

THE LINGUISTIC TURN: THE ABSENT TEXT OF
EDUCATIONAL HISTORIOGRAPHY*

Sol Cohen

What is omnipresent is imperceptible. Nothing is more commonplace than the reading experience and yet nothing is more unknown. Reading is such a matter of course that at first glance there is nothing to say about it.

Tzvetan Todorov, "Reading as Construction," in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crossman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 67.

I

"What do you read my lord?"

"Words, words, words."

This exchange between Hamlet and Polonius might be echoed by the historian of education who is asked to state the basic material of his study. Yet we don't pay much attention to words, language, or reading.

This should be an exciting time for historians of education. During the past fifteen years or so some of our best scholars in fields as diverse as linguistics, philosophy, sociology, and literary theory have been re-examining conventional ideas about language and re-thinking the relation between language and thought, language and action and language and history. The emphasis on language has led one group of historians to develop a new framework for doing history in which language is considered as an event or form of action as real or material as any non-linguistic event or action; in which codes, or paradigms, or systems of language become the basic unit of historical investigation; and in which language generally, its use, production, diffusion, and appropriation over time is moved to the centre of the historian's concern. The radical focus on language as event not

only adds a whole new category of historical "facts," a whole new family of historical "acts" to the historians' traditional concern with laws, wars, and changes of political administrations, but calls attention to new methods for understanding the problem of social and cultural change and new methods for gauging the extent of such change. This approach, pioneered by the English historian of political thought, J.G.A. Pocock, is currently being pursued by historians Keith Baker and Lynn Hunt among others.¹ The "linguistic turn" has at the same time led another group of historians to explore the relevance of modern literary theory for history. It is this latter development which is the primary focus of this paper.²

It might be assumed that as a species of non-fiction, history is free from the entanglements and limitations posed by the nature of language and which condition all writing. But in recent years, thanks largely to the work of historians Hayden White, Hans Kellner, Dominick La Capra, and F.R. Ankersmit, it is now possible to discuss the relationship between history and language, and history and rhetoric, in ways that would have been deemed outlandish ten or fifteen years ago. White's is the most fully and carefully articulated theory of a poetics of historiography.³

White construes history-writing as pre-eminently a literary or poetic activity. That is, historical writing is writing, a form of prose discourse, a piece of literature first of all, and thus possesses the same linguistic properties as any other kind of literature. Consequently, literary theory must be at the centre of modern historiography. A work of history is to be read with the tools and concepts provided by literary theory, for the art of its composition, the rhetorical demands required by its particular mode of emplotment, and the rhetorical means by which it claims to represent historical truth or reality. White's project is to correct the epistemological innocence of most historians, namely, their reluctance to consider the fabricated quality of histories, "the contents of which are as much *invented* as *found* [sic] and the forms of which have more in common with their counterparts in literature than they have with those in the sciences."⁴ In short, the historian is a story-teller. Historians make stories out of mere chronicles, shaping their materials, choosing what is a fact, an event, and then arranging the selected events into a particular narrative plot structure. Indeed, priority must be given the plot structure, the historian's "prefiguration" of a sequence of events "as a story of particular kind."⁵ Historians give the past meaning by telling now one and now another kind of story about it. However, the number of possible story forms or emplotments available to us for endowing events with meaning are not infinite but are "coterminous with the number of generic story types available in a historian's own culture."⁶

As White depicts the field of prefigurative narrative structures available to historians, he allocates historical plot narratives to genres just as one would a novel or a play. Following literary critic Northrop Frye, White identifies a stock of four inherited story forms or archetypal plot structures which constitute the historian's initial dramatic resources: Romance, Comedy, Tragedy, and Satire,

which, within limits, can be mixed or combined. Briefly, the essential plot element in Romance is the "adventure quest," characterized by a progress or evolution, ending in ultimate triumph, or the promise of ultimate triumph. The characteristic plot trajectory of Comedy is U-shaped, with the action sinking from grand beginnings into potential catastrophe, then a sudden upward turn to a transformation or happy ending. The pre-generic plot element of Tragedy is that of the death of the hero, or the demise of the heroic. The essential plot element of Satire is that of a decline and fall from grand beginnings and (authorial) criticism, or "attack from a high moral line."

