This passage functions as a turning point of the article. Before the passage, the article is talking about the background of how people regard ownership in premodern, modern, and postmodern time, revealing the tension within the quest for originality. After the passage the article discusses the tension between Western teachers’ emphasizing which originality got from their background, and students’ doubt of stressing originality who are not native English speaker and originality is not that crucial to them from their former learning experience. The criticize of originality before the passage lies the ground for the discussion after the passage. The passage leads originality’s inner problem (whether originality exists or not) to its outer issue (tensions between teachers stress on originality and students care less about it). Also, it turns the article to discussion that TESOL’s readers should care more about, which is the realistic vague boundary between originality and plagiarism.

I’m confused about the passage as I can’t figure out what do “authorship” “writers” and “them” in sentence one refers to.

Let’s assume one of the “endless books of apparently dubiously attributed quotations” () refers to writer A’s book with a quote attributed to person B. Do “authorship” “writers” and “them” refer to A or B? When the passage says “attribtute authorship to certain words”, does that mean A is attributing itself authorship to the words or A is attributing B’s authorship to the words? When it says, “elevate writers to their canonical status by attributing pithy sayings to them”, does it mean A elevates itself or A eleates B?” The subjects of the passage are unclear for me. What’s more, I’m wondering what “authorial (author-real?) creation” and “textual creation of authors” mean. I guess “autorial (author-real) creation might mean that the words created by a writer originally, and “textual creation of authors” means giving ownership to the people who write the quotes used by others’ work. The whole sentence might be saying that when writers attribute part of its work to someone else, what they care about is not creating original ideas mentioned by no one before but showing that the person they copied from has the ownership of part of the work.

I feel sympathy with the passage as I encounter problems of written in a second language as the passage describe. The problems start with reading. I couldn’t understand many academic vocabularies. When I look them up in the dictionary, they always have more than one meaning. Sometimes I know which meaning the reading used, while from time to time as I don’t understand the overall reading, I couldn’t recognize the specific meaning used in the reading. Therefore, it’s hard for me to understand the ideas of the reading first. Yet, the more severe problems lied in writing. As English is not my native language, I have limited vocabularies and phrases, so it happens all the time that when I read English articles, it’s my first time to learn how to express the article’s idea in English. I’m not only learning the ideas, but the English expression as well, and the article’s expression becomes the only way I know to express such an idea. When I need to paraphrase sentences in the article, in which I need to “use my own language” as required, I can only use the vocabularies I know before reading the article. I know I’m not convey the idea accurately, yet I couldn’t find a better expression. Thus, the words I written distort from the idea I want to convey. That’s why I feel the same when the passage describes English as an “alien language” and says “write ‘in their own words’ is not something that can be done in English”, as I’m learning while reading, yet I’m asked to go beyond the reading, which I haven’t learnt yet.