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Preface

This tribute to the memory of Robert M. Estrich was designed for the occasion of the Gala Homecoming Reunion of the O.S.U. Department of English in May of 1996, which seemed to myself and others a highly opportune moment for recognizing his contribution to the Department as its Chairman from 1952 to 1964. Realizing that the number of people who remembered Bob was getting fewer and fewer, while the number of those who really ought to know something about him was annually increasing, I took it upon myself to send a letter to all former Department members of professorial rank who served under him asking them to submit written reminiscences for publication in the form that you see here. Though I tried hard not to omit anyone, it is possible that one or two persons may have been overlooked—if so, they have my apologies. This was a shot in the dark: I had no idea what might result. I am pleased that a number of substantial contributions did come in, all of which are reproduced here. I wish there had been more, but my letter made it clear that we were not going to badger anyone to get reminiscences out of them, and so for whatever reason memories of Bob remain sealed in pettro, I feel sure that they are consistent with what you will see here and that they too would reflect honor upon him.

I took the liberty of expanding my own contribution by trying to give some sense of what it was like to be in this Department during the fifties and early sixties. I have been frank—and have encouraged the others to be frank—about what they experienced. Inevitably there are some repetitions, because we all worked independently and no attempt was made to harmonize the results. My editorial intervention was minimal and consisted chiefly of inserting a footnote here and there. I am grateful to Bertha Ihnat, of University Archives, who supplied some essential information, to our current Chair, Jim Phelan, for supporting this project, and to David Citino for egging me on. There are of course major, if underappreciated, continuities between the past and the present in any institution like the one to which we belong, but I have been struck,
while gathering this history together, by the enormous differences that remain to be pointed out between the Department of, say, 1956 and that of 1996, artifacts of time that few persons now can bear personal witness to. –Which makes it all the more urgent that, while these memories are retrievable, they be set down for all to see.

–C.B.W.

Charles Wheeler:

My own relationship with the Department of English at Ohio State began in the fall of 1951 when I was finishing my Ph.D. at Cornell. Francis Mineka, Chairman of English, called me into his office to tell me that I should include this Department in the requests I was then sending out for interviews at the MLA meeting that Christmas. He had received a letter from the chairman here inviting applications from new Ph.D.’s. This was welcome news: the post-war boom in higher education was drawing to a close, and suddenly the jobs we had all thought we could count on were becoming very scarce. “It’s The Ohio State University,” said Mineka helpfully, sharing a little smile over this bit of protocol that an institution so far from the Ivy League seemed to consider important. And thus among the eight or ten requests for interviews that I sent out, one went to James F. Fullington.

I knew where Ohio was. I had even been there: going back to Saint Louis at the end of one term, I had driven through the state, down from Cleveland to old U.S. 40, and then straight through Columbus, crossing the Broad Street bridge and heading toward the only stretch of four-lane divided highway on the whole trip, one that ran from Columbus to Springfield.

The 1951 MLA meeting was held in Detroit. At the time appointed for my interview I showed up outside the hotel room where the Chairman of the Ohio State English Department was staying, and knocked on the door. I was admitted by a stocky young man with short reddish-blonde hair, wearing rimless glasses, who I learned was not Professor Fullington. The latter announced himself in a loud voice from the bathroom: “Have a seat, Wheeler. I’m just in here clipping some hairs from my nose.” The interview began shortly thereafter. It was friendly and informal, though not quite to the degree that this opening remark might have led one to expect. While Fullington and I talked,
sitting in chairs, the mysterious young man sat on the bed and listened, grinning but saying nothing. I was a little miffed. Who the hell was he, and why was he there? We had been introduced, of course, but neither his name nor his function—if the latter was mentioned—had made any impression on me. I'm afraid that all I remember of the interview itself is that at one point Fullington said, "I think you ought to know, Wheeler, that ours is a drinking department." I suppose this was meant to warn me, in case I entertained principled objections to the consumption of booze. He didn't know anything, of course, about my own bibulous history, and I, in turn, did not know that on his departmental roster were several certifiable alcoholics.

Fullington had been named Chairman in 1936, following a period during which the Department had been ruled by a triumvirate consisting of Harold Walley, John H. ("Jim") Wilson, and Milton O. ("Sam") Percival.*

*I can't go on without a few words about Sam Percival, who stood out even in that group of fierce eccentrics. He was a year from retirement when I first arrived (he had come here in 1914) — a wispy, gentle, patrician man whose bearing accorded well with his reputation as one of the few real scholars in the Department (Walley, though formidably able, had published almost nothing, and Wilson, though quite prolific, had the misfortune not only to court popularity but to achieve it when his Nell Gwyn, Royal Mistress made Book-of-the-Month Club in 1952). Percival had begun as an 18th century scholar, hence the nickname "Sam" (for Sam Johnson), but in mid-career saw the light and abruptly changed course to the Romantic period. His major work was William Blake's Circle of Destiny (1938), followed 12 years later by A Reading of Moby-Dick. I remember when Meyer Abrams, my mentor at Cornell, was visiting here to lecture in the early 50's, I took him to a party at the Utleys' where I introduced him to Percival. Abrams looked a little blank until I gave him Sam's whole and proper name. "Oh," he exclaimed, the

By the time I had signed a contract to come here as an instructor at $3,900 a year, I had learned though correspondence that the mysterious young man at my interview was in fact the Chairman-nominate of the Department, Robert M. Estrich. He had been Fullington's Vice-chairman; the opening existed because Fullington was moving up to the office of Dean of Arts and Sciences. Nor was Estrich really young: he was then 45 years old and had been a Department member since 1928. As the quarter began in September of 1952 his promotion had not been officially confirmed, so he was only Acting Chairman. This fact gives significance to a practical joke that I saw pulled on him early in that academic year. William Riley Parker, the Miltonist, had been a member of this Department, which he left shortly before my arrival to become Secretary of the Modern Language Association. His wife, Mab, was a sculptress of some real ability, and while they were here she did several portrait heads of Department people, one of which may still be seen in the English Commons Room. Another was a quite realistic head of Francis Lee Utley, or "Fran," the indefatigable folklorist and polymath whose long tenure here brought us much renown. One day Richard Altick got a notion to sneak into Estrich's office while the boss was not there and install the head of Fran Utley in Estrich's chair, so that it looked out across the desk quite convincingly toward anyone entering the room. I was present when Altick gleefully carried the head in, and also when Estrich came back and found his colleague stoically confronting him from behind the blotter where he himself had just been sitting, serenely fixed in the posture of usurpation. Estrich was not amused. The sculptured head was whisked out of sight and the joke fizzled. I was not then aware that Utley thought that he should have got the chairmanship, not Bob Estrich—but Bob himself was all too well aware of it.

light dawning, "Blake Percival!" and pumped the old guy's hand vigorously.
That was neither the beginning nor the end of the Estrich-Utley rivalry. It was carried on politely, with few overt signs of tension. Bob may have suspected that Fran thought his scholarly credentials were pretty thin. Though Bob was nominally a medievalist, having written a dissertation on Chaucer, his main publication was outside of that field, a book called *Three Keys to Language* (1952), which he had written in collaboration with Hans Sperber, of the German Department. I have to confess that I never read it. I know from references that Bob made to it that writing it had cost him much anguish, mostly from having had to push and cajole and flatter the old philologist in order to get any work out of him. I was told by persons who had read it that the book, as part of some deliberate strategy, they supposed, never did inform the reader what these three keys were. For his part, Utley was said to be writing a book on the history of the Noah story in post-biblical times, but work on it kept being sidetracked by his many other activities, and it never saw the light of day. He was a copious producer of *feuilletons*, an omnivorous consumer of scholarly material, and an indefatigable networker. So he made a great deal more noise in the world than Bob did. Moreover, his Ph.D. was from Harvard, while Bob's was from Ohio State (1935). One of Bob's vexations was that as Chairman he had to process the steady stream of applications that Fran made for grants, leaves of absence, travel, special courses, Fulbrights, visiting professorships, and the like. One year Fran applied for and got a research Fulbright to Italy, but when he landed there he finagled a change in it to make it a teaching Fulbright, freeing him from the obligation to do the research that he had never intended to do anyway.* Bob felt he had been double-crossed. Not only had he lost Fran's departmental services for the period, but he had put his endorsement on the original grant application. "Fran Utley goes abroad," he told me through gritted teeth, "and changes his Fulbright to a teaching one so that he can play the big shot on all the university campuses of Italy."

---

*IAs I remember, teaching Fulbrights were in greater demand and hence harder to get.*

I must not leave the topic without noting that Fran's services to the Department were of very great value. His national visibility did us much good, and he ushered a steady stream of students through their graduate work and out into the world with degrees. He was a mine of information that anyone was welcome to have. His differences from Estrich were mostly those of temperament and not of values. It was, I think, a classic association of a hedgehog and a fox.

As Instructors, the new Ph.D.'s in my group taught mainly Freshman Composition, and in that first autumn quarter four sections of composition, all on the beginning level—a heroic schedule that today would be unthinkable. (My first quarter here I taught four identical sections of freshman composition, two in the morning and two in the afternoon. As you can imagine, practicing the same lesson all day led to steady improvement until the final class, when I tended to collapse from mental fatigue and start babbling.) Nevertheless, various openings on the upper level were being made for us. Bob Shedd, whose specialty was drama, was inducted into the mysteries of teaching Shakespeare by Harold Walley. In my turn, during the second year I was asked to sit through a new course in the Introduction to Poetry taught by Fran Utley, who planned to let me give the course thereafter. Again, today no new faculty member would be asked to undergo this kind of apprenticeship.

The dissimilarity between those times and ours certainly includes the curriculum, for not only were our course offerings then quite limited compared to those of today, but the adoption of a new course to expand them was surrounded by many obstacles, not the least of which was sheer inertia, the reluctance to confront change. For example, we had no course of readings in literary criticism of the Plato-to-T. S. Eliot type at the time of my arrival, so as soon as feasible I started agitating for the adoption of one. Because literary criticism (which has now been transmogrified into "theory" and then fragmented according to various current ideologies) was viewed with great suspicion by the old guard, it
was several years before my quite reasonable proposal was accepted. The new capstone course for English majors, English 690, vigorously pushed by Roy Pearce, had to run a gauntlet that went all the way up to the Vice-president for Academic Affairs, whose personal intervention was needed to get it adopted. (The problem was that the prospectus was too specific, and that frightened people. "Vague it up a little," said Fred Heimberger, the sympathetic VP, and we did.)* I had a special encounter with this resistance to change as faculty adviser to a new undergraduate literary magazine, Counterpoint. The enterprise was run entirely by volunteers and received neither sponsorship nor money from the University, so it was necessary to pay for printing costs by selling copies on campus. Well, we had to get permission to sell on campus, for the notion of money changing hands at tables set up here and there in

*English 690 (eventually 699) was a heroic and, as it turned out, last-ditch effort to establish coherence in the study of English and American literature. It was compulsory for senior English majors, taught in small sections of 6 to 8 students, with weekly tutorials, a reading list designed to represent the canon, and a common final exam graded by all the teachers. It was the most hated and feared course by every student until after they had taken it, at which point it suddenly became the best course they had ever had! Its conceptual design and early management came from Roy Pearce. Part of Roy's design was a series of public lectures to be given by senior professors, each on his or her own specialty, as a way of adding scope (and authority) to the rather blinkered poring over individual works that took place in the seminars and tutorials. Its unintended consequence was to strike fear and trembling into the senior staff, who now faced the awful prospect of engaging in what instantly became a rite of self-justification before a large audience that included not a few rivals and skeptics, colleagues as well as students—a far, far different thing than showing off before a roomful of respectful acolytes. This pressure eventually killed off the 690 lectures, but not before quite a few had been given, and given well. I remember particularly a splendid performance by William Charvat.

the corridors of buildings like Derby Hall, or outside on the sidewalk, in a merely private enterprise with no official status, appeared to strike the authorities as subversive of their control over University life. So we applied to the President's office. Nothing happened. Weeks passed, and we could not even get a phone call returned. President Bevis was inaccessible. In desperation I brought the problem to Bob Estrich, who got on the telephone and started calling people. Though he had no personal interest in the magazine or what it represented, he warmly supported the students' right to publish what they believed in. Finally he was able to get the ear of Dean of Students Bland Stradley, an affable, gregarious old ag school type who knew nothing and cared nothing about modern literature but saw no harm in what we were up to and said, in effect, "Sure, go ahead."

I spoke above of apprenticeship for new teachers, but I should add that this was by no means always the case. Only a few of the senior professors, those with scholarly territory to defend, bothered to make sure that their subjects fell into the hands of qualified people. If the need was great enough, the nearest warm body might be installed behind the podium—though as yet we had not assigned literature courses above the freshman level to graduate students. For reasons that could have nothing to do with formal preparation I was early on assigned a section of the lower-level Shakespeare course, then English 550. I had never had a graduate course in Shakespeare. So naturally I prepared furiously, sitting for hours in the English and Speech Graduate Room hunched over the Shakespeare Variorum, and after surviving that initiatory quarter went on to teach the course more often than any other in my tenure here.

The standard teaching load at the professorial level was five courses a year. The quarter with one course was the so-called "light" quarter. Now and then one might get a "research" quarter with no teaching duties, but this was a privilege and not to be counted on. Freshman composition then was a three-quarter course, taking up the
student's whole first year, though the third quarter was supposed to be the "literary" one and did offer a little relief. That requirement was an enormous consumer of man-and-womanpower, and here the concept of professional qualification really fell apart. A picturesque array of graduate students, career academic hangers-on, and emancipated housewives taught the course. Partly for that reason it had little or no conceptual structure. Nobody had yet heard of rhetoric, it seems. The object was to get the students able to write halfway decent sentences and string them together in a fashion that made some kind of coherent point—which, come to think of it, isn't such a bad idea. But I don't know how many students found their writing actually improved by the process. Some years later the Department discovered that three whole quarters were not really necessary, and shrank the course to one. That this shrinkage coincided with our experiencing a severe shortage of teachers was surely only a matter of chance.

I remind you that we newcomers in 1952 were Instructors, not Assistant Professors. So there were three promotion hurdles ahead of us, not two, though tenure was then granted at the Assistant Professor level. We were worked hard and paid little. That year Andy Wright, one of our group and the son of a well-to-do Columbus lawyer, who had not been trained to poverty and besides had a new wife to support—and remember, in those days wives seldom had jobs—organized a revolt of the underclass. We asked for an audience with Estrich. What he did was take us, the whole group of new Instructors, to lunch at the Faculty Club, where we sat at a round table in the southwest corner of the dining room and ate and talked. Or rather, Estrich talked. He talked. The words flowed out with hardly any interruption and gradually condensed over our table into a nimbus of golden ambiguity that confused our senses and lulled our suspicions, a sort of nitrous oxide to the aching spirit, and this while other diners came and ate and left, and Bob still talked... until finally it was 1:30 in the afternoon and we were the only customers left in the dining room. As we rose and made our way stiffly to the exit, we felt that somehow the problem had been resolved, while at the same time we were aware that no raises had been promised us that year—and indeed, that none were forthcoming. For some reason, it didn't matter.

I had better occasion than most to know that Bob Estrich was a great talker, since in the fall of 1954 I became departmental Executive Secretary, in effect his adjutant, and I had regular daily contacts with him. The title, though not the function, had been created for me. I operated from a room in the main office in Derby Hall separated from the Chairman's office by the reception area, its previous occupant having been Edwin Robbins, and before that Estrich himself. But I was not Vice-Chairman, as Ed was and Bob had been. I kept this job for four years. Besides answering correspondence and taking care of other routine business, my main duty was once a quarter to station myself behind a table at the entrance to the hallway and deal with the students, standing in a long line that snaked down the hallway from my door, who were trying to get into classes from which they had been excluded. Yes, there were closed sections then, too.

So I saw and talked with Bob Estrich every day. He put in long hours at his desk, writing nearly every document by hand on yellow foolscap, even those to be typed up later, and dealing personally with all sorts of minutiae that another man might have delegated the responsibility for or just ignored. When I appeared at his door with a problem, he usually seemed glad for the interruption, and even if I remained standing because the errand was meant to be a brief one, he would hold me talking while the minutes dragged on and he lit and smoked one cigarette after another. Meanwhile I'd be shifting from foot to foot, looking vainly for a graceful way to take my leave. The smoke thickened and the words poured on. About five cigarettes later, Bob might look up and say something like, "Well, Charles, I'm afraid I can't talk to you any longer because I've got to meet the deadline on this damned report to the Dean," as though I had been holding him from his duties, rather than vice-versa! I would be lucky if I remembered what I'd gone in there to ask him in the first place.
This garrulousness was no more than one of the more conspicuous signs of Estrich's interest in people. He was deeply and permanently involved with human nature and had no visible concern for abstract issues. The lives and careers of his colleagues were paramount. People came to Estrich with their troubles. He held their hands. He dispensed advice and consolation. He read their manuscripts and annotated them as well. He kept their secrets. He took their problems home with him. He intervened on their behalf. On occasion he even lent money to some needy member of the lower ranks. (There was an annual salary pinch in the fall because our first pay check came at the end of the first full month of work, meaning that somehow one had to live unpaid until November 1.) In my first quarter here he stepped in to prevent me from making a foolish blunder. I had decided not to enroll in the State Teachers' Retirement System because I felt that I could not afford the monthly deduction from my slender salary. Moreover, the future seemed much too hypothetical to start worrying about at that early date. When the papers crossed his desk and he noticed what I had done, he called me in and talked to me like a Dutch uncle—which in a sense he was. I was quickly made to see the folly of my decision, and I signed on. I wonder how many other chairmen would have bothered to counsel a new junior colleague on so mundane a matter, or even have taken notice of it at all.

Yes, this was a drinking department, but it was a publishing department, too, a fact of which he was very proud, and much of the credit for this should go to Bob himself.* Only the recipients of his help knew the extent of their indebtedness to him for encouragement, advice, and editing, but it is possible that some works would not have appeared at all without it. I remember Bob telling me once how he had labored with Roy Pearce over the several manuscript versions of Roy's early magnum opus, The Continuity of American Poetry (1961), and I venture to guess that no department chair today would feel the obligation to offer that kind and degree of help to a colleague.

Estrich, as I have indicated, was a heavy smoker, and he continued to be one until a mild stroke in the 1960's forced him to quit. But in those days, everyone smoked. After lunch in the Faculty Club, the diners lit up. Leaving the classroom, students lit up. Faculty meetings were conducted in a blue haze. Mostly the cigarette butts and ashes were left on the floor, though occasional scrupulous persons would fashion makeshift ashtrays out of paper for themselves. All seminar rooms has ashtrays on the tables, and these would usually be filled at the end of the second hour. The trademark professorial pipe, for some reason, was not much in favor. So what might be called the behavioral distance between then and now is enormous, a gap that only those of us who have lived on both sides of it can fully appreciate. I have to add that although the health gains of the revolution against smoking are certainly valuable, we have lost something as well: the function of the cigarette as prop. Feeling for the pack, offering it around, picking out the single one, tapping it on the thumb, lighting, flicking ashes, exhaling thoughtfully, grinding out the butt—all these actions bought time and gave the fingers something to do while, it might be, one searched for something to say or maneuvered oneself around the shoals of tricky social waters.

The heavy artillery of the Department were Fran Utley, Hal Walley, Ruth Hughey, Jim Wilson, Richard Altick, Claude Simpson, Roy Pearce, and William Charvat. This was a formidable lineup of what we

*In those days the drink of choice was often the dry martini, a concoction likely to bring on early paralysis of the functions through its mysterious synergy of gin and vermouth. For several years after I came, it was the custom for each new class of tenure-track Instructors to be given a welcoming party during the first quarter by the class immediately preceding, and these were guaranteed to push social drinking nearly to its limits.
would now call traditional scholarship. Somewhat junior to them were several visible and effective Associate Professors like Morton Bloomfield, Jim Logan, Ed Robbins, and Bob Elliott. (These people were already on the scene when Bob took over the Chairmanship, so in regard to personnel it was still Fullington's Department. Then, beginning in 1952, there was the annual increment of new persons hired for the tenure track which eventually transformed it.) Freshman composition was run by Bill Hildreth, himself an OSU Ph.D. and one of the world's great originals. Bill had written his dissertation under Jim Wilson. But Bill's heart wasn't in conventional scholarship. What he really loved to do was hunker down in the reading room of the Ohio Historical Society, then at 15th and High Street, and immerse himself in old Ohio newspapers. His especial interest was the history of aboriginal Indian tribes in our state, and had Wilson not mercilessly flogged him through it, Bill would probably never have finished his dissertation. Very aptly, his name for Wilson—out of hearing, of course—was "Mother Legree."

Such was the crowding in Derby Hall that some of these senior faculty had to share offices, with two or even three full professors in one small room. (Derby Hall has recently been gutted and completely remodeled.) I myself shared an office for a while with Pearce and Utley. (Fran kept a huge cardboard box next to his desk in this office, seriously compromising its usable space, into which he tossed all the book catalogues he received, after carefully annotating each one. Eventually there must have been hundreds of them in there. One night a janitor [this was in the era when janitors actually cleaned and tidied offices] left a note on the box saying "What do you want done with all this junk?" Pearce found the note the next morning before Fran did and could hardly contain his delight. This time I think it was Fran who was not amused.) Down the corridor, toward the west end, was the French Department, in the basement were the theater, the bookstore, and the English Department Library, presided over by Clarene Dorsey. This library, now dispersed, had an excellent collection of basic research materials and a pretty good collection of modern literature and criticism. It was supported by the fees students paid who were taking English 540, a course in what was still considered modern literature, featuring such authors as Shaw and Conrad and Frost and Forster. The library was heavily used by both students and faculty (at times every seat in the room would be taken), but attendance began to fall off in the 60's, and finally it got to the point where often the only person there would be the librarian herself.

Denney Hall was built on the cheap during the winter of 1959-60, using money from a recently passed surtax on cigarette sales. Now, 35 years later, we are seeing the folly of cheap construction. Bob Estrich was closely involved in its planning, at least as far as the architects would let him, because the building was meant from the start to house mainly the English Department. The most visible sign of Bob's involvement is the two side-by-side urinals in each men's room on the fourth and fifth floors. The original design called for only one, but Bob, horrified at the vision of a line of barely continent elderly male professors waiting turns in front of each single facility before class time, insisted on the change. There was also a finally intractable problem with the interior offices, because the classroom module on which the building was designed did not work for office space. The Professor Denney whose name the building bears and who is memorialized on the plaque by the west-end elevator, was an uncompromising martinet of the old school, but the quotation from Shakespeare that accompanies his portrait was carefully chosen to ignore this fact. James Thurber was guest of honor at the dedication in April of 1960, the year before his death, sitting on a platform where the main desk for the Arts and Sciences advisory program now is. Because he was indisposed, his wife read his speech for him. It referred warmly to the giants of the past in our Department, including Joe Denney, whom Thurber particularly admired. His appearance there marked the end of his very public disenchantment with his old Alma Mater over the matter of an oath of allegiance to the U. S. government that all faculty members then had to sign as a condition of
employment. (This oath hung around well past the McCarthyite period that spawned it, until it was quietly eliminated by President Jennings.)

Estrich's office in Denney Hall was where the Chairman still presides, but there was as yet no partition separating it from his assistant's office, so not much of the business he conducted was really private. At a nearby desk for most of the day sat the famous Alyce Moore, a cigarette dangling from her lips, doing the work that actually kept the Department going. Alyce was the original democrat: "a man's a man for a' that" might well have been her motto. Rank did not impress her at all, as a number of self-important persons found out who rashly tried to pull it on her. She was fully capable of assigning you to an eight o'clock class if you crossed her. Years of exposure to the vagaries of human nature, which she was in a unique position to see, had tanned her spiritual hide, so to speak, and nothing really surprised her. She had gone through cynicism and come out on the other side. Her job was thankless, but she didn't ask for thanks—she just wanted you to do your own job properly and keep out of her way. The gritty work of running the Department day-to-day was handled by her, and she saw to it that Estrich got essential departmental business done on time, for he was not an efficient manager.

James Fullington had been a Head, rather than a Chairman, which meant that he could more or less hire and fire and promote as he and the Dean of the college saw fit. This was the original form of departmental organization everywhere: only in comparatively recent times has the chairman (or "chair" in current nomenclature) been considered to be primus inter pares, elected by and answering to the faculty. Estrich straddled this divide uneasily. His heart was in the old system, but he was stuck with the new. He didn't really want to consult in public with department members about matters of administration and policy. Given the number of prima donnas he had to deal with, it is hard to blame him. He would preside uncomfortably at the rare general department meetings, his face getting redder and redder as the nonsense went on and one after another the big guns of the faculty fired salvos at imaginary enemies or charged up the hill to overwhelm some trivial position. I think that some of the larger egos, like Walley and Utley, saw these meetings as an opportunity to push Bob around. After all, he'd been Jim Fullington's flunky just a little while ago, so they had difficulty thinking of him as boss.

At the same time, Estrich was a stout defender of free speech and instinctively unsympathetic to the mindless conservatism that ruled the upper echelons of the University and the city. Before taking a stance of high moral superiority, it might do for us to remember the context in which these reactionary events took place. The whole society, and not just university administrators, was conservative to an extent hard to realize today. It was as much social as political. First-name familiarity between faculty and students was almost unknown. We called students "Mister" and "Miss" (occasionally "Mrs." if we spotted a wedding ring), and of course were addressed formally in return. Men taught in jackets and ties, and except in the summertime they regularly wore hats when they went outdoors. There was a Dean of Women who had rules of conduct for coeds (as we then called female students), among which was "hours" that specified when they had to be back in their dormitories—which (Heaven witness!) were all single-sex. The ROTC was a thriving institution and had a big parade on the oval every May. For many years an ROTC detachment gathered every Wednesday at 10:30 a.m. at the base of the flagpole in front of what is now Bricker Hall and played taps in memory of an OSU student fallen in battle—and all traffic stopped during the ceremony. Men wore short hair—the crew cut was still popular. Nobody had a beard. There was no such thing as a T-shirt with a picture or a slogan on it. The campus police, with full support of the administration, zealously pursued sexual deviance. In the process first the locks were removed from the doors to the toilets in the main library's men's room, then the doors themselves. The prevalent atmosphere of conformity made even tiny efforts to do something different look suspicious. So in attempting to deny left-wing views a
forum on campus the Administration was only acting reflexively and within its own sense of the limits. The general public in central Ohio was quite sympathetic to this.

