

This article was downloaded by:[Purdue University]  
On: 21 June 2008  
Access Details: [subscription number 788775672]  
Publisher: Routledge  
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954  
Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## Quarterly Journal of Speech

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:  
<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713707519>

### Women's Rhetoric in History: A Process-Oriented Turn and Continued Recovery

Robin E. Jensen

Online Publication Date: 01 February 2008

To cite this Article: Jensen, Robin E. (2008) 'Women's Rhetoric in History: A Process-Oriented Turn and Continued Recovery', Quarterly Journal of Speech, 94:1, 100 — 112

To link to this article: DOI: 10.1080/00335630701790834  
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00335630701790834>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article maybe used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

# Women's Rhetoric in History: A Process-Oriented Turn and Continued Recovery

Robin E. Jensen

Alisse Portnoy, *Their Right to Speak: Women's Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), ix+290 pp. \$49.45 (cloth).

Jane E. Simonsen, *Making Home Work: Domesticity and Native American Assimilation in the American West, 1860–1919* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), xi+266 pp. \$59.95 (cloth), \$22.50 (paper).

Wendy B. Sharer, *Vote & Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915–1930* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004), xi+218 pp. \$50.00 (paper).

Karyn L. Hollis, *Liberating Voices: Writing at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004), xi+192 pp. \$55.00 (cloth).

In the 1970s and 1980s, scholars began noting the absence of women in the rhetorical canon and attempted to alleviate that disparity by recovering and reclaiming the words of women from different moments in history. Arguing that men “have an ancient and honorable rhetorical history” while women “have no parallel rhetorical history,” Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, in particular, fought to make women’s rhetoric a viable area of study.<sup>1</sup> Campbell published two landmark books, in which she laid a foundation for exploring women’s historical rhetoric and featured original texts by women from the period 1840–1920. She also edited two sourcebooks featuring analyses of U.S. women’s rhetoric from 1800–1925 and 1925–1993, respectively.<sup>2</sup> Andrea Lunsford expanded the scope of this reclamation project by editing a collection of essays on women rhetors from ancient Greece to the contemporary west.

---

Robin E. Jensen is Assistant Professor of Communication at Purdue University. The author would like to thank Debra Hawhee and Susan Zaeske for their helpful comments and suggestions. Correspondence to: Department of Communication, Purdue University, Beering Hall of Liberal Arts and Education, Room 2114, 100 North University Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907-2098, USA. Email: [rejensen@purdue.edu](mailto:rejensen@purdue.edu).

Like Campbell, Lunsford's goal was to "at last give voice to women lost to us; by examining in close detail their speech and writing; and by acknowledging and exploring the ways in which they have been too often dismissed and silenced."<sup>3</sup> These efforts broadened the realm of rhetorical study and fleshed out existing narratives of rhetorical history.

Other scholars have followed in this important tradition of studying "great women speakers" who, despite a lack of rhetorical resources and role models, and a surplus of hostile audiences, managed to deliver speeches that received public attention and/or acclaim.<sup>4</sup> For example, in *Angelina Grimké: Rhetoric, Identity, and the Radical Imagination*, Stephen Howard Browne analyzes many of Angelina Grimké's speeches and tracts to assess what arguments she made and how she made them. Similarly, Mari Boor Tonn explores several of Mary Harris "Mother" Jones's speeches to demonstrate how she utilized an ethos of militant motherhood to further the goals of the industrial labor movement.<sup>5</sup> In these studies, as well as in the majority of the essays anthologized by Campbell and Lunsford, the authors focus on an exceptional speech or speeches, noting how women speakers created credibility for themselves, how audiences seemed to respond to their appeals, and how speakers' backgrounds and the historical context related to their speech. In addition, they demonstrate how an orator's gender served as a rhetorical limitation and/or was appropriated as a form of rhetorical agency in specific historical situations. Although these projects may peripherally deal with the process of rhetorical production, they are largely speech- or "product"-oriented.