Further, these four *mythoi* correlate in a general way with four principal modes of ideological implication: Anarchist, Liberal or Progressive, Conservative, and Radical. That is, how one emplots history engages larger social and cultural questions. The historian's choice of story form or plot structure is an index of a particular ethical or moral and political sensibility and as such accounts for the generation of different interpretations of history. From this perspective, disputes among historians are not so much about what "really" happened or about "objectivity" versus "distortion" as much as they are disputes about different emplotment strategies; "what one historian may emplot as a tragedy another may emplot as a comedy or romance," each of which possesses its own ideological implications. Moreover, the historian's choice of plot structure and rhetorical devices have a "performative" dimension in the sense that written history is history *for* as well as *of*. Written history is "for" in the sense of being written for a specific audience or social group or community of discourse and performs a certain function in some particular discourse of its time; it is "for" in the sense of being written with some political or ideological aim in view. Moreover, histories are structured for purposes of persuading readers that one version of the past is truer or more correct or more objective than another one and thus to persuade readers to assume a particular attitude towards the past and thus towards present reality.⁷

Certainly there are serious theoretical issues raised by White's approach, many of which he himself has addressed.⁸ Nonetheless, the value of White's topological or poetic theory of historiography is this—it enables us to read historical texts by reference to the mode of emplotment and rhetorical strategies that predominate in them in addition to or as an alternative to our usual way of reading which focuses on a "content" which exists outside or prior to its form or structure, the supposed neutral or transparent container in which that content is transmitted. This approach to historical writing as pre-eminently a poetic or literary enterprise has led Hans Kellner, following White, to elaborate a rhetorical or "crooked" way of reading histories which most economically makes the point. To avoid misunderstanding we should quote Kellner:

Getting the story crooked means looking at the historical text in such a way as to make more apparent the problems and decisions that shape its [rhetorical] strategies.... It is a way of looking...at the *other* sources of

history [sic], found not in archives or computer databases but in discourse and rhetoric.⁹

By reminding historians of the irreducible rhetorical or poetic nature of historical discourse, White and Kellner challenge us to domesticate ourselves in the poetic world and to become more reflective about the nature and problematics of writing and reading history. Their challenge, so far as historians of education are concerned, has largely fallen upon deaf ears.

One must be concerned with the current state of educational historiography. An unseemly provincialism, a singular lack of intellectual curiosity even, has in the last decade or so settled over the historiography of education.¹⁰ White is the most interesting if not the most talented of historians in the field today. Whether one agrees with him or not, his work cannot be ignored. It is astonishing that in the seventeen years since the publication of his *Metahistory* (1973) White has had so little visible impact on historians of education. With the exception of Richard Angelo's fugitive essays, historians of education have shown no interest in theory of narrative or in the rhetorical sources of historical knowledge, understanding, or practice.¹¹ This is the absent text of educational historiography referred to in the title of this paper.

What follows is an exercise in the application of historiographical poetics and narrative theory to the reading of a recent work of American educational history. I have chosen David F. Labaree's *The Making of an American High School: The Credentials Market and the Central High School of Philadelphia, 1838-1939*, the winner of the (American) History of Education Society's Outstanding Book Award for 1989, for the exercise.¹² With its particular narrative formulae, particular ideological implications, and particular rhetorical strategies, *The Making of an American High School* represents one of the two main competing and alternative genres, modes of emplotment, or prefigurative moves in American educational historiography today, the other being the Romantic or Comedic genre as represented, for example, by the late Lawrence A. Cremin's *The Transformation of the School* or Diane Ravitch's *The Troubled Crusade*.

This exercise is intended as illustrative and suggestive. There is no one right way of reading Labaree's book or of reading any historical work, only ways of reading.¹³ What I hope to demonstrate is that a rhetorical reading, one which focuses on the rhetorical tactics Labaree employs, how he attempts to establish the credibility of his version of the past reality of American education and to persuade readers his is the "true" or "correct" version, may yield novel insights, discover meaning in unexpected places, and increase the pleasures of "reading between the lines."

II

The mythopoeic titles of many histories of education are revelatory of their mode of emplotment, e.g., Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (Romance);

Diane Ravitch, *The Troubled Crusade* (Romantic Comedy); Michael Katz, *The Irony of School Reform* (Satiric Comedy); Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (Tragedy); Ira Shor, *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration, 1964-1984* (Satiric Comedy). *The Making of an American High School* is emplotted in the mode of Satire, an unrelenting critique, the reverse or a parody of the idealization of American public education which, for example, characterizes the Romantic/Comedic tradition in American educational historiography. The political and educational ideology implicated in *The Making of an American High School* is Progressive.

