

## Introduction

MARGARET R. HIGONNET

Does gender have a literary history? Does literary history have a gender? The preliminary response in this issue to both questions is yes. Theorists such as Michel Foucault and Judith Butler have expounded the historical evolution of our concepts of sexuality, the cultural coding of the body, and the instability of binary categories – and the term *gender* is often used to affirm those features of change, social construction, or performance of identity as they are recorded in texts. Literary history, in turn, not only traces the inscriptions of gender in all their complexity but has itself characterized both texts and critical tools as masculine or feminine. Yet a comparative literary history that addresses the phenomena of literary gendering, and that successfully paints the strands of tradition produced by men and women, lesbians and gays into a larger literary landscape, remains to be written. Debra Castillo in this issue explains that, in spite of major contributions to the history of Latin American women writers, the integration of women writers into big comparative, continental projects has stalled. We can address here just a few of the broader conceptual issues that arise out of the challenges brought by feminist and queer theory to comparative literary history. A full and nuanced accounting of the two questions and of their intersection would require not only more space but far more extensive scholarship than exists to date. As I suggest in a volume on *Teaching World Literature*, the challenge of weaving women into our historical survey courses and our anthologies is ‘to trace historical shifts and cultural differences for which the scholarship is still evolving’.<sup>1</sup> The goal of this introduction therefore is to lay out problems rather than solutions.

The term *gender* itself has emerged recently from the history of feminism, and has accrued a rich array of definitions in many disciplines,

as Karen Newman points out in her critique here of the definition of ‘gender studies’ posted on ‘Wikipedia’. The term brings with it variegated and coexisting critical approaches that point toward the fluid processes of literary history highlighted in *Literature as System: Essays Toward the Theory of Literary History*, where Claudio Guillén declares that a period should be understood as ‘a plural number or cluster of temporal processes, “currents”, “durations”, [...] flowing’ simultaneously in a dynamic process.<sup>2</sup> The widespread reliance on ‘LGBT’ today at once distinguishes and blurs subject positions into an alphabet soup of identities that are assumed to shape literary forms of expression, but that cannot be pinned down.

Over the course of several years, the Gender Studies Committee of the International Comparative Literature Association has put out calls for papers addressing the intersection of literary history and gender, for the triennial congresses and regional meetings as well as for this issue. Just as feminist critics organized a session in 1994 at the Modern Language Association asking ‘Where Are We Going? Where Have We Been?’ so too we started taking snapshots of the path we wanted to map, within an international and comparative frame. The responses that came in from colleagues from around the world testified to very diverse scholarly conditions within different national and regional institutions. If ‘feminist’ scholarship seems passé in some Western contexts, as Jonathan Culler hinted in 2006 in this journal,<sup>3</sup> in other contexts work on retrieving forgotten strands of literary history – whether spiritual writing by women, *testimonios* of racially suppressed minorities, or recordings of oral traditions – has just begun. The assessment of structures that inscribe alternative views of bodily and sexual differences in non-Western literary and philosophical traditions remains in its early stages. Marie-Paule Ha, for example, has written in *Signs* about the gap between a Western conceptual matrix for the body and Chinese conceptions of the body, a gap which places the comparative interpreter of literary texts at the intersection of cosmological and biomedical bodily schemas.<sup>4</sup> Oyèrónké Oyěwùmí goes further, arguing that in Yoruba culture, unlike Western culture, the body was not the basis of social roles and therefore culture was not organized primarily around gender distinctions but rather around age and status.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps this difficulty of terminology is an instance of the chicken-egg conundrum. However inadequate the concepts of feminist and gender analysis, they are necessary tools for the construction of a new kind of comparative edifice. As I argued in

the Charles Bernheimer report, 'gender studies [...] should be comparative' (155).<sup>6</sup>

Indeed, one challenge to the development of a comparative gender analysis springs from the growing realization in the field of cultural studies that just as cultures are not homogeneous, identities are not static, uniform, or coherent. Trinh T. Minh-ha and Judith Butler have made particularly influential contributions to our understanding of a self that is complex, many-layered, projected and performed in a constantly shifting process. Trinh, for example, suggests that the 'I' is 'not a unified subject, a fixed identity'.<sup>7</sup> A preliminary caveat is therefore in order. Labels such as 'feminist', 'queer', or 'gay', which imply a recognizable identity, ideology and critical practice, belie the multiple critical practices under those rubrics. The first step must be to recognize the labile nature of 'feminist' critical approaches, as they have morphed into 'gender' and 'queer' interpretations of texts across time and nationalities. Similarly, as the essays by Chantal Zabus and Sylvie André in this issue argue, there is no singular African gender ideology or literary iconography and no singular Pacific island culture. To trace the emergence of literary forms and themes requires that we establish a sociological context for asymmetries in access to literacy and the Republic of Letters, as these evolve variably across cultures.