Over the last few decades, some scholars of rhetoric in history have taken Campbell's reclamation project in a slightly different direction by analyzing collective rhetoric by women. For instance, Martha Solomon's edited volume, *A Voice of Their Own: The Woman Suffrage Press, 1840–1910*, includes essays that explore the collective rhetoric of women suffrage presses. Susan Zaeske's *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women's Political Identity* analyzes U.S. women's anti-slavery petitions.<sup>6</sup> Both of these works stand out not only because they focus on women's collective rhetoric but also because they focus almost as much on rhetoric as product (i.e., articles, essays, and speeches featured in suffrage publications; woman's anti-slavery petitions) as they do on rhetoric as process. Process-oriented criticism—criticism that analyzes the process of rhetorical production, often within a collective—is particularly helpful in illuminating how traditionally marginalized groups such as women and minorities created themselves as speaking subjects at different points in history. Because women and minorities have had fewer opportunities to give great speeches or to publish influential writings, scholars must look beyond publicly celebrated rhetoric to piece together a comprehensive narrative of rhetorical history. In this sense, process-oriented projects have the potential to broaden our sense of what rhetoric is, as well as our understanding of the constitutive properties of rhetorical invention.

Herein, I demonstrate that some of the newest books contributing to the study of women's rhetoric in history focus more on rhetorical process than they do on rhetorical product, by emphasizing collective rhetoric as a valuable constitutive

method regardless of (or in spite of) the merit or effect of the resulting rhetoric. In this sense, the field of rhetorical history is engaged in a turn toward process-oriented analyses. These analyses highlight the importance of recovering overlooked rhetoric by women and minorities, but use revised criteria for establishing appropriate artifacts of study. If information about the creation of a specific rhetoric exists, and if the creation process discursively altered individuals' sense of self, group, and/or Other, then the process is fertile ground for rhetorical analysis. Although process-oriented analyses may focus on rhetoric that reached many people or had a clear public impact, they must draw from rhetoric that helped individuals and/or collectives create themselves discursively and materially, regardless of the end rhetorical product.

The authors of the books reviewed here engage in process-oriented criticism, sometimes in combination with product-oriented criticism, but always with a focus on how women in the course of creating rhetoric also created subjectivities, as well as opportunities, relationships, and limitations, for themselves and others. Alisse Portnoy's *Their Right to Speak: Women's Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates* analyzes how and why women created Native American anti-removal petition campaigns and anti-slavery petition campaigns. Jane E. Simonsen's *Making Home Work: Domesticity and Native American Assimilation in the American West, 1860–1919* explores the "Indian question" through the creation of domesticity discourses by white, middle-to-upper-class women, and the creation of rhetoric, both textual and visual, by Native American women. Wendy B. Sharer's *Vote & Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915–1930* investigates the collective production of women's rhetoric between feminism's first and second waves. Similarly, Karyn L. Hollis's *Liberating Voices: Writing at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers* discusses the creation of women's rhetoric in those interim years, focusing on a writing- and speaking-intensive educational program run primarily by white, middle-class women for working-class women. A process-oriented framework helps these scholars to illuminate differences among women, how those differences functioned rhetorically at various historical moments, and how women differentiated by class, race, and religion created rhetoric for and with each other.

### Speaking of Race and National Identity

In *Their Right to Speak: Women's Activism in the Indian and Slave Debates*, Portnoy revisits and revitalizes nineteenth-century debates about Native American removal, African colonization, and abolition through the lens of gender and women's rights. She explores "the ways a group (here, women) acquires the authority to speak about a topic for which they usually have no authority (national policy) in a community from which they typically are excluded (the national legislature)" (6). Throughout her book, Portnoy demonstrates that women's early attempts to influence political decisions were intertwined with issues of racial politics. For example, she points to Catherine Beecher's seemingly contradictory stance against women's abolitionist petitions in 1837 after Beecher anonymously encouraged women to sign Native

American anti-removal petitions in 1829. Some have argued that Beecher's 1837 statement signaled a change in her support for women's rights. However, Portnoy argues that the difference between Beecher's stance in 1829 and her stance in 1837 had more to do with her rejection of the abolitionist movement than it did with her sense of women's "right to speak."