But nothing can excuse the manner in which the Administration reacted to perceived threats to the status quo, a mixture of timidity and clumsiness that was guaranteed to exacerbate any problem. Matters came to a head in April of 1962 when a student group, with the consent of its faculty advisor, invited three members of the Emergency Civil Liberties Union to speak on campus at the Law School auditorium. One of the three was a particularly abrasive type who was already well known locally for his radical views. When the time for their appearance came, the doors to the building were found to be locked and guarded by police, on orders of President Fawcett, who had intervened and canceled the affair. As a result, an unprecedented general University faculty meeting was called by petition for the purpose of censuring the Administration's action. It met on May 14, 1962 in Mershon Auditorium. Novice G. Fawcett presided, and a gaggle of Administration honchos sat on the platform facing a full house, with faculty occupying the orchestra and students the balcony. A deanlet who supported the Administration moved that the faculty endorse President Fawcett's action.* Andrew J. Wright of the English Department spoke eloquently against it and made a counter motion to postpone a vote, seconded by Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences Todd Furniss, also from English. This motion was defeated by a voice vote. The original motion of support was then passed by a 2-1 majority. But the house had been packed with county extension agents, called in from the four corners of the state, and M.D.'s employed part-time at the medical school—all thoroughly committed to the status quo, and all technically faculty members, though very few of them had ever attended any kind of faculty meeting and some had scarcely set foot on campus until that moment. A standing count revealed that more than one-third of the faculty, even by that generous definition, opposed the President, and Fawcett, an old public-schools administrator who believed in order and respect for authority and who never in his life had met open opposition on such a scale, looked, as one account put it, as if he had been "poleaxed." He was never quite the same again.

The meeting wound down with further motions and statements, among the latter an emphatic and heartfelt defense of free speech by Robert Estrich, who said in part:

"I have been teaching at this University for 34 years. Time and time again in those years we have all been harried, and the University's proper business of education interfered with, by problems of freedom of speech on the campus. Early in my time here they involved faculty freedom. . . . Today we have, I believe, no longer any problem of faculty right to teach and speak with genuine intellectual freedom. . . . There still remains to us, however, the acute problem of the right of our faculty and students to hear on-campus speakers from outside the institution. . . . Of course there are problems in today's world. But how are they to be solved? Specifically, how are we who teach at The Ohio State University going to accept the obligation laid on us to educate young men and women to solve them? There is only one way—the way fought for and won by science, the way fought for and won by medicine—free discussion, totally free discussion."

His concern for the rights of students to hear what he termed "the conflict of the orthodoxies of our day" debated fully and freely before them was stated in a most moving manner. We were all thrilled

---

*The speaker, Richard Bohning, happened to say at one point, "I would hope that action can be taken with dispatch..." which brought a roar of laughter from the audience, because he had unintentionally invoked the name of Columbus's major right-wing newspaper.
and proud. It was a fine hour for him and for the Department of English.*

The speaker at commencement that spring was General Curtis ("Bomb them into the stone age") LeMay.

Bob remained in the chairmanship to the end of his third term, quitting it in 1964 when he was only 58 years old. The Department gave him a surprise dinner party on the occasion that packed the banquet room of a local motel. Among the various tributes presented was an acrostic sonnet by the present author that went as follows:

R obust and cordial, courteous without fail,
O ver the years by every folly tried,
B ut still with faith in Reason as a guide,
E ven if not convinced it will prevail;
R eady with human kindness to the frail,
H e flawed (but fellow) being at your side,
M aking your own his honor, hope, and pride,
E xcepting none—nothing beyond the pale;
S aved by the grace of humor from the end,
T hat waits most seekers of the absolute,
R Ich in good name, in follower and friend,
I n wisdom rich, your place beyond dispute,
C ome now, alas, to this—that I must send,
H aving no other gift, such poor salute.

Allowing for ceremonial exaggeration, I still think this an accurate tribute.

*I am indebted for information about this faculty meeting to The Ohio State University [Alumni] Monthly of June, 1962, which ran a very full and well-balanced story on it entitled "Largest Faculty Meeting In History."

Sometimes the things that endear people to us and remain salient in our memories are small human imperfections—little tics or quirks or habits—that we would never have been impolite enough to call to their attention, even though at times we found them annoying. Among these I would have to put Bob Estrich's crossed eye, which is evident in the photograph we have reproduced here. The problem it caused for anyone talking to him face to face was that often you could not be sure which eye was looking at you and thus which eye you should look back at. Was he seeing anything at all out of the sideward-turned eye? It certainly seemed to be engaged in the social encounter, and so perhaps should be acknowledged from time to time. Thus you found yourself unhappily conscious of something that one normally never thinks about, and your own eyes began doing a pas de deux along with his.

Another trait I remember was the way Bob's lips would twitch and curl whenever he was struck by a particularly humorous thought. It was not exactly a smile, but it certainly wasn't a laugh. You had the feeling that he was holding in the full expression of his pleasure, perhaps out of some respect for decorum like that advocated by Lord Chesterfield, or perhaps simply because it gave him even more pleasure to contemplate human folly in private. Needless to say, there was plenty of folly to contemplate, especially for the chairman of a large department. But Bob was usually more appreciative than censorious. He had a healthy love for gossip, and he sometimes was a little indiscreet in passing along what he knew, at least to me, though what he knew and didn't pass along was surely much the larger part.

Bob discharged the social duties of the chairmanship with goodwill and attentiveness. He and Alice gave many cocktail parties and receptions in their modest home on Olentangy Boulevard, and Bob as host seemed to enjoy them as thoroughly as his guests did, though coming home after a hard day at the office to help arrange everything
could not have been easy. It was there that I once heard him make a remark that I have never forgotten, though I have no recollection whatever of its context: "I may be the world's worst medievalist," he said, "but I know how to decorate a house."

I can't say what kind of medievalist Bob really was, but he must have been a compelling and even inspiring teacher. I remember his once doing what we might call a "riff" on the character of Wealhtheow, wife of the Danish King Hrothgar, in which the Beowulf poem suddenly came to life and dimensions of tragic meaning opened and attached themselves to that stately, confident figure. It made me want to rush home and dig out my copy to see how I could possibly have missed such wonderful stuff. And this was just during a prosaic conversation. Bob had hoped during his retirement to return to the study of Old English, but his stroke ended that possibility. Though it left him with no outward mark of debility, according to him it instantly erased his memory of that language.

In retirement Bob soldiered on without complaint, doing what he could. I used to see him frequently walking along North High Street in the area between Henderson and Morse Road, taking his daily exercise. He had always loved to walk, but had had little opportunity for it when he was working. Other problems began to surface, chiefly his claustrophobia. I'm giving it that name because he was, or became, extremely fearful of things like tunnels and elevators and crowded airplane cabins, a very bad thing for someone who loved to travel. I suspect, though, that these panic attacks had a more complex source that can't be pinned down with a single term. He and Alice moved from their house during this period and took an apartment in a high-rise on the Olentangy River Road quite near Riverside Hospital— I was told so that Bob could get medical attention right away when an attack hit him. Eventually they moved farther north to their last residence, Friendship Village, a retirement community. The last time I saw him was on the occasion of a special trip to the Village that was organized in order to set up a group portrait of Bob together with Al Kuhn, Julian Markels, John Gabel, and Murray Beja—the last the current Chairman and the others former Chairmen of the Department. Bob seemed quite pleased by the attention, though he didn't say much. I am happy that this recognition came at a time when he could still appreciate it, and that I, as the photographer, was able to be a part of it. The year was 1986; he died in 1989.

W. Todd Furniss:

In 1951, married Ph.D.s, new fathers at age 30, maintained a formal and respectful attitude toward professors, especially professors with whom they had scheduled interviews at the MLA meeting after Christmas in Detroit. Because I could not be sure until mid-December of being there, I couldn't get an appointment with Professor James Fullington, the OSU English Department chairman; the only appointment available was at 7:30 a.m. with the vice-chairman, Robert M. Estrich. (Pron.? Rhyme with "best witch")

On the morning of Thursday, December 28, therefore, I knocked on his hotel room door and, with little delay, Professor Estrich appeared in his undershorts, asked me to come in while he dressed, and said we'd have breakfast together downstairs. Because I'd lived a year on Guam with senior officers who appeared in the same latrines as lieutenants (but not sergeants), I was not floored by this first meeting, but I did have a hard time imagining that other medievalist Robert, Professor Menner of Yale, meeting his interviewees in skivvies!

If it hadn't all worked out I would not be writing these notes. By the time I reached Columbus as a new instructor that summer, Bob Estrich was chairman, Jim Fullington was dean, and all was right with the world. They'd even engineered a starting salary of $3,900 instead of the $3,600 I'd agreed to come for. In due course my relations with Bob changed and deepened. At first he gave me good advice about getting along with certain members of the department leery of my eastern ways;
then he edited my first scholarly publication before I sent it off; then he recommended me to Jim Fullington as a deanelet (the lowest subspecies: Assistant to the Dean, Part-time); then he made a series of adjustments to my teaching schedule to allow me to work—eventually—full-time for the dean, by then Oz Fuller. After 1959, I was negotiating with Bob the employment, promotion, raises, and occasional sanctions of English Department faculty members. It was in this role that I became especially conscious of his wisdom and fairness, and his clear vision. If anyone likely to read this thinks he ever hoodwinked Bob Estrich, he is mistaken.

On his retirement as chairman, Bob wrote a piece on the chairmanship that I took with me to my new post as dean of A & S at the University of Hawaii. Although it covered many aspects of the job, the point I remember best is Bob’s contention that—despite their protestations to the contrary—those who take on administration do so because it has an attraction for them. He was the first academic administrator I ever heard admit this attraction, and his example relieved me of a lot of posturing over the next years of my career. Further, his confession helped me recruit some really good chairmen. A dean’s a dud without good chairmen, and Bob was the best.

**Julian Markels:**

Every time I think of Bob Estrich now, I remember first his physique and appearance. Although I never in 33 years saw him without a tie and jacket, you could also see he had grown up on a farm doing hard chores. He was maybe 5'10", his shoulders bulged, and his powerful torso tapered like a body builder’s. In the years I knew him I don’t know that he did a minute of programmed exercise, but although I was 20 years younger and a workout freak, I would never have wanted to arm-wrestle him.

He had a bulbous nose and reddish face, and in fact he was an accomplished drinker. He also had that ophthalmological condition where one eye looks straight ahead while the other looks peripherally into space. That could make him look tipsy when he was sober, or three sheets to the wind when he was barely lubricated, and it was often to us an absorbing question just how many he’d had—if any. When I joined the department early in his tenure as chair, cocktail parties were de rigueur: on seven of my first eight Saturdays here, we new people were invited to meet the department in homes where the martinis and Manhattans were composed and replenished by the pitcher. Estrich drank martinis straight up, and two decades later, when I was department chair and he was in his late 70’s and I took him to lunch periodically, I would nurse one martini while he talked his way through three before we looked at the menu.

But Bob Estrich had a hollow leg, and for him alcohol was simply a lubricant to conversation. His conversation was even more accomplished than his drinking, and it was his conversation that inspired us, nurtured us, and never stopped teaching us. His intellectual challenge and steady support in continuing conversation were the foundation for any number of others’ careers, and he had more books dedicated to him, and more eloquent acknowledgements, than anybody in the profession of his generation and maybe since. Although he published little and networked not at all, his fostering of others brought him national recognition by word of mouth. I eventually lost count of the times at MLA meetings when people from other universities took occasion to say in the course of our conversation, "Ah, and you have Robert Estrich!"

How we had him, mainly, was through long talks one-on-one. He would call you into his office, maybe to offer you your first opportunity to teach a graduate seminar, or maybe your opportunity to teach grammar and punctuation to the Columbus Chapter of the National Secretaries Association at $25 a session for six evening sessions.
in some building downtown. Whichever it was, the conversation would last 45 minutes at least and you would emerge with a sense of mission. In fact, a couple with two young children and a salary of $4,500 didn't need much sense of mission to sign up for that extra $150. But Estrich would talk about the importance for state funding of town-and-gown relations, about the land grant ideal, about how his wife Alice had begun as a secretary and become an executive, as if there were no end to the political and educational good you could do while making that $150 teaching them to punctuate a compound sentence.

That may be a little exaggerated, but the fact is he was often fulsome, he was even sometimes tiresome, and that didn't make any difference. He was fundamentally right most of the time, and he understood, as Roy Harvey Pearce said in acknowledging Estrich in The Continuity of American Poetry, that "He who would do good to another must do it in Minute Particulars."

It was through the combination of his caring with his instinct for minute particulars that he inspired and sustained so many different people.

You soon found yourself going to him for advice about the direction of your research, or your frustration in the classroom, or your work on a university committee. (Some people went to him when they just needed cheering up.) You showed your manuscripts to the people in your field but also to Bob Estrich because you wanted his critique of your logic, rhetoric, and style. And if you had a feeler from another institution, you could feel absolutely secure talking to him informally about whether and how you should address him formally.

His conversation constantly sharpened my thinking and extended my horizon, and, as it happened, I was also privy to his longtime mentoring of Don Howard, who was in Estrich's field and who became one of our generation's great medievalists. In fact Estrich and Morton Bloomfield discovered Don Howard. During those years when the department was growing faster even than now, 99.44% of the new people hired had Ph.D.'s from Ivy League schools or else Berkeley. I came the year after Don, in 1956, and I believe I was our first Ph.D. from the lowly Big Ten. Well, Don was a Bostonian who had got his B.A. not at Harvard but at Tufts, and his Ph.D. at Florida. Florida! But Estrich and Bloomfield saw his potential by reading his dissertation, and that was only the beginning.

Don and I became friends right away, and when it came time to choose offices from the blueprints of Denney Hall, we chose an office to share. He was a great drinker and talker himself, also a great histrio, and during his remaining years here Don told me endless stories of Estrich's subtlety, wisdom, and support for his work. And in the privacy of that office he also regaled himself and me with hilarious imitations of Estrich.

He would come up to the office from an hour's talk with Estrich, close the door, and say, "You know it's serious when he looks at you the whole time with his good eye"; then amidst his own roaring laughter Don would mimic Bob's discourse down to the last intonation, and if you've ever heard Howard perform Chaucer you can imagine it was done to a T. But the mischief of his mimicry was the measure of his affection, and in dedicating The Three Temptations to Robert Estrich, Don Howard wrote, "In dedicating the volume to the best of my unofficial teachers, I acknowledge more lessons, of more kinds, than I have yet been able to learn."

Don Howard was also one of the first, if not the very first, eminent gay scholar to come out of the closet, years after he'd left here but while Estrich was still alive. I don't know how the news got to Bob, but at our last lunch that's all he wanted to talk about. Much as he had always cared for Don, he was newly awed by Don's character and courage in making the career he had made (which now included endowed chairs at Hopkins and then Stanford) while keeping that secret. I of course had been in on the secret and was long accustomed to Don's strength, fragility, irascibility, and aplomb. So I didn't respond with quite
he did I'd be satisfied. Like Don Howard, I'd had more lessons from him than I had yet been able to learn—and now after another twenty years I find that is still true.

Frances Ebstein Shapiro:

My first contact with Professor Estrich was as a freshman in 1956. I had tested out of the first of the three composition courses, and a catalog had indicated that one could do the same for the second. No one in the office had heard of that; it was impossible. Not allowing myself to be intimidated (though of course I was), I nervously asked to speak to the chairman. A bit startled, he was nevertheless very kind, spent some time flipping through files, and came up with a short story (a bad, cliche-ridden story) and a blue book, and asked me to analyze and evaluate the story. I did, in a little room next to his office in Derby Hall. He read my critique immediately, told me I'd passed, and arranged for whatever official stuff was needed. What a wonderful chairman, to be so willing to help a little freshman, to say with a twinkling smile (sorry for the cliche—he did seem like Santa Claus to me) that yes, it was possible, and resourcefully to make it so!

Andrew Wright:

My years at Ohio State were 1947-1963. Therefore I was luckily under the benign scrutiny of Bob Estrich throughout, except for a year in England. From the beginning, when I arrived as a first-year graduate student, he was so overwhelmingly there. I was young, naive, eager, and ignorant. I thought that all I had to do to enroll was—enroll. And I was more or less right. Oh, those simple days! I went to the English Department office in Derby Hall, and the receptionist sent me in to speak to Mr. Estrich, whose title (if I remember correctly) was Secretary; he was actually the second-in-command to James Fullington, who was soon to give over the chairmanship to Bob on becoming Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.
Mr. Estrich—for so he was until I had been there for several weeks—chatted with me for a while. My goodness, what a pock-marked face, what a red complexion, what massive shoulders!—he didn't look at all like an English professor. He told me to go to the next building and enroll. That's all there was to it. I remember no application forms, no waiting period, no selection process; and it was the same for everyone, because there was nothing special about me.

First there was the course in Old English, of which I knew nothing. I had loved Chaucer, but Middle English was comprehensible, at least after some moderate effort. Old English was a different cup of tea, a foreign language that I had not thought I should have to learn. Bob taught the language and the literature with irresistible gusto; I had seldom worked so hard, but I wanted to come up to the level of his enthusiasm. It was not difficult to respond, and Beowulf remains one of the highlights of my reading experience.

Bob and I became friends, for he had no sense of hierarchy, or rather he ignored such inconveniences. The fact that I was a beginning M.A. candidate and he a senior professor was a trifle. We often lunched together at a restaurant in Grandview that he favored, while he filled my head with advice about the study of English literature, and also proposed ways of proceeding. As I moved through graduate school he kept an eye on me, a benevolent elder brother; and when in 1950 I was recalled to active duty in the army in order to save Korea from whatever it needed to be saved from, Bob wrote such a winning letter to the commanding general of the district that I was allowed to remain at Ohio State and finish my dissertation. By the time I did so, in the spring of 1951, I had been awarded a Fulbright scholarship to England, and that superseded or suppressed the military authority for good. (I have been a pacifist ever since—Bob's influence again.)

When I returned to Ohio State in the fall of 1952, having accepted an appointment as Instructor of English (annual salary $3,600 before deductions) I brought a bride from London, with whom Bob and his wife Alice fell in love, as who could not? One afternoon late I was chatting with Bob in the chairman's office when my wife, Gina, drew up in our car just outside the window. And honked.* I said to Bob, "Don't worry, Bob, I'm married to a submissive European." He waved to Gina and replied, "Don't bank on it, buster." This exchange has remained a permanent part of Gina's and my life.

He told us once that he and Alice were in Dallas, and he wanted to buy her a string of pearls. At the best jewelry shop in town he was shown example after example of pearls—real, cultured, long strings, short chokers; the shop display table was eventually replete with pearls. Bob selected a necklace and ordered a diamond clasp to be attached. When the purchase was completed, Bob, who was sometimes treated as a suspicious character on account of his looks, remarked to the person showing the jewels, "I'm surprised that you exhibit all these necklaces to a complete stranger." To which the clerk replied, "Oh, sir, this is Texas. We do this for anybody." Bob told this story on himself.

And now I shall boast, but not on my own account. Many years later, when Bob and Alice were living in retirement in Friendship Village, Gina and I went to see them. Bob made martinis of heroic size and strength, but before we touched them, Alice left the room for a moment and returned with the pearls. "I don't think I'm going to need these any more," she said to Gina. "We want you to have them."

*In those days North Oval Drive, now a pedestrian mallway, extended all the way westward from Hayes Hall, past the front of University Hall, and connected with Neil Avenue, permitting through traffic. The English Department chairman's office windows looked out over this street.

-C.B.W.
Morris Beja:

In the beginning, Robert Estrich was for me only a figure who had written in reply to my application for a faculty position at Ohio State: a person whose name I mispronounced until someone (perhaps he did it himself, at the interview) said it correctly.

That interview took place in December 1960, in Philadelphia—the last time the MLA has met in that city, at least up to now. It was totally different from the interviews we have nowadays in the Department and in fact have had for decades—and different as well from all the others I had that year (and those were the good old days: I had nineteen interviews at MLA). It was the very last interview on either of our schedules, I'm sure, and it took place on a cold and snowy Saturday morning, the last day of the convention, in a hotel (the Benjamin Franklin, I think) blocks from the headquarters hotel.

The interview was unique because we were just one-on-one. As I recall, I'd had only one other interview with just the Chair ("Chairman," of course, in those days), but that hadn't been at all cozy or intimate; it took place in some lobby or lounge that the MLA had set aside for such purposes, crowded with dozens of other interviews going on at the same time. In contrast, Bob and I just sat and had a leisurely, civilized conversation. Of course he asked about my dissertation, and that got us on to Proust, who figured importantly as background to my topic; I was vastly impressed with Bob's familiarity with A la recherche du temps perdu—all the more so when I soon realized that while I was talking about the translation, his familiarity was with the original. But he didn't use that distinction to be intimidating. It was, in all honesty, the only actual literary discussion (as distinct from grilling) that I had at that MLA. (I wonder how many I've had since?—Not many that enjoyable.)

I guess he enjoyed it too, because soon afterward I received an offer from Ohio State. That was it: no visit, no contact with anyone else, other than letters back and forth with Eric Solomon and Roy Harvey Pearce. I had several other offers, but the only other one that tempted me was from Colby College in Maine. Naturally, since I'd grown up in the Bronx, and since I'd only attended very large institutions of higher education (CCNY, Columbia, and now Cornell), I had decided that what I really wanted was a job at a small liberal arts college like the ones I'd seen in the movies. But as I asked for advice of faculty at Cornell, even I could tell that—coming from people who had decided to be at a university rather than a small college—their counsel would have a certain, well, bias.

The first bit of advice that's relevant to the current memoir was from the Chair of the Department, William Rea Keast, who didn't know Bob. He strongly advised going to Ohio State. When I asked what he thought my chances would be for getting tenure, he quite quickly and calmly said Oh, none at all, but I wouldn't want to stay with my first job anyway. I wasn't so sure about that, and I decided to approach a faculty member I didn't know at all, Ep Fogel, because his own degree was from Ohio State. He too urged me to go there; but this time, when I reported what Keast had said, Fogel immediately and vehemently assured me that Bob Estrich wasn't the kind of person who would hire anyone for whom there wasn't room, and who he didn't think would have a good chance for tenure. What struck me then, and what still does now, is how Fogel put it all on a personal level: not what OSU would do, not what the Department would do, but what this fellow Bob Estrich would do, and what he wouldn't.

So I came, and while Bob could be tough and demanding, Fogel had been right: Bob was a man of complete integrity. The whole process I've described was, clearly, one in which a kind of old boy network operated. Bob and the system he worked with were of their times, and I don't want to make claims for his or its being more liberatored than in fact they were. But I believe in all honesty that under his direction the Department was hiring and promoting more women than most English
Departments at the time. I certainly know that his hiring a number of Jews was not all that popular with at least one or two of his senior colleagues.

Within that world, too, Bob could be paternal toward junior faculty; being I suppose quite insecure, I didn't mind that. And good God, how he could talk... He loved to talk; you didn't walk into his office figuring you'd get out in a few minutes. He'd ask you about all kinds of things in your life, and talk about his as well, professional and personal. I recall that we once talked (in his office? during lunch at the Faculty Club?) about the recipe for a perfect martini. That was not an idle subject for Bob Estrich. Even so, I guess by then I felt comfortable enough with him to make what at the time I thought would be an embarrassing admission—that I preferred my martini on the rocks. He then ventured the view that yes, he could agree that maybe some element of dilution with ice could be a very positive element in a martini, and explained why that was so, as I couldn't have (and couldn't today).

Conversations in his office had one element of discomfort: in his time there was no dividing wall between the Chair's desk and area and the desk and area of his assistant. I'm not going to write a memoir about Alyce Moore: suffice it to say that she was a profoundly formidable presence in the Department, and often enough a deeply troubling and scary one. And she heard everything that went on between you and the Chair—everything. That put a certain edge to the wonderful knack Bob had of making you feel comfortable and more, but in the end that knack wasn't truly diminished. The junior faculty used to say that Bob Estrich could get you into his office, make you feel terrific and loved, and you'd eventually leave and be halfway down the hall before you realized you'd just been fired.

Now I'd like to talk about my proudest memory of Bob: his role in the whole Speaker's Rule controversy. Very quickly, let me review that the controversy centered on a University rule that required that all speakers from off campus had to be approved by the central administration. The purpose of course was, in the early 1960's, to keep "Communists" from speaking at the University.

By the wonders of synchronicity, the only copy of the Columbus Dispatch I ever saw before arriving at Ohio State (one from the Out-of-Town Newspaper stand at Times Square) contained an editorial consisting of a vicious attack on the OSU English Department for not firing a graduate teaching assistant named Henry St. Onge. Henry, whom I came to like and admire, had been at a gathering that was supposed to have a controversial speaker; when the University authorities wouldn't permit the speech, Henry invited everyone over to his nearby back yard to hear it. Robert Estrich did not deem that just cause for being fired. (Knowing all that made me react with some anger to a throwaway passage in E. L. Doctorow's Book of Daniel, in which we're told that in the 1950's someone at Ohio State had been fired for teaching The Catcher in the Rye. That was absurd, of course; I wasn't here then, but I knew it couldn't have happened under Estrich; I checked with people who had been here, and they all said no such event occurred.)

During my first few months here the controversy over the Speaker's Rule got hotter. Eventually the entire faculty of the University met to decide on a censure (if that's precisely what it was) of the President of Ohio State, Novice Fawcett. As a faculty member who hadn't been here two full quarters, I wasn't eligible to vote and couldn't sit with all the other faculty, but only in the balcony of Mershon Auditorium. I was, however, immensely proud of the active presence of the English Department among those who made formal presentation of their views. Andrew Wright, who could talk about his having grown up
in central Ohio, was beautifully eloquent in his defense of free speech and free thought.*

But most impressive of all was Bob. Even in my relative ignorance of campus politics and the realities of power at a University, I recognized that for a Chair to speak against the President was an act of courage and integrity. In the years since, I've seen many faculty members do things that have made me feel pride (and, unfortunately, a few—very few—do things that have made me feel shame, for them and for the Department), but I've never been so proud as I was of Bob Estrich that day during my first year at Ohio State. (The President won the vote, but only by packing the meeting with agricultural agents and medical part-time "faculty"; when he saw the hundreds of real faculty who stood up in opposition to him, he and we knew that he had lost. Within a few years the Speaker's Rule was history.)

That, then, is the encomium part of this reminiscence. Over twenty years later, when I went into that same Chair's office (to sit, literally, in the same chair), I vowed to myself that I'd try to live up to Bob's example. Bob was chair for eleven years, a long time. So was I; I stopped before quite finishing my last term.

I wonder if there was something in my being or in my fate that determined that hubris could take me only that far.

