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The present state of scholarship in twentieth- and twenty-first-century rhetoric studies is diverse. Rhetoric, in multiple guises, has permeated a variety of academic disciplines, such as advertising, anthropology, classics, communication, critical theory, economics, ethnic studies, law, literary studies, management, marketing, medicine, natural sciences, philosophy, psychology, rhetoric and composition, theater, theology, transnational politics, and women’s and gender studies. Because tracing scholarship in all these disciplines is beyond the scope of this book, this chapter focuses on the diversity of the twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholarship that informs rhetoric and composition studies.

Thanks in part to this field’s emergence in the mid-1960s,* rhetoric scholarship exploded during the 1970s and dispersed during the 1980s, 1990s, and

---

*Rhetorical studies traditionally focused on the integrated arts of speaking, reading, writing, and listening. But in 1914, speaking and listening split from reading and writing when public speaking professionals (influenced by a German model of the university that favored disciplinary departments) seceded from NCTE. Consequently, rhetorical studies split into two departments: speech (focusing primarily on speaking) and English (focusing primarily on reading), with listening and writing relegated to secondary status, respectively. During two world wars and the 1950s boom, this split became institutionalized within U.S. universities. English professors taught great literature, simply assuming students could write, but the increased enrollments in the 1960s exposed the myth of this assumption. Consequently, scholars and teachers organized to seek theories and methods for training writing teachers and for teaching students to write. Because rhetorical studies was one site where such theories and methods were rediscovered, rhetorical studies was revived as rhetoric and composition studies in English departments by scholars such as Edward P. J. Corbett, James Kinneavy, and Winifred Bryan Horner—all of whom are now heralded as pioneers of rhetoric and composition—primarily to ground composition pedagogy. Since the mid-1960s, however, rhetoric and composition studies have greatly diversified.
2000s. To map this dispersion, this chapter offers a 2009 snapshot of scholarship that both updates existing research areas from previous editions of this book and also identifies new research areas. As with all snapshots, this one leaves some scholarly landscape hovering outside the frame of this chapter. For example, research areas (such as rhetoric and disability studies) do not have separate sections here. Other research areas (such as rhetoric and hermeneutics) do not have separate sections here but are present in earlier editions of this book (1983 and 1990), which readers are encouraged to consult.

The value of this 2009 snapshot lies not simply in the nineteen updated or newly identified research areas but especially in the generous contributions of noted scholars in each research area. Given the diversity of rhetoric scholarship, no one scholar possesses expertise in all research areas (or at least I do not). Consequently, I invited the following scholars to contribute their expertise to this chapter: Michelle Ballif and Diane Davis, Patricia Bizzell, Richard Enos, Theresa Enos, Cheryl Glenn and Shirley Logan, Marguerite Helmers, Joyce Irene Middleton, Roxanne Mountford, Beverly Moss, Malea Powell, Kate Ronald and Hephzibah Roskelly, Jacqueline Jones Royster and Anne Mitchell, Rebecca Rickly, Duane Roen, John Schilb, Victor Villanueva, Hui Wu, and Morris Young.

These contributing scholars responded to the following requests: (1) list twenty sources that anyone new to a research area must read; and (2) identify five topics for future scholarship within that research area. Although each scholar was assigned only one research area, his or her work may inhabit more than one area; for example, note the multiple mentions of Villanueva’s *Bootstraps*. Conversely, more than one research area may define a contributor’s scholarly identity; note Villanueva’s expertise in Latino/a studies, rhetorical theory, and composition pedagogy. Notably, these scholars accepted this invitation not only because of their interest in defining their research areas but also because of their respect and affection for Winifred Horner. Whatever their motivations, I am very grateful for their contributions, which helped frame each research area. And as is conventional in any acknowledgment, I claim any errors as my own.

**“Traditional” Contemporary Rhetoric Theories**

In 1984, Edward P. J. Corbett assigned the theories listed in this section’s bibliography as required readings in a graduate seminar at the Ohio State University. These theories—written by Wayne Booth, Kenneth Burke, Chaim Perelman, I. A. Richards, and Stephen Toulmin—were presented along with theories from previous centuries as the foundations of rhetoric and composition studies. These theories are included here not as foundational but, rather, as evidence of a twentieth-century historical moment when rhetoric scholarship worked alongside expressivist process approaches, cognitive science, and
critical theory to institutionalize the field of rhetoric and composition. In that moment, these “traditional” rhetoric theories appeared to be composed by theorists (read white men) educated at universities (read privileged) and interested in men’s public rhetorical performances (read rhetorical performances of power). As such, these theories were, and are, undoubtedly important; as such, they also inspired searches for alternative theories and traditions.

During the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, these theories have been studied in ways that have remapped rhetoric studies. This remapping embraces different methods: (1) rereading traditional rhetoric theories, as in Ann George and Jack Selzer’s *Kenneth Burke in the 1930s* (2007); (2) recovering rhetoric theories and practices not included or preserved within traditional academic memory, as in Karen Foss, Sonja Foss, and Cindy Griffin’s *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory* (2006); (3) extrapolating theories from texts and practices not traditionally deemed rhetorical, as in my *Anglo-American Feminist Challenges to the Rhetorical Tradition* (1996); and (4) writing new theories, reflective of the times, such as John Schilb’s *Rhetorical Refusals* (2008). Such remapping seeks not to negate traditional theories but, rather, to demonstrate that there is always more to the story. Indeed, remapping pushes these theories from the center of rhetoric studies while calling into question the very idea of a center. Though dethroned from a place of privilege, these rhetoric theories still prove valuable because their rhetorical wisdom informs current scholarship, such as Wayne Booth’s *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric* (2004) or my *Rhetorical Listening* (2006), even as such current scholarship questions the limits of traditional rhetorical wisdom.

Topics for future research include: (1) historicizing claims and identifications that haunt traditional theories; (2) rereading traditional theories for heretofore unacknowledged traces of gender, nationality, race, and so on; (3) rereading theories from postcolonial and/or global lenses; (4) analyzing audience as fictionalized dis/identifications; and (5) rereading theories and cultures to identify silence and listening as rhetorical arts.

**Contemporary Receptions of Histories of Rhetoric**

History is not simply the past. History is a compilation of stories that we tell ourselves, at particular moments, about the past. As stories, histories of rhetoric are rife with characters, plots, settings, and narrative points of views. They differ depending on their sources, purposes, and authors’ cultural locations. Yet they all represent their historical moments of production, which is why

** These four methods are the same four that I argue feminists have used to articulate feminist theories of rhetoric (Ratcliffe [1996], 2–6).
histories of rhetoric written in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries deserve a place within this chapter even if their topics are receptions of non-twentieth-century rhetoric.

Contemporary histories of rhetoric are as diverse as the discipline itself. They include not only traditional histories, as in Ed Corbett’s heavily Aristotelian Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student (1965), but also challenges to such histories, as in Susan Jarratt’s Rereading the Sophists (1991); Kathleen Welch’s The Contemporary Reception of Classical Rhetoric (1991); and Richard Enos’s Greek Rhetoric before Aristotle (1993). These challenges reflect differences in both topical and historiography, which is the study of how histories are constructed. As a hallmark of twentieth- and twenty-first-century rhetoric scholarship, historiography invites these questions: What method of writing history is employed? Who is writing? How is the writer positioned historically and culturally? What authority does such positioning give—or not give—the writer? What is included; what is omitted? What sources are available for writing the history? What sources are employed? What other sources might be employed? How reliable and representative are such sources? What use might such histories serve, and for whom? And always, Why?

Contemporary histories of rhetoric vary not only in historiographical methods but also in focus and historical ranges. Some histories focus on a particular period, for example, the contemporary period, as in Lynn Bloom, Donald Daiker, and Edward White’s Composition in the New Millennium (2003) and Steven Mailloux’s Disciplinary Identities (2006). Other histories employ contemporary lenses with which to review 2,500 years of rhetoric theories and praxes, as in George Kennedy’s Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times (1999) and Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg’s The Rhetorical Tradition to the Present (2001). Still other histories use contemporary lenses (such as ethnic studies and feminist studies) to map multiple histories, as in Jacqueline Jones Royster’s Southern Horrors and Other Writings (1997), Cheryl Glenn’s Rhetoric Retold (1997), and Molly Meijer Wertheimer’s Listening to Their Voices (1997). And still other “histories” engage contemporary lenses (such as poststructuralist theories) to reimagine the functions of history altogether, as in Victor Vitanza’s Negation, Subjectivity, and the History of Rhetoric (1997), Mailloux’s Reception Histories (1998), and Susan Miller’s Trust in Texts (2007). Regardless of theoretical orientation, the above scholarship proves that, in contemporary rhetoric studies, history matters.

