

Peitho

Newsletter of the Coalition of Women Scholars in the History of Rhetoric and Composition

Volume 7, number 1

Fall 2002

Co-editors:

Susan C. Jarratt

Campus Writing Coordinator
University of California, Irvine

CA 92697-2650

sjarratt@uci.edu

Susan Romano

Department of English

University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, NM 87131

sromano@unm.edu

Please contact either of us with questions, ideas, suggestions for books to be reviewed, notice of awards and honors, calls for papers, conference announcements, or any other news of interest to Coalition members. The editors were assisted by Iveta Cruse from the office of Campus Writing Coordinator at the University of California, Irvine.

* * *

Table of Contents

Walled-in-Spaces,
Ambulating Bodies,
Transgressive
Women.....page 1

Review: *Gender and
Rhetorical Space in
American Life, 1866-
1910*, by Nan
Johnson.....page 7

An Invitation to
Archivists.....page 10

Walled-in Spaces, Ambulating Bodies, Transgressive Women: The First Female European Teachers in the Americas

Susan Romano, University of New Mexico

The first European initiative in female education in the Americas was launched by Spain's Emperatriz and Queen Isabel in partnership with the evangelizing Catholic orders that dominated scenes of education in that place we now know as Mexico City. The year is 1530—less than a decade after Cortés's assault on the Moctezuma regime—and tremendous power over educational practice has accrued to the Franciscans. The term *education* here means indoctrination of native peoples in Christian ideology and in European cultural practice. In some but not all cases, education entails reciting, reading and writing, painting, music, carving, dance, theater, and even, in the case of a select group of sons of the native elite, the study of Latin, rhetoric, and oratory. The need to educate native girls had been articulated early in the Conquest by royal decree, but it was only after the 1529 abduction by Spaniards of two young native women from an informal school that the friars stepped up efforts to establish educational spaces where girls would learn European and Christian ways (Zumárraga Aug. 27 & Oct. 19, 1529). The Queen supported this idea by funding travel to the Americas for six "honest" and "prudent" Spanish women "of good habits" (Zumárraga June 12, 1531). Documentation of this venture is limited—the Queen's directives, purchase requests, letters by the friars and by the Audiencia to the Queen. To my knowledge native chroniclers do not refer to this early schooling venture.*

*Attributions to Zumárraga's letters and to directives from the Queen are taken from the García Icazbalceta collection of unedited documents and from Gómez Canedo, who cites other documentary collections.

Feminist historiography and nonrepresentational theory

The voluminous histories produced by the Franciscans about themselves and about their professional deeds raise questions about how best to study women's elusive presences and cramped positions in this literature—an old problem for feminist historiographers to be sure. This short paper allows me to experiment with a cluster of social theories that magnify the scanty information about those female teachers charged with educating native Mesoamerican little girls, teachers whose performances disappointed the mendicant friars. More important, perhaps, this approach offers an alternative treatment of prominently transgressive female figures by suggesting how such women might serve as conduits to their more anonymous co-actors in history.

My analysis derives from propositions advanced by a group of social theorists who consider patterns of bodily movement and spatial structures as fundamentally involved in the production of human agencies and ideologies (see, e.g., Pred, Grosz, Law, Thrift). I've abstracted some of these propositions as follows:

- First, that material, spatial arrangements are *products* of contest and conflict, not their mere settings.
- Second, that *practiced* space is not the same as material place.
- Third, that the *mundane* movements of anonymous bodies are forms of tactical or “weak” (and hence very important!) resistance.
- Fourth, that the exteriorities of the body—those movements and habits that are non-cognitive and non-rhetorical—produce agencies complementing those attributed to the modernist and postmodern interiorities associated with speech, writing, and educational formation.

Given the scant and suppressed documentary evidence of writing or speech composed by these female teachers, and given the role of bodily motion and spatial enclosure in what documentation we have to go on, theories of spatialization seem a useful addition to the repertoire of feminist historiographical procedures.

Qualifying the teachers and imagining education

The six women recruited to Christianize and Europeanize the daughters of the native Mesoamerican elite were tapped for these teaching positions on grounds of their status as *beatas*. The term *beata* in contemporary Spanish means “excessively and comically pious,” but in sixteenth-century Spain, *beatas* were women who belonged to women's spiritual communities. These communities customarily were only loosely affiliated with the male mendicant orders, and the particular *beatas* of this historical episode were neither cloistered nor virginal. At least one had a child, and one brought along a male companion. The *beatas* qualified for the available teaching positions not by education but by reputation as women of good character and prudent conduct. In words ubiquitous in Franciscan literature, they were honest, honorable, prudent, and devoted to Christian exercise (Zumárraga June 12, 1531; Mendieta book 3, ch. 52). In the words of the Queen, they were women of quality (May 28 & 31, 1530).