The first few chapters of *Their Right to Speak* engage debates about Native American anti-removal campaigns in the early nineteenth century and how white, northern, middle-class women, led by Beecher, became active in those campaigns. Nearly 1500 women signed anti-removal petitions from 1830 to 1832. Ultimately, these petitions did not halt removal policies, and neither did they receive much public or governmental attention, but they did encourage the women who signed them to construct themselves as morally authoritative citizens devoted to a paternalistic relationship with Native Americans. White women justified their petitioning by claiming that their womanhood cued them in to the experiences of Native Americans in ways that white men could not grasp. They highlighted their womanly ways of knowing and their innate understanding of the family, and the nation, as a "home" (a domesticity theme that, as I will discuss shortly, Simonsen explores more thoroughly).

Portnoy investigates the ways that women created "objects of advocacy" (e.g., Native Americans and later African slaves) through petitions and argues "that the ways many European Americans imagined Native and African Americans precluded immediate abolition as an appropriate topic of women's advocacy" (89). The majority of northern, white women of means had very few opportunities to interact with these groups, and therefore their sense of them was created through "discursive imaginings" in novels and news coverage. Although Native Americans were often framed as savages, popular novels, for example, offered European Americans ways to imagine Native Americans as potential members of society, although those same novels did not offer them a similar way to imagine African Americans. Thus, women could petition for the inclusion of Native Americans in the United States, but they had more trouble (and less support) petitioning for the inclusion of free African Americans in the United States.

Portnoy devotes the final three chapters to exploring the colonization and abolition debates as they intersected with white, northern women's petitioning. She justifies her efforts by identifying two gaps in the historical literature about the United States in the 1820s and 1830s. First, Native American removal and African American slavery are often dichotomized, even though, at the time, those issues overlapped in numerous ways. Second, despite its popularity during this period, very little scholarship exists on the U.S. colonization movement as scholars have been inclined to study pro- and anti-slavery debates rather than abolition-colonization debates, which were both sub-sets of the anti-slavery movement. Portnoy's findings here serve as a backdrop for her analysis of the famous debate on anti-slavery petitioning and women's public roles between Catherine Beecher and Angelina Grimké in 1837, a debate that serves as a rhetorical "product," if you will. Portnoy's goal in studying the public letters and tracts that Beecher and Grimké

exchanged is less to explore how or why their rhetoric was persuasive and more to highlight the process of rhetorical creation, education, and imagination that led up to that debate. Over a period of many years, both Beecher and Grimké developed positions against slavery and believed that women could play an important role in overthrowing that institution, but Beecher came to believe that the transition out of slavery should be gradual while Grimké developed a commitment to slavery's immediate end. Portnoy's analysis reveals that both Beecher and Grimké claimed "activist roles, rights, and responsibilities" for women in light of "Jacksonian-era national crises" such as Native American removal efforts and the institution of slavery (213, 243). *Their Right to Speak* offers readers a multifaceted, well-developed picture of this exchange and the intersections of women's rights activism, Native American anti-removal campaigns, colonization efforts, and anti-slavery discourse in American rhetorical history.

In *Making Home Work: Domesticity and Native American Assimilation in the American West*, Simonsen analyzes white, middle-class women's role in the land allotment acts of the late nineteenth century—acts that Jason Edward Black has recently connected to the removal act rhetoric featured in Portnoy's study.<sup>7</sup> Simonsen does not use the language of rhetorical analysis to guide her discussions, but scholars of rhetoric will find within her book's pages valuable insights into the process of rhetorical invention, language's constitutive qualities, and women as rhetors in U.S. history. Her book explores "the forms through which domesticity was produced" in the western United States within "contact zones" where Native Americans and European Americans collided (5). In particular, Simonsen analyzes how white, middle-class women and Native American women produced new identities for themselves as they created rhetoric about domesticity.

