The editors begin this collection of essays with the observation that all essayists included reveal the importance of what they write in a world where written discourse certainly has its value. Each essayist, likewise, recognizes the importance of publication in order to share opinions and convictions about writing. Thus, point out the editors, this collection of essays reflects a “rhetoric of doing,” a rhetoric that, by its nature, is designed to contribute to and impact the professional conversation concerning writing.

Exclusive of the introduction, which warrants a relatively close look later in this review, the book is organized into five sections. The first section addresses rhetoric in historical contexts. The essays here center upon, among other topics, the exclusion of various classes in ancient Greece, considerations of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, and modern interpretations of a few classical Greek terms. Especially useful to students of rhetoric are James Berlin’s contemporary refiguring of class and Kathleen Welch’s critique of consumable, positivistic rhetorical stances because these give particularly insightful ways to evaluate the study of rhetoric in both the classical and contemporary ages.

The second section is devoted to the topics of discourse and community, including the social construction of knowledge. Included in this section is the opening up of Kinneavy’s *Theories of Discourse* to interpretations of feminist rhetoric and of social analysis in the hard sciences.

Following is a section titled “Discourse in School Settings,” and this section takes on a variety of topics as wide as cognitive aspects of writing, writing across the curriculum, *ethnology* in composition, and the assessment of writing. Though the topics seem related only somewhat loosely at best, each of the essays utilizes, though to varying degrees, student writing and other contributions from “the classroom.” For example, Anne Herrington describes three assignments by professors from different departments who have either been quite pleased or quite disappointed in the student writing generated by the assignments. Herrington includes the comments of the professors, as well as some of the student reactions to those responses. Also, in a piece that might fit nicely with Welch’s, mentioned above, Lee Odell and Sally Hampton rely on experiences with a school district in Texas as they explain their procedures in training both public school teachers and students to negotiate a state-mandated writing examination.

Three essays that address discourse in nonschool settings comprise the fourth section, and they combine in a couple of intriguing ways. The
first two essays, one by Stephen Doheny-Farina and the other by Carolyn Miller, both expound on the notion of *kairos* and both use the same essay by Kinneavy as a means to begin or continue their discussions. William J. Vande Kopple's essay, although concerned more with the stylistics of scientific discourse, does, similar to Miller's, use science as the content to elaborate on rhetorical conventions.

The book ends with a bibliographic essay of the work of Kinneavy. This essay, by Timothy Crusius, is both impressive and, one would guess, exhaustive in its scope. And perhaps the most crucial point here in the bibliographic essay is that the field of rhetoric requires its scholars to move beyond the historical perspectives that Kinneavy has offered and left open for further inquiry. Thus, this essay is particularly useful to students of rhetoric because it provides the bibliography of Kinneavy's publications along with Crusius's reminder to use this bibliography as a starting point in our own rhetoric of doing.

Arguably, the primary strength of this book is its beginning. The introduction to the collection clearly illustrates a rhetoric of doing. Rather than merely give an overview of the project or a rationale for including the particular contributions, this introduction does both in a most ambitious manner. The first 27 pages of the introduction are given over to fairly substantive summaries of each essay in the collection; the editors call these summaries "condensed statements of key arguments and clarifications of significant links among the diverse themes addressed by the contributors" (1). These significant links take the form of direct commentary on the manner in which each essay extends itself or the form of a relation to Kinneavy's own work. For example, the summary of Robert Connor's piece concerning the dearth of women in classical rhetoric includes the observation that this essay "easily extrapolates beyond itself" into the recognition of ways in which contemporary rhetorics may exclude certain groups (4). Then, in a transition from the summary of Connor's essay to that of Richard Enos and Janice Lauer, the editors relate the rethinking by contemporary scholars of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* to Kinneavy's own crediting Aristotle as the source for the communication triangle. The summaries are faithful to the actual essays, so the reader in deciding which contributions to read or in what order to read them, has the advantage of using, in essence, abstracts that summarize and then connect the contributions.

The final 15 pages of the introduction serve as a "field context" of the book's sections. That is to say, the editors entertain possibilities for further research based on the work presented in the essays, and it is at this point that the introduction truly sets itself apart as more ambitious than most other introductory comments to essay collections. It is in this section that the editors begin instituting the notion of *kairos*, specifically as it has been
defined in Miller's essay titled "Kairos in the Rhetoric of Science." Miller combines the temporal and spatial metaphors of kairos to construct a definition that allows an ephemeral instant that, in turn, allows the opening up of newer or different thought.

The editors of this collection take hold of at least one point of the several contributions and demonstrate how that point might encourage further consideration in a number of areas. These areas, which serve as section headings for the remainder of the introduction, address the "modern era," methodologies and knowledge construction, issues and directions, and further inquiry in the discipline. In defining knowledge in a field and in speculating about the future of scholarship in written discourse, the editors recognize the instability of knowledge and how that instability affects further inquiry. In that spirit they have outlined several assumptions that they believe are reinforced by the essays in the collection (43). The assumptions revolve around issues such as these: writing as a constructive act, the various contexts of and purposes for writing, the cognitive and social aspects of writing, the study of writing processes and written products in a number of diverse settings, interdisciplinary approaches to studying writing, and the complex nature of writing that invites a variety of research methods and data gathering.

An easy negative criticism of a book written in honor of a scholar would be to search for instances in which the writers seemed merely to follow their own interests while indiscriminately patching in the name of the scholar they are to honor. Indeed, one might point out that Berlin, Herrington, and others mention Kinneavy's name only briefly or at the beginning and end of their essays, seemingly in passing, but this is a criticism that does not hold given the nature of the work. The essays are designed to appeal to a fairly diverse academic audience—students, teachers, and writers of many disciplines—and the contributors make good the editors' claim that Kinneavy's work is without question a fecund starting point for studies in written discourse. Thus, this collection does, indeed, honor James Kinneavy.

—Bill Bolin
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas


This collection of essays approaches evaluating teachers of writing by providing sections on "Background and Theory," "Evaluation Methods," and "Evaluating Specific Groups." A major theme of each section is that the evaluation of teaching takes place within the competitive