Writing and Reading: The Missing Elements in Historical and Contemporary Studies of English Language Writing[1]

Harvey J. Graff, The Ohio State University

Abstract: Scholarly disciplines are historical reservoirs riven with contradictions. Often unaware of their own history, the humanities lead in complications, with English departments outpacing other fields of study. Both writing and English language and literature studies exhibit long-standing omissions and conflicts. This essay explores their similarities and differences, emphasizing the centrality of literacy—both reading and writing—to these concerns. These are elements of what I identified in 1979 as "the literacy myth." They are often central across fields, disciplines, departments, and today cross-campus initiatives. However counter-intuitive it may seem, serious interest in the fundamental human activities of writing and reading, in necessary relationship with each other, is among the common major missing links in the subfields of English. To a historian of literacy, I emphasize that lack of attention to the inseparable actions of writing as a form of expression and reading as mode of understanding marks writing studies and history of English language. It is empirically, theoretically, and logically impossible to study or comprehend one without the other. Writing and reading are inseparably interrelated. This essay begins an interrelated critique and proposal for change. These fundamental connections are clear from studies of traditional classics through the present in English and English translation. We cannot understand either the production or the consumption of writing and printing, the making of meaning(s) itself, without central attention to literacy, that is, reading and writing especially taken together. What I first defined as the literacy myth continues to stand as both cause and consequence of this persisting gap in approaches and understanding.

Introduction

Scholarly disciplines are historical reservoirs riven with contradictions. Often unaware of their own history, the humanities lead in complications, with English departments outpacing other fields of study.[2] Both English language and literature studies, and writing—formerly rhetoric and composition—exhibit long-standing omissions and conflicts. This essay explores their similarities and their differences. I underscore the centrality of focusing on literacy historically and contemporarily—both reading and writing—to these concerns. These are elements of what I identified in 1979 as the literacy myth. They are often central across fields, disciplines, departments, and today cross-campus initiatives.

However counter-intuitive—indeed, un- or even anti-scholarly—it may seem, serious and sustained interest in the fundamental human activities of writing and reading, in necessary relationships with

Across the Disciplines wac.colostate.edu/atd
A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing ISSN 554-8244
10.37514/ATD-J.2024.21.2-3.14

each other, is among the common major missing links (to use a certain evolutionary metaphor) in the subfields of English.

To a historian of literacy—that is, of reading and writing across media, forms of linguistic representation including translation, across time and space—lack of attention to the inseparable actions of writing as forms of expression and reading as modes of understanding especially marks writing studies and history of English language independently and in conjunction. It is empirically, theoretically, and logically impossible to study or comprehend one without the other. Writing and reading are inseparably interrelated. This essay begins an interrelated critique and proposal for change.

These fundamental connections are clear from studies of traditional classics through the present in English and English translation. We cannot understand either the production—expressing meaning, across media, including the uses of language—or the consumption of writing and printing, the making of meaning(s) itself without central attention to literacy, that is, reading and writing especially taken together. What I first defined as the literacy myth continues to stand as both cause and consequence of this persisting gap in approaches and understanding.[3]

In the broadest scope, directly relevant to this special issue and to the fields of study it addresses, are the oral and the visual. In fact and in theory, here is no written or printed evidence of language and literature past or present, indeed no actual production, without oral, individual, and collective writing and reading. This includes visual representations and recording of language in use. Pioneering classicists, early modern scholars, and ethnographers of language and literacy together demonstrate this conclusively. With rare exceptions, students and studies of writing and history of English language neglect this literature, its conceptualizations, and its conclusions to their detriment.[4]

In a larger intellectual sense, this means the absence of necessary historical, comparative, contextual, and critical foci with consequential restrictions on understanding as an interpretive epistemology. This includes theory, sources, and methods in writing studies and history of the English language. Literacy, historically and ethnographically conceptualized, is too often the missing link.

Literacy Myths, Reading and Writing Myths, and the Failures of the Humanities

In the vocabulary that I presented first in 1979 in the origins of the then new literacy studies, I refer to the intertwined scholarly and more popular perpetuation and functioning of the literacy myth. By this I mean the presumption—implicitly or explicitly, casually or formally—of the centuries-old belief that reading and writing (across notation systems and media) are self-evident, self-determining, and independent of context, history, variability, and human agency. That is: literacy—reading and/or writing—as independent variables. Interestingly, writing studies on occasion show more awareness of this than history of English language researchers and teachers.

Deborah Brandt's ground-breaking studies reflect the dilemma for writing studies. Brandt remains ensconced within what I declared in my tribute to her "the writing myth." For her among many of her colleagues, literacy continues to be equated with writing rather than reading and especially reading and writing. This marks the field.[5] I contrast it with the seminal studies of Mike Rose, well-known to readers. In the history of American literature, Christopher Hager's 2013 *Word by Word: Emancipation and the Act of Writing* is exemplary.

As I document most recently in my 2022 *Searching for Literacy: The Social and Intellectual Origins of Literacy* Studies, the assumption that literacy—especially reading and writing—is independent and

determinative regardless of historical or other contexts and human agency, crosses disciplines, disciplinary clusters, and popular presumptions. It does this despite evidence to the contrary and common sense (see also Graff, 2024).

Let me be clear.

