

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 961

HE 032 669

AUTHOR Hartman, Joan E.; de Filippis, Daisy Cocco; Kruger, Steven F.; O'Driscoll, Sally; Ling, Amy; Webb, Barbara J.

TITLE Literature. CUNY Panel: Rethinking the Disciplines. Women in the Curriculum Series.

INSTITUTION Towson Univ., Baltimore, MD. National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.

SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.

ISBN ISBN-1-885303-13-0

PUB DATE 1997-00-00

NOTE 71p.; For related documents in this series, see HE 032 663-689.

AVAILABLE FROM Towson University, 8000 York Road, Baltimore, MD 21252; Tel: 800-847-9922 (Toll Free); Fax: 410-830-3482; Web site: <http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw> (\$10).

PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; *College Instruction; Eighteenth Century Literature; Ethnicity; Females; Feminism; *Feminist Criticism; Higher Education; Latin American Literature; *Literature; Medieval Literature; Multicultural Education; Race; *Sex Bias; *Sex Fairness; Sexual Identity; Social Class; Teaching Methods; Theories; World Literature

IDENTIFIERS Asian Literature; Caribbean Literature (English); Gender Issues

ABSTRACT

This collection of six essays examines the ways in which literature, as a discipline, reflects ongoing scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, social class, and sexual orientation. In "Rethinking the Discipline of Literature: Gender," Joan E. Hartman presents the results of a Modern Language Association survey that highlights the prominence of feminist approaches to literature. In "Latin American Literature," Daisy Cocco de Filippis addresses the marginalized place of Latin American women writers in the curriculum. In "Medieval Studies," Steven F. Kruger notes that the new scholarship enriches and broadens contemporary views of medieval culture. In "Eighteenth-Century Studies," Sally O'Driscoll discusses the effects of queer theory on the field, while in "The Impact of Asian-American Literature," Amy Ling reviews the growing but limited impact of Asian-American literature on English departments. In "Caribbean Literature," Barbara J. Webb notes the numerous parallels between recent developments in Caribbean and African-American literature and discusses the cross-cultural aspects of the genre. Each essay contains references. (MDM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

HE

ED 432 961

LITERATURE

CUNY Panel: Rethinking the Discipline

H5032669

WOMEN ⁱⁿ the CURRICULUM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Women ⁱⁿ the Curriculum

LITERATURE

*CUNY Panel:
Rethinking the Disciplines*

Joan E. Hartman
College of Staten Island, CUNY

Daisy Cocco de Filippis
York College, CUNY

Steven F. Kruger
Queens College, CUNY

Sally O'Driscoll
Fairfield University

Amy Ling
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Barbara J. Webb
Hunter College, CUNY

**National Center for
Curriculum Transformation
Resources on Women
1997**

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University
8000 York Road
Baltimore, MD 21252
Phone: (410) 830-3944
Fax: (410) 830-3469
E-mail: ncctrw@towson.edu
<http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw>

Copyright © 1997

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Reprint of "The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Science:
Rethinking the Disciplines," 1994.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.

The National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women is partially supported by grants from The Ford Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, whose support is gratefully acknowledged. The viewpoints expressed herein, however, do not necessarily reflect those of the funding agencies.

Printed on recycled paper by Uptown Press, Baltimore, MD

ISBN 1-885303-13-0 4

CONTENTS

Preface v

Rethinking the Discipline of Literature: Gender .. 1
Joan E. Hartman

Latin American Literature 15
Daisy Cocco De Filippis

Medieval Studies 24
Steven F. Kruger

Eighteenth-Century Studies 30
Sally O'Driscoll

The Impact of Asian-American Literature 38
Amy Ling

Caribbean Literature 47
Barbara J. Webb

Contributors 55

PREFACE

In the fall of 1992 the SEMINAR ON SCHOLARSHIP AND THE CURRICULUM: THE STUDY OF GENDER, RACE, ETHNICITY, AND CLASS, under the aegis of the **City University of New York Academy for the Humanities and the Sciences**, and generously funded by the Ford Foundation, undertook a series of meetings devoted to "Rethinking the Disciplines." The Academy Seminar had already spent four years examining ways in which the study of gender, race, ethnicity, and class has slowly been transforming the curriculum of the university. Panels had explored women's studies, ethnic studies, area studies, interdisciplinary studies, pedagogical issues, and teaching about such topics as AIDS. The Academy Seminar draws upon faculty at CUNY who are members of the CUNY Academy, and upon those interested in these specific issues and those who have themselves taken part in one of the several curriculum transformation projects within CUNY beginning in the 1980s.*

* Two at Hunter College beginning 1983 among those teaching introductory courses and in 1985 among faculty in the professional schools; two sponsored by the Center for the Study of Women and Society with Ford Foundation grants for the community Colleges and for Integrating Materials on Women of Color into the Senior Colleges; four semester-long seminars funded by the New York State Department of Education's Vocational Education program for technical and vocational education faculty within the University; and six year-long seminars organized by the Office of Academic Affairs of the University for Balancing the Curriculum for Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class.

It was timely, therefore, that in its fifth year the Academy Seminar should ask directly how much the new theory and curriculum changes that have been identified over the years have actually affected the pursuit of our disciplines. The four areas targeted—Literature, History, Sociology, and Biology—represent disciplines in which a great deal of new “theory” now exists, new journals have proliferated, and considerable work has been done under many aegises to identify, explicate, and disseminate the transformed perspectives that have been formulated. There is no lack of materials now, no absence of theoretical frameworks, no question of the level of sophistication and argumentation, and no dearth of pedagogical analyses demonstrating the importance of these new methodological approaches, this new knowledge base.

For LITERATURE, each panelist was asked to consider the issues from a set of questions framed to bring forward what is happening from her or his perspective in the discipline. These questions probe the ways literature currently reflects the ongoing scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class: Have there been any shifts in the ways research is taught to graduate students in this field, for example, or are the questions asked by the discipline in any way different? If there have been changes, have they begun to show up in introductory textbooks?

More fundamentally, do our panelists believe that there have been efforts to reconceptualize the discipline? If, on the other hand, panelists think disciplinary changes have been minor, do they care to comment on why—in the light of so much new scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class, changes remain marginal to the practice of the discipline?

Has our new wealth of knowledge affected our teaching? Has it accomplished any significant paradigm shifts in traditional disciplines?

The essays by Hartman and De Filippis are the Literature I (October 26, 1992) Academy Seminar; the rest are from Literature II (October 25, 1993).

Dorothy O. Helly

Series Editor

October 26, 1992 and October 25, 1993

Literature

Rethinking the Discipline of Literature: Gender

Joan E. Hartman

Time was, twenty years ago, there were two Modern Language Association (MLA) conventions. One was a substantial convention in which the business of literary criticism went on as usual, the other a small feminist counter-convention in which we discussed women authors and images of women in male authors—Elaine Showalter had not yet taught us to distinguish between the study of women authors as gynocriticism and feminist approaches to male authors as the feminist critique. We met one another and we exchanged horror stories about our professional lives. We schemed to maintain the Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession when we were told there was no money to support it and we ran write-in campaigns to nominate women to the Executive Council of the MLA and to the succession of second vice president, first vice president, and president; we also elected them. We tried to find out how many of us were members of the MLA; the MLA, we were told, was reluctant to ask members to identify themselves by sex—I think that was what we still called it. We estimated ourselves at 33 percent.

Nowadays MLA statistics include gender. A 1990 survey of members showed, among respondents with doctorates, somewhat under half (45%) female, somewhat

over half (55%) male; among all respondents, slightly over half (53%) female, slightly under half (47%) male (all percentages rounded); the difference is accounted for by large numbers of women among the graduate student members.¹ Women are regularly nominated to the presidential succession and elected to the Executive Council. The Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession is now a permanent committee. We still, however, exchange horror stories about our professional lives—even as the small feminist counter-convention has yielded to a convention dominated by gender studies. Is this feminist change? While I can no longer reconstruct what I had in mind twenty years ago, I'm sure it wasn't the social construction of gender—even as I hold that gender is socially constructed.

