

Introduction

Rhetorics and Roadmaps

ANDREA A. LUNSFORD

KIRT H. WILSON

ROSA A. EBERLY

Language is a place of struggle.

—bell hooks (1990)

Rhetoric appears as the connective tissue peculiar to civil society and to its proper finalities, happiness and political peace.

—Marc Fumaroli (1983)

Some speech for another history.

—Peter Dimock (1998)

The idea of a *SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* emerged in 2004 during conversations among the Sage editor Todd Armstrong and Professors Andrea Lunsford and Jim Aune. It seemed like a *good* idea, one whose time had come: This *Handbook* would join a long list of other distinguished handbooks published by Sage, volumes designed to provide overviews of the best scholarship in important fields, to serve not only as an introduction for advanced undergraduate and

graduate students but also as a reference text for established scholars. Moreover, this *Handbook* would come at a time when rhetoricians in departments of communication—under siege from both empirical-social scientists and university administrators—were building alliances to maintain their disciplinary legitimacy and when rhetoricians in English departments were increasingly joining ranks with their colleagues in writing studies to form new departments, occasionally with

rhetoric in their titles. On the national scene, the dangerously misguided bumbling of the second Bush administration pointed to the urgency of making a shared space for critique, resistance, and alternative rhetorical visions of viable 21st-century democracy. Internationally, scholars in English and communication were making serious efforts to include and study the rhetorical theories and practices of Europe, Africa, and Asia.

That was nearly 4 years ago, before we had any idea of how difficult it would be to bring out this volume. The conceptualization, after all, had come easily enough: This volume would be written and edited by scholars in both English and communication studies. A multidisciplinary perspective would extend the project's scope and bring together voices that could articulate the complex roadmaps of interdisciplinary rhetoric. The editorial team was chosen with these principles in mind. Jim Aune, Kirt Wilson, Martin Carcasson, John Lyne, and Ed Schiappa were trained primarily in communication departments; Andrea Lunsford, Cheryl Glenn, Carolyn Miller, and Jan Swearingen were trained primarily in English studies; Rosa Eberly was trained in English, writing studies, and speech communication and holds faculty appointments in both communication and English. We paired scholars from each field around topics of common concern (noting, not to put too fine a point on it, that all the scholars from one discipline were men and all those from the other were women). Why then did we encounter significant difficulties? In a nutshell, despite the proximity of our fields, working collaboratively across English and communication turned out to be even more complicated than we had imagined it would be.

Nearly 25 years earlier, scholars in communication and in English also had worked together to honor Edward P. J. Corbett in a volume called *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse* (Connors, Ede, & Lunsford, 1984). The introduction to

that volume attributes the “decline” of rhetoric after its momentary revival in 18th-century America to three forces: (1) the tendency to equate rhetoric with Hugh Blair’s concept of *belles lettres* rather than to focus on classical rhetoric as the productive art of public discourse, (2) increased specialization of disciplines and the rise of English, and (3) the growing emphasis on written discourse rather than oral performance in college and university curricula. Particularly important, in hindsight, was the series of disciplinary divorces that transpired as groups broke away from the Modern Language Association (MLA), founded in 1883. The first to establish its own identity was the group that began the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) in 1911, taking rhetoricians such as Fred Newton Scott and other scholars of oral communication with them. Scholars such as James Winans and James O’Neill worked to create an organization of their own, and in 1914 the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking (later the Speech Communication Association and now the National Communication Association [NCA]) was born, effectively severing the ties between speaking and writing, which remained in English. Addressing the history of communication studies in his 1998 Arnold Lecture, Bruce Gronbeck (1999) noted the gendered nature and consequences of these disciplinary changes. In the United States at the turn of the 20th century, “female elocutionists were associated with fine arts, and male rhetoricians with the socio-political arts. . . . [R]hetoric and elocution were largely gendered, and the women were sent home when rhetorical studies came to dominate collegiate and university instruction” (p. 8).

In 1924, the Linguistic Society of America took as its mission advancing “the scientific study of language.” This disciplinary narrowing and fragmenting was not good for rhetoric, an interdisciplinary and synthetic art capable of bringing together knowledge and ability in

various fields with audiences and exigencies of various kinds. Thus, those who studied and professed rhetoric found themselves—often for practical or quotidian rather than theoretical or ideological reasons—housed in very different departments or schools or both. Ironically, the events that fragmented the study of rhetoric revealed a cross-disciplinary anxiety: how to legitimize the study and practice of human rhetorical interaction as the central concern of education and not simply as an ancillary interest and how to do so in the context of a field of study and practice denominated a nondiscipline at the very moment of its literal founding, when Plato put the *-ic* in rhetoric (*rhetor-ike*).

Several additional 20th-century developments—theoretical, methodological, and practical—also returned attention to rhetoric. An educational shift toward communication as a fundamental skill brought publicity and occasionally controversy to the arts of speaking and writing and, particularly, the relationship between the quality of instruction and the proper functioning of workplaces and polities. The influence of the University of Chicago teachers and critics Richard McKeon, Ronald Crane, and Richard Weaver, as well as Kenneth Burke (associated with, though never officially affiliated, with Chicago), generated attention to pluralist “ideas and methods” and the theoretical, critical, and practical consequences of different points of departure. Daniel Fogarty’s (1959) *Roots for a New Rhetoric* paved the way for still another “new rhetoric” that would emerge as European scholars encountered Anglo-American rhetoric; and, most notably in Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s (1969) *The New Rhetoric* and in the founding of the journal *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, some philosophers moved their foci from formal and informal logic to rhetorical inquiry.

In 1949, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) providing an opportunity to bring those in

English and in communication together. Despite this effort, teachers of writing and of speaking were nearly entirely unaware of each others’ work, as they have remained until very recently. In the 1960s, however, more cross-fertilization seemed possible with the founding of The Rhetoric Society of America (RSA), whose first newsletter (December, 1968) lists as members of its founding board of directors Edward P. J. Corbett, Wayne C. Booth, John Rycenga, William Irmscher, Ross Winterowd, Henry Johnstone, Richard Larson, Robert Gorrell, Joseph Schwartz, Richard Hughes, Harry Crosby, Owen Thomas, and Donald C. Bryant. These scholars came from English, speech, philosophy, and linguistics, a virtual reuniting of the groups that had splintered in the early 20th century. While this august board of intellectuals reflected the creative spirit of inquiry that marked the 1960s, it failed to represent what was, perhaps, the most enduring challenge to the post–World War II academy, the inclusion of women and minorities. This group was diverse in some ways but not in others: As was all too common at the time, no women or people of color appeared among the leaders.