One topic for future research is to explore histories of all the categories in this chapter. Rich Enos, who compiled the bibliography for this research area, identifies other topics: (1) women in the history of rhetoric; (2) orality and literacy—historical perspectives; (3) developing new research methods for the history of rhetoric; (4) rhetoric and religion; and (5) historical issues in comparative and contrastive rhetorics.
Rhetoric Reference Works

Rhetoric reference works have greatly increased in number since earlier editions of this book were published. This increase may be attributed to the growth of rhetoric and composition studies as a scholarly discipline and also to the expanding Internet, where search engines and library databases provide immediate access to online texts of rhetoric theories and rhetorical performances as well as to bibliographies, scholarly journals, encyclopedias, indices, dictionaries, disciplinary blogs, podcasts, listservs, and more.

Bibliographies provide ready access to rhetoric research. The online Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing links users to “History and Theory,” “The Rhetorical Tradition,” “History of Rhetoric and Education,” and “Rhetoric and Composition Theory” as well as to other bibliographies. Other online resources include the CCCC Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric, which offers links to pre-2002 sources; Rich Haswell and Glenn Blalock’s CompPile, which provides links to sources from 1939 to the present; and Rebecca Moore Howard’s Bibliographies for Composition and Rhetoric, which provides invaluable links in a variety of categories, such as African American rhetoric, contrastive rhetoric, and visual rhetoric. In addition to online sources, useful rhetoric bibliographies may be found in books, such as James Murphy and Richard Katula’s Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric (2003), Murphy’s Short History of Writing Instruction (2001), and Pat Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg’s The Rhetorical Tradition (2nd ed., 2001). Nonrhetoric and composition bibliographies (whether online or not) may also serve as a resource for rhetoric scholarship. The MLA International Bibliography (accessible through most university libraries) includes a database of many rhetoric and language articles; in addition, Gregory Ward’s Web site Studies on LGBTQ Language provides a bibliography for research in rhetoric and queer studies, and the online Disability Studies Bibliography enables users to search using “rhetoric” as an option.

Journals may also be studied to trace patterns in contemporary rhetoric scholarship. Online archives for College Composition and Communication, JAC, Rhetoric Review, and Peitho allow users to review tables of content and to download articles and book reviews that are associated mostly with rhetoric and composition studies. Journals that merge rhetoric and composition studies with communication, literary studies, and philosophy include Rhetoric Society Quarterly (RSQ) (the journal of the Rhetoric Society of America), Rhetorica (the journal of the International Society for the History of Rhetoric), Quarterly Journal of Speech, College English, Philosophy and Rhetoric, and Hypatia. Because its first volume was published in 1928, RSQ remains a valuable resource for tracing patterns in twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholarship.

Reference books and articles are valuable resources, too. Andrea Lunsford, Kirt Wilson, and Rosa Eberly’s The SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies

Patricia Bizzell, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) anthologies (comprehensive or special area) of rhetorics in different countries; (2) anthologies (comprehensive or special area) of rhetorics in different academic disciplines; (3) annotated bibliographies for English speakers of rhetorical work done in other languages; (4) annotated bibliographies for scholars in English, composition, and communication of rhetorical work done in other disciplines, such as classics, philosophy, political science, history; and (5) more “synoptic” histories of rhetoric that link traditional and revisionist works.

**Rhetorical Criticism**

*Rhetorical criticism* is a difficult term to discuss because it signifies myriad ways of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Traditionally, it refers to methods of analyses grounded in rhetoric theories and used to analyze public discourses in terms of author (intent), audience (effect), textual strategies (content/form), and rhetorical situation (historical/cultural context). Early twentieth-century rhetorical analyses were written mostly within speech departments, resulting in oft-cited scholarship written by Thomas Benson, Lloyd Bitzer, Edwin Black, and Marie Hochmuth Nichols. As speech and public speaking gave way to communication studies, rhetorical analyses were expanded in terms of topics and methods, such as in Karlyn Kohrs Campbell’s *Man Cannot Speak for Her* (1989), a groundbreaking work in women’s rhetoric. As rhetoric and composition studies emerged in the second half of the twentieth century, rhetorical analyses tended initially to be grounded in Aristotelian
theory. For example, Kenneth Burke’s theories echo Aristotelian concepts even as they blend rhetoric and philosophy, Freud and Marx, literary analyses and cultural critiques, structuralist moves and poststructuralist leanings. And the Chicago school of narrative theory—Wayne Booth’s *A Rhetoric of Fiction* (1961, 1983) and James Phelan and Peter Rabinowitz’s *Narrative as Rhetoric* (1996)—forward neo-Aristotelian concepts of the rhetorical triangle (such as multiple levels of speakers and audiences) as strategies for reading narrative.

As the field of rhetoric and composition grew, there emerged a broader conception of rhetorical analyses than had dominated Western university curricula until the nineteenth century. Grounded in rhetorical elements of poststructuralist, feminist, psychoanalytic, and cultural theories, these twentieth-century analyses have been published by various journals, such as *JAC, College English,* and *Rhetoric Review.* Even more broadly, traces of rhetorical criticism haunt contemporary literary/cultural analyses in different disciplines, such as English studies, history, anthropology, and religion. For example, feminist critics analyze bodies of authors performing textual strategies at particular cultural sites in the presence of particular audiences for particular purposes at particular historical moments. New historicist critics analyze textual strategies and historical/cultural contexts; poststructuralist critics engage textual tactics of language play and tropes; and new formalist critics are currently reengaging style and so forth. Though evident in the journals mentioned above and in scholarly books, such as John Schilb’s *Between the Lines* (1996), these traces of rhetorical criticism remain an area for future research.

Theresa Enos, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) social-movement rhetorics; (2) political rhetorics; (3) religious rhetorics; (4) rhetorics of technologies and multimedia; and (5) global community rhetorics.

**Rhetoric and Poststructuralism**

In the 1970s, when the field of rhetoric and composition invited more questions than classical rhetoric theory, expressivist process theory, cognitive science, or structuralism could answer, poststructuralism emerged within the discipline’s scholarly conversations. The juxtaposition of rhetoric studies and poststructuralism gave rise to a ludic scholarship that is sometimes called the Third Sophistic and is associated with the scholarship of Victor Vitanzia and his colleagues, for example, Michelle Ballif’s *Seduction, Sophistry, and the Woman with the Rhetorical Figure* (2000) and Diane Davis’s *Breaking Up (at) Totality* (2000). Indebted to Friedrich Nietzsche, Jacques Derrida and others, this scholarship plays the deadly serious game-that-is-language as it informs subjectivity and culture, inviting us all along for the quest(ioning)-that-never-ends. But not everyone has come along willingly. Some Aristotelian/Ciceronian scholars
denigrate poststructuralist theory for its traces of sophistic language theory. Other cultural studies scholars worry that poststructuralism’s free play of the signifier might lend itself to ahistorical and, particularly, apolitical thought and action. But in the best scholarly intersections of rhetoric studies and poststructuralism, these fears prove groundless.

The metonymic juxtaposition of rhetoric and poststructuralism introduces myriad opportunities for questioning the rhetorical tradition, the methods of historiography, and the “methods” of rhetorical criticism. This juxtaposition enables rhetoric scholars to remap rhetoric studies, as in Cheryl Glenn’s “Remapping Rhetorical Territory” (1995), Steven Mailloux’s *Rhetorical Power* (1989), and Vitanza’s “Seeing in Third Sophistic Ways” (2002). This juxtaposition enables historians of rhetoric to identify gaps in traditional histories and fill these gaps with their own musings, again in different ways, thus rethinking rhetorical history, as in Jaspar Neel’s *Plato, Derrida, and Writing* (1988) and Susan Jarratt’s *Rereading the Sophists* (1991). This juxtaposition also enables rhetoric scholars to identify functions of in/visible cultural categories, such as whiteness, in different ways, as in Lynn Worsham’s “After Words” (1998) and Joyce Irene Middleton’s “Toni Morrison and ‘Race Matters’ Rhetoric” (2005).