The revolution in literary theory over the past twenty years partially accounts for the predominance of gender studies in our scholarly and critical lives. We needed, Jonathan Culler told us, instead of the interpretations of literary works we were busy supplying, a theory of interpretation;² now we've got several. The Cartesian subject has vanished, along with the objective text, and so has the monolithic ideology of Marxism. The theoretical discourse of the profession finds ideology (or ideologies) everywhere. Gender ideologies particularly engage us, perhaps, James Kavanaugh speculates, because of “the precarious but real gains of feminist politics and discourse . . . as opposed to the relative weakness of class-based politics and discourse.”³ Feminist theory, Paul Smith pronounced, is “not easily separable from the general ‘theory’ that has worked its way into the humanities over the last ten or twenty years,” situated as it is “within the array of post-structuralist discourses with which many of us are now perhaps over-familiar.”⁴

However, a recent MLA survey, “Today’s Literature Classroom: Findings from the MLA’s 1990 Survey of

Upper-Division Courses,”⁵ indicates that feminism has prevailed where other poststructuralist discourses have not, in our pedagogical lives. The MLA’s resident sociologist, Bettina Huber, interprets the survey’s impeccable statistics with a light but careful hand, and I am substantially indebted to her analysis. My own deploys a hermeneutics of suspicion, for I find the feminist change “Today’s Literature Classroom” reports puzzling.

The 1990 MLA survey of the English curriculum was prompted by an earlier survey of upper-division courses in English undertaken by the Association of Departments of English, an MLA-affiliated organization; “The ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Progress Report” appeared in 1986.⁶ The committee, inquiring into the extent to which changes in the discipline were reflected in upper-division courses, surveyed the English major by consulting institutional catalogues. They reported, provisionally, limited changes: the traditional core remained intact, nontraditional material had been added on. Nevertheless, they observed, catalogue descriptions of courses might mislead. Charles B. Harris, the author of the report, traced a course in Restoration and eighteenth-century British literature taught under the same catalogue description at his institution, Illinois State University, back to 1950: it was taught, in succeeding generations, by an old historicist critic, a new critic, and a Marxist materialist feminist. Disciplinary changes, the committee observed, were more likely to be reflected in the authors appearing on course syllabi and the critical approaches of instructors than in catalogue prose.⁷

The 1990 survey was designed to include both. It focused on three courses: American literature, 1800–1865 (or whatever version of it constitutes the first half of a department’s American literature survey); British literature of the Renaissance, excluding Shakespeare; and the

nineteenth-century British novel (or, in a two-semester sequence, either the Victorian novel or Victorian literature). Among other questions, the survey asked respondents what texts they regarded as important—and presumably kept on their syllabi—and what texts they had added. I wish it had also asked them what texts they had removed, for as a profession we are more willing to add than to give up.

The respondents, 571 of the 918 queried (or 62%), Huber pronounced representative of the profession.⁸ Almost half were full professors; of the rest, slightly over a quarter were associate professors, slightly under a quarter assistant professors. Because rank correlates with age, 33 percent of the respondents received their highest degree (in most instances a doctorate) between 1947 and 1969, 40 percent between 1970 and 1979, and 27 percent between 1980 and 1990.⁹ The survey reports rank and year of highest degree collectively; women and men both, we are a greying profession.¹⁰ Among the respondents (without regard to rank and year of highest degree), one out of three was female, two were male.¹¹

Nevertheless, these respondents, polled with respect to the theoretical approaches to literature that influenced their teaching of upper-division courses—cited feminist approaches to literature in substantial numbers. The survey offered twelve approaches to literature (I list them in order of their popularity): history of ideas; new criticism; feminist approaches to literature; reader-response criticism; mythic approaches to literature; new historicism; psychoanalysis; minority approaches to literature; Marxist approaches to literature; poststructuralism; structuralism; and semiotics. According to the survey, allegiances to these theoretical approaches vary slightly according to which of the three courses the respondents taught; I report them collectively. The approaches fall into four groups.

The first group includes three—history of ideas, new criticism, and feminism—which were cited by, respectively, 76 percent, 64 percent, and 61 percent of the respondents, well over half the respondents. The next group includes four—reader-response criticism, mythic approaches, new historicism, and psychoanalysis—which were cited by, respectively, 44 percent, 40 percent, 40 percent, and 38 percent, somewhat less than half. The next group includes two—minority and Marxist approaches—which were cited by 28 percent each. And the last group contains the postmodern trio of poststructuralism, structuralism, and semiotics, cited by, respectively, 21 percent, 16 percent, and 9 percent.¹²

Among the first group of three—history of ideas, new criticism, and feminism—the spread of allegiances is wide: 15 percentage points stand between the most cited, history of ideas, and the least cited, feminism. Feminism nevertheless belongs in this group, for another 17 percentage points stand between it and the most cited approach in the second group of four—reader-response criticism, mythic approaches, new historicism, and psychoanalysis. Another 10 percentage points stand between psychoanalysis and the paired group of minority and marxist approaches; another 7 percentage points stand between marxist approaches and the last group of three postmodern approaches. According to the respondents, feminist approaches to literature—and feminist approaches alone among new theoretical approaches—have influenced pedagogy on a scale comparable to the traditional approaches of history of ideas and new criticism.

The survey surprised not only by the prominence of feminist approaches to literature but also by their dispersal among men as well as women and among older as well as younger male faculty. The year of degree figured in female faculty's commitment: women who received their degrees

after 1970 were more likely to acknowledge their influence than women who received their degrees before 1970: 77 percent of the former, 58 percent of the latter recognized them as influential. The year of degree figured less in male faculty's commitment: 58 percent who received their degrees after 1970, 52 percent who received them before 1970 recognized them as influential.¹³ That is, over half the greying male faculty hired before 1980, whose property the English curriculum is, professed themselves influenced by feminist approaches to literature. What are these "feminist approaches"? And how do they manifest themselves in the English curriculum?

From the evidence of the survey, rather little with respect to gynocriticism, that is, the study of women authors. American literature has been most hospitable to women authors.¹⁴ Respondents most frequently cited as important Hawthorne, Thoreau, Melville, Emerson, Whitman, and Poe (in this order) and presumably include them on syllabi with some regularity. Less frequently cited as important among fiction writers (again in order) were Stowe and Chopin; among writers of nonfictional prose, Douglass, Rowlandson, Fuller, and authors of slave narratives; among poets, Dickinson and Bradstreet. The author most frequently added to syllabi, by 15 percent of the 103 respondents, was Stowe; Douglass was added by 11 percent and black women—Jacobs, Sojourner Truth, Wheatley, Wilson—by another 12 percent.

British literature of the Renaissance has been least hospitable to women authors.¹⁵ Respondents most frequently cited as important Spenser, Sidney, Milton, and More (in this order). Among courses that include drama, Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Jonson were cited; among other poets, Donne and Shakespeare. Less commonly taught texts by male authors had been added by 7 percent

of the 91 respondents, less commonly taught texts by female authors by 18 percent. Nevertheless, 50 percent of the respondents had added literary criticism, particularly criticism published after 1975; only 19 percent of the respondents in American literature had done the same.¹⁶ In the absence of gynocriticism, these may represent the feminist critique, that is, feminist readings of male authors; they are as likely to represent new historicism.

Respondents teaching nineteenth-century British fiction evidenced less agreement than respondents teaching American literature and British literature of the Renaissance about authors important to teach.¹⁷ They most frequently cited Dickens, Eliot, Wollstonecraft, Shelley, Hardy, Emily Bronte, Austen, Charlotte Bronte, and Thackeray (in this order). Women have always appeared among the canonical nineteenth-century novelists. Given the limited number of three-decker novels students can read in a semester, respondents appear to add and subtract canonical novelists without notably expanding their number. Of the 80 respondents, 20 percent had added less commonly taught texts by men, 13 percent less commonly taught texts by women; 50 percent had also added literary criticism.