As this small contingent of *beatas* traveled under chaperon from Salamanca in northwest central Spain to Seville in the southwest and on to the port of San Lucar to catch their ship to the Americas, the Franciscans across the ocean advanced plans for housing the bodies of the female teachers and pupils and for isolating the proposed experiment in aculturation. In other words, it was the growing conflict between Spanish culture and native cultures that gave rise to the production of gender-specific, material spaces within which to address these conflicts.

The discursive convergence of enclosure, schooling, and confined female bodies draws on terms whose distinctions were collapsed in Franciscan discourse:

- *Cerca*: Fence. What surrounded the 1529 school and had been insufficient to prevent the abduction of native girls.
- *Clausura*: Cloister. The institutional practice of enclosure associated with some but not all female religious orders.
- *Emparedadas*: Walled-in women. An informal and nonspecific term for nuns and *beatas* that ignored differences in community practice.
- *Recogimiento or recolección*: Collection of dispersed items or gathering up of scattered objects. Refers to women's and girls' schools and to women's shelters.



Las Beatitas, Fidelio, Galeria Cubana
(used by permission)

Conflating the referential with the metaphorical and metonymical, Zumárraga does not distinguish between material and practiced space. In the initial Franciscan vision, the young women of Spain were to quietly insert themselves behind walls just as the term *emparedada* implies. In the initial Franciscan vision, the little girls too were to embrace this enclosure because in native cultures, girls were subject to confinement in obedience to the agendas of others. Walled-in time together for native girls and Spanish teachers, write the friars, will as a matter of course produce Christian women (Zumárraga Dec. 20, 1537). In fact time, contact, and practice produced something else entirely. But before examining more closely the differences between material and practiced spaces, I want to call up through the documentation the available images of material women.

Imaging the body

Body images of the *niñas*—the little girls: Zumárraga writes that they had difficulty persuading parents to enroll their female children—ages five to seven—in the new European schools where they would remain learning embroidery and Christian ritual until suitable marriage partners were found (Dec. 20, 1537; Sept. 17, 1538). He images the mothers and fathers clutching and hiding their girls and the Franciscans using unspecified acts of “persuasion” to take them anyway. Justifying this

scene of institutional abduction are images of captivity and sexual abuse—little girls imprisoned by their families and relatives in caves to be bartered among native groups (Nov. 14, 1536; Nov. 25, 1537).

Body images of the *beatas*—the teachers: An exhaustive list of the travel provisions puts flesh on an incomplete list of individual names (“Provision”):

- Food: 200 eggs for each *beata* and a basket to carry them, olives, capers, raisins, rice, almonds, saffron, ginger, pepper, cinnamon and cloves, garbanzos, limes, vinegar and oil, bacon, biscuits, chestnuts, chickens.
- Cooking utensils: wooden spoons, copper kettles weighing 5 pounds, barrels for vinegar and oil.
- Clothing: two habits each, made of 12 yards of cloth, 2 sashes, 2 headpieces, shoes.
- Toiletries: soap, rose and sandalwood creams.
- Writing materials: four “hands” of paper, desks, lanterns to “keep the light,” wax.
- Mattresses and bedding.
- A female servant to prepare food.
- Chests to hold effects, locks for these chests, locks for the cabin doors.

This list of provisions conjures the *beatas*’ historical presence by its prominent ministry to the body. These women of quality dress and eat as such; they will be doing some writing. The Queen’s care to supply them with identical dress, foodstuffs, and items of personal care generalizes rather than particularizes them. In fact the six parts of this collective of women prove interchangeable: Three (nameless) *beatas* defect en route from Salamanca to Seville and are replaced by three others (“Provision”).