First, by myth, I do not mean false or fictitious. Notions only are developed, circulated, and accepted by some as myths if they seem to accord with at least a slight degree of some persons' beliefs and expectations, regardless of their degree of accuracy or established foundations (see Graff references; Graff & Duffy, 2007).

Second, the literacy myth persists over time, space, and academic specializations. Despite apparent contradictions and enormous evidence to the contrary, the writing, reading, and printing myths have a continuing appeal among scholars, especially in the humanities but also in psychology and much of linguistics. The most dramatic recent example is the disturbing but revealing non-debate over Elizabeth Eisenstein's 1979 under-researched and myth-perpetuating *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change.* As an intellectual but not social and cultural historian, she never inquires into questions of distribution, access, or basic reading accessibility of printed texts. She ignores available studies of popular literacy and the circulation of earlier block prints.

Eisenstein's uncritical reception and prizes reflect the academic biases toward celebrating print as an agent of modernization and democracy without attention to human populations and their own agency. She endorsed and reinforced a pseudo-humanistic partial understanding of the power of print by itself to the exclusion of any direct study of the oral, the written, or actual reading and direct influence. This is the printing myth.[6]

Third, the literacy myth is pragmatic and an active force. In addition to reinforcing self-serving academic partial truths, the power and persisting influence of these myths is often more practical. Accepting the literacy, writing, and reading myths without direct study and neglecting a large literature provides too many academics a perverse freedom from their responsibilities to consult relevant literature and explore multiple methods. It thus frees them to write more quickly and publish more while simultaneously reinforcing distracting and sometimes harmful myths (Bradbury, 2016; Graff, 2011, 2022c).

The literacy myth is resisted periodically in the realms of rhetoric and composition—recently and uncritically renamed writing studies if that were somehow self-evident—as well as important sectors in history, anthropology, linguistics, psychology, and education. For several decades, what is called the new literacy studies had a strong influence. In part, Brandt's work reflected this, and even more so, Duffy (2007), Harker (2015), and Bradbury (2016).

In the 21st century, however, the literacy myth has returned with mounting misunderstandings and distortions in writing studies (Graff, 2022a, 2023). At the same time, it is ignored in scholarly conversations about the history of the English language.

Of direct relevance to this issue, I underscore that major components of the literacy myth embrace what I termed "the writing myth" and "the reading myth." In these flawed, ahistorical, and profoundly anti-humanistic but powerful conceptions, for example, students of authors' writing and all persons' reading seldom recognize the role of social, cultural, and political economic contexts, and human agency and variability in all acts of writing and reading. Nor do they attend to the critical roles of the oral and the visual.

Take the revealing example of one recent popular book that crosses at least implicitly writing and history of English studies by a young literary scholar published by a major university press. This is Merve Emre's 2017 *Paraliterary: The Making of Bad Readers in Postwar America*. As the word choice

of the title suggests, this is almost a caricature of post-modern literary criticism. It never occurs to the author to explore directly both readers' own choices and their acts of reading of her derisively called (in the shadows of Great Books) "bad readers," *or* the crafting of "bad books" by their sometimes extraordinarily successful writers.

Rather than a study of readers or even the making of readers as if human readers are somehow made by books, Emre engages in ideological top-down literary criticism by presenting her own readings of popular books in post-World War II United States. Her selection criteria are not presented but her critical semantics tell her own readers a great deal. This ranges from "bad readers" to chapter titles named "Pop Quiz," "Reading as Imitation," "Reading as Feeling," "Brand Reading," "Sight Reading," "Reading Like a Bureaucrat," "Reading Like A Revolutionary," and "Retracing One's Steps." Paraliterary begins with a "Pop Quiz."

Both actual readers and the acts of both reading and writing, let alone their critical dialectical interactions, are absent. Emre neglects book reviews as an intermediary methodological step on the path to living readers and their choices and abilities. She ignores acts of writing in recent English languages. Neglect of both writing and reading is debilitating to *Paraliterary.*

With no awareness of the imperative to problematize her project and therefore the need to engage in innovative cross or interdisciplinary research, consciously or unconsciously, Emre takes the pseudo-scholarly way out: untested assumptions—literacy myths, in my lexicon—inadequately substitute for primary research. Her notes show no awareness of literacy, reading, and writing studies in any discipline including literary studies. Neither do her arguments, sources, and methods.[7]

For Emre and her colleagues, none of this matters. She appeals to academic stereotypes and reinforces the biases that turn researchers in other disciplines and far too many students away from both historical and contemporary English, language, and humanities studies. They tout the significance of reading but have no interest in readers themselves, despite decades of examples of how to study them.[8] Many approaches to literary criticism have not yet confronted cultural studies, modern cultural ethnographies, and histories of literacy, both reading and writing, with the seriousness, indeed the challenge, they merit.

It is not coincidental that the same publisher, University of Chicago Press, also issued *Popularizing the Past: Historians, Publishers, and Readers in Postwar America* (2023) by Nick Witham. As with Emre, historian Witham freely generalizes about readers. He makes no effort to study either readers or reading. Despite the book's title, he writes only about well-known historians who became popular. Interestingly, he is not interested in the relevance of how specifically they wrote.

Even more commonly recognized is the three-quarters century-old non-debate about the value of required courses in Great Books and the fraught notion of the literary canon. Here ideology combines with uncritical, unresearched presumptions that fail to substitute for research and arguments.