Commenting on these different patterns of addition by course, Huber observes that the “degree to which works by less commonly taught authors were added to reading lists does not vary by any of the institutional or personal characteristics considered, suggesting that such works are added because of recent developments in the field rather than because of perspectives that prevail among certain types of respondents or at certain types of institutions.”¹⁸ So much for the impact of gynocriticism on three traditional courses of the English major segmented by period and genre.

What about the impact of the feminist critique? For, if 61 percent of the respondents to the 1990 survey claim to have been influenced by feminist approaches to literature, that influence should be visible somewhere. What are these approaches, and how do they coexist with the respondents' substantial allegiances to history of ideas and new criticism? In my own teaching, my allegiance to history of ideas includes not only a feminist critique of ideas about the nature and status of women in the past but also attention to the oppressive weight of these ideas in the present. And my allegiance to new criticism includes not only attention to the text but also to the process of making meanings. Nevertheless, history of ideas does not require attention to the weight of the past upon the present, nor new criticism attention to gendered subjectivities of reading; that is legitimated by the less popular reader-response approach.

Other information in the 1990 survey suggests that the respondents' allegiance to feminist approaches to literature does not encompass what I consider the feminist critique. The survey asked about educational goals as well as theoretical approaches.¹⁹ It offered nine (I list them in order of their popularity): learning the intellectual, historical, and biographical backgrounds needed to understand the literature of the period (chosen by 93% of the respondents); deriving pleasure from the wisdom and artistry displayed in literary works (chosen by 89%); understanding literary genres, forms, and conventions (chosen by 87%); reading closely and explicating texts (chosen by 86%); understanding human character, action, and motivation (chosen by 74%); understanding the influence of race, class, and gender on literature and interpretation (chosen by 62%); understanding the enduring ideas and values of Western civilization (chosen by 51%)—these seven goals were chosen by over half the respondents. The eighth goal—learning several methodologies of reading and inter-

pretation and how they conflict—was chosen by almost half the respondents (47%), while the ninth goal—understanding how reading exposes the impossibility of deciding whether meaning communicates a reality outside language—was chosen by a small group of deconstructionists (only 12%).

In clearly discernible ways, the two most favored theoretical approaches of the respondents, history of ideas (chosen by 76%) and new criticism (chosen by 64%), correlate with their first, third, and fourth educational goals—learning the intellectual, historical, and biographical backgrounds needed to understand the literature of the period (chosen by 93%); understanding literary genres, forms, and conventions (chosen by 87%); and reading closely and explicating texts (chosen by 86%). The third favored theoretical approach of the respondents, feminism (chosen by 61%), correlates—almost exactly—with their sixth educational goal, understanding the influence of race, class, and gender on literature and interpretation (chosen by 62%).

However, the respondents' second and fifth educational goals—deriving pleasure from the wisdom and artistry displayed in literary works (chosen by 89%) and understanding human character, action, and motivation (chosen by 74%)—do not correlate with any of the theoretical approaches named in the survey. Together they may be seen as characteristic of the untheoretical or even antitheoretical stance of the traditional humanistic consensus. They may, in addition, subvert feminist approaches. Deriving pleasure from wisdom and artistry posits their felicitous coincidence, a coincidence that the feminist critique questions, and may preclude criticizing the wisdom of the past; understanding human character, action, and motivation is a goal malleable to respondents' predispositions. And, as Terry Eagleton observes: "Hostility to theory usually

means an opposition to other people's theories"—including feminist theory—"and an oblivion of one's own"²⁰—which may be unselfconsciously masculinist.

There are correlations among these traditional goals, Huber points out, and the respondents' seventh educational goal, understanding the enduring values and ideas of Western civilization (chosen by 51%). Respondents concerned that their students derive pleasure from wisdom and artistry were disproportionately likely to choose as their other goals understanding character (chosen by 79%) and understanding the values and ideas of Western civilization (chosen by 51%). Respondents who did not choose deriving pleasure from wisdom and artistry as a goal were less likely to choose understanding character (only 37% did) and understanding values (only 23% did). Similarly, respondents concerned that their students understand character were disproportionately likely to choose as another goal understanding values (61% did); those who did not choose understanding character were less likely to choose understanding values (only 22% did). These correlated goals likewise reflect the traditional humanistic consensus that literature is art embodying timeless human wisdom.²¹

On the other hand, instructors concerned that their students understand the influence of race, class, and gender on literature and interpretation were disproportionately likely to choose as another goal learning several methodologies of reading and interpretation and how they conflict (58% did); those who did not choose understanding race, class, and gender were less likely to choose reading and interpretation (only 28% did). These correlated goals reflect the postmodern theoretical consensus, which is more compatible with the feminist critique than is the traditional humanistic consensus.

However, the survey indicates that the traditional consensus does not perceive understanding the influence of race, class, and gender on literature and interpretation as incompatible with understanding the enduring values and ideas of Western civilization. Among instructors concerned that their students understand its values and ideas, 58 percent chose as another goal understanding race, class, and gender; among instructors not particularly concerned with understanding its values and ideas, 66 percent chose as another goal understanding race, class, and gender—a not significantly higher percentage. (I suspect that the traditionalists who find them compatible inflect literature more emphatically than interpretation while the postmodernists who find them incompatible inflect interpretation more emphatically than literature.) Traditionalists probably save the eternal verities of literature by acknowledging failure to extend them to persons of color, persons without status, and persons of female gender and suspect sexualities. Sensitive to the predominance in their classes of persons of female gender, they have undoubtedly curbed their fondness for clubby masculinist jokes about the war between the sexes, *carpe diem* ploys for seduction, and Eve's diminished rationality and sexpot cuteness. I don't mean to write off such changes in the pedagogy of traditionalist colleagues as insignificant. But they are palliative, intended to preserve the English curriculum rather than to enlarge it and alter our readings of it.

My analysis of the English curriculum and the curricular impact of feminist approaches to literature does not earn me prophetic powers, but it does suggest where to look for signs of change—or stasis. Half the respondents to the 1990 survey were full professors. That they will retire is incontrovertible; who will replace them bears watching. If, as now, women continue to earn more of the doctorates awarded in English, the balance of genders in

the profession will change. Whatever the balance, however, the postmodern theoretical consensus, espousing goals such as understanding the influence of race, class, and gender on literature and interpretation and learning methodologies of reading and interpretation and how they conflict, will be better represented, as will feminist approaches to literature correlated with these goals.

But the MLA survey suggests caution in linking change in the English curriculum with the gender of those who profess it. Not all the female respondents acknowledged the influence of feminist approaches to literature: the figures were 77 percent of those receiving their degrees after 1970, 52 percent before 1970. Nor did the survey probe the range of differences among feminist approaches, from palliative approaches intended to conserve the curriculum to radical approaches intended to subvert it. In consequence, the materialist Marxist feminist who teaches Restoration and eighteenth-century literature at Illinois State University is of considerable interest. Is she primarily a *materialist Marxist* feminist or a materialist Marxist *feminist*? Or is she primarily a Restoration and eighteenth-century specialist who adjusts her theoretical approaches to developments in the field? And what are her commitments to the women in her classes and to change outside the academy as well as within it? Has the postmodern consensus that moved her and other women into the master's house provided them with the courage and tools (to borrow the title of the volume of feminist essays that have won the Florence Howe award²²) to rebuild it? When they show the women in their classes how gender is socially constructed, do they also show them how it can be socially reconstructed? Unless they do, feminist approaches to literature, postmodern as well as traditional, are conservative rather than radical, and that, I suspect, is why the MLA survey reveals them as popular.

Notes

1. Phyllis Franklin, "Editor's Column," *MLA Newsletter* 25:1 (Spring 1993): 4.
2. Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983), 5.
3. James H. Kavanaugh, "Ideology," in *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 311.
4. Paul Smith, "Men in Feminism: Men in Feminist Theory," in *Men in Feminism*, ed. Alice Jardine and Paul Smith (New York: Methuen, 1987), 34-35.
5. Bettina J. Huber, "Today's Literature Classroom: Findings from the MLA's 1990 Survey of Upper-Division Courses," *ADE Bulletin* 101 (Spring 1992): 36-60.
6. Charles B. Harris, "The ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the English Curriculum: A Progress Report," *ADE Bulletin* 85 (Winter 1986): 26-30.
7. Harris, 29-30.
8. Huber, 36-37.
9. Huber, 37-38.
10. Huber, 59, n. 6.
11. Huber, 37.
12. Huber, 48.