In an addendum to her initial instructions, the Queen orders the purchase of 300 primers, bound in parchment, for the girls’ literacy education. The *beatas* are to “show” (*mostrar*) these primers to the little girls (“Provision” Feb. 14, 1530). Even as the Queen images women “demonstrating” Christianity to native girls through books, the Franciscans, her partners in educational planning, image the thicknesses and heights of the walls that will enclose a rather different set of educational activities: instruction in the “womanly arts” of embroidery and a keeping of the liturgical hours (Mendieta, book 3, ch. 52). At puberty, in the Franciscan vision, the little girls will exit the walled spaces after years of contact with stitching and singing *beatas* to marry the sons of the native elite who by 1536 are studying Latin grammar, rhetoric, and oratory at the new College of Santa Cruz de Tlaltelolco (Zumárraga Nov. 30, 1537).

On their arrival in Mexico, the *beatas* shift shape in the Franciscan literature. They now materialize as thin young women (*flacas*) whose long ocean voyage has taken a toll on their health, women who require both medical attention and rest before they can take up their teaching responsibilities. Yet even as it references poor health, the term *flaca* begins to pair up with terms for youth, vitality, and attractiveness. One very transgressive *beata*, for example, is described as *mujer flaca y de muy buen espíritu* (a skinny woman of very good spirits) and as *moza y flaca* (young, of marriageable age, and skinny) (“Carta de Abyencia”).

The Practice of Space

Embodiment, writes Nigel Thrift, “is understood in terms of what it can do” (128). Soon the *flacas-emparedadas-honradas-beatas*--that is, the young, attractive, skinny, weak, walled-in, honorable, spiritually-inclined female teachers--go out and begin the *practice* of space. Rather than remain with their little girl pupils inside walls designed to contain the educational activities, the *beatas* take up the customs of their spiritual community: they ambulate, walking freely outside of the monastery with their pupils (Zumárraga Nov. 25, 1536). Historically *beatas* were not cloistered, and these particular *beatas* evidently have no intention of becoming so.

In addition to ambulating, they successfully petition the Queen for relief from Franciscan visitation to and entry within what they now *practice* as *their* walls (“Provision” Nov. 27, 1534). Thus whereas the Franciscans envision these walled spaces as protective of order and preventive of flight while subject to Franciscan vigilance, the female teachers practice these spaces quite otherwise, leaving the confines at will and refusing entry to the most powerful ecclesiastical order of the land. These skinny bodies accept the material spaces but practice them in their own way, moving outside the walls designed to house and resolve cultural conflict by molding native women into desirable cultural shapes. We might call this the deployment of an alternative spatiality, what spatial theorists understand as “weak” yet socially significant resistance.

Interiority, exteriority, and the transgressive woman

These spatially-defined and spatially-enabled transgressions are perhaps as significant in the history of female education as is the inflammatory behavior of one Catalina Hernández, spiritual leader of this group of teachers. Catalina and a male associate and ship companion Calisto (who had been a disciple of Jesuit founder Ignacio Loyola) had deepened their relationship while confined on ship during the ocean crossing. Even though their Franciscan chaperone and confessor Antonio de la Cruz assured interested parties that the relationship was pure, that is, not sexualized, on the group’s arrival in New Spain, the friars asked Calisto to absent himself from company of the *beatas* and to go forth on his own mission. He had acquired the undesirable habit of “entering into” Catalina’s spaces, and there was no place for him in the proposed educational spaces. Objecting strenuously, the outspoken Catalina wrote an inflammatory letter to members of the Audiencia, an action resulting in the interrogation of her conscience by which she was found guilty of “illumination,” a practice characterized by an excess of spiritual fire leading in the “wrong” directions and, in Spain, subject to investigation by the Inquisition (“Carta de Abyencia” August 14, 1531).

One contemporary Franciscan historian reports on this incident by saying that all traces of Catalina then vanish; she “evaporates from history, leaving no footprints. “*Catalina Hernández se esfuma desde entonces: ninguna huella suya ha sido descubierta hasta el presente*” (Gómez Canedo 111). Neither bodily nor discursive traces remain, only the references to both.

