



Writing About Boys: Using the Feminist Method of Strategic Contemplation When Researching Male Subjects

Liz Rohan

Frances Power Cobbe's Stranger-Guest Rhetorics in "Life in Donegal"

Kelly Cameron

"Celebration of Life": Memorials for Linda S. Bergmann (1950-2014)

Sullivan, Weiser, Rose, Angeli, Driscoll, and Lee

Review: *The Managerial Unconscious in the History of Composition Studies*

Seth Kahn

Review: *To Know Her Own History: Writing at the Woman's College, 1943-1963*

Andrea A. Lunsford

Review: *Rewriting Success in Rhetoric and Composition Careers*

Megan Schoen

Review: *Feminist Rhetorical Practices*

Alexis E. Ramsey-Tobienne

Editors

Jennifer Bay, *Purdue University*

Patricia Sullivan, *Purdue University*

Associate Editor

Lisa Mastrangelo, *The College of St. Elizabeth*

Editorial Assistants

Carrie Grant, *Purdue University*

Christine Masters Jach, *Purdue University*

Editorial Board

Katherine H. Adams, *Loyola University*

Barbara L'Eplattenier, *University of Arkansas, Little Rock*

Lindal J. Buchanan, *Old Dominion University*

Andrea Lunsford, *Stanford University*

Nancy C. DeJoy, *Michigan State University*

Kelly Ritter, *University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

Jessica Enoch, *University of Maryland*

Shirley K Rose, *Arizona State University*

Lynée Lewis Gaillet, *Georgia State University*

Aparagita Sagar, *Purdue University*

Cheryl Glenn, *Pennsylvania State University*

Wendy B. Sharez, *East Carolina University*

Tareq Samra Graban, *Florida State University*

Hui Wu, *University of Texas-Tyler*

Nan Johnson, *The Ohio State University*

Peitho (ISSN 2169-0774) is published twice a year, in the Spring and Fall. Access to the two most current issues of *Peitho* are part of the Coalition membership package. Coalition membership is \$15 for graduate students and \$25 for faculty; more information and joining information is available at [cwshrc.org](http://www.cwshrc.org). With the exception of the two most current issues, the back issues of *Peitho* are available at <http://www.peitho.cwshrc.org>.

Peitho seeks to encourage, advance, and publish original feminist research in the history of rhetoric and composition and thereby support scholars and students within our profession. For submission guidelines and requirements, please see <http://www.peitho.cwshrc.org>.

Cover and Interior Design: Cheri Lemieux Spiegel
Copyright © 2013 by the Coalition of Women Scholars
in the History of Rhetoric and Composition

Peitho:

A Journal of the Coalition of
Women Scholars in the
History of Rhetoric & Composition

Volume 16

Number 1

Fall/Winter 2013

Editors' Welcome

3

Articles

Writing About Boys: Using the Feminist Method of Strategic
Contemplation When Researching Male Subjects

8

Liz Rohan

Frances Power Cobbe's Stranger-Guest Rhetorics in "Life in
Donegal"

34

Kelly Cameron

"Celebration of Life": Memorials for Linda S. Bergmann (1950-
2014)

58

Sullivan, Weiser, Rose, Angeli, Driscoll, and Lee

Book Reviews

*The Managerial Unconscious in the History of Composition
Studies*

88

Seth Kahn

*To Know Her Own History: Writing at the Woman's College,
1943-1963*

94

Andrea A. Lunsford

Rewriting Success in Rhetoric and Composition Careers

98

Megan Schoen

Feminist Rhetorical Practices

106

Alexis E. Ramsey-Tobienne

Editors' Welcome

We welcome you to the Fall/Winter edition of *Peitho: A Journal of the Coalition of Women Scholars in the History of Rhetoric & Composition*.

It has been a pleasure to work with the founding editors of this peer-reviewed journal, Barbara L'Eplattenier and Lisa Mastrangelo. Their vision has transformed the Coalition of Women Scholars in the History of Rhetoric and Composition Newsletter into the peer-reviewed journal that we now take forward. More importantly, both Barb and Lisa embody the feminist mentorship so richly needed by other scholars; they don't relax standards but encourage us all to strive for the best versions of ourselves.

As we see it, the field faces challenges, holds hopes, and continues to craft responses that meet the challenges and fulfill the hopes.

Challenges

Challenges surround us perennially, and in recent years varied and particular ones have been laid down for scholars who study women's contributions to histories and theories of rhetoric, composition, communication, and writing. Historical work has raised challenges to focus, stakes, figures, and methodologies, to name a few. In 2003 Jacqueline Jones Royster's "Disciplinary Landscaping, or Contemporary Challenges in the History of Rhetoric" highlighted landscaping as an interpretive process and urged us "to resist exclusionary practices and to reform disciplinary habits" by joining reform-minded scholars "in the close and careful work of recovering, re-ordering, re-situating, re-visioning, and re-creating. . . non-normative subjects in order to make visible new and different features of the territory that might enable paradigmatic shifts" (160-161). Her challenge directed attention both to disciplinary formation and to disciplinary knowledge making. Others, such as Tarez Graban, Shirley Rose, Alexis Ramsey, David Gold, have since focused on rethinking archival methods in ways that support work that assists in the recovery of women's contributions to the histories of rhetoric and writing.

In addition to the work needed to meet Royster's challenge, other challenges have been issued that invite our response, with the shifting definition of writing holding a prominent position. NCTE under the leadership of Kathy Yancey, to offer one example, has massaged the

definition of 21st century literacies to make writing encompass "create, critique, analyze, and evaluate multimedia texts." Yancey details this challenge in "Made not only in Words," as she expands the definition of writing/texts into other composing media and offers a new kind of challenge for those of us who privilege a certain "written" communication format over others. The implications such media shifts for literacy and composing can be profound.

Hopes

These challenges should, we think, be used to spur our work, not to discourage us. Our efforts can and do matter. Elizabeth Grosz, as she describes feminist theory practice both in terms of philosophy and political movements, confirms our hopefulness when she writes, "feminist theory is directed toward bringing about a future better than and different from the present." Though she acknowledges immense differences among feminists, Grosz goes on to say there is a shared subject— "woman, women, the feminine, and their social, political, economic, cultural, and conceptual relations" —and a need "to understand how change is possible" (101-102). We agree, and we find her words hopeful and ones that help push us forward to forge new alignments of force. The atmosphere Grosz creates is one of hope that feminist theory can, as she says, reveal forces "that enable the actual, the present, to become otherwise."

One of the hope-filled methods that resonates with Grosz's words comes from Susan Leigh Star's deployment of the concept of boundary objects. In 2010, Star mused about the impact of boundary objects on the studies in science and technology over the 30 years since she and Jim Griesemer had proposed them as methodological interpreters. She focused her remarks on how boundary objects work as a tactical method (one we think is feminist, though she does not name it so) that links "generation of residual categories [with] communities of practice of 'others' or 'outsiders'" (615). Then, after alliances and cooperative work have emerged and been facilitated by boundary objects, standardization collapses or administers or regulates those objects in ways that makes the boundary objects less powerful.

We recognize and take up the challenges Royster and others have posed, at the same time as we share the hopes Grosz, Star, and others

hold, hopes we know other scholars in the Coalition hold as well. We are particularly pleased to be helping with the journey that we have experienced to be invisible to some in the broader field but needed for the health of all research in Composition and in Rhetoric.

Responses

In this issue of *Peitho* we present essays by Kelly Cameron and Elizabeth Rohan that offer new responses and practices that take up some of these challenges.

Kelly Cameron investigates France Power Cobbe's journalistic writing, focusing on "Life in Donegal" (which appeared in 1866). Cameron details Cobbe's travels and colorful life as a way to chart the sorts of productive resistance to stereotyped portraits of the Victorian woman that Cobbe forged into the persona of the "stranger-guest." Cameron contends that such a persona allowed her writing to operate at the intersection of travel writing and rhetoric, in part because it "represents women on the move, physically, socially, and ideologically."

Liz Rohan probes how a feminist method of "strategic contemplation" assists in the study of male subjects in the Price family archives, with a focus on John M. Price's post-World War I diaries during the years he was in college at Denison University in Granville, Ohio. While she was editing his diaries, Rohan shows how the vulnerabilities of her own life connected with those of her male subject. She explains that "extending feminist research methods so that they might be used to measure scholarship for which men or non-feminist topics are subjects, does seem a logical extension of any productive feminist enterprise with the aims of nurture and inclusion and when considering that collective experience and memory includes actors of each gender."

The issue then moves to a "Celebration of the Life" for Linda S. Bergmann who died unexpectedly in early January. As you will see from that piece, Linda, a lifelong feminist mentor, began her scholarship with a study of American humor, moved to archival study of Elizabeth Agassiz' writings, and eventually worked across disciplines with the goal of demonstrating how communication knowledges morph and transfer. We dedicate this first issue to her memory.

We end the issue with book reviews of recent feminist scholarship: Kelly Ritter's *To Know Her Own History: Writing at the Woman's College,*

1943-1963, by Andrea Lunsford; Donna Strickland's *The Managerial Unconscious in the History of Composition Studies*, by Seth Kahn; Amy Goodburn, Donna LeCourt, and Carrie Leverenz's *Rewriting Success in Rhetoric and Composition Careers*, by Megan Schoen; and Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa Kirsch's *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*, by Alexis Ramsey-Tobienne.

Before ending our remarks, we acknowledge two people who work behind the scenes: Christine Jach and Carrie Grant. Because production of this issue includes a reworking of behind the scenes manuscript handling (transferring the process to a manuscript management software), our editorial interns have shouldered more work than usually they would. We are indebted to Carrie and Christine for their excellent work and flexible, go-for-it attitudes. They are as hard-working as they are smart. Thanks, ladies.

Look for an announcement on the website of two special issues, a twenty-fifth anniversary issue and another special issue forthcoming in Fall 2014, and keep your manuscript submissions coming. We promise to uphold the journal's standards and rigor modulated by a feminist ethics of care as established by Barb and Lisa.

Forward.

Jenny and Pat

References

- Grosz, Elizabeth. "The Practice of Feminist Theory." *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 21.1 (2010): 94-108. Print.
- National Council of Teachers of English. *NCTE Position Statement: The NCTE Definition of 21st Century Literacies*. Web. Feb. 2008. <<http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/21stcentdefinition>>
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones. "Disciplinary Landscaping, or Contemporary Challenges in the History of Rhetoric." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 32.2 (2003): 148-167. Print.
- Star, Susan Leigh. "This is Not a Boundary Object: Reflections on the Origin of a Concept." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 35 (2010): 601-617. Print.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Made not only in Words: Composition in a New Key." *College Composition and Communication* 56.2 (2004): 297-328. Print.

Writing About Boys: Using the Feminist Method of Strategic Contemplation When Researching Male Subjects

Liz Rohan

In her preface to Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa Kirsch's recent book, *Feminist Rhetorical Practices*, Patricia Bizzell, who inspired many of us in 2000 by acknowledging "the role of emotion in feminist historiography" (10), claims that the feminist rhetorical practices and methods developed in the last three decades by composition and rhetoric scholars can be used to study subjects who aren't women and topics that aren't explicitly feminist (xii). Bizzell once again makes a timely claim as men's studies scholars express frustration that gender has not been used as a lens for studying men often enough, or at all. Two of these scholars argue specifically that "the ongoing quest for gender equity should be inclusive of [male subjects] and responsive to their challenges" (Harper and Harris 5).

To further the case that feminist methods can apply to the study of men, in this article I showcase methods Royster and Kirsch call "strategic contemplation" that I used when studying a set of archives compiled and left behind by male members of the same extended American family, the Prices. Royster and Kirsch associate strategic contemplation with self-reflexivity and the "inward journey" researchers take when aligning their identities as people with their topic as scholars, engaging meanwhile in the "outward journey" of the research process, collecting data. In this analysis that emphasizes synergy between theory and practice, I outline a specific case of strategic contemplation in the study of male subjects, while punctuating that the interpersonal work required of strategic contemplation (the inward journey) has epistemological functions. That is, as we sort our vantage point as scholars, we gain insights about how

certain subjects and their struggles reflect or are in conflict with our own values and identities. As a result, we can better theorize why our subjects and conflicts/struggles might matter to anyone else and ideally better craft our arguments and identify our audiences. As Royster and Kirsch put it, “[M]editative/contemplative moments, and naming them as such, enhance the possibility of recognizing the dynamic intersections between the fact of intellectual discovering and the experience of it as a credible strategy in the rhetorical act of knowledge creation” (87). When noting that over-identification with a research subject can circumvent critical analysis (78), Royster and Kirsch also claim that “identity plays a much larger role in research than we have considered at this point” (95). Indeed, while finishing a draft of the project using the Price family archives, I realized that significant experiences profoundly shaping my identity corresponded with the cultural conflicts experienced by my historical subject, and that my subject and I shared significant collective experiences as college students, if years apart. My research about a historical male subject might be framed as a feminist endeavor with an insight by feminist historian Kathryn Kish Sklar who claims, “One possible difference between a feminist work process and that of a nonfeminist biographer might be the degree to which a feminist biographer is willing to connect her work with the vulnerabilities and struggles associated with her own life” (32). With that directive, and to that end, in this essay I will show how the vulnerabilities of my own life have connected with those of my subject, John M. Price (1899-1976), whose work I studied while editing his diaries set in post-World War I America during the years he was in college at Denison University in Granville, Ohio. For the sake of clarity, and the fact that I discuss several “Prices,” I will be calling John Price, “John” or “John Price” throughout this piece.

John Price was the grandson of Thomas Price (1826-1900), the son of Enoch Price (1864-1945) and the nephew of Ira Price (1856-1939), all diarists whose volumes I studied as well. John was born in Chicago in a neighborhood known as Morgan Park where his father was a lawyer. His family also had an acre of land which they used to do some light farming, way ahead of the contemporary urban farming craze. An undergraduate at Denison University in Granville, Ohio from 1917 to 1921, John was a member of a fraternity, Phi Gamma Delta. John’s father Enoch, his mother, and several of his uncles attended Denison. Enoch, in fact, had

been a founding member of “Phi Gam.” The Price ancestral homestead was about 10 miles away from Granville, outside the city of Newark. John, like Enoch, his grandfather Thomas, and some of his uncles, was an avid diarist a bit after diary writing became more associated with women’s interests early in the twentieth century. In 1950 Price typed up his diaries, commented on them, and gave this archive to his son. Upon graduating from Denison in 1921, and after some vocational angst, he landed a job as an editor at the *New York Herald Tribune*, where he worked for his entire career. While he was well respected for his work, he also was looked upon suspiciously as a self-declared Communist during the McCarthy era. His retirement from the paper coincided with the paper’s folding. Some of his radical views as an older adult are foreshadowed by his rebellious spirit when a college student.

Prior to the epiphany about how conflicts shaping my personal identity corresponded with John’s historical experiences, I was perhaps armed with a better approach to scholarly inquiry and analysis from a cynical standpoint. I was objective. Or somewhat. I didn’t like John very much. Most of the time I was bringing part of his story to life by editing his diary, I was bored with him. Yes, like me, John liked to write and yes, like me, John kept a diary. But unlike me, John was, of course, male. And, John reveled in the kind of slackerdom that drives most college professors crazy. He tended to hand in all of his homework at once at the end of the semester, particularly in his English classes that were otherwise easy for him. As a result, and most significantly, during most of my data gathering stage, I didn’t take John very seriously as a subject who could teach *me* something. The treatment of our research subjects as just that, *subjects*, who can teach us something, instead of objects whose data we manipulate to prove a theory, or about whom we are so-called objective, might not be considered a feminist perspective, although Royster and Kirsch make connections between strategic contemplation and “[a]n ethics of hope and caring” (146).

Although I had been writing about feminist research design in the field of composition and rhetoric before and during my research with the Prices, and also with Gesa Kirsch was editing essays in *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process, a collection* which foregrounds feminist methods of scholarly inquiry for historical work as one of its themes, I was not ready to determine if and how feminist methods

might apply to the study of male subjects. However, I was somewhat unconsciously, if inevitably, applying the feminist methods I had learned to appreciate when studying women such as my dissertation subject, the missionary Janette Miller. Her lived experience had inspired my interest in mindful research about historical subjects whose perspectives are no longer considered mainstream or progressive. Inevitably and eventually, when studying male subjects, specifically the Prices, I could not help but employ facets of “strategic contemplation,” a method for which I previously did not have a name but for which I was developing a vocabulary in some of my research and when working on the production of *Beyond the Archives*. Prior to major discussions in our field, and discussions with Kirsch about the application of ethics to research about historical subjects, including the role of emotion in feminist research design, I had borrowed methods from feminist anthropology, and particularly from anthropologist Ruth Behar. In her 1996 book, Behar calls a researcher who ‘locates her self in her text’ a “vulnerable observer” (13). To make some interdisciplinary connections, one might claim that a “vulnerable observer” values “strategic contemplation” as a research method, and may or may not share her vulnerability in published reports. So, in this essay, I set up the reader to ideally understand a feminist move when writing about a male subject, John Price, characterized most specifically by the connections I eventually made between the particular cultural contexts shaping my life and his.

The Outward Journey of Strategic Contemplation

My outward journey for this project began shortly after I discovered a diary belonging to John’s father Enoch, when I also came across John’s diary and related materials. John’s brother Allen had donated their father’s diary to the Bentley Library at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor because it chronicles Enoch’s year of law school at the university during 1890-91. I happened to have read about Enoch’s diary in a March, 1971 issue of the University of Michigan-Dearborn student paper, *Ad Hoc*, as I was preparing for a discussion about college life in one of my introductory writing courses. From reading Enoch’s diary, which had just been donated to the Bentley library in 1971, the *Ad Hoc* writer learned that in the fall of 1890 a town and gown scuffle between a crowd

of students and the local Ann Arbor militia, a type of national guard, resulted in a freshman’s accidental death. The writer thought there might be similarities between this 1890 scuffle and the then recent violence at Kent State where several students died during a conflict with the national guard following a war protest.

When reading the 1971 article featuring information from Enoch’s diary, I was also planning a course on diaries. I had been writing about women’s diaries, but wanted to read some male diaries as well for some balanced perspective. As a newcomer to Ann Arbor, Enoch observed and wrote about the death of the young freshmen in October of 1890 with some logical alarm. Although Enoch plays the role of the stern breadwinner in his son John’s papers, he shows a tender side in the 1890-91 diary, which chronicles his decision to propose to his future wife Louise, his then correspondent, who lived with her parents in Dayton, Ohio. Enoch used the diary to emote about this commitment as he also pondered his future as a lawyer in Chicago. Despite the fact that Enoch reported a quintessential masculine event in his diary, a young man’s death by violence, he largely used his diary to write about his relationships with his fellow law students, his law professors, and Louise. Because writing about relationships is a function of diary writing that might be associated with women, I decided to write an article about Enoch’s diary in which I roughly make this argument.

Along with Enoch’s diary, which is actually a photocopy of the original diary, Allen also included a note that five of Enoch’s brothers, Ira, Silas, Milo, Orlo, and Homer, were all listed in a *America’s Who’s Who* directory, along with the citation and page number for this volume. I followed up on the reference to learn that all these men had gone to Denison University. All of them also had careers of distinction in higher education in the field of religion except for Homer who became dean of the agricultural college at Ohio State. *This must be some college*, I thought, as I planned a research trip to the university in Granville, Ohio.

My trip to Denison University to read more about the Price family after finding Enoch’s diary parallels, analogously, an excursion I undertook the summer of 2006, attempting to “run around Lake Minnetonka” when visiting my cousin Ann who lives in a Minneapolis suburb on this lake. Eyeballing the landscape and the houses across the lake from Ann’s house, I surmised that it would be about a six-mile run around it. Doable, for

an avid runner like myself, and, what the heck, it was a beautiful day and I was on vacation. Yet on my run I seemed to have taken a wrong turn. After about an hour and half on the road, when I failed to make any kind of circle, I realized I was lost, made my way up to a main road and told a man pumping gas at a gas station that I was trying to run around Lake Minnetonka. Could he help me?

Minnesotans are stoic people, which is probably why this man did not burst out laughing as he calmly set down the gas hose, led me into the gas station and pointed to a map of “Lake Minnetonka” behind the cash register, and in the grim manner of Scrooge’s ghost of Christmas future.

Lake? Lake Minnetonka is not a lake—it’s a *generation of lakes*, except that all of these lakes are Siamese twins, none of the lakes ever left home, just got married and kept pro-creating. As a result the “lake” on the map looks like a three year old and a drunken sailor tried to draw Lake Superior. I learned, from my next shot at getting directions later in this fun run turned marathon, with a different map and another stoic yet kindly stranger, that my cousin lived on a bay of this lake that has over 100 miles of shoreline. To put it analogously: Enoch’s diary was my 6-mile run. Finding out about where Enoch’s diary came from was like, well, seeing a map of Lake Minnetonka.

I was introduced to John’s college papers pretty early in my the process of discovering the Price family’s large and scattered archive during my first visit to the Denison University library. The archivist there Heather Lyle brought out what she had on Enoch, on his brother Ira, and also, since I “was interested in diaries,” John’s diary manuscripts. During a cursory sift through John’s diary as I meanwhile skimmed articles about Enoch, Ira, and the remarkable Price brother family of which they were members, I surmised immediately that John’s papers told a comprehensive story of college life and that the manuscript could interest general readers, particularly college students. At the time I was not thinking about how the manuscript would interest the male students in my classes particularly, but this would prove true. The manuscript, which, as mentioned, describes John’s four years as a college student at Denison from 1917 to 1921, includes all of his diary entries, letters to and from home to his parents and family members, correspondence with friends, particularly during the Great War, and other artifacts including tuition bills and report cards. John also annotated the diaries to define slang

terms, to identify people mentioned in diary entries and letters, and also to reflect on some of the events in the diary, presumably as he retyped and rearranged these artifacts from 1950 to 1962. As a longtime editor for the *New York Herald Tribune*, he obviously used his vocational skills when creating a comprehensive archive. Fortunately and unfortunately, Heather also showed me a finding aide of the Price family papers that are housed at the Ohio Historical Society in nearby Columbus and include more of Enoch’s papers, Ira’s papers, and their father Thomas’s papers, all within 20 boxes of documents. I learned then that Thomas kept a diary for fifty years. The universe was laughing at me, or was it *with* me? I had been looking for diaries by men and I had hit the jackpot. If Allen had been looking for a witness to his family’s passion for writing, and diary keeping in particular, when donating his father’s diary to the Bentley Library, he had found her.