Despite the incessant repetition by humanities scholars, principally conservative English professors in book after book and the pages of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, required Great Books courses and curricula were never common except in certain periods at the University of Chicago, less often at Columbia and Yale, and a few very small private colleges, especially St. Johns in Maryland and New Mexico. The traditional liberal arts colleges of the 18th and 19th centuries almost never had such courses (see Graff and Guillory references).

Even more to the point is that the proponents of Great Books as the required foundation for all learning express no interest in how students learn to read and actually read the books, and very rarely in how they were written. Without ever quite saying so, the presumption reigns that if Johnny, Jill, Maria, and Ahmed are locked in a room with Plato or Shakespeare or Melville, and perhaps a

woman or minority author, students' transformation is all but guaranteed. If it does not transpire, it must be the students' fault.

Princeton University Press promotes coffee table mock-ups of the greats.[9] The press believes that pictures of the "greats" sitting unread on display in living rooms are more important than promoting interest or even suggestions on how and why to read them.

Among the many missing elements is lack of interest in the history of writing in both English and in translation that are central to meaningful understanding and interpretation. If students were taught about how any pieces of writing—greats old and new, classical and diverse, canonical and critical—their understanding of all forms of communication could be transformed. Teaching any texts—from the classics to contemporary banned books to Supreme Court decisions—as objects written by human beings in various different ways, and as objects to be read in multiple, even conflicting ways has the potential to give meaning and agency to the humanities. Just as lists or syllabi of required classes are human constructs, so too are their construction and modes of understanding. The understanding and skills learned have value across their education and well beyond across their lives.

Construed in these ways, through a literacy lens, the arts and humanities could actually seek a central place in both secondary school and university curricula. Then English, philosophy, and classics faculty would cease complaining about losing what they never actually had. Equally important, elite college professors might stop publishing guest essays in the *New York Times* that assert, typically fallaciously or fictitiously, "By Abandoning Civics, Colleges Helped Create the Culture Wars" and "I Teach the Humanities, and I Still Don't Know What Their Value Is."[10]

Learning from Alternative Reconstructions of Writing and Reading Past

My criticisms are neither abstract nor utopian.

There is a rich tradition of studies from antiquity to the present that demonstrate the necessity, and the possibilities, of studying writing and reading in conjunction with the oral and the visual in historical, linguistic, literary, and broadly inclusively humanistic contexts. Neither language nor literature as written and/or read can be understood without direct attention to the specific circumstances, concrete collective and individual contexts, and modes of composition, circulation, access, and comprehension. In other words, that is writing across media, and reading, or making and communication, collective and individual, also across media. Here writing and history of English are inseparably interconnected. Translation across languages, including the visual and the oral, is among the critical missing links in almost all discussions.[11]

Instructive Examples of Reading and Writing

These original and compelling examples should truly be the stuff of graduate seminars—and undergraduate classes, too—across disciplines. I begin at the beginning, so to speak.

In the beginning, there was the word. The word was spoken. The world was preliterate and pre-alphabetic, in modern terms, but oral and visual. Our knowledge of this necessarily long after the fact of creation/composition comes from written remains and in certain circumstances oral traditions and performances. Multiple meanings and layers of translation are central to these cultural transformations.

Therein lies a set of relationships—a conundrum—that plagues specialists while it simultaneously underlies persisting inadequate attention by those who study and seek to understand reading and writing including the history of language. In the place of either cross- or interdisciplinary approaches by individuals or in collaboration, a long self-serving legacy of formulaic divides surrounding "from oral to written or literate" is periodically reinvigorated and reinforced. It also presumes an evolutionary, trans-historical process. The linguistic bases of writing and reading studies swing from presumption to assumption, antecedent and precedent to subsequent.[12] To my understanding as both a humanities and social science scholar, these assumptions contradict the generalized agenda of linguistic scholars.

To a great extent, the basic study of language—the discipline of linguistics, including formal linguistics and sociolinguistics—divides over the primacy and the determinative influence of either the oral or the written. Linguistics' roots in religion and foundations in philology are not appreciated by students of reading and writing.

To a surprising degree, these understandings are dismissed or obscured. This is part of their neglect—or (to the same end) their presumption of history, and their acceptance of a foundational shift from oral to written. This recognition helps to explain the failure to note and probe the interactions between the oral and the written as well as reading and writing, the individual and the collective, and the visual and alphabetic.[13]

Without outlining the development of alphabets themselves and the multiple collective and individual forms of manipulating them, I underscore that the classic works of so-called Greek antiquity linked to Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, among others, were dictated orally perhaps by a single author (or perhaps not) who was unlikely to be able to read and certainly not write for him- or herself. Collective writing, as well as reading, crosses all languages, including English.

Almost certainly, what we accept as the written classics represented the distillation of years of collective discussion and what we simplistically and ahistorically refer to as seminars driven by the so-called Socratic method, now a caricature of first-year discussion sections and introductory law school classes, both now the stuff of bad movies. But in Athens BCE, Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, and their non-individually literate peers dictated to white male slaves.[14]

Slavery was not tied to race and was not an inheritable condition. But the first, if I may translate a term, "modern intellectual workers" were literate enslaved persons. There is scattered evidence of female authors but none of literate female slaves. As instruction in formal reading and writing began to spread, boys and men were advantaged. Only the latter fits into the historical and literary stereotypes. Reading the classics by Eric Havelock, Milman Parry, Alfred Lord, William Harris, among others, reveals a new world of the word and words much more generally.[15] Their modes of reading remain revealing.