---

*As Andy wrote, in forwarding the reminiscences we have printed here: ". . . I have tender and happy recollections not only of my native town (I was born in Grant Hospital) and the years I spent growing up there, but of my time at Ohio State, to which I had an inherited attachment: my grandfather was a professor in the medical school; and my father was an undergraduate in the time of James Thurber (with whom he did not compete in the swimming pool) and John Bricker (with whom he played baseball)."
extemporaneously, he carefully explains that if something is worth explaining, it is worth organizing and putting on paper.

And when I say images, I see Bob's lithe figure, coiled at rest or in movement, cigarette in mouth or hand, clear eyes full of fun, and the whole persona that of the wise mentor, the happy warrior, the kindly, tough-minded leader, the brilliant, warm, witty, profound father of us all. Like many fathers, he had to cope with some of his family favorites' departures from the nest in the early 1960's, adding a touch of genuine sadness to the splendid lyric poetry of his departmental leadership.

Richard D. Altick:

This is one of those fragments of reminiscence whose necessary use of the past tense is at odds with its subject and spirit. Bob Estrich, it is said, would have been ninety years old this year. We choose not to think of him in the decrepitude that extreme old age brings. When the few of his old friends who remained in Columbus sought, unsuccessfully, to visit him as he lay month after month in the sick bay of a staif, upmarket "retirement community," it was with the subconscious expectation that the vigorous Bob we knew had somehow escaped the inroads of mortality, so that such a bedside visit might, miraculously, turn into a party. We still cling to the image we formed in the late forties and fifties, of a person of medium height, whose reddish hair nature had grown straight up, brush-like, and then trained back; ruddy complexion; bulbous nose; and glasses that inadequately corrected the strabismus which prevented his driving a car. And talking, always talking.

Fortunately for the many of us who entered the profession under his benign auspices, Bob had found himself in the right place at the right time. His powerful personality made its lasting imprint upon the lives of us youth as we sought to adjust ourselves to post-doctoral life, especially to the demands and expectations of our new profession and those imposed by an explosively growing public university. All we had known of Ohio State we learned from the sports pages or from Thurber's "university days" essays and, most of all, from The Male Animal, which was set unmistakably in Ohio State's English Department. One way or another, even as we struggled to find somewhere to live in a city afflicted with a severe housing shortage and met our first classes, our experience began to be colored by a dominant and engaging figure whose equal was not to be found at Harvard or Yale or Brown or Princeton or Johns Hopkins. Bob was sui generis. He was a connoisseur of people and, ruefully, of life's little ironies and deficiencies. Never bored or boring, he played, with infinite zest, a variety of roles in which circumstances, primarily the presence of a large contingent of eager neophytes, thrust him. He was a mentor, a father confessor, a counselor on domestic affairs, and a fixer.

Like his close friend and fellow Ohioan Bill Hildreth, the director of Freshman Comp, Bob was also an expert raconteur. Bill's delight was to spin meandering yarns of great length and, it seemed to us spellbound auditors, dubious veracity. These primarily related to the denizens of the small town from which he had come, including eccentric members of his extended family, to politicians downtown at the state capitol, and to events in the University prior to 1945. At their best, these homely narratives, always delivered with utter gravity, led us to the very brink of incredulity, an adamantly refusal to suspend our disbelief; whereupon Bill assumed an injured look and proceeded to pull from his sleeve a circumstantial detail that seemed to authenticate the whole preposterous tale. Bob's anecdotes, by contrast, were not examples of impromptu performance art; they were not only concise but always credible. He once related, for example, episodes in the Prohibition-era history of Buckeye rum running, occasions on which he and fellow students transported loads of illicit liquor from the Hocking Hills to Columbus with revenuers in hot pursuit. Bob's function was to toss the cargo, bottle by bottle, out the window as they sped along. The sacrifice was sharp, but the smashed tire-slashing glass in the road, it was thought, might enable them to outrun the cops, in addition to destroying the
evidence. Supposedly enough was preserved to have made the trip, and the risk, worthwhile.

Bob personally was a multiple-martini man. At those frequent cocktail and protracted evening parties which should have entered the stock of departmental lore while they remained vivid in participants' memories, Bob was most in his element. Cigarette in one hand—this was the last Age of Innocence—and glass in the other, he was always to be found holding forth to a knot of attentive friends in a corner of the noisy, smoky room. His intake would have floored any lesser man, and while it was far from incapacitating him, he once reported that in the aftermath of a particularly bibulous get-together he showed unmistakable signs of alcohol poisoning and his doctor sternly warned him to take it easy.

I have always thought that, given a different temperament, Bob would have been a superb scholar. But scholarship is essentially a solitary occupation, and Bob was too extroverted, too deeply concerned with the people around him, to wrap himself in the austere eremite's gown. As all of us knew who were beginning to publish, he had a keen appreciation of what scholarship was about. Somehow he kept up with the latest developments, and not only in his chosen field of Anglo-Saxon and medieval literature. This knowledge was laid atop a foundation of wide reading of the literary texts themselves; I recall especially his affection for Proust. It always seemed that he had, of course, read all the books we had read, that our literary interests, however diverse, were his as well. Having so much relevant knowledge at his fingertips when conversational contexts called it forth gave the impression that he was one of those lucky people who had read everything and forgotten nothing. But what was most persuasive about this polymathism was that it was never flaunted; it seemed to be the most natural of accomplishments. It is easy to believe that he was as discriminately responsive in an art gallery or a concert hall as he was when reading a book. (And it is a telling fact that after he retired from the chairmanship

he resumed his long-neglected musical studies with one of the city's best piano teachers.)

Never did any of us give Bob an offprint of our latest article or even our first book without promptly receiving in return a hand-written memo expressing, in terms most likely to gratify us, his appreciation and encouragement. Coming from others, the praise might have seemed merely fulsome. From him, it was both apt and, we were convinced, heartfelt; praise from so well informed and perceptive a person was praise indeed. No one could have boosted our egos and confirmed our ambitions more effectively than Bob.

On a decidedly more mundane level, he was equally knowledgeable about university machinery and politics. Even despite its expanding to accommodate the so-called G.I. Bill bulge, Ohio State was not yet the mega-university it has since become. But its day-to-day operations, like those of any comparable institution, were already entangled in miles of red tape and divided into numerous bureaucratic turfs. Snafus were routine, and in ordinary cases the first resort was to the saturnine and formidable Alyce Moore, the departmental secretary whose desk was, significantly, not outside the chairman's office but inside, cheek by jowl with the chairman's own. When confidential matters (e.g. salary increases) were to be discussed with "the boss," Alyce had to take a break, much to her annoyance. She cowed even the most bumptious of the new faculty; it was of her that Roy Harvey Pearce once observed, "A. Moore vincit omnia." If she was not precisely the archetypal English Department secretary who was subsequently to figure in the many novels of academic life we read, our memories of her daunting personality inevitably filled in the sketches of her fictional counterparts.

Alyce usually was able to resolve on her own the frequent low-level problems that cropped up, such as scheduling conflicts or the allocation of classrooms, which were in perennially short supply. She
knew the right telephone extensions to call. When larger difficulties arose, Bob took on the job, figuratively rubbing his hands with anticipatory relish. Having been on the site ever since he came from his alma mater, Ohio University, to work toward his doctorate, he knew—to borrow a phrase from a slightly later epoch—where the bodies were buried. He too knew the right telephone extensions, but now they belonged to, say, the dean of women or the university registrar, whose knives, under his tactful guidance, sufficed to slice the Gordian knot.

Rules, he often said, were meant to be bent if the cause, most often the comfort and convenience of faculty and meritorious advanced graduate students, was just. This philosophy was applicable off campus as well. More than once, apart from the bottle-jettisoning ride from the Hocking Hills, he helped someone outrun the police. Among the T.A.’s in those years was a young Englishman whose sexual orientation, as we would say today, was at odds with local morality. Bob once recounted to me—I wish I could remember the details—how he managed to spirit the scapegrace out of town at night, just one step ahead of the law. (The fugitive later became well known in London theatrical circles.)

It is not easy to summarize Bob in a single word. “Warm,” “energetic,” “ebullient,” and “generous” are among those that come to mind. But “humane,” in both of its expansive senses, perhaps does it best. Temperamentally he was the humane person to whom the dictionaries of synonyms attribute such qualities as sensitivity, empathy, and compassion; intellectually, he was all that is implied by the phrase “humane learning,” a broadly civilized gentleman.

He laughed often, and we laughed with him. But few of us were aware of another, deeply shadowed aspect of his humanity. Beneath all his sociability, beneath all his consuming interest in other people, he bore an emotional scar that, I suspect, was far from healing: the memory of his young wife, married after a college romance, whom he had watched dying a lingering death not many years before the first of us arrived on the scene. They had had no children. It is disturbingly easy to envision him returning from a convivial Saturday night party, to find himself suddenly alone in his silent Olentangy Village apartment. In his case, the price of vibrant humanity was an intimate acquaintance with tragedy.
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textual scholarship in American literature; and he was pressing forward his main work on the economics of literary authorship, which, had it been completed as projected, would have been a definitive history of American publishing in the nineteenth century. At the same time, he was a member of the University Committee on Teaching, whose searching work elicited a remarkable degree of self-consciousness about good teaching all over the campus. All these late professional concerns for sound and relevant scholarship and for effective teaching at every educational level were wholly characteristic of his distinguished career, a career too early ended.

William Charvat was born in New York City on July 15, 1905. He attended New York University, where he received B.S. and M.A. degrees, and the University of Pennsylvania, which awarded him the Ph.D. in 1934. After service on the faculty of New York University, he won a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1943 and in the following year came to Ohio State as professor of English. He held visiting professorships at the University of Copenhagen, where he was Smith-Mundt Lecturer in 1952; at the University of Penn-sylvania, where he delivered the Rosenbach Lectures in 1958; and at the University of Madrid, where he helped Harvard University set up a chair of American literature in 1962–63. He served on the editorial boards of the American Quarterly and American Literature, on major committees for the American Council of Learned Societies, the Modern Language Association, and the Fulbright Program, and he was president of the American Studies Association.

Professor Charvat began his scholarly career with investigations of the social and historical contexts of American thought and literature, and published papers on, among others, Thomas Bancroft and William Hickling Prescott. His dissertation appeared as The Origins of American Critical Thought, 1810–1835 (Philadelphia, 1936). These and similar studies had led him to project an ambitious study of cultural history in America, but the foundation of such a study, he became convinced, lay not in easy inferences about the American mind or imagination, whether of writer or reader, but in the hard and frequently mundane facts involving the process whereby a literary manuscript became
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Scholar,
an ancient occupation which, despite our proliferating courses in general education, is seriously undervalued in the United States. Proof of this undervaluation lies all around us. There is, for example, the astounding recent statement of former Governor of Alabama George Wallace that it is "the intellectual liberals who come to power and think they know everything and what's good for everybody and who oppress the people" — and the term "intellectual liberals" includes the scholar. There is the recent cut from $5 million to $3 million in the appropriation to the National Humanities Foundation.* To the north of us Canada this year spent $5.6 million to support the humanities and will next year spend $10 million; and France annually budgets about $25 million for the humanities and the arts.

Professor Charvat believed in standard scholarship; it is a mark of the indecision into which we have drifted that I find myself using terms like "traditional" and "standard" almost apologetically. Except in plumbing, "standard" is a pejorative word. Except at weddings, funerals, and commencement cere-

*As of March, 1968, the House appropriation was about $2 million.

monies, we do not care for anything traditional. Like the phrase "gentleman of the old school," the term "scholar" has fallen, if not into disuse, then into obloquy — we are all for teaching, dialogue, confrontation, excitement, and modernity. Standard work is without novelty, and without novelty how shall we startle the student mind into at least minimum attention to the literary, philosophic, musical, or historical masterpieces we ask him to understand? Standard scholarship — the normal practice of humane learning — inherits two bad figures of speech. One is the tiresome metaphor of the ivory tower, a structure which nobody ever rented; and the other is the garb of the pedant. Pedantry can be defined only as somebody else's scholarship. Pedantry is, however, held to be the occupational disease, so legend runs, of Dr. Dry-as-Dust, who teaches literature, or philosophy, or the fine arts, or history, because he is a faded expert on some faded patch of time in the irrecoverable past.

It is easy to denigrate patterns of scholarship we inherited from the nineteenth century. These were strongly tinctured by German practice and Darwinian assumptions. The
result was the genetic theory of explanation. As biologists inferred that the use and development of an organ could best be understood by going backward in time and tracking its evolution from some primitive Urgeistalt to forms more modern and complex, so in the humanities the genetic approach seemed illuminating. In the languages everything began at the beginning; and the beginning for Western speech was a mysterious tongue supposedly used by a mysterious people called the Aryans and hypothetically reconstructed by skilled philologists. The student moved majestically down a sort of temporal waterway from Sanskrit to Gothic, Old High German, Middle High German, Old English and Middle English; or, if he chose another channel, he came down through Low Latin and Old French to the modern world, or to Spanish, Portuguese, or Italian. The boat was slow, and there were frequent stops; but when the passenger arrived at some recent port—say, the poetry of Carducci or of Browning—he was put on shore with a certificate saying he had made the trip. History followed a similar pattern, Henry Adams, for example, exclaiming, “I threw myself into the arms of the Anglo-Saxons,” meaning that his principal scholarly concern was to relate the New England town meeting to the shire moot of King Edgar, who died in 976. The teaching of art and music was on the same genetic lines, and a proper course in philosophy arranged the thinkers of the Western world in a kind of chronological museum. You began with Plato and Aristotle on the right and left of the door, and you made your way past a series of showcases, examining in chronological order the schoolmen, Bacon, Pascal, John Locke, Hegel, and so on.

A difficulty imputed to this approach was that it offered no preparation for life. It seemed to many guaranteed to turn the scholar away from the living present; and to others it failed as a mode of refining taste, creating style, or enriching personality. Dr. Dry-as-Dust lived in the library, surrounded by monographs, while eager, active humanity swarmed all over the campus. “Academic” became a term of reproach, and though it was politely conceded that to study Kant, to read Chaucer, and to learn about the fugues of Bach or the paintings of Giorgione was all
very well in its way, when you got out of college you read magazines, looked at the drawings of the Gibson girl, the Vargas girl, or some later girl, and decided that Paul Whiteman's orchestration was far more fun than that of Beethoven. I am speaking, of course, of remote antiquity, before the proliferation of long hair, electric guitars, and the assumption that love-ins are a potent form of political action.

Certainly the traditional system had defects. Certainly, also, scholarship ignores the contemporary at its peril. If the argument was good that you couldn't take up William Faulkner or John Brain in the classroom because they had not yet been frozen into classics, the argument was equally good that what froze the Spectator papers and the poems of William Dunbar into classics was the classroom. Lore sometimes took the place of learning; and one famous course in Edmund Spenser, taught not a thousand miles from here, went so thoroughly into the background and genesis of Spenser that it didn't get around to "The Faerie Queene" until the last two weeks of the academic year. At least this was the legend.

Two major attacks were launched upon the traditional program in literary studies. One was principally, though not wholly, emotional, and the other was principally, though not wholly, philosophic. The emotional assault was mounted by bodies like the National Council of Teachers of English. Teachers had to be trained—it was not argued they should be educated—and what use was a study of Barnaby Googe or a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon to the public schools? The National Council argued that little or nothing in the fixed pattern of literary education prepared the future pedagogue for the literary, or rather the non-literary, interests of pupils. That a person of initiative, culture, and some historical perspective might adjust what he knew to the problems of a high school was a proposition passed over in our obsession with the immediate, the relevant, and the reformatory; and the National Council and bodies like it demanded something they called "appreciation," a term never defined, and spoke up for "modernity," a term never analyzed. Yet the conflict was not only between bodies of teachers and traditional departments of
English. It lay deeper. It really arose out of a basic population shift in the American schools, particularly in the high schools. At the end of the nineteenth century the American high school was still a college preparatory school with a few commercial or vocational additions, attended by children of middle-class white native Protestant parents. But by World War I the schools were flooded by children from newer American families, to whom a background in English literature was as alien as were Greek and Latin; and the demands of the curriculum were naturally altered from 1883, when, at an early meeting of the Modern Language Association, an earnest speaker urged that Anglo-Saxon be taught in the high schools because chronologically it preceded modern English and threw some light on contemporary syntax.

The second assault was many-pronged. In the first place there was the New Criticism. The New Critics held that the canon of academic interpretation, when it was sound, was timeless and could be applied to any literary work produced at any time. They further held that a literary work was a literary work, and that nothing was germane to its explication outside the sphere of aesthetic and intellectual explanation. Much of the information accumulated by scholarship was, they said, irrelevant to art. The essence of literary study became the closest possible examination of the text. You might of course glean from the biography of the writer some hint as to what occasioned the work, you might look up in a book of reference the significance of an allusion not otherwise clear, and you were permitted to consult a dictionary, even though a dictionary is the product of historical scholarship. It might even be revealing to know the date, the decade, or the century of the work. But your primary business was to concentrate on the text as art—usually that of a poem—to understand the words, to note the emotional or intellectual impact of figures of speech, to work out the relation between style and meaning. In the extreme case you might work out not merely the meaning but the meaning of the meaning; that is, you strove not merely to comprehend the writer’s intent but you might categorize this intent in some larger way; for example, the work was a true statement of religious awe, or of erotic emotion, and so on.
The intention was so excellent it is difficult to quarrel with it. Nobody could cavil at an injunction to read thoughtfully. Although it is not true that literary works are never documents—most literary masterpieces are documentary, controversial, or didactic—still it is true that to reduce literature merely to documentation is to betray art. But difficulties arose. In the first place, it is not true that conventional scholarship had lacked interest in the text; on the contrary, from Alexandrian times to the present, scholarship has scrupulously considered the words of a text. Our modern versions of ancient poets rest upon the care of Renaissance scholars for the presumed meaning of the author. In the second place, enthusiasts concentrated on work that seemed to them to present textual puzzles—for example, the poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins; but literary works quite as exquisite but presenting few knotty problems—for example, the lyrics of John Dryden—were passed over. In the third place, fruitful as the method was when you were dealing with short poems, it proved somewhat less manageable when you applied it, say, to the essays of Macaulay or the novels of Trollope.

The consequence was that certain literary works got a great deal of attention, other types received considerably less, and literary history became distorted.

The second assault was carried forward by those who conferred American citizenship on Freud and Jung and their disciples and argued that the whole basis of interpretation required radical alteration in the direction of the unconscious, the subconscious, the repressed, and the sexual. Let a writer be ever so rational, let his meaning be ever so plain, there was lurking under the surface some esoteric significance, the product of his subconscious or his unconscious, which, being radical or primitive, was more fruitful and more contemporary. Freudians tended to concentrate on images implying sensuality; Jungians went in for racial memory and archetypal images. The approach in many ways proved exciting. You could classify metaphors into new categories, you could trace the shaping of the fictional hero or heroine back to some traumatic experience in the author’s youth, you could argue that literature as imaginative release requires precisely this primary or primitive drive. It is amusing to note that this
sort of analysis relied precisely on the biographical information that the New Critics tended to disdain; that is, it sought in the life of the artist sexual, familial, or social instances of deep emotional shock or commitment that were afterward conveyed in disguise to the printed page.

Again difficulties appeared. In the first place, objective evidence was negligible or lacking, and its thinness or absence was replaced by a wild surmise, plausible to one interpreter but anathema to another who had his own symbolic system. In the second place, since successive literary eras have their own conventions, a considerable acquaintance with literary history as a record of diction, cadence, figure, and style was necessary before the reduction to universal images springing from the unconscious could be made. Could any figure or formula, from Homer to Valley of the Dolls, be reduced by an amateur psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, or psychologist to a particular expression of juvenile shock, frustration, trauma, or what not; and even if it could, what was gained for art when the reduction was verified? It is interesting, even illuminating, to speculate upon the relation of Dickens’ heroines to Dickens’ sexual life; but once you have speculated, there they still are—Rosa Dartle and Dora Spenlow, Flora Finching and Lucie Manette—convincing or unconvincing to readers precisely as Helen and Cassandra and Andromache are convincing in Homer, no more and no less. We inevitably return to the fundamental axiom that style is the morality of art.

The weakness of many novelties in the classroom and in the editorial office is, I suggest, not the failure to recognize styles as important components of literature but rather the inability to think of style as something more than a hypocritical garment stretched over the nudities of suppressed desire. All poetry, said Rossetti, is the product of fundamental brainwork. All art has something to do with intellection. To subordinate the public and intended meaning of a work to some private and incommunicable system of expressions may now and then be useful, but it seems unlikely that the great masterpieces of literature—Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Milton, Goethe, and the rest—will significantly alter what they mean to say. What is true of larger masterpieces seems
likely to be true in greater or lesser degree of smaller ones; and we are right, I believe, in assuming that any form of art is an expression of conscious intelligence communicating to the world a particular and conscious message, imaginative or rational or both. The ambiguity of Swift’s relation to Stella does not radically alter the meaning of any part of Gulliver’s Travels.

The third assault on traditional scholarship was a more complicated affair, and I am not sure I am competent to deal with it. This was an attack on traditional notions of language by both disciplined bodies of professional soldiers and an irregular cloud of militiamen and guerilla warriors. The professional philologists discovered that language is a problem in communication and argued that a great deal of damage has been done by applying to many languages the false logic of Latin grammarians. They held with considerable justice that the more immediate need of the world was a capacity to grasp any linguistic system quickly. In their point of view language is what people say and what is inferred from the sounds they make, the gestures they use, the facial expressions which accompany these actions. As most of the world speaks rather than writes, and as even among those who write, only a small fraction write the formal, quasi-archaic kind of language known as literary expression, formal or so-called “good” English was thought of as a badge of class distinction, a minor dialect principally kept up in publishing houses and the schools. Formal grammar, formal rhetoric, formal style, a concern for those niceties Henry James had in mind when he wrote “The Question of Our Speech”—these became not the ideals but the handicaps of English. Students were no longer encouraged to form their style by the study and imitation of masterpieces—the so-called sedulous ape theory—but were urged to be themselves, to write informally as they talked, to be chatty, disorganized in any logical sense, colloquial, and even vulgar, since vulgarity is a kind of brutal strength. Above all they were urged to be creative; that is, to express themselves. That the self thus expressed ought to be worth expressing and listening to, that some mastery of formal English (like some mastery of the diatonic scale in music) might enrich the self and improve expression—these primary con-
siderations were overlooked. Plainly, I am being unfair to many linguists, who felt that the scientific study of the behavior of languages was an end in itself; but such, I think, was the practical gloss put upon their theories by persons less erudite than they. The general weakening of any sense for style in contemporary criticism is in part the result of the feeling thus innocently induced; namely, that distinction and democracy cannot meet together.

Whether I am right or wrong, I find that clouds of militia and guerilla fighters joined the assault upon the formality of style as one of the noblest achievements of mankind. In the beginning, we read in St. John, was the Word; and so modern a work as Goethe's Faust wrestles with this problem; that is, with the essentiality of trustworthy rational discourse to culture. The last half-century has seen an assault upon the Word. The Word is no longer trustworthy. The Word does not mean what it seems to say. The Word is moving in the direction of Orwell's newspeak of 1984 with increasing rapidity.

Do I seem pessimistic? Perhaps I am. From the first utterance of the oracle of Delphi to the present credibility gap in Washington the aim of the Word for public purposes has too frequently been to deceive. Who can forget that searing definition of Sir Henry Wotton that an ambassador is a man sent to lie abroad for the commonwealth? We no longer send him abroad. We keep him as a speech writer, a public relations man skilled in preventing any public figure from committing himself. Moreover, the whole vast force of modern advertising is directed toward juggling words and meanings; and hidden persuaders are but the latest invention in the long war between rational judgment and emotional insinuation. A book, one feels, ought to be an honest piece of craftsmanship, and it often is; try, however, to estimate the probable goodness of any book from the insane procession of adjectives found in our publishing ads. Statesmen are wary of taking a stand on an issue; they work toward a favorable public image of themselves. In the long run, of course, it is hoped the digital computer may retain or restore honesty to communication; but I am not talking about mechanical accuracy but rather about the significance of such a statement as
Luther's "Here I stand. God help me, I cannot do otherwise."

Scholarship believes, as Professor Charvat believed, in the integrity of the Word. In its simplest form that doctrine means that the aim of the scholar is now, has been, and must always be a primary one: to discover that the work before him, be it book, manuscript, or artifact, is what it purports to be and not something tinkered with, or faked, or improved upon, or substituted for an original. As I put the case, it seems, I am sure, elementary and remote: elementary because we tend to assume as a matter of course that print gives us the very words of the author; remote because, given the generations of scholars, their abundance in the United States, the apparently wide acceptance of textual accuracy as a desideratum, a problem that may have troubled the age of manuscript or the age of censorship is surely now old hat. But are we so remote from the newspeak of 1984 as we believe? Look at the placards displayed at any strike, any meeting about Vietnam, any rally of the black power sort or of the Ku Klux Klan sort, and the answer is clear.

At higher levels the professional training of scholars becomes specialized. Expertise in bibliography, in the deciphering of manuscript hands, in sorting out families of manuscript or successions of printing—these and like branches of learning are not for everybody. Of course, the kind of detection that determines that a string quartet supposedly by Haydn is not by Haydn, the search that exposed the forgeries attributed to Thomas J. Wise the book-collector, the skill to distinguish a genuine Rubens from a false one—this kind of work has its fascinations, as Professor Altick has demonstrated. But we can not all be skilled bibliographers, art specialists, or musicologists. We should nevertheless be aware of the importance to the humanities of this kind of investigation, too often dismissed as inhumane or meaningless. Precisely as law suits involving vast sums of money have sometimes turned on the meaning of a word or the punctuation of a contract, so the skilful determiner of what is true and what is false in any field of art renders valuable service to scholarship and history; and we ought on all appropriate occasions not merely to honor him but also
sturdily to defend his right to pursue his special calling.

But the humanities are mainly the possession of the schools, where the prevailing concept should be that of the scholar-teacher; that is, of the professionally trained person of sensitivity and intelligence eager to communicate known values in the classroom, eager also to keep abreast of newer values in his department of intelligence. That department need not necessarily be only bibliography or philology or their equivalents in art, music, philosophy, and history. The humanist is always in some degree a historian of culture as culture has expressed itself in some durable form. His profession is a learning, a learning as essential for an understanding of the book of Genesis as it is for an understanding of MacLeish's J.B.