Somewhere in between finishing up the research for the Enoch diary article and still vaguely planning to publish John’s diary manuscript even though I had only more or less skimmed it, I embarked on the enterprise of sifting through the Price family papers. It was a blur of going to Ohio and reading diaries, a process that was driven by passion, but not with a purpose that I would call strategic nor with any insight about how this project might parallel any ongoing and oft-studied conflicts I was working out in my inner life. These insights that I will describe, would come a few years later. My initial research on the Price family took place before editing *Beyond the Archives*, a process which garnered me more tools for understanding the role of “strategic contemplation,” a method for which, as mentioned, I hadn’t a name for yet but that I began to think about and apply in a non-linear fashion. That is, I wasn’t considering how feminist methods of research might apply to the study of men, but it was inevitable that how I had been learning to think about history, people, texts, gender, as well as self-reflection, was shaping my work in the archives. Hence, although I hadn’t yet engaged in much interpersonal work vis a vis the Price brothers’ texts and their contexts, I was relatively self-aware about my emotions as a researcher when conducting this preliminary research, even though these emotions had yet to add up to any insights I could use to significantly shape an argument about this research.

I read Thomas’s diaries—all fifty years’ worth—outlining his life as an apple farmer, Sunday school teacher, and father. He often wrote about

family life, the books he read, his accounts, and also about how he babysat for his wife on Sunday afternoons. I read about Thomas's grief when his son Asa died as a young man in college, and when using the college funding tactic he had founded, the perpetual fund, and for his perpetually arriving sons whose births he had dutifully and lovingly described in his diaries. I read Thomas's son Ira's diaries, where he described his journey to Germany—the country where two of his young children, Dudley and Mary, died within two weeks of each other of diphtheria. I read about Ira's journey back to the US with his wife Jennie, with their surviving children—Grace and Royal—and his work back in Morgan Park, the elite Chicago enclave where Enoch and Louise would soon move. I read about the birth of Ira's daughter Genevieve, his move from Morgan Park to the University of Chicago in Hyde Park, how he worked incredibly exhausting days as a teacher and scholar and then came home and nursed sick children. I read a diary his wife Jennie kept briefly in which she wrote, "Ira has too much to do." *That's an understatement.* I read about Jennie's breast cancer, how it came back, and how she died leaving Ira a lonely widower. I read the story of Jennie's life that Ira wrote as a memorial to her and made into a book. I read about Ira's incredible around-the-world lecture schedule and read with sadness when Ira returned home to a lonely house at Christmas in 1917. "Up early," he wrote, "but no prattle of children to break the silence, no shouts of joy, no surprises to gladden hearts—only the echoes of my own steps and as walks this flat's lonesomeness." He then wandered over to Enoch's house in Morgan Park. I read the history of Thomas Price's life that his son Allen wrote along with the commentary about this history between Enoch's three sons, Allen, Owen, and John. I also read one more of Enoch's diaries, written when he was establishing himself as a lawyer in Chicago and before he and Louise married. Unlike his father, brother, and son, Enoch was not that interested in everydayness as a diary topic. He wrote to figure things out. When he had finally gotten his life settled by going into business for himself with a loan from Ira, and had set a date for his wedding with Louise, more or less, he didn't need to write anymore.

I also figured out not necessarily what led Enoch and his brothers to be such overachievers, but what led them to use Denison University as their collective launching pads for their successful careers. As alluded to earlier, Thomas was responsible for his sons' educations in that he funded

Denison University, then Granville College, several miles from his farm in nearby Newark. In 1853 and 1854 Granville's trustees conceived of a creative way to raise funds for their new school and offered a "perpetual" scholarship to local Baptists and "friends of education in general," which set him up to sponsor a student financially throughout this student's lifetime (Ira Price). Neither Thomas nor Granville College fundraisers would guess that Thomas would have eight sons—no daughters. Eventually Thomas struck a deal with school administrators so that his scholarship endowment would be transferred towards free tuition at the school for all of his sons, five of whom graduated from Denison.

While using the Price family archives for research that was driven with a purpose, which at that point remained for the most part unknown to me, I was also coming down with a bad case of archive fever. Overwhelmed with all of the data that the Price family left behind, I did feel, however, the men's calling to me to bear witness to their lives, another purpose of research that Royster and Kirsch associate with feminist rhetorical methods, and particularly in the archives (140). But, aside from appreciating the small and large choices these men made while making their careers and rearing children, not to mention their compulsion to mediate their experiences through writing, what was the grand narrative and who would care? Carolyn Steedman describes archive fever as a hyper sense of responsibility to the dead that can never possibly be met, and which haunts the archivist after her day is done and she's alone in her hotel room:

You think: these people have left me *the lot*: each washboard and doormat purchased; saucepans, soup tureens, mirrors, newspapers, ounces of cinnamon and dozens of lemons; each ha' penny handed to a poor child. . . Everything. Not a purchase made, not a thing acquired that is not noted and recorded. You think: I could get to hate these people; and then: I can never do these people justice; and finally: I shall never *get it done*. (17-18)

After a day reading Thomas's accounts in the diaries he kept for fifty years, my archive fever was particularly severe as I tossed and turned in my hotel room bed, my brain attempting a synthesis of all the information I had absorbed. Its result is a mini-example of what can happen to us when we do research as embodied people, and witness others' lives, possibly

showcasing a positive result of archive fever, a facet of the “inward journey” of strategic contemplation which can be associated with feminist methods most explicitly as researchers acknowledge connections between their lives and others.’

Thomas’s accounts, as far as I could surmise as a relatively competent bookkeeper of my own accounts, told the story of a farmer with very good financial acumen. (In a written exchange between Thomas’s grandsons John, Owen, and Allen that I happened to read during a later trip to Columbus, these men made similar observations when they too read these diaries, noting that their father, Enoch, was also good with money as was his brother Ira. Also, Ira, it won’t surprise you to learn, considering he wrote a book about his wife’s life, also used his father Thomas’s diaries to write a publishable manuscript about him, a text from which I garnered the story of the perpetual scholarship.) While I wouldn’t go so far as to say that Thomas was talking to me from the grave, the night I pondered the contents of his diaries, and consequently his life, I was able to solve a pressing financial quandary in my own life. I had gotten a small sum of money that I hoped to use wisely and was also considering joining a rather expensive club with an indoor and outdoor pool which interested me as an avid swimmer. I figured the extra money could buoy me so to speak for about two and a half years worth of membership at the club, but then how would I afford it thereafter? So “Thomas,” through osmosis and the lessons I garnered from the diary records about his personal finance, pointed out that I could use the money to pay off my car which would free me up to pay the membership fees for a potentially longer period. That night I literally woke up with a start because of this loud thought: *Pay off your car!* Which I did. This Thomas-inspired economic strategy in fact worked for five years until my car got totaled in an accident, I got re-saddled with car payments, and had to quit the club.

Granville, Ohio, home to Denison University, is also itself a kind of archive. Civic leaders past and present have preserved and polished every nook and cranny of this quaint college town, which is now an affluent outburst of Columbus. There are plaques everywhere. And ghosts. Literally. A blue lady ghost haunts Granville’s Buxton Inn, a building that formerly housed women who attended one of Granville’s earliest women’s colleges. I happened to stay in this inn on, I am not kidding, Halloween. I hadn’t heard about the blue ghost at this point but I didn’t need to. I

had spent time with my share of Granville ghosts already. Having read more of the Price family archive, and having been haunted by several of the Prices whom I met on paper, I was beginning to think I would never get to edit John’s diaries. There was more to do, and so much to do. Why oh why did these Price people write so much? Why didn’t they throw anything away! And, why, for that matter did not the town of Granville? Even dead people were preserved at the Buxton Inn. My work interacting with this place reflects another dimension of strategic contemplation, using physical spaces to engage with deceased research subjects in *their* inevitable absentia, “attend[ing] to the places where past and present meet” (Royster and Kirsch 22), and which again is another way to engage emotionally with a subject through collective lived experience, a feminist value. Engaging with the built and natural environments where our subjects once dwelled intersects with both strategic contemplation methods and another method of self-reflection Royster and Kirsch introduce, “critical imagination,” which helps the researcher speculate about “what might be true” given what can be known or observed (71).

I had also tracked down and talked to John Price’s son, John Jr., who with his sister Emily, gave me copyright to the diary that’s in the Denison archives. With the copyright I could then bring a copy of the diary home, read it more thoroughly and, somewhat as a result, I began to teach portions of John Price’s diary in several different writing classes, which was an appropriate mini-result of my Price family research since I originally had gone to look at Enoch’s diary hoping to teach with it.

John’s diary manuscript has proven to be an important teaching resource for several reasons. First, young people rarely learn about history from the point of view of ordinary individuals. Secondly, I am able to show students, particularly novice students, the relationship between secondary and primary sources when they read portions of John’s diaries along with parts of historian Paula Fass’s book, *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*, which catalogues perspectives of young American high school and college students in the 1920s who shared John’s attitudes about scholastics. Contemporary students have been able to see how John’s values and choices were scripted for him. While he had been late with deadlines for school assignments, he met them relatively faithfully when working as a newspaper reporter and editor for the college paper the *Denisonian*, as a features editor for the

yearbook the *Adytum*, as a writer and editor for his fraternity newsletter the *Lambda Deuteron Fiji*, and as the editor of a college humor magazine that he helped to found, the *Flamingo*. Like many of his World War I era peers, John spent much of his time consorting with his peers, drinking, smoking, gambling and attending movies. A young man overly preoccupied with school work would easily be labeled a “grind” during this era (Fass 173), and would likely claim to be “getting by” on tests and other school-sponsored assessment. (Since Price used the phrase “getting by” several times in his diary to describe his studying habits, I eventually titled the manuscript of his edited diary and related documents, *Getting By*.)

Students learn that John’s behavior was pretty typical, and they, mostly the girls, are disgusted that John “bucked” classes nearly every week, spent his allowance on alcohol, lied to his parents, and, when a leader in his fraternity, took part in the hazing of pledges which required these pledges to hike back to campus fifteen miles unaided. Yet readers have admitted that John’s life did not follow popular scripts *exactly*. Upon closer examination, he was less of a slacker than it would appear. He read difficult books for fun, he even plowed through Milton’s *Paradise Lost* when it was assigned to him, and he took his work launching the *Flamingo* very seriously—this set of circumstances suggests that popular or dominant scripts about the past, or about a certain group of people, do not always tell the whole story. John was no “grind,” but he did care a lot about reading and writing. It could even be argued that with all his bravado and bucking, he was, in the era of the 1920s jock hero, a feminist type, considering his passion for indoor pursuits. Discussions inspired by John’s diary materials have encouraged students to be more self-reflective about how the values of *our* time shape our choices and concepts of self, the intersection of the perspective of self and “Other” being perhaps another feminist value. John’s interest in writing, and the many genres he used to chronicle his life at Denison University, has also helped these students consider the many genres they use to communicate and construct their identities, and how they use different kinds of writing and media given the audience. They have learned that habits and communication processes have histories and were not born yesterday. They have also learned why it’s important to withhold judgment about historical people whom they do not know, and about whom they lack

facts, just as they might resist prejudice when encountering people from a different, race, gender or nationality.

When talking to John’s children, John Jr. and Emily, I also learned that he wasn’t all that close to them. He worked nights when an editor as his children were growing up and later in his life he holed himself up in his home office typing his diaries, an endeavor that he undertook, ironically, so that his children could know him better. John also became estranged from his very Victorian parents, first because a short early marriage ended in divorce and later because of his extreme political views as an espoused Communist. John’s obnoxious behavior as a privileged subject chronicled in his college diary materials coupled with only a kind of posthumous vulnerability made it easier for me to use the diary as a resource. I wasn’t all that worried what readers would say or think about John, which made class discussions about the diary more generative than they might have if I was teaching with a beloved heirloom. As a scholar concerned very much with ethics when it comes even to historical subjects, I essentially let my guard down.

The scholastic value of teaching the diary in these several classes influenced a final decision I made when studying the Prices once again in Granville, this time at the Granville Historical Society. When a search for article in the *Granville Times* about the Price family rendered around 10,000 hits, I decided that I would honor the values and pursuits of the Price family on the whole, including Thomas and Ira, by editing and seeking publication of John Price’s Denison University diary collection. Although John was not much like his father, uncle, and grandfather whose stories have their own rich contexts, I decided that John’s lifestyle, and the texts he produced, reflected in part many of the values of his forefathers, particularly the use of writing to mediate experience. Furthermore, John’s texts better translate these values to contemporary audiences as a more modern subject. As it turned out, my knowledge of the Price family history made for a more nuanced analysis of John’s materials when I developed some scholarly framing about it, and beyond this article.

In the midst of making this decision to commence editing John’s diary, I also discovered another very important archive: the Ridge Historical Society in Morgan Park, located in the Chicago neighborhood where John grew up and where Ira once lived before the Morgan Park Baptist

Theological Seminary merged with the University of Chicago and Ira moved to Hyde Park. John's brother Owen bought the Morgan Park family homestead from Enoch and Louise, and it might not surprise readers that Owen had a hand in founding this historical society which keeps its archives in a large house on the "ridge," a ridge which used to be a bank of Lake Michigan long, long ago. Yes, more history. The neighborhood of Morgan Park, like Granville, is another incredibly pleasant place to visit, even if it's a bit more rough around the edges than Granville, more citified. If Granville is a Republican, Morgan Park is a Democrat. This south side neighborhood is nowhere near my friends and relatives who live on the north side of Chicago. The Ridge Historical Society might as well be my summer home by the time I get across town to see these friends and family members, and where I stay. But visiting Morgan Park makes me want to quit my job and spend the rest of my life walking around its bucolic streets thinking about its houses and its past. I understand then why the people who run the Ridge Historical Society are so passionate about the place and its history where, remarkably, Enoch Price is still a celebrity. When Morgan Park was still a village Enoch was its attorney and fought for "home rule." The village was invariably swallowed up, or annexed, by the ever encroaching city of Chicago in 1916 and "home rulers" wanted Morgan Park to remain a separate municipality. Enoch, who might have seen the merger as inevitable, made sure that the village had a high school before Morgan Park was officially annexed by Chicago. The Ridge Historical Society houses, not surprisingly, more of the Price family papers including John's high school diaries.

Strategic contemplation was somewhat built into my method for editing the diary, in that I spent some time with the materials before I made judgments about their meaning, even if this process meant more work. John technically had done a lot of this work for me, by transcribing his diaries and letters, but these typed pages are for the most part not scannable, so I had to retype them. The other problem: there is just too much material. I doubt the average reader would stay engaged with a 500-600 page manuscript that took me, an interested reader, a week to slog through. So I spent about three months retyping the entire manuscript, cutting only a few items from the original. I did most of my editing after I had retyped the entire manuscript, and to ensure that I hadn't carelessly

or ignorantly removed a key detail, which would come in handy when cutting more systematically to highlight or foreground narrative themes or threads. When doing so, retyping the diaries, I therefore reenacted Price's process as an editor who had also transcribed the same work.

Strategic Contemplation: The Inward Journey

Strangely, it wasn't until I had finished typing the manuscript that I became curious or even really knew what John looked like as a young man. I had so much work to do putting the diary in context that I didn't have a chance to look through Denison University yearbooks, having approached the project more or less as a "grind," pursuing results and not pleasure from a scholarly enterprise, aside from my "vacations" in Granville, Columbus and Morgan Park. Had I not been able to fully transcribe the manuscript, there would *be no project* and maybe therefore it was hard for me to enjoy it too much. When I did have a chance to look at these yearbooks during a visit to Granville in August 2009, the project really came alive for me. I engaged more fully in the process of "strategic contemplation" as it can be coordinated with a researcher's "critical imagination," particularly when place stands in for deceased subjects and as researchers use some admitted admiration for their historical subjects, and across time, to make connections that might be regarded as more emotional than scholarly. As I have mentioned, I hope to demonstrate how these emotional connections can actually be useful for meaning making.

Having essentially lived with John Price's collection for several months, I knew the cast of characters featured in the yearbooks—students and teachers alike. I also had the chance to visit John's former fraternity house, the old Phi Gamma House, which is now the Downers-Robbins museum on Granville's main drag. Truth is stranger than fiction. The eccentric former owner, who eventually donated the Greek revival style house to a foundation, had bought the house after the fraternity houses were moved up the campus hill, and built a few additions onto to the back of the house. These additions include a shrine to the nineteenth-century radical feminist Victoria Woodhull, one of the first woman stockbrokers who also ran for president in 1872. I thought John would have appreciated the Woodhull shrine amidst the stodgy historical plaques in conservative and tidy Granville.

I also use photography as a research method. Photos help me remember where I've been and the act of recording through the camera enacts the combined role of intimate witness and detached critical observer when a researcher of historical materials. Photography also helps me hone my "critical imagination," when the material world stands in for my subject who cannot entirely be known. In other research trips to Ohio I had taken photographs of the land and site of the Price family's previous apple orchard, buildings in the town of Granville, the town square in nearby Newark, and the cemetery where John's grandparents are buried.

Armed with photographs from the yearbook, and those supplied for me by Heather, I walked the campus that last August night in Granville, attempting to transport myself back to John's world. Having fully engaged with the history of the campus via John's texts, I was able to get a better lay of the land, particularly the division between the part of campus where female students lived, and the rest of the campus and town where male students were free to live wherever they could find an affordable room. I assessed the proximity of the Phi Gamma Delta house to the women's dorms—about a half mile—deleting, in my imagination, the newer dorms and athletic fields.

While transporting myself back in time with my visual aides on location, I was thinking about the gender divisions set up by the built environment, along with cultural codes, during John's time at Denison. Customary at colleges across the nation, female college students at Denison had strict curfews when they lived in the "Sem," nicknamed for the original female college, the Granville Ladies Seminary, which was a set of dorms—Stone Hall, Burton Hall, and a few cottages. Some of these original buildings still stand at the bottom of a hill, the campus's main topographical setting. The top of Denison's hill was and still is home to the Observatory and the President's house, which I also photographed. Not only could male students live wherever they wanted, they were free to come and go from their residences as they pleased. But young women living in the Sem were not. Even by 1921, young men and women had to "scheme" in order to hang out together. A "schemer" was someone who organized a date not authorized by elders (Chessman 286). A schemer who got caught risked getting "campused." An especially ambitious scheme could result in "campusing" the entire "Sem."

The last of my photographs of the "old" Denison needed to be undertaken in intervals because the battery in my digital camera, which apparently was on its last leg, kept having to be recharged. *Grr*. So I had to walk up the hill to the old campus a few times. Anyone walking up this very steep hill to the dorms and buildings on Denison's campus has immediate solidarity with every Denison student, staff member and faculty member since the beginning of time. Surely none of these people can possibly be overweight. Walking up this hill must burn like 8,000 calories and if you've eaten lunch shortly before your trip up the hill you're ready for dinner by the time you've gotten to the top. At this point, I was actually was experiencing a growing solidarity with John Price himself who, as mentioned, I didn't always like and often was bored with. As I stood at the top of the hill, with time at last to smell the roses—or in this case sit down for a minute—I was thinking about what happens when you spend a lot of time with someone, like say four years of your life, and theirs, albeit not in the same lifetime.

My subconscious or even reluctant bonding with John had actually begun a bit sooner than that August evening when a few months earlier I had completed Nicholas Syrett's book, *The Company He Keeps*, a historical account of the white male collegiate fraternity system in America. The book helped me to sort out the Price family genealogy in context with the burgeoning college Greek system in America. Although Thomas had not been to college, Thomas's involvement with the Granville area literary society paralleled the founding and function of literary societies in American colleges. Fraternities morphed from these societies, as did the Denison chapter of Phi Gamma Delta co-founded by Enoch.

I brought my own context to Syrett's historical analysis that takes readers to the present. I had also been in the Greek system in college and felt restricted by the gender roles assigned to me, which stifled me and my cohorts from informal interaction with male friends whom we were to presumably only interact with when on a "date" in order to pursue an MRS Degree, circa 1958. The days I spent in my sorority house were among the worst of my life. I had been extremely puzzled and hurt by one fraternity man in particular, whom I call Lloyd, and I spent nearly a decade healing from the wounds of his treatment of me when he was also under the influence of "the system" during our four years of college. After reading Syrett's book, and studying the history of American men's college

experience, I could understand that Lloyd, a straight A student, was a type of “grind” at heart who was otherwise pressured to fulfill a prescribed masculine identity marked by rebellion and promiscuity. In the end of his comprehensive analysis of white fraternities, Syrett is quite condemnatory of the behavior and scripts promoted by white fraternities in America, asserting, “The story of fraternities, then, is the story of the men who have most relied upon their whiteness, their maleness, their class status, and their heterosexuality to assure their continued prestige and power” (305). Lloyd indeed had a degree of power over me because of his privileges as an upper middle-class male, and a member of a fraternity who was lauded for his sexual risk taking. Yet his uneven behavior toward me, which at times revealed some cracks in his powerful armor, was likely symptomatic of another kind of ambivalence about the rigid gender roles prescribed to us that made the years I spent in a sorority house so miserable.

Lloyd’s antics, which included romantic liaisons with my sorority sister whom I call Betty, so upset me that at one point I began calling my sorority house “jail.” It took nearly twenty years to consider that Lloyd might have felt trapped while carrying out this drama, too. Sleeping at a sorority house (which was against the rules for men), might have earned Lloyd a badge of honor within his circle, as it did for Betty when hostessing him. But how pleasant could his stay have been? Lloyd couldn’t go to the bathroom on the second floor of the house and he also had to sneak in and out of it. Syrett’s study made me consider, and in a sympathetic way, that Lloyd had struggled, too, in this system. I had also used my diaries when in college to describe this drama starring Lloyd, and reread these diaries over the years to better understand it. Syrett’s book was also published the same month I had finished typing the Price diary. So by coincidence, or grand design, it wasn’t until I was completely done typing up John’s documents that the project became consciously personal for me, and feminist, if following Sklar’s definition of a feminist biographer. My meaning making about John’s life was made in conjunction with insights about my own. More precisely, John Price’s story, and its larger context with the history of the American college Greek system, helped me to be more aware and astute about the scripts shaping my life and those close to me—the exact kind of exercises that I had encouraged my students to engage in when reading John’s diary and related materials in my writing classes.