Even more startling, if controversial, are the oral, collective, and folk origins of both recorded language and written literature. Especially neglected among writing and history of English scholars is Harvard classicist Milman Parry's and his student Alfred B. Lord's heroic and pioneering effort in the 1930s to track the origins of Homer's the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* by conducting on-site folkloric research in then Serbo-Croatia through comparing multiple recordings of different recognized "singers of tales." Their methods were ethnographic with the aid of now primitive recording devices. In revealing ways, recent researchers like Anne Dyson in her studies of children's reading and writing acquisition and practices offer instructive models to other students.

In a 2000 edition, Lord summarized,

> What distinguished Parry from most earlier Classicists who had posed the 'Homeric Question' was not only his hypothesis that the Iliad and the Odyssey were originally the products of an oral tradition that was older than any written literature; it was also his formulation of a method for testing that hypothesis, a discovery procedure capable of moving the debate from the content of orally produced songs to the actual processes through which such songs are produced in performance. (Lord 2000, viii)

Parry himself put it this way:

> If we put lore against literature, it follows that we should put oral poetry against written poetry, but the critics so far have rarely done this, chiefly because it happened that the same man rarely knew both kinds of poetry, and if he did he was rather looking for that in which they were alike. That is, the men who were likely to meet with the songs of an unlettered people were not ordinarily of the sort who could judge soundly how good or bad they were, while the men with a literary background who published oral poems wanted above all to show that were good as literature. It was only the students of the "early" poems who were brought in touch at the same time with both lore and literature.[16] (qtd. in Lord, 2000, p. viii)

With Lord's assistance, Parry journeyed to the mountains of Bosnia in 1933 and 1935 with special recording equipment to record variant versions of the classic tales. Parry's research on the Homeric texts identified the technique of formulaic epithets. He became persuaded that Homer's poems were traditional epics, and concluded that they must be oral compositions. Parry's and Lord's arguments have challenged scholars since the 1930s. They remain powerful hypotheses and guides to all students of writing of any period.[17] But students of writing and the history of English language and literature are generally unaware of these leads.

The exemplary studies of William Harris (1989) on Greece and Michael Clanchy (1993) on early medieval England and English help us to trace the centuries from formative eras in Athens to the Middle Ages in England with their multilingualism and collective production, access, and use of writing and reading with the development of great works and seminal documents from the classics to the Magna Carta and many literary and linguistic achievements and traditions.

Consider next the early modern origins or our own times. Combining original conceptualization and primary sources, pioneering European sociocultural historian, Natalie Zemon Davis escaped the narrative of the timeless triumph of the printing press, presumption of popular illiteracy, and mandate on mass individual acquisition of reading in sixteenth-century France. There are contemporary cross-cultural analogies today. Davis brings the well-developed, mass-participatory traditions of collective reading and writing, including religion, education, economics, and politics dramatically to life in "Printing and the People" (1975).

Contrast Davis' interpretation with the printing canon that persists today:

> [T]he first 125 years of print in France, which brought little change in the countryside, strengthened rather than sapped the vitality of the culture of the *menu people* in the cities—that is, added both to their realism and to the richness of their dreams, both to their self-respect and to their ability to criticize themselves and others. This is because they were not passive recipients (neither passive beneficiaries nor passive victims) of a new type of communications. Rather they were active users and interpreters of the printed books they heard and read, and even helped give these books form.[18] (p. 225)

Consider how parallel presumptions continue in contemporary English language studies and works that presume, but in fact pretend, to study readers. These include Emre and Wilthy cited earlier. How seldom we take into account differences of writing and reading abilities, practices, access to materials including pencil and paper, let along laptops and broadband, and actual uses of reading and writing. We know a great deal about social, cultural, and economic inequalities. But we seldom allow that to influence our own research and teaching. Critical here is how a few readers and writers continue to inform and assist many others. Researchers in community literacy studies offer examples from which all may learn today.

Davis also introduced a widespread reading and cinema-watching audience to another dimension of early modern women's literacy in her 1983 classic *The Return of Martin Guerre.* This scholarly archival recovery was translated into the language of cinema in the best-selling French film by director Daniel Vigne, starring Gerard Depardieu. The most critical dramatic moment is the scene in which Bertrande de Rols astonishes the justices and the cinematic audience at her erstwhile husband Martin Guerre's trial. To confirm her oral testimony, Bertrande formally signs her name.

No one expects a peasant woman to have that ability. But only scholars know that the ability to sign one's name by itself did not, and does not, signify the ability to read and to write independently. Reading and writing are not necessarily synonymous abilities or actions. Nonetheless, this was one form of cultural participation, and one of the history of writing and reading's perennial contradictions.[19]

Although writing about France and French, Davis's work is instructive for those working on history of English and writing studies. The parallels are both historical and contemporary. Anthropologists have learned this more often than writing and English language faculty.