Michelle Ballif and Diane Davis, who compiled the bibliography for this section, cite texts from outside the field that have influenced rhetoric and composition scholarship. For this reason, they identify below not just the following five topics for future research but also some rhetoric and composition scholars working within these areas: (1) relationship between rhetoric, hermeneutics, and ethics (Davis, Michael Bernard-Donals, Mailloux); (2) relationship between rhetoric and subjectivity/agency (Ballif, Pat Bizzell, Davis, Vitanza); (3) relationship between rhetoric and body studies, affect, and/or desire (Jenny Edbauer, Debbie Hawhee, Byron Hawk, T. J. Johnson, Thomas Rickert, Daniel Smith, Worsham); (4) nonfoundational approaches to the histories of rhetoric and/or composition (Ballif, Sharon Crowley, Cheryl Glenn, Jarratt, Vitanza); and (5) nonfoundational approaches to the canons of rhetoric and to the teaching of writing (Lester Faigley, Thomas Kent, John Muckelbauer, Neel).

**Rhetoric and Cultural Studies**

Cultural studies heavily influenced rhetoric studies in the 1980s and 1990s. Early cultural studies scholarship emphasized class issues, but its male bias prompted Nedra Reynolds to echo feminists in other disciplines and write “Interrupting Our Way to Agency” (1998), a call for feminist interruption of cultural studies topics and methods that ignore or downplay the role of women. More recently, rhetoric and cultural studies scholars interrogate cultural discourses, such as gender, race, class, sexual orientation, age, region, nationality, religion, and so on. Wedding rhetoric and cultural studies enables scholars
to take “high” and “low” cultures as their subject matters and use rhetorical analyses as methods. The results are critiques not just of culture but of rhetoric theory. For example, Jacqueline Jones Royster’s CCCC’s chair address, “When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own” (1996), astutely reconceptualizes interlocutors by arguing that it is important to distinguish between subject position (one’s identity) and cultural positions (one’s multiple locations within cultures). For while cultural positions inform one’s identity, one’s identity can never be reduced to a single cultural position; thus, Royster theorizes a way to invoke the importance of cultural groups in rhetorical exchanges while resisting stereotypes.

The intersection of rhetoric studies with cultural studies is associated with the scholarship of James Berlin, Patty Harkin, John Schilb, John Trimbur, and Christine Farris—scholarship that engages cultural theories, analyzes cultural practices, and designs cultural studies pedagogies. As evidenced in Cultural Studies in the English Classroom (1992) and Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures (1993), Berlin is particularly adept at connecting rhetoric and cultural studies theories and discussing pedagogical implications. And as evidenced by the Indiana University composition program, Farris is particularly adept at designing theoretically grounded cultural studies composition pedagogy. While some traditional scholars worry that cultural studies is overshadowing rhetoric, some poststructuralist scholars worry that cultural studies analyses are too ploddingly Marxist to be productive. But the best scholarly intersections of rhetoric and cultural studies are finely attuned to the rhetoricity of discourse (as in Joyce Irene Middleton’s studies of whiteness), to the constructedness of culture and subjectivity (as in Lester Faigley’s and Victor Villanueva’s studies of how culture informs the subject of composition as well as the composing subject), and to their material/ideological groundings and implications (as in John Trimbur’s, Bruce Horner’s, and Min Zhan Lu’s studies of composition programs and pedagogy).

John Schilb, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) rhetorics of visual culture; (2) the relationship of contemporary rhetorics to late capitalism, including globalization; (3) the role of popular culture, including popular new media, in rhetoric and composition classrooms; (4) the relationship between culture and agency; and (5) rhetorics of past and present social movements.

**Rhetoric and Literacy Studies**

*Literacy* is a term almost as slippery as *rhetoric*. In popular usage, *literacy* signifies the ability to read, but, in actuality, it encompasses all the rhetorical arts of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Even more, literacy entails knowing how and when to employ these arts so as to navigate social and cultural
systems, whether these systems be schools, workplaces, social networks, or bus routes. Consequently, literacy influences the way one thinks, the way one imagines oneself in the world, and the way one acts (or not). Because literacy studies explores how language fosters socialization, critical thinking, and communication, it intersects easily with rhetoric studies.

Literacy scholarship has evolved into two strands that have influenced rhetoric studies. One strand theorizes about minds of individuals, with a bias toward how literate minds produce more sophisticated thinking. Noted examples are Walter Ong's *Orality and Literacy* (1982) and Eric Havelock’s *The Muse Learns to Write* (1986). To counter this bias toward literate minds, a second strand theorizes social/historical dimensions of literacy. This second strand employs empirical research methods, usually ethnography, to test traditional assumptions about literacy and to posit new ones. Harvey Graff’s *The Literacy Myth* (1979) uses both quantitative and qualitative methods to challenge traditional apolitical assumptions about the places and practices of literacy in nineteenth-century North America; Sylvia Scribner and Michael Cole’s *The Psychology of Literacy* (1981) models an ethnographic method much emulated; and Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1981) further politicizes this method and, along with Shirley Brice Heath’s *Ways with Words* (1983), popularizes it within U.S. scholarship and classrooms.

Some traditional scholars worry that a focus on literacy ignores rhetoric as subject matter and reduces it to an unspoken/untheorized method for analyzing ethnographic data. Some poststructuralist scholars worry about naive objectivism and static identity politics. But again, in the best scholarly intersections of rhetoric and literacy studies, these fears prove groundless, as evidenced by the first-rate studies of Deborah Brandt, Ralph Cintron, Ellen Cushman, Marcia Farr, Ann Gere, Beverly Moss, Catherine Prendergast, Elaine Richardson, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Robert Yagelski, and Morris Young. Together, this research (much of it award-winning) not only exposes the constructedness of cultural categories, cultural assumptions, and cultural knowledge but also articulates how social/economic power differentials affect what counts as literacy, what affords one access to literacy, what may be achieved via literacy, and what results from a lack of literacy.

Beverly Moss, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) language and literacy practices of non-academic communities, demonstrating their commonalities and differences with academic literacy practices; (2) changing natures of digital literacies and digital rhetorics, in concert with visual literacies and rhetorics; (3) relationships between religion(s), rhetoric, and literacies, particularly in understanding how religion impacts literate and rhetorical practices of recent immigrant populations; (4) gendered literacy and rhetorical practices; (5) literacy and rhetorical practices emerging from popular culture (such as hip-hop and other forms of
music and culture, popular fiction, community and/or underground publications); and (6) defining literacy—that is, What does it mean to label someone “literate” in the twenty-first century, given the increasing globalization and digitization of the societies in which we use language? Is literacy even going to be the right term? Is it already being overused?

Rhetoric and Feminist Studies

In the 1980s, feminist rhetoric scholars began making three moves: writing women into the history of rhetoric, writing feminist issues into theories of rhetoric, and writing feminist perspectives into rhetorical criticism. Initially, these scholars drew on feminist scholarship from other disciplines, for example, African American studies (Barbara Christian’s 1985 Black Feminist Criticism and bell hooks’ 1981 Ain’t I a Woman); Chicana studies (Gloria Anzaldúa’s 1981 This Bridge Called My Back and Cherrie Moraga’s 1981 “Theories in the Flesh”); communication studies (Karlyn Kohrs Campbell’s 1989 Man Cannot Speak for Her); linguistic studies (Dale Spender’s 1980 Man Made Language and Deborah Cameron’s 1985 Feminism and Linguistic Theory); and psychoanalytic studies (Helene Cixous’s 1975 “The Laugh of the Medusa” and Julia Kristeva’s 1974 Revolution in Poetic Language, both of which were translated into English in the 1980s). Once inspired, however, feminist rhetoric scholars began writing scholarship from the site of rhetoric and composition. By 1992, scholarship critiquing methods for writing women into the history of rhetoric emerged in Barbara Biesecker’s “Coming to Terms with Recent Attempts to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric,” Pat Bizzell’s “Opportunities for Feminist Research in the History of Rhetoric,” and Susan Jarratt’s RSQ Special Issue: Feminist Rereadings in the History of Rhetoric. Scholarship that writes twentieth- and twenty-first-century women into histories of rhetoric include Andrea Lunsford’s Reclaiming Rhetorica (1995), my Anglo-American Feminist Challenges (1996), and Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald’s Available Means (2001).

