

The editors write that the book is intended for both students in composition and rhetoric beginning archival work but also “seasoned scholars in the field who are not historians by training but use archives for their work” (2). While I would certainly assign it for a research methods graduate course (and others), I can imagine new scholars noticing the number of tenured scholars (many of whom responsibly acknowledge their position) who embark on projects because they have the time and institutional support or income to have more time to be less efficient, to let their research projects meander and gestate. Seasoned scholars, however, would find such chapters motivating, especially if they’ve previously found similar projects too personally or professionally risky. And the essays by David Gold, Wendy B. Sharer and in part 4 are particularly useful for new scholars, as they describe projects begun in graduate school that have morphed and sustained their scholarly work years later. Some readers more comfortable with traditional scholarship might balk at the suggestion in a couple of essays about research subjects as spirits or muses. Still, the collection holistically promotes serendipity and personal investment, and to erase these emotive moments uncommon in conventional scholarly work would continue the erasure of lived process of research the book seeks to reveal. As a whole, while just a smattering of essays in the book could be read as a bit self-indulgent, the book certainly offers a significant contribution to the field regarding research practices and processes and in modeling essayistic, scholarly prose. As a teacher, researcher, and writer, I found many ways into this book and think others will do the same.

Fort Worth, Texas

Writing Matters: Rhetoric in Public and Private Lives, by Andrea A. Lunsford. Atlanta: University of Georgia Press, 2007. 104 pp.

Reviewed by Julia Voss, Ohio State University

Writing Matters collects the speeches Andrea Lunsford delivered as the 2005 Jack N. and Addie D. Averitt Lecture Series speaker at Georgia Southern University into a slim, impressive volume. In keeping with the commitment of the Series to bridging the gap between town and gown, Lunsford focuses on the influence of academic writing instruction on the way people see writing in their everyday lives. In aspects of the book that cater more to an academic audience, Lunsford takes up the question of authority in the writing classroom and the design of English graduate education to

examine how reimagining writing also has considerable ramifications for the composition profession itself.

Lunsford sets out to develop a new understanding of writing that accounts for the new contexts and media in which twenty-first century students compose. Although the book is called “Writing Matters” the case Lunsford makes isn’t so much that writing *matters* (versus being unimportant) but that *writing* matters, that it needs to be discussed and re-evaluated, and that such re-examination is essential to the profession.

Chapter 1, “Key Questions for a New Rhetoric,” begins with a brief history of rhetoric and composition in the twentieth century—based on historical and anecdotal evidence—focusing on the separation of rhetoric and composition in the development of the American university system. Lunsford argues that the emergence of digital literacies provides the field with an opportunity to reintegrate these two skills. She takes what tends to be polarized debate—focusing on traditional rhetorical and writing skills versus integrating new technology—and offers a solution that draws on both sets of skills. Lunsford’s case example is a sophomore-level course developed by the Stanford Program in Writing and Rhetoric. The course uses multimedia assignments like videos, audio essays, and web texts to add delivery and presentation style to the canons of invention and arrangement focused on in the first-year composition course. In candidly outlining the struggle to create a course that both addressed instructors’ goals and students’ needs, Lunsford argues persuasively against pitting classical and “new” rhetoric against one another. Instead, she sees the future of rhetoric and writing as negotiating—and helping students negotiate—the ongoing “power of print” in the face of the resurgence of “oral performance of discourse” which new media makes possible (16).

After chapter 1 focuses its praxis on the syllabus of a twenty-first century writing course, Lunsford’s second chapter, “Notes on Language Wars in the USA,” suggests possible content for such a course using primary source documents from debates like the English Only movement and the Oakland School District Ebonics decision. To challenge many students’ kneejerk reactions against linguistic pluralism, Lunsford points out that the variant of “133t speak” many students use in text and instant messages (e.g. “OMG U R so l8!!!”) constitutes its own kind of pluralism, introducing the concept of *kairos* to help nuance students’ understandings of “right” and “wrong” language use. Within this framework of open-mindedness toward nontraditional uses of language, Lunsford uses graphic and hypertextual novels as well as examples of nontraditional academic prose to help students see debates over writing use as encompassing both language and genre. Locating and expanding students’ own experience of writing within contemporary American debates about what, if anything, constitutes correct language use and what kinds of writing matter helps them see writing a private as well as a public matter.