What does it mean to juxtapose literary history with comparative gender study? Literary history has always been central to comparative literature, even if René Wellek doubted its possibility, asking, 'Is it *possible* to write literary history, that is, to write that which will be both literary and a history?'<sup>8</sup> Until recently, however, gender has not played a large role in comparative literary histories. To be sure, today we find feminist, gay, and queer historical approaches to periods such as the Middle Ages and Renaissance.<sup>9</sup> Most of these have traced particular traditions rather than integrate those traditions into a more general narrative. More familiar is the revisioning of genres in which identity is central to narrative structure, such as autobiography and the *Bildungsroman*. Karen Newman in this issue provides a long list of publications that testify to this dramatic shift toward gender analysis. A number of factors may explain, however, why gender has taken so long to come into view among comparatists.

One explanation for the absence of gender analysis in literary histories until recent decades may lie in the old distinction drawn by René Wellek and Austin Warren between intrinsic and extrinsic modes of

study. While they devoted a section of *Theory of Literature* (1949) to chapters on literature and biography, psychology, and society as well as intellectual history and interart comparison, Wellek argued that such 'extrinsic' concerns distract literary historians from an 'analysis of the works themselves'.<sup>10</sup> The task, he felt, was to trace 'the history of literature as an art, in comparative isolation from its social history, the biographies of authors, or the appreciation of individual works'.<sup>11</sup> While Wellek found space in his *History of Modern Criticism* for Mme de Staël's *De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales* (1800), he could not embrace her emphasis on the contexts within which literature is produced.

In response to Wellek's position, we might argue that literary history in fact premises (whether explicitly or not) the interwoven influences of educational curricula, legal mandates, historical archives, patronage or government grants, and private foundations in manufacturing literary tradition. The social conditions of production that affect an individual author's art also in part mirror literary reception or demand, and as Mme de Staël pointed out in *De la littérature* two centuries ago, this aesthetic economy has a gender inflection. Following in the steps of Judith Butler, we can start from the position that the shifting definitions of gender relations are a cultural phenomenon, like the box step, which we learn to perform, but which also takes place in a real time and space. A new literary history might therefore compare the distinctively national or cultural conventions that shape genre, voice, or style. Those conventions are not restricted to gender, of course. A writer on the margins, for whatever reason, may write 'slant' or with a wall-eyed gaze, queering conventions, as Sigrid Weigel argued that women have done, in her essay 'Der schielende Blick'.<sup>12</sup>

A second explanation for the long resistance to gender analysis is a corollary of the distinction between extrinsic factors (such as the sex of the author or the gendering of social roles and scripts) and intrinsic structures. It is the value-laden distinction between high and low cultures. In men's writings, richly complex allusions to the ancient 'literature' read in school carry a weight lacking from allusions to popular 'texts' in the vernacular, to women's or to children's culture. Maggie Tolliver grasps immediately the absurdity of this distinction when she reads her brother Tom's Latin grammar. Asymmetrical access to literacy and to schooling have shaped over the centuries different paradigms and concomitant values, as Virginia Woolf proposes: 'This is an important book, the critic assumes, because it deals with war. This

is an insignificant book because it deals with the feelings of women in a drawing room. A scene in a battlefield is more important than a scene in a shop—everywhere and much more subtly the difference of value persists.<sup>13</sup> Such assumptions produce a stratification of literary history that goes well beyond the neglect of female authors.