I could see that both Price and Lloyd struggled to certain degrees as members of the Greek system, but also living in a longstanding part of society that sociologist Michael Kimmell calls, “Guyland.” Here, young men’s behavior can be shaped by a set of codes that might lead them to act against their own interests and, in the process, cause damage to those close to or around them. As Kimmell puts it, “These ‘almost men’ struggle to live up to a definition of masculinity they feel they had no part in creating, and yet from which they feel powerless to escape” (9). When categorizing John and Lloyd as ‘almost men,’ collectively, I could better interpret their motivations and be more sympathetic towards them as subjects. John’s historical college life years and Lloyd’s more recent college life years also bookmark the heyday of the “Animal House” culture within the college Greek system. John was a fraternity member as the college Greek system as we know it expanded when images of the college Greek life became iconic symbols of college culture in the mass media, and when fraternity culture became associated with sexual conquest and exploitation (Syrett 227-228). Partly in response to date rape and alcohol related deaths in fraternity houses, and perhaps as a byproduct of a culture less tolerant of sexism, Lloyd’s fraternity is now one among many that went dry by 2000 (Denizet-Louis, Nixon).

Before beginning the leg work of editing John Price’s diary and letters I also decided I needed to write something “for myself,” and had I put together what writer Dave Eggers might call a “memoir-y kind of thing” (n. page), which happened to entail editing my college diaries and writing essays to introduce their contexts. My goal was to better figure out why I was so hurt and damaged by *my* frat boy relations with Lloyd and why, in the end, I hadn’t enjoyed college life. With a kind of eye on publishing this memoir, I wrote it for a general audience and circulated it to friends to see if what I had to say made any sense. When writing my memoir, and editing my college diaries, I came to the conclusion that I was not able to function healthily with the identity of a sorority girl. Since I was in an elite sorority, this identity was particularly rigidly prescribed. As one scholar of college Greek life has observed, “The elite groups [of the Greek system] have far less freedom to deviate from assigned gender roles and embrace a more traditional conception of masculinity and femininity” (DeSantis 39). It might seem fairly obvious in retrospect, but it had only dawned on me that summer of 2009, how my personal memoir project,

which included editing my diary, was part of a larger enterprise of writing and scholarship which *included* writing about John Price and putting his life into context. What's more, I used some techniques editing John's diary that were inspired by the discoveries I made when editing my own diaries, such as cutting some details to create more narrative tension and limiting narratives threads when imagining a general reader. French scholar Alice Kaplan came to similar conclusions about the value of writing memoir in conjunction with more formal scholarship, a method that might seem to many a lot of work but which might be regarded as a feminist enterprise. The interests shaping her dissertation, which became a book, and her second scholarly book, *The Collaborator*, about a World War II era fascist, Robert Brasillach, were linked to her personal identity, which she describes in her memoir *French Lessons*. Kaplan's father was a lawyer for the Nuremberg trials before his untimely death that led her to France as an escape from a sad house in mourning. When completing a portion of *The Collaborator*, she realized "that [she] was at the end of a trilogy" ("An Interview"). Kaplan's memoir was a scaffold to a scholarly project, in the same way that my memoir featuring Lloyd was a scaffold to my writing about John Price.

Studying the lives of dead people, as it turns out, isn't that much different than trying to figure out our own lives—we don't always fully understand how the many episodes and conflicts in our life add up to a main idea, and even with the help of an expensive therapist, friendly readers, or, in the case of me *and* John Price, a lot of typing and the gift of hindsight. However, during my last minute bonding with John on the hill that August evening as I assessed the logistical constraints of time and destiny that prohibited a forty-one-year-old female college professor from being friends with a twenty-year-old college student, who was on the other hand one hundred ten, I first realized that from a college professor's perspective, John's "getting by" certainly got really old, but from a fellow diarist's perspective, well, I actually got John Price. I had a lot in common with him and he was actually a kindred spirit when considering our collective interest in mediating experience through diary writing, and perhaps to a fault on each of our ends. I considered our nebulous meeting of the minds, if inevitably one sided, since John was dead. Maybe it was no accident that John was not around the day someone figured out what made him tick and perhaps this is how he'd want it or was the only way

he knew. After all, the cultural scripts in John's collegiate life kept him separated from those whom he also had much in common with when alive, such as his fellow female students. Later in his life he was separated psychologically from his parents, and, ultimately, his children. As it turned out he did elicit witnesses to his life, but probably not the ones he imagined when he typed up his diaries. And so my new project, writing about John Price, became fused at last consciously with a longtime project of mine for which I which I knew and cared entirely too much about, but had yet to adopt for scholarly purposes: writing about boys.

Conclusion: Why John Price's Story Matters and the Usefulness of Strategic Contemplation

Arguably, my identity as a diarist drew me to the work of the Price family while my identity as a former member of the college Greek system helped me to make some meaning of John Price's diary materials more specifically. Sorting out some of my longtime interpersonal conflicts helped me better see my subject and my subject helped me better see myself. Having completed my memoir and the editing of John Price's diary, I feel free of the past and its hold on me, a freedom which was enabled foremost by recognizing not only my own vulnerability but that of my subject(s), too—John Price and Lloyd. The legacy of gendered identities among college students also remains a problem for all of us to address. Authors of a recent study of contemporary college men, for example, describe how their subjects have felt beholden to the script of a college man who crams as much partying as he can into four years. Studying and preparing for the future is not considered masculine for these college students, as was the case for John Price nearly 100 years ago (Edwards and Jones). My story and John Price's story belong not just to the two of us; they belong also to a collection of stories that continue to be lived, and continue to be problematic.

Kirsch and Royster encourage researchers to come "out of the shadows" (86) to describe their inward and outward journeys that characterize their research processes, and "call for greater attention to lived, embodied experience because [they] consider it to be a powerful yet often-neglected source of insight, inspiration, and passion" (22). These scholars also, of course, call for rigor among researchers. Researchers need to work hard, and dig deeply, to best identify and articulate how

their personal identities can be sources for knowledge creation. Behar makes similar claims, and asserts, “It is far from easy to locate oneself in one’s text” (13). When writing about the Prices, I certainly was not quick to identify with them, mostly because I couldn’t or wasn’t ready to, and not just because these subjects were men.

Certainly there will be naysayers who will consider any acknowledgment of personal investment in a research subject, or the sharing of personal information in scholarly reports, not to mention writing about boys in diaries, as a form of self-absorption or naval gazing. These readers are trained to “not care” that I got lost running around Lake Minnetonka, that there is a blue lady haunting the Buxton Inn, that Thomas Price helped me afford a swim club or that Lloyd couldn’t go to the bathroom in a sorority house in 1988. These readers just want “the data.” But these readers might consider historian Susan Crane’s argument that the story of history doesn’t necessarily exist outside of individuals because we all share a collective memory. As she puts it, “Historians are always ‘from’ not only their own pasts but also the pasts that they write, insofar as they work on that past in their own lives. Therefore, it is not necessary to strictly segregate the genres of autobiography and history” (1384). Royster and Kirsch also address the influence of collective memory in relationship with strategic contemplation. They claim that the awareness of colliding or conflicting histories between a researcher and her subject, which comes with strategic contemplation, “enhances a researcher’s capacity to ground the analysis within the communities from which it emanates” (86). To apply these concepts to my own inward journey: I was better able to consider John Price as a subject to be taken seriously when I ascertained how our individual lives have intersected with a larger history or collective experience of gendered tensions and divisions among college students, and college students in the American Greek college system in particular. This collective experience included Lloyd’s, and Lloyd is a subject with whom I also struggled to bond with, but needed to, in order to forgive him.

Feminist scholar, Daphne Patai might be the quintessential skeptic of academic memoir when declaring that “academics have reached new heights in the self-important pretense that the world’s ills can be set right merely by making personal disclosures” (A52). Patai’s perspective about scholarly memoir is likely neither exceptional nor outdated. At the

very least, perhaps, and as one answer to the skeptics, the scaffolding of memoir to scholarly projects might be one method for getting novice scholars to engage, and with primary sources particularly. My students align personal experience with primary and secondary sources quite naturally when engaging with John’s materials, while they also consider their own identities as college students and the legacy, as part of the collective, that they may or may not have inevitably inherited. My limited experience in the classroom using John’s diary suggests more opportunities for training young people, and even particularly young men, the value of emotional identification with research subjects that feminist researchers have come to find useful for meaning making. Royster and Kirsch also advocate critical imagination and strategic contemplation as productive classroom methods. Royster, for example, encourages her students to consider scholarly study as ‘a whole body experience’ (97). Finally, and to come back most specifically to my introductory argument, extending feminist research methods so that they might be used to measure scholarship for which men or non-feminist topics are subjects, does seem a logical extension of any productive feminist enterprise with the aims of nurture and inclusion and when considering that collective experience and memory includes actors of each gender. Including men as subjects for feminist projects does not necessarily entail getting our subjects off the hook for poor behavior, but rather acknowledges them as members of our stories, too.

Works Cited

- Ad Hoc*. University of Michigan-Dearborn. March 1971. Print.
- “An Interview with Alice Kaplan.” *The University of Chicago Press*. Web. 25 May 2012.
- Behar, Ruth. *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology That Breaks Your Heart*. Boston: Beacon P, 1996. Print.
- Bizzell, Patricia. “Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric: What Difference Do They Make?” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30.4 (Fall 2000): 5-17. Print.
- . “Foreword.” *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012. ix-xii. Print.

- Chessman, Wallace. *Denison: The Story of an Ohio College*. Granville: Denison University, 1957. Print.
- Crane, Susan A. "Writing the Individual Back into Collective Memory." *American Historical Review* 102.5 (December 1997): 1372-1385. Print.
- Denizet-Lewis, Benoit. "Ban of Brothers." *New York Times*. 9 January, 2005. Web. June 12, 2013.
- DeSantis, Alan D. *Inside Greek U: Fraternities, Sororities, and the Pursuit of Pleasure, Power and Prestige*. Lexington: The UP of Kentucky, 2007. Print.
- Edwards, Keith E., and Susan R. Jones. "Putting My Man Face On": A Grounded Theory of College Men's Gender Identity Development." *Journal of College Student Development* 50.2 (March/April 2009): 210-28. Print.
- Eggers, Dave. *A Heartbreaking Work of Staggering Genius*. New York: Vintage Books, 2000. Print.
- Fass, Paula S. *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977. Print.
- Harper, Shaun R., and Frank Harris III. "Beyond the Model Gender Majority Myth: Responding Equitably to the Development Needs and Challenges of College Men." *College Men and Masculinities*. Ed. Shaun Harper and Rank Harris III. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. 1-16. Print.
- Kaplan, Alice. *The Collaborator: The Trial and Execution of Robert Brasillach*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000. Print.
- . *French Lessons: A Memoir*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1993. Print.
- Kimmel, Michael. *Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2009. Print.
- Kirsch, Gesa E., and Liz Rohan, eds. *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2008. Print.
- Patai, Daphne. "Sick and Tired of Scholars' Nouveau Solopsism." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 23 Feb. 1994. A52. Print.
- Nixon, Jacquelyn. "More Greek Houses Go Dry." *The Michigan Daily*. 2 February, 2011. Web. June 12, 2013.
- Price, Enoch. Diaries. 1890-1891. MS. Enoch Jones Price Papers. Bentley Historical Lib., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- . Diaries. MS. Welsh Hills (Licking Co.) Price and Related Families Genealogical and Biographical Collection 1801-1974. Box 15. Ohio Historical Society, Columbus.
- Price, Ira. Diaries. M. Welsh Hills (Licking Co.) Price and Related Families Genealogical and Biographical Collection 1801-1974. Box 30. Ohio Historical Society, Columbus.
- . "Price, Thomas Davis." MS. Welsh Hills (Licking Co.) Price and Related Families Genealogical and Biographical Collection 1801-1974. Box 2, Folder 1. Ohio Historical Society, Columbus.
- Price, Jennie (Mrs. Ira). Diaries. 1901. MS. Welsh Hills (Licking Co.) Price and Related Families Genealogical and Biographical Collection 1801-1974. Box 3. Ohio Historical Society, Columbus.
- Price, John. Diaries. 1917-1921. TS. The College Diaries. Letters, etc. of John M. Price, Class of 1921. Denison University Archives, Granville.
- Price, John, Owen Price, and Allen Price. Letters. Welsh Hills (Licking Co.) Price and Related Families Genealogical and Biographical Collection 1801-1974. Ohio Historical Society, Columbus.
- Price, Thomas Davis. Diaries. MS. Welsh Hills (Licking Co.) Price and Related Families Genealogical and Biographical Collection 1801-1974. Boxes 6-8. Ohio Historical Society, Columbus.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones, and Gesa E. Kirsch. *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition and Literacy Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012. Print.
- Sklar, Katherine Kish. "Coming to Terms with Florence Kelly: The Take of a Reluctant Biographer." *The Challenge of Feminist Biography*. Ed. Sarah Alpern, Joyce Antler, Elisabeth Israels Perry, and Ingrid Winther Scobie. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992. 17-33. Print.
- Syrett, Nicholas L. *The Company He Keeps: a History of White College Fraternities*. Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 2009. Print.
- Steedman, Carolyn. *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2002. Print.

About the Author

Liz Rohan is an Associate Professor of Composition and Rhetoric at the University of Michigan-Dearborn. With Gesa Kirsch she is the editor of *Beyond the Archives: Research as Lived Process* (Southern Illinois Press, 2008). Her research that reflects her ongoing interests in pedagogy, feminist research methods and America's progressive era have appeared in journals such as *Rhetoric Review*, *Composition Studies*, *Pedagogy*, *JAEPL*, *Reflections*, and also in several book chapters. Some of the data she collected as part of her research on the Price family will appear in an article forthcoming in the next issue of *Composition Studies*.

Frances Power Cobbe's Stranger-Guest Rhetorics in "Life in Donegal"

Kelly Cameron

Weary men, what reap ye?—Golden corn for the stranger.
What sow ye?—Human corpses that wait for the avenger.
Fainting forms, hunger-stricken, what see you in the offing?
Stately ships to bear our food away, amid the stranger's scoffing.
From "The Famine Year," by "Esperanza," Lady Jane Wilde, 1864

The sophists' rejection of transcendent truths and eternal values, their ability to move a popular audience with a range of rhetorical techniques, their interest in social exigencies: all formed a dark "shadow" of timeless Platonic idealism and the frozen perfection of Aristotelian logic. There is much about the well-known lore of their historical existence which contributes to the impression of "otherness." They were all aliens, stranger-guests to Athens, who impressed its citizens with their expertise as diplomats, teachers, and performers. But they could be victims of fickle public opinion.

From *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*, by Susan Jarratt

In the Oct. 20, 1866 issue of the London-based periodical *Once a Week*, Frances Power Cobbe published "Life in Donegal," which recounts a year Cobbe spent in the then isolated region still known for its natural wildness, an essay that drew upon her life in Ireland to support her belief that the country was not fit to govern itself. Cobbe was an activist writer who was positioned at the intersection of several ongoing conversations about gender, race, and class in the periodical press during the mid-to-late nineteenth-century. She was born in Dublin on December 4, 1822,

near her family's estate, and died on April 4, 1904 in Hengwrt, Wales, in a house on the family estate of her "special woman friend" Mary Lloyd (qtd. in Mitchell 351). During her lifetime, she had been the pampered only daughter of an Anglo-Irish landowner, the household manager of her family's estate, the self-described "exile" from her father's home after a bout of religious apostasy, and the young woman who voyaged out from her home as an independent traveler of the world. As a writer, she was the young, anonymous author of an ambitious theological work, *Intuitive Morals*, which most reviewers assumed was written by a clergyman (Mitchell 79). She was a journalist and essayist in London's busy print culture, writing on topics that ranged from women's suffrage to the American abolitionist movement. Throughout her professional life and well into her retirement, Cobbe actively campaigned for women's equal treatment under the law, most notably in her journalism in support of the Married Women's Property Act of 1870 and the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1878. The only cause that competed with women's emancipation for the bulk of the animal-loving Cobbe's energies was anti-vivisectionism.

Late in the year 1848, 26-year-old Cobbe left what she considered the relative civilization of her father's estate outside of Dublin (relative to London, the center of British imperial culture) for a year's stay at her brother's estate just outside of the town of Donegal. Cobbe's year-long sojourn was productive to her self-fashioning as a rhetor, as it informed her later writing on Ireland, evidenced most directly in "Life in Donegal." This rhetorical moment—encompassing Cobbe's lived experience of Ireland and her written construction of that experience—provides important evidence of Cobbe's perception of herself as a woman writer and thinker, which played an important role in her rhetorical strategies. In this article, I am specifically interested in how Cobbe constructed an identity based on her experiences as an Irish woman of high status without clearly identifying herself as such within the text: this evasive self-construction was her strategy for making her appeals about Ireland's place within the British empire persuasive to her mostly English audience.

Cobbe died over 100 years ago and is largely unfamiliar to American audiences, so where should we position her within the wide landscape of women's rhetorics? In a keynote address of the 2011 Feminisms and Rhetorics conference, Eileen E. Schell called for scholars not only to reclaim and refigure past women rhetors but also to reposition the field(s)

of women's rhetorics in relation to the rest of the world, to practice methodologies that considered women's rhetorics geopolitically and not just nationally. Schell argued that our focus on American women—and in some cases, Western European women—has caused us to ignore the transnational networks of women's texts and oral communication. Schell's call was revisited and expanded during the 2013 Feminisms and Rhetorics conference, Gesa Kirsch and Jacqueline Jones Royster invited scholars to engage with women's rhetorics on a global scale by broadening our perspectives to include women communicating in multiple transnational contexts. Cobbe's journalism on Ireland is a productive means of widening our scope of research while raising questions about how power complicates women's rhetorical agency within global and transnational networks.

In this article, I focus on a woman who was Western European and privileged, yet her complicated national identity as an Anglo-Irish woman forces us to interrogate established categorizations of race, nationality, and status. Cobbe lived a hyphenated identity. She was of upper-class English stock but lived in Ireland the first half of her life, where her patrician father was a devout evangelical Anglican, but the women who did the daily work involved in caring for his children were mostly Catholic Irish; her status would have enabled a life where she did little or no visible labor, yet her paid journalism appeared in periodicals across Great Britain and America; she did not marry a man and bear children, thus fulfilling her role as "big house daughter"¹ by replicating the gentry class, but lived in a partnership that she termed a "marriage" with a Welsh gentry woman. This partnership bore many markers of upper-class respectability. Most importantly for this article, Cobbe performed variations of this hyphenated identity within the periodical press.

The conflation of the physical space of Ireland and figurative space of the periodical becomes the rhetorical space from which Cobbe makes her arguments. Her action not only replicates larger imperialist actions that maintains English control over Ireland, but also maintained a metaphorical place for women for women to stand and speak on behalf of their own interests. Travel writing, by its very nature, examines how a subject moves through a specific space and how that subject presents

¹See Margot Backus's *The Gothic Family Romance: Heterosexuality and Child Sacrifice in the Anglo-Irish Colonial Order*.

her experiences in written form, suggesting that it is the navigation, the movement, through rhetorical spaces that creates rhetorical identity, as identity in discourse is not created until the author responds to the pressures of the rhetorical space.

This article focuses on the concept of rhetorical space and its intersection with place, the geographical *and* imagined Ireland, given that Ireland is a place that exists and a place created in discourse. Travel writing allows us to look even more closely at the concept of how rhetorical space impacts the self-fashioning of a woman rhetor. Both pieces feature many of the conventions of travel-writing, a hybridic genre that often could just as easily be classified as autobiography while embracing all manner of scholarly inquiry, including the social sciences, history, and art (Kinsley 73). Travel writing is "nonfictional," though novels that fictionalized an author's travel experiences are often included as examples of the genre (Kinsley 10). The travelogue appeared mostly in guidebook, narrative, or epistolary formats, but its hybridic nature allowed a movement between the three types (Kinsley 38-39). Like many British travelogues, Cobbe's "Life in Donegal" also took special interest in social science, art, and history. It also illustrates the hybridity and flexibility of the travel-writing genre, as it was published in periodical format.

Cobbe's travel did not mark her as absolutely exceptional among Victorian upper-and-middle class women. After all, evidence of British women's travel writing began appearing in the eighteenth century, when Lady Mary Wortley Montagu circulated her *Letters* detailing her experiences in Constantinople where she traveled with her husband, ambassador to Turkey, well over a century before Cobbe began her writing career (Bassnett 229). However, as Susan Bassnett points out, "In an age when relatively few people travelled at all, the idea of a woman traveller was something of a novelty" (229). Some women writers chose to capitalize on this novelty when it came to fashioning their narrative selves, while others did not (Bassnett 229). Cobbe seemed to find it more rhetorically effective to *not* emphasize her uniqueness as a female traveler. Instead, she emphasized her experiences of Ireland without specifically referencing her gender.

Cobbe used her experiences of Ireland as a means of making imperialist arguments, arguments that would need to be delivered in a

vessel her audience would find credible, informative, and entertaining. Dana Anderson's book, *Identity's Strategy*, describes how rhetors construct selves in language that are persuasive in different contexts. Through Anderson, Kenneth Burke's theories about persuasion and identity become a clear and coherent means of examining how rhetors construct selves within language that are designed to persuade, which Anderson describes as "the rhetorical strategy of *identity*, the influencing of others through the articulation of our sense of *who we are*" (4, emphasis in original). To Anderson, identity is always contextual, and is not merely biographical, but a rhetorical construction:

One way of viewing identity rhetorically ... is to view it as a kind of persuasive strategy, as a means of moving audiences toward certain beliefs or actions. ... Identity matters less as something that one "is" and more as something that one *does* in language; or, more exactly, identity matters as something that one does to an audience through the expression of who or what one is. (4, emphasis in original)

The question that continues to guide my study is how did Cobbe fashion a self that could speak with authority about Ireland without rooting herself too firmly in the relatively powerless position of being an Irish woman? One answer to that question lies in her self-construction as a "stranger-guest," a strategy that relied upon a certain unfixity in positionality that enabled Cobbe to move freely between spheres, English and Irish, public and domestic, male and female.

Travel writing intersects in productive ways with Susan Jarratt's feminist reconceptualization of sophistic rhetoric, providing a new means of imagining women rhetors navigating the physical and conceptual spaces of the nineteenth century, which enables us to see how Cobbe fits, and expands, our definition of a Victorian woman rhetor. I pay special attention to "distancing strategies," which Sara Mills defines as women speaking about "unfeminine" topics by de-emphasizing themselves as the source of the information; one example of a distancing strategy would be the quotation of letters to relay controversial information (82). Cobbe's distancing strategy was the use of the genre conventions of travel writing, which she used to build a rational, objective identity, one that would create an ethos of credibility on the subject of Ireland. In order to distance

herself from the irrationality and sentimentality attributed to Irish and women's rhetorical performances, Cobbe adapted a style of travel writing that allowed her to move through the discursive space of *Once a Week* by constructing herself as a neutral, impartial "stranger-guest."