Scholarship seeks certainty—the certainty of text, the certainty of meaning. It is true, of course, that the farther back one goes in time, the greater the uncertainty one faces. We know a great deal about T. S. Eliot; we know nothing but rumor about Homer. We are sure that the New York edition of Henry James is what the novelist intended to be the final versions of his work; we are uncertain about the conflicting claims of many medieval, Oriental, or classical manuscripts. We know the King James Bible was printed in 1611; the best we can say about the gospel according to Mark is that we hope it was written by Mark. Yet the progress of scholarship steadily diminishes uncertainty. For example, we know vastly more about the spacious days of great Elizabeth than Dr. Johnson did. We are better attuned to the art of Emily Dickinson than was her first editor, the sympathetic Thomas Wentworth Higginson. We are also learning how to bring scholarship in related disciplines to bear upon interpretation; for example, studies in the history of ideas, studies in the history of painting, studies in the history of science.

But as I have hitherto spoken as if the only relation of scholarship to art is that the artist produced his work for the scholar, I now turn to the obvious truism too often forgotten: the poet did not write for the teacher, nor the painter paint for him, nor the musician play for him. No definition of any art has ever remotely hinted that scholarly investigation is what the poet, the painter,
the playwright, the composer, the architect, or anybody else had primarily in view. He wrote or painted or sang or built to instruct or to please or to move mankind. He commonly had only his contemporaries in mind, even though Renaissance poetry is full of assertions about the poet’s undying fame—“So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.”—and most of the romantics felt they were addressing eternity. Scholarship comes limping after the muses; wherefore, to many ardent souls, the relation of scholarship to art is that of death to life. Hence they move to turn the classroom into creativity or psychoanalysis, racial memories or social significance, criticism or propaganda. I have already said something about some of these topics, but I now add to my components of at least the literary problem another basic element.

No literary work exists until it is read or heard by someone other than its author. The act of making literature available to some audience, however limited, is a public act like unveiling a statue or hearing a symphony. We rightly call it publication. Publication may be for the few or for the many; it may take the form of oral discourse, as when the rhapsodes recited long passages from the Iliad, or the form of the replication of manuscripts as in the classical scriptorium, or the form of duplication by type, or the form of reproduction by photography, tape, phonograph record, or some other pattern of audiovisual presentation.

I suppose there is always some narcissistic element in all literary composition. Nevertheless, literature, however defined, implies a public act. Even when literary discourse is dense or radical like the prose style of George Meredith or that of Gertrude Stein, innovation is intended not to deny but to extend the area of public comprehension.

Such comprehension has steadily widened in the Western world. Compare any novel by Walter Scott with any novel by Raymond Chandler. Scott had laboriously to set forth what seems to us the obvious, whereas Chandler, appealing to readers trained on Scott and his successors, on newspapers, on comic strips, magazines, and modern periodicals, can telescope what his greater predecessor had to spell out. Hence it is that the interplay between the author and audience, between, to be Coleridgean for a moment,
the esemplastic imagination and the writer's business consciousness that he wants to get read, is as essential to understanding literature as any element of textual accuracy. True, the work may fail commercially; true, the work may not reach the audience for which the writer imagined he wrote; true also, the appeal of the work may be delayed in time and altered in space. But nobody ever deliberately wrote to fail, very few writers have objected to being read, and even when the greater meaning of a work has been delayed beyond the author's life, as in the case of Melville's *Billy Budd*, the intent has not been altered. The necessity of reaching some public is forever present. *Hamlet* is a product of the philosophical imagination at work on human destiny and may be read as such; it is also a melodrama for the groundlings, and the so-called Hamlet problem must include not only the metaphysical probings into good and evil but also the duel scene, the exchange of rapiers, the poisonings, the instant deaths, and the rapid end, so like the endings of our Western movies.

Certainly in the days of printing, probably also in the days of manuscript, the publishing component of the literary act involves at least three important considerations. The first is the question of what audience the author dreamed he was addressing. The second is the question of what audience he actually reached when the work was first made public. In the third stage the work has perhaps reached a more or less stable repute, so that in literary terms we are dealing with a classic; that is, a book we approach gingerly or with repulsion in many cases, feeling that a classic is somehow confined to the classroom. Some classics of course triumphantly live a life outside the classroom; examples are the plays of Shakespeare, the stories of Edgar Allan Poe, the verse of Heinrich Heine. Few persons, I imagine, actually read *Paradise Lost* spontaneously in the way they read Capote's *In Cold Blood* or Manchester's *The Death of a President*. And it is precisely at this point that the work of William Charvat seems unique and valuable; he made us ask what scholarship truly should include.

His investigations into the history of publishing perpetually remind us not only that a classic was not always something frozen
and formidable, they remind us as well that literature is a social art. This notion displeases many, who cannot believe that the word "social" has any other meaning than "sociological." All the arts, nevertheless, exist in and for some society. Every craftsman, whether he works in stone, or paint, or wood, or tone, or words, or bodily rhythm, fashions what he makes for an audience. In primitive societies this truth is so obvious that we assume as a matter of course that the arts originate in, or possess some religious or ritualistic meaning for, a social group. They are formulary, and seek to propitiate a deity, to express the fear, the desire, or the adoration of worshipers. They conserve the tradition of the tribe. Activities like sand-painting, the corn dance, changing the clothing of priest or bard, or creating religious symbols that range from statues of Buddha to the Christian crucifix are of this order. The majestic offspring of ritual comes in time to be epic poetry, Greek tragedy, the Bible, the sonorous Latin of the medieval church, the masses of Palestrina, the paintings of El Greco. None of these denies the remote origin of the art. The need to commemorate heroes and to remember history gives us narratives about Charlemagne, the Cid, King Arthur, Washington, and Napoleon; witness, as an instance in modern times, Hardy’s *The Dynasts*. Indeed, every year sees in the United States a new crop of books about the colonial past, the American revolution, the Civil War, and so on. The problem of the relation of artificer to theme and tribe is, then, very old.

But when we come to the invention of the printed book, scholarship seems to divide. We know little about the economics of the scriptorium, and except in musical history and the history of painting we care little, or seem to care little, about the economics of patronage as a form of support for art and thought in more secular periods. We assume as a matter of course that the dedication of an eighteenth-century sonata to a royal or noble patron will be high-sounding and essentially meaningless.

In time, however, the book becomes an article of commerce, the writer turns into a professional man, the complexity of contracts, rights, royalties, editions, reprints, translations, and so on takes literature out
of the area of high culture into the area of trade. Scholarship splits into mutually repellant parts. Bibliography becomes a special craft but a craft that seldom soils its hands with the crude economics of selling books. Book collecting goes its rarefied way, often substituting scarcity value for moral, intellectual, or aesthetic worth. Histories of publishing or of publishers, usually naive, cannot make up their minds whether the records of sales, pleasing anecdotes about eccentric authors, or the cleverness of the head of the firm is the real subject of the book. The scholar in the classroom therefore comes to feel that the book trade is no concern of his and that a text exists like Mohammed’s coffin, suspended somehow between heaven and earth. Though he may recognize textual differences between one edition and another, he will not inquire too curiously what agreement between publisher and author may have brought these differences into being.

Another difficulty develops as we confront modernity. The literary world, even the academic literary world, feels some moral obligation to be up-to-date and assumes, therefore, a quite different attitude toward books and publishing in present time from that which it takes in the case of Ben Jonson. Inquiry about books in the present tense is not merely “Have you read it?” but goes on to the exclamatory “Boy, did you see what critic A said about novelist B’s new book in magazine C?” In this context critic A is usually somebody in the current literary establishment, whatever that term may mean, but so is writer B, and the magazine is commonly a periodical of special interest to members of the establishment. The odd result is that excitement about a book in “literary” circles may be in inverse proportion to its public appeal. This is not necessarily a bad thing, but it irresistibly creates an inference that a book which sells well must ipso facto be an inferior book. On this argument Tennyson would be rated below Martin Tupper and Dickens would be inferior to Thomas Love Peacock.

It is true that what the living critic says about the living author in a contemporary magazine does not differ in kind from what Jeffrey said about Wordsworth in the Edinburgh Review. It is also true that in time the living novelist, the living critic, and the
magazine (which, like the Dial in Concord or Coleridge's the Friend, may soon suspend publication) may have passed into history. If critic A is carrying on a literary vendetta against author B, we know that personal, and often hostile, relations among literary folk in 1967 do not differ in kind from similar relations in the past. The literary gossip of today becomes the source material of tomorrow, and the source material of tomorrow becomes the scholarly lore of the day after tomorrow. Therefore is the feeling sometimes expressed that there is no need to worry about the relation of authors to their fellows or to the public or to the publisher; in the long run we shall know all we need to know.

But shall we? I am far from saying we should all get up the history of publishing or, for that matter, become expert in the problems of twentieth-century publishing houses. A factual history of art dealers would probably be useful, but it would be no surrogate for a proper history of art. We know something about the relations between Beethoven and various music publishers, but it does not follow from this that all musicolo-
gists ought to learn about all music publishers.

Yet to remain persistently ignorant of the fact that in the modern world objects of art, be they books or statues or symphonies, have to be brought before some public by some means, usually commercial, and that the subsequent history of the repute, vogue, and influence of the work of art and of its creator or of both seems increasingly to depend upon modes of keeping the work and its creator before the public mind—this, surely, is as important a fact in the history of the arts as the influence of Leigh Hunt on John Keats, or the fact that Beethoven outgrew eighteenth-century classicism, or the truth that the Pre-Raphaelites partook of the realism of their age before they became enamored of the medieval revival. Let us not mistake the part for the whole; on the other hand, let us note that the whole has in it a good many parts. I have found few essays on the development of any American poet more illuminating than Charvat's studies of the relation of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow to his publishers and his public. It compelled me to re-examine all the traditional presuppositions and prejudices that
have obscured the genuine achievements of one of the great prosodists in American letters. Scholars do not betray either the humanities or the arts if they realize that when royal and noble patronage ceased, commercial support came in; and they should pause to inquire how and why and when a work became known in the market place and, if its repute continued, whether commercial values may not have had something to do with its history. We would not have had *The Scarlet Letter* if it had not been for the commercial instinct of James T. Fields.

The danger is the abandoning of that psychological distance between the scholar and contemporary problems that will only bring disaster to scholarship, tempting the scholar to give up to party what was meant for mankind. I think the danger is real. I think the current celebration of creativity is vastly overdone. I think academic excitement about what is new and novel in poetry and prose, painting and music, ethics and theology, philosophy and current events stands in need of moderation and check, something that should not stifle but should curb excessive and narrow enthusiasms by returning to the true meaning of the scholar's craft. But this is a problem of such complexity I shall not discuss it here.

The scholar is or should be, as Emerson said, man thinking. But every man who thinks is not a scholar, nor are all thoughts scholarly. The fallacy of much that passes for admirable activity in the humanities—particularly in English departments, which sometimes seem like St. Paul's Greeks to be eager after each new thing—is to confuse fashion with fate. The latest craze is but the latest craze. The 1960's are not the totality of history, and the business of the scholar is not only to remember that this is so but to insist in public that this is so. Fashions and novelties in art and criticism have been, are, and ever will be; but in the perspective the scholar clings to, none of them is forever. We seem to grow professionally afraid of ultimates, but our professional business is with the ultimate, so far as it can be known, and to show that the long development of culture in time is always relevant if we will but admit that man lives in time and not merely in the present tense.

Scholarship tries to see the world as it
really is and not as it appears in the kaleidoscope of the television set. Scholarship arises from a passion for the truly aristocratic, which in the long run is the only lasting basis of cultural meaning and therefore of any truly spiritualized democracy. Scholarship lives in the abode where the eternal are, or seeks to, and remembers that the violent and the young rebel in vain; in twenty years they will be twenty years older and view with anxiety the antics of a new generation of teen-agers. Scholarship is an act and life of infinite patience—witness Scaliger, Porson, Kittredge, Willamowitz-Moellendorff, Thayer toiling for years over his biography of Beethoven, the Korean professors who, during the Japanese occupation, went underground and continued to labor on a dictionary of the Korean tongue. Scholarship comes after the creative act and should always do so, but it justifies and orders for mankind the significant acts of creation. To keep the vital distinction between the look of history at any time and the meaning of history at all times—this is the ideal of scholarship.

*Marat/Sade* may be fascinating as a play—I have not seen it—but not even the author thinks of it as a picture of the French Revolution but only of the madhouse he equates with our troubled time. I suspect *Hamlet* may outlast *Marat/Sade*. The greatness of Shakespeare does not lie in the theory that he gave Tudor England a mirror image of Tudor England but rather in that he gave Tudor England an indication of the potential of greatness in Western man in all the centuries from the Trojan war to the day when Master John Falstaff was thoroughly taken in by two merry wives of Windsor. If in a sense Timon of Athens, Julius Caesar, Coriolanus, Antony, Cleopatra, and the rest are projections of Tudor or Stuart notions of history; if in a sense all Shakespeare's royal or administrative personages are counterfeit presentments of the audiences' notions of what is good and bad in rulers, who now reads Shakespeare only for this? The dramatist availed himself of the scholarship of his age—North's version of Plutarch, Holinshed's *Chronicles*, and much else—but he did not Tudorize history as we seem to want to Freudianize writing. He read history as a Tudor genius had to, but he knew it was history, not current event. It is well to
recall the words E. A. Robinson puts into Jonson's mouth in his poem, "Ben Jonson Entertains a Man from Stratford":

   You are a friend, then, as I make it out,
   Of our man Shakespeare, who alone of us
   Will put an ass's head in Fairyland
   As he would add a shilling to more shillings,
   All most harmonious—and out of his
   Miraculous inviolable increase
   Fills Ilion, Rome, or any town you like
   Of olden time with timeless Englishmen.

   Is there not here a just image of that fusion of the present and the past that is the peculiar virtue and desire of scholarship? Are we never to see the world philosophically but only in terms of controversy? Scholarship does not confuse Marcus Aurelius' dear city of Cecrops with St. Augustine's dear city of God, but neither should it confuse these with Columbus, Ohio. To be concerned about contemporary culture, to be aware of grave issues of state and conduct, to know how the arts are at present doing and how they are publicized—these problems should not be absent from scholarship, they should aid scholarship; but they should not take over scholarship. To do one's work in the firm conviction that if mankind, if humanity is to prevail, man must be seen in the long perspective of his development. This is what scholarship must insist upon as its finest contribution to any troubled age. The age cannot go down in anarchy; it must be reminded that there are other, fairer slogans than those of power. The best contribution of the scholar to education is to enrich scholarship, to continue it, to make it available to all those competent and ready to accept the philosophy that scholarship implies. Such seems to me still the proper goal and appropriate contribution of the scholar to this or any other time. If I understand him correctly, this also William Charvat believed.
COLUMBUS, O., March 27 -- An Ohio State University scholar is examining William Wordsworth's first published work which appeared in 1793 to find out what sort of a Romantic the poet was.

According to Dr. Ford T. Swetnam, Jr., assistant professor of English, "we already know what 18th century sources Wordsworth borrowed from. Now I want to see what he did with them."

Aiming principally at manuscripts of "An Evening Walk," Swetnam will analyze "which figures of speech or other bits of rhetoric Wordsworth kept, and which he left out."

He will make his study this summer, both on Cornell University's Wordsworth collection, and at Dove Cottage, the Wordsworth family home in Grasmere, England, under a $1,500 National Endowment for the Humanities stipend.

"Some existing manuscript revisions of Wordsworth's 'Evening Walk' seem to represent the first stages in the philosophical growth of the author who was to become a mature transcendentalist," Swetnam said.

"Wordsworth is the first really influential English Romantic poet and the effects of the Romantic period are still important in present-day culture," he pointed out.

"An examination of the manuscripts in which this revolutionary way of writing and thinking are visible should indicate whether a
new edition is required."

"Wordsworth made corrections in some copies of the first edition he had, and I want to know when in order to trace accurately both his philosophical and his aesthetic development.

"A study would tell what kinds of literary expression were dropped from his work in the course of his stylistic development.

"By analyzing revisions of his poems we may be able to see where he thought his originality lay."

"An Evening Walk" appears in many of the standard editions of Wordsworth in print today.
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Student poets at Ohio State University have a new mark to shoot for -- a $100 Academy of American Poets prize.

The award program, newly-established at Ohio State, provides a prize each spring for the best poem or group of poems written by students at the university.

Deadline for submission of entries to the English department, 421 Denney Hall, 164 W. 17th Ave., is May 8, according to Prof. Robert Canzoneri, who is arranging judging procedures.

Canzoneri is author of a forthcoming book of poems entitled "Watch us Pass" to be published in September by the Ohio State University Press.

His poetry has appeared in a number of journals, including "Southern Writing in the Sixties," "Poetry Southeast," "Saturday Review," and "Sewanee Review."
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COLUMBUS, O., April 24.--An Ohio State University scholar has unearthed two copies of novelist F. Scott Fitzgerald's "Daily Dirge," a newspaper parody account of a prominent St. Paul, Minn., social event of the roaring twenties.

Bearing the banner headline, "Cotillion is Sad Failure," the society page spoof, dated Feb. 13, 1922, was long considered among scholars as a characteristic antic of the novelist during the period of his return to his hometown following initial literary success.

They thought, however, that no copies of the publication had survived until Prof. Matthew J. Bruccoli of Ohio State recently learned that two were in the possession of St. Paul residents who had attended the 1922 dance.

Apprised of their literary significance, the owners donated one copy to the Minnesota Historical Society, and Bruccoli acquired the other for his extensive personal collection of Fitzgerald materials.

Bruccoli has had a photo-offset facsimile made which he has distributed to scholars and libraries.

Editor of "The Fitzgerald Newsletter," Bruccoli describes the "Dirge" as an important insight to the light-hearted wit of the novelist during his early literary career.

Bruccoli is author of 'The Composition of 'Tender is the Night,'" a study of the novelist's literary processes in writing his longest work.
Release on Receipt

COLUMBUS, O., July 19.-- --The English department at Ohio State University will offer a new course, "Introduction to Negro Literature in America," during the 1969 spring quarter.

The five credit-hour course will examine the important works of fiction, drama, and poetry about the Negro in American life, with emphasis on works by Negro authors.

Works by Caucasian authors, such as William Faulkner, also will be studied. James Baldwin and LeRoi Jones will be among Negro writers whose works are on the course reading list.

Dr. Morris Beja, associate professor in the department of English, will teach the course. Dr. Beja joined the Ohio State faculty in 1961.

A New York City native, he received the bachelor of arts degree from the City College of New York in 1957 and the master of arts degree from Columbia University in 1958. He received his Ph.D. from Cornell University in 1963.

Dr. Beja has held a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship, a Fulbright grant, and a Cornell University summer scholarship. Among his major publications is "It Must Be Important: Negroes in Contemporary American Fiction," in the 1964 fall edition of the Antioch Review.

The Ohio State department of history previously announced a new course in "American Negro History" to begin in the autumn quarter of 1968.
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british novelist james p. donleavy will speak on "the tools and traumas of the writing trade" at ohio state university thursday (11/14) evening. the free public talk at 8 p.m. in the college of law auditorium is sponsored by the department of english and the office of research.

known as a leading exponent of "black humor," donleavy is author of "the ginger man," "the saddest summer of samuel s.," "a singular man," and the forthcoming "the beastly beatitudes of balthazar b."

his characters have been described as "free-wheeling rogues and innocents completely without prejudice, responsibility, or what passes in society as morality, who speak to the generation of today and to all those who would understand them, even a little."

donleavy received his education in new york, his native city, and at trinity college in dublin.
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Dr. Francis L. Utley, professor of English at Ohio State University, was elected a member of the Executive Council of the Modern Language Association for a three-year term during its December meetings in New York City.

Prof. Utley was also elected president of the College English Association for 1969 and secretary of the Middle English group of the MLA.

He also served as chairman of the meetings of the Association of Medieval and Renaissance Centers and of the American Place-Name Survey, the latter with members of the American Name Society.

A past president of the American Name Society, he has served as a consultant on folklore and mythology for the "Encyclopedia Americana" and on literature for the "Random House Dictionary of the English Language" and the Barnhart Dictionaries.

He is author of several books, including, "Studies in Biblical and Jewish Folklore," "The Forward Movement of the Fourteenth Century," and "Bear, Man and God."

He lives at 1456 London Dr.
STAFFER-AUTHOR RECEIVES $3,000 GRANT

Ohio State University president Novice Fawcett, right, and Dr. Albert J. Kuhn, left, chairman of the university’s English department, presented Escalus E. Elliott, III, a $3,000 creative writing grant from the Book of the Month Club in Fawcett’s office. Elliott, 22, is one of 13 college seniors in the U.S. selected for the grant. The manuscript which won the grant for Elliott also brought him a $3,500 Wallace Stegner Fellowship to Stanford University. Elliott is the son of Mrs. E. J. Hamon and E. E. Elliott Jr., both of Columbus. He has been a staff member of the Columbus Dispatch for two years. He lives at 310 W. 7th Ave.
English Professor Resigns
In Protest of Department

By DAVID K. STRAIGHT
Lauren Staff Writer

One of the youngest English professors to teach at Ohio State has resigned because he feels the University failed him and he failed the University.

Matthew Brucoli, former Director of the OSU Center for Textual Studies, resigned in February 1968 "in protest against the lack of professionalism in the English department and the American Literature staff in particular."

"I'm leaving in disgust," Brucoli said.

Brucoli was sitting in a third floor library room where he has spent a great deal of his seven years at the University. His 5-year-old son, Joseph, was amusing himself among the research books lining the walls and scattered on the desks.

He raised himself off the wooden chair, began stuffing his pipe and said, "There are people in the English department who want to obscure their lack of professional attainment in a fog of political commitment."

He began to pace the floor.

Professional, scholarly academic achievement is the only way to judge advancement, he said. If one judges on political standards, a man may be promoted one year because he is a liberal and another because he is not a liberal.

"It is that serious."

Brucoli, who came to the University in 1961, said Ohio State once had a distinguished English Department. "It is now a department which is unprofessional and even anti-professional."

University professors are overpaid if their work is devoted only to teaching, he said. "They are paid to engage in research and scholarship which could demonstrate the excellence of the University, help them to teach better, and attract better faculty and students."

Some of the best professors have left the English Department, he said. "The losers have stayed and perpetuated their kind."

There are men at this University who year after year publish nothing, he said.

In the time he has been on campus he said he has published at least 15 books, scholarly articles, and has had three articles in "Esquire" magazine.

"I am therefore moving to a department that does have the professional standards I believe in," Brucoli has accepted a professorship on the English staff at the University of South Carolina.

Brucoli said one of the elements in his decision to leave Ohio State was the way which the University treated former Ohio State English Assistant Professor, Joseph Katz.

"He was one of the most brilliant and promising young members of the English Department," and he was not kept, Brucoli said. He declined to comment on the reasons he felt Katz left.

"It is not coincidental that Professor Katz is joining me at the University of South Carolina."

Significant Book

Brucoli seated himself and tossed a book across the table. The book was titled "The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870."

"The University should be grateful for works such as these," Brucoli said, "but the University does not care about its great scholars."

The book was researched by a friend and colleague of Brucoli, William Charvat, who taught at Ohio State for nearly 20 years. Charvat studied in a scholarly way, Brucoli said.

Charvat died in 1966.

The book is a completely new idea, Brucoli said. It shows the influence conditions of publications have on an author's work. "The influence is in dollars and cents." The author responds to the ways in which his work is published, distributed, and sold, he said.

Brucoli edited the unfinished book for Charvat.

This scholarly work will not get the proper exposure from the University, Brucoli suspects. "Just as so many other University scholarly works are not promoted."

Brucoli received his Ph.D at the University of Virginia. He says he will continue his work on the works of F. Scott Fitzgerald at the University of South Carolina.
Student writing ability declining

By Valerie Weber
25 Nov 74

"A lot of students coming to college these days don’t even know enough about sentence structures or word forms to be able to put a paper together."

This statement from an Ohio State English tutor, and many others like it, reflect both the local and national trend of a decline in the writing ability among college students.

"THE WRITING ability of students has been gradually declining over the last several years," said John Gable, chairman of the English Department. "However, this is not an easy matter to generalize about because there are just so many factors that could be involved."

Margaret D. Blickle, director of freshman English, said, "The basic problems in writing are an increasing emphasis on literature and therefore not enough practice in expository writing."

Many instructors blame the high schools, where work loads are the heaviest. Some say the influence of television is a primary cause for the decline in writing, and still others say it's the environment in general.

"As an English tutor I find many problems stem from a lack of proper English instruction in the high schools," said English tutor Edward Yasuhara.

"I have students coming to me trying to write a one-page paper on the concept of freedom. These students are not taught to break down and divide a paper into smaller, writable topics. Or they are simply illiterate on the topic they are writing about," he said.

"Television is another factor affecting writing. There is a definite trend away from words to pictures, and this is bound to affect a student's writing ability," he continued.

"In television everything is done for you, and there is no need to use the imagination as there is in reading."

One study conducted by the Modern Language Association concluded that "...students are coming from high schools with far less firm grasp on fundamentals than before — middle class as well as disadvantaged students."

DAVE CARPENTER, an English 100 instructor, called "today's average student a "functional illiterate" who can't write and has no tools with which to discuss the parts of a sentence."

"When essays are written, they just don't receive enough criticism or analysis to be of any value to the student," Carpenter said. "For example, students will receive papers with 'nice' or 'good' on them. And what can a student learn from that type of criticism?"

Carpenter said most students don't read enough on their own. Most of the reading a student does comes from literature readings assigned to him as classwork.

As head of the English Department, Gable views the decline in writing as "a part of the times. Young people are just less attuned to the written word."

ALTHOUGH NO remedial English courses are offered at Ohio State, a "slowed-down English 100 course" is offered — English 194.

English 194 is two quarters and covers the same materials as 100, only in "a different approach," said Sharon Howard, an instructor.

"We go back to the basics, such as defining terms. We do this because many of our students lack training in expository writing."
Profs index medieval prose

By Jo Hall
5-15-80

After 20 years of accumulating and processing data, three former OSU English professors have completed a bibliography indexing more than 7,000 essays written during the Medieval period.

The research project, published last fall, tracked down the present locations of the essays written about the virtues and vices during that era, says Thyra B. Kabealo, one of the professors.

Between the 10th and 14th centuries, the popularity of the Catholic Church inspired written works on the subjects of faith, hope, charity, justice, fortitude, temperance and humility, the retired professor says.

Along with accounts of man’s righteous responsibilities, essays were written on the seven deadly sins — pride, lust, envy, anger, greed, sloth and gluttony.