The narrative trajectory of Labaree's book is a downward spiral. Its predominant mood is one of anger and disillusionment with the deterioration or subversion and fall from grace of American public secondary education. The story line of *The Making of an American High School*, though the reverse of Romance, is equally formulaic: from democratic origins, conflict and decline and fall. The conflict is between egalitarianism and "market values," between the early democratic aspirations of Central High School to produce a virtuous and informed citizenry for the new republic and its latter-day function as an elitist "credentials market" controlled by a middle class whose goal is to ensure that their sons receive the "credentials" which would entitle them to become the functionaries of capitalist society.¹⁴ The decline and fall of American public secondary education, according to Labaree, begins in the 1890s, not only at Central High School (CHS) of Philadelphia but throughout the United States; Labaree egregiously extrapolates from the former to the latter throughout the book.¹⁵ The metaphor of the "credentials market," by which Labaree means to signify a vulgar or profane and malignant essence of American secondary education, is one of the main rhetorical devices deployed in *The Making of an American High School*. Labaree stresses the baneful effect of "market forces" and "market values" on every aspect of CHS and American secondary education: governance, pedagogy, the students, the curriculum. As befits his Satiric mode of emplotment, Labaree attacks the "market" conception of secondary education from a "high moral line," that of democracy and egalitarianism. The lugubrious downward narrative trajectory of *The Making of an American High School* unexpectedly takes a Romantic or Comedic upward turn at the very end of the book, when Labaree mysteriously foresees the coming transformation of the high school. We have to quote Labaree's last paragraph. "As a market institution," he writes, "the contemporary high school is an utter failure." Yet "when rechartered as a common school, it has great potential." The common public high school "would be able to focus on equality rather than stratification and on learning rather than the futile pursuit of educational credentials." Stripped of its debilitating market concerns, "the common high school," Labaree contends in his final sentence, "could seek to provide what had always eluded the early selective high school; a quality education for the whole community."¹⁶ The End. Labaree's ending is underdeveloped and implausibly optimistic, even utopian, in

stark contrast to his previous chapters. It is an ending which poses a fascinating historiographical problem.

The problem of beginnings and endings of histories is a fascinating one because beginnings and endings are not *givens* and they demonstrate in an obvious and fundamental way, once one is made aware of it, how our decisions to start and stop writing at a certain point are literary or rhetorical decisions, and how these decisions affect the stories we tell.¹⁷ Suppose we take a closer look at Labaree's ending. The last line of his book suggests that we may be at the dawn of a new age. This ending is a piece of pure literary design, a hoary convention of the Romantic genre. That is not the problem. The problem is that Labaree's ending conflicts with the Satiric mode of emplotment which characterizes *The Making of an American High School*. That is, the Satiric trajectory of Labaree's narrative should lead inexorably to the conclusion that we must resign ourselves to the world of secondary education as it is—alas, we live or rather go to school unhappily ever after—or to the conclusion that radical action must be taken to change the educational system or some catastrophe will occur which will destroy our schools or our lives. Instead, *The Making of an American High School* ends with reference to the world of desires and dreams; the dreamer says "Let There Be Common High Schools."

The high school may presently be a servant of the marketplace, but it can be transformed, as in a wish-fulfillment dream or fantasy, into the kind of high school its democratic advocates always envisioned. But the underlying thrust of *The Making of an American High School* is that nothing has changed in American secondary education between the 1890s and 1939 or the 1890s and the present; yet Labaree would have us believe that things will be different in the future. Everyone will live or learn happily ever after. The "market forces" will be overcome. The public high school will in the future be transformed. How might this come about? How will the dark forces of the market be overcome? One can only make happen what one dreams about first.

Diane Ravitch, in another but related context, criticizes histories of American education that define American public schools as institutions which simply "preserve the status quo and parcel out credentials." Such "hard-edged cynicism," she goes on, "has less truth than the 'myth' it is intended to debunk."¹⁸ We have no quarrel with the Satiric tradition of doing educational history or, more specifically, with Labaree's Satiric mode of emplotting his story. His is a legitimate way to create meaning from the profusion of meaningless "sources" on education we find about us as the Romantic mode of emplotting histories of education. Labaree's ending, however, lacks one of the key ingredients of a good story: a credible ending, a plausible and convincing culmination, closure, moral. Labaree's concluding statement of hope and promise does not follow from what precedes. His ending requires more bite, a call to take up arms, a call for an educational revolution. Labaree's Satiric mode of emplotment calls for a cataclysmic transformation type of ending, not a wish-fulfillment dream type of

ending. Labaree's happy ending lacks "rightness of fit," to borrow a term from Nelson Goodman.