13. Huber, 48–49.
14. Huber, 39–41.
15. Huber, 42–43.
16. Huber, 44–46.
17. Huber, 41–42.
18. Huber, 43.
19. Huber, 46–48.
20. Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), viii.
21. Huber, 46–47.
22. *Courage & Tools: The Florence Howe Award for Feminist Scholarship, 1974–1989*, ed. Joanne Glasgow and Angela Ingram (New York: Modern Language Association, 1990).

Latin American Literature

Daisy Cocco De Filippis

I will begin my remarks by reading a poem by the contemporary Puerto Rican woman writer Rosario Ferre, "Envoi," translated by Kate and Angel Flores, that appears in the Feminist Press anthology, *The Defiant Muse* (1986).

ENVOI

to my mother, and to my mother's monument,
to my aunts, and to their well-bred manners
to Martha, as well as to Mary
because she dared to choose the better part,
to Francesca, the immortal one, because from the
deepest hell
she insists on praising love and agony,
to Catherine, who unravels over water
the pristine obscenities of her ecstasy
each time she strums the axes' whistle,
to Rosario, and to Rosa Rio's shadow,
to the Erynies and the Furies who, locked in amorous
strife,
mourned and Bang over the cradle,
to all those who agreed in principle
to what I also consented to,
I address the completion of these verses:
because I sing,
because I still sew and shine and rearrange
the ever-changing order of my bones,
because I cry and trace, o'er my goblet's vanished
breath
the humors of my human-borne experience,

I declare myself the mortal foe
of my own hand's irate, harmless blow
as I avenge my destiny's misfortune.
because I love
because I still live, and am, and hesitate to gag
my heart headed woman's side,
because I still laugh, and keep my promises and mer-
cilessly
iron, amongst all of us, the tiniest creases of my cha-
os,
I confirm today my right to joy and glory.

Rosa Rio Ferre's words are an invitation to pause from the fight, a few moments, long enough to rejoice in whom and what we are as women. In this spirit of tempered and cautious optimism I frame my remarks.

When I received the invitation to speak on the subject of women and the Latin American literature curriculum, I was gratified and comforted by the knowledge that invitations such as this one are being extended nowadays with increasing frequency. Yet, despite the voluminous publications and the frequency of such gatherings, when these occasions are viewed in the context of an academy still quite jittery when asked to address the issue of diversifying the general curriculum, one has reason to pause and consider the place of the profession in American universities and colleges. Other considerations also underscore the need for cautious optimism. Recent controversies surrounding the selection of categories and the number of sessions offered at national conventions of the Modern Language Association have kept many *hispanistas* from participating in the activities of this learned society. It has become commonplace to hear colleagues, for example, bemoan the fact that they have tired of proposing and presenting in the so-called "special sessions" included in their programs.

Enough anecdotes of discomfort abound to fill many evenings such as this one. It suffices here to recall Professor Hillis Miller's unfortunate remarks: "I believe in the established canon of English and American literature and in the validity of the concept of privileged texts. I think it is more important to read Spencer, Shakespeare, or Milton than to read Borges in translation, or even, to say the truth, Virginia Woolf." (Miller 12: quoted in Gilbert, *Norton* 20). Professor Miller's choice of writers included in his "less important than" category is neither casual nor innocent. Both Virginia Woolf and Jorge Luis Borges enjoy a reputation that far exceeds that of most of their contemporaries. Their selection signals that in Professor Miller's view all "others" are unacceptable, less important, inferior. Jorge Luis Borges, I believe, would have been quite amused. *Hispanistas*, I assure you, are not.

Professor Miller's remarks, however, also serve to underline the place accorded to Latin American women writers. How can these women, we ask even today, struggling for recognition within their own academy, ever hope to achieve recognition, respect and a place in the curricula offered in American institutions of higher learning? By now, it has become quite patent, I suspect, that as subjects of research and study, women writers of Latin America, despite the many gains, still occupy the place reserved for the more than marginalized: the fringes of the margins.

The first conference on women writers from Latin America to take place in this hemisphere was hosted by Carnegie Mellon University on March 15-16, 1975. Its organization came about as a response to the United Nations' designation of 1975 as the "Year of the Woman." Yvette Miller, the editor of the proceedings published the following year by *Latin American Literary Review*, indicates in her introduction that the conference marked the beginning of a concerted effort to bring women writers

from Latin America out of the shadows of anonymity. The essays included in the *Literary Review's* publication present a wide range of topics, designed to recreate a history of Latin American literature that would include and acknowledge the contributions of women. In retrospect, 1975 marked a period of taking stock and inventory in terms of counting the number of editions of works by women and the number of women included in anthologies. It also marked the beginning of a questioning of images of Latin American women as presented in the mirrors of men's desires and writings. It marked, as well, the beginning of new scholarship about the works written by women by including thematic papers on the works of some of the better-known women writers such as Teresa de la Parra (Venezuela), Beatriz Guido (Argentina), Maria Luisa Bombal (Chile), and Elena Poniatowska (Mexico).

Almost two decades have passed since that first gathering of *hispanistas* and writers from Latin America took place at Carnegie Mellon. Since then many conferences have taken place both within the United States and throughout the Caribbean and Central and South America. There is now a substantial bibliography of new editions of works by women already considered classics—Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz, Gabriela Mistral, Teresa de la Parra, and Maria Luisa Bombal, to name only a few. There is also a growing number of monographs on the works of younger, contemporary women writers such as Isabel Allende, Rosario Ferre, and Luisa Valenzuela, among others. The number of anthologies of women writers is also impressive, such as Sara Sefchovich's *Mujeres en espejo*, Celia Correa's *Anthology of Short Stories Written of Latin American Women* and Carmen Esteves and Lizabeth Paravisini's *Green Cane and Juicy Flotsam: Short Stories by Caribbean Women*. The number of collections of critical writings about and by Latin American women writers is also on the rise with publications such as *La sarten por el*

mango or Hernan Vidal's voluminous *Cultural and Historical Grounding for Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Feminist Literary Criticism* of 1989, and many others not mentioned for fear of turning this presentation into an enumeration of titles, easily available in any research library.

As of this date, however, and despite the many gains in the field, the primary concern is the inability to formulate a critical discourse specific for Latin American women writers. Hernan Vidal's collection of essays, for example, deals primarily with individual studies. Yet feminist criticism has had a determining impact on the evolution of studies of women as authors in Latin America. In particular, much of Latin American criticism has benefited from Beauvoir's invitation to women to reject a formulation of self as other. Similarly, as a catalyst for the study of misogyny in male-authored texts, Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* was of capital importance, as have been Patricia Meyer Spacks' study of *The Female Imagination* and Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's classic study of nineteenth-century English women writers, *The Madwoman in the Attic*.

Perhaps the most important contribution feminists have made to the development of literary theory in Latin America is the questioning of traditional authoritative voices. This challenge to a static, monolithic tradition has opened the way for other voices and genres, marginalized within the confines of Latin American literature and society. The past decade has seen a rise in the study of the African presence, image and contribution to Caribbean and Latin American literature. Miguel Barnet's now classic works, the *Autobiography of a Runaway Slave*, *Rachel's Song*, and *Gallego*, reinterpret Cuban history and rewrite it from the point of view of the colonized. Oral tradition and history as told from the point of view of the oppressed has gained a place in the form of testimonials of women who

have spoken with dignity of their plight—from the jails of Argentina, those little houses of horror, to the mines of Bolivia to the Indian villages of Central America. The recent award of the Nobel Prize for Peace to Rigoberta Menchu is, in a small way, also a recognition of the work of her translator, Prof. Elizabeth Ordonez, an *hispanista*. Another occasion for us to pause and rejoice.