But plagiarism, passing off another’s written work as one’s own, was not on the list. Kabealo says it was

Works treat vice, virtues

thought for years that only one copy of each essay existed.

However, it was discovered in the late 1950s that the monks copied each other’s work, as identical manuscripts were found in different monasteries.

After that discovery, Kabealo and two of her colleagues, Morton W. Bloomfield, currently at Harvard, and Donald R. Howard, at Stanford, realized the need to compile a comprehensive list of the manuscripts.

Although essays were not titled during the era they were written, Kabealo says they are identified by their incipits (opening lines).

The three professors, with the help of Frenchman Bertrand-Georges Guyot, associated with a research commission in Europe, spent hours in libraries going through essays and catalogues to match the first lines.

By 1973, they were able to use computer technology to organize the data for their book, “Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices.”

Thomas G. Whitney, computer programmer at the OSU Instruction and Research Computer Center, supervised the assembling of data.

The 779-page volume, Kabealo says, is a principal source for anyone doing research on the Medieval period. Writ-
Attitudes remain medieval

ON CAMPUS 5-22-81
By Lisa Holstein

When Stanley J. Kahrl says today's attitudes toward women are medieval, he means it literally.

"I've maintained to my students for years that if they want to understand the nature of the problems they face today, they ought to go back to the Middle Ages for answers," says Kahrl, professor of English.

"That is the time when a great many habits of mind, conscious or unconscious, that are the basis for today's problems were formed. And ideas are extremely powerful — they have a life that is independent of the cultural patterns that brought them into existence."

The culture of the medieval Western European world Kahrl refers to was the church, the dominant force in government and intellectual life as well as religion of the time.

"Until very late in the Middle Ages, all university graduates who hoped for advancement could do so only through positions controlled by the church," he said. "To hold those positions, one had to be celibate. Thus the consequences of falling for a woman's attractions were quite serious. And medieval writings contain all the vitriolic hatred of women bred from centuries of celibate male fears of their inability to resist the temptations of the flesh."

The reasons for the church's demand of celibacy in its offices, which though law from the 4th century on was not strictly required of all ordained clergy until the 12th century, are based both on the attitude that love — and thus women — undermined the "true" rational and intellectual nature of man, and on a presumed need to justify further the special privileges of the ecclesiastical establishment by making all such men appear to be "better" than others.

The student who challenges Kahrl that such career consequences are no longer exacted for love or marriage is quickly refuted by some current parallels.

"The traditional pattern of success for male executives is subordination of wife and family to career," Kahrl says. "We all have friends who have moved their families frequently to move up a corporate ladder, ultimately with considerable cost to the family.

"Men who require such sacrifices of their families become heads of large corporations and in turn reward the same values in the young executives, or academics, or lawyers, or doctors in the institutions they run. In doing so, they are, albeit unwittingly, continuing to subscribe to an important medieval attitude toward women."

Kahrl can recount numerous tales from Chaucer and other writers of the period in which the love of women is blamed for male failures, including the story almost everyone knows — how King Arthur's Camelot fell because of Lancelot's passion for Guinevere.

"Is it any wonder that we still use the words 'femme fatale' to describe a particularly attractive woman?" Kahrl asked. "Is there any context other than 'falling in love' in which that word 'fall' has a happy connotation?"

In all this destruction of men's happiness and futures that women caused they were blamed not for seeking to incite passion in men, but for the simple fact of being. It was not only "bad" women who were dangerous, but all women.

That attitude finds perhaps its most damaging contemporary reflection in cases of rape, Kahrl said, in which a woman who reports the rape finds herself being accused as a temptress. Like the judge who freed a convicted rapist on grounds that today's women dress to call attention to their physical attractiveness, medieval writers would say such a reaction in men is only to be expected.

"Women don't have to do anything to be blamed," Kahrl said. "The young knight so frequently smitten by a maiden in medieval stories often has never met her, just glimpsed the lady in a garden or across a distant hall. Yet off the knight will go to do gallant deeds on her behalf, in hopes of winning her 'mercy,' as it was called."

Kahrl updates that example, too. He refers to a discussion on a radio program about teenage sexuality in which girls were asked the circumstances of their first sexual encounter.

"One girl said she didn't especially care for the boy who had talked her into it, but she went ahead anyway," Kahrl related. "She said it was not because she was all that curious about sex, but because 'he seemed to need it so badly.' And that, in a nutshell, is 'mercy' as the medieval people understood it and as teenagers understand it today."

Women thus have a dual and conflicting role as assigned by medieval attitudes that endure today — to stay out of men's way in the world of work so men can avoid falling in love with them, and at the same time to provide for men's happiness by making themselves available. Women were, and still are, assigned responsibility for managing men's emotional bank accounts, Kahrl said.

An ever greater dilemma arises in terms of the idealized role model available for women in those times, Kahrl said. "Men knew the road to success and status was a celibate life in the church and counted especially on the purely contemplative monks as the 'saving remnant' of humanity for final salvation."

For women, the perfect life was embodied in Mary. "There is absolutely no real hope for women to achieve perfection, since none could seriously expect to become a virgin mother."

"The answer to the Aristotelian question, "What is that essential thing that makes a woman a woman and not some other being?" is 'her ability to bear children,'" Kahrl explained. "Yet the concept of virginity says when a woman loses hers, she becomes less perfect. To be perfect, a woman must deny her very essence — and at the same time, to be perfect is to be less than perfect because she has not borne a child."

"While we may think this concept has largely ceased to function, do we not all still say that a woman 'loses her virginity' and when we lose something, do we not normally think of it as something we wish we had?"

Kahrl makes a point of acknowledging the contributions of his wife, an Ohio State graduate student, to his conclusions. "I may be the expert on medieval attitudes toward women, but she is the expert on the survival of those attitudes," he says.

He chose to present a paper drawing together all these themes at a meeting of the all-male Torch Club in Columbus.

The national Torch Club had changed its charter last year to permit its membership selection process to consider and admit women. But the central Ohio group — and many other chapters across the nation — had refused to modify their local by-laws.

Kahrl, when asked to speak there, intentionally chose a topic sensitive to the membership.

At the end of his presentation to the Torch Club, delivered on a "Ladies' Night" to which wives were invited, Kahrl said, "The purpose of the Torch, after all, is to
stimulate discussion, to provide a forum for the discussion of controversial ideas. That certainly is a rational activity.

"But when I look at this audience, containing as it does so many fine women, I suspect that some of my friends here fear their presence on a regular basis not for any of a number of 'rational' reasons, but because they are distracting. Could they, and men elsewhere, still fear The Fall?"

Apparently, Kahrl did get some results he can live with. He has had requests to deliver his paper to two other Torch Club chapters in Ohio. And at the next monthly meeting of the Columbus Chapter, the membership voted to admit women.
English problem for many

By Rexanna Yerian
Lantern staff writer 4-26-83

English 110 is a class a majority of students take for
granted, but for as many as 2,000 students it can be a ma-
jor barrier to overcome.

According to Mike Rupright, assistant chairman of
English, about 2,000 students from spring quarter 1982
through winter quarter 1983 did not place into Freshman
English 110. This does not include foreign students enroll-
ed in English as a second language.

Students who score a 15 or lower, out of a possible 36
points on the ACT college entrance exam, are placed in
remedial English classes. A remedial English class is
anything below 110.

"Many of the freshmen who enter this university, with
its open admissions policy, don't read well enough and
write well enough to make it in college," Rupright said.

Rupright feels students are not being prepared for col-
lege in high school. In fact, these students are "certainly
less prepared than were their generations of predeces-
sors," he said.

According to the Director of the Section of Basic
English, Sara Garnes, students who score lower than 15 on
the ACT are screened to determine whether they should
spend one quarter or two in a remedial writing workshop.

The problem is gradually improving over the years.
During autumn quarter of 1980, 1,182 freshmen were
enrolled in remedial English programs and during winter
of 1981 there were 888. This number decreased during sprin-
g of 1981 to 315.

The figures from this past year reflect an obvious
change; autumn quarter 1982 there were 976, winter of
1983 there were 816, and this quarter there are only 214.

"Students are becoming more aware of the importance
of writing skills as entering freshmen. I think the pro-
gams in the high schools are improving writing skills
greatly," Garnes said.

Although students in the remedial classes have severe
problems in spelling, sentence organization, grammar
and development, Garnes said "the main problem is logic.
Just making sense."

These students are intelligent, they simply are lacking
writing skills, Garnes said.

For example, a student may be exceptional in
mathematics, but poor in English, or vise versa. Garnes
hopes the remedial writing workshops will improve these
students' skills and prepare them for future classes.

Garnes said the remedial writing workshops have been
very successful so far.

"Since the university is concerned about the expense
of operating the remedial English classes, OSU is working in
cooperation with many area high schools to improve
writing skills before the students reach the college level,
Garnes said.

During 1978-79, its first full academic year, the remedial
program cost $170,003. These program costs increased to
$327,839 during the 1981-82 academic year.

This increase can be attributed to inflation and increased
personnel costs. "We simply had to adjust teaching
loads, we had to put more faculty members in the pro-
gram," said E. Garrison Walters, assistant dean of
humanities.

OSU recommends four years of high school English
before a student goes to college, but there is no way to en-
force that, Garnes said.

"We (the university) are recommending that they take
classes that employ writing," Garnes said. "Ohio State
does have a conditional admissions policy applying to in-
coming freshmen, but it is only a strong endorsement for
the four year high school English requirement."

The Ohio Board of Regents has set up recommendations
for college preparatory English programs in high schools
because it is in this area the widest gaps appear between
college expectations and high school preparation.

"The university has endorsed all of the recommenda-
tions of the Board of Regents," Garnes said.

The focal points suggested by the Board of Regents are
process, logic, organization, practice, attitude and respon-
sibility.

---

John Doe
English Remedial Writing

Television without question is the most
influential medium in our lives because it is
an escape.

All people forget their daily problems
and resort for short time in to the world of
fiction.

Which is fine I feel we all need a little
fiction in our lives too release stress agression
denpession which could lead to mental Illness.

But the problem is in my own personal
opinion is adults forget that television programs
such as All In the family and Fish our only
fiction and not real.

Of course young children do not comprenhend
such a understanding of The diffance between
fiction and non fiction

A sample essay written by a student who scored less
than 15 on the ACT and was placed into one of the
remedial writing workshops.
English students: Program not effective

By Kim Stock
Lantern staff writer

"A group of students met faculty members at an English forum colloquium Wednesday, debating the effectiveness of the current undergraduate program for English majors.

"There seems to be a consensus among the students in the forum that the current requirements for the undergraduate English major may not offer enough background for a major in English," said Charles Finlay, a senior from Columbus and president of the undergraduate English Forum.

The English Forum is a group of students who meet weekly to promote communication between students and faculty in the English Department.

In the English program there are only three classes required for the English major. The remainder of the classes are chosen by the student.

"(The required) 200-level classes stress breadth rather than depth," Lisa Kiser, associate professor of English, said. "They are designed to spark an interest in students to take the more detailed 300-level courses."

Julian Markels, professor of English, said the English department curriculum is too diverse to require any two students to take the same core classes. "We want every student to be able to get exactly the kind of education they want," Markels said.

English professor Anthony Libby said the scheduling help students receive from counselors makes the system work. "We rely on the common sense of the student and good advising for students to make the most of the program," Libby said.

"The problem is that some students don't care about getting a well-rounded education."

Concerning the meeting, Finlay said, "What became clear tonight is that the students do not have a clear understanding of the department's philosophical approach to literary studies, which relies on the initiative of the individual student."

Libby said as a result of the colloquium the faculty will discuss the problem of advising to make it easier for students to take more responsibility for their major program.

"We may not have come up with any concrete solutions," Finlay said, "but at least we have opened up lines of communications between the faculty and the students, and that's the first step to solving the problem."
English courses reduced

By Chris Hanschmidt
Lantern staff writer

Students will find fewer English sections to choose from next year if the English Department's approximately $1 million budget request is not granted.

All sections of English 301, 304 and 305 have been eliminated from the summer schedule of classes, and fewer sections will be taught next year, said Ruth Falor, coordinator of the English 305 sections.

The English Department's special budget, which pays the salaries of lecturers and teaching associates, does not have the money to accommodate the increasing enrollment, said Michael Ripplright, assistant to the chairman of the department.

But even if the department receives the $1 million, the same budget allocation as last year, it will suffer a cut because the budget will not allow hiring more lecturers, said Isaac Mowoe, assistant dean of the College of Humanities.

However, Mowoe said there has not been a cut yet. He said he is waiting for the provost's official response to all the 11 humanities departments' budget requests. The response is expected in early June.

He said the humanities college sent a budget estimation based on the previous year's total budget allocation to the English Department in March. The estimation stated that roughly 75 percent of the department's special budget would be approved.

Morris Beja, chairman of the department, has received 83 percent of his budget request so far, Mowoe said.

"We may be able to make up the balance of the 17 percent we expect to be able to do so," he said.

Ripplright said, "The graduate students in that budget are our first priority and by definition, we are most concerned with the education of our graduate students."

Engineering students are required to take English 305, technical writing.

For those who planned to graduate in August and have not taken the course yet, this requirement resembles a bad dream.

"This morning I had a senior (in engineering) come in and cry, "What am I going to do?" I didn't know what to tell him," Falor said.

Robert Redmond, associate dean of the College of Engineering, said the dean has been looking for a solution to the situation.

Mowoe said, "It would be premature to say that we have had a budget cut. In the meantime, we have to make some tentative decisions, because we can't wait until the end of May to let our departments know how much money they have with which to work next year."

Beja said the lecturers are usually part-time teachers from outside the university. "They are frequently the more experienced people."

He said in the past few years the department has been authorized to hire more faculty members, but that part-time lecturers are still needed to teach some classes.

"Hopefully we can become less dependent on this kind of teaching," Beja said. "We hope (hiring more faculty) will alleviate the need for some of the lecturers. But I can't believe that we'll get in a position of not being able to use some lecturers and part-time people to some degree... We need some kind of flexibility."

John Wanzer has been an English lecturer since 1980. While in graduate school, he was a TA.

He said he is pleased with the department's handling of the situation. The department informed lecturers about two months ago. He said he is looking for another job.

"The hiring of lecturers has always been tenuous," Wanzer said. "There's nothing like tenure (here) and there's no reason to expect it."

Beja said lecturers are on quarterly contracts and cannot teach more than three courses a quarter. They are retired according to performance only.
Departments change policies for 100- and 200-level classes

By Mike Sponhour
Lantern staff writer

The College of Business and Department of English have changed their policies for students attempting to add closed classes.

Both recently abandoned a "hold all drops" policy, which allowed departments to decide which students were given first opportunity to fill open spaces left by students who have dropped. The decision was usually based on class rank or whether the student had been closed out before.

This quarter, the College of Business allowed the registrar's office to place students in closed 200-level classes on a first-come, first-served basis, said John Yutze, assistant director of undergraduate programs for administrative science.

Yutze estimated about 200 students were able to add classes directly through the registrar's office this quarter. Previously, they would be required to fill out a petition stating their reasons for adding the class.

"There were 200 who knew immediately if they had a course, and that is 200 we didn't have to see first," Yutze said. "The preliminary indications are very positive."

Petitions to enter closed, upper-level classes are still required.

In addition, the English Department will now allow the registrar's office to add students into remedial and 100-level sections before the quarter begins, said David O. Frantz, vice-chairman of English.

Previously, students could not add lower-level English classes until the first Saturday of the quarter when the English department placed them, Frantz said. The registrar's office will now add these students immediately if spaces are available.

Both departments' administrators said students need to be prevented from being closed out of the same class several quarters in a row.

"(The registrar's office) ought to be able to identify those people who are third quarter freshman and say 'these are people who need English composition,'" Frantz said.

To combat the problem, the College of Business may propose that students be given priority in scheduling according to class rank in preregistration.

In addition, if students have been closed out of a class several times, they can now be given "college priority" during early registration. Although it is not widely used, it gives these students first opportunity to get the class they need, said Gene Schuster, university registrar.

Jack Tzagournis, a junior from Columbus, was closed out of accounting 211, but managed to add the class at Lincoln Tower when another student dropped.

"I think the whole thing is a hassle. You have to go to class every day and see if there is a space," he said.

Kathy Quigley, a sophomore from Columbus who was closed out of English 110 three times, said she thought the close-out problem could be solved with additional staff members.

"There should be more people teaching (English) 110," Quigley said. "There are so many people that need to take it. I think I would have been better off if I had taken it my freshman year."
Student input aids prof's study of play

By Shelley J. Burger
Lantern staff writer

"If Godot comes, tell him to wait," is the opening of the book, "The Arrival of Godot: Ritual Patterns in Modern Drama" by Katherine Burkman, professor of English.

Burkman's study is based upon the absurdist play "Waiting for Godot" by Samuel Beckett, written in 1949.

The characters in the play are standing by a tree in the middle of nowhere waiting for someone named Godot. They don't know when he will come or even if he will come, but they continue to wait and wait.

Godot is taken by many as a symbol of the Savior, whose arrival may bring salvation or damnation to those who place their faith in him, Burkman wrote.

Burkman has used Godot as such a symbol, focusing her discussion on plays written by Samuel Beckett, Harold Pinter, Edward Albee, Eugene Ionesco, Gunter Grass and Jean Genet.

Each are dramas in which the ritual quest for renewal revolves around the arrival or nonarrival of such Godot/savior figures.

"This sort of idea of looking at a savior figure, the Godot figure in literature, was a way of bringing together my classes in absurdist drama," she said.

The book is based upon research and information she gained from the classes she teaches at Ohio State.

"I learn from students a lot," she said.

Formal lectures are not a part of her teaching method, she said. She only guides the discussions about the plays the students have been assigned to read.

A class requirement for students is to perform or direct a scene from one of the plays.

"I believe very strongly that plays were written to be performed," she said, "and the best way to understand them is through performance."

"I was really nervous about doing a performance," said Scott Hinson, a graduate student majoring in English. "It forces you to analyze a play and look at it more in-depth. It helps you understand staging and dramatic production, which was something I didn't know anything about."

Jami Bray, a senior majoring in International Studies, said "I'm nervous about giving a performance, but instead of reading something on a page, it helps you understand the feelings that go on."

Burkman illustrates the use of performance as a teaching method to aid the learning process in another work, "Drama Through Performance," written in 1977 with Mark Auburn.

Quite often, the students are invited to take charge of class discussions. In one of her classes that was a study of fools based upon characters in Shakespeare and Samuel Beckett plays, she kept a "fools cap" for anyone to put on and play the fool.
"I invited them to do some 'fooling around' and they really did," she said.
For instance, she was teaching about the play "Waiting for Godot" and one of the students said he knew something he would like to do.
"He stood us up along the walls and told us to be quiet and he left," she said. "We waited and waited. Then we started doing all the things that they do in 'Waiting for Godot.' We started saying 'should we go?' or 'is he going to come?' We started doing funny movement things. We were very uncomfortable, very exposed. We realized he was playing Godot who never comes and we were the other characters."

Jenni Hunt, a senior majoring in English, is in Burkman's English 302 class.
"We are reading 'The Endgame.' She (Burkman) asked a student to try to get a pen from another student who was instructed not to give it to her, Hunt said. "First the student tried force and then she got the whole class involved in trying to figure out how to take the pen. This introduced the genre of drama. It was really neat and fun too."

Burkman has been teaching at Ohio State for 19 years. She attended graduate school here from 1966 to 1968 earning her doctorate in Theater.
She is married to Allan Burkman, professor of Pharmacology, and has two children, David, 16, and Debra, 13.

"When my children were young, I was always torn about leaving them," she said. "I guess I have felt, even though I have done a lot of writing and get very involved in my teaching, that my children come first. My husband has always been very supportive about the children."

"It has turned me into a feminist," she added. "I always felt that the mother could just do everything, that there were no special problems. I do think women like to be taken seriously."
English 110 to receive 75 computers

By B.P. Borgert
Lantern staff writer

The OSU Department of English was awarded 75 Macintosh Plus computers, valued collectively at $300,000, by Apple Computer Inc. for use in freshman composition classes beginning spring quarter.

"With a few hours of simple instruction, students will have editing capabilities at their fingertips that they never had before," said Frank O'Hare, director of writing.

O'Hare, author of the proposal that lead to the award, said the department will receive 35 computers this month and the remaining 40 in April, when more space is available. Printers, hard disks and graphic equipment are also included in the award.

O'Hare said the computers will allow students to write multiple drafts with the benefit of instant editing.

"Students cannot only change surface errors in their paper, but will be able to envision the paper to make substantive changes of content as well as organizational changes," he said.

The computers will also allow students to print copies of their initial drafts and distribute them to classmates for discussion and editing, he said.

Jim Minton, account executive for Apple, said O'Hare's proposal was very creative and denoted a commitment by the university to use the computers in the highest professional manner for curriculum and instructional development.

"We are completely sold on Ohio State," Minton said. "The proposal by the university should stand on its own merit. It was extremely professional and the idea of computerizing the freshman composition course helped lead to the award."

Because computer software will be developed experimentally, Ohio State could set a precedent on how freshman composition classes will be taught in the future, he said.

O'Hare said the computers will be placed on the periphery of the classrooms, maintaining the center of the classroom for instruction and group discussion.

In the future, the department plans to expand the computer program to advanced writing courses and other courses in the College of Humanities, he said.

Mervin Muller, chairman of computer and information science and co-author of the proposal said, "I believe that computers should become a pervasive part of education."

Muller said the computers will help the learning process between the students and the instructor.
Freshman-level English classes to receive more word processors

By Pat Hagen
Lantern staff writer

Twenty-five percent of all English 110 classes will begin using word processors in classrooms to complete daily assignments starting Fall Quarter, said Frank O'Hare, director of writing in the Department of English.

Sixteen percent of the 110 sections are currently using the word processors, O'Hare said. The department has decided to use more computers to make the editing process easier for students.

"Planning, drafting, revising and 're-re-re-writing' form the basis for good writing," O'Hare said.

Traditionally, students did the draft of a writing assignment the night before it was due, O'Hare said. For the second re-write they might change some commas, fix a dangling participle and fix a run-on sentence, he said.

By using the word processors students will learn more and become better writers, he said.

"I call it re-envisioning; we're changing the architectural structure of the paper," O'Hare said.

All sections of English 110 contain the same elements, he said. After the planning stage, the students write an exploratory draft, a working draft and a final draft which should be proofread, O'Hare said.

"Real writing doesn't come the first time with a quick clean-up," O'Hare said.

Using word processing gives students a different view of writing, O'Hare said.

"I don't have to retype papers. I can erase, go back, delete sentences and make changes," she said.

Keith Gildee, a freshman from Lexington, majoring in psychology, says revisions are much easier using a word processor.

"It seems that writing is a lot less work when you sit down with the computer," Gildee said. "Time goes by much quicker than sitting in your room with a typewriter."

Liz Raglow, a freshman psychology major from Mentor, said she was not originally scheduled to be in the computer section of English 110.

"The first day of class they asked if we wanted to change classes," Raglow said.

"Now, I'm glad I switched," she said.
"Satanic Verses" assigned on English class' syllabus

Ad prompted prof's decision

By Patrick J. Geyer
Lantern staff writer

"The Satanic Verses," a book that evoked world controversy when its author was sentenced to death by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, is one of the novels on the English 564 syllabus this quarter.

The five-hour class, taught by associate English Professor Walter Davis, is a study of Thomas Pynchon's "Gravity's Rainbow," but Davis said he plans to discuss "The Satanic Verses" in the final weeks of the class to show how Pynchon has influenced other authors.

Davis said he decided to include the book after reading a statement by the Moslem Student Association, issued last quarter, about their opinion of the book and its author, Salman Rushdie. The group's statement was published the final day of classes in an advertisement in the Lantern.

The ad discussed "The Satanic Verses" and condemned it for maligning Islam. The statement was signed by 40 students in the class, which Davis said he intentionally misread to mean the novel should be read and discussed.

Davis also blasted the ad saying it was riddled with factual errors.

In the novel, the prophet Mohammed describes a character named "Mahound" (a derogatory name for Mohammed) who becomes disenchanted with his religion. In several dream sequences, his wives are seen as prostitutes, and his friends as "bums and scum.

Earlier this year, the novel's author went into hiding after Khomeini offered more than $5 million to anyone who would kill Rushdie.

The president of the Moslem student group declined to comment on Davis' decision to include "The Satanic Verses."

But one parent voiced her opinion of the use of the book.

"Less than 45 minutes after the class was dismissed, Davis received a call from the mother of one of his students, who said she did not want her daughter to take the class.

Other students say they will stay enrolled in the class despite the use of the book.

Lara Paley, a junior from Cleveland majoring in English and psychology, said she is eager to begin the study and has a lot of respect for Davis.

"If I had to choose one professor to teach this class it would be Professor Davis," she said. "Professor Davis is one of the few professors that actually has something worth talking about."

Carla Pomeroy, a junior from Columbus majoring in English, is also taking the class.

"The problem is people making judgments before reading the book," she said. "The fact that it is so controversial is the very reason to read and discuss it."

Although Davis has provided room for his class to get larger, he said he expects several students will drop.

Davis invites anyone who wants to take the class to enroll, especially members of the Moslem Student Association.

"I think that Ohio State should be happy and proud that someone is doing what we're going to do as a class," Davis said. "Some might say it is a politicization of the classroom. I say it was already politicized."

English 564 is offered every autumn and spring quarter, but focuses on a different author each year. The curriculum is decided by the professor teaching the class.
Professor Walter Davis reads in his OSU office yesterday.

‘Satanic Verses’ taught at OSU

By Tim Doulin
Dispatch OSU Reporter

The Satanic Verses is required reading spring quarter in an English course at The Ohio State University.

Some people believe the book insults Islam, and it prompted Iran’s Ayatollah Khomeini to order the death of author Salman Rushdie.

The book will be taught during the final two weeks of the quarter in English 564, said Walter Davis, an English professor.

The bulk of the course will focus on a study of Gravity’s Rainbow by Thomas Pynchon. The Satanic Verses will illustrate how Pynchon has influenced the work of other authors.

“I think the only thing we can do is teach the book,” said Davis, 46.

“Luckily, I had a course where I was teaching Pynchon, and thus there was a pedagogical rationale. But what can a university community do but say, ‘We’ll read this. We’ll talk about it. We’ll discuss it.’”

Davis, who has taught at OSU for 11 years, describes The Satanic Verses as one of the more successful fictional books that combine fantasy and realism. Rushdie has been influenced by the work of Pynchon, Davis said.

“It is a very good book,” Davis said. “It is a funny book. It is a book written by somebody whose loss of faith and homelessness implied terrible suffering and the burden to create a new reality.”