Labaree's problem seems to have been this. The future of the American public high school is very much at the centre of the contemporary debate in American education. Labaree is committed to the ideal of public secondary education. *The Making of an American High School* could not end with a call for revolution in the public high school; Labaree is a Progressive, not a Radical or Anarchist. Nor could it end on a note of resignation or despair (readers cannot be left without the hope that somehow, sometime, change will be effected in the public high school or else they might flee to the private school sector, the *bete noir* of American Progressives). Labaree's egalitarian political and educational sensibilities will not permit an unhappy ending, although nothing in his narrative justifies anything else.

Labaree employs two major rhetorical devices in *The Making of an American High School*: one is that of the "market" metaphor, the other is his utilization of the technical apparatus of Quantitative Research Methodology. Labaree's utilization of the "market" as his central, governing metaphor, at least since the publication of *The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Market-Place* and *Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargain and Academic Reform in the American High School*, no longer has much force as revelation.¹⁹ And his use of the metaphor is mechanical and simplistic. Labaree refers hazily to "markets," "market values," "market pressures," "market forces," and the "intrusion of the market." Readers are supposed to understand what Labaree intends to signify by the metaphor and to agree with him that public secondary education in America is undemocratic and inequalitarian. Labaree takes all this for granted, never explaining, never justifying. That the "market" might also stand for deregulation, freedom of choice, empowering parents, or accountability, for example, none of which would seem to infringe adversely on democratic ideals, and all of which might possibly advance the goal of egalitarianism and quality in education, seems not to have crossed his mind.²⁰ Nevertheless, the "market" metaphor is an heuristically useful device which enables Labaree to reveal an aspect of American public education that is completely ignored or omitted in Romantic emplotments of American educational histories.

There is something more significant going on in Labaree's book, however, than his emplotment of the history of American secondary education in the mode of Satire and the formulation of his argument in terms of the metaphor of the market. Thus, the most prominent rhetorical device Labaree utilizes in *The Making of An American High School* is actually not that of the market metaphor, but that of the terminology and apparatus of Quantitative Research Methodology. Labaree confronts the reader with no less than fifteen statistical tables in what is a very brief work (only about 180 pages of text), as well as four statistical Appendices. Two samples from the latter will serve to give the flavour of the whole.

From Appendix B:

Table B. 1, "Wealth of Central Parents by Class, 1860 and 1870 Combined" (with columns for "class," "mean," "N," and "S. D."), Table B. 2, Occupational Distribution of Household Heads, CHS vs. Philadelphia, 1880. (With columns for "Central High (%), Philadelphia (%), Index of Representativeness (%)"²¹)

From Appendix C:

The primary technique used in analyzing student achievement was multiple classification analysis (MCA), a form of multiple regression using categorical predictor variables (called factors). MCA constructs a beta for each factor as a whole rather than for each level of this variable as is done in regression with dummy variables.

There is one assumption of both regression and MCA which was violated routinely during my analysis, the assumption of homoscedasticity....²²

What stance are we to take before these Tables and Appendices? What is their meaning or function? What do they do? How do they work? How shall we read them?

We will assume, with White, that histories have a performative dimension; to persuade an audience to act, feel, or value in a particular way. And that they are structured to have that particular effect: *all* their constituent parts, from title to dedication and acknowledgements, from foreward to footnotes to bibliography, index, and appendices, etc., may be thought of as rhetorical strategies. And that is how we intend to read Labaree's Tables and Appendices. One can applaud Labaree's diligence in finding and mining a trove of empirical data ("based on a sample of two thousand students drawn from the first hundred years" of CHS).²³ But there is a kind of rhetorical overkill here. For all his figures and statistics, we are not much wiser than before; they are actually redundant. They give us no new information. What is their function in the text then? Labaree's utilization of the nomenclature and technical apparatus of quantitative research methodology is to be understood as no more (or less) than a rhetorical strategy in the service of "realism."²⁴