The majority of Simonsen's book is devoted to white, middle-class women's efforts to assimilate Native American women, a movement that she positions as a western counterpart to the more celebrated eastern settlement house movement led by Jane Addams and Lillian Wald. Like Portnoy, Simonsen explores literary portrayals of Native Americans, noting that sentimental novels of the late 1800s generally ignored European Americans' imperial racism and emphasized their attempts to "help" Native Americans integrate into middle-class society. Simonsen also finds that feminist publications such as the *Woman's Standard* argued that all women, regardless of race, should band together to fight against the oppression of domestic labor. At the same time, however, these publications drew from popular theories of social Darwinism to argue that white women deserved to be treated better than minority wage laborers because they were more civilized. In this sense, domesticity became a topic that allowed white women to communicate their oppression, their ties to other women, and their superiority over other races of women.

Simonsen emphasizes the way that middle-class homes, cookware, and other domestic materials served as "object lessons" to Native American women during the allotment era. The Women's National Indian Association (WNIA) moved Native Americans into traditional, one-family houses on the plots of land that the U.S. government allotted them. The white, middle-class women behind this work

focused on the power of domestic labor to assimilate and civilize. The WNIA's journal, *Indian's Friend*, often featured first-person accounts from "field matrons" who lived with Native American communities and encouraged community members to abandon their tribal ways. WNIA leaders believed that if Native American women would learn to maintain a proper home, their entire society would more easily assimilate into white culture. Their efforts were largely unsuccessful, however, and Simonsen, like Portnoy, emphasizes the role that white women's imaginings of Native American women played in forming pockets of miscommunication between the two groups.

Towards the middle of her book, Simonsen emphasizes some of the fissures in white women's discussions of domesticity as civilizing *and* as oppressive, fissures that were evident in the photography of E. Jane Gay, a WNIA member and allotment assistant. Many of Gay's photographs feature domestic objects, the supposed civilizing agents of the home, as tools of imperialism. The photographs communicated how the U.S. government was "organizing the nation's household" with its attempts to allot land to Native Americans (112), and Simonsen engages in several close readings of specific images in Gay's repertoire. She finds that Gay's photography highlighted the process of civilizing through domestic training, but also Native Americans' resistance to being "whitened."

The last two chapters of *Making Home Work* are among the most interesting; they discuss Native American women's rhetorical processes in response to white women's assimilation efforts. While Portnoy focuses most explicitly on white women and men's rhetorical processes, Simonsen aims to compare and contrast these to Native American women's rhetorical processes. In this way, she offers readers a more complete picture of rhetorical womanhood in the nineteenth-century American west—one that accounts for several different classes, races, and cultures. For instance, Simonsen highlights the career of one of the first Native American civil service field matrons, Anna Dawson Wilde. A graduate of an eastern, assimilation-focused academy and the Boston School of Domestic Science, Dawson Wilde lectured to and displayed herself before white and Native American audiences as proof of the success of assimilation efforts. As a field matron in North Dakota, she kept her house, herself, and her children clean and orderly so that they would be "object lessons" for others to model themselves after.

Angel DeCora, a Native American artist and teacher, demonstrated that the lives of Native American women fit into the contemporary world and were not a thing of the past. She argued that Native American women had innate artistic talent and used that argument to sell their crafts to middle-class, white Americans. Simonsen claims, "In celebrating the Native American woman artist as cultural producer, [DeCora] advocated a more vigorous and valuable kind of domestic production than what she saw as the artificial productions of white women, symbolized by the middle-class home" (212). DeCora endorsed a new identity for Native American women workers that allowed them to exist at the boundaries of their native culture and industrial society.

Readers will find that *Making Home Work* is heavy on description and light on analysis, which may be a sign that Simonsen was trying to do too much with this project. This conclusion becomes especially salient when the book is paired with Portnoy's tightly focused work. Where Portnoy offers close readings of a few texts, Simonsen discusses a wider range of texts by diverse authors. The breadth of her project is impressive, but it allows her fewer opportunities to provide evidence for her conclusions. Even so, by analyzing the stories of white women and Native American women, and mapping the ways that they created textual and visual discourse about domesticity, Simonsen provides readers with a glimpse into the complex nature of the "Indian question" through the lens of gender. Her descriptions shed light on the constructed nature of domesticity, gender, and national identity, while also filling gaps in existing narratives of rhetorical history.

