supportive community to which they don't have access, presents a challenge that may help to change a way of thinking deeply rooted in this student's perceptions and in the community most important to him.

Such a fraternity presents an extreme example of a closed community whose values may counter those of the academy. Yet nearly all students have a community of peers who seek to help each other. Once, as students handed in their final papers on plagiarism, I asked them to jot down how much help they had gotten with it, venturing into the realm of unacknowledged tutoring. One student had simply walked around his fraternity asking about the topic and could identify a different hand in virtually every sentence. Subsequently I asked whether the help students get in dorms and fraternities constitutes plagiarism. A very bright senior in Teachers College said, emphatically, "No, that's education!" She is certainly right, and steering one's way through the ethical complexities of unacknowledged (and in some settings virtually unacknowledgeable) collaborative learning on the one hand and full participation in a scholarly community on the other is difficult, to say the least. Still, students' conduct in such matters is ethical, bound by sets of rules that they can elaborate and test, which implies that they are perfectly capable of learning the practices of attribution in a scholarly community. Of course, they have to be invited into that community first and to be willing to join.

The reasons for writing and talking with students about plagiarism, I have tried to suggest, are serious. The values that govern acts of plagiarism are continuous with values and feelings students display in their living, such as, the value of friendship or of getting ahead, loyalty to the interests of a group, fear of shame at performing inadequately, distrust of faculty, obligations to work and play. Students can be helped to understand themselves and their various communities better by writing in an exploratory and collaborative environment.

Faculty, for their part, may gain some appreciation of the various possibilities involved when they see that particular car go through that red light. Kroll's CCCC paper was based on a survey of what composition texts say about plagiarism, and he concluded that students are given mistaken and misleading advice. Faculty need to be educated or reeducated because their responsibility is great. In dealing with cases of plagiarism, an instructor acts as plaintiff, prosecuting attorney, judge, jury, jailer, appeals court, and sometimes defense attorney as well. Of course, some of us manage to dispense true justice, tempered with charity, but students will testify that we do not do so all of the time. In fact, they will testify that faculty dodge responsibility, seldom explain the rules they judge by, rarely discuss the topic at all, accuse falsely, and fail to see much that goes on under their very noses.

If they are allowed, students can educate faculty. Both groups can also move into the classroom a lot of the collaboration that takes place in dorm rooms or over the telephone. Further, faculty can demonstrate their own ways of giving "credit where credit is due" (an aphorism, a bit of lore, that has considerable power), of conscientious collaboration with others, of discussing the problems of attribution quite openly, rather than waiting to pounce on some unsuspecting mark. We have an opportunity to encourage the acknowledging of help, in a generous and not exclusively economic spirit. Still, when I encourage students to write a note acknowledging help they have received from other students, I usually flinch and warn them that they had better inquire before they do so in their other classes. Booth and Gregory say that while careers have been ruined for plagiarizing, none has been ruined for acknowledging sources (28). Yet I imagine a forthright student's honesty met with cruelty, with a scrawled remark like, "Why didn't you do it yourself?" and a suitable deduction from the grade. Experience has taught me, like my students, to be cautious in trusting my colleagues to deal fairly with apprentices. If, on the other hand, we show students we can be fair and trustworthy within our own classrooms, and if we allow them to investigate and write about plagiarism for themselves, then we may improve their conduct and ours, their thinking and ours. The more fully we help them participate in a scholarly community as they learn, the better the chance that they will join it.

Works Cited

Booth, Wayne C., and Marshall W. Gregory. *The Harper & Row Rhetoric: Writing as Thinking, Thinking as Writing*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

Britton, James. "Talking to Learn." In *Language, the Learner, and the School*. Rev. ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971. 81-115.

Brooke, Robert. "Underlife and Writing Instruction." *CCC* 38 (1987): 141-53.

Brown, Dorothy S. "The Perils of Plagiarism." *CCC* 26 (1975): 206-07.

Fulwiler, Toby. *Teaching With Writing*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1987.

Goffman, Erving. *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *FE* (1985): 105-27.

Kroll, Barry M. "Why Is Plagiarism Wrong?" Paper given at CCCC Convention in Atlanta, 1987.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Malloch, A. E. "A Dialogue on Plagiarism." *FE* 38 (1976): 165-74.

North, Stephen N. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1987.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Perelman, Chaim. *The Idea of Justice and the Problem of Argument*. Tr. John Petrie. New York: Humanities Press, 1963.

Rawlins, Jack. *The Writer's Way*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Smith, Frank. *Reading Like a Writer. Language Arts* 60 (1983): 558-567.