Within the conventions of its genre, *The Making of an American High School*, though lacking in grace as a piece of writing, possesses some complexity and depth, if not breadth: it is an acceptable story. But as if Labaree were dissatisfied with the credibility and persuasiveness of a mere story, or with that story's formal rhetorical properties, its Satiric mode of emplotment, its metaphoric mode of explanation, its fairy-tale ending, or were aware of its writerly deficiencies, he puts on scientific or Positivist airs. Labaree's piling on

of inessential detail and his deployment of the arcane vocabulary and symbols of quantitative research function as a rhetorical device to counteract or efface the discursivity, the textuality, the obvious literary-ness of *The Making of an American High School* and to reinforce or enhance the authority of his book and the ideological thrust of his argument. As if the language of "mean," "standard deviation," "regression analysis," "beta factors," "dummy variables," and "homoscedasticity," vis-à-vis ordinary language, were a transcendent, epistemologically superior or privileged language: rigorously scientific, impartial, objective. From this perspective, the Tables and Appendices in *The Making of an American High School* are not actually there to be read; they are, in fact, unreadable. They are simply there to be seen; their sheer presence in the text is what "counts."

As we learn from White and Kellner, among others, historians are engaged in the reading and writing of stories. Writing history is in essential ways analogous to writing a story. Reading history is in essential ways analogous to reading a story. As writers what we produce are stories or models of story-telling, representations of historical reality, or manifestations of the historical imagination; in our field, what we produce is a way of conceptualizing the reality of American education. As readers, the stories our colleagues tell cannot be compared with the educational past as "it really was," since there is no basic, canonical version of that past to compare them to. However, we can judge history writing within its own conventions, and we can compare histories of education or "stories" about education to each other (and with other representations of educational world-making). *The Making of an American High School*, within the conventions of its genre, is a modest and minor work, so thin the last chapter has to be fleshed out by a review of the past decade's literature on the American high school. But the point is not to reprove or criticize Labaree. *The Making of an American High School* is a first book. It is or was a competent doctoral dissertation, with all the flaws of even a competent dissertation. That it was awarded the Outstanding Book Award for 1989 by the History of Education Society simply shows which way the historiographical winds are currently blowing in the United States.

III

By way of summary, one direction the "linguistic turn" has taken in recent years is toward history-as-narrative or history-as-story. Historians are tellers and readers of "stories." To say that history is a "story" does not imply falsity; it is simply to assert that histories are constructions of language and rhetoric. It is to underscore White's point that "any representation of history has to be considered a *construction* of language, thought, and imagination rather than a *report* of a

structure of meaning presumed to exist in historical events themselves" [sic].²⁵

Kellner puts it this way:

The processes of the historical imagination... are everywhere [not just in the final stages] *linguistic*, shaped and constrained from the start by rhetorical considerations that are the "other" sources of history. [sic]²⁶

Within the frame of this model of historiography, to ask of a history of education whether it is "true" is not a useful question, although how one views the history of education matters, since history is frequently summoned in order to influence or justify attitudes or actions in the present.²⁷ What we can do is to acknowledge the multidimensionality of historical reality and point out that those who have no sense of *histories* of education can believe any history of education. And we can acknowledge that since historians themselves are forced to choose among competing modes of emplotment and narrative strategies, the best grounds for a reader's choosing one interpretation of history of education rather than another are ultimately aesthetic and moral rather than epistemological, which is to say the reader's choice is "part of a larger cultural discourse of which historical understanding is a part, and not apart."²⁸

Where does that leave us? Historians of education, like other historians, once forsook rhetoric for science in order to present the truth unadorned and to privilege our specialty. The nineteenth-century paradigm of scientific method we emulated was almost outmoded at the very moment of our appropriation of it. Now, thanks to the pioneering work of White and Kellner among others, we can rediscover the rhetorical sources of our historical understanding, of our practice of history, and of our authority as historians. Finally, as tellers and readers of "stories" we have much to learn from our colleagues in literary theory.²⁹ That is, as tellers and readers of "stories" we all of us possess an initial stock of rhetorical resources which can be expanded the more we learn about "stories." And that is *my* story.

NOTES

- * An earlier version of this essay was presented at the CHEA Biennial Conference, University of Ottawa, Oct. 14, 1990.
1. Pocock's seminal "Languages and Their Implications: The Transformation of the Study of Political Thought" appeared in his *Politics, Language, and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History* (London: Atheneum, 1971). Pocock has influenced the thinking of a handful of American intellectual historians. See the essays by Gordon S. Wood, David A. Hollinger, Thomas L. Haskell, and Thomas Bender in John Higham and Paul K. Conkin, eds., *New Directions in American Intellectual History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979). See also the essay by Keith Michael Baker on the ideological origins of the French Revolution in