### Women's Rhetoric between the Waves

The next two books reviewed here are from the Southern Illinois University Press's *Rhetorics and Feminisms* series and focus on rhetorical activity in the first half of the twentieth century. Sharer's *Vote & Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915–1930* analyzes women's collective rhetorical activities between feminism's first and second waves. The book's overarching goal is:

To change popular perceptions of women's participation in political discourse in the decade after suffrage through an investigation of the extensive, collective literate practices large groups of women used to create widespread pressure for reform even *after* they were granted official status as voters. (4)

Sharer focuses specifically on the creation of community literacy practices in two non-governmental political organizations, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) and the League of Women Voters (LWV). She maintains that although the WILPF and LWV's rhetoric did not include many seminal texts (i.e., "great" rhetorical products), the consistent appeals that members communicated over time (i.e., the rhetorical process) created a rhetorical groundwork for social and individual change (7).<sup>8</sup>

Sharer begins her book by arguing that the pre-suffrage rhetorical activities that women honed in benevolent societies, abolitionist organizations, mission societies, temperance groups, and suffrage organizations continued long after women earned the right to vote. Women's organizations such as the WILPF and the LWV encouraged their members to write letters, articles, and books, give speeches, and navigate the intricacies of media circulation. In the WILPF, a group headed by Jane Addams and founded during World War I to counter the U.S. government's hostile international communication style, members fostered alternative diplomatic organizations and exposed the mainstream press's censorship of "anti-war" communication. Sharer catalogues the many different rhetorical activities in which WILPF members engaged, highlighting educational opportunities where students were trained in international awareness, peaceful mediation, public speaking, writing, and publicity. She concludes



that, for the most part, the group's efforts did not alter international politics. However, she highlights the value in studying the rhetorical activities of the WILPF by explaining how the organization's discursive activity transformed members into active, confident citizen-rhetors.

Sharer's discussion of the LWV, a non-partisan organization that emerged after the passage of the 19th Amendment and was led by suffragist Carrie Chapman Catt, explores how members attempted to expand what was considered political, unite women, and involve them in electoral politics. As she does with the WILPF, Sharer catalogues the different LWV educational efforts designed to teach women to speak, read, and write about political issues. The LWV's "rhetorical curriculum" prepared women to face hostile audiences and coached them in methods that might turn members of those audiences into sympathetic listeners. LWV members became familiar with voting procedures, legislative activity, and other political processes, and they practiced defending the organization's interests using theories of debate and argumentation. Sharer concludes that the LWV's "nonpartisan education as a strategy" was unsuccessful in challenging political parities and legislation (158). Nevertheless, she holds that the process of creating LWV-endorsed rhetoric was valuable because it enabled women to create themselves as speaking subjects in history and because it contributed to the archives of pedagogical theory.

A limitation of Sharer's study, and, to be fair, one that she repeatedly acknowledges, is that members of the WILPF and LWV were primarily white and middle-to-upper class. Organization members dealt with this insularity in different ways. Leaders of the WILPF suspended women's differences in order to create the illusion of a united front among all women and to downplay the inequalities inflicted on working-class and minority women by white, middle-to-upper-class women. In contrast, members of the LWV recognized the class differences among women and, in some cases, drew from classist, racist, and xenophobic ideas to legitimate their work. Sharer's study demonstrates that in the process of creating themselves as speaking subjects, the women in these organizations also created limited subjectivities for women who did not share their race or class. By focusing on women's rhetorical history "between the waves," Sharer recovers women's rhetoric from a time period that has received little attention from scholars of women's rhetoric in history. Future scholarship should expand her project by recovering and analyzing the rhetoric from this era of women's organizations with diverse memberships.