A RETURN TO THE "TREASURE-HOUSE OF INVENTION": MEMORY IN THE COMPOSITION CLASSROOM

Rick Cypert
Nebraska Wesleyan University

Despite the fact that most "rhetoric" textbooks ignore it, that many English teachers don't teach how to use it, and that only a few theorists are talking about it,[1] a consideration of the ways in which memory contributes to a writer's developing capacity for self-expression proves both pedagogically helpful and enlight-

ening. Modern applications of classical memory enable our students to generate details that flesh out their texts as well as provide meaning to those texts. Allowing style to become the vehicle that retrieves/creates that discourse couples two of the most helpful invention aids in rhetoric.

The writer of the *Ad Herennium* called memory the "treasure-house of Invention and the guardian of all parts of rhetoric" (205). Memory was divided into two types: artificial and natural. Artificial memory was established from places and images. *Locus*, its official term, was a place easily grasped by the memory such as a house – a multi-columnar space. Through the accumulation of these images, the rhetor developed his own internal system of categorization relating major points in his discourse to familiar spaces, such as rooms in a house that he could then "walk" through when "delivering his speech." Natural memory, on the other hand, was similar to the rote memorization with which we are familiar. A rhetor who made exclusive use of natural or *memoria verborum* constructed a speech of stylistic finery with which to sway his audience and then fixed it in his mind for unwavering recall. He therefore could not meet the changing demands of particular occasions or varying audiences. The rhetor who made use of artificial *memoria rerum*, in contrast, relied on an infinite set of possible commonplaces that could be organized, retrieved and revised in structure to meet the concerns of any rhetorical situation. This second method, not surprisingly, was preferred. These two types of memory, however, served different purposes, and the ideal use of them (then as now) made use of their interdependence.

Although the classical rhetoricians who used these "types" of memory had different epistemological assumptions than modern teachers do, it is not difficult to see a twentieth-century application for them in the composition classroom. *Memoria verborum* and *memoria rerum* (or natural and artificial), after all, parallel two types of writing and thinking our students often engage in. The former, memorizing word for word, by heart, is not unlike the narrative accounts that first semester freshmen are so fond of writing both in journals and personal experience essays.

When we memorize a poem, for example, we are not primarily concerned with the meaning, but rather with accomplishing a task. Students writing about a personal experience are similarly concerned with "getting it down." They catalog chronologically as we would memorize stanza by stanza. Often their prose reflects the formulaic way they retrieve the memory: "and then . . . and then . . . and then. . . ."[2] As they retrieve the memory of an experience, they leave it bound in the meaning they assigned it when they first filed it away.

For protection, for ease, because of convention, students remember or choose to record the most superficial aspects of their experience. Their *memoria rerum*, or categorization of the experience "walks" them along a fence of maxims and old sayings that protect the experience (and the writer) from new insights. A student writing about her grandfather's death, for example, may remember a great deal more about the experience and her grandfather's life than she records.[3] She has, however, built a fence of generalities around the experience and has assigned it only the most simplistic meaning for protection. The meanings vary; they often appear in the last sentence of the paper as didactic maxims like "He's in a better place now and I'm sure he's happy." The writer repeats these bromides, these fences of meaning, just as institutional authorities – the church, the family, the school – previously repeated them to the writer. Not surprisingly, the students do not try to break down the fence. Instead of recording a general version of an experience with a conventional meaning assigned, student writers should be encouraged to tear down old fences of simplistic meaning, to splice disparate yet related experiences of a living and dying grandfather, to build new fences to corral and to embrace these experiences with meanings that they the writers create for the particular rhetorical occasion.

But tearing down fences is dangerous business. Barbed wires and post splinters abound when you ask language to produce new meaning. I've asked students in my classes to do a couple of things. First, I ask them to tell two or three of their favorite stories about a person and then to list two or three incidents about the same person that concerned them or that they thought didn't match with the first group. They are instructed to tell the story only – not to make any comments of their own. I then ask them to staple blank sheets of paper at the end of their essay and exchange with other class members. Their readers are to provide a thesis sentence and a conclusion as well as comment on which details/sections best support their comments. The students rarely receive similar responses from the four readers who attend to their papers during the class session.

This process of rebuilding meaning parallels the latter type of memory, *memoria rerum*. In utilizing this type of memory, we organize notions and images into a cognitive schemata in such a way that they may be retrieved and fitted into a new context. It is this "memory" that resembles the type of writing we more often *want* from students – writing that explores, analyzes, connects, rebuilds. It is the type of memory, in fact, that might best be called structural memory. The emphasis in *memoria verborum* is on parts – individual words, in some cases. The emphasis in *memoria rerum* is on the whole image or framework of images.