Thus, at the end of the tumultuous 1960s, rhetoric stood at an important crossroads. In communication, the methods of Neo-Aristotelian criticism were no longer viable, and administrators and department chairs began to wonder whether rhetoric might benefit from the methodologies that their colleagues in the social sciences had embraced. In English, scholars expressed a renewed interest in rhetoric not only as a forgotten tradition but also as a potential resource for intellectual inquiry. Simultaneously, students across the academy challenged their professors to explain how two and a half millennia of rhetorical history mattered to the political issues that animated their private and public lives. Within these contexts, an interdisciplinary group of scholars assembled, in 1970, at the Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin. The

rationale for the conference, as expressed to the National Endowment for the Humanities by the Speech Communication Association, was fourfold: (1) unrest at home and abroad necessitated a reevaluation of traditional theories of persuasion; (2) technological change had created new problems that required new methods of analysis; (3) scholars needed to consider the new perspectives suggested by shifts in psychology, linguistics, philosophy, English, and anthropology; and (4) rhetoric required a new formulation to reach its scholarly and pedagogical potential (“Rhetoric Project Assured,” 1969). In their 1971 book, Bitzer and Black modestly summarized the purpose of Wingspread and its accompanying conference, Pheasant Run, as an effort to “outline and amplify a theory of rhetoric suitable to 20th-century concepts and needs” (p. v).

Even a partial list of those who attended Wingspread gave one reason for hope. The presence of Carroll Arnold, Edwin Black, Henry Johnstone, Wayne Booth, Chiam Perelman, Lloyd Bitzer, Edward P. J. Corbett, Samuel Becker, and Richard McKeon suggested that a truly cross-disciplinary approach to the study of rhetoric was imminent. Again, however, the absence of even a single woman or person of color, despite the conference’s extensive attention to the era’s political issues, reveals the dissociations that sustained this particular intellectual community. Regardless, the Wingspread and Pheasant Run conferences did play a role in rhetoric’s evolution across the academy, largely because the scholars who attended these conferences legitimized a kind of methodological pluralism. They had reoriented theoretical development, first, toward the “new rhetorics” and, eventually, toward critical theory and philosophy. Most important, conference participants had broadened the object domain of rhetorical inquiry. “It is imperative,” they concluded, “that rhetorical studies be broadened to explore communicative procedures and practices not traditionally covered” (Bitzer & Black, 1971,

p. 238). The impact of this expansion was both disciplinary and personal.

Roadmap #1

Institutional and disciplinary histories are often personal histories as well. I (Andrea Lunsford speaking/writing here) began work toward the PhD at Ohio State in 1972. As a teacher of high school and community college students in the late 1960s with only an MA in English literature, I realized that while I had a fair idea of how to teach reading of literary works, I had almost no idea how to teach writing. (I wasn't even thinking of speaking at the time, though I had been fortunate to have some good speech classes during my undergraduate career at the University of Florida.) When I received a copy of Edward P. J. Corbett's Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student, I read it with amazement: What I had been trying to teach myself how to do was here described in detail and related to a 2,000-year-old tradition. As soon as I could, I quit my job and applied to graduate school, arriving in Columbus in the fall of 1972 to find that Corbett was teaching not rhetoric but 18th-century literature and the Bible. He was also, however, editing College Composition and Communication—which he invited me to help out with, and he was willing to do a series of independent study courses with me on the history of rhetoric. In addition, he introduced me to his colleagues in speech communication, including James Golden and Goodwin Berquist. In a correspondence with Jim Golden a few years ago, he said, “It is quite clear that English and Speech came together through the relationship we created and sustained [at Ohio State].” Indeed, Corbett and Golden had both arrived at Ohio State in 1966; in 1968, they edited a volume on the rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately, and they regularly visited each other's classes and encouraged their graduate students to do “crossover” work. I was fortunate, then, to take a number of courses taught in the Department of Speech. I completed my degree in 1977 and joined the English faculty at the University of British Columbia, unaware of how remarkable my training

had been and how fortunate I had been to learn across these disciplinary boundaries.

When I returned to Ohio State as a professor of English in 1986, I joined a small but thriving group of rhetoric and writing specialists in English and in speech communication. In addition to Ed Corbett, the English faculty included Frank O'Hare, Kitty Locker, Sara Garnes, Ann Dobyns, and Louis Ulman. Josina Makau was in speech communication, along with Sonia Foss, and soon Mary Garrett, James Darsey, and Jim Hikins rounded out the speech communication community. We began holding quarterly rhetoric colloquia between English and speech communication faculty and graduate students, and our students moved back and forth across departments, taking courses in both; we regularly served on each other's dissertation committees. But like other speech communication departments around the country, Ohio State's was to take an antirhetorical turn, led by a dean who valued only quantitative research. In an amazingly short time, this dean and her successor eliminated rhetoric as a serious field of study in speech communication. Golden and Berquist retired, and hiring in rhetoric ground to a halt. In 1994, Makau left for another position, as did Jim Darsey a little later and, soon after Darsey's departure, Mary Garrett. By the time Garrett left in 1999, the speech communication rhetoric group was effectively dissolved, and several graduate students who had been pursuing PhDs in speech communication moved over to English, where the rhetoric and writing group then stood at 14 tenure-line faculty members.

Before Makau left, she and I talked together and with colleagues about trying to establish a new department of rhetoric and writing at Ohio State. Eventually, we faced too many obstacles at both the departmental and college levels, and in retrospect I simply didn't have the vision and ability to create this change. I am still asking myself, "What if . . . ?"

Today, dozens of new departments and programs exist, dotting the academic landscape. Yet most of these departments and programs deal primarily in writing studies; few focus intensely on rhetorical history and theory, and fewer still bring together scholars of rhetoric from communication and English.

Since I have spent my long career entirely in departments of English, I still see writing, reading, and speaking (and increasingly listening and viewing) as arts that English can and should encompass. But as my narrative roadmap indicates, I also appreciate—and often embrace—the desire to create new alliances, new ways to move beyond the strictures of the all too often narrow disciplinarity of English.

* * * * *

This reflection provides one concrete example of disciplinary identifications and divisions, of one scholar's journey that in some ways reflects the status of rhetoric and rhetorical education in the United States in the mid- to late 20th century. What had seemed so promising in the 1970s as a matter of theoretical expansion and again in the 1980s as a revival of classical rhetoric, which increasingly informed writing (and rhetoric) programs, began to wane as the emphasis shifted strongly to composition theory and practice in English and prescriptive methods of rhetorical criticism in communication. The CCCC program, long a bellwether for shifts in the English discipline, featured fewer and fewer sessions on rhetoric, and composition journals reflected the same shift. In the meantime, communication departments continued the emphasis on empirical studies and on social science methodologies, leaving many humanist rhetoricians on the fringes of these departments. These trends, along with the pressing sense of fragmentation, denied rhetoric a chance to inform university curricula or national discussions of educational priorities and reform.

Roadmap #2

My (Kirt Wilson speaking/writing here) graduate education began at Purdue University in 1989. Purdue was the only program to which I applied, and I considered myself fortunate to be considered, let alone employed, as a graduate instructor of public speaking. I came to speech communication

late in my undergraduate career. As a freshman, I was convinced that my future field would be clinical psychology. This certainty began to crumble when, after a class in oral interpretation, the professor insisted that I try out for the collegiate forensic team. I had participated in team sports since elementary school, and I was intrigued by the idea that I could combine two things that I loved—competition and oral performance. Traveling to a wide variety of small midwestern colleges, I dutifully competed in *Prose, Poetry, Duo, and Impromptu Speaking*, and many of the tournaments and events I entered still persist in my memory with startling clarity.