The periodical functioned as a third space between the material and the conceptual, and travel writing's place in the periodical culture illustrates how women navigated this terrain. It is also a midpoint between the privacy of the domestic sphere and the exposure of the public sphere, where women could enter into societal debates without transgressing cultural taboos about women speaking publicly to mixed audiences. A periodical is a site where the literal meets the metaphorical: it's a material collection of multiple genres of writing and a figurative meeting place for writers with multiple points of view. Imagining Cobbe as a "stranger-guest," a term in classical rhetoric re-envisioned in modern rhetoric by Jarratt, will help us envision how Cobbe used the conventions of travel writing as a means of navigating both geographical and metaphorical spaces.

This stranger-guest persona, a term I unpack in greater detail in the next section, authorized Cobbe to speak with conviction on the issue of Ireland, while masking her identity as an Irish woman, enabling her to speak about the other though she often functioned as a societal other herself. After I define the term "stranger-guest," I offer a brief discussion of the theories surrounding women's travel writing. I then describe Cobbe's year-long stay in Donegal and its impact on her self-fashioning as a writer, before concluding with an exploration of how her construction of herself as a stranger-guest to Ireland enabled her to navigate the rhetorical space of *Once a Week*.

Jarratt's Feminist Reclamation of Sophistic Rhetoric and its Implications for Women's Rhetorical Performances in Journalism

Though the term "sophist" is often used rather loosely today, the original sophists are generally known as traveling teachers who taught rhetoric for a fee during the fifth century B.C.E. They were "educational innovators responsive to social and political changes that made the ability to speak effectively a valuable commodity" (Rountree 681). Sophistic rhetoricians "believed that logical arguments could be constructed

on either side" (Rountree 682); thus, they were often viewed as being opportunistic, uninterested in "Truth" in exchange for multiple "truths." However, the sophists have been reclaimed for modern rhetoric and are most often used today for their philosophy of context-based truth: "They evinced a special interest in human perceptions as the only source of knowledge in all fields, including nature, and emphasized the significance of language in constructing that knowledge" (Jarratt xviii).

The unfixed nature of sophistic rhetoric is what makes it an apt means of theorizing women's speech and writing, as it disperses rhetorical authority over groups of people and across multiple spaces. Such flexibility would allow someone like Cobbe, privileged in many ways and marginal in others, the authority to speak persuasively in a space like the periodical press. However, there were two sides to the sophistic coin: strategies of sophistic rhetoric worked in positive and negative ways for cultural "others," whose writing and speech acts either predicted or emulated practices of sophistic rhetoric. In addition, Jarratt makes important connections between the sophists and women rhetors, describing how ideas about their otherness often cut both ways in terms of their reception by their audiences. In the epigraph for this article, Jarratt describes how the sophists represented the otherness of being born away from a cultural center. Stranger-guest has many implications in terms of the otherness Cobbe would have experienced as an Anglo-Irish woman writer.

The concept of "stranger" would have meant something very different to someone living in Ireland during the nineteenth century. "Stranger" was a term that the Irish used to describe English and Anglo-Irish people living in Ireland. Examples of this usage in the nationalist literature are plentiful. In the poem that is the epigraph for this article, Lady Jane Wilde, under the pseudonym Speranza in nationalist newspaper *The Nation*, castigates the "stranger" as the recipient of the "golden corn" harvested from Ireland that should have gone to the starving people who cultivated it. In Lady Gregory and W.B. Yeats's nationalist play *Cathleen ni Houlihan*, the titular character, an old woman personifying Ireland, is asked what has "set her to wandering" (7). She answers, "Too many strangers in the house" (7). The term "guest" connotes someone who is welcome under certain conditions, but not permanently. Cobbe is a stranger-guest on different levels: she is a stranger-guest in Ireland due

to her English heritage, a stranger-guest in England due to her Irish background, and a stranger-guest in the masculinist discursive space of imperialism, represented by the family literary journals for which she wrote. Cobbe was an interloper in the country of her birth *and* an interloper in the masculinist world of journalism.

But how can we compare wandering, male teachers of rhetoric active during the sixth century B.C.E. to women writing and speaking about two thousand years later? The implications of the stranger-guest position for women's discourse have to do with the term's connections to hierarchical gendered and racial systems. According to Jarratt, the sophists were feminized and, thus, denigrated: "The character projected onto the feminine as 'other' shares with Plato's sophists qualities of irrationality (or non-rationality), magical or hypnotic power, subjectivity, emotional sensitivity; all these are devalued in favor of their 'masculine' or philosophic opposites—rationality, objectivity, detachment and so on" (65). According to Jarratt, the feminization of sophistic rhetoric is bound up in the concept of nationalism: those born away from Athens were cast as the irrational, submissive "other." Irish communication styles were similarly devalued, depicted as overly emotional, illogical, and subjective. Cobbe's adoption of an objective, detached persona throughout her writings helps her distance herself from charges of irrationality and subjectivism, characteristics that would have marked her writing as female and Irish, guaranteeing a more difficult reception.

While Jarratt posited that the denigration of sophistic rhetorics resulted in its feminization (and recursively the feminization resulted in its denigration), my use of the term stranger-guest will emphasize how it allowed women the power of movement through hostile or contested spaces. Cobbe's stranger-guest persona illustrates the flexibility of the strategy of first-person constitution: Cobbe could enter into discursive spaces where women had only just begun to set foot and, thus, shape larger cultural conversations that impacted people across the globe. If Cobbe had elected to emphasize her Irishness and/or her femininity, she risked not being taken seriously by her audience. The strategy of first-person constitution enabled women to use what could be held against them—their very otherness—as a means of making effective arguments. Cobbe fashioned herself as a stranger-guest in order to more effectively navigate the rhetorical space of the periodical, taking advantage of the

foreignness associated with the racial or gendered other by offering a perspective that depended on displacement and dislocation. As a stranger-guest, Cobbe leaves her identity as an Irish woman *out* of the equation, instead constructing herself as an English, masculine subject. While she negated her femininity and her Irishness, the stranger-guest persona does allow her to enact the role of interlocutor between English and Irish culture and to assert herself as an authoritative voice in a polyvocal rhetorical space. This construction of Irishness was wholly dependent on her construction of herself as a stranger-guest to Ireland, which left her identity persuasively open to her readers' interpretations, investments, and expectations. While Cobbe's endorsement of imperialism remained unchanged regardless of context, her use of language to fashion a persuasive self in discourse is sophistic. Like the sophists, she emphasized the construction of truth through language. Her strategy of making different choices in the fashioning of her Anglo-Irish persona in response to changing contexts also reflected the flexibility and variability of sophistic rhetorics. Jarratt's concept of the "stranger-guest" complicates an easy categorization of Cobbe's writing on travel, because it does not allow us to comfortably place her within any one tradition, suggesting as it does that cultural others are always set apart from the dominant rhetorical paradigm. Yet Cobbe was not alienated from the dominant culture, enjoying a place of privilege even when she stepped out of bounds.

In order to navigate the treacherous terrain of the periodical press, Cobbe would need to use her status in specific ways. Cobbe emulated the conventions of travel-writing in order to speak authoritatively on Ireland but from a strategic distance. Cobbe's goal was never to persuade her audience to visit the country of her birth. Rather, her purpose was to narratively construct Ireland and then claim Ireland not only as part of the Empire, but as rhetorical platform. Cobbe's use of the travel writing genre to advance her own class interests at the expense of the Irish underclasses shows the problematic malleability of the periodical as a rhetorical space for women. While it offered women a metaphorical podium to address large audiences of willing listeners and often did serve as a mouthpiece for social change, it also gave rhetors the ideal apparatus for maintaining their privilege: a ready-made audience that had many of the same investments as the writer. Travel-writing was a readily

acceptable and available means to deliver arguments about England and her colonial holdings. In the case of Cobbe's imperialist rhetorics in *Once a Week*, her stranger-guest persona endowed Cobbe with the power of navigation over the metaphorical spaces of the periodical press.

In a sense, *all* women writing during the nineteenth century were navigating newly chartered spaces. Travel writing makes the figurative literal and the literal figurative, tracking how women navigated these conceptual and physical arenas. Examining travel writing as rhetoric shows what Cobbe did with the rhetorical spaces available to her and how she expressed her material body moving through material spaces in discourse. Cobbe's travel writing not only helped legitimate women's movement through physical spaces, but through the world of journalism. Her travel writing on Ireland, no matter how problematic a portrayal, shows a woman on the move, in terms of geography and writing, displaying the potential of the third-space for women rhetors. Access to physical spaces would allow women access to rhetorical spaces, and vice versa. The act of travel allowed women the authority to speak about subjects unrelated to hearth and home, while women's presence in the rhetorical space of travel writing made their exploration of the world outside the domestic sphere seem a lot more commonsensical.

Cobbe's Excursion to Donegal and its Translation into "Life in Donegal"

When considering Cobbe's positionality, we need to understand how her ideological location intersected with her geographical location. If Ireland as a whole was often described as the wild opposite of stately England, western Ireland was seen as even wilder and more removed from English culture. Donegal is even now part of the *Gaeltacht*, "the appellation employed to describe certain geographical areas containing a diverse group of communities which are predominantly Irish-speaking. These communities are mainly in the west of Ireland" (Watson 256). In the 1990s, there were 80,000 people living in the *Gaeltacht*, and 60,000 were Irish speakers (Watson 256). In the latter half of the nineteenth century, Donegal was even more widely Irish-speaking. For Cobbe's English audience, it would have signaled a particularly foreign experience, though logistically it was not far away. As Mitchell noted, "It seemed a long way from civilization. By 1848 news reached Dublin by telegraph

and twice-daily London mails. Donegal still had no rail service" (71). Because the western end of Ireland was further away both geographically and culturally, Cobbe could more easily establish herself as an expert on the subject, as most of her audience had not likely seen Donegal for themselves.

According to her autobiography, Cobbe was banished to the wilds of Donegal from Newbridge by her strictly evangelical father after revealing that she no longer was a believing Christian (her atheism did not last long). However, this may be another important example of Cobbe's ability to fashion a persuasive self in discourse, as Mitchell points out that there is no evidence of a rift between Cobbe and her father in his diary, where he agonized over one son's decision not to enter the clergy and his other son's brief interest in an alternative sect of Christianity (Mitchell 71). This implies that Cobbe's dissension barely registered with her father (or did not register at all) and that Cobbe's putative banishment stemmed from something else entirely. While Mitchell makes the very reasonable assumption that Cobbe was actually sent to Donegal to tend to her seriously depressed brother, Cobbe's writing never suggested that her exile was an extension of her role as domestic caretaker of Newbridge instead of punishment for her religious apostasy.

All of Mitchell's suppositions speak to Cobbe's position as a woman in a patriarchal culture. Cobbe's father may not have even "heard," literally or figuratively, Cobbe's assertions about her own spiritual beliefs, though those beliefs were important enough to shape his daughter's identity as a reformist writer for the rest of her life. Cobbe's experience within her own home mirrors the problems of reception women writers faced outside the domestic sphere. If Cobbe's father heard her assertions and disregarded them, it suggests that Cobbe's expressions as a woman did not carry as much intellectual or spiritual weight as a man's. Cobbe's role as a stranger-guest in her own home would replicate itself in her roles in the public sphere, including the periodical press.

It is possible that she continually asserted that she was sent away due to her father's anger because Cobbe saw herself—and saw the benefit in fashioning herself—as equal to a man. Cobbe was remarkably self-possessed, and this attribute greatly informed how she constructed her authorial persona. Many women writing during the nineteenth century made different rhetorical decisions, opting to emphasize their roles as

domestic caretakers in order to build their ethos. While these women rhetors used their domestic experiences to harness rhetorical power, it is fair to say that this sort of power was undervalued in comparison to the political and social power of men (a trend that we can recognize in our own age). Cobbe surely recognized this and opted to construct herself as equal to her brothers in importance to her father and, more expansively, saw her rhetorical performances as being just as valuable as any man's.

The fact that she could not assume that her audience would feel the same way informed how she portrayed her writing self in each of her pieces. In *Once a Week*, Cobbe found it most expedient to use the conventions of travel writing, a genre popular with writers of both sexes. Of course, the ways that men and women employed the conventions of travel writing were often different and put to different purposes. However, at times, those purposes would converge. This was the case in Cobbe's imperialist rhetorics, which sought to keep in place the colonial system that benefited her and other members of her class. The complex interplay of status, genre, and gender in Cobbe's travel writing enabled a masculinist voice that facilitated a certain construction of Ireland forever open to the excursions, literal and imaginative, of the English.

Fashioning a Self Outside of the Confines of Newbridge: Cobbe's Use of Travel-writing as a Means of Entering a Wider World

Before Cobbe could open up Ireland to the imaginative excursions of her readers, she would need to take literal excursions of her own. Status was the very mechanism that allowed Cobbe to function as a travel writer. Cobbe's status enabled her to speak persuasively on the Irish Question, as it afforded her the privilege of dislocation and displacement from her native land *and* traditional expectations of gender—the ability to be on the move, free from financial concerns and domestic duties. While the boundaries between genres may be a bit nebulous, it is clear that Cobbe was no stranger to travel writing before her pieces in *Once a Week* and *Fraser's*. Upon the death of her father, she had left the safe confines of Newbridge for a year-long excursion to the Middle East and Italy. According to Sidonie Smith, an increasing number of women were embarking on voyages at the time Cobbe left her family estate for the wider world: "The expanding mobility of *certain women* in the middle to

late nineteenth century came as an effect of modernity—democratization, literacy, education, increasing wealth, urbanization and industrialization, and the colonial and imperial expansion that produced wealth and the investment in 'progress'" (xi, my emphasis). Due to her status, Cobbe was one of those "certain women," free from the "drudgery of daily survival and from ignorance" (Smith xi).

Cobbe's independent travels illustrate how enacting the role of stranger-guest could work in positive ways for the woman writer. While Cobbe's travel marked her as a woman independent of father and husband, it also marked her entry into a wider world, one where she could also be free of her privileged background if she chose: "She was especially happy to discover that people enjoyed her for herself, even without the social advantages of her position in Ireland" (Mitchell 87). One could imagine that Cobbe's travel gave her the sense that she could shape her identity to make herself appealing to the strangers she met on her journey. Was her navigation of the physical spaces of Italy and the Middle East, where she was never sure what people and events she would encounter, the origin of her ability to negotiate the conceptual spaces of the literary miscellanies that would help make her career? We can only imagine.

What *is* clear is that Cobbe's class helped propel her into the world outside the gates of Newbridge; within those new contexts—including the periodical press—she could also turn off, so to speak, her classed identity when it proved advantageous. We also know that Cobbe mined her experiences for her first publications in the periodical press. In 1862, "The Eternal City (in a temporary phase)," a piece about Rome, was published in *Fraser's*, while "Women in Italy in 1862" was published in *MacMillan's Magazine*. In 1863, *Fraser's* also published "A Day at the Dead Sea" and "A Day at Athens." Travel writing helped keep Cobbe employed as a professional writer from the beginning of her career to the end. Little wonder, then, that she relied on its conventions even when writing about her own homeland.

Tours of the "Celtic fringe" had become increasingly popular during the eighteenth century as regions on the outer edge of Britannia gained the infrastructure to support a tourism industry. What Kinsley described as the "home tour" of the Celtic regions by British citizens "assisted the articulation of national character, yet instead of promoting Britishness

as a coherent and united identity, it placed emphasis on the foreignness of much home tour experience and accentuated regional difference" (Kinsley 129). The first few decades of the nineteenth century brought waves of middle-class British tourists "eager to demonstrate its cultural and economic capital" in an expression of "a metropolitan desire to 'tame' the previously colonized, ever-expanding margins of the United Kingdom" (Kroeg 200). Travel writing "provided a space and a language for ongoing cultural negotiations between Great Britain and England" (Kroeg 200).

In important ways, Cobbe continued the tradition of writing the home tour in her journalism on the Irish Question. Travel writing was yet another way for Cobbe to use her Irish heritage as a means of shaping a persuasive identity, as it relied on her class status as much as her personal experience of Ireland. As a member of the Ascendancy class, Cobbe shaped herself as a writer above the task of giving mere tourists the practical information they would need to visit Ireland. Instead, she used her expertise to craft a wider argument about culture, an argument that always ended with an intact Great Britain, with England at its political and cultural center.

Telling Tales of Travel in "Life in Donegal": Cobbe's Use of Travel-writing Conventions to Construct an Identity of Stranger-guest

Cobbe's experiences of Ireland were mediated through a rhetorical self that was designed to move through discursive and literal places, despite cultural codes that reified women's rightful place in the private or domestic sphere. The stranger-guest persona would prove to be a successful strategy when Cobbe used the conventions of travel writing as a means of persuasion about Ireland because it enabled her to use the power of her position while mitigating the factors that could make her powerless. Cobbe's rhetorical identity came into being at the intersections of the multiple spaces she inhabited. In this section, I bring together discussions of the physical space of Ireland, especially Donegal, and the more conceptual spaces of the periodical in question, in order to demonstrate the rhetorical space Cobbe navigated. The contents of *Once a Week* reveal that it was "an emphatically middle-class magazine that takes reading, history, and art seriously" (Hughes 46).

"Donegal" was the second piece that Cobbe published in the magazine that year; an essay detailing her travels to Egypt, "A Lady's Adventure in the Great Pyramid," had appeared in the April 14, 1866 issue. This reveals that the editors of *Once a Week* were interested in travel writing in general, and in particular, Cobbe's travel writing. "Donegal" was the only piece in the October 20 issue that featured Celticist² themes. Overall, the issue displayed an interest in Teutonic subjects, featuring titles such as "A German Jubilee," an essay commemorating the German victory over Napoleon at Leipzig, and the travel piece "A Day at Salzburg and Berchtesgaden." Cobbe's travel piece was written about a space much closer to her English readers, and to herself.

For Cobbe, the location of Donegal was bound up not only in her construction of herself as a writer, but as a commentator on the Irish Question. Writing on the home tour shared many of the same genre conventions as travel writing that detailed journeys to faraway lands: "British travellers touring their own island encounter difference just as travellers 'abroad' do, and that difference is commonly given expression through rhetorical gestures that imitate or echo the motifs of travel texts relating foreign journeys" (Kinsley 2).

Cobbe's introduction to "Life in Donegal" is an exercise in identity construction by the means of evasion. The constraints presented by *Once a Week* are the constraints posed by a larger imperialist system. In *Once a Week*, Cobbe portrays herself as an active participant in empire building by downplaying her position as a "big house daughter," thus undercutting the expectations of feminine behavior that go along with it. While the piece bears her byline, it does not come until the end. It is not obvious at the beginning of the piece whether the author is male or female, and Cobbe makes no allusions to her gender throughout the entire piece. In

² In "Celticism: Macpherson, Matthew Arnold and Ireland," George J. Watson described the duality of Celticism: "If Celticism had a patron saint, it would have to be the Roman god Janus, who faces both ways at once" (150). Watson posited Celticism as less systematic and coherent than Said's definition of Orientalism: "Celticism ... is an ideological construction, originating in the eighteenth century, an attempt to recreate or assert a cultural identity for the people of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales which will distinguish them from the majority inhabitants of the British Isles, the English" (148). Celticist discourse cast the Celt as the binary opposite of the Anglo-Saxon: where the Celt is feminine and irrational, the Anglo-Saxon (usually English) is rational and masculine.

the passage below, Cobbe places herself at the level of adventurous young men prepared to travel to the furthest reaches of the Empire:

If it should happen to any parent with a mind thus well-regulated, to possess a son troubled with a strong desire to emigrate to Upper Canada or New Zealand, we should recommend, as the best possible remedy, that the youth should be induced to make a short and easy trial of how he really likes solitude, by spending six months or so in the county of Donegal. If he pass through that ordeal, and return to London still talking of the delights of living out in the world, then let him go by all means to the Antipodes, or the society of those sweet creatures which brave S. Baker met about Gondokoro. He has certainly a "call" from St. Anthony. (436)

In fact, by constructing herself as an authority, Cobbe occupies a space *above* these young men: her identity here reads more like a middle-aged Victorian gentleman about to recount his past adventures to a younger audience than a middle-aged spinster, which is how many of her readers may have viewed her. Cobbe's performance of masculinity here deemphasized her role as a woman in shaping colonial culture.

Cobbe establishes herself as an adventurer to the outer limits of the British Empire, a difficult identity for women travelers to claim, as they were afforded less freedom of movement and behavior than men. To claim this identity, Cobbe distances herself from any information that would reveal her inferior status as an Irish woman. In order to construct an Ireland her audience would accept, Cobbe would need to set the parameters for discussion, undertaking this task in the most literal sense by becoming an educator for her English audience, offering her readers a quick geographical primer:

[Donegal] is a vast shire some forty miles long at the N.W. angle of that island of whose history and geography you know less than of those of Kamtschatka.³ Donegal is large, and Donegal is beautiful in a certain wild desolate style. There is a magnificent rock-bound coast to the north, and a bay like the Bristol Channel

swarming of fish to the south, and plenty of mountains and salmon rivers, and a few woods here and there; altogether a county which in England people would walk over and talk over perpetually. *But it is in Ireland, and at the outermost and most inaccessible rim of Ireland. So who cares for its beauty or wildness?* (436, emphasis mine)

Though Cobbe's piece is not illustrated, her descriptive language reflects the ethos of *Once a Week*, providing her readers with a vivid portrait of Donegal. Cobbe's physical descriptions were never simple; instead, they were overlaid with multiple meanings. In this one, there is a hiccup in Cobbe's careful construction of herself as an objective, English traveler to Irish lands. She expressed a sense of indignation at English ignorance of a land not that far away. The line "so who cares for its beauty and wildness?" suggested that the ignorance was a sort of willed ignorance: the curiosity of the English middle-class about foreign cultures did not extend, in Cobbe's view, to Ireland (though the sheer number of essays and articles about Ireland in many literary miscellanies refutes this point). Cobbe's labeling of her English audience as ignorant of Ireland's attributes is calculated to create the opportunity for Cobbe to act as educator. Her strategy of first-person constitution would construct Cobbe as a credible resource for her English readers, actually placing her above them in terms of authority and expertise on the subject of Ireland.