One more example instructs us. This is American literary historian Christoper Hager's (2013, 2018) pioneering studies of the writing, and reading, abilities and practices of emancipated Black Americans during and after the Civil War. Learning from historians of literacy as well as studies of the antebellum and Reconstruction United States, Hager read the letters of freed women and men, diverse Northerners and Southerners, through new a lens and with different questions and expectations. All students of writing and English language and literature should consult his *Word by Word: Emancipation and the Art of Writing* (2013) and subsequent *I Remain Yours: Common Lives in Civil War Letters* (2018). Hager's readings give new meaning to evidence of writing. Hager (2013) writes,

> This book is about acts of writing by enslaved and newly freed southern blacks during the era of emancipation—a neglected episode in the history of African American writing and of American culture, more broadly, as well as a crucial dimension of the history of slavery and emancipation. It tells the stories of writers most people have never heard of, because none of them became a professional author or played a leading role in the events of their time…. Somewhere along the way, they learned to write…. [20] (p. 2)

Others have literally written them off as illiterate. Hager demonstrates that the truth lies in just the opposite. The lessons should echo across all of our fields of study.

Conclusion

Allow me to conclude simply and boldly: literacy—that is reading and writing over time and space, across diverse cultural, social, political, and economic contexts, and equally importantly across media—is the missing link in both written language and writing studies. The arguments and examples presented above—across time periods, spaces, modes of composition and preservation,

different creators and receivers—all illustrate this. Researchers and teachers cannot continue to neglect the complicated and sometimes contradictory realities of human acts of writing and reading—broadly defined—in inseparable relationships with each other(s). The literacy, reading, and writing myths must be criticized and qualified.

From classicists like Parry and Lord, the fundamental role of collective oral composition and transmission is made clear. This is reinforced by anthropological, linguistic, and cultural psychological research. Major works with supporting bibliographies fill the list of References below. Confirmation is cross-temporal, geography, class, gender, and other socio-cultural grouping.

Davis's groundbreaking early modern Europe studies along with religious history show the continuities over time. One or a few readers have always informed a much larger population. Unlike the studies of Parry and Lord, first block printing and then Gutenberg's moveable typography began to transform—gradually, unevenly, and selectively—the world of Davis' common people. We learn more from Martin Luther and early Protestant reformers use of new printing presses and the Roman Catholic Church's Counter-Reformation campaigns to ban books. Unlike today's book banners, the Popes' secretaries actually read the texts that they attempt to stop.

Original research on slave narratives by scholars like Hager continues the cross- and interdisciplinary reconstruction of our understandings of both reading and writing in inseparable interrelationships and interactions with each other.

In sharp contrast, rarely do written literature and writing studies attend to the concrete contexts of either or both composition and reception, to employ traditional literary critical terms. There are no actual readers in Emre's and others' studies of readers. Similarly, research on classic and canonical texts far too seldom inquires into the circumstances and the human processes of their creation. Impact is presumed.

We must redraft—that is, reread and rewrite—the study of reading and writing as deeply human and contextual. Without repeating my arguments and examples, I underscore the absolute centrality of the study of both writing and its reading in historical context for the future of writing studies and the history of English language research and interpretation. In the context of this special issue of *Across the Disciplines*, I also assert the interconnection and mutual enrichment of the study and interpretation of the writing and language(s) in their inescapable intersections.

We owe that to the past, present, and future. We must learn from each other across intra- and interdisciplinary separations.

References

Basso, Keith H. (1974). The ethnography of writing. In Richard Bauman & Joel Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 425-432). Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, Richard, & Briggs, Charles L. (1990). Poetics and performance as cultural perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 59-88.

Bennett, Eric. (2023, February 3). Can literary scholars transcend their training? The field has painted itself into a corner. John Guillory offers a way out. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/can-literary-scholars-transcend-their-training

Boone Hill, Elizabeth, & Mignolo, Walter D. (Eds.). (1994). *Writing without words: Alternative literacies in Mesoamerica and the Andes.* Duke University Press.

Bradbury, Kelly Susan. (2016). Reimagining popular notions of American intellectualism: literacy, education, and class. Southern Illinois University Press.

Brandt, Deborah. (2001). *Literacy in American lives.* Cambridge University Press.

Brandt, Deborah. (2015). *The rise of writing: Redefining mass literacy.* Cambridge University Press.

Callard, Agnes. (2023, December 2). I teach the humanities, and I still don't know what their value is. *New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2023/12/02/opinion/education-humanities-college-value.html

Clanchy, Michael. (1993). From memory to written record: England, 1066-1307 (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny, & Gumperz, John J. (1981). From oral to written culture: The transition to literacy. In M. Farr Whitman & L. Erlbaum (Eds.), *Variations in writing: Functional and linguistic cultural differences* (pp. 89-109). Routledge.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. (1975). Printing and the people: Early modern France and proverbial wisdom and popular wisdom. In N.Z. Davis*, Society and culture in Early Modern France* (pp. 189-226 and 227-267). Stanford University Press.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. (1983). *The return of Martin Guerre.* Harvard University Press.

Drucker, Johanna. (2014). *Graphesis: Visual forms of knowledge production.* Harvard University Press.

Duffy, John M. (2007). Writing from these roots: Literacy in a Hmong-American community. University of Hawaii Press.

Dyson, Anne Haas. (1989). Multiple worlds of child writers: Friends learning to write. Teachers College Press.

Dyson, Anne Haas. (2013). Rewriting the basics: Literacy learning in children's cultures. Teachers College Press.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. (1979). *The printing press as an agent of change* (Complete in One Volume). Cambridge University Press.

Emre, Merve. (2017). Paraliterary: The making of bad readers in postwar America. University of Chicago Press.