Before long, I realized that my coach hoped that I would play a very specific role for the team. I was to be the black orator, the speaker who would breathe life into James Weldon Johnson's *The Creation* and then shift gears in the next round to offer a rhetorical critique of South Africa's apartheid policy. Initially, this expectation bothered me, but my long history in athletics had conditioned me well—success for a team means that everyone must play a part; one must leverage every opportunity for the good of the whole. Eventually, I reconciled myself to this situation when I realized that my race could be important, but its significance would not be defined by the occasional insult I endured. It would be important to me as a strategic category—a means to victory and a rhetorical and political problem to be analyzed before public audiences. What began as an expectation based solely on the color of my skin became, at least in my mind, a strategic decision to embrace an identity from which others and I might learn. I was never the team's star—others would go to nationals while I remained at state; nevertheless, the experience was exhilarating. I had found an intellectual community that I understood and in which my contributions were valued. The "veil of race" was omnipresent, of course, but it did not preclude the generous friendships I developed with my white teammates. Needless to say, I changed my major from psychology to speech communication.

Although it is less common than it once was, a great many professors in communication studies encountered rhetoric through exposure to forensics and collegiate debate. I began my PhD at

Northwestern in 1991, an institution with a storied debate tradition. Most of my professors—David Zarefsky, Michael Leff, G. Thomas Goodnight, and Tom Farrell—had first competed on the debate circuit and later coached debate teams. The scholars we read in class—Edwin Black, Robert L. Scott, Michael McGee, Steven Lucas, David Frank, Phil Wander, Edward Schiappa, Charlie Willard, Bob Craig, Craig Smith, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, Kathleen Hall Jamieson—were debaters and coaches before they became published scholars. The graduate students with whom I studied, Gordon Mitchell and Erik Doxtader, would disappear on Thursday or Friday to accompany Northwestern's undergraduate team as it secured yet another victory. When I accepted my current position at the University of Minnesota, I was the only rhetoric scholar without a debate pedigree. One retirement (Robert L. Scott) and a hire (Ronald Greene) later, and my status as the exception remains intact. Today, few rhetoric graduate students in communication programs believe that coaching debate is a desirable career choice; nevertheless, the argumentative skills of those who once held a national ranking are respected still. You have to be very confident or very foolhardy to challenge some of my colleagues either in the classroom or at a national convention.

The influence of forensics and collegiate debate on the field of communication studies during the 20th century was profound. As speech-communication departments solidified their identity and moved with confidence away from the traditions of English and composition, debate and forensics functioned as a kind of "minor league," a proving ground for young talent and a recruiting resource for departments. Forensics and debate attracted bright young minds that were articulate and interested in the interconnections among rhetorical theory, philosophy, and public policy. Debate and forensics rewarded both aggression and obsession; consequently, these future professors possessed an amazing knowledge of both history and the details of domestic and foreign policy. The penchant among communication scholars to read widely and borrow, sometimes shamelessly, from

other fields reflected the practices of debate and individual events. An intense interest in political conflict meant that the discipline quickly recognized the cultural transformations that reshaped the United States in the 1960s and 1970s; but, at the same time, this recognition did not include a welcoming of women and African Americans. Debate, in particular, was a decidedly masculine enterprise. Women who succeeded in that space (e.g., Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson) earned the respect of many, but the process of earning that respect was taxing and the norms of the debate culture were inherently agonistic. Most important, debate and forensics helped reinforce values and practices that defined the communication discipline in the 20th century: a restless desire to discover the next important topic, a belief that the quality of one's scholarship was determined by its argumentative force, an emphasis on oral rather than written forms of communication, a presumption of individual and disciplinary self-sufficiency, and an implicit assumption that a single scholar could know everything that mattered and answer any question that was relevant.

* * * * *

In 2000, at the biennial meeting of the RSA, a large group of rhetoric scholars met in open session to talk about how better to coordinate our scholarly and political efforts for the good of rhetorical studies and our shared worlds. During 2001 and 2002, conversations at national meetings brought scholars of rhetoric in English and in communication together once again to address their related interests. In particular, the creation of the Alliance of Rhetoric Societies (ARS) constituted a community of scholars from existing academic societies devoted entirely or in some part to rhetorical studies, including American Forensic Association, American Society for the History of Rhetoric, Coalition of Women Scholars in the History of Rhetoric, Canadian Society for the History of Rhetoric, Conference on College Composition and Communication, International

Society for the History of Rhetoric (ISHR), International Society for the Study of Argumentation, Kenneth Burke Society, National Communication Association, and Rhetoric Society of America. In inviting members of these organizations to join the ARS Board, Gerard A. Hauser (a contributor to this volume) wrote that ARS would “seek to regularize dialogue among rhetoricians and, thereby, promote a comprehensive intellectual community of rhetoricians who share in the common labor of scholarship” (personal communication, 2001). Today, ARS is chaired by the University of Minnesota’s Art Walzer (a contributor to this volume), and the group includes representatives from most professional societies interested in rhetoric, writing, and argumentation.

In September 2003, the ARS held the “Conference on the Status and Future of Rhetorical Studies” at Northwestern University; addressing four major issues: (1) How ought we to understand the concept of rhetorical agency? (2) Do we have a “rhetorical tradition,” or are we better advised to think of “traditions”? If we do recognize a tradition or several traditions, how do we identify and characterize it (or them)? (3) What should be the institutional and social goals for academic rhetoric in the 21st century? How can rhetoric best contribute to the social, political, and cultural environment that extends beyond the university? (4) What does it mean to teach rhetoric? What does it mean to teach composition and performance seriously? What is the relationship between rhetoric and composition? Should they be distinguished? Four plenary speakers and respondents kicked off this working conference, which resulted in a set of reports/position papers later published in *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* (Summer, 2004). Since then, ARS has continued to explore these issues and to sponsor workshops during RSA meetings; the 2007 workshop devoted much of its time to probing the relationship between rhetoric in communication and rhetoric in

writing and English programs; to working toward making rhetoric more visible in places such as the American Council of Learned Societies, the Survey of Earned Doctorates, and the National Research Council; and to developing model undergraduate major programs (within both disciplines) that could encourage the founding of more such majors. In 2008, ARS will hold a workshop as part of RSA's biennial institute.

Roadmap #3

"I wake to sleep and take my waking slow. I know by going where I have to go." I (Rosa Eberly speaking/writing here) fell in love with that villanelle by Theodore Roethke (1953) when I took my first American literature class at Penn State, with Ron Maxwell, then a tenured assistant professor and soon to become the director of the Writing Center. Back in 1980, my first year at Penn State (a first-generation college student, I was allowed to apply to only one college), I was not a "lit major" or even an English major: I was a "journ major," a 17-year-old cub reporter, soon promoted to desk editor, of Penn State's superlative student daily. I was a debater and extemporizer in high school—went to the state finals in extemp; but "the paper" seduced my soul in college, and for much of my undergraduate career I skipped classes and worked at The Daily Collegian 50 to 60 hours a week. I changed my major to English, writing option, my second year because the journalism major—at the time still housed in the College of the Liberal Arts—felt redundant, given what I was learning at one of the top three student dailies in the country. When one of my journ professors learned that I had changed my major, he refused to sign the paperwork for my Newspaper Fund Scholarship and accused me of "wanting to write the Great American novel." Well, no, actually. . . . In any case, I was fortunate to learn early that there are consequences to changing paths, or helping forge new ones, . . . "and learn by going where I have to go." In short, the various strands of rhetorical theory and practice—the language arts—thread, sometimes knotted,

sometimes knitted, through my educational history and my life.

