that conclude the essay, like the claim that “the tentativeness or hesitation writers hear in phrases like ‘you might want to think about. . .’ or ‘I wonder if. . .’ [and other] phrases a tutor uses to indicate nondirectiveness, others may interpret as wishy-washy” (102). It’s almost as if Rafoth hasn’t read the previous chapters that warn how some people find directness offensive and rude. He could qualify this by reminding tutors to watch for cues as to whether the student sees nondirective comments as an invitation or an undermining of their authority.

The book could also have been reorganized from a director and consultant’s perspective. Clearly the training chapters (like 4 through 8) are intended more for consultants than directors, while 1, 2, and 10 through 13 are devoted to the theory directors need to know for designing training classes, staff meetings, policies and even the layout of the space given some ESL students’ fear of being seen as inadequately prepared for college. Many essays are intended for both tutor and director, such as the excellent concluding chapter which gives voice to experiences of actual ESL students who used writing centers in the northeast, and the user-friendly glossary. Despite these criticisms, Bruce and Rafoth have, for the most part, selected essays whose scholarship will lead to this becoming the most indispensable resource available to writing center directors and consultants alike working with ESL students from all backgrounds.

Pullman, WA


Reviewed by Shane Borrowman, University of Nevada, Reno

There are terms, such as process and freewrite, whose general definitions are accepted by a majority of scholars in rhetoric and composition. As Hill and Helmers make clear in their preface and introduction, visual rhetoric is not one of these shared terms. Even a cursory examination of the literature of visual rhetoric published in recent decades in long-running professional journals reveals much. Perhaps the finest and most prophetic statement ever made on the study of visual rhetoric in English came from Richard M. Gollin in 1969: “[If] we bring film study into traditional courses of literature our colleagues regard us with genial condescension, as if we were harmlessly drunk” (424). Certainly this field of study has wavered and waffled and staggered as it has moved forward, frequently stumbling back over its scholarly steps and infrequently making headway. Consider the range of topics, methodologies, and scholarly rigor represented by a random sampling from the late 1960s to the mid-1980s.

In 1971, in CCC, Richard Williamson argued that departments of English ought to combine with departments of filmmaking to allow the “student to express
himself in the way he is most often communicated to” (134). William Costanzo, somewhat plaintively, echoed a piece of this argument fifteen years later, arguing that “Films are compositions, too.” At the midpoint between these two articles in *CCC, College English* devoted its entire April 1977 issue to considerations of “mass culture” in English studies, with individual contributions analyzing films, advertisements, and television drama and comedy. Six years later, in 1983, in only the third issue of *Rhetoric Review*, Robert J. Connors wrote of Cicero, font sizes, and paper quality. The list could go on, and Hill and Helmers cover much of the relevant literature in their brief introduction, including scholars as disparate as Charles Sanders Peirce and Roland Barthes (in a discussion firmly anchored in the analysis of 9/11 and its visual, rhetorical, and actual aftermath). All of these articles and their kin, with their disparate methodologies and topics of study, could be lumped together as the early literature of modern studies of visual rhetoric. But such lumping serves to prove only one important point: With a definition of *visual rhetoric* this broad, the term is effectively without meaning. While covering some of this same ground in its central essays, effectively anchoring itself in the literature of the field, *Defining Visual Rhetorics* moves the study of visual rhetoric forward in important ways, leveraging it out of the quagmire in which it has been spinning its wheels for three or four decades. Ultimately, the analyses that comprise the bulk of *Defining Visual Rhetorics* are as wide ranging in their topical foci as are past works on visual rhetoric, from analysis of film and advertising to analysis of memory and the politics of history/history of politics.