Despite the number of acknowledgments and the increasing publications, there is still work to be done. The challenge for *hispanistas* in the decade of the nineties is to formulate a critical discourse that can be applied to women authors of Latin America. Professor Jean Franco, one of the foremost authorities on Latin American culture in this country, shares this concern. In her 1989 study, *Plotting Women: Gender and Representation in Mexico*, Franco indicates that “the intervention of modern feminism in the sphere of public debate demands critical reflection on the differences between cultures and on the diverse configurations of the struggle for interpretative power” (xii). As we assess how far we have come since that first gathering of 1975, *hispanistas* must also grapple with the issue of diversity within the field. Attention must be paid to the social and historical context from which the literature has emerged. We must also consider the issue of race as we confront the fact that in many instances the literary legacy of Latin American women writers as in their male counterparts is the product of a middle-class, white- and male-oriented focus.

How have all these factors had an impact in what takes place in our classrooms? As we all know, changes in the curriculum are come by quite slowly. However, we are beginning to see evidence of change. At the beginner’s level, textbooks are being revised to acknowledge gender, race, and class differences. *Dicho y hecho*, in its second edition, has taken pains to include photographs of women as active

participants in the activities illustrated. At the intermediate level, I have just reviewed the third edition of *Avanzando*, where the readings have been changed to 50 percent works by women as opposed to the 15 percent included in past editions. I believe the study of most texts at the beginning and intermediate undergraduate curriculum level would yield similar conclusions. As far as the more advanced undergraduate courses are concerned, change has been slower. Many anthologies—and Seymour Menton's *Antología de cuentos hispanoamericanos* is typical—still contain predominantly the works of male authors, much in the same vein as the *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, where a token number of women authors are included despite the recent publication of a *Norton Anthology of Literature by Women*. (I hope we are not embarking on a system of separate but equal publications.) As a consequence, in the classroom we are still resorting to hand-outs and to inclusion of single texts by women authors to balance the material offered by these anthologies.

Graduate programs, however, if the increased number of proposals submitted to the American Association of University Women is an indicator, appear to be much more receptive to the study of women than in the past. If I may be permitted, I would like to offer a personal anecdote. When in 1978 I decided to write a proposal for a dissertation on Dominican verse, the advice I received from a very “progressive” professor was (a) not to limit my study to the works of one author, and (b) to choose a methodology respected by the academy. The result was a semiotic study—semiotics as formulated by Michael Riffaterre of Columbia University—of the development of modern Dominican verse. The proposal, although accepted, was still greeted with the following questions: “Dominican what?” and “Are there authors worthy of study in the Dominican Republic?” In 1992, fourteen years later, I have

been approached to work as a consultant for three dissertations to be written by three Dominican women on Dominican women authors. These students have had no difficulty presenting proposals at their institutions—Indiana University, Rutgers University, and Harvard University. Another occasion to pause and rejoice.

To conclude, I will call on another of my favorite women poets, Sylvia Plath, to summarize the essence of my comments:

Nudgers and shovers
in spite of ourselves.
Our kind multiplies.
We shall by morning
Inherit the earth.

Bibliography of Works Consulted

Abrams, M. H., ed. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Vols. 1–2. 3d ed. New York: Norton, 1974.

Avanzando. 3d ed. New York: John Wiley, forthcoming.

Barnet, Miguel. *Biografía de un cimarrón*. Cuba: Casa de las Americas, 1986.

———. *Cancion de Raquel*. Cuba: Casa de las Americas, 1975.

Burgos, Elizabeth. *Me llamo Rigoberta Menchu y así me nació la conciencia*. 2d ed. Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno, 1986.

Correa de Zapata, Celia, ed. *Short Stories by Latin American Women: The Magic and the Real*. Houston: Arte Publico Press, 1990.

Dawson, Laila and Albert. *Dicho y hecho*. 3rd. ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1989.

- Esteves, Carmen C. and Lizabeth Paravisini-Gebert, eds. *Green Cane and Juicy Flotsam: Short Stories by Caribbean Women*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991.
- Flores, Kate and Angel. *The Defiant Muse*. New York: The Feminist Press, 1986.
- Franco, Jean. *Plotting Women: Gender and Representation in Mexico*. Columbia University Press, 1989.
- Gilbert, Sandra and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- . *The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women: The Tradition in English*. New York: Norton, 1985.
- Gonzalez, Patricia Elena and Eliana Ortega, eds. *La sarten por el mango*. Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico: Ediciones Huracan, 1984.
- Menton, Seymour. *Antologia de cuentos hispanoamericano*. 21 ed. Mexico: Fonda de Cultura Economica, 1986.
- Meyer-Spacks, Patricia. *The Female Imagination*. New York: Avon Books, 1975.
- Miller, Yvette, ed. *Latin American Women Writers: Yesterday and Today*. Pittsburgh: Latin American Review Press, 1975.
- Millett, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. New York: Doubleday, 1970.
- Plath, Sylvia. *Ariel*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Sefchovich, Sara. *Mujeres on espejo 2. Narradoras latinoamericanas siglo xx*. Mexico: Folios Ediciones, 1985.
- Vidal, Hernan. *Cultural and Historical Grounding for Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Feminist Literary Criticism*. Minnesota: Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature, 1989.

Medieval Studies

Steven F. Kruger

In 1962, in an influential (if controversial) formulation, D.W. Robertson could argue that “the medieval world was innocent of our [modern] profound concern for tension”; “with its quiet hierarchies [it] knew nothing” of “class struggles, balances of power,” “conflicts between economic realities and traditional ideals.” “Its aesthetic, at once a continuation of classical philosophy and a product of Christian teaching, developed artistic and literary styles consistent with a world without dynamically interacting polarities” (*Preface to Chaucer*, 51).

Though I began my own graduate training twenty years after Robertson’s *Preface to Chaucer* and under the tutelage of anti-Robertsonians, the “medieval world” pictured in my graduate school days was not so different from Robertson’s: that “medieval world” was European—and there was felt no need to specify it as such. Understanding that “world” demanded a comparatist and historicist approach, but one where the literary traditions engaged—“classical” and “Christian”—were firmly European and where the history studies was a history of the Western church or of Western European politics or of Western intellectual traditions. Little or no historical or literary work on women, on nonliterate classes, on racial difference, on sexuality had made its way into the mainstream of medieval studies. At least from within an English department, the study of medieval literature meant the study of *Beowulf*, the other Old English poems (a few of them intriguingly spoken with a woman’s voice, though even this was sometimes denied in the scholarship), and the study of Chaucer, Langland, the *Pearl* poet, Gower, Malory.

The past ten years have seen large changes in the discipline of medieval studies, though these changes have occurred more slowly than in many other fields. A suspicion of “literary theory” has contributed to this slow movement, with the feeling that ideas strongly inflected by psychoanalytic or Marxist or feminist or queer agendas are somehow not pertinent to a “premodern” literature. There survives today, I would say, a strong strand within medieval studies that would emphasize, as Robertson did thirty years ago, the monolithic unity of the European Middle Ages, with Christianity and Latin literature providing a pervasive common culture for Europe, with literature the property of the aristocracy and a growing class of literate bourgeois, and also largely the property of men.

In my view, and I believe in the growing view of many other medievalists, such a conception of medieval culture is wrongheaded. That many of us have come to believe this of course owes a large debt to the scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality that has mainly been done in other fields. But beginning in the early 1980s, medievalists themselves began turning attention to questions that a vision of a hegemonic—Christian, male, heterosexual, upper-class, self-contained European—medieval culture makes it difficult to ask. In history, we have John Boswell’s *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (1980), Carolyn Bynum’s *Jesus as Mother* (1982) and *Holy Feast and Holy Fast* (1987), Jeremy Cohen’s *The Friars and the Jews* (1982), Amini Maalouf’s *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes* (1984), and R. I. Moore’s *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (1987). The Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship and the *Medieval Feminist Newsletter* were founded in the 1980s; and the 1990s have brought us the Society for the Study of Homosexuality in the Middle Ages (a group accepted by the Medieval Institute on the condition that its name not be

the more “political” Gay and Lesbian Causus originally proposed by the group’s founders). In literary studies, we have begun to rediscover and study women writers, to realize that perhaps the Jewish and Islamic traditions available at certain places and time in medieval Europe were less separate from Christian Latin and vernacular literatures than we once believed, and to reread canonical authors like Chaucer from feminist, queer, antiracist, class-conscious perspectives.