- Dominick La Capra and Steven L. Kaplan, eds., *Modern European Intellectual History: Re-appraisals and New Perspectives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982). My review of Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980*, has clearly been influenced by Pocock: *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, vol. 1 (Fall 1989): 307-26.
2. For the several directions the "linguistic turn" can take see Martin Jay, "Should Intellectual History Take a Linguistic Turn?" in La Capra and Kaplan, *Modern European Intellectual History*, chap. 3.
 3. The essential texts are White's *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) and his two collections of essays: *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), and *The Context of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987). See also Hans Kellner, *Language and Historical Representation: Getting the Story Crooked* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989); two collections of essays by Dominick La Capra: *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), and *History and Criticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985); F.R. Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language* (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983). A handful of philosophers, e.g., Alisdair MacIntyre, W.B. Gallie, Paul Ricoeur, and Arthur Danto have also turned their attention to the relation between narrative theory and history.
 4. White, *Metahistory*, 7.
 5. White, *Tropics of Discourse*, 82, 58, 22.
 6. White, "Historical Pluralism," *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1986): 488.
 7. See White's *Metahistory*, 7-38, for a full discussion. See also the following by Northrop Frye: *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), esp. sec. 3, "Archetypal Criticism; Theory of Myths"; and *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1963), esp. chap. I, "The Archetypes of Literature."
 8. E.g., White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," in *On Narrative*, ed., W.J.T. Mitchell, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 1-24, and *passim*. And see Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The Objectivity Question and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 599-607.
 9. Kellner, *Language and Historical Representation*, VII. La Capra suggests that "in a sense, historians are professionally trained not to read." La Capra, *Re-Thinking Intellectual History*, 339. La Capra describes the historian's traditional form of "documentary" reading as an excuse for taking a detour around texts and not really reading at all. La Capra's call for a "dialogical" or "worklike" reading of texts as opposed to a "referential" or "documentary" reading of texts complements Kellner's notion of a "crooked" reading.
 10. But see J. Donald Wilson, "The New Diversity in Canadian Educational History," *Acadiensis* 19 (Spring 1990): 148-69.
 11. E.g. Angelo's "Myth, Educational Theory, and the Figurative Imagination," *Philosophy of Education Proceedings, 1978* (Urbana, Ill., 1979), 227-38, and "The Freedom We Have in Mind," *Educational Theory* 28 (1978): 177-83. And see the intriguing effort to employ narrative theory in curriculum and teacher studies by two Canadian scholars: F. Michael Connelly and D. Jean Clandinin, "Stories of Ex-

- perience and Narrative Inquiry," *Educational Researcher* 19 (June-July 1990): 2-14.
12. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
 13. Compare Lazerson's review of *The Making of an American High School* in *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 2 (Fall, 1990): 375-77.
 14. *The Making of an American High School*, 1.
 15. Labaree's aim in choosing to study CHS was "not to pick a typical high school" but "to choose one that is exemplary." *Ibid.*, 2.
 16. *Ibid.*, 182.
 17. See Keilner's discussion of the rhetorical problems posed by beginnings and endings of histories in *Language and Historical Representation*, 2, 7-8, and chap. 3, "Boundaries of the Text: History as Passage."
 18. *The Troubled Crusade, American Education, 1945-1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), xii.
 19. A.G. Powell, E. Farrar and D.K. Cohen, *The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985); and Michael Sedlak et al., *Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform in the American High School* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1986).
 20. There are useful discussions of the problems involved in the use of metaphors in William Taylor et al., eds., *Metaphors of Education* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1984).
 21. *The Making of an American High School*, 186.
 22. *Ibid.*, 187.
 23. *Ibid.*, 2.
 24. See the discussion in "From Realism to Convention," in Wallace Martin, *Recent Theories of Narrative* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), chap. 3, and Philip Wheelwright, "The Sense of Reality," *Metaphor and Reality* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968), chap. 8. And in general see White's discussion of Ranke and historical realism in *Metahistory*, chap. 4.
 25. "Historical Pluralism," *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1986): 483.
 26. *Language and Historical Representation*, 24.
 27. In continually rearranging our knowledge of reality, the historian helps to determine "how we wish to act on it." Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*, 250.
 28. Keilner, *Language and Historical Representation*, 24.
 29. For example, see the essays in the following collections: Josue V. Harari, ed., *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979); Jane P. Tompkins, ed., *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980); Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crossman, eds., *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980); and Mario J. Valdes and Owen Miller, eds., *Identity of the Literary Text* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985).