I became a serious student at Penn State after courses with Jim Rambeau, Gus Kolich, Bob Hudspeth, and Wilma Ebbitt. Wilma—Mrs. Ebbitt, who, I learned much later, not only taught at the University of Chicago but also taught the likes of Phillip Roth and Wayne Booth how to teach writing there—introduced me to rhetoric and composition in my last year of undergraduate study. My senior honors thesis was on William Faulkner's narrative strategies, and I was hired by a local Knight-Ridder newspaper as assistant news editor on the "bulldog" edition, where I stayed for 2 years, as planned, before going to graduate school.

While I had the great fortune to study with Wayne Booth at Chicago and to complete my A.M. with him as my advisor, I escaped Hyde Park as soon as I could. My parents couldn't quite get their heads around why I was going to college again, so I thought I'd return to Centre County and maybe get my teaching certification. One education course extinguished that desire. Meanwhile, I had started teaching as a lecturer in English: rhetoric and composition. I learned how to teach from Nancy Lowe, Marie Secor, and Jack Selzer; I learned about the mysteriously powerful enthymeme from Jeff Walker; I encountered collaborative learning through Ron Maxwell in the Writing Center. Though I applied to other graduate programs, the pull of Central Pennsylvania and the quality of the PhD program Penn State was building gave me no good reason to leave. My PhD was in both English and speech communication: major in English (at least three times as many lit classes as rhetoric classes) and minor in speech (all history and theory of rhetoric). Studying rhet-comp in English and the history and theory of rhetoric with Jerry Hauser in speech com helped me finally understand why I had left Chicago. In staying at Penn State for the PhD, I had chosen to become a scholar of rhetoric.

Attending my first RSA meeting in 1992 in Minneapolis persuaded me that I would have a professional home, despite the necessity of MLA, CCCC, NCA, and a few other conferences each year. In taking my first job at the University of Texas at

Austin, arriving in the second year of existence of the Division of Rhetoric and Composition (DRC), my good fortune continued. Though I took a good deal of guff from folks whose jobs I did not accept ("She wants to work in a DIVISION. Get it? It's not English: it's a DIVISION."), I again felt I was forging, with superlative collaborators, some kind of new path for the study and practice of interdisciplinary rhetoric; furthermore, the DRC's Computer Writing and Research Lab and Undergraduate Writing Center enabled rhetoric to make its powerful presence known across and beyond campus. Several of my colleagues in communication at Utah also became important allies in work and friends for life. I remain passionate about the connections among rhetoric, public education, and sustainable democracies. I have been blessed by so many of rhetoric's road trips, and I look forward to the wakings and wanderings to come.

* * * * *

The efforts of ARS demonstrate that we continue to try to learn, think, and work collaboratively. Yet in spite of ARS, fragmentation continues; as our three narrative accounts of the roadmaps we consulted (and stumbled on) in coming to rhetoric suggest, scholars in rhetoric reside in several different departments—now not only Communication and English but also newer departments of Writing Studies; Communication, Rhetoric, and Digital Media; Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures; Composition and Cultural Rhetoric, and so on. Such an array of disciplinary homes is not unique to rhetoric; indeed, it may indicate, in part, the decline of disciplines as we have known them for the past 100 years. Consider the many homes of scholars who study media, for example, or cognition: While interdisciplinarity is still very, very hard to do, the experiences of women's or gender studies departments or ethnic studies departments are instructive; traditional disciplinarity is clearly fraying at the edges. If there is to be a sustainable 21st-century

revival of rhetoric, we will need to think well beyond old boundaries; furthermore, we will have to work productively together to discredit and defeat reactionary attacks on any and all disciplines ending with "studies" and to explain rhetoric—pluralistically and pragmatically and well—to a variety of academic and public audiences. *The SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* hopes to participate in just such a revival by mapping the territory of rhetoric today and by laying solid groundwork on which scholars can build something new. Coming together to create a rhetoric capable of moving beyond disciplinarity means, among other things, coming to grips with a series of key problematics.

THE NATURE, SCOPE, AND FUNCTION OF RHETORIC

Among the many issues facing our field of study, the long-standing debate over the nature, function, and scope of rhetoric continues to loom large. Rhetoric has been viewed as the "counterpart" of dialectic (Aristotle), as the art of speaking well (Quintilian), as the purview of elocution and pronunciation alone (Ramus), as the study of misunderstandings (Richards), as the "symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols" (Burke, 1969, p. 43), and as "hot air" or deceptive practices (Plato, Chaucer, Locke, and a host of others). As a plastic art that molds itself to varying times, places, and situations, rhetoric is notoriously hard to pin down, and arguments about how to define rhetoric and what its scope should be characterize the long history of Western rhetoric.

The earliest U.S. colleges and universities defined rhetoric narrowly, in Ramistic terms, but as the works of Cicero and Quintilian became more widely available in the 18th century, rhetorical education in the United States began to adopt broader definitions; books such as John Ward's (1759) *A System of Oratory* considered invention and arrangement

as within the scope of rhetoric, along with style and delivery. Yet as writing took on more and more importance in higher education and as college student populations doubled and tripled and new students flooded the campuses, this broader definition of rhetoric began to give way to restricted conceptions of rhetorical and grammatical correctness rather than to a more expansive Ciceronian understanding of the arts of rhetoric.

In addition, and very important, during the 19th and early 20th centuries, the curriculum shifted its primary focus from the production to the consumption of discourse: Whereas students in earlier times had opportunities to practice rhetoric—in speeches, debates, dramatic performances, and other aspects of the old *progymnasmata*—they have now been made increasingly to focus on reading (consuming writing by others), while they themselves write, sometimes daily, perfunctory “themes” that were graded primarily for correctness. If we take the long view, we can see that the rise of writing (from before the time of the printing press well into the 20th century) goes hand in hand not only with the decline of robust oral traditions and the production of discourse but with capitalist commodification of value as well. What can be commodified, of course, can be owned and protected; hence, the regime of copyright launched in the early 18th century grew up to control texts, to allow for only certain kinds of circulation, and to grant rights of production to a few while denying them to many. Such protected and valuable texts were to be consumed by students and the general public alike; any writing that students did would be in response to these commodified and protected great works. And rhetoric, previously understood as a culturally productive and practical art, was left to focus in its most legitimated forms on the arts of effective oral persuasion, consumption, or hermeneutics. During the same time period, literature came to define itself as imaginative literature—“high” forms of fiction and poetry, thus excluding much that

had been within the grasp of rhetoric but was now excluded from it.