Cobbe enacts this expert authorial persona by organizing the English into different groups, suggesting that the class of Englishman implied what each was looking for in a holiday. This labeling, surely meant to be comical, has uncomfortable overtones. For example, Cobbe offers the correct pronunciation of Donegal for her "dear brother Cockneys" who "are sure to mispronounce it" (436). Rather than use ornamented, lyrical prose, Cobbe strives for an objective, scientific tone, but that does not mean she was not also striving for humor. She dryly observes the travelling patterns of her fellow Britons, carefully categorizing them according to their class: the Cockney, "an animal so naturally gregarious," longs for the "alpine solitude" of a Swiss chalet, while the Londoner—clearly distinct from his "brother Cockney"—"aspires" for "a lodge in some vast wilderness" (436). Cobbe's self-conscious adoption of a scientific persona creates moments of comedy: the Cockney does

³Kamtschatka is a peninsula located on the outermost northeast region of Russia, extending the length between Brussels to Reykjavik.

not leave "his wonted habitation" in a train, but a "shoal," in a "process corresponding partially to the hybernation of the mole, and partially to the passage of the herring" (436). Her stranger-guest persona enables Cobbe to persuasively categorize her fellow British subjects without revealing where she fits into such a broad hierarchical system. The working-class Cockney is described in much the same way as Cobbe often described the Irish: uneducated, ignorant, and highly animated. Cobbe's categorization of English tourists only anticipates much more serious categorizations that would come later in the piece, categorizations that would have greater implications for questions of empire.

It takes more than military and economic might to conquer a nation: language also plays an integral part. Cobbe expends more energy describing the land than she does the people, placing her within the masculinist tradition of the "manners and customs" style of travel writing. Mills argues that in "the physical act of describing the landscape the narrator is also mastering it" (78). Travel writers often describe landscapes "as if they were empty of people," symbolically emptying a colonial space of its native inhabitants to make room for colonial occupiers (Mills 75). Cobbe takes a similar tack in "Life in Donegal." Gone is the "big house daughter," who had a close, though hierarchical, relationship with her father's villagers, who could name them and ascribe them characteristics and life stories that emphasized their humanity even within a system that subjugated them.

Instead, Cobbe focuses her energies on narrating the landscape of Donegal in order to discursively package its wild landscape for a new audience. Her power in this context would hinge on her ability to construct a persona that was knowledgeable but not vested.

Few tourists ever hear of it. Beyond the immediate corner of the little county town nearest to the rest of the world, there is hardly a resident gentleman. Half of it is a vast district, thinly inhabited by the poorest of poor Irish-speaking cottiers; and, if the Ordnance Surveyors were not beyond suspicion, we should entertain private doubts whether the villages marked sparsely in the map were not

fancifully introduced, as in *Hudibras*⁴ days, when "Geographers on Africk's downs/Stuck elephants for want of towns." (436)

The above paragraph is typically Cobbian, with many layers of meaning and intertextual references, including the 20-year endeavor by English government to map the terrain of Ireland. In 1824, the British government began mapping "every nook and cranny of the country" which would "address inequalities in local taxation" (McWilliams 51). In one short passage, Cobbe renders Donegal as the western other to the civilized England and even the rest of Ireland, emphasizing their strange tongue and perhaps more importantly, the lack of an aristocratic presence in the region. In her biography, Mitchell sees Cobbe's musings in *Once a Week* as straightforwardly autobiographical. No "gentleman" means simply that there is no society and Cobbe was socially isolated. But what Mitchell read as Cobbe's boredom due to lack of society, I read as a signal to her English audience that the area had seen little English influence, with the lack of civilization that would suggest to her middle-class English reader. Of course, her brother was a "gentleman," but he is left out of Cobbe's piece, as is any information that would openly signal Cobbe's Anglo-Irish identity.

In sophistic rhetoric, there was a focus on the local over the universal. But for Cobbe, as stranger-guest in Donegal *and* in the English periodical, what is "local" is the audience represented by *Once a Week*; it is the shared values between the audience and Cobbe that become transposed upon the landscape of Ireland. But instead of remapping Ireland, she rewrites Ireland through the imperialist lens of a middle-class English miscellany. Her position as stranger-guest enables her to function as both a traveler to and a resident of Ireland, allowing her to claim authority through her experience with the land and people, without revealing or emphasizing parts of her identity that would mitigate that authority: her Irish heritage and her gender. By focusing on one part of the country, "Life in Donegal" offered a piece of Ireland for the consumption of her English audience.

⁴ This is surely a reference to *Hudibras*, a mock epic poem written by seventeenth-century poet Samuel Butler. The poem is a satirical indictment of Cromwellian politics. According to the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Butler was widely read and imitated in Great Britain and continued to be published until the early twentieth century.

The strategy demanded and enabled a certain selectivity in what the rhetor revealed to the audience, which not only allowed the woman rhetor to speak within the contested third space of the periodical, but to fashion an identity that could persuasively answer the question for her Victorian audience: To whom does Ireland belong? For her readers in the twenty first century, what does Cobbe's answer to this question say about the intersection of hierarchy and rhetorical agency? At a time when so much was in flux—gender roles, racial conceptualizations, geographical boundaries—Cobbe's rhetorical mapping attempted to keep Ireland and its people frozen in time, perpetuating the classed system that allowed a woman such as Cobbe rhetorical agency in the first place.

It could be argued that Cobbe practices sophism in the worst sense of the word, as she attempted to persuade the English public of the essential rightness of continued colonial rule over Ireland without acknowledging her investments in the issue. Her ability to be "English" or "Saxon" dependent on context could be seen as an "attempt to persuade through deception." While Cobbe is often discussed as being an "exceptional" Victorian woman, she was very much of part of that age, and was subject to—and perpetuated—some of the worst prejudices of her class, race, and time. While we work to recover Cobbe's rhetorics for what they can teach us about the Victorian age, we should not forget her shortcomings and remind ourselves that even during the nineteenth century, she might have made different choices. The Lady Wilde poem "The Famine Year" that begins this article illustrates that upper-class Victorian women did write on behalf of the poorer classes of Irish from a nationalist perspective.

Conclusion: Negotiating Gendered and Geographical Spaces

In this article, I have shown how Cobbe used the conventions of travel writing to extend her imperialist argument. Cobbe's strategy of constructing herself as a stranger-guest to Ireland, like other strategies performed by women rhetors, has both positive and negative implications for women speaking and writing during the Victorian age. On the one hand, while Cobbe underplays her gender by equating herself with masculine adventurers, the fact remains that she was a woman asserting her right to travel freely through the empire, which lent her—and by extension, other women—the authority to speak credibly on issues of

empire. Cobbe's construction of herself as a travel writer is instructive to the myriad ways Victorian women used the strategy of first-person constitution in order to persuade, as it emphasized how in flux the concept of identity was for women writing and speaking about empire. Travel writing is where the materiality of the rhetorical situation—the journals, the contested physical space of Ireland—interconnects with conceptualizations of rhetorical space that are vital when discussing Victorian women rhetors.

The intersection of travel writing and rhetoric represents women on the move, physically, socially, and ideologically. Travel writing enabled women to, borrowing a phrase from Hélène Cixous, write themselves into being on an international scale. In the case of Cobbe's travel writing, we can view her writing on place as an argument that women had rights to traverse the globe and make meaning about what they saw and the people they encountered. Cobbe's travel writing on Ireland shows how complicated this global rhetorical stage could be for women, despite the greater freedoms afforded those "certain women" described by Sidonie Smith. On a larger scale, women were on the move through multiple contexts during the Victorian age. That Cobbe traversed through so many successfully enough to become a celebrity writer on both sides of the Atlantic signals to us that we should be very interested in just how she did it. *Where* Cobbe came from—geographically and ideologically—is an important question to consider as we begin to examine Cobbe's rhetorical journeys through the Victorian English-speaking world.

I hope including Cobbe will broaden the conversation, if only a bit, by widening our focus to include a woman who, like her American counterparts, had to answer questions about race and status. Those questions may have come with different historical and cultural baggage given different cultural and political contexts, but are still instructive to us as we strive to construct a more complete picture of women speaking and writing in the past, and as we work to expand our vision of women and speaking and writing transnationally today.

Works Cited

Anderson, Dana. *Identity's Strategy: Rhetorical Selves in Conversion*. Columbia: The U of South Carolina P, 2007. Print.

- Backus, Margot Gayle. *Heterosexuality, Child Sacrifice, and the Anglo-Irish Colonial Order*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan. "Travel Writing and Gender." *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*. Ed. Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2002. 225-241. Print.
- Cobbe, Frances Power. "Life in Donegal." *Once a Week* (20 October 1866): 436-38.
- . *Life of Frances Power Cobbe by Herself*. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1894. Print.
- Curtis, Liz. *The Cause of Ireland: From the United Irishmen to Partition*. Belfast: Beyond the Pale Publications, 1991. Print.
- Hughes, Linda K. "Inventing Poetry and Pictorialism in *Once a Week*: A Magazine of Visual Effects." *Victorian Poetry* 48.1 (2010): 41-72. Web.
- Jarratt, Susan C. *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991. Print.
- Jarratt, Susan C., and Nedra Reynolds. "The Splitting Image: Contemporary Feminisms and the Ethics of *êthos*." *Ethos: New Essays in Rhetorical and Critical Theory*. Ed. James S. Baumlin and Tita French Baumlin. Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1994. 37-63. Print.
- Kinsley, Zoë. *Women Writing the Home Tour, 1682-1812*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2008. Print.
- Kirsch, Gesa, and Jacqueline Jones Royster. "Feminist Rhetorical Practices and the Building of Global Communities." *Feminisms and Rhetorics* 2013. Stanford University, Palo Alto. 26 September 2013. Address.
- McWilliams, Patrick S. "Reactions to the Ordnance Survey: A Window on Prefamine Ireland." *New Hibernia Review* 13.1 (Earrach/Spring 2009): 51-72. Print.
- Mills, Sara. *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism*. London: Routledge, 1991. Print.
- Mitchell, Sally. *Frances Power Cobbe: Victorian Feminist, Journalist, Reformer*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2004. Print.
- Rountree, J. Clarke, III. "Sophist." *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*. Ed. Theresa Enos. London: Routledge, 1996. 681-682. Print.

- Schell, Eileen E. "Introduction: Researching Feminist Rhetorical Methods and Methodologies." *Rhetorica in Motion: Feminist Rhetorical Methods and Methodologies*. Eds. Eileen E. Schell and K.J. Rawson. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2010. 1-20. Print.
- . "Keynote Address." *Feminisms and Rhetorics* 2011. Minnesota State University Mankato. 14 October 2011. Address.
- Watson, Iarfhlaith. "The Irish Language and Television: National Identity, Preservation, Restoration and Minority Rights." *The British Journal of Sociology* 47.2 (June 1996): 255-74. Print.
- Wilde, Lady Jane. "The Famine Year." *Irish Literature 1750-1900: An Anthology*. Ed. Julia M Wright. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008. 477. Print.
- Yeats, W. B., and Lady Gregory. *Cathleen Ni Houlihan. Modern Irish Drama*. Ed. John P. Harrington. New York: W.W. Norton, 1991. 3-11. Print.

About the Author

Kelly Cameron is a lecturer in the English Department at North Dakota State University in Fargo, where she teaches first-year and upper-division composition, focusing mainly on basic writing. In 2012, she received a Ph.D. in Rhetoric/Composition with a graduate certificate in Women's Studies from Texas Christian University. Kelly's scholarly interests include women's rhetorics, Irish literature, and rhetorical identities in transnational spaces.

"Celebration of Life": Memorials for Linda S. Bergmann (1950-2014)

Professor Linda Shell Bergmann died unexpectedly on January 11, 2014. Director of the Writing Lab at Purdue University at the time of her death, Professor Bergmann's current work addressed transfer of writing skills in several arenas—writing centers, writing across the curriculum initiatives, community-university engagement, and high school to college transitions. Her scholarly career began with a study of American humor. After completing her dissertation *American Historical Humor: The Tradition and the Contemporary Novel* at the University of Chicago, Linda turned to the writings of 19th century educator, biographer, traveler, and amateur naturalist Elizabeth Agassiz. These early works prepared her for lifelong publishing in cross-disciplinary venues as she often studied varied topics (and even disciplines) simultaneously, deftly assembling issues of science, education, literature, rhetoric, and writing in a common space (see bibliography). Linda's professional journey included Director of Writing at Hiram College (1989-1991), Director of Writing Across the Curriculum at Illinois Institute of Technology (1991-1996), Director of Writing Across the Curriculum and Writing Center at University of Missouri-Rolla (1996-2001), and first Associate Director and then Director of the Writing Lab at Purdue University (2001-2014). While at Purdue, Linda was promoted to the rank of Professor (2010), won several grants including a two-year project funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and directed eight completed dissertations, with three more underway (see list in bibliography). In addition to extensive participation in professional conferences, Linda was active in writing center professional organizations worldwide, and traveled extensively on behalf of writing centers.

We at *Peitho* and the Coalition of Women Scholars in the History of Rhetoric & Composition celebrate Linda Bergmann’s contributions to scholarship, Writing Center administration, feminist mentoring, nineteenth century women’s rhetoric, and the study of how composing reflects and extends critical thought as well as its communication. In the memorials that follow we see some of the sides of Linda Bergmann that made her such a treasured teacher, colleague, and friend. For us at *Peitho*, it is particularly important to note how her students celebrated her life, for it shows us feminist mentoring at work: generous and supportive without relaxing scholarly standards, intent on making the graduate experience for young women (and men) more humane than it was in the past, collaborative, extending beyond the classroom and becoming lifelong friendship, funny, inclusive, and the sort of support that builds trust and affection.

What follows are the memorials read in Linda’s honor at the Celebration of Life service held on January 17, 2014. At the invitation of Linda’s husband Professor Bernard Bergmann, III, and her son Bernard (Bernie) Bergmann, IV, speakers were colleagues, friends, and past students in this order:

- Patricia Sullivan (speaking for the Rhetoric and Composition program and the Department of English)
- Irwin Weiser (speaking as colleague and friend; remarks read by Jon Wallin)
- Shirley Rose (speaking as colleague and friend; remarks read by Jon Wallin)
- Liz Angeli (speaking as former student; including remarks by Morgan Reitmeyer)
- Dana Driscoll (speaking as former student; including remarks by Danielle Cordaro and Jaci Wells)
- Judith Yaross Lee (speaking as longtime friend, colleague, and fellow traveler)

Patricia Sullivan’s Reading

Before 2001, I knew Linda Bergmann primarily through her particularly canny and sensitive examination of the writings of Elizabeth Agassiz, a 19th century biographer, author, educator, wife, and budding naturalist. This scholarly investigation of a complex figure who co-founded and was first president of Radcliffe prefigured the scholarly demeanor I would come to recognize in Linda herself. It revealed what I would and have come to know as Linda’s habit of dwelling in a knowledge space, somewhat uncomfortably—a bit like perching on two chairs simultaneously.

Then, in early 2001, Linda visited as a candidate for a position that would become Director of Purdue’s Writing Lab and be a member of the Rhetoric and Composition faculty in English.

I remember a sketchy, winter dinner at the New Pub and a response she offered to a question posed about why Purdue: “I want to teach graduate students,” she simply and quietly said. When Linda arrived in the fall, she began to greatly enrich the graduate study of Writing Across the Curriculum as well as carry on the Writing Lab’s strong tradition of service built by its founder, Mickey Harris and the dedicated staff, such as Tammy Conard-Salvo (current Asst. Director) and many more. Linda immediately reached out to others on the campus to promote the Writing Lab’s potential to sponsor research into how writing works within its various disciplinary cubby holes and also across them. A scholar of Writing Across the Curriculum, Linda set out to build bridges among departments and groups, to enhance the Writing Lab as a center for research about learning to write, and to empower people to speak their minds through the texts they produced. Yes, she was busy. And that work has born fruit, most obviously in an Online Writing Lab that is the premiere writing resource in world, and in, I think, more important but less documentable ways as well.

Linda’s work has enriched our scholarly community by reaching out to colleagues in writing centers, both here and abroad. She has traveled widely, hardly ever passing up a trip, and using that travel to learn from other writing programs in the world and also to impart her gathered wisdom. In November, in what marks her last international consulting, Linda visited Colombia to meet university partners who wanted to join

with us in building a Spanish-language OWL (Online Writing Lab). Linda had been ambivalent about the project before the trip, but she returned with stories of the country's hilly beauty, its people's needs, and their wonderful character . . . and she began to plan and look forward to this spring's seminar in Writing Center Theory. The class project would begin the on-the-ground planning for this Spanish Language OWL.

Of course, there were to be many more dimensions to the course . . . she admitted it was over-packed for the time allotted. So over the break, in addition to opera and museum trips, Linda was busy pruning, revising the syllabus. All through that process, Linda was adamant that the core of the course must hold: "For writing center faculty to reach their full potential," she would say, "they need to be researchers." Often after that statement she would pause and twist her glasses and add, "While there is more research than before, so much more is needed . . . we just need more research."

Of course, Linda herself helped fill that gap, with her highly regarded work on disciplinarity and transfer. In a study of that same name she and Janet Zepernick interviewed students about their perceptions of what they were learning in their tutoring sessions and detailed a paradox: these students believed that writing skills **did** transfer to their home disciplines but they also thought that **if** the writing in English classes focuses on personal expression what is learned **does not** transfer. This finding operated as a touchstone, and Linda the scholar and researcher and teacher worked to diminish gaps in transfer on three fronts—

First, through learning partnerships with other departments in the university (e.g., mechanical engineering and animal science);

Second, through further research on transfer (e.g., with involvement in the Elon Initiative on Transfer, and often through her students' dissertations); and also

Third, through a number of Writing Lab projects that aimed to develop and provide new kinds of resources to writers and writing teachers [e.g., QWEST (community outreach materials developed with Lafayette Adult Resource Academy and WorkOne West Central for GED preparation and job skills, see Bergmann,

Wells, and Brizee), new visions of and components for the Purdue OWL (including partnering with Pearson Education to ensure the sustainability of the OWL), and TOWN, a writing environment that addresses transitions between high school and college (funded by a Gates grant codirected with Professor Janet Alsup)].

As in her earlier work on Agassiz, Linda's more recent projects have recognized the knots and gnarls of the in-between, have addressed the spaces that demand our attention (or would if they could speak), and along the way have reminded us that well-crafted writing helps us conquer communication's complexities.

If she were standing here today, she would say to us and to her students, both assembled and listening in, that . . . **more** is needed. Writing holds one of the keys to real citizenship because it seeks to bridge gaps between groups . . . and writing centers play two critical roles: they **assist** those particular people who need encouragement (or instruction) along their path to that real citizenship . . . at the same time as they provide a **place** for the study of those ways and struggles we need to understand in order to deliver the needed encouragement and instruction. If this message sounds sure of its mission it is because it channels Linda's spirit, which has consistently been a civic-minded and idealistic one, alert to and striving to achieve the possibilities for good that are ignited by the achievement of an educated populace.

We will hear from friends and students, she loves her students, and they will deliver powerful personal messages. As a long time member of the faculty of Purdue and a scholarly colleague, I speak for our Department of English and our CLA faculty, in delivering this one note: Purdue is a better university because Linda Bergmann has worked here. She has helped us care deeply about how writing . . . and rewriting . . . matter . . . how these acts of reflection and communication transform us and those we encounter in our journeys.

Thank you, Linda.

Irwin Weiser's Reading

Sometimes, you just get a feeling.

That's how it was in spring 2001 when we interviewed Linda Bergmann for the newly created position of Associate Director of the Writing Lab. We had a terrific telephone interview, and as chair of the search committee, I drove to the airport in Indianapolis to pick up Linda for her campus visit. I'm not sure why it happened—we didn't know one another well at all—but we hugged when we saw each other. It was at once both awkward and natural. And it was for me, at least, a foreshadowing of the friendship that developed between us when she joined our faculty the following August.

As a colleague, Linda's contributions are too many to enumerate, but as I think about them, those that stand out in my mind include her commitment to the professional development of graduate students. She developed and taught a much needed seminar in Writing Center Administration, a valuable addition to our WPA secondary area, and she and I shared responsibility for teaching the seminar in Writing Across the Curriculum. She directed dissertations—at least 8 of them—and served on over a dozen more dissertation committees, providing doctoral students with insightful guidance and helping launch their careers as rhetoric scholars and administrators. And those of us who had the opportunity to work with her on those committees know first-hand how her perceptive comments helped students, but even more, how she offered encouragement and support when, as almost inevitably happens, the dissertation suddenly seems impossible.

Under Linda's leadership, our already internationally respected Writing Lab earned more accolades, including the Conference on College Composition and Communication Certificate of Excellence, and became even more valuable as a resource, leading to its being solicited to participate in a \$1.5 million dollar grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. She also recognized the opportunity provided when Pearson Higher Education came to her to talk about making Purdue's OWL part of its Pearson Writer. That collaboration assured that Purdue's Writing Lab and OWL would continue to be everyone's go-to and trusted source for writing support.

There is much, much more that could be said about Linda's professional accomplishments as a scholar and national leader, but for those of us privileged to count her as friend, what overshadows all of that is the charming, funny, and sometimes disarmingly ditzy person we grew to know. Linda shared her passions with us—for fashion, for opera, for travel. Especially for international travel, which I always found at least somewhat surprising and perhaps a little alarming, given that she needed detailed directions to get across town and once realized when we were half-way to Indianapolis for a flight that she had forgotten her ID. But she went to France, and Poland, and Guatemala, and Beirut, and Colombia—and to Istanbul, which she loved. And of course, she had a passion for—or at least a very quirky interest in—salt and pepper shakers, the stranger and more risqué the better. Those of us who had the privilege to be guests at her home got to see that collection and got to experience another side of Linda—the gracious, thoughtful, generous host.

I'll mention one more passion of Linda's—or at least something that often led to passionate lunch table conversations: politics. Linda had a fine sense of the outrageous, which as she saw and the rest of the similarly aligned group in the Union agreed, was the province of the Republicans.

Of course, she was especially delighted and proud when Bernie, like her an Oberlin graduate, got involved in political campaigning for Democratic candidates. She loved talking about where he was and what he was doing.

Linda's intelligence, wit, compassion, and generosity made her a very special friend to me and to all of us. We'll feel her absence, but we'll know how lucky we have been to have her in our lives. She'll be with us always in our good memories of her.

Remembering Linda Bergmann by Shirley Rose, February 2014

When I remember Linda, I will remember our walks.