In “‘Authority’ in the Writing Classroom,” Lunsford hones in on a more specific rhetoric and composition subject: the power of the teacher in the classroom. Describing writing teachers as complicit in authority maintenance of an exclusionary status quo, Lunsford argues that “Every time we ‘place’ students, every time we ‘exempt’ students, every time we give a grade—we are deploying traditional authority and using power in traditional ways to authorize certain kinds of knowledge and to deauthorize others” (42). Lunsford argues logically and anecdotally that students’ perception of the teacher as an authority figure who will discipline and punish them must be acknowledged. However, recognizing that it is impossible to immediately jettison students’ view of writing teachers as authority figures, as well as irresponsible and dishonest to pretend that teachers and students hold equal power in the classroom, Lunsford proposes a new understanding of power in the classroom, “focusing on a community ethic that would recognize and value difference, on negotiating responsibilities, on developing inclusive understandings of authority” (52). This view of power, she argues, makes possible progressive revisions of authority, like those called for by Gesa Kirsch and Peter Mortensen, who call define authority collaboratively in a specific context.

Chapter 4, “Thoughts on Graduate Education in English,” continues Lunsford’s discussion of institutional issues in rhetoric and composition. Building off of the previous chapter’s themes of exclusion and authority, Lunsford talks about the blatant opposition she faced as a young woman pursuing higher education in the 1960s and 70s, a trend of discrimination she sees continued in the paucity of women and people of color in the profession today, especially at its highest levels. Lunsford connects the “wolflike atmosphere” of English departments to their “continued reliance on agonism, on competition” (59). To address the lack of diversity in English, she suggests, departments should change their admissions policies (abandoning the GRE, for example) to attract a more diverse pool of applicants. Within departments, Lunsford suggests a dramatic overhaul of degree requirements and teaching responsibilities to give graduate students more freedom to adapt both graduate study and teaching to their research, which Lunsford praises as innovative. The other significant change Lunsford argues for—not surprisingly—is an emphasis on collaborative research that would give groups of graduate students access to the skills and labor hours necessary to tackle significant research questions, rather than restricting them to “narrow and highly defined topic[s]” mandated by the single-author dissertation requirement (68). These are the kind of large-scale, sweeping changes to English departments that Lunsford sees as necessary to bring in people with diverse interests, backgrounds, and skills as a means of changing the competitive climate and preparing the profession to take on new challenges.

Clearly, *Writing Matters* is written for a non-specialist audience, in the best sense of the term. The depth and breadth of her experience as a scholar and teacher in rhetoric and composition informs the book, speaking to people interested in education and the humanities generally. Each chapter begins with a discussion of the origins and positions of the issues Lunsford examines, making the book comprehensible to outsiders and providing an insightful review for rhetoric and composition scholars. The chapters retain the charm and accessibility of speeches they originated from, including the asides that people who have heard her lectures will recognize. Whether recounting her early experiences as a novice instructor at a community college or talking about her longstanding and ardent support for collaboration, Lunsford's descriptions take on a humorous self-deprecating tone that does not undermine her myriad achievements; rather her tone demonstrates her cordial demeanor as a speaker, overcoming the distance print can put between reader and author.

The oral origins of Lunsford's book gives it an approachable tone but may also lead to one limitation. While the reader can imagine the links Lunsford sees between new rhetoric, language wars, teacher authority, and graduate program design, she does not provide a connecting conclusion to tie the lectures together. Adding a concluding chapter might have better transformed Lunsford's insightful, accessible speeches into a printed text. In itself, however, each chapter does an excellent job of using Lunsford's "authority" as a leading scholar and stateswoman of the discipline. She turns a sympathetic ear to both sides of some of the most polarizing debates in the field, explaining the challenges facing rhetoric and composition as well as offering theoretical and practical and suggestions for how to address them.

Columbus, Ohio

Teaching Rhetorica: Theory, Pedagogy, Practice, edited by Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Heinemann, 2006. 208 pp.

Reviewed by Jessica Enoch, University of Pittsburgh

Rhetoric Retold, Intimate Practices, With Pen and Voice, The Gendered Pulpit, Regendering Delivery—these are just a few of the over forty monographs, not to mention the countless scholarly articles, dedicated to the recovery of women's rhetorical significance. Undoubtedly, this scholarship has transformed traditional notions of rhetorical history, theory, and research methodology. But what difference, ask Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie, has this