THE STATUS OF RHETORICAL KNOWLEDGE

Such limited definitions of rhetoric clearly affect the status of rhetorical knowledge as well. In the Western tradition, the argument between philosophy and sophistry perfectly captures competing conceptions of rhetorical knowledge, with philosophy linking Truth to dialectic and logic and the sophists linking contingent truth to rhetoric. In the *Phaedrus* and *Gorgias*, Plato makes his case clear: The way to knowledge, truth, and wisdom comes through the application of rigorous logical principles. Rhetoric, more akin to cooking or ornamentation, could create the appearance of truth but not truth itself. While Plato does sketch in what a noble rhetoric might look like toward the end of the *Phaedrus*, it is clear that he doesn’t expect such an art to be probable, or even possible.

In the debate between philosophy and rhetoric, philosophy long held the upper hand. But 20th-century challenges to Platonic notions of truth and knowledge began to mount as thinkers across a range of fields (from physics and history to literature, sociology, economics, and even law) began to build more relational, contingent, social theories of knowledge. In 1967, the influential *Central States Speech Journal* published Robert L. Scott’s “On Viewing Rhetoric as Epistemic,” effectively launching a debate over the nature of knowledge within rhetorical circles. Drawing on the work of Stephen Toulmin, Douglas Ehninger, and Wayne Brockriede, Scott argues that humans “must consider truth not as something fixed and final but as something to be created moment by moment in the circumstances in which [they find themselves] and with which [they] must cope.” Scott concludes by saying, “In human affairs, then, rhetoric, perceived in the frame herein discussed, is a way of knowing; it is

epistemic” (p. 17). Scott’s essay drew response and criticism from several quarters, which Scott answered in three additional essays (1976, 1990, 1994). But in spite of Barry Brummett’s (1990) declaration that epistemic rhetoric was dead (a declaration vehemently denied by Richard Cherwitz & James Hikins, 1995, 1998), scholars continue to acknowledge rhetoric’s ability to make knowledge and define contingent truths.

This social turn in rhetorical studies is paralleled in composition, especially in the early work of Janet Emig, whose *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders* (1971) laid the groundwork for her influential essay “Writing as a Mode of Learning” (1977), in which she argues that writing is a means of creating knowledge. During the next decade, James Berlin (1987) developed the concept of “social epistemic rhetoric,” which he defines as “the study and critique of signifying practices in relation to subject formation within the framework of economic, social, and political conditions” (p. 77). For Berlin, this form of rhetoric views knowledge as produced through the relationship among writers, communities, and contexts. Thus, there can be no Truth but only the kinds of contingent truths rhetors struggle to create. Berlin’s goal was to engage student writers in the kind of cultural and political critique that could lead to transformative change.

It is beyond the scope of this introduction to trace the myriad paths of the social turn in communication, rhetoric, and writing and the ways in which that turn has led to an understanding of rhetoric and writing as capable of both creating and shaping knowledge—epistemic, doxastic, material. Suffice it to say that, in terms of a theory of knowledge, rhetorical scholarship today is much closer to sophistic than Platonic concepts of knowledge: In the absence of absolute certainty, rhetoric is the art (and theory and practice) that can guide humans to make the best decisions possible in any given circumstance. Furthermore, as Kenneth Burke (1969) reminds us, rhetoric is

perhaps the primary means through which humans overcome their physical separation to create communities, affiliations, and networks of collective meaning. What kind of contingent truths rhetoric can produce and what status those truths should enjoy, however, remain as fraught as ever: A viable and sustainable 21st-century rhetorical turn will need to build a strong case for rhetoric as seeing, making, and doing.

Future scholarship also must make room for theories that view rhetoric as something more than an epistemology and an instrument of persuasion. In communication studies, the work of critical, cultural scholars such as Raymie McKerrow (1989), Maurice Charland (1987), Dana Cloud (1994), and Ronald Greene (1998) resists easy distinction between rhetoric and its circulation or its consequences. To understand rhetoric materially is to consider, first, that existing structures, institutions, and modes of distribution are technologies of communication not unlike words and symbols. The print technologies that so interest cultural historians and many scholars in English are more than just vehicles for knowledge or its formulation. They also are material elements that constitute and sustain print cultures; consequently, these technologies have an impact on meaning *and* communal relations and systems of social power. What distinguishes a speech text from a printing press is, from this perspective, a complex question. Both are simultaneously the means and the products of rhetoric. In recent years, critical perspectives on rhetoric have had a profound and often controversial impact on both communication and English. Their influence is evident especially in the study of agency and identity.

RHETORICAL AGENTS AND AGENCY

What we have been calling the social turn in rhetoric leads to a careful consideration of participants in rhetorical situations and, more particularly, the nature of those participants.

No challenge has been greater for rhetoric in postmodern times than that of accounting for rhetorical agents and their agency. Concerns with subjectivity and agency, of course, grew out of the Enlightenment, with its emphasis on originality and on the individual, words that came to have very different meanings than they had held in the past. For instance, prior to the 18th century, “originality” meant not uniqueness but a return to origins; indeed, an individual was most often understood as one from among a series of types as set forth by Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and other historically distant sacred and secular writers. As theorists reacted against the Enlightenment, they inevitably turned to the teleology and individualism of that period, declaring the (decidedly individual, autonomous) author to be dead and illustrating the degree to which “individuals” are rather constituted in and through discourse, at best occupying “subject positions.” In reflecting on the problem of agency at the ARS conference, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell (2005) commented wryly,

The term “agency” is polysemic and ambiguous, a term that can refer to invention, strategies, authorship, institutional power, identity, subjectivity, and subject positions, among others. I imagine myself in my speech writer persona rafting down a river filled with rapids named Barthes, Derrida, and Foucault at the end of which I must navigate a vortex of feminist controversy with Judith Butler, Seyla Benhabib, Nancy Fraser, and Michelle Ballif as sirens luring me seductively toward disaster as I consider whether the phoenix of female agency can emerge out of the ashes of the dead male author. (p. 1)

Indeed, feminist theorists have resisted the post-structuralist challenge to individual autonomy and agency, often noting with irony the fact that no sooner had women established claims to autonomy and agentive power than those concepts were declared “dead.” Most

certainly, Maria Stewart, W. E. B. Du Bois, Julia Cooper, Ralph Ellison, and Richard Wright did not need a critique of subjectivity to understand the contingent nature of black identity, but they chose not to abandon agency either. Similarly, buoyed by end-of-philosophy pragmatism, scholars such as Fraser and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak have helped articulate notions of strategic essentialism that bracket insoluble theoretical questions in favor of positive social change in actually existing communities. In short, notions of agency, particularly in material practice, do not necessarily reify the Cartesian dualism.