In the midst of this scholarly activity, intersections of rhetoric and feminist studies have been institutionalized within rhetoric and composition studies, thanks largely to the work of the Coalition of Women Scholars in the History of Rhetoric and Composition, which was organized by Winifred Horner, Ian Swearingen, Nan Johnson, Marjorie Curry Woods, and Kathleen Welch in 1988–1989 and was carried on by scholars such as Andrea Lunsford, Jackie Royster, Cheryl Glenn, and Shirley Logan. In 1996, the first edition of the coalition’s newsletter, Peitho, was published by Jarratt. And two past presidents, Glenn and Logan, created and now coedit SIUP’s Rhetorics and Feminisms series, which has published Elizabeth Flynn’s Feminism beyond Modernism (2002), Nan Johnson’s Gender and Rhetorical Spaces in American Life, 1866–1910 (2002), Carol Mattingly’s Appropriating Dress (2002), Roxanne Mountford’s The Gendered

Cheryl Glenn and Shirley Logan, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identify eight topics for future research: (1) feminist deliberations and collaborations across race, class, and nationality; (2) marginalized women’s ways of being heard; (3) invitational rhetorics for people not (self-)identified as “feminist”; (4) women’s rhetorical prowess within traditionally feminized spaces; (5) women and religion, such as television preachers and church leaders; (6) women’s practices not yet identified as rhetorical; (7) feminist-, racially, and/or ethnically marked styles; and (8) women, rhetoric, and technology. In addition, a wealth of contemporary research possibilities exist in countries other than the United States, such as analyzing rhetorics of activist groups, such as WOZA (Women of Zimbabwe Arise), whose members regularly protest for civil rights despite very real threats of arrests, jail terms, and beatings.

Rhetoric and Critical Race Studies

Critical race studies emerged in the late twentieth century as an antiracist project in legal studies, most notably in the work of Patricia Williams and Derrick Bell. It evolved into an interdisciplinary academic study, as surveyed in Richard Delgado and Jean Sefancic’s Critical Race Theory (1995, 2000) and as represented in literary criticism by Toni Morrison’s Playing in the Dark (1992) and in history by David Roediger’s Working toward Whiteness (2005). It evolved, in part, to counter the failures of multiculturalism. When multiculturalism gained prominence in education in the 1980s and 1990s, its mission was to promote understanding of and tolerance among all U.S. ethnic groups by studying ethnicity. Ethnicity was often defined as cultural heritages that inform people’s identities even as people’s identities are constructed by more than just ethnicity. As a result, African American studies, American Indian studies, Asian American studies, Latino/a studies, and so on became academic sites of scholarship and pedagogy. Critics charged that such categories resulted in static identity politics; proponents, however, demonstrated the ongoing change, diversity, and intersections within and among such categories. In rhetoric and composition studies, these categories emerged as popular and important areas of rhetoric study, as evidenced by the sections immediately following this one.

But the failures of multiculturalism are more complex than a debate over identity politics. As Greg Jay and Sandra Jones (2005) note in “Whiteness in the Multicultural Literature Classroom,” multiculturalism branched in two directions: (1) a celebratory multiculturalism that promotes a feel-good smorgasbord of ethnic differences but renders racial power differentials invisible and unquestioned; and (2) a critical multiculturalism that emphasizes how power and discrimination—racial, gender, class, sexual, and so on—inform ethnicity,
not just in the United States but globally (100). Critical race studies emerged, in part, to challenge the former and advocate the latter. Because critical race studies posits “race” as a socially constructed category grounded in bad science but embodied in all people via socialization, critical race studies easily intersects with rhetoric studies.


Joyce Irene Middleton, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) whiteness and visuality (or ocularcentrism); (2) unpacking white privilege embedded in color-blind rhetoric; (3) the meaning(s) of race in the twenty-first century; (4) rhetorical listening as a global rhetoric; (5) reproducing whiteness in academics, science, and/or popular culture; (6) teaching rhetorical listening in film as a code of cross-cultural conduct; (7) critical race studies and the rhetoric of science and/or medical practices; (8) critical race studies, rhetoric, and democracy; (9) critical race studies, assimilation, and immigration in the United States; and (10) critical race studies and definitions of cultural rhetorics.

**Rhetoric and African American Studies**

African American rhetoric has been present within U.S. culture since its beginnings (indeed, since before the nation was founded), but this rhetoric has not always been the subject of study within the academy. Within the past few decades, however, an explosion of research has emerged on intersections of rhetoric studies and African American studies. Jacqueline Jones Royster and Anne M. Mitchell, who compiled the bibliography for this section, divided their top twenty texts into three categories: (1) critical anthologies of rhetorical performances; (2) rhetorical history, theory, and criticism; and (3) language culture and rhetorical performances. These categories not only provide an apt framework for this particular discussion but also suggest the kinds of work needed for any emerging research area in rhetoric.
Critical anthologies serve several purposes: they recover rhetorical performances omitted from dominant histories; their critical glosses offer historical and theoretical interpretive frames; and their contents provide grounds for further research, whether rhetorical analyses of specific performances or extrapolations of rhetoric theories from such performances. For example, Gerald Early compiles African American essays by writers such as W. E. B. Du Bois and Alice Walker in a two-volume collection, *Speech and Power* (1992 and 1993), and Bettye Collier-Thomas compiles the sermons of black women preachers in *Daughters of Thunder* (1998).

Articulating African American rhetorical history, theory, and criticism is an important and complex enterprise. First, African American rhetorical history makes visible cultural conversations that have not always been present in the academy. Histories, such as the African American feminist thinking collected in Beverly Guy-Sheftall’s *Words of Fire* (1995), remap disciplinary boundaries and challenge traditional criteria for inclusion in rhetorical history. Second, African American rhetoric theory provides a lexicon of principles and strategies for producing and analyzing texts, as in Royster’s introduction to *Traces in a Stream* (2000), which calls for a new way of reading. Such theories, like the ones offered in Ronald Jackson and Elaine B. Richardson’s collection *Understanding African American Rhetoric* (2003), supply interpretive frames for analyzing African American texts in terms of their own cultural traditions. And third, African American rhetorical criticism provides a scholarly and cultural forum for such analyses, enabling multiple arguments among and about African American texts, both written and oral, to be identified, debated, and judged, as in Carole K. Doreski and Albert Delpi’s *Writing America Black* (1998), which rhetorically analyzes black journalism and literary works to make claims about how race informs concepts of history, literature, kinship, and nationhood. But perhaps the most important point about studying African American history, theory, and rhetorical criticism is that these three categories intersect in powerful ways: African American theories and rhetorical analyses are historically grounded; histories and rhetorical analyses merge to build theories; theories and rhetorical analyses emerge from and thus represent cultural moments.

Scholarship in rhetoric and African American studies that emphasizes connections among language, culture, and rhetorical performance is important, too. One strand identifies African American language use in order to challenge traditional (read: white) definitions of language competence and, more importantly, to offer definitions grounded in African American culture. Noted examples are Geneva Smitherman’s *Talkin’ and Testifyin’* (1977, 2000) and Keith Gilyard’s *Voices of the Self* (1991). Another strand of scholarship highlights African American cultural contributions. In the realm of music, intersecting performances of culture, gender, and hip-hop are explored in Gwendolyn Pough’s *Check It While I Wreck It* (2004) and Elaine Richardson’s *Hip Hop*
In the realm of preaching, the power of words in relating the Word and in reimagining the world is evidenced in Beverly Moss’s *Community Text Arises* (2003), Chanta Haywood’s *Prophesying Daughters* (2003), Melissa Victoria Harris-Lacewell’s *Barbershops, Bibles, and BET* (2004), and Davis W. Houck and David W. Dixon’s collection, *Rhetoric, Religion, and the Civil Rights Movement* (2006). Running throughout these texts is an emphasis on how languages, cultures, and rhetorical performances intersect to inform and revise both personal and cultural identities.