What does medieval studies gain from such changes in the discipline? I would say, quite simply, a more complete view of medieval culture and the complex forces that shaped it. Europe was not a self-contained entity separate from the rest of the world until the great explorations of the Renaissance. While the heterogenous situation of Spain has long been recognized, it has also long been bracketed as a “special case”; but if we bracket Spain, we must also bracket much of southern Europe, in its active interactions with Northern Africa and the Middle East, and in fact much of northern Europe, since the Vikings made a practice of violating the neat boundaries of Europe. To read Marco Polo and other “travel writers” as anomalous and marginal is to decide before-hand the question of possible connections, interactions, and influences between Europe and Asia and Africa.

When we treat medieval culture as homogenously Christian and European, we write out the presence of Judaism within Europe itself and the consistent European awareness of Islamic culture at its borders. Jews are in England from at least 1066 until the expulsion of 1290; after 1290, they remain an important presence in English literature. Not to read Maimonides, Averroes, and the other Jewish and Islamic Aristotelians means, ultimately, not to understand Aquinas (or Dante) fully. We need to look at Jewish and Islamic presences in medieval Europe not just

as they were suppressed by an overwhelming Christianity, but also as they, at least at moments, expressed themselves in strong and unexpected ways: thus, while we predict that texts recording Jewish conversions to Christianity would survive from the European Middle Ages, would we also expect to find, as we do from southern Italy, fragments recording Christian conversions to Judaism?

Thinking about class also enriches and broadens our view of medieval culture. As the work of historians like Carlo Ginzburg suggests, there are ways—through court documents, folklore studies, an examination of public art, an attention to the silences of texts as well as their voicings—to begin to excavate the culture, the thoughts, the stories of nonliterate classes, and to recognize how these might differ from (and not be merely “imperfect” versions of) “high cultural” artifacts. Texts like Chaucer’s, scholars have begun to suggest, not only enter into dialogue with Dante and Boccaccio’s “high” poetry but also respond to and reflect “low” oral forms, little direct evidence of which may survive. And an important history remains to be written of how Christian ideas were adopted, reworked, perhaps melded with pre-Christian systems of thought in a nonliterate culture that sometimes expressed itself in the “heresies” anathematized by the orthodox church.

Feminist work has pushed us to look for and find women writers who have been ignored, lost, or denied: the women troubadours (see Meg Bogin’s *The Women Troubadours*, 1980), Marie de France, Heloise, Hildegard of Bingen, Julian of Norwich, Margery Kempe, Catherine of Siena, Marguerite Porete, Hadewijch of Brabant, Christine de Pisan (for a collection of some of this material, see Katharina M. Wilson’s *Medieval Women Writers*, 1994). We find such writers sometimes expressing and extending male literary and religious traditions, sometimes rewriting and challenging them, sometimes, as with

Christine, actively attempting to build a “City of Ladies” outside and in opposition to male antifeminist traditions. And both feminism and lesbian and gay studies push us to rethink the canonical (male) works of medieval tradition (for one feminist rethinking of Chaucer, see Carolyn Dinshaw’s *Chaucer’s Sexual Poetics*, 1989): in what ways do these exclude women’s experience? How are women’s positions voiced by these authors, and what do such voicings suggest about women’s power and powerlessness in medieval society? How does the representation of masculinity (in Chaucer or Dante or Chretien) depend on a particular view of the feminine? How is the centrality of heterosexuality maintained through particular representations of men, of women, of the interactions between men and women, and of the homosocial interactions of men with men and women with women?

Asking such questions about gender and sexuality—as about race, ethnicity, and class—of course responds to a contemporary urge on our part as scholars. But so, of course, does any study of a prior culture reflect our concerns. What we gain in rereading medieval culture with such contemporary concerns in mind is a Middle Ages to which some of the complexity and tension has been returned. To quote, in closing, one of my own current projects—a queer reading of Chaucer:

[R]eading texts like the *Pardoner’s Tale* as part of a process of writing queers (and women and Jews) back into the Middle Ages, we can begin to understand the ways in which a dominant medieval European culture—[which might wish to define itself] as Christian, heterosexual, masculinist—[in fact] depended for its self-definition upon a rigorous writing-out of Judaism and Islam, of women’s experience, of the sexually other. Our own historical accounts, insofar as they replicate and support the dominant view of a Middle Ages that is

“naturally,” effortlessly, monolithically Christian, masculinist, and heterosexual, erase the particular sites of struggle at which the female, Jewish, “heretical,” queer resisted silencing even as they were [often] brought to silence. Claiming [Chaucer’s] Pardoner, we can intervene at one such site to locate and excavate the operations of medieval homophobia, and to hear, in however muted and distorted a fashion, the queer presences against which that homophobia was anxiously erected (“Claiming the Pardoner: Toward a Gay Reading of Chaucer’s *Pardoner’s Tale*,” in *Exemplaria*, 1994).

Eighteenth-Century Studies

Sally O'Driscoll

I am speaking here as a recent Ph.D. and beginning assistant professor. I also speak as someone whose work trajectory in some ways matches what I see as the recent trends in eighteenth-century studies. My work has been on women novelists of the eighteenth century, in England and France, and my perspective has been through feminist narratology: that is, I have been concerned about narrative patterns in the novel, and how they have been affected by gender. My work is now moving into queer studies, and this is what I see as the most important recent change in my field as a whole.

Queerness officially arrived in the eighteenth century as of this year, with the recognition of a Queer Caucus in the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies conference. I'd like to talk about what that development means for those of us who work on the eighteenth-century novel.

Queering the Eighteenth Century

During the seventies and eighties, feminism brought a revolution to eighteenth-century studies. The premise of the feminist revision of the field was that a major proportion of early novels were written by women, yet all the major theories of the rise of the novel were based solely on men's writings. As in other fields, feminism launched a two-pronged attack: first, there was a retrieval operation, to make available all the works by women that were languishing in rare book rooms; and second, feminism rethought the field—if we talk about narratives by women,

how does that change all our categories? Landmark articles like Nancy K. Miller's "Emphasis Added" (1981) and Elaine Showalter's "Women Writers and the Double Standard" (1971) changed what was read and how it was read, and—even more important—this work made us see a creature who had been invisible, the woman reader, who read texts differently than men did, asked different questions, and used another lens.

Now we have moved on to a new moment, which is being called the queering of the eighteenth century. This move could not have happened without the two decades of feminist work that preceded it. In a nutshell, the feminist debate about the nature of femininity—was it biologically innate or socially constructed?—combined with poststructuralism's destabilizing of the subject and its questioning of binary oppositions. Poststructuralist-feminist theory enabled us to argue that the woman writer and the woman reader occupy positions that are culturally and historically defined: they are not a result of biological essence. Writing and reading positions are constructed, rather than "natural." This paved the way for queer theory by making visible the connections between subjectivity, gender, and sexuality. The concept of "queer" now argues that we have to move beyond the heterosexual binary of male/female positions, and into a wider array of sexual positionings.

Using queer theory in literature means that we recognize in texts a multiplicity of narrative positions, rather than simply the traditional one of male heterosexual desire. Recent literary criticism has made a clear connection between desire and narrative: narrative as a reflection of the trajectory of the hero's desire. Unfortunately, the unquestioned assumption has often been that desire is male and heterosexual. Peter Brooks, for example, sees the "engine of plot" as set in motion by the male subject's desire

for the female object. Feminist theory, and queer theory in its wake, explore how narrative patterns follow the many different paths of desire and its satisfaction.

Eve Sedgwick's definition of "queer" shows us how "queering" literature opens up our understanding of desire and the narratives it can produce. Sedgwick calls "queerness"

the open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, dissonances and resonances, lapses and excesses of meaning where the constituent elements of anyone's gender, of anyone's sexuality aren't made (or *can't* be made) to signify monolithically. ("Queer and Now," 247)

Sedgwick uses "queer" as a way of breaking down the current binary categories of sexual orientation into what she calls a "rich stew" of multiple categories such as "male algolagnia, child-love, and autoeroticism, [. . .] zoophiles, zoerasts, automonosexualists, and gynecomasts" (*Epistemology of the Closet*, 1990, 8-9).