Davis decided to add the book to the course after listening to responses from world leaders to Khomeini’s threat.

“The people who should speak for this in some meaningful way are making little statements so they can feel good,” Davis said.

Davis said people offended by The Satanic Verses probably have not read the book. Davis doesn’t find the book offensive.

“One of the things that upsets me is the notion that a writer does not have the right to offend a group of people. . . Groups of people, especially religious groups, offend those of us who think,” Davis said. “When do we get to express our disgust with their mininess?”

Davis has considered the personal risk he might be taking. “I would be foolish not to consider that possibility. I thought this over for a week before deciding to do it,” he said.

Originally, 45 students enrolled in the course. After word leaked that The Satanic Verses would be taught, 20 more students signed up.

Alex Rentel, a student in the class, is looking forward to studying the book. “Me (Davis) has read it and says it’s a good book. I always like to read a good book.”

A mother of a student called OSU to complain when she found that the book would be taught. The woman was told her daughter should drop the course, which is not required for graduation.

Morris Boja, chairman of the department of English, said, “There is a lot of interest in the book, so why not? I’m reading it now.”

Students will be required to write a paper on the political nature of Rushdie’s book, Davis said.

“Literature is political, and you can’t separate those two things. It was political long before Khomeini,” he said.
English classes integrate

By Juli Klyce
Lantern staff writer

About one-fourth of the English classes, basic composition writing, at Ohio State are now taught on computers, said a computer specialist for the English department.

Eric Walborn said the Department of English sponsored an open house Thursday to recruit teachers and introduce the possibility of using computers in university classes besides Computer and Information Science.

The Apple Project Open House is targeted at anyone who is interested in integrating computers with teaching, Walborn said.

Faye H. Purol, who teaches English 110 classes with the computers, said that students' grades in her computer classes are higher than those in her non-computer classes.

The university is studying the effects of the computers on students, grades and teachers, but it is too soon to have data for comparison, Walborn said.

Students using computers pick up on the vital parts of the writing process, revising and drafting, faster than students who use paper and pencil, Walborn said.

During the last two quarters, students were closed out of the computer English 110 classes, he said.

Purol said because revising on the computers is so easy, students are encouraged to go over their work many times. She said students using computers revise papers about nine times, but only about three times using a typewriter.

"The revising is an ongoing process, but students always know where they stand because the paper is right in front of them," Purol said.

Chris Hurd, a freshman majoring in jazz studies, said he knows his grades are better because he is taking the computer class.

"It's phenomenal how much time it saves," Hurd said.

computers and teaching

Purol said the computers help students form a camaraderie that would not happen in a non-computer class. That interaction makes peer critiques more effective.

Purol encourages students who know word processing to teach those who do not. It takes about a week for the students to become computer literate, she added.

Although the learning period is awkward, word processing is a valuable skill students might need in the future, Purol said.

Rick Figuly, a sophomore from Dover majoring in finance, said that although he thinks his grade in English 110 was better because of the computers, it was hard at first because he did not know how to type.

Purol said students who cannot type are discouraged from taking the computer class.
Swift editing adds ‘fun’ to writing

By Jeff Grabmeier

Until recently, many students ranked the University's freshman composition requirement alongside 8 a.m. classes and comprehensive finals among the least favored parts of college.

But computers are changing that.

The Department of English's Apple Project allows students to take a new computerized composition class (English 110C) that makes writing easier and more rewarding for many of them.

Of course, word processing on computers is nothing new. But for college students who equate writing with sweating over typewriters and bottles of correction fluid, computers seem like a gift from above.

One student who took English 110C wrote on his course evaluation that using the computer "makes (writing) a lot simpler. Heck, it even makes it kind of fun." Another said, "computers help a lot in cutting out a lot of the boring work in English. It makes English a lot more interesting."

The Apple Project began in November 1986, when Ohio State's proposal for English 110C won a national competition sponsored by Apple Computer Inc., says Eric Walborn, a senior computer assisted instruction specialist in the Department of English.

Apple donated more than $300,000 worth of Macintosh Pluses, Macintosh SEs, printers and software to the department.

The first courses were offered spring quarter 1987, but many students didn't know they were available.

"During the first few quarters, we had to go to regular 110 courses and recruit students to switch to the computer classes," Walborn says.

Now, 24 English 110C sections with 20 students each are taught each quarter — and the classes are filled during pre-registration, Walborn says. Classes are taught in three computer labs in Denney Hall.

Students in the computerized classes have the same requirements as those in the traditional composition course. They write at least four 500-600 word essays and take two essay exams.

The best student essays appear in MacBest, a newsletter published four times each quarter and distributed to the English 110C classes.

The students aren't the only ones who like the computerized classes. The graduate assistants who teach them also have become advocates.

"I've taught the traditional 110 classes, but now I wouldn't want to go back to teaching them," says Michael Hitt, one of the 110C teachers.

Hitt and others say that computers don't magically make students better writers. But because they make re-writing easier, students are more motivated and consequently do better work.

"Drafting and re-drafting papers is so important in 110," says Elizabeth Brockman, another teaching assistant. "Computers are made for that. They make revising easier."

Part of the appeal for students and teachers is the open atmosphere of the computer labs and the abundant table space to work and spread out papers. Students say they don't feel as cramped as they do in traditional classrooms.

"The key is that students have a different attitude about writing," says teaching assistant Joyce Fee.

Walborn says the Apple Project can't accept any more students than it currently has with the facilities and equipment available. But there are plans for some improvements, such as putting the computers on a network so students and teachers can look at each other's work.

In the meantime, English 110C is sure to remain popular, Walborn says.

As one student put it, writing and computers are "a match made in microchip heaven."
Public Lectures on Rhetoric and Theory

Our second Academic Challenge Grant Distinguished Speaker, Carolyn Miller from North Carolina State University, will present her public lecture, "The Polis as Rhetorical Community" in the EDRR at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, February 5.

As part of the Inaugural Lectures in the Humanities series, Prof. James Phelan will present his lecture, "Practicing Theory - And Never Making It Perfect," on Wednesday, Feb. 7, 7:30 p.m. in the Grand Lounge of the Faculty Club. A reception will follow.

Meet Our Faculty Candidate

A candidate for a faculty position in our department, Elizabeth Klaver (Drama; Diss.:"Postmodernism and Metatextual Space in the Plays of Beckett, Ionesco, Albee, and Mamet,"UC Riverside) will be visiting us this week and will be giving an informal afternoon presentation, followed by questions and discussion, on Thurs., Feb. 8 at 4 p.m. in the EDRR. Students, faculty and staff are invited.

Nudge, Nudge

Just a reminder to all of you that your final Annual Departmental Activities for 1989 was due on Friday, February 2; please put your completed report form in Richard Martin's mailbox. -- Dick Martin

Congratulations!

Stephen Page (medievalist) has accepted an Assistant Professorship (tenure track) at the University of Hawaii. Congratulations, Stephen!

The University-wide College Bowl Tournament concluded this past Monday. The winning team, "Acronyms," boasts of two undergraduate English majors: Jennifer Felden and Ron Woodruff. The next stage of competition is the regional tournament at the University of Windsor on March 3 and 4. Congratulations to Jennifer, Ron and their teammates.

Wordcruncher Disc Available

The Wordcruncher Disc, a compact disc (CD-ROM) containing the texts of Shakespeare's complete works (Riverside edition); selected Library of America editions of works by Franklin, Jefferson, Emerson, Whitman, Thoreau, Hawthorne, Melville, Cather, Faulkner, Twain, London and Henry James; the Declaration of Independence, U.S. Constitution, Federalist Papers, and other texts related to constitutional history; the King James and New International versions of the Bible; and many other texts, is now available at the Second Floor Main Library Information Desk, adjacent to the ETC Reading Room. Anyone can use this disc during the hours in which the Desk is staffed. Operating instructions and a searching manual are located at the CD-ROM workstation. For additional information about this disc, please contact Jim Bracken in the ETC Reading Room (ext. 22786).
Group aims to improve English

By Beth Herschelman
Lantern staff writer

The Freshman English Policy Committee and the English department are sponsoring a conference to improve writing techniques and to discuss changes in writing styles in all college departments.

The conference will be held at the Ohio Union, Friday, May 4.

Professors, instructors, graduate and undergraduate students from all departments are invited to share their insights about writing, teaching, and learning by presenting papers and leading a presentation.

The English department is asking for papers in the categories of freshman composition, gender writing, business writing, computers and writing, creative writing and technical writing.

Presenters will be chosen by a committee and will be free to choose the format of discussion, such as individual presentations, roundtables, workshops, or open-forum discussions.

Frank O'Hare, professor of English, said undergraduate writing in all fields is a top priority at Ohio State.

By incorporating writing into a subject such as physics, it will help in the understanding of theories and will definitely help in the writing of final documents for graduate students, O'Hare said.

It is hoped that the conference will become a biannual event.

"It's exciting because the conference is so inexpensive," O'Hare said.

Amy Goodburn, a graduate teaching assistant, said writing effects everyone, not just those in English-related areas.

Corporations complain that they get business graduates who can not write comprehensible memos so we need to address the problem of writing outside the English department, she said.

Goodburn also said that writing is a hot topic these days. Collaborative writing and gender writing are at the forefront of topics because they relate to so many other areas including women's studies, comparative studies and comparative literature.

Joyce Fee, a teaching assistant and doctorate candidate in English said, "We'll be discussing changes in the field of writing, the interaction among students and instructors, and improving the quality of instruction at the conference."

People have misconceptions about writing, they think it is all grammar, when it is much more than that, she said.

We need input from students in particular because they can help by giving their ideas and suggestions, Fee said.

Students will find out that other students have the same problems as they do. We can deal with the problems here and develop strategies to improve them, Goodburn said.

The purpose for the conference is for the audience and participants to learn, said Randy Beller, a teaching assistant in the English department. We've sent a notice about the conference to all two and four year colleges in Ohio so they can have some input too, he said.
English honor students get epic reading assignment

By Lori Timmins
Lantern staff writer

Sebastian Knowles, an assistant professor of English, has planned a reading of the 783-page work for his honors literature history class.

The book is part of the class this quarter, but Knowles thinks more than a single reading is in order.

"Ulysses is a notoriously difficult book to read, and to understand it at all it has to be read at least twice," Knowles said.

The length of the reading parallels the time span portrayed in the book. ""Ulysses" is a portrayal of ordinary people in an ordinary town in Dublin on an ordinary day," Knowles said.

The action takes place on June 16, 1904.

To be true to the work the reading would have to start at 8 a.m., but Knowles was not convinced that people would show up that early.

The reading, which is being held at a student's apartment, will begin at 6 p.m. Saturday, and will continue through Sunday afternoon. It will be open to anyone on a space-available basis, and everyone who wants to will be able to "read until they drop," Knowles said.

Even if they can't stay awake for the entire reading, Knowles thinks the students will still get something out of it.

"The book will be received subconsciously, or unconsciously, depending on how long you stay awake," he said.

"It will be an intravenous transfusion of Joyce's language, which is the lifeblood of his work." This is not the first marathon reading of "Ulysses." Every June 16 the book is read aloud all over the world in places like Dublin, Ireland and New York, Knowles said.

To break things up a bit, films will be shown with the sound turned down during the reading. "Ulysses" will be shown, as well as some non-literate flicks such as Elvis Presley's "Roustabout," he said.

A spaghetti dinner will be served at midnight, and there will be bagels and orange juice for breakfast, Knowles said.

"At first the class was wondering if he was really serious," said Michael Merritt, a senior majoring in English, "I think it will be really interesting," he said.

Anyone interested in reading should call Sebastian Knowles at 469-9483.
Student offers $100
to add packed class

By Chip Ramsey
Lantern staff writer

Do I here $50? Do I hear $100?
This is what a desperate graduat-
ing senior finally offered to anyone
who would drop their English 553
class, according to Casey Miller, a
graduate student in journalism.

Miller said the desperate student
started the bid at $50, then raised the
offer to $100 for anyone who would
drop the class immediately over the
phone on B.R.U.T.U.S., so he could
ad the class.

Professor Ernest Lockridge, who
teaches English 553, said he has a
blanket policy of not letting anyone
into the class.

“It’s the only course of action we
can take to limit the class size,” he
said.

Morris Beja, chairman of the Eng-
lish Department, said the department
doesn’t want to turn to a system of
huge lecture courses where there will
be 300 to 400 students in a class.

According to Beja, overcrowding is
genuine problem.

“We know it and we’re addressing
it,” he said. “We have increased our
faculty over the last few years, and
this year we’re seeking to fill nine
positions.”

Beja said besides increasing fa-
culty, the English Department is in-
creasing the number of 500-level En-
lish courses.

According to Beja, the department
is adding five more 500-level courses
and two more sections of a 500-level
Shakespeare course.

“We’re just trying to meet the de-
mand,” he said. “Some courses are al-
ways going to be in high demand and
we may never be able to do anything
about faculty shortages.”

According to Beja, over the last se-
ven years there has been a 300 per-
cent increase in undergraduate En-
lish majors.

He said the department at the
500-level assigns a lot of writing and
there is only so much a professor can
handle.

“There are only ‘x’ number of seats
in a class and you just can’t add a stu-
dent even with all the good will in the
world,” he said.

Beja said the department prefers to
have only faculty members teaching
at the 500-level because it’s only fair
to the students.

According to Beja, the department
is looking at the possibility of con-
trolling the numbers of English ma-
jors, but it is only in the early stages of
planning.

He said the increase in English
majors is because of the quality of the
English Department at Ohio State.
Festival to honor playwright’s works

By Sue Reeser
Lantern arts writer

The movie “Awakenings” has received positive reviews. If you enjoyed the movie you will enjoy what the Department of English has to offer the weekend of April 19-21.

The Department of English along with the College of Humanities and the Department of Theatre are presenting “A Pinter Festival: An International Meeting” in celebration of the 60th birthday of the world’s most important playwright, Harold Pinter.

The festival will feature one of Pinter’s most notable plays, A Kind of Alaska, which coincides with the movie. “Awakenings,” starring Robin Williams and Robert De Niro. Katherine Burkman, professor of English at Ohio State is the director of the conference which is being held at Ohio State. Burkman said that A Kind of Alaska, which is being performed by a Columbus-based group, the Stuart Pimsler Dance and Theatre Co., will be of great interest to those who enjoyed the movie.

“The play is based on a real case history from Oliver Sack’s novel, ‘Awakenings.’ Pinter’s play focuses on the first half hour of a woman’s awakening after 35 years of being asleep. The sleep epidemic actually did occur and a lot of people suffered,” Burkman said. She added that she enjoyed the movie but thinks that the Pinter play has much more depth and is perhaps a bit more of a feminist piece than the movie.

Stuart Pimsler’s dance company has immersed itself in the production of this play, Burkman said. Those who attend A Kind of Alaska after seeing Awakenings will not be disappointed, just enlightened, by the Pinter play, Burkman said.

“A Pinter Festival: An International Meeting” will be attended by 130 scholars from 8 different countries. Burkman said. The distinguishable playwright will have his works celebrated and critiqued by those in attendance. There are a great number of people that want to discuss Pinter’s works they have read.

Pinter himself will not be participating in the April conference and Burkman agrees with his decision.

“He chose not to attend but it’s appropriate for him not to come. We’re going to be talking about him and he is a very private person anyway. It would not be his style,” Burkman said.

She added that it will be easier for those attending to discuss his works without him being there.

“The festival meeting is being based on another successful conference held at Ohio State in the early 80’s celebrating the works of Samuel Beckett,” Burkman said.

The weekend workshop includes five productions by various international as well as national artists including a company from London. The Ohio State Theatre Department’s production of the play The Hothouse will be included in the weekend’s festivities.

For more information about the Pinter festival contact Katherine Burkman at 292-6866 or 292-6065.
Plants and Landscape in Literature


Plants and Landscape in Folklore


**Literary Naturalists and Horticulturists**


Muir, John. *Mountaineering Essays.* Salt Lake City, UT:


Writing students get professional advice

By Ellen Daly
Lantern staff writer

OSU students enrolled in Summer Weekend Writing Programs receive expert advice from journalism professionals.

Director William Allen, an associate professor of English at Ohio State, has recruited eight professionals with various English and journalistic backgrounds to bring their experience to the classroom.

C. Michael Curtis, senior editor of the Atlantic, has been a recurring visitor to the university since 1974. He began teaching the "Writing and Editing for a National Publication" workshop three years ago and said it is always a positive experience.

"I enjoy it because it is a different format," Curtis said. "I like to give individual attention and I'm usually sorry when it's all over."

Curtis' class on July 12 and 13 was the second of nine classes to be taught this summer. He taught tips on how to write good fiction and non-fiction stories and gave evaluations on the students' short stories in class. Curtis also advised the students on some helpful hints for submitting manuscripts to magazines.

Ray Ward, a former OSU graduate student, will teach a travel writing course August 15. Ward was the editor of Ohio Conventions Visitors Guide and has been published in Ms., Changing Homes, Columbus Monthly and the Columbus Dispatch.

Ward said the courses are beneficial to the students because they get a "behind the scenes" look at writing.

"The students get practical advice and information from people who are actively working in the field," Ward said.

Other courses offered in August include Writing for Children with Tracy Dils, Science Fiction Writing with Lois McMaster-Bujold, Humor Writing with Mike Harden of the Dispatch and Self-Publishing Today with Harden and Ward.

The summer writing courses are open to any college level student for one credit hour. They are two-day courses offered on Saturdays and Sundays from 1 p.m. to 6 p.m. every weekend until August 23,
First Hispanic to join English department

By J. P. Finet
Lantern staff writer

The OSU Department of English has acted on its commitment to recruit and retain minority students and faculty by hiring an Hispanic to teach in ethnic studies.

Jose Amaya, a doctoral student at UCLA, is the first Hispanic in OSU's Department of English to teach Latin-American studies, said Morris Beja, chair of the Department of English.

Amaya said he chose Ohio State over several other schools offering faculty positions, because Ohio State has a better track record.

"My information may be a year or two out-of-date, but I found that Ohio State has the highest number of Chicano/Latino graduate students in any English department in the United States," Amaya said.

Amaya was offered the position of assistant professor two weeks ago, said Jim Phelan, chair of the new personnel committee for the Department of English. He said Amaya, who is currently studying for his doctorate in English literature, will be teaching at Ohio State Fall Quarter.

Phelan said there were three reasons why the Department of English opened the position.

First, the Department of English thinks it is important to keep up with, reflect upon and contribute to a new understanding of American literature.

"We are concerned with the interaction between tradition and minorities," he said. "In the past... tradition has been primarily male, white, and Protestant."

Second, the department wants to show students that it is diverse and open to diversity, Phelan said.

Last, Phelan said the position was opened to address issues, rather than just interpreting Hispanic literature.

Phelan said that all of these reasons reflect the idea that the Department of English must come to terms with multiculturalism.

The department wanted to expand its program and began looking for a professor who had an interest in Latin-American studies in 1992, Beja said.

Enrique Lopez, president of the OSU Multicultural Forum at Ohio State, said that he was quite pleased with the department's decision to fill the position with an Hispanic.

"As one of the largest departments in the country, the OSU English department has taken a great stride in recruiting its first Hispanic faculty member," Lopez said.

Lopez said the hiring of Amaya was important for recruitment purposes and it shows that the university, as a whole, is attempting to comply with the Hispanic Action Plan instituted by the Office of Academic Affairs.

"As a role model, Mr. Amaya can help the department recruit Hispanic students as well as other faculty," he said.

The plan states that the university wants to increase the number of Hispanic faculty by 50 percent, from 42 to 62, by 1995.

Amaya said he wants to take an active role in recruiting Latin-American students from Ohio to come to Ohio State.

"I think there's an exciting possibility there to recruit," Amaya said. "I'm hoping to go on the road recruiting."

Lopez said he is happy with the recruitment of an Hispanic in the field of ethnic studies, but emphasized that not all minority groups are represented in ethnic studies.

"We are hoping the department will hire a Native American and an Asian-American member to round out our pursuit of multicultural studies," Lopez said.
Second annual
Writers Harvest

Sit back, relax and listen to creative writings read by their original authors at the second annual Writers Harvest.

The OSU English department will be the host of this Columbus area reading event held at 8 p.m., Oct. 5 in 311 Denney Hall.

Writers Harvest is a series of readings held simultaneously at more than 300 bookstores and college campuses across the United States.

Participating in the event, but not reading on campus, are best-selling authors William Styron, Maya Angelou, Joyce Carol Oates and Calvin Trillin.

Sally Savic, novelist and short story writer from Clintonville, and Janet Desaulniers, originally from Chicago, will be reading at Ohio State.

Savic will read two original short stories including "God's Door." Desaulniers, often published in The New Yorker magazine, will be reading her piece "The Good Fight."

"Students have a great opportunity to listen to creative original writings," said Lee Abbott, OSU English professor and coordinator of the Writers Harvest.

American Express and the Princeton Review are the national sponsors for this event which benefits hunger relief agencies.

Ninety to 95 people came to Ohio State's Writers Harvest last year which raised $750.

"This year we hope to raise $1,000," Abbott said.

"Students should be reminded how privileged they are to have food in their stomachs and the ability to read and write. (These) are not conditions enjoyed by all Americans," Abbott said.

— Megan P. O'Connor
Poet brings wisdom to OSU

By Erin Keeling
Lantern staff writer

To be a real poet one must love poetry, care about it and know it like a priest claims to know the Lord, said American Poet Albert Goldbarth during a visit Tuesday to Ohio State.

"Knowing poetry, reading it, knowing living poets, knowing dead poets, knowing American poets, knowing British poets . . . loving it intimately the way you would love another human being or even go to bed with someone or marry somebody . . . caring about it even in the cells of your body," Goldbarth said.

Goldbarth, who has had poetry published in over 12 books, read several of his poems to an estimated 65 people at Denney Hall. He came to Ohio State through the Ohio Poetry Circuit Readers program, a program sponsored by nine colleges, including Ohio State, Denison, Otterbein and the University of Cincinnati.

The nine participants combine their resources to bring one well-known poet to the universities each quarter, said David Citino, a poet and OSU English professor.

Goldbarth, a professor of humanities at Wichita State University, said poetry is his life.

"I just feel as though I was born to write poetry. It's in my blood," he said.

Goldbarth said it is hard to describe his works, most of which are free verse. In his newest book, Across the layers: poems old and new, Goldbarth's poetry ranges from 12 lines to 90 pages.

He said it would be difficult to generalize his poems. "I can only say I try to be true to the spirit and need of whatever poem is being done at the time," he said.

Goldbarth "is an original American poet," Citino said. "The reader is invariably caught off guard by a Goldbarthian poem but always sure of the poet's moral heart and soul."

Goldbarth said today's poetry is much more segregated than it was in the past. He said there are no longer many central poets, such as Robert Frost, to cluster around. "But on the other hand, (today's poetry has) a real sense of democratic excitement," he said.

Goldbarth, who grew up in Chicago and received a master's in fine arts from the University of Iowa, was first published when he was in his early 20s. He said he tries to make time for writing everyday.
AMERICAN INDIAN WRITER WILL READ FROM WORKS AT OHIO STATE

COLUMBUS -- Sherman Alexie, an American Indian writer, will read selections from his work Tuesday, Oct. 4, at 7 p.m. in the Conference Theatre of the Ohio Union, 1739 N. High St. on The Ohio State University campus.

The performance is free and open to the public. A reception will be held immediately afterward.

Alexie's appearance is co-sponsored by Retention Services in Ohio State's Office of Minority Affairs, the American Indian Council, and the Department of English. The program is made possible in part by the Ohio Humanities Council and the National Endowment of the Humanities.

The event is an opportunity for the community to share a unique perspective of the American Indian experience as presented by this highly acclaimed young author.

Alexie writes from his own experiences growing up on the Spokane Indian Reservation. His stories and poems are filled with passion and affection, yet they echo the irony, anger and pain of reservation life. They vividly depict everyday life -- the alcohol, the children, car accidents, basketball games and romances. He describes the distances between people: between Indians and whites, reservation Indians and urban Indians, men and women, and most poetically, between contemporary Indians and the traditional figures from their past.

At 28, he has acquired a remarkable literary reputation very quickly. He was first published in Hanging Loose magazine in 1990. Since then, he has published more than 300 poems, stories

Alexie's first book of poetry and short stories, The Business of Fancydancing, was selected as a "1992 Notable Book of the Year" by The New York Times Book Review; and his second collection, I Would Steal Horses was winner of Slipstream's fifth annual Chapbook Contest in March 1992. He was awarded a National Endowment for the Arts Poetry Fellowship in 1992. This year, he won the Annual New Writer's Award from the Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) for a first book of fiction, The Lone Ranger and Tonto Fistfight in Heaven (1993).

The New York Times Book Review described Alexie's work as "...so wide ranging, dexterous, and consistently capable of raising your neck hair that it enters at once into our ideas of who we are and how we might be, makes us speak and hear his words over and over, call others into the room or over the phone to repeat them."

Kirkus, in its starred review, said "irony, grim humor, and forgiveness help characters transcend pain, anger, and loss while the same qualities make it possible to read Alexie's fiction without succumbing to hopelessness.... Forgiveness seems to be the last moral/ethical value left standing: the ability both to judge and love gives the book its searing yet affectionate honesty."

Alexie, a member of the Spokane and Coeur d'Alene tribal nations, is from Wellpinit, Wash., on the Spokane Indian Reservation. He was educated at Gonzaga University in Pullman, Wash. He currently lives and works in Seattle, Wash.

#

NOTE TO REPORTERS AND EDITORS: For more information or to arrange an interview with the author, please contact Rebecca Nelson or Marti Chaatsmith of Retention Services in the Office of Minority Affairs, (614) 292-8732.
One of the hundreds of adult learners who have enrolled in ALP’s evening ESL program, Hiroko Kinoshita is a visiting instructor of Japanese at Kenyon College.