Jackie Royster and Anne Mitchell, who composed the bibliography for this section, identify the following topics for future research: (1) how peoples of African descent engage in rhetorical practices in various sites and contexts; (2) how contemporary rhetorical practices within African diasporic communities in the United States and beyond show evidence of continuity and change over time and, especially in light of new media, in global contexts, and other distinctions that now exist in our contemporary world; (3) how using various types of analytical lenses (race, class, gender, sexuality, region, power, privilege, authority, and so forth) or various combinations of them enrich our capacity to interpret rhetorical behavior; (4) how theoretical frames have the interpretive power to enhance our understanding of particular rhetorical sites and practices and to clarify how such sites and practices connect with or diverge from others synchronically and diachronically; (5) what remains underinterrogated and undertheorized when we view rhetorical action from a more expansive perspective; and (6) implications of what we have come to understand about rhetorics in general and the rhetorical practices of peoples of African descent in particular regarding both formal and informal opportunities for rhetorical training and rhetorical performance.

**Rhetoric and American Indian Studies**

Studying intersections of rhetoric and American Indian studies requires a working knowledge of both fields. Many books in this bibliography engage American Indian histories and cultures, perhaps the most famous being the late Vine Deloria Jr.’s *Custer Died for Your Sins* (1969), *Red Earth, White Lies* (1995), *Evolution, Creationism, and Other Modern Myths* (2002), and *The World We Used to Live In* (2006)—all of which explain the world from a Native perspective. A work theorizing methods for employing Native perspectives as scholarly lenses is Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999). Theorizing such research methods is important because scholars in this area are especially attuned to the following questions: Who is speaking? For whom? About what? And with what authority or vision? Important to scholars in this area are not just an attentiveness to method but also a lived engagement with American Indian issues and a willingness to immerse oneself in the study of these issues.
Although American Indian ancestry need not be a litmus test for scholarly authority, care should be taken when pursuing such research, not as a means for meeting some arbitrary notion of political correctness but, rather, as a means for showing respect because, far too often in the past five hundred years, respect for the reality of American Indian cultures has been missing in the dominant U.S. culture. Instead, there exists a history of romanticizing anything associated with American Indians, relegating such associations to the past, and collapsing myriad cultures into one. And in white academe, there exists a history of relegating American Indians to the status of objects of study rather than as subjects of their own scholarship and of defining Native concepts in terms of non-Native ones. Such history haunts scholarly research in this area. And it is precisely this concern with history, story, rhetorical situation, the positioning of interlocutors, the analyses of rhetorics in different types of texts, and a consideration of audience that foster productive intersections of rhetoric studies and American Indian studies.

In rhetoric and composition scholarship, Malea Powell brings American Indian lenses into rhetoric studies with “Blood and Scholarship” (1999), which exposes how rhetoric studies often imposes a non-Native frame on Native rhetorics; with “Listening to Ghosts” (2002), which questions the dismissal of emotion from academic argument and offers an alternative rhetoric; and with “Down by the River,” which posits alliance as a rhetorical tactic that, unlike inclusion, does not force American Indian rhetorics into a European American framework (2004). In addition, research on different functions of writing emerges in James Axtell’s “The Power of Print in the Eastern Woodlands” (1987), Laura Donaldson’s “Writing the Talking Stick: Alphabetic Literacy as Colonial Technology and Postcolonial Appropriation” (1998), and Scott Lyons’s “Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?” (2000). Research that focuses on how American Indians find a place (or not) in rhetoric and composition studies may be found in Resa Crane Bizzaro’s “A Captivity Narrative” (1998) and “Making Places as Teacher-Scholars in Composition Studies” (2002). And research on how white teachers in tribal schools might rethink their pedagogical positions and pedagogical narratives is discussed in Stephen Gilbert Brown’s Words in the Wilderness (2000). Research on the rhetorical tactic of silence in multiple American Indian cultures is explored in a chapter of Cheryl Glenn’s Unspoken (2004), and the idea of Powell’s nineteenth-century research on survivance is continued in Ernest Stromberg’s edited collection American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance (2006).

Malea Powell, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) American Indians and the Web; (2) more historical recovery; (3) more bridging of the rhetoric-poetics divide; (4) material culture and nonalphabetic texts; and (5) popular culture in relation to American Indians.
Rhetoric and Asian American Studies

Rhetoric and composition scholars articulating intersections of rhetoric studies with Asian American studies must acquire an understanding of the latter, an interdisciplinary field that focuses not only on multiple ethnic cultures that fall under the category “Asian American” but also on the way race has informed receptions of these cultures in the United States. Kent Ono provides an introduction to this interdisciplinary field in his edited collection *Asian American Studies after Critical Mass* (2005), which addresses globalization, politics, gay issues, film, and a host of other issues facing Asian Americans; Eric Liu uses autobiography and cultural analyses in *The Accidental Asian* (1998) to critique the roles of Asian Americans in U.S. culture and to critique the influence of dominant culture’s perceptions of Asian on public policy; and Frank Wu names and unpacks prejudicial constructs such as “model minority” and argues for coalitions across ethnic and racial boundaries in *Yellow* (2002). In literary studies, Frank Chin and his coeditors provide a compilation of Asian American literature in *Aiiiiiiieeee! An Anthology of Asian American Writers* (1974); King-Kok Cheung analyzes silence as an Asian American strategy in *Articulate Silences* (1993); and Patti Duncan continues this analysis, arguing that contemporary U.S. feminism needs to engage Asian American women’s issues in *Tell This Silence* (2004). In education, multidisciplinary theories and practices that benefit Asian American students are recounted in Don Nakanishi and Tina Yamamoto Nishida’s collection, *The Asian American Educational Experience* (1995). And contextualized language issues emerge in sociolinguistics and popular writings; for example, Charlene Sato’s academic “Sociolinguistic Variation and Language Attitudes in Hawai‘i” (1991) traces the origins of Pidgin (Hawai‘i Creole English) to the Hawaii plantation economy and discusses the functions of Pidgin in employment discrimination and identity-building; Lisa Linn Kanae’s autobiographical *Sista Tongue* (2001) explores the effects of code-shifting between Pidgin and English for speaking and writing; and Lee Tonouchi’s collection of essays and poems, *Living Pidgin* (2002), presents Pidgin as a legitimate language.

The rhetorical dimensions of the above scholarship offer fertile grounds for intersections with rhetoric studies. Some rhetorical dimensions include analyzing the dominant U.S. culture’s tendency to define Asian as “exotic,” articulating multiple cultures and myriad personal identities collapsed into the terms Asian and Asian American, negotiating troubled notions of citizenship, and critiquing reading/writing pedagogy.

These and other issues are addressed by rhetoric and composition scholars. Yuet-Sim Chiang charges, in “Insider/Outsider/Other?” (1998), that composition research is grounded in white, middle-class assumptions and argues for its engaging Asian American cultures. Gail Okawa continues this questioning of
composition research and extends the questioning to composition pedagogy in “Coming (in)to Consciousness” (1998) and “Removing Masks” (1999). Morris Young grounds the discussion of Hawaiian language debates in a rhetorical frame of Hawai‘i’s shifting cultural logics in “Native Claims” (2004). He also combines autobiography and textual/cultural analyses in his award-winning Minor Re/Visions (2004) to critique U.S. discourses of citizenship as they are informed by race and ethnicity. LuMing Mao, who also publishes in comparative rhetorics, explores the construction of Asian American rhetorics in “Uniqueness or Borderlands?” (2004) and in Reading Chinese Fortune Cookie (2006).