Similarly, another factor in the formation of a monocultural, homosocial literary canon has been the distinction between major and minor forms and the tacit segregation of folklore or children's literature from elite literary forms.<sup>14</sup> The distinction between oral and written texts, often linked to social status, has inhibited the incorporation of oral productions into our histories. Marta Weigle reminds us that the first named author in the world's written literature was Enheduanna, a woman. Yet, as Weigle explains, in the field of oral study, 'it has been difficult to analyse and appreciate women's expressive forms simply because those forms were not considered except when related to the female domestic sphere and work, reproductive life cycle, or child rearing'.<sup>15</sup> Those forms have been absent from the record, in some instances, because male fieldworkers were not permitted to study women, and in others, because their forms were not considered artful. A study of oral production provides evidence that certain genres such as mourning and lament traditions are frequently assigned to women, as well as evidence for women's bawdy lore and provocative songs, along with their covert expression of subversive ideas.<sup>16</sup> Segregated performance, secrecy, and taboo may all have collaborated in stripping such traditions out of the record.

A new literary history seeking to incorporate oral traditions would find that within oral cultures separate forms marked by distinctive themes, metres and genres are sometimes assigned to male and female performers, as we see in Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, where the mother's animal fables are distinguished from the father's epic narratives. When those oral traditions enter into writing, as South African playwright and novelist Zakes Mda has explained, the cultural heritages transmitted by the grandmother and grandfather may become fused, transforming features that had formerly been 'marked' by gender.<sup>17</sup> At the same time myth attaches to bisexual sages such as Tiresias the cumulative wisdom of androgyny that Coleridge and Woolf attribute to the creative imagination. We might ask whether such traditions are carried forward in literary representations of intermediate sexual roles today. Moreover, as Edward Chamberlin notes, the sharp distinction between an elite literate culture and primitive oral culture is itself illusory. 'All so-called oral cultures are

rich in forms of writing', and our written cultures are replete with public arenas in which oral performance continues to play a central role.<sup>18</sup>

Ironically, resistance may spring from the fact that even our critical tools are gendered, just as manufacturers adapt scissors to the left and the right hand (which anthropologists tell us are also culturally aligned with female and male). Such gendering affects the main analytic categories of literary history: periodization, genre, and (inevitably) the understanding of authorial voice and style.

Perhaps because of the preeminence of canonical 'masterworks' in comparative study, even though those exceptional texts often seem to stand outside history, the metaphors for causality applied to literary history frequently imply sexuality. Diachrony and change are figured as births. Paul de Man accordingly urged critics to give up 'the pre-assumed concept of history as a generative process [...] of history as a temporal hierarchy that resembles a parental structure in which the past is like an ancestor begetting, in a moment of unmediated presence, a future capable of repeating in its turn the same generative process'.<sup>19</sup> Inverting the 'parental structure' described by de Man, Margaret Ezell has in turn critiqued feminist critics for seeking to give birth to their female ancestors, thereby generating a selective vision of women writers from the past, segregated from their social context, and seeking out literary traditions that conform to the feminist premises of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in a neat hermeneutic circle.<sup>20</sup> Jasbir Jain agrees in her essay here, concluding that such a critical bias may distance critics from the authors they study as well as their audience. In a sense, Virginia Woolf inaugurated this mode of criticism when she wrote, 'a woman writing thinks back through her mothers'.<sup>21</sup> In her radical current study, *The Sexuality of History*, Susan Lanser argues that we must move beyond 'the premise that sexuality is historically constructed to the claim that history is also sexually constructed'.<sup>22</sup> As Ina Schabert points out in her essay in this volume, biological metaphors of growth and reproduction are implicitly gendered. Like Hayden White, who proposed the application of Northrop Frye's cycle of literary forms to historiography, Schabert teasingly suggests we could interrupt the subliminal conventions of literary history by overtly imagining textual relationships through the model of romance. Gertrud Lehnert considers Schabert's own two-volume *Englische Literaturgeschichte* (English Literary History) an 'exemplary' experiment in dramatizing writers' participation in literary history along lines that follow the evolution of gender norms.<sup>23</sup>

Intertextuality, adaptation, appropriation, and outright plagiarism all shape literary history. But the weight of the literary past, the burden of authoritative allusiveness, has borne down differently on the pens of men and women and has affected relationships between the two. It was a startlingly simple matter for Eve Sedgwick to trace homosocial themes in a way that queers the theory of influence propounded by Harold Bloom.<sup>24</sup> The transmission of creative power down male lines coexists with occasions of hysteria about possible contamination that might result if a writer draws creative inspiration from his literary foremothers. Thus Keats critiqued the sentimentalism of bluestockings and ‘sublime Petticoats’, but himself was accused of ‘emasculated pruriency’, as if virility or effeminacy could be transmitted by reading the right or wrong poets.<sup>25</sup>

Sexual metaphors have represented not only diachronic processes, but also the synchronic dimension of periodization, as we shall see. Do periods have a sex? was one of the first, witty questions to be asked by feminist historians. If literary movements are related to ‘schools’, ‘circles’, ‘salons’, and ‘little magazines’, do some of them carry a masculine charge and others a feminine charge? Do such distinctions overlap with spaces encoded as public and private, or with a preference for print rather than manuscript circulation?