Rhetoricians too had a hard time giving up on agency: After all, in spite of differences in linguistic and cultural traditions, the concept of the rhetor as a person who could and did do things with language has been a hallmark of Western rhetorical theory. In her ARS talk, a version of which was later published in *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, Campbell (2005) offered a series of propositions about rhetorical agency today:

[Agency is] communal and participatory, hence, both constituted and constrained by externals that are material and symbolic; is “invented” by authors who are points of articulation; emerges in artistry or craft; is effected through form; and is perverse, that is, inherently, protean, ambiguous, open to reversal. (p. 2)

Like many of their colleagues in communication, scholars of rhetoric and writing in English also have worked to posit a sense of agency that would reject Enlightenment norms while providing for the possibility of meaningful symbolic action. A long-standing but now somewhat dated joke in the field features graduate students, deep into post-structuralist theory in their seminars, learning that all the world is a text and that meaning is infinitely deferred, and then going to teach their (usually required) writing classes in which they mentor young students in shaping voices and messages

to which others can and will respond. In fact, composition and rhetoric have long resisted the attacks on agency, working rather to build a sense of empowerment and authority in student writers. It is not unusual for students to coauthor scholarly articles in the field (see, e.g., Anderson et al., 1990); and for the past 5 years, *Young Scholars in Writing: Undergraduate Research in Writing and Rhetoric* has served as a venue for student writers to publish their work, offering them another means of exerting agency.

Among the many scholars of writing who have addressed issues of agency, we point particularly to Lester Faigley (1992), Susan Miller (1998), Cheryl Glenn (1997, 2004), and Jacqueline Jones Royster (1996, 2000). Writing from within the intellectual traditions of African American women, Royster provides an eloquent rationale for the kinds of agency practiced and passed down from one generation of Black women to another. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's (1973, 1986; Campbell & Jerry, 1988) groundbreaking work on 19th- and 20th-century feminist rhetoric recognizes both the traditional and the nontraditional forms of agency employed by women orators. Likewise, Michael Leff's (1986, 1992; Leff & Sachs, 1990) invitation to critics to consider the artistry of exemplary texts not only helped start the close textual movement in communication studies, but it also reintroduced the speaker's inventional power as an important consideration of the rhetorical situation.

If rhetoric has needed to retain some possibility of rhetorical agents and agency, it seems imprudent to lean too far in that direction today, especially given what we know about the relationship between agency and the traditional concept of Western individualism—the belief that human beings can act in purely autonomous ways. This sense of agency, after all, can be seen as deeply ethnocentric, suggesting that all of culture and society are simply the accumulated results of radically individual actions. In the case of

enabling student writers to take on authorship and agency, the danger is overt: As Don Kraemer (1991) says, “Asking students to be like us” is “simultaneously oppressive and emancipatory: oppressive because the students are enjoined, emancipatory because the students’ and teachers’ discourse communities change as they join” (p. 54). As a result, we need to take special care in constructing occasions for students to engage with rhetorical agency. Yet in spite of these very real dangers, most contemporary theorists make room for at least some form of agency, with thinkers such as William Sewell (1992) describing a “capacity for agency” in all people and arguing, moreover, that agency is both individual and collective (pp. 20–21) and Charles Taylor (1985a, 1985b) arguing that all people have the potential to act as agents. In communication studies, Michael Leff writes of the work of rhetoricians who are “seeking to discover a more intricate relationship between rhetorical performance and the social and cultural milieu,” particularly noting James Crosswhite’s argument that rhetorical agency results from an “interplay between individual action and the cultural environment in which individuals speak and act” (Leff & Lunsford, 2004, p. 63). Rhetorical scholars trained and practiced in public as well as academic scholarship will be more able, pragmatically and pluralistically, to explain rhetorical agency to—and practice rhetorical agency with—a wide variety of audiences across and beyond their campuses and communities.

Campbell (2005) sums up her meditation on agency, which includes a memorable exploration of the works, person, and responses to Sojourner Truth, by saying,

What needs to be resisted is a simplistic, humanistic view of agency rooted in the theory of George Campbell and his contemporaries, and the simplistic approaches to cause and effect that arose out of some social scientific approaches to the study of

mass communication, for example. What is needed are synthetic, complex views of authorship as articulation, of the power of form as it emerges in texts of all sorts, of the role of audiences in appropriating and reinterpreting texts when they emerge and through time, and of the links of all these to the cultural context, material and symbolic, in which discourse circulates. (p. 17)

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

If rhetoricians have sought a space for rhetorical agency, they have done so in some sense by claiming agency—the power to take efficacious actions—for rhetoric itself. As the discussion above suggests, rhetoricians in both communication and English believe that the work of rhetoric should and does make a difference in the world. Indeed, the concept of rhetorical agency demands a realm within which its agency is manifest, and thus rhetoric has long sought to encourage civic engagement, to create public spaces for deliberation and debate, and to help develop a robust theory of the public sphere. In particular, rhetoricians have worked to provide a means of moving beyond Habermas's (1962/1989) view of public life as a form of spectator sport dominated by corporate media and consumerism. A subfield within communication has focused on public discourse studies as scholars explore the relationships among “public,” “public sphere,” and “public discourse.” Among many we could name, Gerard Hauser (2003, 2004) has articulated a sphere of rhetorical action in which rhetors can identify and resist what Wayne Booth (2004) calls “rhetrickery” and take action to establish and maintain civic life. Within English, rhetoricians such as Selfe and Hawisher (2000) have helped characterize and explore the way new media create civic and public spheres that writers and speakers can shape as well as participate actively within. The debate over whether or not such a rhetorical public sphere

can be developed and maintained, either virtually or materially, will not be settled anytime soon, since we have much to learn about how discourse arises and circulates in digital contexts. In fact, today the very concepts of public and private have been called into question by the explosion of social networking sites, with the argument that such sites constitute the most important arena for public discourse today. The spectacular growth of social networking sites began in earnest with Six-Degrees.com in 1997 and hit the mainstream in 2003 with MySpace, followed by Facebook (2004) and YouTube (2005). Scholars, teachers, and parents were quick to note that such sites privileged the public over the private; in fact, users of the sites seemed not to feel a need for what many older people consider the right to privacy. As a result, privacy concerns have arisen, especially in terms of younger users (George, 2006). Whatever the eventual effect of social networking sites, the public is unlikely to abandon them, and the public sphere likely cannot do without their millions of users.

RHETORIC AND PEDAGOGY

For scholars of rhetoric, the opening up of new publics and new arenas for public discourse presents a welcome challenge, an opportunity to test our theories of the epistemic capacity of rhetoric as well as theories of rhetorical agency and civic engagement. They also offer the opportunity for revisiting rhetoric's relationship to pedagogy, since so much of what we teach is affected by new and highly mediated environments. Of the issues we have discussed that face rhetoric today, pedagogy is the one that in some ways has most clearly separated scholars in communication from those in English/rhetoric and composition. Attention to teaching and to pedagogy has been central to the work of scholars in rhetoric and writing: Indeed, an insistent attention to pedagogy has been said—often pejoratively—to define the

field. In contrast, communication has deemphasized pedagogy; it has not been a prominent aspect of the discipline's most public and celebrated scholarship. To be sure, teachers of speech founded the discipline, and *The Speech Teacher*, now *Communication Education*, has 80 years of published history and many dedicated readers. Nevertheless, conference panels on the basic speech course and theories of pedagogy do not receive the attention of panels devoted to public address, rhetorical theory, or critical/cultural communication. Furthermore, although the accepted histories of rhetoric in communication begin with affirmations about the public-speaking course, they quickly move on to disputes over research methodology and theory. The International Society for the History of Rhetoric exemplifies this stance in its dismissal of pedagogy: "We do not accept papers on pedagogy," they have said. The dismissal of pedagogy is not unique to communication or ISHR, of course; MLA has only reluctantly yielded pedagogy a place at the disciplinary table. Even in the CCCC, which was founded on pedagogical concerns, a sometimes bitter conflict has sprung up between theory and practice, with those advocating for the crucial role of theory arguing that studies in composition/rhetoric will not prosper or mature unless the field gives up its attachment to practice, to pedagogy.