Here is how theories of nonrepresentation and spatiality enrich this history of European women engaged in an early episode of cross-cultural educational practice. Both historians and the Franciscans gain some access to the interiority of Catalina Hernández—to her transgressive bravery, her independence, her passions for friendship, her spirituality, her literate production, her sense of the rhetorical power of letter writing, her possible practices of mysticism. This access to her interiority and individuality enlarges her attraction as an historical figure. Certainly *I* will pursue her case to the point of her evaporation. Spatial theorists, however, might argue that we gain less by this pursuit than by tracking those movements in and out of material spaces, movements undertaken by

her sister *beatas* and the little girl pupils. Re-embedding Catalina within the historicity of those quotidian, mobile, non-representational practices she may have shared in minor variation with others similarly positioned redirects focus to the more mundane yet fully transgressive remapping of spatialities—to those open air walks with the little girls, to the refusal of Franciscan visitation rights, and even to the out-of-sight goings-on within these now unvisited enclosures—the “showing of primers” and other unseen activities. Better we hold the single, provocative body Catalina Hernández in tension between her individual, verbal, confrontational expressions and those bodily activities she has in common with the more silent but still moving *beatas*. Better we build into our histories a relationship between discursive and bodily excesses.

Educational Outcomes

The outcomes of this experiment in female education are as follows: Whether it was the reading and writing or the singing or the embroidery we do not know, but reportedly the intended spouses, the boys of the college of Tlaltelolco who were studying rhetoric and oratory, would not marry the *beata*-educated girls. The girls had become lazy, so say the Franciscans, and refused to serve their husbands as their mothers had done. Indeed so unsuccessful by institutional standards was this first experiment in female education that by 1544, no schools remained. No little girls were to be found inside the walls. The *beatas* returned to Spain or found work elsewhere (Zumárraga June 2, 1544).

Works Cited

- “Carta de Abyencia de México a Su Magestad.” *Colección de Documentos Inéditos Relativos al Descubrimiento, Conquista, y Organización de las Antiguas Posesiones Españolas de América Oceania*. XLI. Madrid: Manuel G. Hernández, 1884.
- Gómez Canedo, Lino. *La Educación de los Marginados durante la Epoca Colonial*. México: Editorial Porrúa, 1982.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994.
- Law, John. *Organizing Modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Mendieta, Fray Jerónimo de. *Historia Eclesiástica Indiana*. 2 vols. Madrid: Estudio Preliminar y Edición de Francisco Solano y Pérez-Lila, 1973.
- Pred, Allan. *Making Histories and Constructing Human Geographies: The Local Transformation of Practice, Power Relations, and Consciousness*. Boulder, CO: Westview P, 1990.
- “Provision.” Reproduced in Gómez Canedo. 850.
- Thrift, Nigel. “The Still Point: Resistance, Expressive Embodiment and Dance.” *Geographies of Resistance*. Eds. Steve Pile and Michael Keith. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Zumárraga, Juan de. *Don Fray Juan de Zumárraga: Primer Obispo y Arzobispo de México*. Ed. Joaquín García Icazbalceta. 4 vols. México: Editorial Porrúa, 1988.

Review: *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866-1910*, by Nan Johnson. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2002. 220 pp.

Jacqueline Bacon

In her earlier book, *Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America*, Nan Johnson examined how the rhetorical tradition in North America developed during the nineteenth century and investigated its influence in intellectual and academic settings. In her latest volume, *Gender and Rhetorical Space*, Johnson turns to “nonacademic or *parlor* traditions of rhetoric and popular constructions of rhetorical performance” (2) such as elocution manuals and letter-writing handbooks. Johnson bases her project on the assumption that postbellum “rhetorical theories and rhetorical practices” in America can be seen as “cultural sites” that sought to define “the boundaries of rhetorical space” and “who was to occupy it,” as well as to codify “rhetorical behavior for women” in ways that promoted “conventional femininity” (1-2). Johnson builds on the current feminist project of “remapping the history of nineteenth-century rhetoric” or recovering women’s rhetoric, but she notes that we have “to complicate” the question of who is “missing from the map” by also asking *why* and by exploring how “cultural power and rhetorical pedagogy” erase women from the history of rhetoric (8-10). This perspective underlies her thesis that “the conservative and gendered agenda of the postbellum parlor-rhetoric movement that promoted the importance of rhetorical training for all American citizens yet subtly reserved instruction in oratory and argumentation for white men is evidence that new maps alone cannot reveal the entire story of the complex situation of the rhetorical status of women before and after the Civil War” (14).