In the short volume *Liberating Voices: Writing at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers*, Hollis also focuses on this under-studied time period, arguing that women who enrolled in the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in the 1920s and 1930s used their writing to "reinscribe their identities and aspirations, resisting stifling cultural scripts and attending to both the 'bread' [economic needs] and 'roses' [artistic expressions] of their desires" (1). Hollis labels this program a successful cross-class alliance in which working-class women from across the U.S. and Europe took courses from professors, high school teachers, and labor reformers to learn how to communicate in public forums and fight for changes in social policy once they returned to work. Despite widespread xenophobia and racism at this time,

the program embraced diversity by including women from a variety of geographical locations, ethnic backgrounds, and labor industries, and by 1926 the program also enrolled African Americans. School administrators put working women's experiences at the center of the curriculum and offered courses in the liberal arts and labor economics. The school's goal was not to help students aspire to the middle classes, but to create strong female leaders within industry.

Drawing from publications written by summer school teachers, Hollis finds that composition teachers put their students' experiences at the center of writing exercises and taught writing as a process. Students wrote autobiographies for their English classes and then published them in the school's magazine, *Shop and School*. Hollis argues that many of these autobiographies demonstrate the change in subjectivity that students experienced while at the school (e.g., grammatically shedding a singular "I" in favor of a collective "we" toward the end of the term). Similarly, students at the summer school frequently wrote, directed, and acted in labor dramas, an activity that allowed them to try on new subjectivities and create a working-class community of collective agency. Hollis highlights the process that school administrators and teachers (almost all of whom were women) went through to get these dramas into the curriculum, as well as the process that students experienced creating and practicing the dramas before performances. She uses Bakhtin's notion of heteroglossia to analyze one play in particular, emphasizing how the range of different voices and subject positions in this play helped students to critique hegemonic power structures.

Throughout her book, Hollis discusses the ways in which summer school readings and assignments tied in to the material world. Teachers designed assignments "to give immaterial text a more material dimension and purpose" (42), a goal that drew from the school's aim to inspire graduates to create material changes in their working environments. Hollis claims that the summer school offered working women a chance to plan and practice how they would respond to their material oppression when they returned to their jobs. Although teachers and students worked on improving their communicative skills in the classroom, they were not "textual determinists" because they argued that discourse without action would not result in better social conditions for workers. In lieu of this emphasis on material reality, much of the student poetry published in *Shop and School* could be classified as "corporeal rhetoric" because it accounts for either the authors' or others' physicality. Hollis's discussions about the physical act of creating dramas, essays, and fiction, as well as her attention to student writings concerning lived experiences, situates her work within the realm of body studies. As Debra Hawhee explains, scholars of bodily rhetoric tend to frame rhetoric as a "whole body encounter between rhetor and rhetor or teacher and student, an art concerned with a deeply habituated, embodied, situated intelligence and sense of timing."<sup>9</sup> Hollis's work illustrates the bodily experience of creating rhetoric, a point that deserves special attention when rhetors are those with traditionally Othered bodies such as working women.

*Liberating Voices* includes several succinct yet engaging discussions of pedagogical and composition theory, as well as extended appendices at the end of each chapter

featuring student writings from *Shop and School*. Although Hollis leaves unanswered questions about how the process of teaching working women shaped middle-to-upper-class white women's sense of self and/or Other, or how students dealt with the material consequences of leaving work and family when they attended the school, her analysis of working women's rhetorical processes illustrates trends in rhetorical history and recovers the voices of women who never had the opportunity to give great speeches.

### Women's Rhetoric in History: Looking Forward

The books reviewed here demonstrate a turn toward process-oriented analyses in scholarship on women's rhetoric in history. The point of this essay is not to dichotomize analyses according to their emphasis on product or process, but rather to assess where this area of study seems to be headed and to address some of the questions and topics that scholars are tackling. These latest studies share Kathleen Turner's view of rhetorical history as a method that "offers us the opportunity to see rhetoric as a perpetual and dynamic process of social construction, maintenance, and change."<sup>10</sup> They address questions about how women used rhetoric to constitute themselves in public ways, how and why women differentiated themselves from each other discursively, and how women connected their rhetorical expressions to their material realities. Unfortunately, by focusing on a specific group's rhetoric, scholars risk essentializing members of that group (what Bonnie Dow labels the "difference" model of feminist scholarship) or subordinating their rhetoric as a lesser, less-generalizable sub-set of the larger field.<sup>11</sup> If anything, however, the books discussed here highlight the many different material and rhetorical ways of being a "woman" in history, as well as the value in studying the process of rhetorical creation regardless of the rhetoric's product or the rhetor's gender, race, or class. As Susan Zaeske explains, and as these books demonstrate, women "did and do influence society" and their discourse can tell us as much or more about rhetorical history, theory, and practice as can men's discourse.<sup>12</sup>