Emre, Merve. (2023, January 23). Has academia ruined literary criticism? *The New Yorker*. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2023/01/23/has-academia-ruined-literary-criticism-professing-criticism-john-guillory

Finnegan, Ruth. (1973). Literacy versus non-literacy: The great divide. In R. Horton & R. Finnegan (Eds.), *Modes of thought* (pp. 12-144). Faber and Faber.

Finnegan, Ruth. (1988). Literacy and orality: Studies in the technology of communication. Blackwell.

Galvao, Ana Maria de Oliveira, de Gouvea, Maria Cristina Soares, & Gomes, Ana Maria Rebelo. (2017). An interview with Harvey J Graff & Brian. *Literacy in Composition Studies, 5*(1), 49-66. (Reprinted from "Joint interview with Brian Street on the development of literacy studies," *Educação em Revista 32*, 267-282, 2016 and "Em busca do letramento: As origens sociais e intelectuais des estudos sobre letramento [Searching for literacy: The social and intellectual origins of literacy studies]," *Revista Brasileira de História da Educação 16*, 215-252, 2016)Ginzburg, Carlo. (1980). The cheese and the worms: The cosmos of a sixteenth-century miller. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Goody, Jack (Ed.). (1968). *Literacy in traditional societies.* Cambridge University Press.

Graff, Harvey J. (2023). The literacy myth: Literacy and social structure in the nineteenth-century city (4th ed.). WAC Publications.

Graff, Harvey J. (1987). The legacies of literacy: Continuities and contradictions in Western Society and culture. Indiana University Press.

Graff, Harvey J. (1991). The literacy myth: Cultural integration and social structure in the nineteenth century. Transaction Publishers.

Graff, Harvey J. (1995). The labyrinths of literacy: Reflections on literacy past and present. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Graff, Harvey J. (Ed.). (2007). *Literacy and historical development: A reader.* Southern Illinois University Press.

Graff, Harvey J. (2010). The literacy myth at thirty. *Journal of Social History, 43*, 635-661.

Graff, Harvey J. (2011, 2023). *Literacy myths, legacies, and lessons: New studies on literacy*. Transaction Publishers; new edition with additional chapters WAC Clearinghouse.

Graff, Harvey J. (2012). Literacy studies and interdisciplinary studies: Reflections on history and theory. In R. Foshay (Ed.), *Valences of interdisciplinarity: Theory, practice, pedagogy*, *Cultural Dialectics Series* (pp. 273-307). AU/Athabasca University Press.

Graff, Harvey J. (2013). The legacies of literacy studies, inaugural symposium, *Literacy in Composition Studies Journal, 1*(1), 15-17.

Graff, Harvey J. (2014). Epilogue: Literacy studies and interdisciplinary studies with notes on the place of Deborah Brandt. In Julie Nelson Christoph, John Duffy, Eli Goldblatt, Nelson Graff, Rebecca Nowacek, and Bryan Trabold (Eds.), *Literacy, economy, and power: Writing and research after* Literacy in American Lives (pp. 202-226). Southern Illinois University Press.

Graff, Harvey J. (2015). Undisciplining knowledge: Interdisciplinarity in the twentieth century. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Graff, Harvey J. (2016). The 'problem' of interdisciplinarity in theory, practice, and history. *Social Science History, 40*(4), 775-803.

Graff, Harvey J. (2022a). The new literacy studies and the resurgent literacy myth. *Literacy in Composition Studies*, 9, 47-53.

Graff, Harvey J. (2022b, May 6). Myths shape the continuing 'Crisis of the Humanities,' *Inside Higher Education*. https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2022/05/06/myths-underlie-humanities-crisis-discourse-opinion

Graff, Harvey J. (2022c). Searching for literacy: The social and intellectual origins of literacy studies. Palgrave Macmillan.

Graff, Harvey J. (2022d). The inseparability of 'historical myths' and 'permanent crises' in the humanities. *Journal of Liberal Arts and Humanities, 3*(9), 16-26.

Graff, Harvey J. (2022e, October 3). The ridiculous proliferation of subject 'literacies' is harming education. *Times Higher Education*. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/ridiculous-proliferation-subject-literacies-harming-education

Graff, Harvey J. (2023). The persistent 'reading myth' and the 'crisis of the humanities.' *College Composition and Communication*, *74*(2), 575-580.

Graff, Harvey J. (2024). My life with literacy: The continuing education of a historian: Intersections of the personal, the political, the academic, and place. WAC Publications and University Press of Colorado.

Graff, Harvey J., & John Duffy. (2007). Literacy myths. In Brian V. Street & Nancy Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., vol. 2, pp. 41-52). Springer.

Graff, Harvey J., Mackinnon, Alison, Sandin, Bengt, & Winchester, Ian (Eds.). (2009). *Understanding literacy in its historical contexts: Socio-cultural history and the legacy of Egil Johansson.* Nordic Academic Press.

Grafton, Anthony T. (1980). The importance of being printed. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* 11, 265-285.

Grafton, Anthony T., Eisenstein, Elizabeth L., & Johns, Adrian. (1980). How revolutionary was the print revolution? *American Historical Review*, 107, 84-128.

Guillory, John. (1993). Cultural capital: The problem of literary canon formation. University of Chicago Press.