Johnson’s introduction outlines her methodology, introduces her central arguments, and situates her project in the ongoing feminist project of recovering women’s words and revising both the rhetorical canon and the history of rhetoric to incorporate women’s discourse. In Chapter 1, Johnson examines elocution manuals and speakers (anthologies of pieces for study and recitation). She demonstrates that although these texts frequently propose that elocution is a valuable rhetorical skill for both men and women, they assume highly gendered arenas for men’s and women’s public speaking, relegating women’s words to the domestic sphere while men could persuade in public life. Chapter 2 considers conduct literature, focusing on its construction of the ideal of the quiet woman who reigns in the parlor, persuading indirectly in her roles of wife and mother and avoiding public life. Johnson turns in Chapter 3 to letter-writing guides, showing how these texts reinforce the belief that women’s rhetorical sphere must be domestic and familial, while public, official, or professional correspondence is reserved for men.

Chapters 4 and 5 examine texts that either describe or erase the rhetorical activities of American women. In Chapter 4, Johnson considers biographical and autobiographical depictions of female rhetoricians such as Francis E. Willard, founder of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Portraits of women orators, Johnson demonstrates, emphasize not their rhetorical skill but their performance of femininity, connecting their eloquence to their status as good women and mothers. This “domesticat[ion] of the podium,” she argues, allows certain “famous women to win the public ear and further social reform,” yet it also reinforces conservative views that marginalize women in the public sphere (144). Chapter 5 extends this argument, demonstrating how this tendency to construct women’s public oratory in domestic and feminine terms undermines women’s inclusion in histories of public address during the period “between 1880 and 1910 when the canon of American oratory is initially formulated” (147-48). Women orators are either excluded from these histories or depicted as “special case[s]” (159)—an omission not corrected until Doris G. Yoakum’s 1943 essay, “Women’s Introduction to the American Platform,” in William Brigance’s *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*.

Johnson is to be commended for her thorough primary research and her emphasis on “rhetorical materials that have not yet been examined” (6). Scholars in our field such as Linda Ferreira-Buckley and Richard Enos call for historians of rhetoric to do archival work in order to explore fully historical practices and to expand the range of what we consider rhetorical texts. *Gender and Rhetorical Space* is a worthy example of scholarship in this vein. Johnson focuses on primary texts, providing textual evidence for her claims from a variety of previously neglected works and genres. Letter-writing manuals, for example, have

not been sufficiently emphasized as a source of information about rhetorical practices and pedagogies in nineteenth-century America; Johnson's chapter on the codification of rhetorical behavior in these texts opens a new range of texts to scrutiny. Her focus on the voices within the texts themselves is refreshing; and her excerpts from primary texts are delightfully engaging, making the book a pleasure to read. Readers will also appreciate Johnson's inclusion of an often-neglected form of textual evidence—illustrations, both photographs and drawings, from primary texts.

This is not to imply that *Gender and Rhetorical Space* is under theorized. Johnson is familiar with theoretical questions and issues in the history of rhetoric, nineteenth-century historiography, and studies of gender; and she calls upon them to inform her analysis. Like any scholarly work, she begins from certain theoretical assumptions about gender, rhetoric, and power (described above). Yet instead of applying particular theoretical frameworks to the evidence she examines, she lets the primary texts dictate what theoretical lenses are relevant. Her approach fits into the “theory from practice” model described by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, who proposes that scholars can base their “theorizing” in “the discursive practices of specific women” (59).

Gender and Rhetorical Space also enters into an important scholarly conversation in the field of feminist historiography of rhetoric. As feminist scholars reconsider the history of rhetoric to take into account women's oratory and writing, a debate arises as to whether this approach is sufficient. Scholars such as Karlyn Kohrs Campbell have sought to revise the canon to include previously overlooked female rhetors. Critics of this “remapping” suggest that we must investigate how canons are formed and why (see, for example, Biesecker). Johnson's position negotiates this divide by suggesting that we must do both. She argues that the history of rhetoric can be seen both “as a map” and as “a politicized cultural field constituted by the links among ideologies about gender, race, or class and conventional principles of rhetorical performance” (10). Johnson identifies a defining tension within feminist historiography that necessarily structures any complex historical project—as we write new historical narratives, we must also be mindful of the context that has enabled only certain stories to be told and critical of the terms and frameworks available to those engaged in revisionist projects. Her final chapter, in particular, in which she investigates what ideological influences excluded women from—or marginalized them within—the early canon of American public address, demonstrates how this perspective can inform scholarship.