Linda and I started taking walks together when she came to West Lafayette to look for a house in the summer of 2001. I invited her to take a walk with me in my neighborhood and we happened to be going up Miami Trail when a realtor came out of one of the houses and put up a For Sale sign at the curb. Linda fell in love with that house at first sight and within 24 hours her offer on the house had been accepted. She never

fell out of love with the house, where she felt at home and safe, even when the air conditioner wasn't working or the dishwasher quit or her beloved crabapple tree had to be cut down. For the next eight years, until I moved away, she and I regularly took walks in the neighborhood. I'd call her when I was ready to head out the door and she would start out from her house and we would meet in somewhere in between, then go back and forth along the meandering streets that surround Happy Hollow Park while we talked about everything from the courses we were teaching and papers we each were writing to what our children were doing as they grew into to young adulthood. Looking over a list of Linda's publications since she came to Purdue, there are few that weren't at some point the subject of conversations on our walks, and the same is true of my list of publications. That off-the-record collaboration is a feature, I think, of feminist scholarship, and I know I am one of many beneficiaries of Linda's generosity in that regard.

I will remember other walks on trips we took together, like the one to a conference in the UK, where we traipsed all over London. Linda had visited London multiple times before, so I let her do the most of the navigating. When I would ask “how far a walk is it?” or “how much further?” she would say “just a couple of blocks,” which I eventually learned was not intended to provide an accurate measure but rather to encourage me to keep going. Back then, Linda seemed tireless in everything she did—not just walking all over London, but her teaching of the graduate seminars in writing center theory and with the students whose dissertations she directed, her development of the content and the global reach of the Purdue OWL, her work on her research on transfer and her Elizabeth Agassiz project. The example she set was an inspiration to not just me but many others and her encouragement helped us to thrive.

These acts of listening, encouraging, and leading others took strength and courage. They are what made Linda a woman warrior. Linda was not just an academic feminist. She was a feminist academic, a warrior who had the courage to challenge dogma and who taught her students to do the same and helped them build the intellectual muscles that would give them the strength to do the research that would overcome dogma's influence.

Last summer, Linda and I took what has turned out to be our last walk together. When we were in Savannah, Georgia for the WPA conference, we took a walk together through Lafayette Square, Madison Square, Pulaski Square and other Squares in the Historic District. Our pace was slow and Linda's breathing was labored and we stopped frequently, but the conversation ranged as widely and easily as ever. We talked about her new research on the humor of playwright George Ade and her ongoing involvement in the writing transfer research projects launched at the Elon seminars. Linda tired quickly, but she insisted she needed the exercise, and we pushed on.

A couple of times in the past few years Linda told me she felt at odds with her body, that her body would no longer do what she willed it to. To accommodate its limits, she found ways to manage her diminished energies, and that meant setting priorities, cutting out the nonessentials, staying focused on directing her energies to the things we recognize as her legacy: her family and especially her son Bernie, who, she said, gave meaning to her life; the work of the Purdue graduate students and others she mentored in writing center research; and her impact on colleagues around the world, who looked to her to help set the direction of writing centers for the future.

Yet, despite her careful management of her energies, she was often tired. Now, finally, that uncooperative body is at rest.

The WPA conference in Savannah was the last time I saw her; but we corresponded by emails and talked by phone over the last few months as we planned a trip to Paris for the 2014 Writing Research Across Borders conference. We had found an apartment to rent near the Avenue des Champs-Élysées, and in our last email exchange she sent the itinerary for her flight to Paris and discussed our plans for the week we would be there. Linda wrote:

“I have permission to travel and have registered for the conference and lunches. The two operas in Paris when we will be there are *Madama Butterfly* and *La Fanciulla del West*. I don't know whether tickets are available. If you haven't seen much opera, you should see *Butterfly*. I can't see it too much. Otherwise, La F—because I have always wanted to go to the Paris opera.” She continued, “Of course, I will be there for the conference. Have you been to Paris before?”

I answered, “Not since the summer after my high school graduation.”

Linda replied, "Then let's plan to see great art and eat great food; I have not been there enough."

I thought about cancelling my trip, now that Linda would not be coming along. But if I had done that, she would have been disappointed with my decision. So I decided to take the trip, just two weeks away as I write this, and to make the trip a tribute to Linda. I'll miss her as I attend the conference, miss debriefing with her about my conference presentation, which she would most certainly have attended as a loyal friend, debating the merits of talks we've both heard, filling each other in on the highlights of sessions we'd each attended separately. I will miss her as I visit the Louvre and recall the pleasure of sharing reactions and reflections on exhibits during the many other museum visits we shared; and as I see Madama Butterfly at the Paris Opera I will remember how Linda's face would break into a wide grin and her eyes would light up at the mere mention of an opera. And as I walk along the Avenue des Champs-Élysées, I will think of Linda and remember how she could craft a less than optimal experience into an interesting, if not amusing, anecdote, and I will be glad again for having had the gift of her friendship.

Liz Angeli's Reading

Hi, everyone. Thank you for being here today. I would like to thank Bernie, Jr., Linda's son, for inviting Linda's students to speak. Thanks, too, to Pat Sullivan and Lisa Hartman for asking us to remember Linda. It's an honor to memorialize Linda in this way.

My name is Liz Angeli, and I was one of Linda's students here at Purdue. I was also the Purdue OWL Coordinator for two years, a position that really should have in its job description, "You will create a close relationship with Linda Bergmann during your tenure as coordinator."

My words today are a collection of reflections that Linda's students have shared on and offline. I'm also speaking on behalf of Morgan Reitmeyer, who was one of Linda's beloved students who wanted me to convey how completely and thoroughly Linda supported her and that Linda "had a depth of love and compassion that I was blessed to be taken in by. I miss her already" (Morgan Reitmeyer, personal communication, 1/16/2014).

Here are my reflections:

Linda was a storyteller. She told her students stories so that we could learn how to be good teachers, administrators, researchers, and people. Eager to remember all the wisdom Linda offered, I kept a running list of what I called "Linda-isms." I started this list in a graduate seminar that I and others here today were fortunate enough to take, Writing Across the Curriculum, or more commonly known as WAC. WAC was one of Linda's specialties; this field demands that its practitioners develop relationships with professionals from all disciplines. She was a natural, and we loved to watch her work. In this class, Linda taught us the skills we'd need through stories. As we listened intently, we realized common threads throughout her stories. So, as a class, we decided to make a list of what you should do as a WAC director: the first set of Linda-isms.

1. Don't be a jerk (and if you do have to be a jerk, don't be a discouraged jerk).
2. Bring food to all meetings.
3. Build trust.

This list reflects Linda's approach to her work, her humility, and her humor, all of which permeated her stories. She told us it was important to "have the humility to listen" and that "humility makes you friends faster." As part of her humble approach to life, she often used humor. One day in class, Linda was telling us about one particularly trying experience about the challenges of doing WAC work. In mid-thought, she paused, grinned, and humbly said in a reflective moment, "I think it's my despair showing."

The stories we've shared of Linda this week through email listservs, phone conversations, and social media show that other people had Linda-isms, too. People have shared that she taught them that "writing is hard." And I know many of us keep an extra blazer on the back of our doors or an extra pair of earrings in our desks because Linda told us, "Keep an extra blazer in your office in case you have a last minute meeting with the Provost or Dean, and always keep extra earrings in your drawer in case you leave the house without putting some on." And, perhaps of most practical value, she would share with us the color of car we might consider owning and the types of adult beverages we should enjoy, which brings me to my personal favorite Linda-ism: "If I were Queen of the Universe, all cars would be red and all margaritas salty, never sweet."

Fittingly, I’ll close with a story. It’s a story of how Linda’s legacy lives on through her students and work, which she loved so much. When I was at a job interview, I was asked, “Is there a professor or other teacher you’ve had whom you hope to emulate?” I answered, “One person whom I hope to be like is Linda Bergmann. She knows how to be an effective administrator, leader, counselor, and person. She values relationships. She knows how to work with administration to support initiatives that have worldwide effects. And she gives her students opportunities to grow and practice their skills on their own while she offers quiet guidance to ensure a student’s success and learning. She’s more than a teacher; she’s a friend to her students, and she loves them.” And now, we have the honor of carrying on her legacy with humility, humor, and good stories.

Dana Driscoll’s Reading (including remarks by Danielle Cordaro and Jaci Wells)

Hello everyone. Thank you to Pat, Lisa, and Bernie Jr. for allowing us this time to speak and share in Linda’s memory. I’m Dana Lynn Driscoll, one of Linda’s students. Like Liz, I worked on the Purdue OWL for two years. Linda was also my dissertation advisor, mentor, greatest supporter, and dear friend. In fact, Linda was the dissertation advisor, mentor, greatest supporter, and dear friend of just about my whole cohort, who I’m speaking for today, and I don’t think that the words “advisor” or “mentor” do any kind of justice to the interactions we had with Linda. Linda nurtured and encouraged us, she kept us going when we were willing to give up, she lit our paths when we were lost and confused, and she shared her own story to help us better understand our own. She was a true mentor to us, in every sense of the word.

I’d like to share a statement from **Jaci Wells**, a member of my cohort, who wasn’t able to be here. Jaci writes, “I could write 100 pages and speak for 100 hours and still not manage to share everything Linda has taught me. The most important lesson, the one that has most influenced my career and my life, is one that she taught by example constantly. Linda taught me that it is possible to be intensely dedicated to one’s career while still being a whole person with passions that have nothing to do with work. She loved red wine, a good steak (medium rare—do not burn it!), NPR, travel, and the opera. I knew Linda for nearly ten years and every time I talked to her, I learned about another of her interests.

That someone could be such a successful academic and such fascinating person, with so many interests, was a revelation to me. Had I not learned, through her, that such a thing was possible, I’m not sure I would have stuck with my plans to get a Ph.D. Without Linda’s influence, I might have managed to become an academic. But, I would not have become a happy one, one who knows that riding a camel in Turkey is as important to have on one’s bucket list as publishing in the most prestigious journal in the field. For that, I will always be grateful.”

I’m grateful to everyone here for sharing their memories of Linda. These reflections on our past, our shared narratives of the meaningful experiences, mentoring, and support we had from Linda will forever shape our lives. And it is this shaping, and what we do now and in the future, that I’d like to spend a few moments considering.

I remember a conversation Linda and I had a year and a half ago, at the Elon Research Seminar on Critical Transitions, which Linda and I had both attended for several years. We were sitting on a bench at Elon University, basking in the warmth of the summer, surrounded by magnolias and ancient oaks. Linda spoke to me of her work on the Gates Foundation Grant, and how it had required her to push aside some of her other projects that she highly valued. She looked at me and said, “I still have so much more to say, Dana. Where am I going to find the time?” I laughed and said, “There’s always more time, Linda. You’ll find it.” I think if Linda were here today to speak on her own behalf, she would say that her work wasn’t finished, that it was cut short, that she had a lot of things she still wanted to say and do in our field.

But my response would be, we her students, are her living legacy. Her work isn’t done as long as we continue to do it. We can take these lessons we learned from Linda, so many of the lessons that Liz, Morgan, and Jaci already shared: about balancing life and work, about having fun, about asking the hard questions, about being nurturing and encouraging, about being dedicated, and about approaching everything with a sense of humor.

When I graduated with my Ph.D. in 2009, I remember sitting with Linda in auditorium, waiting to go up to the stage and be hooded. She was all smiles, and gave me this look, and leaned in close and said, “Dana, I hope you go do some rabble rousing. Stir things up a bit. But before you send out anything controversial, make sure I see it.”

All that we can do now is the do the best work we can, perhaps engage in some rabble rousing like Linda would. It is now up to us continue in her footsteps. Her careful nurturing can become our careful nurturing. I know that all of us already do this work—but now, we can do it with more purpose and determination because we know we are Linda’s living legacy. Whatever paths we take, I know we can work and live in a way that honors Linda’s memory, and holds her always in our hearts.

I’ll close with the words of **Danielle Cordaro**, another member of my cohort, who recently said, “Sometimes it takes a while to come up with New Year’s resolution. This year I resolve to take on challenges like my mentor and friend Linda—often, and with aplomb.”

Thank you.

Judith Yaross Lee’s Reading A Friend in Full: Linda S. Bergmann, 1950-2014

Linda Bergmann was my dear friend for 40 years—across the whole length of my adult life—so it’s hard to think of her except in the ways that she was there, with me and for me, at so many key points. I feel awkward speaking about my own life along with hers when we are gathered in her honor, but what is the meaning of any life except its impact on others? Linda was the familiar Oberlin face sitting across from me at Regenstein Library almost daily from the time I entered the MA program in English at the University of Chicago in 1973 (“the U of C”), a year behind her, until I left for New York five years later, when she feted me at a fabulous farewell dinner featuring the Bergmann family lasagna—an act of love you’ll understand when I explain that the recipe from her Italian mother-in-law fills six index cards and begins, “Roast the bones from a leg of lamb.” In 1975, we were the only two students in Hamlin Hill’s contemporary humor seminar (doubtless because we were the only students who trudged over to the English office to see the topic); there we found our dissertations in our efforts to prepare so thoroughly for class that he wouldn’t learn how little we knew. In 1976, she was the confidant who shared the unspeakable news of my first husband’s betrayal, and later that year she was my companion in divorce court. Soon after that we went to New York for the first of many MLAs together, wondering whether our mistakes on the subway, which took us uptown to Harlem instead

of downtown to the Village, augured ill for our abilities to navigate the profession as we embarked far too many years of dissertation writing and adjunct teaching. In 1978, she was the only friend of mine at my wedding to Joe Slade in New York. In 1983, she finally triumphed over the Darwinian Ph.D. system at the U of C, which at the time consisted of letting students flounder until they either figured out how to write their dissertations or gave up trying—a system at its worst for the women, whom the mostly male faculty mostly ignored—and when she sent me her graduation photo, she inspired me to do the same. In 1986, she waited in the Gates-Blake conference room while I defended my dissertation across the hall.

By then, she had already written her spectacular paper for the 1983 Conference on Science, Technology, and Literature that Joe & I hosted at Long Island University. Her essay “Reshaping the Roles of Man, God, and Nature: Darwin’s Rhetoric in *On the Origin of Species*” then became a cornerstone of my first book, *Beyond the Two Cultures*, and led Linda toward her first real job as an assistant professor at Hiram College. And for the next thirty years, we each shared our knowledge at each new step in life—as scholars and teachers, daughters, wives, and mothers—helping each other move forward, and celebrating each milestone along the way. We marveled at our good luck as we climbed through the ranks from adjunct slots to full professorships at major universities, moves that we saw as both unlikely and hard-earned.

We routinely exchanged syllabi, assignments, job letters, and manuscripts. Linda taught me how to use in-class writing time more effectively when she visited my composition classes at LaGuardia Community College/CUNY in the late ’80s during a trip to New York City for a CCCC meeting that also meant a four-day reunion at my house in Brooklyn; I was honored when a few of my historical research assignments ended up in her 2010 textbook *Academic Research and Writing*. In the mid-’90s we spent much of a year collaborating on a monograph proposal, *Sites of Science in American Popular Writing, 1865-1914*, which we submitted to one university press and then abandoned as we became absorbed in independent projects more engaging or more professionally useful. But we continued to read each other’s work—sometimes in manuscript, always after publication—and to at least imagine other projects together. Last winter, when illness in my

family derailed our Chicago visit, we compensated by phone with a long conversation whose topics included George Ade’s *Fables in Slang* and other early 20th century humor with one eye toward Linda’s paper, “Literary Comedians and Social Cartoonists,” for the 2013 Feminisms & Rhetorics Conference last September and another toward my possible participation in Shirley Rose’s archival project on John T. McCutcheon’s suffrage cartoons, of which Linda’s paper was a part. In October, she reviewed a draft of my editorial manifesto for *Studies in American Humor*, “Enter Laughing: American Humor Studies in the Spirit of Our Times,” just now published. I will miss her feedback of course for its honesty and affirmation, but also, and more deeply, for its sincerity as friendship.

A few scenes stand out across time. Among the strongest is a kind of montage of Linda rehearsing conference papers in various generic hotel rooms as I critiqued her performance. Those of you who have known Linda only since she came to Purdue and admired her roster of international residencies and keynote addresses in places as far away as Poland and Lebanon would be stunned to know that early in her career she struggled so severely with public speaking that the wise men of the University of Chicago who conducted her 75-book exam—our prelims, an entirely oral exam covering 75 representative works of English and American poetry, drama, prose fiction, and non-fiction chosen by each student from Chaucer to the present—advised her to consider a career outside of teaching. So her success in this arena not only testifies to her grit but also cautions us about presuming to gauge students’ futures. But other scenes capture other dimensions of her nature. I can still see Linda, whose two-year-old stoically let her wipe the jelly off his face, telling me as I chased my three-year-old all over the sand at the beach in the Rockaways to do likewise, “You have every right to expect his cooperation.” I can still see her, young and slim and glamorous in new blonde highlights, leaning toward me as my snarky divorce lawyer looked at us, dressed to the nines to cover our nervousness as we walked to court, and asked, “Are you ladies really doctoral students at the U of C?” to which Linda whispered, “Are you really a Michigan Avenue lawyer?” I still see her, turning a grim day of testimony, in that world before no-fault divorce, into a celebration by booking a table for us later at a long-gone cheap Armenian restaurant, where we sat in a kind of fake white cave as she presented me with a new address book in a gold chinoiserie print

from the Art Institute—one of her favorite places to visit and shop, and always one of our favorite places to meet—with the remark, “Now you can literally write him out of your life.” I can still hear her on the phone, when I worried how she was doing after her son’s premature birth: “The great thing about having a baby spend weeks in intensive care is that you get a lot of help with nursing and a full night’s sleep at home.” I can hear her joking about the medical bills that came after: “I just say they’re too high, and they cut them some more.” And I can still feel her hand on my arm, holding tight as we crossed a traffic overpass during an ALA in San Diego (she hated bridges) talking about how she might pack in one carry-on for an upcoming trip to Utrecht with her son; and pulling me from the convention hotel another year in Baltimore for a boat ride across the Inner Harbor to the Museum of Outsider Art, where we gawked in one room after the next until we reached the highlight of the show, an Elvis-type car completely studded with plastic jewels and bottle caps that captivated us both.

The same creativity, incisiveness, practicality, and delight sparked her research. Having taken on the Darwin paper after I unimaginatively suggested his most famous book, with its voluminous body of scholarship, as a central text in literature and science, she decided that her next project in the field would be on Elizabeth and Louis Agassiz’s *A Journey in Brazil*—which she chose not so much because she already had a strong interest in the Agassizes, singly or jointly, as because she had rummaged through Regenstein Library until she was sure that she had found a book that no one had written on—and hardly anyone had even checked out of the stacks—since it came out in 1867. Yet that study, along with the body of letters from a former U of C student that she edited for a woman in her apartment building, led to Linda’s distinguished research program in women’s private writings, rhetorical history, and writing pedagogy—and eventually led her, after her years in Rolla and fellowships at Radcliffe, to Purdue, where she led the Writing Lab to new heights and satellite operations, online and off.

With all this focus on her work and our friendship, I don’t wish to minimize the importance of Linda’s family life, although—except for two weekends when our families gathered—I knew it mainly from outside. And that knowledge was tinged with guilt, since I knew that in her house, as in mine, the phone calls that delighted and absorbed us

were not always so popular with our husbands and kids, who knew that they might be topics of the conversations that made us MIA for hours. But we also shared backgrounds in religiously conservative, eastern-European households with old-fashioned ideas about the centrality of domestic life, and these values grounded us both. Through her many dislocations around the Midwest, Linda stayed connected to her husband Bernie, maintaining for 45 years her promise of loyalty "in sickness and in health." Some of those moves aimed at better arrangements for her son Bernie, for whom she felt great love and great pride. She often marveled that he was, as she put it, "so charming," and wondered where he'd acquired such grace. When we spoke in December, she expressed particular delight at his successes in Washington and her high hopes for his future. Her relationships with graduate students here at Purdue also had something of the maternal to them, I think, in that she felt determined to give them the professional guidance she had wished for from her own advisors to position the next generation for maximum success. But some of that guidance was also the overflow of the loving and generous self that both Bernies knew well.

I look back at Linda's life with gratitude for what she gave to me and with admiration for what she gave to others. And I'm conscious that those others included close friends in every community she lived in, because friendship was one of her great gifts. Two of the oldest friends are here today, Linda Barassa from her years at Hiram College and Marsha Gilliland-Roberts from the University of Chicago. I feel lucky to have 40 years of memories, because a deep and life-long friendship across hundreds and sometimes thousands of miles is no small thing in our world. But her death leaves a hole in my life, and I grieve at her loss.

Thank you for coming today to honor her memory with those of us who loved her so long.

Selected Bibliography of Works by Linda S. Bergmann

While not exhaustive, this bibliography seeks to represent major publications taken from different phases of Linda's scholarly career. Notice that she moves from humor to science & literature, and adds in extensive archival work on Elizabeth Agassiz (whose work was difficult to shoehorn into a traditional category). Then, by 1994, she starts

evidencing an interest in Writing Across the Curriculum. As her work progresses, Linda begins to collaborate, and one of her final publications is co-authored with two of her dissertation advisees as the three of them discuss collaboration during dissertation work.

Bergmann, Linda S. *American Historical Humor: The Tradition and the Contemporary Novel*. Dissertation. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983. Print.

Bergmann, Linda S. "The Whys and Wherefore's of 't': History and Humor in *The Sot-Weed Factor*." *Markham Review* 12 (Winter 1983): 31-5. Print.

Bergmann, Linda S. "The Contemporary Letter as Literature: Issues of Self-Reflexivity, Audience, and Closure." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 17.3/4 (1989): 128-139. Print.

Bergman, Linda S. "Reshaping the Roles of Man, God, and Nature: Darwin's Rhetoric in *On the Origin of Species*." *Beyond the Two Cultures: Essays on Science, Technology, and Literature*. Ed. Joseph W. Slade, and Judith Yaross Lee. Ames: Iowa State UP, 1990. 79-98. Rpt. in *Nineteenth Century Literary Criticism*. Ed. Denise Kasinec. Detroit: Gale, 1997. Print.

Bergmann, Linda S. "Woman Against a Background of White: The Representation of Self and Nature in Women's Arctic Narratives." *American Studies* 34.2 (Fall 1993): 53-68. Print.

Bergmann, Linda S. "Academic Discourse and Academic Service: Composition vs. WAC in the Academy." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication Skills microfiche (ED 371 362), March 1994.

Bergmann, Linda S. "A Troubled Marriage of Discourses: Science Writing and Travel Narrative in Louis and Elizabeth Agassiz's a Journey in Brazil." *Journal of American Culture* 18.2 (Summer 1995): 83-88. Print.

Bergmann, Linda S. "Epic, Parody, and National Identity: George Washington in Nineteenth-Century American Humor," *Studies in American Humor*, 3.2 (1995): 1-22. Print.

Bergmann, Linda S. "Funny Papers: Initiation and Subversion in First-Year Writing." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 15.1 (1996): 141-60. Print.