On its surface, David Blakesley’s “Defining Film Rhetoric: The Case of Hitchcock’s *Vertigo*” appears to be a perfect representative of the status quo in the swirling maelstrom of scholarship on visual rhetoric: an analysis of a single visual text with its scholarly oars planted in the waters of both English and film studies. But Blakesley’s contribution to *Defining Visual Rhetorics* (and to the analysis of *Vertigo* itself, for that matter) goes far beyond this simple surface level. Most significantly, Blakesley builds his argument on a definition of film rhetoric, language, and ideology—an argument that culminates in the analysis of *Vertigo* that is a model of this type of analysis at work. The analysis is especially skillful in its blending of text and exemplary visuals, weaving the two together into a single cohesive and coherent line of argumentation. The same can be said of Diane S. Hope’s “Gendered Environments: Gender and the Natural World in the Rhetoric of Advertising.” Although it relies less on visuals, Hope’s argument, like Blakesley’s, is firmly built upon a consideration of the argument’s operative terms, placing them in their historical context and pulling them into the analysis of masculinity and femininity in the iconography of the environment.

In one of the most intriguing analyses in this collection, Greg Dickinson and Casey Malone Maugh’s “Placing Visual Rhetoric: Finding Material Comfort in Wild Oats Market,” the analysis of visual rhetoric is extended beyond film and advertising to a consideration of place and postmodernity. Dickinson and Maugh range widely across their subject, covering topics as diverse as the dislocated self
of postmodernism, the produce section of the supermarket, and the production of community at the Wild Oats market. It is an argument rooted in both the locality of the particular store under consideration and the primary scholarship of two fields: English and Communications. The latter point in particular is worthy of note, given that, historically, much of the work on visual rhetoric done in English has relied only upon previous scholarship in English.

Continuing this analysis of “place,” Andrea Kaston Tange, in “Envisioning Domesticity, Locating Identity: Constructing the Victorian Middle Class Through Images of Home,” argues that “Victorian domesticity was importantly disseminated as a visual rhetoric that combined ideological significance . . . with physical images of homemaking in textual illustrations that reproduced this ideology in a consumable form” (277). Advancing this argument, Tange works through the most intriguing mix of visuals present in this collection, including drawings of “ladies’ work tables” in the 1844 *Encyclopedia of Domestic Economy*, floor plans from middle-class homes, and William Holman Hunt’s 1853 painting “The Awakening of Conscience” (with its scandalous-for-the-time portrayal of a “‘fallen woman’ at the point of moral crisis” [280]). In a very different interpretation of “place,” Charles Kostelnick, in “Melting-Pot Ideology, Modernist Aesthetics, and the Emergence of Graphical Conventions: The Statistical Atlases of the United States, 1874-1925,” writes of the development of the “visual language” of business, professional, and technical communication (215). More specifically, he examines the discourse communities in which these visual languages are developed over time for varying purposes and deployed to achieve their ends.

Focusing on more current texts, J. Cherie Strachan and Kathleen E. Kendall analyze the rhetoric of various political candidates’ convention films, tracing the development of the visual rhetoric of politics from the first live coverage of nomination conventions in 1952 to the Gore/Bush films in 2000. As with the work of Dickinson and Maugh, this work of Strachan and Kendall is—in addition to being well reasoned and researched—strong in its interdisciplinary focus. The same is true of Janis L. Edwards’s “Echoes of Camelot: How Images Construct Cultural Memory Through Rhetorical Framing,” although the more narrow focus necessitates the use of a more narrow range of scholarly sources. In addition to analyzing the construction of cultural memories of JFK, Edwards examines the “appropriation and re-presentation” of key images from the assassination, including the panic of the First Lady at the moment of the shooting and the salute young John delivers at his father’s coffin.

In “Doing Rhetorical History of the Visual: The Photograph and the Archive,” Cara A. Finnegan focuses on the frozen image in its historical context, concentrating on *LOOK* magazine’s visual “rhetoric of poverty” during the New Deal (208). Most usefully, Finnegan constructs “a way of doing rhetorical history of the visual that accounts for three key moments in the life of photographs: production, reproduction, and circulation” and both proposes and models an ap-
proach rich in its complexity and deeply rooted in historical, visual, and rhetorical scholarship (211).