Johnson similarly avoids easy conclusions about the rhetorical traditions that she investigates. The pedagogies and texts that she considers cannot be seen as monolithic, she proposes; they simultaneously empower and marginalize women rhetors. Parlor-rhetoric manuals appeared to validate rhetorical instruction for both sexes, for example, and early biographies of women such as Susan B. Anthony described their entrance into important postbellum political debates. Yet Johnson demonstrates that women's rhetoric was continually framed in highly gendered terms that suggested that women had to entertain, persuade indirectly, or rely on maternal or domestic tropes to obtain credibility. Emphasizing rather than minimizing the ambiguities and paradoxes within the rhetorical traditions she analyzes, Johnson accounts for the complexities of rhetoric's “function as a discipline” that is “always simultaneously empowering and disenfranchising” (18). Johnson's approach is instructive for those of us considering the voices of women and other disenfranchised rhetors; we must keep in mind the constraints of pedagogies, histories, and traditions even as we analyze the discourse of those who sought to expand those boundaries.

All scholars must place limits on their consideration of materials, and in Johnson's case she focuses on texts aimed at white, middle-class women. Johnson is not unmindful of issues of race; she points out, for example, that by the turn of the century African-American women had been excluded from the canon of American oratory. Yet her scope necessarily precludes consideration of other questions that arise. Were African-American middle-class women influenced by the rhetorical practices and pedagogies of conduct literature? Were texts codifying rhetorical practices for African Americans similarly gendered as those written for whites? The 1896 *College of Life, or Practical Self-Educator: A Manual of Self-Improvement for the Colored Race*, for example, is a sort of hybrid of various genres that Johnson considers, containing guidance on etiquette and letter-writing as well as portraits of African-American male and female rhetors. It would have been interesting for Johnson to refer to or speculate about such texts (as well as others, perhaps, such as advice on manners and morals from postbellum African-American newspapers).

The fact that Johnson's study raises questions, though, should not be seen as a deficiency but as an invitation to other scholars to build on Johnson's thorough research to explore new genres and texts. *Gender and Rhetorical Space* demonstrates that archival work in the history of rhetoric is wide open and exciting. I have no doubt that she would welcome other feminists to the archives to extend and challenge her work.

Works Cited

- Biesecker, Barbara. "Coming to Terms with Recent Attempts to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 25 (1992): 120-61.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Consciousness-Raising: Linking Theory, Criticism, and Practice." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32.1 (Winter 2002): 45-64.
- Enos, Richard Leo. "The Archaeology of Women in Rhetoric: Rhetorical Sequencing as a Research Method for Historical Scholarship." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32.1 (Winter 2002): 65-79.
- Ferreira-Buckley, Linda. "Rescuing the Archives from Foucault." *College English* 61 (1999): 577-83.

**88th Annual Meeting of
the National
Communication
Association
November 21-24, 2002
New Orleans**

**[http://www.natcom.org/
convention/](http://www.natcom.org/convention/)**

4Cs 2003: Electric Rhetoric

Joyce Irene Middleton of St. John Fisher College, new chair of the Coalition, has organized a roundtable entitled "Electric Rhetoric" for 4Cs next spring. Seven women scholars will discuss the important ways that new electronic technologies are reshaping how we read the history of rhetoric and how we view the future of our discipline. The speakers will focus on theory, pedagogy, archival work, gender, diversity, race, whiteness, and publishing. The second hour will offer small-group mentoring sessions, headed by one or two members of the Coalition's Board of Directors, in which participants will discuss issues facing women in the profession, from grant writing and publishing to job hunting and tenuring to negotiating intellectual property.

Speakers include:

Kathleen E. Welch (University of Oklahoma), **Laura Gurak** (University of Minnesota), **Akua Duku Anokye** (Arizona State University), **Michelle R. Kendrick** (Washington State University), **Piper Kendrix Williams** (Rutgers University), **Andrea Abernethy Lunsford** (Stanford University), and **Cindy Selfe** (Michigan Technological University).

From the editors: An invitation to archival researchers

Two recent publications mark a new level of attention to archival research in rhetoric and composition. The authors of a 1999 *College English* Symposium on archival work confront practical questions—what do we actually have in our archive? what should be in it? how can access be broadened?—as well as staging a debate about theory.¹ Even more to the point for our purposes, a recent special issue of *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, edited by Patricia Bizzell, on Feminist Historiography in Rhetoric engages such issues as they apply to women’s rhetorical practices. The textual space of the journal allows for rich reflections on questions of both method (what do we do?) and methodology (what kinds of knowledge are we constructing? where does interpretation begin? how do our research questions, our social locations, and our theoretical premises determine what we will find?)—a distinction spelled out eloquently by Gesa Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan a decade ago.