This teaching-based distinction between communication and composition may, however, be resolving itself. The ARS conference, for example, kicked off with both Jerzy Axer and Jeffrey Walker sounding a similar theme: Rhetoric, they both argued, is a *teaching* tradition (see Walker, 2003). In his address, Walker sketched in two distinct impetuses in rhetoric: one toward production of theoretical knowledge and the other toward development of the communicative capacities necessary to civic life in a democracy. This second impetus is what Walker sees as rhetoric's teaching tradition, one that offers "a gymnastic for the mind" as well as a habitus for life.

Scholars in rhetoric and composition would agree with Walker's and Axer's view of rhetoric as a teaching tradition and with the importance of our working proactively to put rhetoric at the center of the educational enterprise (Walker, 2003). In addition, they would agree on the need to focus on a range of communicative abilities—including writing, reading, speaking, and listening. It has been instructive to see renewed attention to speaking, especially; as speech departments morphed into communication departments, the often-required speech courses began to disappear, yet students' need to "stand and deliver" in various media continued to grow. As a result, many rhetoric and writing programs began incorporating speaking into the curriculum and sometimes working with their colleagues in communication to teach multimodal communication most effectively.

RHETORIC(S) AND TRADITION(S)

As Walker (2003) suggests, whether the goal of rhetoric is to theorize or to teach depends in large part on how the rhetorical tradition is defined. And certainly this issue of traditions is at the heart of many debates among rhetoricians today. While scholars acknowledge that rhetoric is a universal art in the sense that every language will carry with it theories and modes of persuasion and communication, it is still the Western tradition of rhetoric that speaks most loudly and that still makes claim to being "the" rhetorical tradition." In point of fact, the focus on Western rhetorical traditions is evident in major resources such as the *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition* (Enos, 1996), the *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* (Sloane, 2001), Bizzell and Herzberg's *The Rhetorical Tradition* (2001), and most standard histories of the field (see, e.g., Howell, 1975; Kennedy, 1980)—and in this volume as well. In addition, most graduate courses on rhetorical history lean heavily toward the West. But the dominance of Western rhetoric

has come under increasing scrutiny as scholars have explored other rhetorical traditions and, within the Western tradition, have sought to recover or redefine a rhetorical tradition that would include women, people of color, and those who practiced as well as theorized about rhetoric.

At the ARS conference, two groups spent 3 days debating the question of rhetorical tradition/traditions. In reporting on these discussions, Pat Bizzell and Susan Jarratt (2004) say,

Although some wanted to emphasize that even the traditional tradition is not monolithic, others, the majority, wanted to emphasize that we must talk of multiple histories and must encourage much more study of figures and texts never before included in “traditional” studies of rhetorical traditions. (p. 20)

Participants in these discussions tried out a number of different terms, metaphors, and models, concluding (not a little ironically), “Do we have a rhetorical tradition then? Well, the answer seems to be yes, as long as we don’t conceptualize it as a ‘tradition’ and don’t restrict it to only one, traditional-tradition, history” (p. 21). Throughout, participants wrestled with the practicalities—and the ethics—of how to teach the history of rhetoric in ways that honor such multiple histories, how “responsibly to meet the obligation to move out of a narrow sphere of established scholarship (Western, elite, male-dominated)—to ‘world-travel’—without becoming a tourist” (p. 21).

The editors of the forthcoming *Norton Anthology of Rhetoric and Writing* have struggled for several years with how best to meet such a challenge. Declaring in a prospectus for the volume that it would attempt to

re-shape the field of rhetoric and writing, first by refusing a separation of the language arts (reading, writing, speaking, and listening),

second by refusing a separation of theory and practice, and finally by refusing to define rhetoric as a western phenomenon only. By focusing on rhetorics rather than rhetoric, this anthology will acknowledge and value the existence of many different rhetorics across time and culture. Such a focus will also broaden and complicate our understanding of Western rhetorical traditions and enable us to become more critical and skeptical when the categories of these Western traditions are being applied to the study of speech in, for example, China, India, Africa, or elsewhere in the world. Finally, a focus on practice as well as theory will allow us to include powerful performances of rhetoric, again across time and cultures. (Lunsford, 2004)

These were bold words. As the editors (LuMing Mao, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Susan Jarratt, Thomas Miller, Robert Hariman, and Andrea Lunsford) have found—and as those at the ARS conference would have predicted—they have been hard to deliver on. But not impossible. As this book goes to press, *The Norton Anthology of Rhetoric and Writing* is slowly but surely taking shape, and while it will certainly fail to achieve its goals fully, it hopes to make a strong start in that direction. In any event, this anthology will join a growing body of work on rhetorical traditions in Africa, China, Japan, Mexico, India, Sweden, and many other places as well.

While some essays in *The SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* focus primarily on scholarship related to the Western tradition, a number push in new directions, beyond Greece and Rome and the Western tradition. Certainly the voices of women and other marginalized groups are now part of the history of rhetoric as well as part of the discussions of disciplinary discourse, pedagogy, and the public arena. As Jan Swearingen points out in her introduction to Part I of this volume, some new transcultural rhetorical

studies reveal that practices “regarded as ‘feminine’ in the West are in other cultures regarded as elegant, elite, and educated.” Readers of this volume will find women’s voices, and their work, present in each part.

Balancing views from the fields of communication and English, *The SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* aims to contribute to the debates outlined in this introduction—on how to locate rhetoric institutionally; to define the nature, function, and scope of rhetoric; to assess the status of rhetorical knowledge; to characterize rhetorical agency; to encourage civic engagement and develop a theory of the public sphere; and to reexamine the relationship between rhetoric and pedagogy. In attempting to survey the territory of rhetorical scholarship today, we have divided the book into four parts: The History of Rhetoric; Rhetoric Across the Disciplines; Rhetoric and Pedagogy; and Rhetoric and Public Discourse. The first part, on the history of rhetoric, comprises nine essays that treat major periods in rhetorical history as well as specialized topics within that history, such as historiography, argumentation, religion, feminist perspectives, and comparative rhetorics. The essays in Part II, on rhetoric across the disciplines, provide intensive surveys of work on rhetoric and the natural sciences, literary criticism and theory, health and medicine, international relations, and economics; this part concludes with a look at the rhetoric of interdisciplinarity. The part on pedagogy and rhetoric takes up the question of whether or not rhetoric has always been a teaching tradition in essays that explore pedagogical issues related to introductory courses in composition and in communication, in upper-division courses, and in larger communities of practice, concluding with a meditation on “Challenges to a Rapprochement Between Speech Communication and English.” Finally, the fourth part—on rhetoric and public discourse—focuses on historical, critical, and theoretical approaches to rhetoric