Portnoy, Simonsen, Sharer, and Hollis continue the invaluable recovery mission that Campbell called for several decades ago, and their work extends beyond the range of her call by examining women's collective rhetoric that may or may not have produced noted rhetorical products. Their shared focus on collectivity offers an alternative to the figure-based models of traditional rhetorical history, just as their orientation toward process provides them with an implicit justification for mining understudied eras, topics, and discussions. For instance, both Sharer and Hollis focus on women's rhetoric between the waves of feminism. They forgo the "wave model" of rhetorical study exemplified by much existing scholarship on women's rhetoric in history and, as Sharer puts it, attempt to alleviate the "painful gaps" that "are still being perpetuated through the political and rhetorical histories that are taught in American schools today" (3). Similarly, Simonsen recovers rhetoric from the Women's National Indian Association, the western counterpart to the much-studied

eastern settlement house movement, as well as rhetoric by several Native American women.

Process-oriented projects also inspire scholars to return to rhetoric that has already been discussed, thereby shedding new light on discursive activity by exploring the process of rhetoric's production. For instance, Portnoy revisits the 1837 exchanges between Catherine Beecher and Angelina Grimké to find that these rhetors were talking more about colonization and abolition than they were about women's rights. Her findings result from her exploration of how Beecher and Grimké came to be rhetors, communicated their ideas over many years, and negotiated their unique roles as women and as public actors.

While these recent studies illuminate new vistas in rhetoric, scholars of women's rhetoric in history have yet to make much progress in international rhetoric. Each of the books reviewed here focuses on U.S. women's rhetoric, and in this way they are fairly representative of historical studies on women and rhetoric in general. Notable exceptions include Elisabeth Croll's *Changing Identities of Chinese Women: Rhetoric, Experience and Self-Perception in Twentieth-Century China*, which explores women's rhetoric in response to major political events in recent Chinese history, and Cheryl Glenn's *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity through the Renaissance*, which offers a history of rhetoric that includes women from a range of countries and time periods—although still mostly Western.<sup>13</sup> More research of this nature is needed. If we are truly dedicated to creating a comprehensive narrative of rhetoric by women and men in history, and to understanding the many vicissitudes of symbolic meaning creation among diverse peoples, we must analyze rhetoric, both as a process and as a product, from around the world.

## Notes

- [1] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *Man Cannot Speak for Her*, vol. 1, *A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric, 1830–1925* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1989), 1. See also Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Women Speaking: A Feminist Analysis of Rhetoric" (speech, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, 1985); Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss, "Incorporating the Feminist Perspective in Communication Scholarship: A Research Commentary," in *Doing Research on Women's Communication: Perspectives on Theory and Method*, ed. Kathryn Carter and Carole Spitzack (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1989), 65–94. Barbara Biesecker challenges these attempts to "insert" women's rhetoric into the canon without critiquing the canon itself, arguing that writing women into the traditional rhetorical canon forces a few exceptional women to speak for all women. Ultimately, however, she urges "feminists working within the discipline of Rhetoric to labor scrupulously on *two* fronts at once." In other words, Biesecker concludes that scholars of women's rhetoric in history must continue studying the rhetorical discourses of women and critiquing the canon to which they contribute. See Barbara Biesecker, "Negotiating with our Tradition: Reflecting Again (Without Apologies) on the Feminization of Rhetoric," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 26 (1993): 236; Barbara Biesecker, "Coming to Terms with Recent Attempts to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 25 (1992): 140–61.
- [2] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *Man Cannot Speak for Her*, vol. 1; *Man Cannot Speak for Her*, vol. 2, *Key Texts of Early Feminism, 1830–1925* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1989); *Women Public Speakers in the United States, 1800–1925: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook* (Westport, CT:

- Greenwood Press, 1993); *Women Public Speakers in the United States, 1925–1993: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994). For other anthologies of historical rhetoric by women, see Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald, eds., *Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s)* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001); Molly Meijer Wertheimer, ed., *Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1997).
- [3] Andrea A. Lunsford, ed., *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995), 6. For a similar project, see Christine Mason Sutherland and Rebecca Sutcliffe, eds., *The Changing Tradition: Women in the History of Rhetoric* (Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary Press, 1999).
  - [4] Carole Spitzack and Kathryn Carter provide a typology of communication scholarship as it conceptualizes women. The “great women speakers” model recognizes “female influence in the public domains” and dismantles “the assumption that only men are capable of greatness.” Carole Spitzack and Kathryn Carter, “Women in Communication Studies: A Typology for Revision,” in *Reading Rhetorical Theory*, ed. Barry Brummett (Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers, 2000), 908.
  - [5] Stephen Howard Browne, *Angelina Grimké: Rhetoric, Identity, and the Radical Imagination* (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1999); Mari Boor Tonn, “Militant Motherhood: Labor’s Mary Harris ‘Mother’ Jones,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82 (1996): 1–21. For other examples of rhetorical scholarship that follow a “great women speakers” model, see Bonnie J. Dow, “The ‘Womanhood’ Rationale in the Woman Suffrage Rhetoric of Frances E. Willard,” *Southern Communication Journal* 56 (1991): 298–307; Cindy L. Griffin, “Rhetorizing Alienation: Mary Wollstonecraft and the Rhetorical Construction of Women’s Oppression,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 293–312; Cindy L. Griffin and Barbara M. Gayle, “Mary Ashton Rice Livermore’s Relational Feminist Discourse: A Rhetorically Successful Feminist Model,” *Women’s Studies in Communication* 21 (1998): 55–76; Amy R. Slagell, “The Rhetorical Structure of Frances E. Willard’s Campaign for Woman Suffrage, 1876–1896,” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 4 (2001): 1–23.
  - [6] Martha M. Solomon, ed., *A Voice of Their Own: The Woman Suffrage Press, 1840–1910* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1991); Susan Zaeske, *Signatures of Citizenship: Petitioning, Antislavery, and Women’s Political Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003). Other examples of studies of collective women’s rhetoric in history, focusing on both the product and the process of rhetorical creation, include Nan Johnson, *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866–1910* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2002); Carol Mattingly, *Appropriate[ing] Dress: Women’s Rhetorical Style in Nineteenth-Century America* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2002); Susan Wells, *Out of the Dead House: Nineteenth-Century Women Physicians and the Writing of Medicine* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001).
  - [7] Jason Edward Black, “Remembrances of Removal: Native Resistance to Allotment and the Unmasking of Paternal Benevolence,” *Southern Communication Journal* 72 (2007): 185–203. Black finds that some Native Americans argued against allotment policies by drawing from collective memories of governmental removal acts from over 50 years earlier.
  - [8] The references to rhetorical product and process are mine, not Sharer’s.
  - [9] Debra Hawhee, *Bodily Arts: Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 190.
  - [10] Kathleen J. Turner, “Rhetorical History as Social Construction: The Challenge and the Promise,” in *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Kathleen J. Turner (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998), 4.
  - [11] Bonnie J. Dow, “Feminism, Difference(s), and Rhetorical Studies,” *Communication Studies* 46 (1995): 113.
  - [12] Susan Zaeske, “History, Theory, and Method in Feminist Scholarship on Early American Discourse,” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 6 (2003): 578.

- [13] Elisabeth Croll, *Changing Identities of Chinese Women: Rhetoric, Experience and Self-Perception in Twentieth-Century China* (London: Zed Books, 1995); Cheryl Glenn, *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity through the Renaissance* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1997). Other examples of international scholarship on women's rhetoric in history are available in Lunsford, *Reclaiming Rhetorica*; and Sutherland and Sutcliffe, *Changing Tradition*.