Both types of memory serve a valuable function, although we seem to praise one more than the other. We praise the writer who can make the connections in her writing, even though she may have forgotten where the substance of these connections came from. Without the meticulous recording of detail, she cannot preserve the image in an individual, new way. Our students need to be aware of the interdependence of these two forms of memory.

It might be useful to compare the meaning making *memoria rerum* to the thesis or topic sentences in writing and the *memoria verborum* to the supporting detail-filled sentences. Such a comparison raises the question of whether students should know what they're going to write about before they begin – in other words, thesis or examples, meaning or image, significance or story. I don't think we know for sure. I do think that a knowledge of these two types of memory might allow our student writers to resolve the question for themselves.

In my freshman English classes, I've also asked students to recall a particular incident from their past at which another person was present.[4] They are then to call the person and ask if he or she remembers the incident, without recounting or discussing it in detail. If the person does, then the student asks him or her to write about it in detail and mail a copy to the student. In the meantime, the students are busy writing their own version. When their partner's version arrives, they are often surprised at the differences that exist between the two texts. Friends and relatives often rely on a different *memoria verborum*, and include details that the student forgot or disagrees with.[5] In addition, students often have established a different meaning about the experience than the *memoria rerum* that their partners generated.

As a follow-up assignment, I ask the students to write an essay in which they attempt to reconcile the differences that exist between the two texts. Students generally come to realize, as a result of the close analysis of the language of both texts, that lan-

guage does indeed create meaning. A brother wrote about a skiing vacation in a more flippant tone than did his sister who viewed the significance of the experience in ways that he had not. His response was to re-evaluate the reason he had used language to create a lighter, more humorous mood. Another student used the assignment as an opportunity to characterize herself and her sister as storytellers. And few of the students failed to see the relevance of this assignment when it came time to pull together sources for a research project. Their study of language, their understanding of memory, and their synthesis of the two in a writing assignment enabled students to grow in both self-expression and close reading of texts.

Yet sometimes memories are pulled forth in a painfully slow manner. Fences get in the way, yes, but the actual articulation of an event can be hard to retrieve as well. In addition to examining the types of memory, then, there arises the necessity of learning how to retrieve these images. A friend of mine assures me that we think in images. That may be so. Yet I don't know what I know until I have retrieved this image by transforming it into language; nor can I share it with others. Memory retrieval, then, appears to be strongly related to style (stylistic production). The reason we are prompted to continue writing is that we are pleased by what we hear. By using rhetorical techniques (whether our students recognize them as such) such as amplification, enumeration, and so forth, we create what we know sounds right.

Assume you have taught the effectiveness of alliteration and the concept of style to a freshman writer. After having discussed the three parts of rhetoric you ask the student to write an essay defining rhetoric. The student writes: "When I think of rhetoric, I think of politicians . . ." She pauses a moment and adds "and preachers . . ." So far so good. She chews on the cap of the pen for a moment, smiles, and adds "and professors!" Reviewing the sentence, marking out words, adding others, she produces: "When I think of rhetoric, I think of preachers, politicians, and professors and of their respective domains – pathos, ethos, and logos."

Style has generated content. The knowledge that one word can lead to an alliterative second (and third and fourth) is a wonderful means of freeing a student to explore a topic. Figures of speech (schemes and tropes), of course, are not the only way to unleash a student's capacity for invention. An introductory knowledge of periodic sentences such as those identified by Francis and Bonnie Jean Christensen can have a generative effect likewise.

Perhaps an example from a freshman paper would help clarify the matter. Based on his coursework in child psychology, Joel wanted to prove his assertion that the perception of a painful event varied from parent to child. The case studies he found in his book weren't falling into place, so I suggested he provide an example of his own.

He sat in my office thinking a bit and then began to write . . . and write . . . and write. He began: "Awkwardly shy, painfully aware, shuddering against my cold, desensitized mother, I was whisked through three sets of doors in a matter of minutes. . . ."

The entire passage was not so embellished, but the many parts that were had been produced (as had been the majority of the paper) by a gliding pen. Joel had been in a class in which examples of good writing were praised and analyzed. Language that was vibrant and vital was studied for arrangement and technique, noted in journals, and discussed as it contributed to the whole piece of discourse.

And after the conference, I talked with Joel about how the way he wrote about the incident helped him remember what he didn't know he knew. Does that sound funny? Joel surely remembered his hospital experience. He had images of all sorts; his *memoria verborum* was well intact, needing only language to harness it. He merely could have recounted the story in a journalistic format. But he didn't. He was busy building new fences, utilizing his *memoria rerum*. The result was a creation of knowledge in a memory that emerged through a stylistic use of language. Not surprising when we remember Cicero's comments about how everyday, petty things are not remembered as well as something exceptionally seen or heard (219).