The more limited space of our newsletter seems to us a good place to address the problem of methods, the pragmatic aspect of archival research. Following John Brereton’s urging that we “consider the needs of those who will depend on our own foresight” (575), we invite senior scholars with experience in archival research to send a letter to your younger colleagues, sharing the benefits of your experience and providing mentorship by way of example and narrative. Supplementing the more formal structure of graduate courses or scholarly articles, we imagine that these pieces will provide an entry-way into archival research through narrative, taking, as Christine Mason Sutherland does, “something of an autobiographical approach” (109).

Here is a list of questions and topics you might seek to address in an archival memo to new scholars:

where are the archives you’ve worked with located? what is their scope? how did you come to find out that the materials you want to work with are there? how did you get the money and time (same thing, really!) to travel and do the research? what have various finding aids done for you (electronic, print, human)? how did you begin to identify markers of good materials? what were the biggest frustrations you faced? is there a model of archival practice that has served you well? how do you distinguish between primary and secondary sources, and how would you articulate the blurred lines of their value? was it necessary to go to the ms. and not use a typescript or translation? under what circumstances? how did you decide when you had seen enough—an elegant sufficiency? how can you explain that tension between needing to say something and not having access to the documents that support what you need to say? or, to put this another way, what do you do when the material you find isn’t what you expected—doesn’t support your hypothesis? how do you begin to compose a text from notes? how do you decide what to put in and what to leave out? what do you do when you discover mistakes in others’ work with the same material? how did you select the publication venue for your work? what else comes to mind about your experience?

Although answering a list of questions is very different from writing a narrative, we trust the rhetorical dexterity of our contributors to take our heuristics and run with them in whatever directions seem pleasurable, useful, and instructive. We can imagine this feature becoming a conversation in which authors agree to invite questions from readers and answer them on the website (<http://www.unm.edu/~cwshrc/>). Women of the archives, let us hear from you!

1. The contributors include John C. Brereton, Linda Ferreira-Buckley, Steven Mailloux, and collaborators Thomas P. Miller and Melody Bowdon.

Works Cited

“Archivists with an Attitude.” College English 61 (May 1999): 574-98.

Kirsch, Gesa, and Patricia A. Sullivan, eds. Methods and Methodology in Composition Research. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1992.

Sutherland, Christine Mason. “Feminist Historiography: Research Methods in Rhetoric.” Rhetoric Society Quarterly 32.1 (Winter 2002): 109-22.

**The Fourth Biennial
Feminisms & Rhetorics Conference**

**Ohio State University
Columbus, OH
October 22-25, 2003**

Sponsored by

The Coalition for Women scholars
in the History of Rhetoric and Composition

and

The Rhetoric & Composition Program
of the Department of English
The Ohio State University

For developing details, see our Website:
<http://english.ohio-state.edu/femrhet/>

Nan Johnson, Conference Chair
Vice-Chair, Rhetoric & Composition
Program, OSU

NEW BOOKS OF NOTE

Imagining Rhetoric. Composing Women of the Early United States
by Janet Carey Eldred and Peter Mortensen
Pittsburgh University Press, 2002

Feminism Beyond Modernism
by Elizabeth A. Flynn
Southern Illinois University Press, 2002

The newest addition to the Series
in Rhetorics and Feminisms
Cheryl Glenn and Shirley Wilson Logan, series editors

CORRECTION AND CONGRATULATIONS

In the last issue, we listed the institution of Katherine Adams (the Coalition’s current Vice President) as the University of New Orleans. Kate actually teaches at Loyola University in New Orleans, where she has recently been honored with the 2002 Dux Academicus Award. The president of the university praised Kate as “a veteran teacher who is regarded among administrators, colleagues, and students alike as a true example of a dedicated professional and a campus leader.” Go to the Loyola website to read more extravagant praise of this fine teacher, scholar, and university citizen (www.loyno.edu). Congratulations!

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

Name: _____

Address: _____

Institutional Affiliation: _____

E-mail Address: _____

Please forward this application form and a check in the amount of your membership (\$10 for faculty; \$5 for students) to

Lynée Lewis Gaillet
Department of English
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, GA 30303-3083

The Coalition of Women Scholars in the
History of Rhetoric and Composition
Susan C. Jarratt, Co-Editor
University of California, Irvine
Department of English and Comparative Literature
Irvine, CA 92697-2650