The picture of the Renaissance that had been widely accepted by scholars when historian Joan Kelly wrote her landmark essay ‘Did Women Have a Renaissance?’ (1977) did not include many women writers or artists, and the recognition of that repressed population gave different boundaries and substance to the definition of the Renaissance. How did the social organization of schooling, literary clubs, or the theatre shape a masculine literary culture that followed the curves of a political history that was also dominated by men? Institutions such as schools gender the shape of national literary histories, and they do so in ways that evolve historically and differ across cultural boundaries. Schools have often shaped bonds among men that in turn become the core of literary movements – thus three of the great German romantics were students together at the theological seminary at Tübingen: F. W. J. von Schelling, G. W. F. Hegel and Friedrich Hölderlin. In an asymmetrical paradigm, salons headed by women often provided a hybrid public yet domestic sphere that attracted men and women alike, and that permitted women to join in the intellectual exchange.<sup>26</sup> Even today in many countries, access to literacy and therefore to the Republic of Letters may be limited by sex, as well as by class and religion. It is no accident that the establishment

of schools for girls was an important goal in the eighteenth-century agendas of Catherine the Great of Russia, Maria Theresia of Austria, Mary Wollstonecraft, and dozens of Frenchwomen who wrote petitions to the Estates General and to the Legislative Assembly at the moment of the French Revolution.<sup>27</sup> Protestant countries were more likely to open the doors of schools to girls than Catholic countries. And to a startling degree, women writers in the eighteenth century became 'transnational' both in their lives and in their reading of female as well as male contemporaries: Madame de Staël and Isabelle de Charrière were polyglot travellers, whose lives were partly spent in exile from the intellectual milieux where they had come into their own as writers. Their interests crossed disciplinary boundaries into areas such as music and politics, making them awkward subjects for a literary history. Yet in very important ways their key texts exemplify qualities that have been taken to define a period from which literary historians have exiled them.<sup>28</sup>

Closely related to the importance of education (from the earliest scribal schools) in shaping European literary history is the rise of printing and the emergence of a popular press. Starting in the eighteenth century literary magazines quickly opened up space for women to contribute and even to edit their own work, in part because the print world bridged the divide for women between the public and the private at the very moment when the public sphere was being created. One example of a woman editor in Germany would be Sophie von La Roche, whose *Pomona* made her a virtual mother to young women, a situation she dramatized in her own fictional dialogues within the journal. Such journals became important not only in Europe and America but on other continents as well. In Japan, for example, Amy Heinrich points to the group called Seito (Blue Stockings), which published a literary magazine for the work of women writers between 1911 and 1916. 'Our group has as its objective the birth of a feminine literature [...] We are animated by an ardent sincerity and our ambition is to express and produce female genius...'.<sup>29</sup> Their range was not purely literary but also ideological and political. Such journals have often been linked to social domains with which women were ideologically identified. Thus one of the early fairy-tale authors, Mme le Prince de Beaumont, became a founder of children's literature in France with her *Magasin des enfans* (1756). Other women's journals embraced high moral territory such as abolitionism. Yet gender identity is always fluid, just as racial and ethnic identities have been performed repeatedly in print, and many 'women's magazines' were edited by men such as Mallarmé, who used the pseudonym Miss

Satin. These complex publishing histories invite a revision of the insular 'masterwork' model in relationship to assumptions about the sex of audiences.