Guillory, John. (2000). The ethical practice of modernity: The example of reading. In Beatrice Hanssen Garber & Rebecca L. Walkowitz (Eds.), *The turn to ethics* (pp. 29-46). Routledge.

Guillory, John. (2008a). On the presumption of knowing how to read. *ADE Bulletin*, 145, 8-11.

Guillory, John. (2008b). How scholars read. *ADE Bulletin*, 146, 8-14.

Guillory, John. (2011). Close reading: Prologue and epilogue. *ADE Bulletin,* 149, 8-14.

Guillory, John. (2021). "Flipping" the history of literary studies. *Los Angeles Review of Books*. https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/flipping-the-history-of-literary-studies/

Guillory, John. (2022). Professing criticism: Essays on the organization of literary study. University of Chicago Press.

Guillory, John. (2023). 'We cannot all be Edward Said': John Guillory responds to his critics on politics and criticism. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/we-cannot-all-be-edward-said

Hager, Christopher. (2013). *Word by word: Emancipation and the art of writing.* Harvard University Press.

Hager, Christopher. (2018). *I remain yours: Common lives in Civil War letters.* Harvard University Press.

Harker, Michael. (2015). The lure of literacy: A critical reception of the compulsory composition Debate. SUNY Press.

Harris, William V. (1989). *Ancient literacy.* Harvard University Press.

Havelock, Eric A. (1963). *Preface to Plato.* Belknap Press.

Havelock, Eric A. (1977). The preliteracy of the Greeks. *New Literary History, 9*, 369-392.

Havelock, Eric A. (1982). The literate revolution in Greece and its cultural consequences. Princeton University Press.

Havelock, Eric A. (1986). *The muse learns to write.* Yale University Press.

Havelock, Eric A. (1990). The coming of literate communication to Western culture. *Journal of Communication, 30,* 90-99.

Heath, Shirley Brice. (1983). Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms. Cambridge University Press.

Hoggart, Richard. (1961). The uses of literacy: Changing patterns in English mass culture. Beacon Press.

Lord, Alfred B. (1995). *The singer resumes the tales* (Mary Louis Lord, Ed.). Cornell University Press.

Lord, Alfred B. (2000). *The singer of tales* (2nd ed., Stephen Mitchell & Gregory Nagy, Eds.). Harvard University Press.

Moore, Colette. (2011). History of the English language in the English department: Past and present. In Michael Adams & Anne Curzan (Eds.), *Contours of English and English language studies* (pp. 157-167). University of Michigan Press.

Olson, David R. (1994). The world on paper: The conceptual and cognitive implications of reading and writing. Cambridge University Press.

Ong, Walter. (1958). *Ramus, method, and the decay of dialogue*. Harvard University Press.

Ong, Walter. (1963). *The presence of the word.* Yale University Press.

Ong, Walter. (1977). *Interfaces of the word.* Cornell University Press.

Ong, Walter. (1982). *Orality and literacy.* Methuen.

Parry, Milman. (1971). *The making of Homeric verse: The collected papers of Milman Parry* (Adam Perry, Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Rappaport, Joanne. (1990). The politics of memory: Native historical interpretation in the Columbian Andes. Duke University Press.

Rappaport, Joanne, & Cummins, Tom. (2012). *Beyond the lettered city: Indigenous literacies in the Andes.* Duke University Press.

Robbins, Bruce. (2023a, February 3). John Guillory's nonalignment pact: Is the prominent critic stuck in the '90s—or the '60s? *Chronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/john-guillorys-nonalignment-pact

Robbins, Bruce. (2023b, February 22). The politics of organic intellectuals: A debate about criticism and society. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-politics-of-organic-intellectuals

Satz, Debra, & Edelstein, Dan. (2023, September 3). By abandoning civics, colleges helped create the culture wars. *New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/09/03/opinion/colleges-civics-core-curriculum-culture-wars.html

Schuessler, Jennifer. (2023, February 3). What is literary criticism for? *New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/03/arts/john-guillory-literary-criticism.html

Scribner, Robert W. (1984). Oral culture and the diffusion of Reformation ideas. *History of European Ideas*, 5, 237-256.

Scribner, Sylvia, & Cole, Michael. (1981). *The psychology of literacy.* Harvard University Press.

Steedman, Carolyn. (1999). A woman writing a letter. In R. Earle (Ed.), *Epistolary selves: Letters and letter writers, 1600-1945,* (pp. 111-133). Ashgate.

Steedman, Carolyn. (2005). Poetic maids and cooks who write. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 39, 1-27.

Street, Brian. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, Deborah (Ed.). (1982). Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy. Ablex.

Turner, James. (2004). *Language, religion, knowledge, past and present*. Notre Dame University Press.

Turner, James. (2014). Philology: The forgotten origins of the modern humanities. Princeton University Press.

Witham, Nick. (2023). Popularizing the past: Historians, publishers, and readers in Postwar America. University of Chicago Press.

Worthen, Molly. (2022, December 2). If it was good enough for Socrates, it's good enough for sophomores. *New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2022/12/02/opinion/college-oral-exam.html

Notes

[1] I use notes for longer lists of references that obstruct readability within the primary text. Readers may interpret this as my effort to interrelate writing across genres with reading. I acknowledge that history of English language (HEL) studies at some points do consider certain elements of literacy among their variables. These efforts remain too rare and are concerned primarily with linguistics and language standardization. My concerns in this essay fall primarily across social and cultural histories, and their intersections in historical contexts, collective culture, the intersections of reading and writing, and across languages. I thank Chris Palmer for asking me to clarify this point, and Jennifer Stone for inviting me and for her constructive criticism.

