

Britney Q. Texan

Professor Graves

Philosophy of Rhetoric GNED-1651

8 May 2009

### Annotated Bibliography

Covino, William A., and David A. Jolliffe, eds. *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions,*

*Boundaries*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1995. Print.

This text has been considered one of the preeminent reference resources on rhetoric currently available. The text is separated into four sections: an introduction to rhetoric, a glossary of major concepts/historical periods/rhetors, essays on the history and theory of rhetoric, and a comprehensive selection of essays detailing how rhetoric connects to a variety of academic disciplines and areas of study. For students studying rhetoric, the introduction offers concise yet complete coverage of basic rhetorical theory and the glossary may be of use in learning unfamiliar concepts/figures that have remained important to the study of rhetoric. The essay selections on rhetoric and education, literacy, and composition are also particularly strong, featuring chapters by well-known scholars in these. This text should be recommended for both new students of the topic as well as more experienced readers.

Olson, Gary A., ed. *Philosophy, Rhetoric, Literary Criticism: (Inter)views*.

Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1994. Print.

This collection of essays (originally published in *The Journal of Advanced Composition*) is organized into six units. Each unit begins with a Q & A interview with a scholar followed by two examples of commentary on the scholar's work by different authors. The text's purpose is to understand the ideas of a particular writer and then determine their impact on composition and the politics of writing through the eyes of other readers and writers. One should note that at times, the examples of commentary lend themselves toward exuberant hero-worship; however, the section on Stephen Toulmin is enlightening to readers seeking a better grasp on the development and diffusion of his theories on argument, as he refutes many common assumptions about his work. The selection of other subjects for the collection seems designed to gather well-known names as opposed to offering the reader new or even substantive discussions.

Sloane, Thomas O., ed. *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.

While this resource is similar to Enos's Encyclopedia, this volume focuses solely on rhetoric. Sloane suggests in the preface that a study of rhetoric is a study of the past and

the text covers topics and figures intrinsic to the development and continued study of rhetoric and rhetorical texts and strategies. Entries tend to be more consistent in length and format than in the Enos volume, and each include bibliographies and suggested readings. Readers should note the odd terminology given to historical time periods and the idiosyncratic selection of entries. The long sections on “classical rhetoric” and “modern rhetoric” make broad generalizations and assumptions, and would have been more effective had the entries been broken down. Tactics such as this, along with author’s assumption that rhetoric begins and ends with the Greeks, forces one to conclude that viewing entries from multiple sources might be preferable, rather than depending on Sloane’s text alone.

Welch, Kathleen E. *The Contemporary Reception of Classical Rhetoric*. Hillsdale, N.J.:

Lawrence Erlbaum, 1990. Print.

Welch’s first book may be intimidating to beginning students, but it is a valuable resource that describes the reemerging popularity and revisionist readings of classical rhetoricians in the contemporary academy. The first section of the text offers Welch’s oft-cited critique of the “Heritage School” of rhetoric and rhetorical scholarship and its elitist, backward view of rhetoric. The second half offers a “rehistoricization” of Platonic and Isocratic rhetorical theory. Each of the book’s chapters are enlightening on their own and give the reader a complete picture on the chapters topic of focus, although a full reading of the book would offer those unfamiliar with classical Greek rhetoric a stronger grasp on the issues under analysis. Of particular note in the context of this text’s inclusion in this annotated bibliography is Welch’s critique of *The Bedford Bibliography* (p. 15-8) and its editors for their superficial treatment of figures and theories from classical rhetorical studies.