Even if political regimes and events have been the most common measure of a literary period, literary historians have also used representations of sexuality to define a period such as fin-de-siècle decadence. Havelock Ellis's theory of inversion, Marc-André Raffalovich's Uranism, and Edward Carpenter's 1908 theory of the 'intermediate sex' saturated the literature of the fin de siècle, from Wilde to Radcliffe Hall. Queer theory too has brought a new understanding of how discourse has structured the inclusion (or exclusion) of writers in literary history, by exposing how writers themselves adapt to forms of cultural resistance inscribed in the law of their times, in medical or sexological treatises, or simply in social taboos. Such resistance to their work has shaped gay, lesbian, or bisexual writers' choices, 'queering' their creative expression and channeling it into alternative forms of publication. Detours and deviations, silence and subversion may mark every level of representation, from metaphor to genre. Once we become attuned to such encoding, we may recognize layers of meaning within texts that destabilize our period definitions. Thus many staid Victorians are now thought to have written on the 'Wilde' side. In the elegiac epic *In Memoriam* by poet laureate and sage Tennyson, the presumably masculine narrative voice crosses gender lines freely, section by section, imagining the bereaved self as wife or lover as well as friend of Hallam. Is it possible that Tennyson assimilated his voice of lamentation to that of feminine figures, in an echo of women's historic assignment to that ritual role and genre?

While development through time and periodization are self-evidently important to literary history, genre study too has retained great prestige in comparative historical study, if only because each new example changes the rules. And like period definitions, genre theory has often been gendered, as Lore Metzger demonstrated by compiling a panoply of quotations from critics such as Roda-Roda, who wrote: 'A man alone: a lyric poem; two men: a ballad; one man and one woman: a novella; one man and two women: a novel; one woman and two men: a tragedy; two women and two men: a comedy'.<sup>30</sup> Friedrich Schlegel similarly wondered whether the novel was a feminine genre ('eine weibliche Dichtart'), whereas Ana Lydia Vega has lamented that the novel is a men's canteen ('La novela es cantina de hombres'). While such playful attributions reflect on the critic's attitudes more than they do on the character of specific genres, the narrative structures of many literary

genres do tend to carry a gender, channeling distinct variant traditions, as many critics have noted. Narrative order implies social order, and social scripts correspond to literary narrative types. Male epic quests may be contrasted to the female epic quest of a figure such as Psyche. The *Ramayana* may be paired with the narrative of Sita. The best-known genre on which such comparative work has been done is the Western *Bildungsroman*, which typically sets a young man on a journey down a road along which he encounters representatives of different aspects of society, from whom he learns the skills and social knowledge that will permit him to join a circle of adult men. But a woman on the road, as the early feminist work of Elizabeth Abel and her colleagues showed, carries very different meaning. Her story of the drive to explore the world tends to become a ‘voyage in’ (where a psychological realm is plumbed) or a voyage down toward death.<sup>31</sup> The narrative articulation of gender in such genre variants has been a particularly successful area of comparative study, and yet such specific studies still need to be woven together into a comparative literary history.

Finally, the most obvious locus for thinking about gender in literary history, of course, is that of authorship and voice—topics that have infiltrated into this entire reflection, eluding the filters of deconstruction and postmodernism. If we understand gender itself as a set of cultural norms that are acted out in writing, then the performance of authorial gender and the covert parody of gender norms are stock features of the history of writing. Think of women who write under male pseudonyms such as Currer Bell, George Sand, and George Eliot, or the men who write under female names, such as Charles Perrault as ‘Mother Goose’ (*Les contes de ma Mère l’Oye*, 1695). Over the centuries, while men have mimed the voices of women and appropriated sexual metaphors of birth to depict their creativity, as Mary Ann Frese Witt shows in her essay here, women have mimed those of men.

Style, one component of what I am calling voice, has often been represented as having a sex. Thus in *Ad Herennium* 3.12.22, Cicero suggests that a ‘kind of slavish quality’ in a sharp voice tends ‘more toward womanliness than manly dignity’. Steering in *De Oratore* 97 between levels of style, he affirmed that a plain style should have ‘a sort of sap’ and the orator with the most power is ‘full, copious, weighty and ornate’; a manly taste would lead to ‘florid style’, although lush extravagance might also infect a virile style.<sup>32</sup> Inevitably, Eric Gunderson suggests, the difficulty of establishing a style that would convey an ‘authentic male presence’ exposes the ‘unstable and chimerical’ nature

of these concepts.<sup>33</sup> Quintilian in the *Institutio oratoria* elaborates the performative aspect of the metaphor: an unhealthy style is like a body ‘plucked and rouged and effeminately prinked’; ‘legitimate and splendid dress gives a man authority [...] but when it is womanish and luxurious it does not beautify the body’.<sup>34</sup> Strikingly, the vitiated style is always depicted as other: as womanish, effeminate, or Asian, and it is assimilated to the body. A long line of theorists reproduce these gendered value judgments. For Seneca, speech should be ‘tough and virile’, and for Francis Bacon, elegance is not a manly ornament (‘non ornamentum virile’).<sup>35</sup> The instability of these affiliations betrays their arbitrariness.

