suggests that teachers respond with more acceptance to students’ inappropriate language and learn to recognize the construction process (113). One way to do this is to reward risk taking with grades (114). Further, she suggests a few exercises that help students consider audience and changing voice.

Bryant concludes by noting, “Many students have not had inviting experiences” (122). Bryant believes that modeling her experiences in creating an academic voice encourages students to explore their own. She ends her book with an afterword by Leah, her former student, who concludes: “We’re all trying to make the squiggles on the page make sense” (132).

Dahlonega, GA


Reviewed by Jessica Enoch, The University of New Hampshire

*Archives of Instruction* is, as the authors suggest, “a book about books” (1). But in being a book that investigates the traditions of rhetorics, readers, and composition texts, it offers the field a new perspective on nineteenth-century literacy practices and rhetorical education. *Archives* is the result of thorough and painstaking archival work by its three authors, Jean Ferguson Carr, Stephen L. Carr, and Lucille Schultz, and the findings they offer are significant. Overall, the authors argue that scholars and teachers of rhetoric, composition, and literacy need to look more closely at what nineteenth-century textbook traditions have to say. Throughout *Archives*, the writers make it clear that these textbooks are complex, revealing, and surprising, that they deserve attention and reconsideration. But even though *Archives* offers much in exposing the peculiarities and regularities of these nineteenth-century textbook traditions, the greatest strength of the text is in the way it teaches contemporary readers to read these materials. Carr, Carr, and Schultz offer insightful archival advice in terms of where to look, what to notice, what to think twice about, and how to interpret not only the textbooks themselves but also their authors and their material production. This aspect of the *Archives* makes it a “must read” for scholars invested in histories of rhetoric, composition, and literacy.

*Archives* is structured around three major textbook traditions, and each of its main chapters takes up a detailed discussion of rhetorics (chapter 1), read-
ers (chapter 2), and composition texts (chapter 3). The introduction to Archives provides a useful overview of these textbook traditions and the distinctions among them. The introduction also sets forth the recurring issues (intellectual property, authorship, educational philosophies, and material production) that the main chapters address. Each of the three central chapters attends to these recurring themes while also moving into pertinent and informative discussions relevant to the particular textbook tradition under consideration.

Chapter 1, “Reproducing Rhetorics,” invigorates and extends the work of James Berlin, John Brereton, Robert Connors, Sharon Crowley, Albert Kitzhaber, and Nan Johnson. While these scholars examined nineteenth-century rhetorics to gain a sense of the larger educational scene or particular disciplinary shifts, this chapter sets its focus on the textbooks in and of themselves and considers the variations and consistencies across this tradition. Here, then, readers find a discussion where familiar texts, such as Samuel Newman’s A Practical System of Rhetoric, are placed next to the unfamiliar, such as J. Scott Clark’s Practical System for Instruction in English Composition. In its explication of the many dimensions of this textbook tradition, the chapter designates a number of useful taxonomies that differentiate various kinds of rhetorics (commemorative rhetorics, compilations, single-authored textbooks) that were circulating in the U.S. and investigates the ways these texts changed over time (subsections include 1800-1830; 1831-1865; 1866-1900).

As mentioned above, though, this chapter becomes especially compelling in the ways it “teaches” the twenty-first century reader to read rhetorics of the nineteenth century. For example, chapter 1 includes a lengthy discussion of Hugh Blair’s Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, which was, we know, consistently reproduced in nineteenth-century textbooks in the U.S. This chapter extends our understandings of Blair by examining how his text was reproduced, drawing readers’ attention to which part of his lectures were taken up and which were discarded as well as how his work was interpreted and translated for American audiences. This discussion not only advances a more complicated understanding of the role Blair’s lectures played in nineteenth-century rhetorics, but it also articulates a new kind of reading practice for researchers working in the archives.