as it engages, participates, and helps shape (mostly U.S.) publics and public spheres. Together, the essays across these four parts aim to provide roadmaps to rhetoric’s disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and occasionally postdisciplinary guises, maps useful not only to students at the advanced undergraduate and graduate levels who want a strong introduction to the field but also to scholars of rhetoric (in English, communication, and related fields such as classics, law, or history) who will use the *Handbook* and its extensive bibliographies in their scholarly work and lives. It is this work—and these lives—that will create rhetoric’s future and draw new maps for helping us see how to get there.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, W., Best, C., Black, A., Hurst, J., Miller, B., & Miller, S. (1990). Cross-curricular under-life: A collaborative report on ways with academic words. *College Composition and Communication*, 41(1), 11–36.
- Berlin, J. A. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900–1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bitzer, L. F., & Black, E. (1971). *The prospects of rhetoric*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (2001). *The rhetorical tradition* (2nd ed.). New York: Bedford.
- Bizzell, P., & Jarratt, S. (2004). Rhetorical traditions, pluralized canons, relevant history, and other disputed terms: A report from the history of rhetoric discussion groups at the ARS Conference. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 34, 19–25.
- Booth, W. (2004). *The rhetoric of rhetoric: The quest for effective communication*. Oxford, UK: Wiley/Blackwell.
- Brummett, B. (1990). The reported demise of epistemic rhetoric: A eulogy for epistemic rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76, 69–72.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Campbell, K. K. (1973). The rhetoric of women’s liberation: An oxymoron. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59, 74–86.

- Campbell, K. K. (1986). Style and content in the rhetoric of early Afro-American feminists. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, 434–455.
- Campbell, K. K. (2005). Agency: Promiscuous and protean. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 2, 1–19.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jerry, E. C. (1988). Woman and speaker: A conflict in roles. In S. S. Brehm (Ed.), *Seeing female: Social roles and personality lives* (pp. 123–133). New York: Crewed Press.
- Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the “Peuple Quebecois.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 133–150.
- Cherwitz, R. A., & Hikins, J. W. (1995). Burying the undertaker: A eulogy for the eulogists of rhetorical epistemology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76, 73–77.
- Cherwitz, R. A., & Hikins, J. W. (1998). Why the epistemic in epistemic rhetoric? The paradox of rhetoric as performance. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 15, 189–205.
- Cloud, D. L. (1994). The materiality of discourse as oxymoron: A challenge to critical rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication*, 58, 141–163.
- Connors, R., Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. A. (1984). *Essays on classical rhetoric and modern discourse*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dimock, P. (1998). *A short rhetoric for leaving the family*. Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). Writing as a mode of learning. *College Composition and Communication*, 28, 122–128.
- Emig, J. (1977). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Enos, T. J. (Ed.). (1996). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition*. New York: Garland.
- Faigley, L. (1992). *Fragments of rationality*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Fogarty, D. (1959). *Roots for a new rhetoric*. New York: Teachers’ College Press.
- Fumaroli, M. (1983). Rhetoric, politics, and society: From Italian Ciceronianism to French classicism. In James J. Murphy (Ed.), *Renaissance eloquence* (pp. 253–273). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- George, A. (2006). Living online: The end of privacy? *New Scientist*, 2569. Retrieved August 29, 2007, from www.newscientist.com/channel/tech/mg19125691.700-living-online-the-end-of-privacy.html
- Glenn, C. (1997). *Rhetoric retold: Regendering the tradition from antiquity through the renaissance*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Glenn, C. (2004). *Unspoken: A rhetoric of silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Greene, R. W. (1998). Another materialist rhetoric. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 15, 21–41.
- Gronbeck, B. E. (1999). *Paradigms of speech communication studies: Looking back toward the future* (1998 Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecture). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burgur & F. Lawrence, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. (Original work published 1962)
- Hauser, G. (2003). *Rhetorical democracy: Discursive practices of civic engagement*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hauser, G. (2004). Teaching rhetoric: Or why rhetoric isn’t just another kind of philosophy or literary criticism. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 34, 39–53.
- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South Bend Press.
- Howell, W. S. (1975). *Poetics, rhetoric, and logic*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1980). *Classical rhetoric and its Christian and secular tradition from ancient to modern times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kraemer, D. (1991). Abstracting the bodies of/in academic discourse. *Rhetoric Review*, 10, 52–69.
- Leff, M. C. (1986). Textual criticism: The legacy of G. P. Mohrmann. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, 377–389.
- Leff, M. C. (1992). Things made by words: Reflections on textual criticism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 78, 223–231.
- Leff, M., & Lunsford, A. A. (2004). Afterword: A dialogue. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 34, 55–69.

- Leff, M. C., & Sachs, A. (1990). Words the most like things: Iconicity and the rhetorical text. *Western Journal of Communication*, 54, 252–273.
- Lunsford, A. A. (2004). *Prospectus for the Norton Anthology of rhetoric and writing*. Unpublished manuscript.
- McKerrow, R. E. (1989). Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis. *Communication Monographs*, 56, 91–111.
- Miller, S. (1998). *Assuming the positions: Cultural pedagogy and the politics of ordinary writing in early America*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation* (J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver, Trans.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Rhetoric project assured. (1969). *Spectra*, 4, 1–2.
- Roethke, T. (1953). *The Waking: Poems, 1933–1953*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Press.
- Royster, J. J. (1996). When the first voice you hear is not your own. *College Composition and Communication*, 47, 29–40.
- Royster, J. J. (2000). *Traces of a stream*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Scott, R. L. (1967). On viewing rhetoric as epistemic. *Central States Speech Journal*, 18, 9–17.
- Scott, R. L. (1976). On viewing rhetoric as epistemic: Ten years later. *Central States Speech Journal*, 27, 258–266.
- Scott, R. L. (1990). Epistemic rhetoric and criticism: Where Barry Brummett goes wrong. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 76, 300–303.
- Scott, R. L. (1994). Rhetoric as epistemic: What difference does that make? In T. J. Enos & S. C. Brown (Eds.), *Defining the new rhetorics* (pp. 120–136). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Selfe, C., & Hawisher, G. (2000). *Global literacies and the World-Wide Web*. London: Routledge.
- Sewell, W. H. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1–29.
- Sloane, T. (Ed.). (2001). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1985a). The concept of a person. *Human Language and Agency: Philosophical Papers*, 1, 97–114.
- Taylor, C. (1985b). What is human agency? *Human Language and Agency: Philosophical Papers*, 1, 1–44.
- Walker, J. (2003). *On rhetorical traditions: A response to Jerzy Axer*. Retrieved January 6, 2008, from <https://webspace.utexas.edu/jw2893/www/RhetoricalTraditions.htm>
- Ward, J. (1759). *A system of oratory*. A series of lectures publicly read at Gresham College.

