grade curriculum in rhetoric. The best persuasion is the most honest, the truest persuasion. Agreed. But we cannot stop there. We must teach our students what they most likely have already sensed: that truth, which is the goal of all valid logic and all honest rhetoric, is seldom either self-evident or incontrovertible. Indeed, on important questions, it almost never is. That, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., says, is why they are so important. Why is there evil in the world? How do we justify its presence with that of an omnipotent God? What is the real nature of man? Is he innately flawed? Can he be improved? Can human nature be changed? Is the dropping of a nuclear bomb justifiable? What is America's proper role with regard to the emerging, underdeveloped nations of the world? Nor do we need to go so far afield for our insoluble questions. We meet them all around us in our everyday life. What ought to be the privilege and responsibilities of children within the family? Are the parents of a family justified in seeking a divorce because they are no longer in love? Should high school students be urged to go to college when they have little academic talent or interest? The list of difficult questions could be expanded indefinitely, and we find that they are, most of them, the sorts of problems which actually do engross us, the sorts which we find ourselves having to confront. Just as most great writing goes on beyond the level of what is demonstrable, i.e., teachable, in a composition class, so do most of the really significant problems defy, by their complexity, the sort of solutions which we could all arrive at concurrently and agree upon. What we think it is important for the student to understand at this point is that rhetoric is, and always has been, primarily involved with uncertainties because the nature of the human condition is rooted in uncertainty.

I. A. Richards once said in his book Science and Poetry. "Man is

not in any sense primarily an intelligence, he is a system of interests. Intelligence helps man, but it does not run him." One would assume that by "intelligence" Richards meant something like logic, or the faculty which leads men to truth, and that by "system of interests" he meant something like the faculties toward which rhetoric directs its efforts. If we accept Richards' statement, for the moment, as true--that is, that man is less susceptible to logic than to rhetoric--then it seems that there are two corollaries which suggest themselves. First, that as teachers we ought to devote our professional lives to tipping the balance back the other way, in favor of logic, reason, intelligence; but second, that we do so always with the awareness that we must take the world pretty much as we find it. That it is not a world of logicians but a world of men. That doubt and paradox underlie most of human experience and that if we wish to function effectively in such a realm we must concern ourselves with man as a system of interests, that is, with man not only as a rational creature but also, and primarily, as a rhetorical creature. As Donald C. Bryant has written:

> (For text, see The Province of Rhetoric, Schwartz & Rycenga, eds.; Ronald Press; beginning on p. 11 with "Rhetoric exists. . . ." and ending with ". . .total subject-matter of decision.")

The tendency is strong in us and in our students to denounce rhetoric for the nagging uncertainties into which it leads us. We long for simple answers and clear decisions of true and false, right and wrong, which will erase once and for all the shifting spectrum of complexity in which we find ourselves. We want a black and white world. But like it or not, our analytical habits, our intelligences, have carried us beyond the point of no return. We cannot turn back to the illusion of simplicity, for we know it is only an illusion. Complexity engulfs us, and the only way we can cope with it is to admit our predicament and set about dealing with it as best we can--through the best rhetoric we can muster.

Nor can we repudiate rhetoric or persuasion out of disgust at those who have used it wrongly, for evil purposes. For if we repudiate it

we repudiate not only the unscrupulous politicians, the image-makers of Hollywood and Madison Avenue, the demagogues and the extremists, but also those who have used rhetoric honestly and well for the creation of our philosophies, our government, and much of our art. If we divorce ourselves from rhetoric, then we repudiate not only Beach Blanket Bingo, soft-drink commercials, advertisements for Cadillac "motor cars," and most campaign speeches, but also the Declaration of Independence, The Gettysburg Address, the Kennedy inaugural speech, Swift's "Modest Proposal" or Gulliver's Travels, Thoreau's Walden, Voltaire's Candide, and all those other great works of our heritage which have acknowledged an audience and sought to persuade it in one way or another. If we, as teachers and supposedly good people, renounce rhetoric, we leave it and our students in the hands of those whose motives may exclude any but the most selfish sort of profit-making or self-aggrandizement. Further, by repudiating rhetoric, by denying the importance of man as a system of interests, we do not make him, by the denial, any more an intelligence than he was previously. Rather we leave him--more particularly we leave ourselves and our students--ignorant of a vital aspect of our humanity, and thus unarmed and, in a sense, helpless in a world which must be understood and ordered through an adequate rhetoric, or not at all.

It ought to be evident from all of this why the term "persuasion" is given such prominence that an entire year of the rhetoric curriculum is devoted to its exploration. We are, of course, not using persuasion as just another in a list of "types of writing," like description, narration, and exposition. Rather we employ the term here in its widest sense, as did Aristotle, almost as a synonym for the entire rhetorical process, the art of communicating effectively, but with special attention to the demands of argumentation.

This classical influence in the year's curriculum is seen in its emphasis upon speech activities--for rhetoric began as an oral art. We have included assignments which will help clarify the special demands of spoken persuasion in all of the year's four units, and we have compiled a speech manual for use in speech classes or by teachers with a special interest in oral discourse. This manual is filled with representative speeches and special assignments further illustrating and supplementing the work in speech contained in the regular units.

The traditional scope of rhetoric is further seen in the units themselves. The first brings the student to an awareness of how he may examine a subject and discover and nurture an opinion about it. The second, building once more upon Aristotle, leads the student to an awareness of his audience in any rhetorical context, and suggests how this awareness gives rise to the questions of truth versus

"ingratiation" discussed above. The third will carry these questions to the heart of the persuasive process, encouraging the student to determine "What is a convincing argument?" The critical inquiries here become "What is proof?" and, further, "What is 'good' and 'bad' proof?" In answering these inquiries, the student will consider examples of various methods of proof--direct proof versus indirect, rational as opposed to emotional proof, and the varying claims to truth and effectiveness posed within these types. Finally, in the last unit of the year, all these matters, as well as the student's earlier work in semantics, style, generalization and support, definition, comparison, and the like, will be applied to an investigation of a vigorous and timely subject: The American High School. Using a "casebook" approach, i.e., a wide-ranging collection of articles and essays on this subject, the student will practice his awareness of good and bad persuasion, of fact and opinion, upon this aspect of the American experience in which he himself is deeply involved.

The aim of this eleventh-grade rhetoric curriculum, then, is not to produce students who are completely susceptible to persuasion or who are completely immune to it. Rather, what we hope for is, as Wayne Booth describes it, ". . . students who know when to be persuaded and when not to be. It is as shameful to resist emotional appeals when emotion is called for as to succumb to emotion when what is needed is hard thought." What we hope for, finally, is a more sophisticated notion of rhetoric within each of our students, a balanced view of himself and his fellow human-beings as both "intelligences" and "systems of interests," an awareness of the twin demands of fidelity to truth and effective communication. If we can achieve all or even most of this with our students, this year's curriculum in rhetoric will have done a great deal.