Another ALP student who is doing something great!
The American Language Program at Ohio State offers English as a Second Language instruction in four formats:

Intensive Program for International Students
- 10-week sessions, 20-25 hours per week
- all skills areas – listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary
- four levels of instruction, Elementary through Advanced
- small class size and Ohio State student status
- admission provides a certificate of eligibility for a student visa (F-1)

Classes for Ohio State Students
- classes in pronunciation, listening, speaking, reading, writing, and grammar
- eligibility for Tuition Assistance Program for faculty and staff

Non-credit Evening Classes for the Community
- one or two evenings each week
- small class size, with emphasis on communication and in-class practice
- a variety of offerings – pronunciation, conversation, grammar review, vocabulary development, and TOEFL preparation

Custom Programming
- ESL curriculum design and programming for your department
- contact the Director for additional information at 292-1364
Joseph V. Denney, the Land-Grant Mission, and Rhetorical Education at Ohio State: An Institutional History

Annie S. Mendenhall

One of the most pressing questions for historians of composition today is how to make local histories of individuals or institutions speak back to the dominant historical narrative of the field—a narrative that nearly always begins with Adams Sherman Hill's development of English A at Harvard in 1874. As origin and historical archetype of composition, Harvard marks the decline of real rhetorical practice and instruction (Kitzhaber; Goggin; Berlin) and the beginning of composition's marginalization as a course, field, and discipline (Connors, Composition-Rhetoric). In an effort to combat this simplistic origins narrative, historians have recently called for local historical narratives to complicate or outright contradict the Harvard origins story. For example, David Gold's Rhetoric at the Margins asks us to "continue to complement broadly drawn, comprehensive master narratives with finely-grained local and institutional microhistories" (7). Similarly, Gretchen Flescher Moon, in her introduction to the collection Local Histories, suggests that as new histories of individuals and institutions emerge, we "might begin to tease out several potential alternative histories"—broader histories not narrowly focused on Harvard and the emergence of first-year writing (3). These and other scholars have shown that writing instruction in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was far more variable than we have previously assumed. Local histories, then, prove valuable because they reflect the diversity of institutional goals and initiatives that have been effaced in composition history.

In an effort to enact this revisionist model for local history, this essay provides an account of The Ohio State University's (OSU) rhetoric department during the tenure of Joseph Villiers Denney, arguing that he appropriated and repurposed

Annie S. Mendenhall is a PhD candidate and graduate teaching associate in the English department at The Ohio State University. She is currently writing a dissertation on the history of professionalization in composition and rhetoric.
national trends in education and rhetoric in ways that complicate the narrative of rhetoric and composition's decline in the late nineteenth century. Denney has figured on the periphery of composition history since Albert Kitzhaber's *Rhetoric in American Colleges*, but he has received little attention from historians. David Russell alone has discussed Denney's innovation of discipline-specific and vocation-specific writing courses at Ohio State (58–59), but has not provided a detailed account of Denney's work. Recently, Lisa Mastrangelo has called for additional research on Denney's and other progressive educators' contributions to the history of rhetoric. She notes that little research has been conducted on Denney's work at Ohio State, despite his collaborations with Fred Newton Scott, a figure lionized in rhetoric and composition because of his well-known rhetoric department at the University of Michigan.

In this essay, I address these gaps in our knowledge about Denney by providing an account of his fourteen-year tenure as head of Ohio State's Department of Rhetoric and his later work as chair of the English department and dean of the College of Arts, Philosophy, and Science. Beginning with his hire in 1891, Denney negotiated fluctuating attitudes toward research and expansions in higher education by arguing for a scientific conception of rhetoric that served both vocational and academic ends. In doing so, he adapted progressive approaches to his institutional context, establishing rhetoric as a significant feature of university curricula and developing a writing program that allowed students to work within their field of interest. Using a variety of archival evidence, including course catalogues, annual reports, faculty meeting minutes, and Denney's writings, I detail how Denney's attitudes about rhetoric underpinned his department's curriculum.

In addition to recovering Denney's educational ideals, I argue that the institutional context in which Denney worked also shaped the curriculum. In doing so, I emphasize the impact of local contexts in mediating national and regional educational trends. Ohio State articulated its institutional identity very differently from Harvard, Yale, or the University of Michigan (three of the most prominent institutions of higher education figured in histories of composition and rhetoric). At Ohio State, Denney's Department of Rhetoric grew, instead of declining around the turn of the century, and then at its height, it merged with literary studies into a consolidated Department of English. The unusual success of the Department of Rhetoric (at a time when, according to most historians, rhetoric was declining in academia) was a result not only of Denney's progressive ideals and his influence as dean of the College of Arts, Philosophy, and Science, but also of Ohio State's commitment to land-grant values of practical and democratic education. While practical courses of instruction were eschewed at more elite institutions as remedial or unscientific, they remained integral to Ohio State's definition of itself from its founding well into the twentieth century.
Throughout this essay, I examine the ways that the rhetoric department at Ohio State navigated shifts in educational structures and definitions of rhetoric and English studies around the turn of the twentieth century. I begin by describing a set of tensions between practical and liberal education that informed curriculum development at many land-grant institutions, and Ohio State specifically. In the next sections, I explain how these tensions created a space in which Denney could develop a rhetoric program that attempted to appeal to both the practical values of the applied science programs and the academic values in the emerging university. The success of this curricular division led to the expansion of the department's faculty and course work and the creation of a graduate focus in rhetoric. To conclude, I discuss how the decision to remerge the Department of Rhetoric with the Department of English Literature at Ohio State complicates the narrative of "the end of rhetoric" given by Kitzhaber, Robert Connors, James Berlin, Maureen Daly Goggin, and others. Typically, this narrative asserts that because rhetoric could not establish itself as a science, it became a remedial course in the new research-model university. However, Ohio State's history, which has been ignored or overlooked in nearly every history of the field, complicates the narrative of the supposed incompatibility of research and rhetoric in the early twentieth century. Rather, it suggests that the problem was not that rhetoric and composition collapsed into one remedial entity, but rather that rhetoric and literary criticism were conflated in ways that made the work of the English and rhetoric departments—courses, faculty assignments, and funding allocations—overlap and thus compete. Rhetoric did not so much disappear as assume other names: criticism and composition.

In composing this history of Denney's work, I have emphasized throughout my own belief that the influence of larger disciplinary and academic trends is contingent upon the values and goals of the local institutional context. As Elizabeth Renker argues in her comparative institutional history of American literature, "[T]he historical phenomenon of the curriculum is not regular but variable and contingent. Curricula might or might not vary from school to school within and across specific time periods" (1). Understanding disciplines, departments, and curricula as historical phenomena that shift based on both internal and external pressures may help us navigate our own vastly different workplaces in an effort to understand the discipline's current (and future) location in the university. Citing Denney as an example, I suggest that a more nuanced history of our discipline and its location(s) helps us avoid oversimplifying historical narratives of composition, and provides ways of articulating our historical identity differently—apart from a conflation of the field with required first-year composition.
BACKGROUND AND CONTEXTS: THE LAND-GRANT MISSION AND THE ROLE OF RHETORICAL EDUCATION AT OHIO STATE

In a letter to the board of trustees in 1896, OSU president James H. Canfield wrote,

[It is not a question of what is being done by Germany and the German schools, or by Harvard and by the Massachusetts schools, or by Yale and the Connecticut schools, or by Columbia and the New York schools, but what can be done here and now by the Ohio State University and by the Ohio public schools. The Ohio State University must be, ought to be, and will be for Ohio what either of the institutions named is for its own constituency [...] but it will not be these institutions simply transplanted. (The Ohio State University, 26th Annual Report 35)

Canfield's remark demonstrates the ways in which national and local contexts intersect to shape an institution's ideology and curricula. On the one hand, Canfield highlighted Ohio State's commitment to the needs of the local community. On the other hand, however, the very fact that Canfield felt the need to emphasize Ohio State's commitment to serving the community suggests that the university experienced pressure to shape Ohio State in the likeness of more prestigious universities. This tension between national and local pressures highlights the ways that local institutions always resist or reinterpret national trends. To understand the emergence of the rhetoric department at Ohio State, then, we need to understand how this pull between national and local educational demands created a space for rhetoric to provide both practical and academic areas of study.

Significant to understanding Canfield's remark is the fact that, unlike Yale, Harvard, and Columbia, Ohio State began as a land-grant university and thus had a distinctive commitment to the ideal of utility in education. Founded as Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College: (Ohio A&M) in 1870, Ohio State was required by the Morrill Act of 1862 to emphasize practical education in the areas of agriculture, mechanics, and military instruction without neglecting "other scientific and classical studies"—a phrase open to interpretation (Thelin 76). Historians of higher education agree that this dual (but unequal) emphasis on technical education and traditional liberal studies created an ambiguity that was a subject of contention in land-grant institutions (Thelin 76-77; see also Veysey; Renker). At Ohio State, notes university historian James Pollard, the role of liberal education was a divisive issue among the founding board of trustees: "A major issue of the formative period concerned the nature and scope of the as yet unborn College: [...] whether it should take the utmost advantage of the language of the Morrill Act or confine itself to a minimum practical program which would make it vocational rather than educational" (16). The board finally voted in favor of a larger scope for the university, and in 1878 they changed the name of the institution to The Ohio State University to represent this new direction.

However, the name change did not ease the tension between practical and liberal
studies. The university felt that it needed to “meet the demand both for thorough instruction in special subjects and for a broad and liberal culture” (The Ohio State University, 21st Annual Report 38), and yet the university also recognized that “the physical and natural sciences and their applications in the industries of life are assigned a leading place by the law to which the institution owes its origin and the laws by which its endowment has been enlarged” (43). Consequently, institutional decisions needed to navigate rhetorically both the demands for practical scientific education that remained part of the land-grant ethos and the push to provide a broad liberal education. The rhetorical force of practicality continued to influence university ideals well into the twentieth century. In 1891, the year that Denney was hired, vocational education remained the university’s primary, but not exclusive, focus. University president W. H. Scott wrote in the Annual Report for that year, “All agree that scientific and technical instruction has a primary claim to recognition in any policy that may be adopted for the university” (The Ohio State University, 21st Annual Report 43). Although utility was everywhere emphasized, Ohio State was not immune from the burgeoning influence of the utility ideal. If Scott emphasized utility in his term as president (1883–95), Canfield’s term (1895–99) ushered in a new era for Ohio State, as it attempted to establish itself as a university (Rudolph 348). The injunction to provide a liberal education for students became complicated as higher education underwent numerous structural and ideological changes in the late nineteenth century.

One of the most important changes for the purpose of this history is that higher education increasingly became influenced by a penchant for scientific research and scholarly specialization brought to America from the German educational system. In a more material sense, this meant that universities began to develop fledgling graduate programs and to proliferate departments, schools, and colleges. Yet even as Ohio State began to emphasize research in order to compete for students and resources, no single university ideal provided a standard to follow. As historian Frederick Rudolph explains, despite the popularity of the “university ideal” in the latter half of the nineteenth century, “the road to university purpose, function, or status was in no sense clearly defined” (331). As Rudolph’s remark suggests, attitudes toward research and science—hallmarks of the German university system—were not as clear-cut as scholars in rhetoric and composition have made them out to be. The fervor for science was complicated by an increasing ambiguity about what exactly scientific study meant.

Understanding how this ambiguity about science and the university ideal affected rhetorical education differently in various locations is central to revising claims about rhetoric’s demise in higher education. Previously, many composition historians have argued along with Connors that rhetoric declined because it “is a field not easily made scientific, and thus it was not lifted with the other boats by the
great positivist tide of German science in the period 1780–1850” (*Composition-Rhetoric* 178). Connors’s and others’ claims about rhetoric’s failure rest on the assumption that the incorporation of German attitudes toward scientific research in American institutions was a smooth process with little institutional variability. Ohio State proves differently, as does Rudolph’s comment that “the United States in its universities was to reveal a remarkable diversity, an unwillingness to be categorized, a variety that would encompass differences in wealth, leadership, public influence, regional needs” (332). In fact, Connors’s estimation of the shift in university education is at best an exaggeration. This narrative of rhetoric’s defeat in the face of German science needs to be attenuated by a more nuanced depiction of the ways in which institutions received, appropriated, or rejected arguments about what a university should be.

Evidence suggests, rather, that scientific values entered the university in contradictory ways, as Danette Paul and Ann Blakeslee discuss in “Inventing the American Research University.” They explain, “Science rhetorically positioned itself in American culture by playing up its connection to middle-class capitalist values of practicality, progress, and individuality while also appealing to a pure research ideal” (266). The rhetoric of science was fundamentally conflicted, and further, the extent to which particular values (utility versus research) exerted influence fluctuated in different kinds of institutions (Thelin 116). In the land-grant context, “science” differed significantly. As Renker explains in her history of Ohio State, “In the world of agricultural and mechanical education in particular, ‘science’ meant applied rather than pure science, and thus served the realm of the practical that land-grant rhetoric liked to call ‘the work of the world’” (105). In many educational contexts, science merely signified “an organizational ethos that prized order and efficiency” (Thelin 114). Further, Laurence Veysey explains, the concept of science was initially “optimistically all-embracing” (135), and “as science took on these new connotations, it became impossible for professors to agree on who among their number actually worked in a scientific manner” (134). Although a “shifting signifier,” science clearly possessed cultural capital within the national educational context. However, science functioned differently as an “available means of persuasion” at Ohio State than it did at Johns Hopkins University or Harvard.

Nowhere was this ambiguity toward science more apparent than in the rhetoric department at Ohio State. The competing national and institutional attitudes toward practicality, science, and liberal education intersected at OSU around the same time that Denney was hired to head a new Department of Rhetoric, placing pressure on him to establish a practical and scientific curriculum that would impart meaningful knowledge to students attending the university for different purposes. When Denney was hired at OSU in 1891 with only a BA and a few years of experience as a high school principal, he had just completed a year of teaching rhetoric with Fred Newton Scott and taking graduate courses at the University of Michigan (although he never
completed a degree there). Despite what today would seem a lack of credentials, the university hired Denney as an assistant professor and placed him as head of a newly created Department of Rhetoric. Although the university's interest in developing a rhetoric program predated Denney's hire, Denney was praised for making "the methods of instruction [...] even more thorough and practical" while still ensuring that "the theory of the subject is carefully taught" (The Ohio State University, 24th Annual Report 26). Denney's interest in creating courses "with special or professional ends in view" and his emphasis on "writing with a purpose and an occasion" meshed well with the land-grant institution's emphasis on utility (Denney, "College" 51). Real, practical, and scientific—terms circulating at the time among progressive educators and in rhetoric textbooks—became buzzwords that Denney and the university used to defend composition instruction. As a result, the rhetoric department gained momentum while more prominent institutions relegated composition to first-year or high school curricula.

**Advocating a Scientific Approach: Denney as Professor of Rhetoric**

The early years of Denney's time at Ohio State were marked by curricular experimentation and a strong commitment to practical writing instruction. To that end, Denney created new courses that served the interests of both vocational students and students pursuing academic courses of study. In both types of courses, Denney emphasized a "scientific" approach to rhetoric. The appropriation of science by rhetorical educators was relatively common and took a range of forms. John Genung, for example, used the term laboratory to describe his method of teaching writing. Fred Newton Scott advocated scientific study of rhetoric, arguing that "the practical side of instruction [...] must be continually freshened and stimulated by ideas from above" ("Rhetoric" 413), and Gertrude Buck asserted that psychology and sociology had much to offer the study of rhetoric (54). Additionally, the "Report of the Pedagogical Section: The Graduate Study of Rhetoric" of the Modern Language Association (MLA) indicates that several others viewed rhetoric as a science (see Brereton 186–202).

Like these educators, Denney used science to position the rhetoric and composition curriculum within the dominant discourse of the university. The key to his success was the continuing ambiguity of "science" in the late nineteenth century. Both because applied science had such rhetorical force at OSU and because the meaning of science was still relatively flexible, Denney could appropriate its rhetoric effectively in his institutional context. In fact, Denney's work during his first year at OSU earned him the praise of the university president, then W. H. Scott, who called the results of the English department's split into a Department of Rhetoric and a Department of English Literature "gratifying," and reassured the board of
trustees of the merit of Denney’s hire and the new rhetoric department (The Ohio State University, 22nd Annual Report 42).

Denney’s appeals to science represent a significant shift from the university’s prior rhetoric instruction. Before Denney’s hire, Alfred Welsh, author of several rhetoric and composition textbooks, including the popular Complete Rhetoric, taught English A (Rhetoric) as a course that meshed a belles-lettres approach, popular among most nineteenth century rhetoricians, with a modern emphasis on written rhetoric. Although Welsh’s first-year course was deemed necessary and required of all students, it did not attempt to insert itself into the practical and scientific rhetoric of the university. It remained a single course of study, and it represented the neoclassical liberal curriculum more than practical or scientific studies. Denney, on the other hand, appropriated the rhetoric of science by proposing at the first faculty meeting he attended to change the required first-year rhetoric course to a course titled the Science of Rhetoric (Faculty Council Vol. 2 399).

Denney’s proposal met with success, and the course was offered immediately (see appendix for an outline of courses in the department). What made this course scientific for Denney was its emphasis on providing an efficient method of learning to write. Over three terms, students in the Science of Rhetoric moved from writing sentences to paragraphs to essays. The course followed a progression similar to Fred Newton Scott and Denney’s approach in their textbook Paragraph-Writing, which modified and popularized Alexander Bain’s paragraph-based writing pedagogy (Connors, Composition-Rhetoric 230–31). Scott and Denney’s approach saw the paragraph as a basic structural unit in which the student could learn to discover “the common tools of expression” most efficiently (Denney, “College” 51). After mastering the paragraph in the first and second terms, first-year students would compose essays in the third term using the methods of rhetorical analysis and textual criticism (The Ohio State University, Catalogue 1892–1893 45). Though modern readers may puzzle over the idea that such a course represented a scientific method, at the time it appealed strongly to educational ideals. By claiming that he taught rhetoric in a scientific way, Denney could underscore the efficiency and effectiveness of his pedagogy, as he did in his 1894 MLA talk, “College Rhetoric.” There, he justified this scientific approach by arguing that it provided a systematic method of instruction, in which students advanced from writing sentences to paragraphs to essays, and once those forms of discourse were learned, students practiced composing different genres. Denney claimed that this progression proved more practical and efficient—hence more scientific—than a traditional approach structured around the four modes of description, narration, exposition, and argumentation (40).

But Denney did not isolate writing instruction to a single first-year course. In fact, he introduced two sophomore/junior-level writing courses based on the idea that students should practice writing in their areas of vocational and academic interest.
In place of required rhetoricals, or theme-writing courses, which had been taught, Denney suggested two new advanced composition-rhetoric courses, an Advanced Rhetoric course geared toward students in the College of Arts, Philosophy, and Science, and a Practical Rhetoric course for students in the College of Engineering (Faculty Council Vol. 2 399). By dividing advanced writing instruction in this way, Denney provided one writing course that emphasized liberal education for students in the liberal arts course of study, and one writing course that emphasized vocational writing for students preparing for engineering careers—a rhetorically savvy move, given the history of conflict over the purpose of Ohio State’s curriculum.

As preparation for a liberal arts course of study, Advanced Rhetoric supplied students with additional experience in rhetorical analysis and textual criticism. For Denney, rhetorical analysis was not an end in itself—not “a study of the gross and trivial matters of grammatical and rhetorical structure”—but a means of “discovering literary structure” and “teaching how the difficulties of writing have been met and overcome” (“Two Problems” 3). In other words, rhetorical analysis for Denney examined both the aesthetics and the situational constraints of a text. Significantly, then, Denney diverged from a strictly belletristic understanding of rhetorical criticism, which asserted that practice in criticism and a knowledge of aesthetics could both improve students’ taste and improve their writing ability. As Nan Johnson explains in Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America, criticism became integral to composition because it was seen to feed directly into students’ powers of eloquence by training them to develop taste and an appreciation of literature (216).

However, Denney argued that the cultivation of taste and the knowledge of vocabulary, rhythm, and language were not the main goals of critical reading (“Two Problems” 3). Instead, he advocated critical reading for its ability to “help to detect the elements of a thought or of a situation which have been selected and abstracted by the author read” (4). In other words, Denney did not necessarily disavow the role of taste in composition instruction; rather, he subordinated it in favor of reading practices that emphasized analyzing the author’s writing as a response to a particular rhetorical situation. Moreover, he asserted that only direct instruction in composition can teach a student “the power to organize his own ideas, in written or oral speech, the power to deal with situations of which he is himself a vital part” (5). As Sharon Crowley notes, Denney was among the first of many to insist that reading alone would not suffice for writing instruction (92).

In stressing aesthetic criticism, the Advanced Rhetoric course was in many ways typical of nineteenth-century scholastic approaches to rhetoric. Yet Denney constructed the course to allow students to pursue their own research interests—an attempt to incorporate the elective principle into an otherwise required course. As he explained, students in this course could choose to specialize in one of three areas during the later two terms of the course: stylistic analysis, aesthetic criticism, or the
history of rhetorical theory ("College" 48–49). The students who took the stylistic analysis track—the track most oriented toward philological studies—composed reports on questions borrowed from Fred Newton Scott's *Principles of Style*, which included such topics as "Paragraph Structure in Macaulay’s Essay on Johnson" or "Word Coinage in Carlyle’s Sartor Resartus" ("College" 49). Students in the criticism track prepared to enter courses in English literature by composing reports about how professional critics assessed literature. Denney suggested, for example, having a student read both an essay by Thomas Carlyle and a critical essay on Carlyle by Richard H. Huttons. After this reading, the student would compose an essay that summarized and explained the critic’s assessment of Carlyle and then either confirm, dispute, or temper Hutton's assessment by analyzing a section of the Carlyle essay in question (50). The final specialization—the history of rhetoric—Denney described (somewhat vaguely) as the application of historical methodology to the field of rhetoric. In allowing students to elect particular courses of study, Denney argued, the opportunity for specialization made rhetoric "more scientific and precise in its methods, aims" (50). These academic courses of study immersed students in specialized research practices.

Unlike the Advanced Rhetoric course, the Practical Rhetoric course taught students professional genres rather than research methods and rhetorical theories. The course also represented one of the first writing courses specifically geared toward the needs and interests of engineering students beyond the first year. The College of Engineering required engineering students to take Practical Rhetoric in either their sophomore or junior year, depending on their focus (The Ohio State University, *Catalogue 1892–1893* 45–46). Spanning three terms of study, the course's units each focused on a different activity designed to prepare students for writing in the profession. In the first term, students were taught to analyze the "literary characteristics and methods of noted writers on technical subjects" (45). According to Denney, the material for stylistic analysis in this course included engineering journals and the writings of influential scientists such as Thomas Huxley and John Tyndall ("College" 50–51). In the second term of the course, students composed articles on technical subjects related to their field of interest. In his description of the course, Denney noted that, unlike Advanced Rhetoric, the Practical Rhetoric course avoided abstruse theoretical discussions:

Instead of having work in criticism and rhetorical theory, the technical students are introduced to magazine work, each reporting frequently on a magazine chosen by himself in the line of his own specialty. [. . .] Practice is afforded in presenting the results of experiments and of laboratory work, looking to preparation for thesis writing, and articles are required, at regular intervals, on subjects in the line of each student's main work. ("College" 51)
Distinguishing the vocational rhetoric course from the liberal one, Denney stressed that the processes of analysis and criticism equipped engineering students to understand the genres that they would use in the profession.

By the late 1890s, this Practical Rhetoric course also opened to students in medicine, agriculture, domestic science, and pharmacy, as well as engineering. Despite the range of interests represented by these different vocational tracks, Denney stressed that the study should be individualized as much as possible. Denney justified this approach by arguing that "[a] subject like advanced Rhetoric, in these days of specialization, will hardly be entered upon with zest by a student of engineering unless it can be plainly and vitally connected with his special work" ("College" 48). In pursuit of this goal, students chose their own readings for rhetorical analysis from their field of study, creating an opportunity to develop practical knowledge of their field in addition to learning to write in vocation-specific genres such as memos, reports, and technical magazine articles (The Ohio State University, 29th Annual Report II 158). Although Russell writes that many early technical writing courses became merely a study of mechanics and form (123), Denney promoted a knowledge of scientific discourses and asked that students practice composing these discourses.

Denney provided more information about this early curriculum design in his MLA presentation, "College Rhetoric." The OSU curriculum, he explained, attempted to come as close as possible to an ideal of individualized instruction according to students’ individual "lines of work." While the first-year course covered paragraph and essay structure—topics he believed related to all students’ work—subsequent years of course work in the rhetoric department allowed students the "possibility of correlating in part the work in Rhetoric with that of other university departments" (47). The goal was that students would "attempt the production of real journeyman work," and Denney even advocated that college rhetoric instructors find real outlets for student work "in the college or city papers, in the college magazines, and in the literary, technical, and scientific societies" (51–52). Given the general devaluation of student writing that followed the literacy crisis of the 1870s and the Harvard reports of the 1890s, Denney’s proposal to seek publication venues for student writing seems unusual, and indicates his commitment to asking students to consider audience and situation as integral to the composing process.

Denney’s courses suggest that the conflict over the purpose of Ohio State as an institution of higher education manifested itself in material ways in the curriculum. The Department of Rhetoric responded to internal pressures by the board of trustees and the technical colleges to teach both academic and vocational students according to the different educational goals of each. The structure of the rhetoric department’s early curriculum allowed Denney to minimize conflict over the purpose of rhetorical studies by splitting students into separate groups based on their career goals. Because
of the focus on vocational preparation in the Practical Rhetoric course, proponents of technical education could not argue that rhetoric was impractical for technical students. At the same time, those who desired Ohio State to provide a broad liberal education could not argue that rhetoric was an entirely practical subject without academic merit. This division between academic and vocational courses would define the rhetoric program at Ohio State for the next decade.

**Integrating Vocationalism and Research: The Expansion of the Rhetoric Department**

The Department of Rhetoric (renamed the Department of Rhetoric and English Language in 1894) experienced considerable growth in the late 1890s and early 1900s. Writing courses in particular professional genres proliferated, but in conjunction with these courses there appeared upper-division courses in rhetoric. The latter actually worked for rather than against the scientific conception of the curriculum Denney promoted, as they provided new opportunities for research and specialization in rhetoric. Suddenly, course work appeared that involved "special investigations," "an introduction to methods of research and use of material," and perhaps most significantly, the production of a thesis in rhetoric (The Ohio State University, *29th Annual Report II*, 156). This conception of rhetoric as an area of advanced study and research became possible precisely because attitudes toward science and definitions of the university had not crystallized and remained highly variable. As John Thelin explains,

> In terms of intellectual and curricular movements, several conceptions of higher learning coexisted with varying degrees of conflict and cooperation. "Piety and discipline," "liberal culture," "utility," and "research" were some of the traditions invoked by academic visionaries and entrepreneurs. Within each emergent university, these disparate, often conflicting notions took on varying configurations. (116)

Science as efficiency and science as pure research remained two different approaches to rhetoric, yet both informed the direction the department would take.