The marriage of memory and style in the composition classroom can bring about generative effects in students' papers. Recall that the writer of the *Ad Herennium* refers to the "treasure-house of the ideas supplied *by* Invention to the guardian of all parts of rhetoric, the Memory" (205). For my purposes, I am bothered by only one word of this definition: the preposition "by." I think that today memory may be the "treasure-house of the ideas supplied *to* Invention *by* style."

In the *Ad Herennium*, Herennius is advised that: "If you exercise yourself diligently in these [elements of style] your speaking will possess impressiveness, distinction and charm. As a result you will speak like a true orator and the *product* of your invention will not be bare and inelegant nor will it be expressed in commonplace language" (409).

While style is related to the *product* of Invention, it seems to me that it also may aid the *process* in a way we don't often think about: an agent and inducer of memory, a friend to our cognitive schemata, a way toward the commonplaces that for our students may not be so common anymore. Our students need to know of this and of the existence and interdependence of *memoria verborum* and *memoria rerum* and of how to use them to produce meaningful discourse.

Notes

[1]Twentieth-century psychologists and some composition scholars (witness the work of Linda Flower, John Hayes, Janet Emig, and others) have reminded us of the importance of understanding long-term and short-term memory and the writer's goals and planning processes. Rhetorician Edward P. J. Corbett briefly mentions memory in *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* in the context of ways it is often taught today ("I Can Give You a Retentive Memory in Thirty Days") (38). And W. B. Horner in her recent *Rhetoric in the Classical Tradition* draws upon Quintilian to advise her students that memory often reflects cultural values as well as those of the individual. Memory, for Horner, is not just a means of retrieving personally stored knowledge, but also knowledge stored by the community in information systems.

[2]Susan Goldman and Connie Varnhagen report that "previous empirical work (C. G. Glenn) indicates that *casual* cross episode connections lead to better story memory than temporal connections (e.g. "Then") (402).

[3]Although according to Willem Wagenaar, who conducted a six-year personal autobiographical study of memory, "pleasant events were better recalled than unpleasant events" yet "although the number of irretrievable events can rise to about 20%, there is some evidence that in fact none of these events was completely forgotten." (225)

[4]The basic assumption in this assignment – paired recall raises points of issue – is supported by recent research by N. K. Clark and others at the University of Canterbury, who discovered that

group as opposed to individual recall of an incident produces enhanced (i.e. more complete and more accurate) responses.

[5]Richard Hammersley and J. Don Read report that subjects who hear a story with intentionally misleading information often include the misleading information in their summary. However, subjects who remember the incident well are unlikely to be permanently misled. (341).

Works Cited

Cicero. *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*. Trans. Harry Caplan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Clark, N. K. et al. "Memory for a Complex Social Discourse: The Analysis and Prediction of Individual and Group Recall." *Journal of Memory and Language* 25 (1986): 295-313.

Corbett, E.P.J. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. NY: Oxford UP, 1971.

Goldman, Susan R. and Connie K. Varnhagen. "Memory for Embedded and Sequential Story Structures." *Journal of Memory and Language* 25 (1986): 401-418.

Hammersley, Richard and J. Don Read. "What is integration? Remembering a story and remembering false implications about the story." *British Journal of Psychology* 77 (1986): 329-341.

Horner, W. B. *Rhetoric in the Classical Tradition*. NY: St. Martin's Press, 1988.

Knoblauch, C. H. and Lil Brannon. *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1984.

Johnson, Samuel. *Rasselas, Poems, and Selected Prose*. Ed. Bertrand H. Bronson. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wagenaar, Willem A. "My Memory: A Study of Autobiographical Memory Over Six Years." *Cognitive Psychology* 18 (1986):225-252.

Announcement and Call for Papers

Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition

Richard Ohmann, George Dillon, Erika Lindemann, George Hillocks, Cynthia Selfe, and Charles Bazerman will be among the featured speakers at the eighth Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition next July 12-15 in State College, Pennsylvania.

Persons interested in participating are invited to present papers, demonstrations, or workshops on topics related to rhetoric or the teaching of writing—on composition, rhetorical history and theory, basic writing, technical and business communication, advanced composition, writing across the curriculum, and so on. One-page proposals will be accepted through April 15.

To submit a proposal or volunteer to chair a session or to learn more about the conference, write to John Harwood, Department of English, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.