Morris Young, who compiled the bibliography for this research area, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) hybrid rhetorical and discourse practices and forms; (2) Asian American diasporic and transnational rhetorical and discourse practices; (3) recuperation of Asian and Asian American rhetoric prior to the early twentieth century; (4) Asian and Asian American digital rhetorics; and (5) intersections of identity and rhetorical practices—that is, Asian Americans and issues of ethnicity, gender, sexuality, dis/ability, region, mixed-race, and so on.

**Rhetoric and Latino/a Studies**

Language issues haunt and energize Latino/a studies. Naming haunts this interdisciplinary field in that it has been variously named: Hispanic studies, Puerto Rican studies, Chicano/a studies, Latino/a studies, and more. These terms signify differently over time and place, depending on the local politics of their institutional usage, but, in general, they are defined as follows. Hispanic is a term created by the U.S. census bureau that reflects only a European ancestry (Spain) and, thus, is often viewed as the most conservative term, especially as it collapses many cultural groups into one category. Puerto Rican, Nyorican (Puerto Ricans in New York), and Chicano (Mexican American) all specify narrower focuses, thus visibly acknowledging differences. Although Latino retains traces of a European ancestry, collapses many different cultures into one category, and codes masculine (hence the use of Latino/a), this term has emerged as the one more commonly used.

This naming issue affects not only programs but scholarship. Suzanne Oboler, editor of Latino Studies, claims on the journal’s online editorial page that the term Latino creates a space of common ground for scholarly and activist work, that the term does not negate but rather assumes differences among national origins, and that both Latino/as and non-Latino/as can participate in this scholarly and activist work. And though written as critical legal theory, Berta Esperanza Hernández-Truyol’s “Building Bridges—Latinas and Latinos at the Crossroads” (1994) explains how the terms Latina and Latino function as identity markers. But such scholarship does not focus on ethnicity alone; it
draws on critical race studies to foreground how cultural constructs of race inform receptions of ethnicity by Latino/as and non-Latino/as alike, as evidenced by Villanueva’s “On the Rhetoric and Precedents of Racism” (1999).

But naming is not the only language issue haunting Latino/a studies; so is language choice. Not only do choices exist (as they do for English-writing academics in all research areas) about what kinds of English to use, but choices also exist about what kinds of Spanish to use. And there are choices not merely between English or Spanish but also about whether and how English and Spanish should be combined. These issues and others are explored both in Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic’s *The Latino/a Condition* (1997), an edited collection that defines this interdisciplinary field with a particular emphasis on legal issues, and in Harold Augenbraum and Margarite Fernández Olmos’s *The Latino Reader* (1997), an anthology of Latino/a writings that traces Latino/a cultural influences in North America back to before the United States was formed.

In rhetoric and composition studies, intersections with Latino/a studies have emerged via ethnographic studies, rhetorical analyses of political rhetoric, and rewriting rhetorical histories. First, Victor Villanueva’s *Bootstraps* (1993) is an autoethnography that skillfully weaves autobiography with cultural critique and theory. Other ethnographic research includes Ralph Cintron’s *Angels’ Town* (1998), which analyzes a Mexican American community in terms of the geographies of false documentation, graffiti, street gangs, and a boys’ room—this analysis not only articulates Latino/a rhetorical practices of the everyday but also models a first-rate ethnographic method. Second, two important rhetorical analyses of Latino/a political rhetorics are J. Delgado-Figueroa’s *The Rhetoric of Change* (1994), which identifies elements of Puerto Rican rhetorics based on political oratory, and John C. Hammerback and Richard J. Jensen’s *The Rhetorical Career of César Chávez* (2003), which identifies elements of Chávez’s rhetoric based on a historically grounded rhetorical analysis of speeches and interviews. Third, other scholarship rethinks rhetorical history, pedagogy, and theory. To rethink history and pedagogy, Susan Romano’s “Tlaltelolco” (2004) describes this sixteenth-century educational institution’s curriculum of grammar, rhetoric, and composition and foregrounds how this curriculum is linked to cultural power and oppression. To rethink pedagogy, Michelle Hall Kells, Valerie Balester, and Villanueva’s collection *Latino/a Discourses* (2004) includes a section about literacy education that rethinks rhetorical concepts; for example, Jaime Mejía’s chapter, “Bridging Rhetoric and Composition Studies with Chicano and Chicana Studies,” argues that this bridge may help teachers rethink traditional pedagogical practices, such as collaboration, so as to construct a critical pedagogy that can help Chicano/a students learn effective academic literacies. And to rethink rhetorical history and theory, Jessica Enoch’s “Para la Mujer” (2004) defines an early twentieth-century Chicana feminist rhetoric.
Victor Villanueva, who compiled the bibliography for this section, claims there is a need for more work in this research area and identifies the following topics for future research: (1) rhetorics of Chicano/as within different historical contexts—for example, during the acquisition of the Texas Republic, World Wars I and II, the Zoot Suit era, and the creation of LULAC and other organizations of the 1950s and 1960s; (2) the rhetoric of Pedro Albizu Campos, perhaps the most outspoken advocate for Puerto Rican independence, who spent many years in prison, mainly for his speeches; (3) rhetorics of Puerto Ricans—among those seeking independence, those seeking U.S. statehood, and those wishing to continue with the current commonwealth relationship to the United States; (4) rhetorical history of Chicana and Latina women; (5) rhetorics of exclusions—such as rhetorics of wishing to remove the Latino/a from the United States in the nineteenth century, during the twentieth-century instances of the Great Depression and Operation Wetback, and during current debates about citizenship and immigration; (6) counterrhetorics to the rhetorics of exclusion; (7) masculine Latino or Chicano rhetorics in the post–Civil Rights era, plus their similarities with and differences from similarly situated Latina and Chicana rhetorics.

Comparative/Contrastive Rhetorics

In his 1966 article “Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education,” applied linguist Robert Kaplan diagrams five cultural traditions and argues that each generated its own rhetoric—that is, its own way to choose topics, select evidence, organize arguments, and so on. Thus the study of contrastive rhetoric was born, spurring discussions in linguistics and English as a Second Language (ESL) and, more recently, in rhetoric and composition. Landmark rhetoric scholarship includes Robert Oliver’s Communication and Culture in Ancient India and China (1971) and George Kennedy’s Comparative Rhetoric (1997). With the publication of Kennedy’s book, the term comparative rhetoric gained popularity; as Kennedy used the term, it signified his attempt to discover a universal “General Theory of Rhetoric” (1). In short, this shift in terms between contrastive rhetoric and comparative rhetoric reflects a difference in method.

According to Hui Wu, who compiled the bibliography for this section, two competing methods have dominated this research area. The first method celebrates a focus on commonality. This method is represented by Oliver and Kennedy, who ground their comparative definitions and methods in Western models, as does Xing Lu in Rhetoric in Ancient China (1998), which offers parallel terms between Western and Chinese rhetorics. Although noting commonalities among rhetorics can be interesting, a problem arises when non-Western rhetorics are forced to fit a Western model: that problem is cultural
imperialism, which risks relegating the “excess” of non-Western rhetorics to the status of unimportant at best and invisible at worst. The second method celebrates a focus on difference. This method is represented by Kaplan in his seminal work as well as by Wu in “Historical Studies of Women” (2002) and Clayann Panetta’s *Contrastive Rhetoric Revisited and Redefined* (2001), which contains articles exploring implications of contrastive rhetoric studies for understanding issues as far ranging as cultural differences, student resistance, business writing, and computer classrooms. This focus on difference resists a Westernizing impulse and attempts to articulate cultural rhetorics on their own terms.

But as with all binary oppositions, a both/and third term always exists when two terms are put into play, as Yameng Liu does in “Contrastive Rhetoric/Comparative Rhetoric” (2000). The rise of globalism has brought increased attention to contrastive/comparative rhetoric in terms of defining the research area. LuMing Mao’s “Reflective Encounters” (2003) introduces the area by offering definitions and a brief history, with a particular focus on the tropes of *deficiency* and *difference*. Xin Lu’s “Studies and Development of Comparative Rhetoric in the U.S.A.” (2006) traces four stages of this research area. And Arabella Lyon and Sue Hum’s “Advances in Comparative Rhetoric” in *The SAGE Handbook of Rhetoric* discusses advances triggered by “globalization, transnational politics, and the American empire” (153).