When we introduce Sedgwick's concept of queer to narrative, we suddenly multiply the number of plot engines that we are able to recognize: if desire is multiple, then so are the plot patterns it produces. Theoretically, then, to queer the eighteenth century means to recognize queer multiplicity in desire and in narrative. The implication is that, as critics, we have, up till now, been missing, and misunderstanding, narrative patterns other than the heterosexual binary of male subject/female object.

Lesbians and Queers

So far this sounds fine. However, I work on novels by women, in which there appear to be some possibilities

of lesbian readings. And once we start doing specific readings of eighteenth-century novels, we find that there is a tension between doing a queer reading and talking about lesbians. Can queer theory produce a lesbian reading?

The tension between “queer” and “lesbian” is manifested in the terminology: these terms indicate very different approaches to the material. “Queer” took on its current meaning very recently, and was reclaimed deliberately from pejorative use. Theoretically, it recreates an eighteenth-century sexual context, in which the “rich stew” of sexual possibilities did not, when practiced, necessarily define the entire identity of the practitioner. You don’t hear anyone in 1820 having “algolagnia” as their primary identificatory label, for example, the way “gay” functions now. So the very use of the term *queer* denotes a breaking down of rigid definitions, a return to that earlier state, not an attempt to define. The term *lesbian*, on the other hand, was coined in the late nineteenth century, along with the term “male homosexuality,” as an attempt to apply scientific objectivity to a particular sexual practice that until then had been, like those other parts of the “rich stew,” simply there. It was a repressive and limiting term, and attempts to redefine it have bogged down in hair-splitting about practice, not theory. Are you a lesbian if you sometimes sleep with men, for example? Despite attempts at liberation such as Adrienne Rich’s “lesbian continuum,” *lesbian* is a term that still engenders rigid definition, rather than breaking it down.

To use *queer* suggests that we can play in the poststructuralist garden, happily letting theory make us free—that is, not tied to our subjectivity. To use *lesbian* reminds us that women, in the eighteenth century or now, are subjects defined by sexuality, and because of that are *subjected* to oppressive circumstances. I want to make three propositions here.

First, queer theory is not the same thing as lesbian theory. Queer theory does not focus on subjectivity, since the queer subject is a deconstructed one; whereas the subject of lesbian theory is defined by practice.

Second, lesbian theory, like feminist theory before it, posits a new reading position: the lesbian reader. What lesbian practice or desire does the lesbian reader see in the eighteenth century? The answer to that is, that the depiction of lesbian desire is so problematic that it leads us to the third proposition.

Third, lesbian theory marks the *limits* of queer theory. Lesbian theory focuses on what queer theory cannot see. Queer theory and lesbian theory are not in opposition: they work in a symbiotic relation. Like looking through two ends of the telescope: they don't do the same thing.

A Queer Reading, A Lesbian Reading

A quick look at a specific text will illustrate the difference between the two approaches. The text is Eliza Haywood's 1724 *La Belle Assemblée*, a Boccaccio-style frame narrative with six friends who spend a week in a country house telling each other stories. Haywood uses the formal structure to explore all areas of sexual anxiety and sexual taboo; again and again, the stories raise anxiety and then contain and dissipate it, just barely keeping it under control. For example, there are stories about brother/sister incest narrowly averted, about women who dress as men and kill other men in war, about intergenerational romance: the cumulative effect is astounding. This is a collection that examines every possibility of inappropriate, unsanctioned love and sex/gender behavior. And amid this mass of scenes of taboo sexuality, there is a passionate scene of lesbian love.

This is the story of Camilla's love for the beautiful Alphonsina; here Camilla tells her friend Florinda about the agony this love is causing her:

—The Image of that charming Lady has never left me one single moment.—All that she said, each kind Embrace, every Action was in Sleep repeated.—One time while I thought myself bless'd in the assurance of her eternal Friendship.—Another time, my Imagination, ingenuous [sic] in tormenting me, represented her unkind, and forgetful of all the soft Professions we had made each other.—Was there every anything like this, Florinda? Could you believe it possible, that one Woman should love another to the extravagant, this distracted degree? (*Belle Assemblée* II: 87)

As it happens, in this episode as in most of the others in the book, the taboo is an illusion. Here, Alphonsina turns out to be Alphonso in drag, and the two get married. There are two ways to read this scene—as queer, and as lesbian.

First, the queer reading. In the context of the book as a whole, the dizzying sequence of terrible possibilities makes it clear that all kinds of sexual behaviors—Sedgwick's "rich stew"—are available: the fact that the narrative resolution backs away from them every time does not make them disappear. Disaster is averted in most of the episodes only because the book would be unpublishable as a novel if it weren't. (Whether it would be possible in the very different category of pornography is an interesting but separate question.) A queer reading allows us to understand this scene in the context of the multiplicity of desire and plot: many different plot possibilities are raised by the variety of queer desires described here. The queer reading opens up the closed circuit of traditional readings.

And then, the lesbian reading. Camilla has always been identified with women. She lives with her cousin, Florinda; the two are so close that whenever Florinda suggests that Camilla marry, Camilla is hurt. Camilla says that “Liberty and [Florinda’s] society were things so dear to her, that Marriage, tho’ attended with the utmost Advantages, would seem a Deprivation of all the Satisfactions for which she valued Life” (II:78). Her love for women is what keeps her from fulfilling the prescribed heterosexual path of marriage.

Camilla’s desire is obvious in the text, but is not officially recognized; since she is not interested in men, she has a reputation for “Insensibility,” which presents a challenge and a threat. That is why Alphonso, knowing that the only way to her heart is through a woman, dresses up as one and insinuates himself into her affections.

The book goes to great lengths to explain away lesbian desire: Camilla’s friends discuss the ultimate revelation of Alphonsina’s transvestism and come to the conclusion that same-sex attraction is unnatural—“it is not to be imagined,” they say, “that *Camilla* would have been possess’d of those Transports, those Disquiets, and a Tenderness so extreme, had Alphonsina been in reality a Woman” (II:97). But the disclaimers cannot deny what is apparent in the text: the possibility of lesbian desire.

The lesbian reading has to account for the lived experience of love between two women: what in Camilla’s circumstances makes her reject the patriarchal system of marriage, and what would be the immediate social consequences of that rejection? Why is it impossible to depict the life of two lesbians in the eighteenth century?

It is the lesbian reader who raises that last question, and the answer to it demonstrates the limits of queer theory.

The queer subject can be presented as a deconstructed one, not completely defined by the performance of sexuality. This lack of definition opens up our thinking in productive ways. But the lesbian, by definition, is a subject defined by practice. The lesbian reader, looking back into the eighteenth century, does not see the life of two lesbians because it was impossible to write it openly. In many of Eliza Haywood's books, and in countless other novels, the story ends just at the point where two women decide to be together. Lesbian theory can and must talk about that absence, that lack; queer theory cannot make visible, or possible, a depiction of lesbian life that does not exist.

Queer theory is the future of eighteenth-century studies; but by itself it is not sufficient to explain the texts that we have without its symbiotic partner, lesbian theory. Lesbian theory, in tandem, marks out the limits of what it is possible for us to read in texts that have been queered.

The Impact of Asian-American Literature

Amy Ling

Whether it is the influence of my western education that has taught me to see every situation in a dialectical fashion, or my eastern background that finds the yin-yang balance and tension representative of all experience (perhaps it comes from being born under the sign of Gemini, the Twins), or whether it's simply the common sense habit of tallying up columns of pluses and minuses—whatever the reason—when asked to discuss the impact of Asian-American literature on our discipline and teaching, despite the fact that binary oppositions are now unfashionable, I cannot help but see such an issue in a dualistic fashion. On the one hand, we, the proponents of ethnic literature and women's studies, have made a great deal of progress; on the other hand, what appears to be progress sometimes feels like a holding pattern at LaGuardia.