Because representations of voice and rhetoric depend on socially shared codes, it is difficult to discern the identity of a truly anonymous text. In anonymous poems from the sixth century BC to the seventeenth century AD, we must guess whether a female voice lamenting her abandonment was composed by a man or a woman – and we may not care what the answer is, since the issue is not a factual one, as in a paternity suit, but an aesthetic one. Thomas Hardy ingeniously constructed fictional voices to reflect gender, class status and dialectal inheritance as well as the philosophic influences of a character’s partner – whether Tess’s beloved husband, the intellectual Angel Clare, or Jude’s cousin, the independent and artistically refined Sue. Even as they blur the stereotypical lines that bound the sex of a character, these creations are so powerful that readers imagine them to be traces of actual people. Hence, while early feminists appeared to argue that a ‘woman’s voice’ could be traced in fiction by women, corresponding to their place in culture and class, critics such as Susan Morgan and Margaret Ezell now reject that notion.<sup>36</sup>

Male and female traditions are positively intertwined. Because literature itself shapes the imagination of gender and reinvents ideology, we can re-imagine and transform the complex workings of tradition and counter-tradition. More broadly, a number of critics in the wake of Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar agree that women have written ‘double’, subverting the surface message with a covert message or scarcely visible ‘palimpsest’.<sup>37</sup> At the same time, we know that minority groups of all kinds tend to exploit the margins of discourse, writing what Elaine Showalter calls both a ‘dominant’ and a ‘muted’ story.<sup>38</sup> Thus what on the surface looks like an essentialist argument is not that far from Derrida’s ‘white writing’ that ‘forces what it says into the margins and then seizes the margins so that nothing may settle there’.<sup>39</sup> Wherever there is a dominant discourse, we find writers who strive to queer the

boundaries. One of the tasks of literary history then will be to juxtapose such 'other' writers as parallel threads in the larger historical text. To sum up: one of my premises is that literary theory and accordingly literary history have covertly embedded gender norms. Much of the important work by feminist scholars—both male and female—over the last three decades has addressed these subtle but surprisingly pervasive assumptions. By confronting the implied criteria of literary value and by embracing the instability of represented identities, as comparatists we may become able to create new stories out of old histories.

## NOTES

- 1 Margaret R. Higonnet, 'Weaving Women into World Literature', in *Teaching World Literature*, edited by David Damrosch (New York: Modern Language Association, 2009), pp. 232–245, p. 233.
- 2 Claudio Guillén, *Literature as System: Essays Toward the Theory of Literary History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 464.
- 3 For Jonathan Culler, 'feminism' has triumphed over adversity, at risk of its own identity: 'Feminism, too, alleged to be dead, can be said to have triumphed in the academy, in that much of what feminist critics and theorists struggled for now goes without saying. [...] This is an outcome, like the triumph of theory and the triumph of comparative literature, that one cannot *not* wish to have happened, though one still would rather that such triumphs gave more cause for joy and were not so easy to identify with the death of what has triumphed'. Jonathan Culler, 'Whither Comparative Literature?', *Comparative Critical Studies* 3:1 (2006), 85–97, p. 86.
- 4 Marie-Paule Ha, 'Double Trouble: Doing Gender in Hong Kong', *Signs* 34:2 (2009), 423–449.
- 5 Oyèrónké Oyěwùmí, *The Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1997).
- 6 Margaret R. Higonnet, 'Comparative Literature on the Feminist Edge', in *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, edited by Charles Bernheimer (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), pp. 155–164, p. 155.
- 7 Trinh T. Minh-ha, *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), p. 94.
- 8 René Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature* (1949; New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1956), p. 241.
- 9 See, for example, Carolyn Dinshaw, *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999); *Same Sex Love and Desire among Women in the Middle Ages*, edited by Francesca Canadé-Sautman and Pamela Sheingorn (London: Palgrave, 2001); Valerie Traub, *The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002); and David M. Robinson, *Closeted Writing and Lesbian and Gay Literature: Classical, Early Modern, Eighteenth-Century* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006).
- 10 Wellek, *Theory*, p. 127.

- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 243.
- 12 See Sigrid Weigel, 'Double Focus: On the History of Women's Writing', in *Feminist Aesthetics*, edited by Gisela Ecker, translated by Harriet Anderson (1985; Boston: Beacon Press, 1986), pp. 59–80. 'Der schielende Blick', in *Die verborgene Frau* (Berlin: Argument Verlag, 1983).
- 13 Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1929), p. 77.
- 14 See Katherine Binhammer, Susan Brown, Patricia Clements, Isobel Grundy, 'Introduction: Feminist Literary Historiography', in *Women and Literary History 'For There She Was'*, edited by Katherine Binhammer and Jeanne Wood (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), p. 14.
- 15 Marta Weigle, 'Women's Expressive Forms', in *Teaching Oral Traditions*, edited by John Miles Foley (New York: Modern Language Association, 1998), pp. 298–307, p. 298.
- 16 See Susan Tower Hollis, Linda Pershing, and M. Jane Young, editors, *Feminist Theory and the Study of Folklore* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993).
- 17 Zakes Mda, in oral presentation at the University of Connecticut, 2008.
- 18 J. Edward Chamberlin, *If This Is Your Land, Where Are Your Stories?: Finding Common Ground* (Toronto: Knopf, 2003), pp. 19–20.
- 19 Paul De Man, *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), p. 164.
- 20 Margaret Ezell, *Writing Women's Literary History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), pp. 57–58.
- 21 Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1929), p. 101.
- 22 Susan Lanser, 'Mapping Sapphic Modernity', chapter 3 of *The Sexuality of History: Sapphic Subjects and the Making of Modernity*. Forthcoming.
- 23 Ina Schabert, *Englische Literaturgeschichte: Eine neue Darstellung aus der Sicht der Geschlechterforschung*, 2 volumes (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1997, 2006), vol.1, p. 15; Gertrud Lehnert, 'Gender Theorie und Komparatistik', in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Allgemeine und Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft 2004/2005* (2005), 91–101.
- 24 Eve Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).
- 25 Cited in Margaret R. Higonnet, 'Telling Thefts: Authenticity, Authority, and Male Anxiety', *LIT* 5 (1994), 119–134, pp. 126–128.
- 26 See Marc Fumaroli, *L'Âge de l'éloquence* (Geneva: Droz, 1980) and for an éloge of the female salon in France, see Mona Ozouf, *Les mots des femmes: essai sur la singularité française* (Paris: Fayard, 1995).
- 27 See Carol Strauss Sotiropoulos, *Early Feminists and the Education Debates: England, France, Germany 1760–1810* (Farleigh Dickinson, Madison, 2007).
- 28 A sampling of women's cosmopolitan, polyglot interests is gathered in 'I have heard about you', *Foreign Women's Writing Crossing the Dutch Border, from Sappho to Selma Lagerlöf*, edited by Suzan van Dijk, Petra Broomans, Janet van der Meulen, and Pim van Oostrum (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2004).
- 29 Amy Vladeck Heinrich. 'Double Weave: The Fabric of Japanese Women's Writing', *World Literature Today* 62:3 (1988), 408–414.

- 30 Cited by Lore Metzger, 'Modifications of Genre: A Feminist Critique of "Christabel" and "Die Braut von Korinth"', in *Borderwork: Feminist Engagements with Comparative Literature*, edited by Margaret R. Higonnet (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 81–99, p. 82.
- 31 Elizabeth Abel, Marianne Hirsch, and Elizabeth Langland, editors, *The Voyage In: Fictions of Female Development* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1983).
- 32 Cicero cited by Joy Connolly, *The State of Speech: Rhetoric and political Thought in Ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), pp. 214 and 256. Amy Richlin, 'Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools', in *Roman Persuasion*, edited by William Dominik (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 90–110.
- 33 See Eric Gunderson, *Staging Masculinity in Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), p. 60.
- 34 Quoted by Page du Bois, *Sappho is Burning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), p. 170.
- 35 Du Bois, *Sappho is Burning*, p. 172.
- 36 Susan Morgan, *Imagining Gender in Nineteenth-Century British Fiction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- 37 Sandra Gilbert and Susan L. Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979).
- 38 Elaine Showalter, 'Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness', *Critical Inquiry* 8:2 (Winter 1981), 179–205, p. 199.
- 39 Jacques Derrida, *Spurs: Nietzsche's Styles*, translated by Barbara Harlow (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 23.

Copyright of *Comparative Critical Studies* is the property of Edinburgh University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.