In addition, increased attention to contrastive/comparative rhetoric has arisen via scholarly interests in women’s contributions and in translations. Women’s contributions to Chinese rhetorical traditions are explored in Wu, “The Feminist Rhetoric of Post-Mao Chinese Writers” (2001), in Garrett’s “Women and the Rhetorical Tradition in Pre-modern China” (2002), and in Bo Wang’s “Rhetoric and Resistance in Lu Yin’s Feminist Essays” (2007) (Wu, personal e-mail). And finally, translation of rhetoric theories and performances is a vital concern, both in terms of quality and quantity. The quality of translations influences scholarship in English because English-speakers’ understanding and uses of non-Western rhetorical concepts are only as strong as the translations. The quantity of translated sources also influences scholarship in English in terms of how representative (or not) scholarly claims about a rhetoric may be and in terms of how accurate a rhetorical analysis may be, two important issues discussed in Yameng Lui’s *Rhetoric Review* article “To Capture the Essence of Chinese Rhetoric” (1996).

Hui Wu, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) definitions of comparative rhetorics and their components on their own terms, instead of their being forced into a Western model; (2) definitions of research methods appropriate to different cultural contexts; (3) rhetorical criticism, based on concepts of comparative/contrastive rhetoric theories; (4) identification and definitions of women’s rhetorics; (5)
formation of different rhetorical traditions; (6) more translations of primary sources; and (7) historical studies of comparative/contrastive rhetorics. In addition, this research area provides a site for investigating intersections of rhetoric and transnational politics.

**Rhetoric and Religion**

*Ars praedicandi*, or the art of preaching, holds a time-honored place within rhetoric studies. In the early to mid-twentieth century, however, the scholarship about this art thrived more in theology and, to a lesser extent, in public speaking. In theology, Harry Emerson Fosdick and Henry H. Mitchell wrote influential tracts about preaching in the United States. In public speaking, Harry Caplan and Henry King documented European preaching practices (1949–1954). By the time rhetoric and composition studies was being institutionalized in the 1960s and 1970s, two oft-cited rhetoric and religion texts were Kenneth Burke’s *The Rhetoric of Religion* (1961) and Richard Weaver’s *Language Is Sermonic* (1970). Yet neither text focuses on religion as a subject matter; rather, each employs religion as a metaphoric vehicle for explaining the functions of rhetoric.

The late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, however, have seen increased scholarly attention to rhetoric and religion as a subject matter. This increased attention reflects the rise of religious influence in the U.S. public sphere as well as the rise of postmodern studies of discourses, including religion, in the academy. With this increased attention, the question that has emerged is not *if* religion plays a role in personal and public life but, rather, *how*. To address this question, scholars in multiple fields have engaged contemporary intersections of rhetoric and religion. In history, Bettye Collier-Thomas identifies previously undocumented preaching practices of African American women in *Daughters of Thunder* (1998). In rhetoric and composition studies, Amy Goodburn questions how the writing classroom is influenced by fundamentalism in “It’s a Question of Faith” (1998); Keith Miller analyzes Martin Luther King Jr.’s civil rights rhetoric in *Voices of Deliverance* (1992); and Roxanne Mountford analyzes women ministers’ performances in *The Gendered Pulpit* (2003). According to Mountford, during the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, “rhetoric theory and criticism have reinvigorated traditional religious studies, including homiletics and biblical hermeneutics” (personal e-mail). And Sharon Crowley astutely questions the role of religion, particularly fundamentalism, in *Toward a Civil Discourse* (2006).

Roxanne Mountford, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) effects of early Judeo-Christian thought on modernity in the West; (2) interventions—theoretical, critical, peda-
the twentieth and twenty-first centuries

gogical—into cultural rhetorics that perpetuate fundamentalist fervor and global backlashes against it; (3) distinctive forms of religious rhetoric in the United States and other countries (for example, their roots, their outlets, both secular and religious, and their import for contemporary rhetoric studies); (4) histories of preaching in the United States (specifically histories of twentieth-century homiletic theories) of the sermon as a genre, of the roles of preachers (including African Americans, women, and those without seminary training), of distinctive traits, of Jewish preaching, and of Islamic preaching; (5) religious influences of philosophies, practices, and organizations on the history of instruction in oral and written English as well as on the education of the poor in the United States and other countries; and (6) rhetoric theories and methods of criticism, whether traditional or new, that are particularly well suited to the study of rhetoric and religion.

Rhetoric, Technology, and Technical Writing

Rhetoric and technology have transformed each other, an idea posited in Christina Haas’s *Writing Technology* (1996) and contextualized in Carolyn Miller’s “Learning from History” (1998). On the one hand, technology has transformed rhetoric studies as well as composition pedagogy in terms of online databases and wireless classrooms, and in terms of the ways people think, analyze, research, and compose, as explained in S. C. Herring’s “Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis” (2004). Conversely, rhetoric has transformed technology, as argued by Charles Bazerman in *The Languages of Edison’s Light* (1999). But in relation to the above claims, two corollary questions inform rhetoric scholarship: what is technology, and what is its value? Philosopher Andrew Feenberg engages these questions in *Questioning Technology* (1999), positing a nonessentialist theory of technology. He further engages these questions in *Transforming Technology* (2002), arguing two points: first, that technology constructs our ways of seeing the world—a claim argued earlier and differently by Donna Haraway in *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women* (1991)—and, second, that it has potential for fostering the continued evolution of democracy.

Although debates about the value of technology abound, technology has influenced contemporary rhetoric studies. For instance, it affects how composition pedagogies have been reimagined, as in Patricia Sullivan and James E. Porter’s *Opening Spaces* (1997) and in Michelle Sidler, Richard Morris, and Elizabeth Overman Smith’s *Computers in the Composition Classroom* (2007), thus affecting the ways students and teachers compose. Technology also affects the ways we read visual texts, as discussed in Carolyn Handa’s *Visual Rhetoric in a Digital World* (2004); it affects the ways we read our bodies, as theorized in Mary Lay, Laura J. Gurak, Clare Gravon, and Cynthia Myntti’s *Body
Talk (2000); and it affects the ways we conceptualize literacy, as in Cindy Selfe’s Technology and Literacy in the 21st Century (1999), Kathleen Welch’s Electric Rhetoric (1999), and Stuart Selber’s Multiliteracies for a Digital Age (2004).

Rebecca Rickly, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research in rhetoric and technology: (1) defining visual rhetoric and incorporating it into our rhetorical sensibilities as well as teaching and assessing it; (2) defining, designing, and employing electronic portfolios in different contexts; (3) analyzing rhetoric, technology, and global access—that is, who has access to the technologies of rhetoric, particularly advanced digital technologies, who decides who gets access, and who decides what access is provided; (4) determining the responsibilities of technologically advanced/wealthy nations or entities toward nations or entities that lack these technologies.

The related, though not identical, field of technical communications has generated a wealth of scholarly intersections with rhetoric studies. Several overviews of these intersections exist. Tim Peeples’s Professional Writing and Rhetoric (2002) includes readings from classical rhetoric to the present. Laura Gurak and Mary Lay’s collection Research in Technical Communication (2002) examines how these intersections are informed by ethics, cultural studies, feminism, different research methods, and so on. Johndan Johnson-Eilola and Stuart Selber’s Central Works in Technical Communication (2004) collects landmark essays. And for added context, Bazerman’s Handbook of Research on Writing (2007) examines the history of writing, including how writing is used in different societal sites.

In technical communication, traditional rhetorical concepts have been redefined for new contexts. Invention strategies are posited for visual rhetorics in Sonja Foss’s “A Rhetorical Schema for the Evaluation of Visual Imagery” (1994). Arrangement strategies are explored as they relate to illustrations in Sam Dragga and Dan Voss’s “Cruel Pies” (2001) and as they relate to genre in Bazerman’s Shaping Written Knowledge (1988), Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas N. Huckin’s Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication (1995), and Clay Spinuzzi’s Tracing Genres (2003). Style is discussed in Carolyn Rude’s Technical Editing (2002). And the interaction of author and rhetorical situation is reexamined in Jennifer Slack, Jennifer Daryl, David James Miller, and Jeffrey Doak’s “The Technical Communicator as Author”; Anne Beaufort’s Writing in the Real World (1999); and Geoff Cross’s Forming the Collective Mind (2001). Finally, the pedagogical implications of this scholarship are examined in Selber’s collection Computers and Technical Communication (1997).