Both Maureen Daly Goggin, in “Visual Rhetoric in Pens of Steel and Inks of Silk: Challenging the Great Visual/Verbal Divide,” and Craig Stroupe, in “The Rhetoric of Irritation: Inappropriateness as Visual/Literate Practice,” write of the tension between visual and verbal communicative methods, which, as Stroupe writes, “long predates the advent of digital culture” (244). While Goggin focuses upon the analysis of needlepoint samplers, providing along the way a brief but engaging history of this art, Stroupe focuses his analysis upon the appropriation of images on the Web, from “Plato’s Plan of Atlantis” to a creatively altered photograph of Lee Harvey Oswald’s murder. Together, the two provide complementary historical analyses and methodological approaches for the examination of visual artifacts.

While the topics analyzed within this collection are broad and deep, the essays that bookend the collection move the scholarship of visual rhetoric in important directions and give *Defining Visual Rhetorics* a general cohesion that wide-ranging collections of essays often lack. The opening three chapters provide a solid foundation on which the internal essays build. In “The Psychology of Rhetorical Images,” Charles A. Hill analyzes rhetoric, psychology, and the connections between the instantiation of strong emotion and visual elements. Marguerite Helmers, in “Framing the Fine Arts Through Rhetoric,” considers the “perception and reception” that combine to make meaning in the arts (84). In “The Rhetoric of Visual Arguments,” J. Anthony Blair “address[es] the relationship among these three: rhetoric, argument, and the visual,” building smoothly and naturally upon the work of Hill (41). Blair traces the focus upon visual persuasion from Aristotle onward, contrasting visual arguments with other types of arguments and concluding, “It does not follow that visual argument is a mere substitute for verbal argument [although . . . ] the visual brings to arguments another dimension entirely. It adds drama and force” (59).

In her conclusion to this collection, Sonja K. Foss, in “Framing the Study of Visual Rhetoric: Toward a Transformation of Rhetorical Theory,” draws connections among several of the contributions to *Defining Visual Rhetorics* and provides a brief but summative overview of the general approaches to visual persuasion detailed throughout the book. “The chapters in this volume,” she concludes, “represent the variety that exists in the analysis of visual rhetoric and provide models for the study of the rhetorical workings of visual artifacts [and . . . ] lay out the primary components of the current framework of such study” (312). For these reasons—and Foss’s characterization of the work of this collection is perfectly accurate—*Defining Visual Rhetorics* is both a solid introduction for new scholars to this area of study and a valuable addition to the libraries of scholars already working on the history, theory, and application of visual rhetoric.

*Reno, NV*

Reviewed by Maureen Daly Goggin, Arizona State University

Invention in Rhetoric and Composition by Janice Lauer is published in Reference Guides to Rhetoric and Composition (ed. Charles Bazerman), a monograph series developed to promote comprehensive but compact surveys of scholarship, teaching, and practice on major topics in rhetoric and composition. Organized into seven ambitious and packed chapters, Lauer’s book delivers on the promise of this new series. Indeed, as the first monograph in it, Lauer has set a high bar for all other authors to follow.

The initial two, as well as the final two, chapters provide readers with instructional scaffolding for understanding the complex theoretical and pedagogical grounds of rhetorical invention that Lauer reviews in the middle three chapters. In her first chapter, Lauer explicates the triadic framework that guides her discussion of invention in chapters 3 and 4, namely the contested scholarly and pedagogical positions concerning the nature, purpose, and epistemology of rhetorical invention. As she rightly points out, theoretical and scholarly debates over these issues form a contentious space that in turn has important implications for both what is taught in composition and how writing is taught. The second chapter provides definitions of key classical, modern and contemporary terms related to invention that appear throughout the other chapters. For example, under classical terms, Lauer explicates such crucial Greek and Latin keywords as kairos, dissoi logoi, topoi, stasis, and status. Relevant modern terms include epistemic, hermeneutic practices, and heuristics. Those identified with postmodernism, poststructuralism and cultural studies include intertextuality, signifying practices, subject, and cultural codes. As a primer for those new to the study of rhetorical invention, these beginning chapters offer a useful context for Lauer’s comprehensive and fair-handed review of competing—and often contradictory—theories, scholarship, and pedagogies of rhetorical invention from ancient through contemporary times.

Chapter 3 traces the complex history of divergent rhetorical theories, practices, and pedagogies of invention from fifth century BCE up through the...