- Bergmann, Linda S. "Academic Discourse and Academic Service: Composition vs. WAC in the Academy." *CEA Critic* 58.3 (1996): 1-10. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Widows, Hacks, and Biographers: The Voice of Professionalism in Elizabeth Agassiz's *Louis Agassiz: His Life and Correspondence*" *A/B: Auto/Biography Studies* 12.1 (1997): 1-21. Print. Winner of the Florence Howe Award, MLA Women's Caucus.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Oedipus in Steerage: On the Pain of the Adjunct," in "Dossier on Shared Borders, Contested Boundaries: Part-Time Faculty, 'Others,' and the Profession." *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 30.1-2 (1997): 46-50. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Missionary Projects and Anthropological Accounts: Ethics and Conflict in Writing across the Curriculum." *Foregrounding Ethical Awareness in Composition and English Studies*. Ed. Sheryl L. Fontaine and Susan Hunter, 144-59. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1998. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Women of Letters: Personal Narrative in Public and Private Voices." *The Personal Narrative: Writing Ourselves as Teachers and Scholars*. Ed. Gil Haroian-Guerin. Portland, ME: Calendar Island Press, 1999. 88-101.
- Murray, Susan L., Connie Meinholdt, and Linda S. Bergmann. "Addressing Gender Issues in the Engineering Classroom." *Feminist Teacher* 12.3 (1999): 169-183. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S., and Lucas P. Niiler. "Problem-Posing Learning in the Computer Writing Classroom." *Interactive Learning: Vignettes from America's Most Wired Campuses*. Ed. David G. Brown. Bolton, MA: Anker, 2000. 229-232. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "WAC Meets the Ethos of Engineering: Process, Collaboration, and Disciplinary Practices." *Language and Learning across the Disciplines* 4.1 (2000): 4-15. Print.
- Gwiasda, Karl E., Susan Allender-Hagedorn, Jonathon Erlen, Jea-Young Eun, Albert Farr, Irina Kabanova, Patricia Marino, Dushyanthi Mendis, John M. Swales, Dirk Vanderbeke, Sheryl Kamps, Linda S. Bergmann, Anne Collins Goodyear, and Linda Dalrymple Henderson. "Bibliography Relations of Science to Literature and the Arts 1999." *Configurations* 9.2 (2001): 253-378. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Women's Ways Adapted, Adjusted, Lost: Feminist Theory Meets the Practices of Engineering Education." *Fractured Feminisms: Rhetoric, Context, and Contestation*. Ed. Gil Haroian-Guerin and Laura Gray-Rosendale. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2003. 103-116. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Assigning Writing in a Literature Survey Course: Applying WAC to English." *More Ways to Handle the Paper Load—On Paper and Online*. Ed. Jeff Golub. Urbana, IL: NCTE Press, 2005. 3-29. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Richard Ohmann and the Development of a History for Composition." *Works and Days* 45/46, 23.1 & 2 (2005): 63-73. Special Issue on Richard Ohmann, ed. Patricia Harkin. Print.
- Keith Rhodes, Irvin Peckham, Linda S. Bergmann, and Bill Condon. "The Outcomes Project: The Insiders' History." *The Outcomes Book: Debate and Consensus after the WPA Outcomes Statement*. Ed. Susan Marie Harrington, Keith Rhodes, Ruth Overman Fischer, and Rita Malenczyk. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2005. 8-17. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S., and Edith M. Baker. Eds. *Composition and/or Literature: The End(s) of Education*. Urbana, IL: NCTE Press, 2006. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Introduction: What Do You Folks Do over There Anyway?" Bergmann and Baker 1-13. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Works for Further Consultation." Bergmann and Baker 221-230. Print.
- Ianetta, Melissa, Linda Bergmann, Lauren Fitzgerald, Carol Peterson Havilland, Lisa Lebduka, and Mary Wisloski. "The Trajectory of Change: Graduate Programs, Professionalization, and Research," in "Polylog: Are Writing Center Directors Writing Program Administrators?" *Composition Studies* 34.2 (2006): 11-42. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S., and Janet S. Zepernick. "Disciplinary and Transfer: Students' Perceptions of Learning to Write." *Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators* 31.1/2 (Fall/Winter 2007): 124-149. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S., and Tammy Conard-Salvo. "Dialogue and Collaboration: A Writing Lab Applies Tutoring Techniques to

- Relations with Other Writing Programs." *Marginal Words, Marginal Work? Tutoring the Academy to the Work of the Writing Center*. Ed. Bill Macauley and Nicholas Amauriello. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2007. 183-196. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Writing Centers and Cross-Curricular Literacy Programs as Models for Faculty Development." Review Essay of Jeffrey Jablonski's *Academic Writing Consulting and WAC: Methods and Models for Guiding Cross-Curricular Literacy Work*; Anne Ellen Geller, Michele Eodice, Frankie Condon, Meg Carroll, and Elizabeth H. Boquet's *The Everyday Writing Center: A Community of Practice*; and Christina Murphy and Brian L. Stay's *The Writing Center Director's Resource Book*. *Pedagogy* 8.3 (Fall 2008): 523-536. Invited review for special issue on faculty development. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "Higher Education Administration Ownership, Collaboration, and Publication: Connecting or Separating the Writing of Administrators, Faculty and Students?" *Who Owns this Text? Plagiarism, Authorship, and Disciplinary Cultures*. Carol Peterson Haviland and Joan A. Mullin, eds. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2009. 129-155. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S., Gerd Brauer, Robert Cedillo, Chloe de los Reyes, Magnus Gustafsson, Carol Peterson Haviland, and Brady Spangenberg. "Being EFL: Issues in International Tutor Exchange." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*. 2nd ed. Ed. Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafter. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2009. 195-207. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. *Academic Research and Writing*. New York: Longman, 2010. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "The Guilty Pleasures of Working with Archives." *Working in the Archives: Practical Research Methods for Rhetoric and Composition*. Ed. Alexis Ramsey, Lisa Mastrangelo, Wendy B. Sharer and Barb L'Eplattenier. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2009. 220-231. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S. "The Writing Center as Site for Engagement." *Going Public: The WPA as Advocate for Engagement*. Ed. Shirley K Rose and Irwin Weiser. Logan: Utah State U P, 2010. 160-176. Print.
- Duff, Andrea, Julia Miller, Helen Johnston, & Linda S. Bergmann. "Somewhere over the Border: Grammar in a Class of Its Own." *Journal of Learning Design* 5.2 (2012): 50-57. Print.
- Bergmann, Linda S., Allen Brizee, and Jaclyn Wells. "The Engaged Dissertation: Three Points of View." *Collaborative Futures: Critical Reflections on Publicly Active Graduate Education*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Graduate School Press, 2012. 229-258. Print.

Direction of Graduate Student Work at Purdue

Linda was a mentor to graduate and undergraduate students in the writing centers she directed, and when she moved to Purdue she added formal mentoring as thesis and dissertation advisor and as committee member.

Director, Completed Dissertations

- Brizee, H. Allen. (2010). *College-Community Partnerships: Designing a Sustainable and Participatory Literacy Program*. Dissertation Number: 3417966.
- Clark, Jessica. (2005). *An Investigation of the Quantity and Quality of Collaboration in Writing Center Tutorials*. Dissertation Number: 3191443.
- Cordaro, Danielle A. (2010). *How Student Data Matters in Writing Program Administration*. Dissertation Number: 3444503.
- Driscoll, Dana Lynn. (2009). *Pedagogy of Transfer: Impacts of Student and Instructor Attitudes*. Dissertation Number: 3378733.
- Morris, Margaret Shepard. (2012). *That Third Hybrid Thing: Locating a Disciplinary View of Collaboration and a Conceptual Model for Exigency-based Collaborative Research*. Dissertation Number: 3556552.
- Morton, Megan Rose. (2009). *Deliberative Rhetoric and Colonial Identity in New England, 1632-1646: Miantonomi, Roger Williams, Samuel Gorton, and Edward Winslow*. (co-directed with Kris Bross). Thesis Number: 3379688.

Reitmeyer, Morgan. (2011). *From Glass Flowers to Computer Games: Examining the Emergent Media Practices of Plant Biologists*. Dissertation Number: 3477739.

Wells, Jaclyn Michelle. (2010). *Online Writing Labs as Sites for Community Engagement*. Dissertation Number: 3444790.

Director, Dissertations in Progress

Koppelman, Zachary. *Understanding the Rhetorical Engineer*. Defense set for May, 2014.

Rankin, Deborah. *Tutor Decision-Making in Tutorials with L2 Writers*. Prospectus defended.

Mike, Gracemarie. *Women Teachers of Immigrants in 19th Century America*. Prospectus underway.

Thesis Chair

Dorn, Christopher. (2013). *An Ecological Approach to Writing Center Studies*. Thesis Number: 1549339.

Kenzie, Daniel. (2012). *Transfer and the Writing Center: A Qualitative Study of Tutoring Sessions*. Thesis Number: 1529701.

PhD Committee Member

Elizabeth L. Angeli, PhD, 2012

Cristyn L. Elder, PhD, 2012

Mary Gitzen, PhD, 2002

Tarez S. Graban, PhD, 2006

John Hitz, PhD, 2012

Debra Huffman, PhD, 2007

Jaisree Jayaraman, PhD, 2011

Karen Kaiser Lee, PhD, 2011

Laurie A. Pinkert, PhD, 2013

Patti Poblete, ABD, 2012

Laurel Reinking, PhD, 2012

Amy Ferdinandt Stolley, PhD, 2007

Virginia Taylor, PhD, 2007

Jessica Frances Woodruff, PhD, 2009

About the Contributors to this Memorial

Elizabeth Angeli is Assistant Professor of English at Towson University.

Danielle Cordaro is Assistant Professor and Director of the Center for Writing and Oral Communication at Mount Union University.

Dana Driscoll is Assistant Professor in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric at Oakland University.

Judith Yaross Lee is Professor of Communication at Ohio University where she edits *Studies in American Humor* and co-directs the Central Region Humanities Center.

Shirley K Rose is Professor and Director of Writing Programs at Arizona State University and Professor Emerita, Purdue University.

Patricia Sullivan is Director of the Graduate Program in Rhetoric and Composition and Professor of English at Purdue University.

Jaclyn Wells is Assistant Professor and Director of the Writing Center at University of Alabama, Birmingham.

Irwin Weiser is Justin S. Morrill Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Professor of English at Purdue University.



Figure 1: Memory Board from Linda Bergmann's Celebration of Life Ceremony, 2014 (Photo courtesy of Freddie DeBoer)



Figure 3: Linda and others celebrating at the Bistro (Photo courtesy of Liz Angeli)



Figure 2: Linda celebrating Allen Brizee's wedding with Jaci Wells, Allen, Danielle Cordaro, 2013 (Photo courtesy of Jaci Wells)



Figure 4: Linda in Class, 2013 (Photo courtesy of Liz Angeli)



Figure 5: Linda with Allen and Liz at Khana Kazana, 2011 (Photo courtesy of Liz Angeli)



Figure 7: Professor Bergmann talking with students about their research, 2006 (Photo courtesy of Patricia Sullivan)



Figure 6: Linda and Judith, 2009 (Photo courtesy of Judith Lee)



Figure 8: Linda as a younger woman

Review: *The Managerial Unconscious in the History of Composition Studies*

Seth Kahn

Strickland, Donna. *The Managerial Unconscious in the History of Composition Studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2011. Print.

I have to start with a confession. Even though my undergraduate background is in history, I often glaze over (at my own expense, I know!) when faced with histories of our field. With few exceptions (e.g., Robin Varnum's *Fencing with Words* because of its methodological peculiarity), I often find accounts of "how we got here" serving as cautionary tales à la George Santayana, and nearly always reinforcing the entrenchment of the problematic ideas they purport to dislodge or expose. That reaction to histories of the field isn't very fair, of course. The more precise version of that reaction would probably go like this: the more convincing a historical account of the field is, the more difficult it is to address the problem it describes. It's a common problem with academic argument: we work so hard to establish the significance of our topics that saying anything about them other than what makes them so significant is tough.

With that said, if you write or think about labor issues in the field of Composition Studies, Donna Strickland's *The Managerial Unconscious in the History of Composition Studies* is a book you'll wish you'd read. Strickland's reframing of our history will interest historians, of course, given that it convincingly contests any number of conventional narratives that tend to be, as she puts it, "histories of ideas" (5) about teaching writing, and that locate administrative work as a subfield. She responds to that prevailing sense by asserting that the administrative ethos so central to our daily lives as Composition specialists is *not* ancillary or subsidiary to our work as rhetoricians or writing teachers. The *managerial unconscious* is for Strickland the heart and soul of the field as it has

developed since the early Twentieth Century. Rejecting a clear distinction between *management* as socio-economic identity and *administration* as a “polite” substitute for the same practices (10-11), she traces *managerialism* through case studies of three moments—the founding of CCCC; the early days of the Council of Writing Program Administrators; and the social turn in composition in the 1990s—Strickland produces what she describes as “the case for a more vigorous materiality” (7) in our histories, in which management of writing programs can be done ethically. I have to say, parenthetically, that Strickland has underestimated her own result. Yes, it’s a “case for more vigorous materiality,” but it more than carries its own weight as an *example* of same.

For readers who aren’t drawn to reading histories, there are two very important theoretical concepts in the Introduction that may propel you into the analysis. First, Strickland points to the troubling tendency in our professional discourse to conflate *work* and *labor*. Although she doesn’t distinguish them precisely the same way I would, just seeing somebody remind us that the terms aren’t interchangeable is important. More concretely, distinguishing the terms forces us to get more specific about how the machinations of our economic systems construct our profession than by relying on abstract, often oblique, references to capitalism or neo-liberalism. A conversation, out loud, about the value we produce as professionals and on whose backs that happens—and what happens when it’s extracted from our programs—is welcome; putting writing program administrators in the center of that conversation is, as the book demonstrates, crucial to developing ethical responses to bureaucratic and political imperatives of all kinds.

Second, Strickland re-engages a debate that has, unproductively in my opinion, gone quiet over the last ten to fifteen years, about the relationships between the terms *managerial* and *administrative*. She credits (and has defended him for saying it) Marc Bousquet for the observation that our field consists largely of “managerial intellectuals” (9); even those of us who don’t administer programs find ourselves increasingly consumed with managerial tasks: assessment, evaluation, placement, scheduling, and so on. While Bousquet was castigated for this position in the mid-2000s, several years later I found myself making almost exactly the same argument in a presentation at the 2009 CCCC (“If I Don’t Do It, Nobody Will”) about management task-creep into

faculty life. That presentation provoked an audience member to stand up, fist shaking, and announce something like, “I can’t believe we’re STILL having this conversation after ALL THESE YEARS! When are we ever going to learn?” Maybe Santayana is onto something after all.

That anecdote helps me frame the most difficult challenge I have in assessing this book: not only am I on board with its key claims, but I’ve wound up making allied claims—or more precisely, drawing allied conclusions—many times over the years already. I’m left trying to imagine what it’s like to read the book without having tried to think through much of what it says. That’s not to say people who are staunchly pro-labor and experienced at thinking about labor issues won’t find it useful or interesting. However, the depth and thoroughness of the historical analysis is such that we sympathizers clearly aren’t Strickland’s only, or even primary, audience. Hinging her analysis on the uneasy relationship between the administrative and the managerial, and self-identifying from the opening page as a career-long writing program administrator, Strickland invokes an audience of WPAs who have to come to grips with the fact that our disciplinary identity has ignored the material implications of that identity on workers—and has done so from (ostensibly) unconscious motives that are troublesome.

In a nutshell, Strickland contends, much of our disciplinary apparatus, especially as represented by our two most recognizable professional organizations (CCCC and CWPA), is designed to manage teachers—and thus the teaching—of writing as efficiently as possible. Debates over pedagogy, from the early days of writing programs through the formation of CCCC and especially contemporary times, for example, often rest on the economics of what we can afford to ask of, demand from, train, and supervise writing teachers to do. Our professional division between the teaching of literature and the teaching of writing emerges from arguments about the intellectual value of consumption and production of texts, and about canonicity and so on. Just as importantly, it also emerges from the institutional belief that teaching writing is gendered—and thus less expensive, less demanding of professionalizing, and less intellectually challenging. Strickland isn’t the first historian to make such a claim, of course. Nan Johnson, Martha Nussbaum, Dana Harrington, Cheryl Glenn (I’m making no effort to be exhaustive here) have all, in their various

projects, articulated the gendered histories and implications of various aspects of writing (grammar/rhetoric/language arts) instruction.

Strickland's refraction of that history is through the lens of administrative/managerial theory, which positions white middle-class men as thinkers and women as transcribers; which purports to teach male students to think, explore ideas and be clever while women produce tidy text; and which discourages teachers of writing from doing scholarship because writing instruction is so labor-intensive, thereby disarticulating composition from recognized intellectual activity. Strickland's claim isn't that these arguments weren't necessarily *unique to* or *new* in the early days of writing program administration, but that managerialism has thoroughly and profoundly embedded them in our disciplinary unconscious while providing all sorts of noble-sounding arguments for doing so, most noteworthy: protecting the students by encouraging writing teachers to focus on the labor-intensive work; and designing programs that alleviate the burdens of curricular design and pedagogical innovation.

As I was reading the book, and even as I write this review—especially as I write—I'm finding it hard to parse two reactions. One is the previously mentioned sense that, while the narrative is different, the outcome is something I already understand; as a result, the internal arguments and evidence are so interesting only because I don't need them to be convincing. I expect, although I'm speculating as I do so, that readers more interested in historical and archival methods will engage that material more deeply and differently than I did. The other: that, as I read this book, I'm shaking my fist in solidarity with the audience member at my CCCC panel, in some ways even harder than he did. We've been talking about splits between composition and literature, about writing pedagogy *vis a vis* professionalization, about management creep, about contingent labor exploitation for as long as I've been in the field, and in many cases much longer. In a roundabout way, Strickland's book reinforces the fist-shaking urge by anchoring these problems even more deeply—not in chronological but in professional/institutional terms, and by obscuring managerial imperatives about workers in discourses that have, in many cases, taken on their own scholarly ethos (assessment and placement are two obvious examples). Having a profoundly frustrating sense of the profession simultaneously illuminated and reinforced is

difficult to react to; if you're already as frustrated by these conditions in the field as some of us are, I imagine the sense of illumination is heightened as a result.

That mixed reaction comes to a head in the Afterword, which is simultaneously optimistic and deflating, neither of which is probably warranted by the details. Having traced managerialism through nearly a century of its impacts on our discipline, Strickland argues for a stance she calls *tweaking* (120), which entails small changes in management practices and visions, with an eye towards opening and exploring possibilities rather than striving only for increasingly effective ways of reaching determined (often not by us) outcomes. Taken as a call for pragmatism that's impelled by a willingness to imagine radical changes, it's a beautiful vision. Taken as a call for caution that's buffered by a cathartic exercise in imagining futures we know we can never really achieve, it feels like settling. In the end, the suggestion to *tweak* acts as both a vision and a caution, and articulating the products of that tension seems like the obvious trajectory following from this groundbreaking analysis.

About the Author

Seth Kahn is a Professor of English at West Chester University of PA, where he teaches courses in writing and activist rhetoric. He currently serves as co-chair of the CCCC Committee on Contingent, Part-time, or Adjunct Labor. Recent publications include the chapter "What Is a Union?" in Rita Malencyk's *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators* and a guest co-edited (with Amy Lynch-Binieck and Sharon Henry) special issue of *Open Words* on Contingent Labor and Educational Access.

Review: *To Know Her Own History: Writing at the Woman's College, 1943-1963.*

Andrea A. Lunsford

Ritter, Kelly. *To Know Her Own History: Writing at the Woman's College, 1943-1963.* Pittsburgh, U Pittsburgh P, 2012. Print.

This engaging, readable, and highly informative volume, in which Kelly Ritter excavates the postwar history of writing in the Department of English at The Woman's College of North Carolina (in Greensboro, sister to the all-male campus in Chapel Hill) is a welcome addition to our knowledge of women's education and of women's writing. Ritter's interest in normal schools and women's education had been sparked during her tenure at Southern Connecticut State College, but not until she joined the faculty at what is now known as UNC-Greensboro, where they take their normal school history as "one of the premier public colleges for women in the South" (3) seriously, was she drawn into this work. Delving into the rich historical archives there, Ritter began to discern the outlines of several narratives and counter-narratives regarding writing's role within this institution, and moreover, of women's role in weaving those narratives and counter-narratives. Drawing on Charlotte Linde's *Working the Past: Narrative and Institutional Memory*, Ritter set out to attend as carefully as her materials would let her to women as viable agents, whose "noisy silences" have been too long ignored. In the pages of this book, these silences speak clearly and loudly, giving readers' a view of women and women's education that runs aslant received historical accounts by Connors, Berlin, and others.

The opening chapters trace the origins of normal schools and their relationship to the State Normal and Industrial School that was founded in 1891 and became the Woman's College in 1931. Noting that such

normal schools served as the training ground for women teachers and that many important state universities today grow out of the normal school tradition, Ritter argues that if we want to understand the roots of women's education, we must look outside the Ivy League and specifically to these much less elite institutions. The second chapter takes us into the inner workings of the English department, where literary studies, composition studies, and creative writing jostled up against one another, each trying to define itself. This chapter provides a fascinating case study of the first-year writing magazine, *The Yearling*, which was published from 1948 to 1951. *The Yearling* featured expository or argumentative as well as creative writing that provided a "model archival story of literacy education in public women's colleges during this era." Ritter reads the story of this student magazine against and within the mission of the Woman's College to graduate women who would be the teachers of their families and "knowledgeable workers, even leaders, within this community postgraduation (55). Their rigorous course of study—aimed at competing successfully with the men's college at Chapel Hill—and high aspirations led the College to distinguish itself by giving freshmen [sic] an opportunity to publish, as students were doing at prestigious colleges such as Bryn Mawr. In this chapter, Ritter shares tantalizing excerpts from student writing (about southern culture, about the choice of colleges, about segregation, in poems, essays, stories, and genre-bending pieces that made me want to head for those archives myself. I savored the emerging picture of highly literate, ambitious young women, many of whom went on to "value and practice writing throughout their adult lives" (90).