According to Rickly, future research for rhetoric and technical writing includes: (1) types of writing that professionals do in various rhetorical settings; (2) types of information and other literacies that professionals need in various
jobs; (3) best practices for the effective and ethical design of technical documents, including but not limited to user manuals and instructions, software user interfaces, presentation slides (as in PowerPoint), and risk communications; (4) functions of communication within large organizations; (5) sources of rhetoric in technical communication—that is, actual objects (which implies that nonliving things have rhetoric), the design (which implies that the object instantiates the design of the creator), or the responses to the object; and (6) pedagogical implications of all of the above.

**Visual Rhetoric**

The visual has always haunted rhetoric studies via the canon of delivery; that is, hearing audiences have long watched performances of speakers, and reading audiences have long gazed at layouts/designs of texts, whether those texts are sculptures, papyri, photos, or paper. But twentieth-century explosions of new media and theories of the gaze have triggered concurrent explosions of scholarly interest in visual rhetoric. Crossing several disciplines (anthropology, art studies, film studies, literary studies, media studies, and rhetoric and composition studies, to name only a few), this scholarly explosion focuses not on simple mimesis but, rather, on the complications of representations. Because scholarship on visual rhetoric intersects with scholarship on visual literacy, rhetoric scholars posit questions of definition: What is the visual? What is visual rhetoric? What is visual literacy? And what are the intersections of the latter two? Scholars also engage questions of function and effect: How may images be interpreted (Roland Barthes)? What do images mean, and what do they want (W. J. T. Mitchell)? How do images affect what we believe, and how does what we believe affect what we see (David Blakesley and Collin Brooke)?

Some scholarship offers methods of interpretations based on elements of the image itself. Roland Barthes’s famous “The Rhetoric of the Image” (1977) argues that the image may be interpreted via three semiotic codes: the linguistic, the denoted, and the connoted. Some scholarship examines methods of interpretation based on genre conventions. In *Understanding Comics: An Invisible Art* (1994), Scott McCloud raises the comic, and by implication the graphic novel, to the level of art by positing (in comics form) a theory of visual interpretation based on a process of composing comics. Some scholarship maps new directions. David Blakesley and Collin Brooke’s introduction to the Fall 2001 edition of the online journal *Enculturation* encourages scholars not just to interpret elements of images and genres but also to explore how images inform people’s interpretations of the world, calling for a theory of the visual that explores intersections of words and images (2). And some scholarship provides definitions, overviews, and introductions to the field. For example, in an
effort to foreground the persuasive dimension of the visual, Charles Hill and Marguerite Helmers’s *Defining Visual Rhetoric* (2004) brings together rhetoric scholars in composition and communication to define and model different methods and theories for analyzing visual texts and theorizing about visual rhetoric.

Marguerite Helmers, who compiled the bibliography for this section, offers the following areas for future research: (1) the role of authorial intent and the creator’s mediation in the creation, dissemination, and reception of images; (2) the history and reception of how the image changes across time and place; (3) the role of images in preserving collective and cultural memory; (4) audience formulations of resistant readings of iconic images; (5) new theories of reading images sequentially, reading the margins, and reading the frames, instead of simply analyzing images discretely; (6) the visual enactment of rhetorical figures of speech in print, electronic, and film media; and (7) the extent to which hyperbole, parody, caricature, and impersonation serve as visual shorthands for argumentation.

### Rhetoric and Program Administration

Rhetoric informs rhetoric and composition program administration at many institutional sites: writing programs, writing centers, writing across the curriculum programs, undergraduate majors, graduate programs, and national organizations. Although not all such sites self-identify as rhetoric studies, they all require administrators skilled in rhetorical negotiation. Overtly or not, administrators may invoke rhetoric theory as grounds for various actions: designing programs, negotiating with upper administration, negotiating with other programs across campus, training teachers, dealing with student issues, and running national organizations. Some overt scholarly intersections of rhetoric with program administration may be found in Locke Carter’s *Market Matters: Applied Rhetoric Studies and Free Market Competition* (2005), Duane Roen’s *Views from the Center: The CCCC’s Chairs’ Addresses, 1977–2005* (2006), Kathleen Yancey’s *Delivering College Composition* (2006), and Rebecca Rickly’s and my forthcoming *Feminism and Administration in Rhetoric and Composition Studies* (2009). But because all scholarship that trains administrators is, by function, deeply rhetorical, more overt scholarly connections remain to be made.

Duane Roen, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identifies the following topics for future research: (1) writing program administration as scholarship; (2) mentoring faculty and teaching assistants in writing programs; (3) assessing writing programs; (4) the nature of writing programs in countries outside the United States; (5) portfolio assessment in writing programs; (6) applying the WPA Outcomes Statement; (7) relationships between writ-
ing programs and writing centers; (8) relationships between writing programs and WAC programs; (9) the status of independent writing programs; and (10) learner-centered writing programs.

**Rhetoric and the Teaching of Composition**


In addition to delivery, the other four canons of rhetoric continue to inform composition pedagogy. Invention exists within composition pedagogy in terms of teaching neoclassical strategies that offer students rational frameworks for thinking through topics; in terms of teaching neo-Romantic strategies that encourage personal expressions of students’ journeys with/in language; and in terms of teaching poststructuralist and cultural studies strategies of analyzing discourses to find traces, gaps, and images that writers may engage from their various subject positions. Arrangement manifests itself in terms of teaching organization, logic, and revision: that is, organization is important for teaching students not to conform to formulaic templates but, rather, to construct logics through which audiences are introduced to ideas; revision is a key way to teaching changing ideas and the order of ideas to strengthen texts’ logics. Style is taught as an intersection of personal signature, cultural convention, and politics, with different teachers giving different weight to each function. And memory is invoked pedagogically as a means of reflecting on research and the storage of knowledge, whether stored in the human mind or in mind-made technologies such as books, libraries, or computer chips.

When rhetoric and composition first emerged, rhetoric studies invoked classical theories to posit writing as a rhetorical act, one that entailed an interlocutor’s writing with an audience in mind. As rhetoric and composition evolved, writing took a turn to personal expressions, then a turn to social/cultural acts, and then a turn to spatial acts, as can be seen in the progression from Donald Murray’s classic “Teach Writing as a Process Not Product” (1972), Kenneth Bruffee’s “Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind” (1984),

In this evolution, writing pedagogy has emerged as the purview of more than just first-year composition programs that train students to write as college students; although that function still exists, critics continually wonder if it should, as Sharon Crowley does in *Composition in the University* (1998). Writing pedagogy has also been theorized as a means of producing and analyzing rhetorics in different disciplines, as traced in David Russell’s *Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 1870–1990* (1991). Writing pedagogy has also been theorized as engaging the rhetorics of public sphere issues, as evidenced in scholarship by teachers who engage service learning (Paula Mathieu in *Tactics of Hope*, 2005), cultural studies (James Berlin, *Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures*, 1993), critical pedagogies (Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 1970, 2000), and feminism (Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie, *Teaching Rhetorica*, 2006). With a current emphasis on public discourse, specifically on connecting academic and public realms, the teaching of writing circles back to its classical origins more than 2,500 years ago, but in new and interesting ways that deserve more study.

Kate Ronald and Hephzibah Roskelly, who compiled the bibliography for this section, identify the following topics for future research: (1) effects of reclaimed and emerging canons of women’s, gender, and ethnic rhetorics on rhetoric and composition pedagogy; (2) effects of rhetoric and composition scholarly diversity on rhetoric and composition pedagogy; (3) roles of individual imaginations and cultural imaginations—in terms of invention, memory, and creativity—in research and pedagogy; (4) influences of rhetorics from other disciplines (including literatures in English) on the teaching of writing; (5) ways to make the teaching of writing the task of other disciplines as well as of our own; and (6) pedagogies of civil discourse, particularly connecting classroom discourses to civic action.
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