actualized through recognition (165). Muckelbauer asks us to follow the “singular rhythm” of futurity, the outgrowth of this movement to the very possibility of beginning.

The practical reader may not be fully convinced, however. I am not yet sure myself how to thoroughly enact Muckelbauer’s philosophy, although I do see a call for rhetorical invention that speaks to our current moment as necessary. Because Muckelbauer rarely breaks from his philosophical prose, our only sense of clear application comes in chapter 6, where he raises serious questions about the teaching of situated audiences. And, in an entire book written about invention, he never once mentions digital composing. I suppose that leaves us wondering how The Future of Invention changes composing practices. What I see as most relevant is Muckelbauer’s sense of “singular rhythms”; these are the lines and movements that don’t fit into points, but rather outgrow the points. Singular rhythms are the differences in each repetition, movement, and argument. They are relevant for what they offer methodologically, which suggests we could draw attention to the movement between points, between binaries, in order to attain an affirmative invention. Yet, it is to digitality and digital composing that I think Muckelbauer’s work most pertains to, as a site of constant movement, allowing composing to evolve out of the movement.

Taken as a whole, The Future of Invention fluently mingles invention, binaries, composition, writing, and change in a way that allows the reader to follow Muckelbauer’s movement across concepts and to envision a practical dimension to his theoretical obsession. It begs for further readings along with pedagogical and scholarly application.

Pittsburgh, PA


Reviewed by Kerry Dirk, Virginia Tech

In 1997, Charles Bazerman claimed that “Genres are forms of life, ways of being. . . . Genres are the familiar places we go to create intelligible communicative action with each other and the guideposts we use to explore the familiar” (19). Years later, perhaps to illustrate just how genres can make communication understandable, Bazerman, along with Adair Bonini and Debora Figueiredo, have compiled a collection of 24 chapters in Genre in a Changing World. Chosen from the conference presentations at the Fourth International Symposium on Genre Studies (SIGET IV) in Brazil, the chapters
represent work from a multitude of countries, including the United States, Brazil, Australia, Canada, Chile, Finland, France, Portugal, the UK, and Argentina. The second book to come from a SIGET conference, the editors argue in their introduction that “all regions of the world are increasingly aware that they are caught up in a global information economy” and thus “people of all nations need to be able to communicate in specialized professional realms” (ix-x). What one can especially appreciate about this book is the plurality of voices that are represented in this international perspective, allowing especially those well versed in genre theory to see what work is being done outside of the United States. Further, this book brings together the ESP Tradition, North American New Rhetoric, and the Australian Systemic-Functional School, providing the reader with an understanding of how these different schools of thought can work together to advance our knowledge of genre. The international perspective illustrates that much of the work being done outside the United States, while not always groundbreaking or in conversation with current theory, is yet consistently interesting and theoretically sound, often approaching the study of genre in new and creative ways.

The book is broken into five parts: “Advances in Genre Theories,” “Genre and the Professions,” “Genre and Media,” “Genre in Teaching and Learning,” and “Genre in Writing Across the Curriculum.” The first section, “Advances in Genre Theories,” consists of the essays that seem to push the hardest at developing new ways of looking at genre. For example, in “World of Genre – Metaphors of Genre,” John M. Swales argues that useful metaphors for genres may be “genre-as-institution” and “genre-as-species,” as such metaphors help us to trace genres from their inception to their variations and sometimes demise. Paul Prior argues in “From Speech Genres to Mediated Multimodal Genres Systems: Bakhtin, Voloshinov, and the Question of Writing” that Bakhtin’s understanding of genres as composed utterances as being equivalent to spoken utterances fails to take into account the writing process. And Favio Jose Rauen’s “Relevance and Genre: Theoretical and Conceptual Interfaces” combines relevance theory with genre theory by questioning how relevance limits genres.

With Swales on one hand arguing that genre analysis is meant to track “textual regularities and irregularities and explain them in terms of the relevant and pertinent social circumstances and the rhetorical demands they engender” (14) and Coutinho and Miranda on the other hand arguing for new ways of analyzing genres, I was hoping that more of the chapters devoted to genre analyses would push their discussion sections further, and I was left wanting to see how each analysis contributed to a larger perspective of genre. Often, the conclusions felt a bit abrupt. For example, in the second section, Leonardo Mozdzenski argues in “The Sociohistorical Constitution of the Genre Legal Booklet: A Critical Approach” that legal booklets are influenced by religious and school primers, by political pamphlets, and by
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educational booklets produced in Brazil. After an extensive genre analysis, he concludes that legal booklets use strategies common to these antecedent genres. “The Organization and Functions of the Press Dossier: The Case of Media Discourse on the Environment in Portugal,” Rui Ramos’s contribution in the third section, offers a detailed textual analysis of this document but then concludes in one brief paragraph that the document has a circular organization. And Giovanni Parodi’s “Written Genres in University Studies: Evidence from an Academic Corpus of Spanish in Four Disciplines,” in which he explains an ongoing project that involves the collection and analysis of academic and professional texts from different disciplines, makes assumptions based on unbalanced evidence and ends by suggesting that something should be done with all of the data. These few genre analyses are fairly representative of a large portion of the chapters, and while I appreciate the international perspective, such selections could benefit from more discussion. In particular, I had hoped to see how such analyses might contribute to our understanding of either the people who use that genre or the community in which that genre functions. Perhaps because scholarship on genre theory has a longer history in the United States than in many other places, scholars in other countries are still working to develop their own theories and to explore the many creative approaches to the study of genres. This development is especially prevalent in Brazil, and one selection from this text that succeeds in using genre analysis to make a larger argument is Débora de Carvalho Figueiredo’s “Narrative and Identity Formation: An Analysis of Media Personal Accounts from Patients of Cosmetic Plastic Surgery.” She argues that choosing to have plastic surgery requires a patient to “uptake” a specific way of being and adhere to a certain narrative, and while she analyzes the personal accounts in detail, she also uses this analysis to make a valid argument about how genres can require people who use them to adhere to a certain identity.