Chapter 3 presents the more familiar story of general educational reform, most often focused on Harvard. Yet Ritter enriches this story by grounding it at the Woman's College and presenting the college's response to the question of "What is an educated woman?" This chapter reveals the fault lines surrounding the terms "writing" and "literacy" within the English Department, whose definitions grow in decidedly different ways in the Department's three areas. Chapter 4—my personal favorite, entitled "The Double-Helix of Creative/Composition"—gives readers an up close and personal look at the Department by juxtaposing the careers of two of its members, Randall Jarrell (the noted poet and strong advocate of creative writing) and May Bush, the director of the first-year

writing program. This chapter alone should be required reading for all students in rhetoric and composition, for it illuminates the history of composition in remarkably insightful ways. While many scholars have figured literary studies as the privileged group with English studies (those Maxine Hairston identified as "mandarins" in her enduring CCCC chair's address), Ritter's study adds a third element—creative writing—that complicates this narrative and raises many additional questions about the relationship of these two "wings" of English. Here her use of "multiple layerings" of archival materials as well as her interviews with alumnae, materials that allow her to produce a history of people rather than merely of documents, allow her to show

how the Woman's College, as an institution already heavily committed to writing and the arts prior to the postwar era and at the forefront of the surge in MFA offerings nationwide, responded to this visibly dynamic decade in writing—specifically, how it came to redefine its priorities where writing instruction was concerned, and how it came to define itself as a primary department of *creative* writing both internally and externally. This redefinition would be one last way in which the college distinguished itself from stereotypical traditions expected of normal schools, and became a case study in cross-pollination of writing pedagogies, as well as administrative priorities, in the postwar era. (153)

But this summary doesn't capture the drama of this chapter, in which we see Randall Jarrell become more and more powerful and take the lion's share of departmental resources even as May Bush fails to gain advancement, or even a decent salary. Over and over again, Ritter's research reveals, and in spite of the Department's supposed support of her, Bush is given tiny increments (\$140) while Jarrell makes (at least) twice her salary and carries half her teaching load. I'm sketching in what is a much more complicated story, and Ritter's conclusion—that the Department's focus on creative writing as a means of bringing the Department to national attention and of turning young women into creative writers (as opposed to making them into "*rhetorically savvy* writers of prose and criticism") failed in the long run to be a sustainable

narrative for the Woman's College, which became the coeducational University of North Carolina, Greensboro, in 1964 (190).

The final chapter of this book explores the debate over whether the Woman's College should continue as a single-sex institution, in the context of the growing UNC system and its relationship to state politics. Ritter urges other WPAs to dig into the history of their own institutions, to scour the archives, conduct oral histories on the institutions, and begin to document the history of writing instruction and of literacy at a host of colleges and universities—and particularly at smaller public schools, through which we might “augment, advance, or otherwise rearticulate the trajectory of our collective and disparate composing histories in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries” (193). Such work, Ritter argues early on in this volume, could “lead to a new understanding of local archival research as not only cataloguing the past, but also troubling and resituating the present for writing programs within all institutional types” (18).

These are ambitious and worthy goals. Fortunately for the field of composition studies, Kelly Ritter has provided a blueprint for others to follow and produced a gripping narrative in all its twists and turns and counter-turns, along the way.

About the Author

Andrea Abernethy Lunsford is the Louise Hewlett Nixon Professor of English, Emerita and Bass Fellow in Undergraduate Education at Stanford University. The Director of Stanford's Program in Writing and Rhetoric from 2000 through 2011, she has designed and taught undergraduate and graduate courses in writing history and theory, rhetoric, literacy studies, and women's writing and is the editor, author or co-author of twenty books and numerous essays. A member of the Bread Loaf School of English faculty since 1990, she is currently at work on *The Norton Anthology of Rhetoric and Writing* and *Writing Lives*, a longitudinal study of student writing and writers.

Review: *Rewriting Success in Rhetoric and Composition Careers*

Megan Schoen

Goodburn, Amy, Donna LeCourt, and Carrie Leverenz, eds. *Rewriting Success in Rhetoric and Composition Careers*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press, 2013. Print.

In February 2013, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* published an article by MLA past president Michael Bérubé lamenting the state of graduate education in the humanities. Bérubé argues that humanities graduate education “is a seamless garment of crisis: If you pull on any one thread, the entire thing unravels.” One thread of this crisis, Bérubé writes, is the humanities academic job market, which “has been in a state of more or less permanent distress for more than 40 years.” He asserts that in response, “We need to remake our programs from the ground up to produce teachers and researchers *and* something else, but since it is not clear what those something else might be, we haven't begun to rethink the graduate curriculum accordingly.” Enter Amy Goodburn, Donna LeCourt, and Carrie Leverenz's timely and important edited collection, *Rewriting Success in Rhetoric and Composition Careers*, which takes on the very project Bérubé calls for: imagining what the “something else” might be and how best to prepare graduate students for them, specifically within the field of rhetoric and composition.

The book's introduction explains the origins of the collection, which began as a proposed 2008 CCCC panel in response to a 2007 CCCC featured session that had introduced Ballif, Davis, and Mountford's *Women's Ways of Making it in Rhetoric and Composition*. Goodburn, LeCourt, and Leverenz describe their reaction to *Women's Ways*, which they saw as too narrowly defining what it means for women to “make it”: acquiring full-time, tenure-track positions in research institutions and producing scholarship (vii). The editors argue that this limited

conception is problematic because “if we continue to value our academic lives primarily in terms of what we publish and its authorized effects, then what we spend most of our time doing—teaching, administering, mentoring—becomes implicitly devalued” (viii). Responses to their own panel impelled Goodburn, LeCourt, and Leverenz to collect narratives from rhetoric and composition professionals who did not follow the highly-sought path to tenured positions at large research institutions, but who rather pursued other options. These stories—told by those working in non-tenure-track university positions, or in traditionally marginalized institutions such as community and tribal colleges, or outside the academy altogether—offer different perspectives that might productively challenge how the field defines itself and its values in order to expand “predominant definitions of professional success beyond the research-focused university career” (viii-x).

Wrapped up with concerns about “disciplinary identity,” and more directly related to Bérubé’s point mentioned above, is the need to address the realities of the academic job market. Goodburn, LeCourt, and Leverenz assert in the introduction that we must acknowledge the trend in higher education toward the dwindling availability of tenure-track positions—and, in fact, the dwindling of academic jobs overall in the midst of economic downturn. Given this reality, the editors state, we cannot assume that all graduates of rhetoric and composition programs will land tenure lines in traditional university settings, or that these graduates will automatically wish to make the sacrifices necessary to acquire those few positions (x-xi). Nonetheless, a stigma remains for those who do not attain these jobs as tenured professors whose primary responsibility is research. Drawing on Marxist theory, the editors explain that “those not directly involved with scholarship signify as having less value, and [...] are accorded with different labor conditions, thus justifying the use of adjunct labor and contributing to the ‘corporatization’ of the university” (xv). In contrast to this devaluing of non-tenure-track work, *Rewriting Success* attempts to valorize the knowledge-making that is made possible specifically by being outside such positions. And it argues that the field should re-think graduate education to better prepare students for the possibility of alternate career paths—paths that should explicitly be valued for the different kinds of

knowledge sought and found by those professionals who follow them (xv-xvii).

The narratives in *Rewriting Success* are divided into three sections, with Section One focusing on “Redefining Work in Academic Institutions.” These compelling essays come from professionals working inside the academy, but in non-traditional roles off the tenure track or in institutions where the primary goal is not research production. Mya Poe’s “Field Notes from a Composition Adjunct at the Biomedical Engineering Outpost” uses the spacial metaphor of the “outpost” to explain how her position as an adjunct at MIT somewhat removed from the department writing program allows her to effectively teach disciplinary writing in biomedical engineering and to bring this knowledge “from the field” back to the discipline of rhetoric and composition (3-17). In “Moving Up in the World: Making a Career at a Two-year College,” Malkiel Choseed challenges the notion that professionals working in four-year institutions are defined by their research and that those working in two-year colleges are defined by their teaching, arguing that this is a false distinction, particularly in rhetoric and composition. Choseed wants “to see teaching valued differently and help those seeking to determine whether a teaching-focused job might best meet their needs as practitioners *and* scholars of rhetoric and composition” (20). Next, Ildikó Melis’s “Nontraditional Professionals: A Successful Career with a PhD in Rhetoric and Composition?” asserts that the undeserved lowly status of many composition instructors in the academy sends mixed messages to students about the value of writing itself in our culture. Melis, who has worked in a variety of positions including at a community college and tribal college, issues a call to “expand traditional concepts of success to include more of the experiences of nontraditional professionals who work in our field...” (35). In “Opportunity and Respect: Keys to Contingent Faculty Success,” Sue Doe contends that contingent faculty positions can be viable and humane long- or short-term career options if the qualities of opportunity and respect are present (51-68). And finally, Heather Graves offers “Disclaimer: ‘Professional Academic on a Closed Course: Do Not Attempt this at Home,’” in which she recounts her decision to leave a tenure-track position at a teaching institution to become a full-time scholar and writer with no institutional affiliation. While Graves acknowledges that many people could not financially afford to make

the same decision, she maintains that it was a useful temporary strategy for her to successfully write and publish several textbooks (69-82). Taken together, these essays show a range of meaningful options beyond traditional positions in research institutions, and they demonstrate how such options not only benefit the individuals who chose them, but also allow those professionals to contribute to the field of rhetoric and composition in innovative ways

Just as Section One highlights the valuable contributions of professionals working in non-traditional roles within academia, Section Two, entitled “Redefining Valuable Knowledge Beyond the Academy,” highlights the stories of rhetoric and composition professionals who have gone further afield by stepping outside of academia altogether. The first essay, “Coming to Terms: Authority in Action and Advocacy” by Moira K. Amado-McCoy, describes Amado-McCoy’s work as the executive director of an LGBTQ community center. She argues that people trained in rhetoric and composition are well suited for work as advocates in the public and nonprofit sectors, and that they should be actively encouraged to pursue those roles (83-103). In “Ten Ways English Studies Contributes to User Experience Research, or: How to Retrofit an English Studies Degree,” Dave Yeats explains how he draws on his graduate education in his job as a user experience (UX) researcher at a small consulting firm (104-116). Similarly, in “Establishing a Writing Curriculum at a Law Firm,” Benjamin Opipari provides an impressive account of how his rhetoric and composition education prepared him for a career as an in-house writing consultant at a large, multinational law firm, where he helps bring clarity and concision to legal writing (117-131). Further, in “My Unexpected Success as a Technical Editor,” Shannon Wisdom describes her position as a technical editor at a company that publishes and teaches educational materials about data and telecommunications (135). She argues that rhetoric and composition professionals are well positioned to succeed and enjoy such work, and she offers recommendations for how graduate programs can even better prepare students for work as technical communicators (132). The final essay in this section, “Conversing with the Same Field: Same Questions, Different Road,” is Nick Carbone’s story of deciding to leave academia for a fulfilling career in publishing at Bedford/St. Martin’s. As Carbone states, the job taught him that “there are lots of places where you can work with smart people who care about

ideas in places other than the academy” (153). These narratives offer compelling alternatives of meaningful work beyond the ivory tower—and they nod toward the need for graduate education in rhetoric and composition to gaze beyond that tower in preparing students for these possibilities.

The redesign of graduate education to better meet the needs of students who may seek alternative careers is the focus on Section 3, “Working for Change.” Cindy Moore’s “Mentoring for Change” begins the section with a charge that those faculty who mentor graduate students are minimally obligated to “ensure that our students understand what the real opportunities are for them, what the pros and cons are for various options, and how to develop the skills they will need to secure the positions they seek” (161). In “Composing a Life: Negotiating Personal, Professional, and Activist Commitments within the Academy,” Jennifer Ahern-Dodson shares her experiences as a postdoctoral teaching fellow and then as an adjunct and how these opportunities put her in “the unique position of collaborating as a change agent to foster writing across the curriculum in unexpected ways” (189). Stacey Pigg, Kendall Leon, and Martine Courant Rife’s “Researching to Professionalize, not Professionalizing to Research: Modular Professionalization and the WIDE Effect” offers an illuminating description of Michigan State University’s Writing in Digital Environments (WIDE) Research Center. WIDE provides a variety of research opportunities to students, and the authors argue that while some might assume this experience in a research center pushes its graduates to pursue elusive jobs in R1 institutions, many graduates of the program find themselves well-prepared to take on work at institutions of all kinds, both inside and outside of higher education (192). The last essay is Lara Smith-Sitton and Lynée Lewis Gaillet’s “Bridging Town and Gown through Academic Internships.” Here, Smith-Sitton and Lewis Gaillet detail their experiences working for the internship program that started in 2005 as a joint initiative of the South Atlantic Modern Language Association and Georgia State University. The innovative program provides graduate students with service learning and internship positions in a variety of areas including “editing and research, event planning, technical and professional writing, or general nonprofit sector administration” (213). The essays in this section offer an impressive

expansion of what graduate education in rhetoric and composition can and should be in order to maximize students' career options.

As a whole, this collection presents readers with a valuable resource for rethinking what it means to “be successful” in a rhetoric and composition career. While the book's audience is not exclusively women, it's important to remember that the inspiration for the project was rethinking narrow prescriptions for being a successful woman in the discipline. As such, the book might be particularly useful for female academics seeking both theoretical and practical approaches in working toward their own definitions of success. More broadly, *Rewriting Success* is a must-read for anyone concerned about the future of our discipline and those who practice in it: academics on or off the tenure track who might be seeking change, current graduate students deciding where they best fit, and any faculty in the field who mentor these graduate students and have a hand in shaping their future choices.

If I have one critique, it's that I would have liked to see more narratives in the collection from this latter group of faculty. In particular, I would like to read narratives from a variety of directors of graduate rhetoric and composition programs who are developing visionary curricula to educate tomorrow's rhetoric and composition scholars with a more expansive conception of and skill set for success. But one can hope more such narratives will soon emerge as we continue to imagine the future possibilities and “something elses” for the field.

To return briefly to Bérubé's metaphor of the “garment of crisis” in humanities graduate education, perhaps what is truly needed to avert the crisis is not a tighter but a looser weave, and a roomier fit that better accommodates more shapes and sizes. That is precisely what *Rewriting Success in Rhetoric and Composition Careers* seeks to do, and it's a worthy alteration indeed.

Work Cited

Bérubé, Michael. “The Humanities, Unraveled.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 18 Feb. 2013. Web. 28 May 2013. < <http://chronicle.com/article/Humanities-Unraveled/137291/>>.

About the Author

Megan Schoen is an assistant professor of English at La Salle University in Philadelphia, where she teaches courses in composition and professional writing. Her research interests include composition studies, writing program administration, and comparative rhetorics. She has published in *Rhetoric Review* and *Writing Program Administration: Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators*. Deeply interested in graduate education, she is a co-founder and past co-chair of WPA-GO, the Council of Writing Program Administrators Graduate Student Organization.

Review: *Feminist Rhetorical Practices*

Alexis E. Ramsey-Tobienne

Royster, Jacqueline Jones and Gesa Kirsch. *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012.

In *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*, Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa E. Kirsch provide a comprehensive overview and analysis of thirty-plus years of scholarship and practice of feminist research methods. The authors believe such a volume is necessary because feminist research practices have caused a “tectonic shift” in Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies (RCL), expanding the scope and practice of rhetorical inquiry. For Kirsch and Royster, feminist rhetorical practices are best understood through an analytic lens of four methodological practices: critical imagination, strategic contemplation, social circulation, and a globalizing point of view. Taken together, this framework offers a means for (re)visiting and revising standard rhetorical practices, as well as a means for anticipating emergent rhetorical approaches.

Beginning with the claim that “stories matter,” Royster and Kirsch introduce readers to their own personal and professional stories, thereby enacting a feminist research method. Indeed, throughout the volume Kirsch and Royster work to reflect the very practices they describe. They highlight the kairotic moment (the Virginia Tech Feminist Symposium in 2007) that was the catalyst for this discussion of feminist research methods. Indeed, they emphasize in their own stories three key ideas: activism, meaningfulness, and respectfulness, that characterize how we as researchers might interact with our research subjects. They remind us, as feminist researchers, that we “need to learn to ask new questions and new ways to listen to the multidimensional voices that are speaking

from within and across the many lines that might divide us as language users” (4). Part I therefore is a call to action for scholars to recognize forms of knowledge production and dissemination that move beyond the traditional canon of rhetorical practice and research. They argue we need to develop a feminist operational framework that is “dynamic, flexible, and enlightening...as we move beyond the core agenda of rescuing, recovering, and re(inscribing) women into the history of rhetoric to work that is more transformative for the field” (18). Such a framework emphasizes the value of the ethical self, not only in the texts we produce, but in the texts we study and the pedagogical frames we use to instruct our students.

In Part II, Royster and Kirsch explore the landscape of rhetorical studies over the last thirty years to point out key ways in which feminist rhetorical practices have helped to shift and reform the criteria for what counts as “rhetorical performance, accomplishment, and rhetorical possibilities” (29). Namely, by establishing new criteria for excellence and for worthiness in RCL, feminist rhetorical practices have expanded both research methods (including reframing western traditions, rearticulating how, when, and by whom rhetorical performance might occur) and methodologies (decisions about what counts as data, and how we gather and interpret that data, embracing collaboration). They also look ahead, asking how research methods and methodologies will continued to be shaped, particularly with the movement toward more global and transnational rhetorical activities.

Chapter 4 and Part III trace four terms of engagement to showcase how, taken together, they form a matrix for understanding and utilizing both former and contemporary rhetorical practices, as well as anticipating future practices. These four methods are critical imagination, strategic contemplation, social circulation, and globalizing point of view. Critical imagination, or “educated guessing,” is taken from Royster’s *Traces of a Stream* and suggests searching for what is likely or possible, given what is currently known. The importance of this inquiry tool is the reminder for scholars to “look more systematically beyond our contemporary values and assumptions to envision the possibilities of women’s practices in broader scope and to bring intellectual rigor to the analytical task” (76). Critical imagination asks scholars to be aware of their own presence in their research and to examine how our own biases, expectations, and

attitudes may shape our interpretations. Further, it asks researches to be open to new possibilities—new research subjects, methods, sources—even as we work to not overromanticize or overidentify with said subjects. Critical imagination asks us to perform a balancing act of sorts: to use our imagination to search for and unearth new research possibilities even as we maintain a critical perspective about the past.

Strategic contemplation suggests that researchers linger in the research space, “to take as much into account as possible but to withhold judgment for a time and resist coming to closure too soon in order to make the time to invite creativity, wonder, and inspiration into the research process” (85). The process of strategic contemplation enables the researcher to consider both the external and internal aspects of the research process. On the one hand the researcher can work in “real time and space” (85), e.g. the gathering of data and experiences to help understand the historical context of the subject; on the other hand, the researcher is also given license for more introspective process of imagining, meditating on materials, on possibilities, on connections. Social circulation indicates the diverse ways that women interact with each other in deliberate, communicative ways. This method also helps researchers to think about the fluidity of language use, moving beyond public domains and beyond traditional uses of rhetorical action, to more diverse, possibly private contexts. Simply put, social circulation recognizes rhetorical action in places not previously valued. The final method is globalizing point of view which acknowledges rhetorical action and innovation in a more diverse and inclusive global and geopolitical context. A globalizing point of view reminds scholars to be cognizant of the multiplicity of rhetorical practices from around the world.

Throughout this section of the book, Kirsch and Royster repeatedly perform what they refer to as “Tacking In” and “Tacking Out,” by providing examples of how these feminist research methods have been practiced. Thus, in addition to the literature review offered in part II, part III provides readers with even more examples of feminist rhetorical practices in action. Tacking In offers a closer examination of extant scholarship that itself looks closely at existing resources and scholarship. Tacking In helps researchers assess what we know, how we know it, and what still seems to be missing. Tacking Out, on the other hand, is a more long-range, anticipatory view that examines what might become more

visible “in broader strokes and [though] deep impressions” (72). Tacking Out is very much about the broader possibilities feminist rhetorical research might engender.

Another important element in this part of the book is the explicit attention to pedagogy. Each section ends with a discussion by both Kirsch and Royster of how they have utilized these four terms of engagement in their own classrooms. For example, after discussing critical imagination as a research tool, Kirsch recounts a story she shares with her students about her serendipitous, circuitous route to researching Dr. Mary Bennett Ritter. In the same section Royster discusses how she utilizes her text *Critical Inquiries* in her classroom. These pedagogical discussions are a particularly helpful element of the book because so many of their readers are educators themselves.

The final section of the book, part IV, moves beyond thinking about women’s historic rhetorical practices, and beyond the current, varied, and vital practices of today’s scholars, toward a “renegotiation of the paradigms by which we account for rhetoric as a dynamic phenomenon” (132). In other words, part IV looks at how feminist rhetorical studies vis-à-vis the research matrix will continue to enhance and deepen rhetorical knowledge. In essence, the feminist rhetorical practices will continue to help (re)define RCL. The conclusion of part IV positions the future of RCL in a “kaleidoscopic view” in which different analyses converge. They note four new “horizons” that are drawing interest and attention: the first is ways of “being and doing in rhetorical studies [that enables the] study of new rhetorical scenes, neglected sites, rarely studied groups of people, extracurricular locations, and unusual genres” (149); the second is a “need for critical and creative attention to be directed toward the interrogation of our listening and reading practices” (150); next is embracing the multimodal and multimedia texts now being produced; and the final horizon is pushing boundaries and understandings of “how knowledge travels, translates, mitigates, and shapes rhetorical actions” (151). Together, these new vistas reinforce the ethics of care and hope which underscore the diversity of practices celebrated in this volume.

Indeed, another welcoming aspect of the book is the personal interaction readers seem to have with both Kirsch and Royster. We, the readers, get to meet them as scholars and as teachers as they share with us their own growth as feminist scholars. This inclusion of their own

intellectual journeys enacts the reciprocal and dialectical interaction between researcher and subject they actively seek to create. Thus, they embody their goal of finding “innovative ways to engage in exchange with these women both critically and imaginatively” (14) by speaking with their readers. In celebrating their own noteworthy achievements within the field of RCL, and by celebrating the achievements of other feminist scholars, as well as pointing to the ongoing and substantial influence of these achievements, *Feminist Rhetorical Practices* exemplifies their own polylogic analytical model by sharing multiple types and ways of doing scholarship, teaching, and research. I highly recommend this volume to all scholars in RCL, but particularly to graduate students and young academics beginning their own research journeys.

About the Author

Alexis E. Ramsey-Tobienne is an Assistant Professor of Rhetoric at Eckerd College, St. Petersburg, FL., where she is also Director of the Writing Portfolio. She teaches courses in Analytic and Persuasive Writing, Advanced Research Methods, Visual Rhetoric, and Social Change Writing. She is co-editor of *Working in the Archives: Practical Research Methods for Rhetoric and Composition*. She has also published on the use of institutional repositories for preservation purposes and on archives and digital humanities.