[2] Among the references to fundamental works on the history of literacy including literacy studies, see Galvao, 2016/2017; Graff, all references; Davis, 1975; Clanchy, 1993; Drucker, 2014; Harris, 1989; Havelock, 1963, 1977, 1982, 1986, 1990; Lord, 1995, 2002; Parry, 1971. Compare those works to Goody, 1968; Olson, 1994; Ong, 1958, 1963, 1977, 1982. See also Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1981; Dyson, 1989, 2013; Finnegan, 1973, 1988; Heath, 1983; Scribner and Cole, 1981; Street, 1984.

[3] See this issue; also Graff, 2022c, especially Ch. 5, 143-187, passim; Graff, 1979, 1991, 2010, 2011, 2014; on interdisciplinarity, see also Graff, 2015.

[4] Among the references to fundamental works on the history of literacy including literacy studies, see Galvao, 2016/2017; Graff, all references; Davis, 1975; Clanchy, 1993; Drucker, 2014; Harris, 1989; Havelock, 1963, 1977, 1982, 1986, 1990; Lord, 1995, 2002; Parry, 1971. Compare those works to Goody, 1968; Olson, 1994; Ong, 1958, 1963, 1977, 1982. See also Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz, 1981; Dyson, 1989, 2013; Finnegan, 1973, 1988; Heath, 1983; Scribner and Cole, 1981; Street, 1984.

[5] See Brandt, 2001, 2015, and Graff, 2014. Compare with others in writing studies such as Duffy, 2007. Duffy was Brandt's doctoral student. Compare also with Harker, 2015; Bradbury, 2016. Harker and Bradbury were my doctoral students. See also Hager, 2013, 2018 and below. For pathbreaking studies of children's writing and reading, see Heath, 1983, and Dyson, 1989, 2013.

[6] On the printing myth, see Eisenstein, 1979; Grafton, et al., 1980; Graff, 1987; Grafton, 1980. Contrast with the works cited in Notes 4 and 5 above.

[7] Emre cites only one article by John Guillory who attempted for three decades to bring these issues to the attention of fellow literary critics. She does not cite his 1993 *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* or the more directly relevant "The Ethical Practice of Modernity: The Example of Reading," 2000; "On the Presumption of Knowing How to Read," 2008; "How Scholars Read," 2008, pp. 8-17; and "Close Reading: Prologue and Epilogue" 2011. Emre misses all this in her uninformed 2023 review of Guillory's 2022 *Professing Criticism*.

[8] See Graff, 2022a, 2022b, 2022d, 2023. I am now writing "reconstructing the 'uni-versity' from the ashes of the 'multi- and mega-versity.'"

[9] See references to Graff and Guillory works; see also Robbins responses to Guillory, 2023a, 2023b; Bennett, 2023; Schuessler, 2023.

[10] Among many examples, see Satz & Edelstein, 2023 of Stanford; Callard, 2023 of University of Chicago.

[11] For introductory background, see Graff, 1987, 2011, 2022; Moore, 2011; Turner, 2004, 2014.

[12] Among a rich cross cultural and ethnographic literature, see for example, Basso, 1974; Bauman and Briggs, 1990; Boone Hill & Mignolo, 1994; Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1981; Finnegan, 1973, 1988; Hoggart, 1961; Rappaport, 1990; Rappaport & Cummins, 2012; Scribner & Cole, 1981; Tannen, 1982, among other linguists and related works.

[13] See in particular Finnegan 1973, 1988; contrast with the works of Goody, 1968; Olson, 1994; Ong, 1958, 1963, 1977, 1982 listed below.

[14] Contrast this with the fictionalizations of Worthen, 2022 in the Opinion pages of the *New York Times*; contrast, for example, with Hager, 2013, 2018, among others.

[15] See the works of Clanchy, 1993; Graff, all references; Harris, 1989; Havelock, 1963, 1977, 1982, 1986. 1990; Lord, 1995, 2000; Parry, 1971; R. W. Scribner, 1984.

[16] See also Parry, 1971; Lord, 1995.

[17] See Parry, 1971; Havelock, 1963, 1977, 1982, 1986, 1990; Harris, 1989; Graff, 1987; see also Clanchy, 1993.

[18] See also Davis's "Proverbial Wisdom and Popular Errors," 1975, referencing Richard Hoggart's 1961 classic work, *The Uses of Literacy*. See also R.W. Scribner, 1984.

[19] See also the classic Ginzburg, 1980; Steedman, 1999, 2005.

[20] Compare with the critical studies of Dyson, 1989, 2013, and Heath, 1983 among others.

Contact

Harvey J. Graff
Title Professor Emeritus of English and History, Ohio Eminent Scholar in Literacy Studies, and Academy Professor
Department of English
The Ohio State University
Email: graff.40@osu.edu

Complete APA Citation

Graff, Harvey J. (2024, December 31). Writing and reading: The missing elements in historical and contemporary studies of english language writing. [Special issue on *Confluences of Writing Studies and the History of the English Language*] *Across the Disciplines*, 21(2/3), 313-326. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2024.21.2-3.14