Other selections within this book also work to provide new insights. I would argue that the strongest section is “Genre in Teaching and Learning,” which offers us six selections from scholars with a variety of backgrounds. Bazerman’s piece begins this section, as he argues in “Genre and Cognitive Development: Beyond Writing to Learn” that the challenges that come with attempting new genres may help with cognitive growth, as “genres identify a problem space for the developing writer to work in” (291). Also in this section is Amy Devitt’s “Teaching Critical Genre Awareness,” an engaging piece that takes a slightly different pedagogical perspective than her 2004 co-authored textbook Scenes of Writing: Strategies for Composing with Genres. Devitt uses tagmemics here, arguing that we can teach genres as particles/things, as waves/processes, or as fields/contexts, as each represents a pedagogical application derived from current and sometimes competing theories that debate if and how genres can be taught.
Other especially notable pieces in this book are scattered throughout the remaining sections. In “Stories of Becoming: A Study of Novice Engineers Learning Genres of their Profession,” Natasha Artemeva follows four students from an Engineering communication class to their workplace, noting that “genre knowledge ingredients” – including agency, content expertise, and cultural capital – are necessary to help students learn genres of their professions. Anthony Paré, Doreen Starke-Meyerring, and Lynn McAlpine’s “The Dissertation as Multi-Genre: Many Readers, Many Readings” looks at five different types of readers for dissertations, concluding that the dissertation functions as a multi-genre. And “Exploring Notions of Genre in ‘Academic Literacies’ and ‘Writing Across the Curriculum’: Approaches Across Countries and Contexts,” by David Russell et al., provides a detailed comparison of Writing Across the Curriculum programs in the United States with Academic Literacies, a newer writing-intensive program in England. One call at the end of their chapter argues for collaboration with secondary schools and with second-language learning communities.

What struck me about this book as a whole was that many authors drew from the same body of knowledge in their works, especially Carolyn Miller’s “Genre as Social Action,” Bakhtin’s “The Problem of Speech Genres,” Swales’s *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, or a selection from the corpus of work done by Bazerman and Russell. While I would like to have seen more current works on genre theory being put into conversation with one another, I also appreciate that such landmark pieces on genre theory were used both to frame a variety of perspectives and to illustrate the international and intercultural power of genres. The editors argue that “forging effective genres is a matter of global well-being” (xiv), and this book, the collaboration of a plurality of voices, is an important step in the right direction. Further, this edited collection is timely given that the next SIGET conference will occur in Summer 2011, and I am optimistic that scholars will challenge themselves to advance our theories of genre, perhaps by studying how genres can help us to understand communication problems on an international level or by researching ways to enable people who find themselves disempowered by genres. Overall, I would recommend this book as an important read, especially for those who are interested in the current state of developments in genre theory from a global perspective.

*Blacksburg, VA*

**Works Cited**


Last Fall, one of my first-year writing students devoted much of his research and writing to examining The DOW Chemical Company. “Paul” wrote a rhetorical analysis of a DOW’s television ad in their “Human Element” campaign. Then, he wrote a persuasive essay, calling consumers to hold the company accountable for some of its questionable corporate practices in Third World countries. Finally, Paul blended content from these alphabetic texts into a multimodal project. The first segment of his video contained an excerpt from a DOW ad, a visual feast of images such as mountain landscapes and close-ups of children of various races and cultures. The narrator explained that even more valuable than the elements on the periodic table, the “human element”—curiosity and ingenuity—could improve the lives of people across the globe. Then, Paul’s voice intervened, asking if DOW was living up to this ideal. As he spoke about chemical spills and the use of FDA-banned chemicals in overseas facilities, the viewer saw video and photographs of disaster victims and babies with birth defects. As Paul explained DOW’s perfecting of napalm during the Vietnam War, he showed a clip from the film “We Were Soldiers,” with Vietnamese and American fighters falling in slow-motion explosions of fire.

Obviously, Paul, like many of his classmates, made use of copyrighted material, and we had to address questions of infringement and fair use. Were he to post his project to YouTube, would take-down notices spell its end? Might he receive cease and desist letters from DOW, from the photographers or their publishers, or from Paramount Pictures? And would those actions and threats be legally justified? Many students wondered if they should keep their projects to themselves or perhaps take advantage of YouTube’s privacy settings, protecting their videos from searches and allowing only those who possessed the link to view their work.

In Copyright Clarity: How Fair Use Supports Digital Learning, Renee Hobbs works to dispel “copyfright,” this wariness, on the part of students