The years around the turn of the century were marked by curricular growth and experimentation within the rhetoric department (and throughout higher education in the United States). Although rhetoric at other institutions was often relegated to a required first-year composition course, at OSU it became a legitimate course of study for both undergraduate and graduate students. In this way Denney maintained a program similar to the one that Fred Newton Scott chaired at Michigan, a fact unsurprising given that they continued to correspond and published several textbooks together throughout both of their careers. At Ohio State, undergraduates interested in rhetoric could pursue an English course in philosophy, resulting in a BPh or BA,
and graduate students in pursuit of an MA could opt to study rhetoric as either a major or one of two minor courses of studies. Additionally, three core faculty joined the department: Joseph R. Taylor, who held a BA from Ohio State, and who had worked previously as Denney’s manuscript reader; George McKnight, a philologist with a PhD from Cornell University, who taught courses in composition and the history of the English language; and William L. Graves, an early graduate student of Denney’s who began teaching in 1895 after completing his master’s degree. Other faculty would come and go, but these three men, referred to in the department’s history as the “trinity” (Dasher 38), were still teaching with Denney when he retired, and remained at OSU for the rest of their careers.

With the expansion of the teaching force, Denney, still head of the department, began to expand the course offerings. By 1899, for example, the department listed thirteen courses for the first semester and sixteen for the second semester.11 Some of these courses covered topics in the history of the English language, and others were public speaking courses absorbed into the department from the now-defunct elocution program. New rhetoric and composition courses, on the other hand, tended to follow the split into vocational (or writing) courses and liberal (or rhetorical criticism) courses. This division, however, did not generally prevent the practical courses from incorporating critical reading or the liberal courses from incorporating practice in writing—these literacy practices were seen as interdependent. In fact, some of the courses involved collaboration across departments, connecting criticism, composition, and public speaking. For example, one two-semester course titled the Study of a Novel for its Dramatic Elements required the collaboration of three professors: students studied the dramatic elements of a novel under the direction of an English literature professor, recast the novel into a play under the direction of a professor of rhetoric, and then actually put the play into production under the direction of the instructor in public speaking12 (The Ohio State University, 29th Annual Report II 155–56). Additionally, a course titled Brief-Making and Argumentation, which also covered two semesters of study, involved critically examining notable speeches, preparing debates, and writing briefs under the guidance of a rhetoric instructor, and then performing these debates with guidance and criticism from the public speaking instructor (155–56). The existence of these kinds of courses demonstrates the flexibility and degree of experimentation that marked the years of growth in the rhetoric department.

In other areas of study, practices of criticism and writing were split into separate courses in order to prepare academic and vocational students differently. This split is evident in the course work the department offered in the study and production of “prose.” On the one hand, a course titled Prose Writing, later renamed Rapid Writing, proposed to train journalism students in the writing and editing of newspaper articles. Conversely, Analysis of English Prose involved rhetorical analysis,
the study of style, and recitations of prose literature, with only one day a week out of four providing practice in expository composition—the mode in which the academic critic of literature composed (The Ohio State University, 29th Annual Report II 155). Because the department also supported the English language and philology courses, the historical study of prose was separated from the production and analysis of prose. For example, the Development of English Prose course offered a “rapid survey of the history of idiom and of the practical resources of the language” (157). As these three different prose courses suggest, with the expansion of course work in rhetoric came increased specialization in different lines of work.

The growth of genre and profession-specific courses demonstrates Denney’s recognition that with increasingly specialized professional and academic cultures, students needed to learn profession-specific genres, not merely rules of grammar, punctuation, and logic. Denney emphasized genre as the final stage of his scientific approach to writing instruction—following paragraph and essay composition (“College” 40). He strongly disagreed with views of composition that dissociated form from thought, and instead argued that if students wrote with particular situations and audiences in mind, “even questions of punctuation would acquire importance as thought-questions, rather than as form questions” (“Two Problems” 8). Among the vocational courses added in the late 1890s were two Advanced Composition courses, one for students in the applied sciences and one for students in the College of Arts, Philosophy, and Science. Both were elective course for students who wanted additional writing practice (The Ohio State University, 29th Annual Report II 158). The latter course had a yearly rotating course theme, and possible topics included short stories, rapid writing for journalism students, editorial work, criticism and book reviews, poetics, essays, speeches, argumentative brief making, and debate (The Ohio State University, Catalogue 1894–1895 87). Nearly all of these topics became separate courses by the early 1900s. Such courses were designed to prepare lawyers, critics, newspaper writers, business students, and writers for the writing they would encounter after completing their degree.

However, the courses added to the catalogue were not all geared toward professions outside the academy; the department also added a research course. This course had multiple titles: Rhetorical Theory and Criticism; Problems in Rhetoric and Criticism. Sometimes it was even listed as two separate courses. But always, it was designed to introduce students to research methods and to provide “lectures on the principles of style, and theories of rhetoric as historically developed, accompanied by special investigations of rhetorical problems with reports and discussions” (The Ohio State University, 30th Annual Report II 160). This course, which Denney frequently taught, was aimed at both undergraduate and graduate students who intended to write a thesis in either one of the departments of English. Records from several annual reports indicate that anywhere from six to fifteen students each year took the
yearlong course from 1896–1904, with an average of around ten. Existing records of thesis titles listed in the commencement bulletins suggest that rhetorical theory, and its relationship to literature or popular prose (such as journalism), were common
topics, although one particular MA thesis titled “Reading and English Composition in 40 Ungraded Rural Schools of Ohio” by John Bernard Parker suggests that composition also commanded scholarly attention. Without more detailed records of these documents, we cannot know exactly what form they took, especially given the extent of institutional variability during this time. Yet as Russell outlines in detail, the thesis was imported from German scholarship practices as the culmination of a course or a degree that represented an “original contribution” to a specialized area of study (80). The addition of a required thesis for an upper-level undergraduate or graduate course certainly suggests the extent to which this new scholarly discourse of research gained capital within the rhetoric department.

Although graduate students apparently trained under Denney as early as 1891 (Dasher 23), no separate graduate course in rhetoric existed until the 1901–1902 academic year, when the department began to offer a separate Rhetorical Theory and Criticism course for MA students. This course remained in place for several years, even after the departments of rhetoric and English literature remerged. Topics ranged from the “Development of Rhetorical Ideas,” taught by McKnight in the 1904–1905 academic year, to the “History of Rhetoric,” taught by Denney in the 1905–1906 academic year (The Ohio State University, 34 Annual Report II 147). The lack of detail in records of graduate students during this time makes it difficult to tell how many graduate students specialized in rhetoric or what were their areas of interest. However, lists in yearly annual reports indicate that several graduate students received fellowships in the Department of Rhetoric and English Language. That none of these students pursued academic careers in rhetoric probably indicates both the uncertain purpose of the MA degree and the dearth of academic careers in rhetoric. Yet growth in opportunities for graduate students to take courses and receive fellowships demonstrates the extent to which rhetoric became a legitimate course of study in the university.

Denney’s popularity with students apparently also filled classes, according to Nancy Dasher, author of the 1970 history of OSU’s English department, who writes, “Those still living who worked with or studied under him can testify to his eloquence, his persuasiveness, and his charm” (19). Additionally, the 1905 yearbook, the Makio, was dedicated to Denney with an inscription that described him as “an honest and inspiring teacher, a tactful and friendly man, and a tireless servant of the University.” Denney’s career at Ohio State during this time proved to be extremely successful—he was promoted to full professor in 1894, served as secretary of the faculty, became dean of the College of Arts, Philosophy, and Science in 1901, and was named temporary acting president of the university in 1909, even as he served
on numerous other committees over the years. The department history refers to him as a Moses with no need of an Aaron (Dasher 19), and an obituary in the Columbus Dispatch claimed, “Ohio State University is in no small part the lengthened shadow of Professor Joseph Villiers Denney, beloved and admired by thousands of men and women who learned from him the charm of culture and the pleasure of learning” (The Ohio State University, Biographical Files). Although I hesitate to describe the success of the department as a cult of character, Denney’s visibility within the university probably contributed in some way to the department’s growth. All accounts suggest that Denney was both a skilled rhetorician and an educational opportunist, which facilitated his work developing the department and advancing educational causes at Ohio State and across state high schools.

The expansion of Ohio State’s rhetoric department demonstrates an alternate pattern of development for rhetoric and composition. Goggin argues that rhetoric everywhere was reduced to a “managerial practice” (13) as “the lines between rhetoric and composition were becoming increasingly blurred” (24). She writes, “What exacerbated the problem for rhetoric was a modernist severing of the long-standing ties between rhetoric and poetics” (16). The course work in OSU’s rhetoric department—and its commitment to “research” and “utility”—do not support Goggin’s claims about rhetorical education. Rhetoric and composition remained interdependent but differentiated practices of criticism and writing. Composition was not isolated to a single first-year course, but remained an integral part of the department’s course work. Moreover, the lines between rhetoric and poetics frequently blurred, as rhetorical theory and criticism overlapped with the practices of what today we might call literary criticism. This account, therefore, requires that we reconsider our narrative of rhetoric and composition’s history to recognize the ways that universities responded differently to national shifts in higher education, with entire departments and fields of study being created as a response to local conditions or what Rudolph calls “the felt necessities of the time or the region” (343).

Consolidating English Studies:
The Emergence of the English Department at Ohio State

The rhetoric department at OSU emerged in the 1890s as a response to the university’s desire to emphasize practical education without ignoring liberal studies. By the early 1900s, it had grown into a department larger than that of English literature, with more faculty (English literature had just one faculty member) and more course work. But this departmental division did not last. Why, given Denney’s position as dean and department head and his focus on rhetoric, did he ultimately advocate
for the unification of the Department of Rhetoric and English Language and the Department of English Literature? The answer is complex and deserves our attention because, contrary to many historians’ claims, the consolidation of rhetoric and literature at Ohio State does not support the assertion that rhetoric everywhere was dissolved into a powerful literature department. Ohio State provides an alternate narrative, one that demonstrates the impact of institutional structures and local contexts on shifts in the field.

Two major developments in Denney’s career and the department led to the reunification of the two English departments in 1904. The first development was Denney’s election to the position of dean of the College of Arts, Philosophy, and Science in 1901. Although Denney remained department head and continued to teach classes, his interests became more broadly concerned with the welfare of the university and the improvement of education—positions that align Denney with other Deweyan progressive educators (see Russell 201–6). As he said in his 1924 president’s address to the American Association of University Professors,

Fixing attention upon those larger interests which vitally concern all who teach in our higher institutions, whatever their specialty, we are slowly but surely raising the level of educational vision. Our calling tends to over-emphasize individualism. It tends to undue limitation of interest to one part of one subject and in extreme cases to contempt for all else. The ability and willingness to cooperate is the first and best authentication of our right to leadership. (19)

In the first decade of the twentieth century, Denney began several larger educational projects that signaled his abiding interest in educational administration. He became involved in reorganizing the undergraduate curriculum into a primarily elective-based course of study, in which students could choose two-thirds of the courses they would take (The Ohio State University, 32nd Annual Report 91). Denney remained proud of this work, and later wrote in his curriculum vitae, “The Group-Elective System with the feature of close articulation with High Schools which I introduced into the College of Arts, Philosophy and Science in 1904–5 has been taken over by practically all of the state universities and has been adopted by both Harvard and Princeton” (Biographical Files). Denney also remained an active participant in discussions with high schools and in debates about university entrance requirements (see, for example, “English Requirements”; “College Entrance”). Toward the end of his career, he noted of his relationship to education, “[I am] recognized throughout the country as a Dean of Liberal Arts who is Friendly to College of Education […] I have made more addresses to audiences of teachers than any other professor” (The Ohio State University, Biographical Files). These projects indicate the extent to which Denney’s move to administration shifted his work toward general education, a move that situated him as a generalist rather than a specialist.
The second development that led to the reunification of the two departments was the convergence of rhetorical criticism with literary criticism that was solidified when rhetoric became an area of academic specialization. Given the influence of bellettristic rhetoric on the academic study of literature and rhetoric (see Johnson; Miller), the advanced courses in rhetoric that Denney created were bound to overlap with courses in the English literature department. This overlap meant that having two separate departments offering similar courses became an inefficient way of organizing English studies—one that potentially could lead to territorial disputes over funding and faculty. In a letter dated May 1904, Denney outlined the pragmatic advantages of a unified English department to president William Oxley Thompson. As he explained, a single department of English would allow the number of courses to be increased without hiring additional teachers. According to Denney’s letter, the Department of English Literature had been unable to expand its course work because A. C. Barrows, the department head, was overworked and had little assistance in teaching (Dasher 30). The merger would prevent resentment and territorial attitudes from forming between the two areas of study, and would eliminate duplicate course work. For example, Denney noted the similarities between the literature course Literary Forms in English Literature and the rhetoric course Poetics, as well as the literature course Literary Problems in English Literature and the rhetoric course Principles of Criticism (30). Redundancies had the potential to create conflict between departments; as Denney explained, “Each department has been prevented hitherto from undertaking certain work that its men are trained to do and desire to do, for fear of trespassing on the territory of the other department” (qtd. in Dasher 30). Thus, a larger English department meant more instructors, more students, more courses, and more claim to university resources.

Within this new department, Denney detailed four main lines of work. The first three were the history and structure of the English language, the history of thought in English literature, and aesthetic appreciation of English and American literature (Dasher 29–30). These areas of study represented the unification of the advanced course work in rhetoric and the advanced course work in the literature department, not the absence of rhetoric course work. In fact, many of the courses developed in the department of rhetoric continued to be taught in the Department of English throughout Denney’s career at Ohio State under slightly different course titles. The fourth line of work for the new English department was composition, which included “principles of Rhetoric, practice in written Narrative, Description, Exposition, Brief-making, and Argumentation” (29–30). In his letter to President Thompson, Denney explained, “In these [writing] courses, extending through the four years, the aim should be purely practical and utilitarian” (qtd. in Dasher 30).
Although the description of writing instruction as utilitarian may seem a negative move to us today, utilitarian did not mean remedial or simplistic. Denney saw the state university, he later said, as built "not on the idea of preserving the integrity of traditional subject-matter but upon the pressing needs of the living generation" (qtd. in "Professor Denney" 56). The emphasis on utility, then, stressed the "pressing needs" of students. Consequently, the departmental history memorializes Denney by calling attention to his long-standing commitment to composition: "Always there was composition (and not just 'Freshman' English): Mr. Denney was a 'rhetoric' man at heart, whatever his literary leanings" (Dash 33). That a history written in 1970 memorialized Denney's work as a rhetorical educator illustrates the degree of respect he garnered for rhetoric and composition as an area of study.

Indeed, Denney's influence on the department and its curriculum continued after he retired in 1933. Although the merger of upper-division rhetoric and literature courses ultimately meant the demise of the term *rhetoric* in the department's course work (with literary titles or "criticism" taking its place), the courses Denney established in first-year composition, advanced composition, upper-level writing electives, and technical writing remained in the course bulletins at least through the 1960s. How these courses were taught or justified in the decades after Denney deserves further research, but it is significant to note that two of Denney's students took positions as English department chair following his retirement. James Fullington, a student of Denney's with a special interest in improving first-year composition, "carried on the Denney Tradition" as chair from 1936 until 1952, although his implementation of writing proficiency and placement tests perhaps complicates this history (Dash 52–53). When Fullington stepped down to take a position as dean, Denney's student Robert M. Estrich served as chair until 1964. Estrich oversaw the English department's move to the newly built Denney Hall in 1960 (63). In 1964 Alfred J. Kuhn, who held a PhD from Johns Hopkins, became the new department head. Although not one of Denney's students, Kuhn notably encouraged "interdepartmental, interdisciplinary scholarship" (Dash 64); in fact, he facilitated the return of rhetorical scholarship to the English department when in 1966 he hired Edward P. J. Corbett to direct first-year writing. Perhaps, then, Denney's decision to consolidate English studies worked in favor of sustaining elements of the curriculum—particularly in composition—that he established early in his career.

**The Value of Institutional Histories**

Reflecting on his time at OSU under Denney's leadership, former OSU English professor Louis Cooper (a Harvard man, no less) wrote,
I have seen something of at least five English departments and know a little about a few others and I can say truthfully the English department at Ohio State was, all things considered: function, purpose, scope, objectives—the best department of the lot. It was not to be compared with Harvard in many ways, to be sure, but it was far better adapted to the kind of work to be done at Ohio than the Harvard or Columbia group would have been. (The Ohio State University, Biographical Files)

Cooper reiterated the rhetoric that Canfield used decades earlier—that Ohio State had a commitment to be a certain kind of university based on the needs of its constituency. Claims such as Cooper’s and Canfield’s, as well as the history I have provided here of the rhetoric and composition curriculum at Ohio State, exhibit the importance of telling local histories to enhance our understanding of the field’s emergence. Ohio State contributes to our understanding of the larger narrative of the history of rhetoric and composition in two ways. First, it establishes that other progressive educators in addition to Fred Newton Scott attempted to elevate the study of rhetoric and composition and to provide extensive opportunities for writing instruction. Although Denney’s rhetoric department did not have the life span that Scott’s did, it nevertheless represents a significant movement in rhetorical education, and it deserves to be recognized in histories of the field.

Second, my history of Ohio State asks us to complicate the narrative of rhetoric’s decline in the university system. The rhetoric department at OSU was both prosperous and progressive during its fourteen-year existence. As department chair, Denney attempted to balance the desire for useful education that would meet students’ needs with the desire to become a state university by subscribing to new ideas about research. Even when the department disappeared, the approaches to rhetoric established at the time—history, theory, criticism, and composition—remained well into the twentieth century. Although contemporary rhetoricians renounce rhetoric’s belles lettrist past, the belles lettrist approach to criticism may represent one of many ways that rhetoric maintained a foothold in English departments. Further research about the institutional locations and curricula of rhetoric and English departments from a range of institutions may shed light on rhetoric’s role in the academy after the nineteenth century. With the expansion of local histories like this one, we might tell a more nuanced history of the field, one that accounts for the relationships between local, national, and international contexts. That Denney’s work at Ohio State has remained so long invisible to historians of the discipline is particularly indicative of the need to continue to rewrite our historical narrative. Denney was a highly visible figure in his own time, and his name appears in almost every history of the field. If such a visible historical subject has been overlooked, what other possible sites might we have missed? What other possible trajectories might rhetoric and composition have followed?
### Appendix: Selected Rhetoric and Composition Course Work at The Ohio State University, 1891–1905

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name and Date of Introduction</th>
<th>Paraphrase of Course Description</th>
<th>Alternate Names and Derivative Courses with Date of Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science of Rhetoric (1891–92)</td>
<td>Paragraph and essay structure, rhetorical analysis. Required for first-year students.</td>
<td>Practical Rhetoric (1893–94); Paragraph-Writing (1895–96); Paragraph-Writing and Analysis of Prose (1902–3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Rhetoric (1891–92)</td>
<td>Style, criticism, and literary aesthetics for sophomore- and junior-level students in the courses in arts, philosophy, and science.</td>
<td>Science of Rhetoric (1893–94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Rhetoric (1891–92)</td>
<td>Style, construction, and presentation of technical writing genres for engineering students and later agriculture and domestic science and pharmacy. Required for sophomore- and junior-level students.</td>
<td>Advanced Rhetoric (1893–94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Composition (1893–94)</td>
<td>Elective providing individualized composition instruction. One section held for students in engineering, industrial arts, chemistry, pharmacy, agriculture, horticulture, forestry, and domestic economy. One for students in liberal arts areas of study.</td>
<td>Advanced Composition —Practice &amp; Criticism (1895–96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prose Writing (1893–94)</td>
<td>Two sections: newspaper writing and an elective offering continued instruction for advanced composition students. The three courses listed in the right column as alternative names each emphasize a slightly different component of the Prose Writing course.</td>
<td>Rapid Writing (1896–97); Newspaper Work &amp; Brief-Making (1895–96); Brief-Making and Argumentation (1896–97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Prose (1896–97)</td>
<td>Rhetorical analysis, principles of style, and practice in expository writing. Required of modern language and English courses in philosophy and in the course in commerce and administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis (1896–97)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Stories (1897–98)</td>
<td>Analysis of structure and plot with practice in writing short stories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Name and Date of Introduction</td>
<td>Paraphrase of Course Description</td>
<td>Alternate Names and Derivative Courses with Date of Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetics (1897–98)</td>
<td>Discussion of and practice in verse writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Exposition (1897–98)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Course in Rhetoric and Composition (1899–1900)</td>
<td>Discussion of issues related to the teaching of composition and rhetoric in schools (textbooks, lesson plans, the essay, current scholarship on teaching, the role of the classics, criticism).</td>
<td>Teaching of English (1901–2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of Style (1901–2)</td>
<td>Discussion of literary style.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems in Rhetoric and Criticism (1901–2)</td>
<td>Lecture on the history of rhetorical theory and criticism, with individual investigation of a particular problem related to one of these areas. For advanced undergraduates and graduates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Course (1902–3)</td>
<td>Graduate seminar focusing on a topic picked by the instructor (usually Denney or McKnight).</td>
<td>Seminary in Rhetoric (1904–5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table is intended to give generalized information about the courses offered in the rhetoric department at OSU; it does not reflect all of the variations in course content or emphasis from year to year. All information is taken from the annual reports and catalogues in the list of works cited in this essay.

Notes

1. See also Suzanne Bordelon’s *A Feminist Legacy: The Rhetoric and Pedagogy of Gertrude Buck*, Lisa Mastrangelo’s “Lone Wolf or Leader of the Pack?” and David Russell’s *Writing in the Academic Disciplines*, as well as the essays collected in *Local Histories: Reading the Archives of Composition*, edited by Moon and Patricia Donahue.

2. The Department of Rhetoric is also referred to as the Department of Rhetoric and English Language both in the archival materials and throughout this essay. Before Denney’s hire, there was a single Department of English Language and Literature. The department split when Denney arrived in 1891 (for reasons that are not entirely clear) into a Department of Rhetoric and a Department of English Literature, sometimes referred to in annual reports and the department history as the two English departments. Denney did not chair or teach in the Department of English Literature until the merger of the rhetoric and English departments in 1904. After that time, Denney remained department head of English until he resigned and became professor emeritus in 1931. He retired in 1933.

3. I use these terms throughout the essay to refer to the discursive categories that land-grant institutions like Ohio State used to classify types of students. I use the terms *vocational or professional* primarily to refer to students in the applied sciences programs instituted as a direct result of the Morrill Act of 1862—those studying any of the various engineering or agricultural sciences. However, I also refer to certain writing courses emphasizing business or journalism related genres as “vocational.” I use the term *academic* to refer to a broader liberal arts education, although not necessarily one based on the classical languages.
4. According to one account of Denney's education, "As an undergraduate he was a distinguished student in the departments of history and political science as well as in the fields of the languages and literatures. He had a vital interest in public affairs" (The Ohio State University, Biographical Files). Indeed, Denney purportedly assisted in passing some legislative measures in Ohio, and he also published an article in support of women's suffrage in 1912 (see Denney, "Votes").

5. The required first-year course, English A (Rhetoric), claimed to teach students "to communicate by copious illustrations from the standard writers, and by a due amount of exercise in criticism and invention, those elements of knowledge and power which may be applied as the result of the teacher's guidance to the actual construction of literature" (The Ohio State University, 18th Annual Report 41).

6. As the modes increased in popularity, Denney incorporated them into his method of instruction as well. However, elsewhere he stressed that the modes do not exist as distinct forms of writing, and they are probably most useful when presented as one of many ways to classify discourse (American 3-4).

7. Under Welsh's chairmanship of the department, students in their sophomore and junior years were required to take rhetoricals, which were two-hour courses that met weekly and involved students presenting written themes before an instructor and other students for criticism (see also Russell 40-45 for a detailed description of rhetoricals).

8. For an interesting overview by Denney of the history of rhetoric, see the preface to his reader American Public Addressers. In the preface he covers the traditions of Greek and Roman rhetoric and discusses more recent American rhetors.

9. Connors writes in his article "The Rise of Technical Writing Instruction in America" that no such course existed until around 1900. Denney brought technical writing instruction to sophomore- and junior-level engineering students a full eight years before that time.

10. In a letter to Fred Newton Scott, dated October 30, 1912, Denney showed some interest in separating out the agricultural students for a specific the first-year course, taught by instructors "more or less agricultural in their antecedents and tastes." However, this arrangement never happened at OSU.

11. The department, during this time, switched from three terms to two semesters, and eventually switched back to terms. Throughout, I use term and semester differently to designate these different divisions of the school year.

12. Although this course remained in the catalogue, I could not discern if it was offered because it was not listed with the enrollment numbers for courses in the rhetoric department. Despite this fact, it still represents an innovative attempt to teach rhetoric and to bridge department boundaries.

13. Some examples of thesis titles include "The Imagination as a Basis of Rhetorical Theory" by Arthur Sullivan for the BA; "A Rhetorical Basis for the Division of Literature into Types" by Burr Wright for the BPh; "Is Adaptation Sufficient as a Theory of Rhetoric" by Bessie Hammond for the BPh; "Condensation as a Rhetorical Principle in English Prose" by Bird Hazelton; "The Development of Newspaper Style from 1800 to 1850" by Gordon Kinder for the BPh; and "Political Pamphlets of the American Revolutionary Period" by Frank Cowen McKinney for the MA (The Ohio State University, 20th-23rd and 25th Annual Commencement). Unfortunately, only some of the commencement bulletins in which thesis titles are listed still exist from the early years of the department, and in later years, undergraduate thesis titles were not always printed. Additionally, the departmental affiliation of the graduating students is not listed for any of these titles, and I have assumed for all but McKinney, who is listed as a fellow in the rhetoric department, that these were students in the rhetoric program based on their thesis titles.

14. These fellowship students include Mary A. Molloy (MA 1902), the second woman ever to receive a PhD at Cornell University and dean of the College of St. Teresa (Kenneally); Frank Cowen McKinney (MA 1902), co-author of Argumentation and Debate (1910) with Denney and Carson S. Duncan; Clara Converse Ewalt (MA 1901), a high school teacher; and Gilbert Lee Pennock (MA 1902), later a theology student at Harvard (The Ohio State University, Register 107).

15. Here, I believe that Denney was referring not to the elective principle instituted by Charles Eliot at Harvard decades before, but rather the modified approach to the elective principle that required
students to take certain core classes and to focus on a particular area of study. Eliot's approach to the elective system was altered by Harvard's next president, Abbott Lawrence Lowell, because it was generally seen as radical and overly utilitarian (see Veysey 248–50).

16. James Thurber, Denney's student, famously spoke in Denney's honor at the inauguration ceremony for Denney Hall.
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