Chapter 2, “Reading School Readers,” explains how readers functioned in their nineteenth-century context as pedagogical sites for both elocution and textual interpretation. As in chapter 1, chapter 2 resists easy understandings of readers by noting that although they often functioned as “conservative texts,” readers were “particularly responsive to change and difference” (83). The chapter delves into the consistency and change inside the reader tradition by first showing connections between readers and related textbooks such as spellers and primers. It then explicates the components of a reader and the ways in
which these components shifted over time and varied uses. In particular, the chapter discusses changes in the size and font of a reader; the role and purpose of the introduction; and the kinds of readings that were included in the text itself. The chapter then delves into who composed, read, and produced readers. Among the many interesting aspects of the chapter is the examination of the part the reader tradition played inside missionary projects and for immigrant, Native American, and African American audiences.

Like chapter 1, this chapter offers a number of pertinent archival reading “lessons,” one being its discussion of Orville Dewey—a noted nineteenth-century rhetorician who is rarely referenced in twenty-first century examinations. This chapter explains how twenty-first century scholars might miss Dewey’s influence by showing how his work was integrated into readers. The chapter records that Dewey’s influential *North American Review* essay “Principles of Elocution” was reprinted numerous times in readers. These texts, though, either did not credit him as the author or simply referred to him as “an eloquent writer of the North American Review” (121). The reason for such an omission, the chapter teaches, is not that nineteenth-century publishers and audiences did not know Dewey, but that they knew him all too well: Dewey was “known by everyone and published everywhere” (121). Therefore, the chapter implies, it is the very popularity of Dewey and his work in the nineteenth-century that has disenabled twenty-first century scholars to recognize and value his contribution to the field.

Chapter 3, “Composing Composition Books” shifts gears to look at the purpose and production of composition textbooks before and after the Civil War. Before moving into this discussion, though, the chapter makes a move consistent with the rest of the text and helps twenty-first century readers question assumptions that might prevent them from more fully understanding the nineteenth-century composition book. In particular, the chapter questions assumptions concerning the relationship of the student to the text, the definition of the term “writing,” and the definition of the term “exercise.” Here, the reader learns that, unlike today, the nineteenth-century student often did not own his or her composition text, and, if a student did own a text, it most likely was not the one the teacher worked from; that “writing” in the nineteenth century was seen as handwriting rather than composing; and that “exercise” did not convey the idea of rote learning as it might today but instead was a progressive form of pedagogy that called for practice and performance over recognition and memorization. By questioning such twenty-first century assumptions, the chapter enables its readers to enact more accurate and complex readings of this textbook tradition.

The chapter moves on to discuss composition textbooks before and after the Civil War. Through a detailed reading of two pre-Civil War text-
books by Richard Green Parker and John Frost, the chapter once again argues that twenty-first century readers must be on guard for reading past or reading over important aspects of these textbooks. The argument is made here that Parker and Frost addressed issues of invention and arrangement in their texts, but because they did not use the terms “invention” and “arrangement,” readers today might overlook such progressive moves. As this chapter turns its attention to the post-Civil War era, it highlights three major events that affected composition instruction and textbook production: the site of writing moving from slate to paper, the beginnings of “language arts” courses, and the advent of graded high schools. Composition textbooks changed because of these innovations, and new forms of these texts were created for the emerging student populations who needed them. Chapter 3 concludes with a discussion of composition textbooks in the college and university, explaining that this iteration of the textbook (the site at which many of our histories begin) was in fact the most recent place where composition instruction was initiated and where composition textbooks can be found.

*Archives of Instruction* concludes with ten lessons that readers can glean from its investigation of nineteenth-century rhetorics, readers, and composition textbooks. Indeed, it is fitting that the text ends this way because, as this review details, the most compelling features of the texts are its arguments and advice concerning how to read and work in the archives. The reading practices Carr, Carr, and Schultz propose and the methodologies they highlight are invaluable to scholars in the field of rhetoric and composition intending to learn more about nineteenth-century literacy and rhetorical education. In addition to the ways this text should reshape archival reading and interpretation, though, scholars and teachers might also take up the important questions that *Archives* raises and use them to reconsider how textbooks are composed and produced today. Thus, we may learn from and use the lessons of *Archives* to re-read the textbook traditions that we encounter and teach from on a daily basis.

Durham, NH


Reviewed by Nancy Myers, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

I have always been fascinated by the triptychs of the Middle Ages, such as Bernardo Daddi’s “Triptych: Madonna, Saint Thomas Aquinas, and Saint Paul.”