The purpose of this paper is to examine the ways in which Bain, Kitzhaber, and Berlin to writing pedagogy by providing a definition of rhetoric, and Bain’s 1890 work “TITLE HERE” provides a definition of rhetoric that continues to exemplify the move away from faculty psychology, (???) and gives special attention to the paragraph. The paragraph, for Bain, is particularly important in teaching writing. In Kitzaber’s “TITLE HERE” published in 1953 provides a historical overview of changes in writing curriculum and pedagogy from 1850 to 1950. Kitzaber provides specific information about the impact of Bain’s work on the paragraph. (FIX) Similar to Kitzhaber, Berlin provides an overview of writing pedagogy and curriculum from 1900-1985. The works of Bain, Kitzhaber, and Berlin continue to contribute to writing pedagogy\_\_\_\_\_\_?

Bain’s definition of rhetoric moves it beyond oratory. He defines rhetoric as “the means whereby language, spoken or written, may be rendered effective” (p. 1146). This definition specifically views rhetoric as an art practiced in both oral and written forms. This definition also explains Bain’s attention given to attempts made to “methodize” instruction of composition. If the purpose of rhetoric is to be effective, then, for Bain, the role of the teacher as the trainer… (p. ???). Because Bain believes improving the writing of students is difficult as a result of limited and/or limiting knowledge of language on account of it “resulting from the practice of a life” and as such composition instructors must find ways to condense lessons. Understanding this issue as a limitation to writing instruction Bain pushes for instructors to focus on the paragraph as a means to teach writing effectively. The paragraph, according to Bain, “PARAGRAPH QUOTE”

Bain introduces the method of prescribing paragraphs. He sees this practice as leading to the student understanding in their mind what is good composition. These paragraphs that exemplify good composition would not only help students understand what is good composition, but also how to unburden the student from what Bain refers to as “finding matter as well as language” (p. 1146). Bain prioritizes the paragraph because it “has a plan dictated by the nature of the composition” (p. 1148). Bain’s approach and understanding of rhetoric, according to Lunsford, suggests, “he looked upon rhetoric primarily as an analytic study of style, its causes, and its effects” (p.293). Lunsford’s observation is evident in his section on paragraphs. Not only does Bain view them as means to teach good composition, but he pays great attention to style. If “every pertinent statement has a suitable place; in that place, it contributes to the general effect,” then I think he also values the relationship between style and arrangement. Bain’s definition of rhetoric would later be contested and impact writing pedagogy

 In 1893 a general consensus is reached, and rhetoric is thus defined as “the art of communication” (p. 149). Ultimately, these shifts lead scholars in rhetoric to address the social aspect of writing, the practice of writing, and other areas explored during this transitional phase.

Kitzhaber’s dissertation “TITLE HERE” addresses the impact of Bain’s work. While Kitzhaber does point out that Bain was not the first to focus on the paragraph, he does cite Bain’s work as the “QUOTE” (idea is that it was the work often built on or used to justify paragraph as teaching model for writing). Eventually writing pedagogy moves away from the paragraph, and begins to focus on composition as a whole, but for a time (FROM Year to Year) the paragraph was vital to writing pedagogy and instruction.

 Kitzhaber does more than provide a historical overview of the changes in writing curriculum and pedagogy from 1850 – 1950. He also provides his own definition of rhetoric. Kitzhaber’s contribution of a definition of rhetoric that is linked to language and human communication allows for a different understanding and approach to language. If “language is the medium of human communication,” then rhetoric is the “art which shows how to make this communication most effective” (p. 141). Rhetoric as communication is as significant to the field then, and now, because it moves away from persuasion and allows for rhetoric to be linked and applied to writing and the language that is used to communicate. This definition of rhetoric moves it from being “predominantly abstract” (p. 205) to a discipline that is more concrete, and visible within writing practices implemented in university curriculums. The attention now directed at writing made rhetoric practical, and therefore practiced more easily.

 Kitzhaber’s definition can be viewed as a system created by his statement that rhetoric is the art of communication.Awareness of the discourse that makes up a system also aids in understanding the discourse that makes up a theory, or discipline. To better understand the discipline of rhetoric we must take into account the numerous systems that created the knowledge that informs rhetorical theory. (From previous QEP may still work with Berlin, but not sure if it does without Foucault)

Similar to Kitzhaber, Berlin contributes to rhetoric as a system with his definition.

For example, James Berlin in *Rhetoric and Reality* defines rhetoric as a term referring to a diverse discipline that ultimately is made up of major systems that are eventually replaced (p. 3). Rhetoric should be deemed rhetorics. He argues that rhetoric should be plural due to the fact that there always exist a dominant system of rhetorics in play, and other competing systems of rhetorical ideas and theories. He explains this by providing three epistemological categories. The objective theories stem from the outside world. It is the nature of what is real. Truth exists before language. Subjective theories come from within. In the subjective truth is only known internally, and it is not shared through communication. Transactional theories come from the interaction or intersection of the objective and the subjective. Truth forms from that interaction, or intersection. Truth, then, can only emerge from “the material, the social, and the personal” as they interact.

This is a reflection of the epistemic nature of rhetoric. The numerous systems help to define rhetoric and create knowledge.

For this reason Berlin prefers to use epistemology rather than ideology. Ideology refers only to the “conceptions of social and political arrangements” (p. 4) of a time and work to reflect the ideology of a dominant group. Berlin focuses on the epistemology because the rhetorical systems are based on “epistemological assumptions” on nature of reality, nature of the knower, and the rules for discovery and communication (p.4). These assumptions are what he believes hold a greater influence of the rhetorical systems of the past, and ultimately the future. He argues that instead of looking back at the ideologies that influenced rhetorical systems we need to look at the epistemology. In the conclusion to *Rhetoric and Reality* Berlin explains that rhetoric moving in the direction of epistemic accounts for its role as “a method of discovering and even creating knowledge” (p. 197). He goes on to add that this knowledge is “frequently within socially defined discourse communities,” which is not vastly dissimilar from Foucault’s view of discourse creating objects.

In the specific case of rhetoric as Kitzhaber and Berlin address the discipline we see that the discourse surround rhetoric created not only a discipline, but also the shifts in the curriculum that make up how rhetoric is taught. The importance of this Berlin’s particular understanding of rhetoric is that it pushes the field forward so that we can focus on rhetorics, and what it means to approach the field of rhetoric in this way.