To speak of the “impact” of Asian-American literature on the English Department curriculum and on our pedagogy initially strikes me as presumptuous. Asian-American literature as a body of texts and authors cannot be said to have had much of an impact, if any, on the discipline. Specialists in the field holding university positions throughout the entire nation can be counted on two hands. No institution, except UC Berkeley, has more than one Asian-American literature specialist; though Hawaii has recently allocated three lines to this field, it has filled only one. Scholarship has been fairly recent and still sparse. Three literary anthologies, which announced that existence of a field, appeared twenty years ago; Kai-yu Hsu and Helen Palumbinkas, *Asian American Authors* (Boston:

Houghton Mifflin, 1972); David Hsin-fu Wang, *Asian American Heritage* (New York: Washington Square, 1974); and Frank Chin, et. al. *Aiiieeeee* (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1974). Our first literary history and criticism, Elaine Kim's *Asian American Literature: An Introduction to the Writings and Their Social Context* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press), was published in 1982. And we have only three other books of literary criticism and history: my *Between Worlds: Women Writers of Chinese Ancestry* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1991) and two excellent books just published in 1993: *King-kok Cheung*, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993), a study of Hisaye Yamamoto, Maxine Hong Kingston, and Joy Kogawa; and Sau-ling Wong, *Reading Asian American Literature: From Necessity to Extravagance* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).

In the two years I have been at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, I have organized more than half a dozen readings on campus by new and excellent Asian-American writers but, with two exceptions (one colleague I specifically badgered and some of the creative writing instructors), none of my colleagues in the English Department, including those teaching contemporary American literature, have come to any of the readings. The writers I invited—David Wong Louie, Wendy Law-Yone, Yong-Ik Kim, Sook Nyul Choi, Mitsuye Yamada, and Peter Bacho—are unfamiliar to most people. Few except readers of the *Heath Anthology* would recognize Asian American names from the past—Sui Sin Far, Younghill Kang, Carlos Bulosan. Thus, I cannot say that Asian-American literature has had much of an impact on the discipline at all.

On the other hand, a few individual Asian-American writers have had a very visible impact in the past two decades, not only in academia but in the larger society as well. These names and facts will be familiar, but allow me

to reiterate: Maxine Hong Kingston's *The Woman Warrior* and *China Men* won the National Book Critic's Circle Awards and the American Book Award in 1976 and 1980, respectively; and according to Bill Moyers, these two texts were the most frequently taught books by any living American author on college campuses in the 1980s. In 1982, Chinese-Korean-Hawaiian-American Cathy Song's *Picture Bride* won the Yale Younger Poets Competition; in 1987, Japanese-American Garrett Hongo's *River of Heaven* won the Lamont Award for the best second book of poetry from the American Academy of Poets and was nominated for the Pulitzer Prize, and David Henry Hwang's *M. Butterfly* received the 1988 Tony Award for the best new dramatic play on Broadway, and it has recently been released as a motion picture. Amy Tan's *Joy Luck Club* was on the *New York Times* Bestseller List for nine months, and the film is a marvelous version, artistically more coherent than the novel. Called an "Asian invasion" by the media, this burst of films depicting Asians in central and sympathetic roles is for me an unusual thrill.

I am pleased that Kingston's *The Woman Warrior* is on my department's doctoral prelims reading list and was surprised when I found 99 articles listed on Kingston in the CD Rom MLA Bibliography for the years 1981 through June 1993. Thinking this an unusually large number, I typed in Toni Morrison and found 269. Then I entered the names of what my colleague at Georgetown, Valerie Babb, playfully calls Dead White Male Authors, and was firmly brought back to earth. Here is a selection of what I found:

William Shakespeare	7549	Virginia Woolf	949
Geoffrey Chaucer	1988	Jane Austen	760
Herman Melville	1272	Emily Dickinson	77
Samuel Clemens	5	Charlotte Gilman	74
T. S. Eliot	339	George Eliot	828
Henry James	1526	Charlotte Bronte	393

Thomas Pynchon	477	Flannery O'Connor	400
Edward Albee	126	David Henry Hwang	7
Jean Paul Sartre	699	Simone de Beauvoir	238
Robert Browning	51	Elizabeth Browning	129
James Boswell	147	Maxine Hong Kingston	99

A word lover, I usually fumble numbers, but in this case, these numbers serve as one measure of the importance and impact of a particular author. They clearly show that the canonical male white writers maintain their dominance. Those who fear that the discipline is being overrun by new ethnic and feminist scholarship have little to worry about when the most prominent Asian-American writer has fewer published articles about her than a minor English biographer. At this moment at least, the impact on the discipline of the new studies of gender, class, and race has been less significant than those of us in the trenches would like to believe.

On the other hand, the MLA, the largest and most prestigious professional organization of our discipline, published *Teaching Approaches to Kingston's The Woman Warrior* in 1992. This publication not only attests to the popularity of Kingston's book in the college classroom, but places it in the heady company of high canonical texts: *The Hebrew Bible*, *The Canterbury Tales*, *King Lear*, *Don Quixote*, *Paradise Lost*, *Moby Dick*, *The Divine Comedy*, *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*, to name only a few. Of the forty-one volumes in the *Approaches to Teaching World Literature* series, only seven are devoted to texts by women, and one each to an American Indian (N. Scott Momaday), and African American (Ralph Ellison) and an Asian American (Kingston). We may rejoice that the glass is half full, or complain that the glass is half empty (or in this case, nine-tenths empty), depending on our way of looking at the world. In a sanguine mood, I believe that the inclusion

of Kingston is a sign that the pearly gates are opening up and others will be allowed entry. When cynical and paranoid, I feel that this is only tokenism. Time will tell.

Certainly the exciting announcement that Toni Morrison was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature on October 6, 1993 bodes well for our cause. Less than a decade ago, at Rutgers University, my course on "Ethnic Literature of the U.S."—in which I was teaching Maxine Hong Kingston, Toni Morrison, and Leslie Marmon Silko—was left off the list of important courses for English majors on three separate occasions. I was required to write a rationale and argue for including this single ethnic literature course when no one gave a rationale for six Victorian literature courses. Now ethnic studies is a requirement in many colleges and universities. Since 1989, all Letters and Sciences students at the University of Wisconsin must take at least one course in ethnic studies.

On the other hand, though students may fulfill their ethnic studies requirement in many disciplines, if they wish to do so in literature, the burden of teaching ethnic literature to all these students falls on the shoulders of a handful of us professors of color. Our introductory courses enroll as many as one hundred students. The unspoken reasoning seems to be: "Now that we have a few ethnic professors, let them take care of the ethnic studies requirement. The rest of us can sit back and do our own thing in the old way."

Elsewhere, however, I see others assuming the responsibility of including race, gender, and class in the curriculum. Last summer the incoming class at Occidental College in Los Angeles was required to read *Imagining America*, a collection of multicultural short stories that African-American novelist Wesley Brown and I co-edited. This year, our second book, *Visions of America*, a collec-

tion of multicultural autobiographies and personal narratives, was the required reading text for the freshmen. Last year, according to the *New York Times*, Columbia and Barnard required their incoming class to read three books for discussion at Freshmen Orientation: *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, Ronald Takaki's *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*, and Warren J. Bloomenfeld and Diane Raymond's *Looking at Gay and Lesbian Life*. This past June, Penn State sponsored four summer seminars in different ethnic literatures, enrolling one hundred college teachers from various parts of the country; the *Heath Anthology of American Literature*, the text with the greatest inclusion of writing by women and ethnic minorities, is going into its second edition; Oxford University Press is compiling the *Oxford Companion to Women Writers of the United States*, giving its imprimatur to women and ethnic women writers, and these are just a few of the projects I am personally involved with. There are others across the land not only at the college level but at all levels down to elementary schools. Multiculturalism is in.

The world seems to have done an about-face. Only eight years ago, a dear friend told me that my research on Chinese-American women writers was trailblazing, but it was blazing a trail to a place no one else wanted to go. Since the publication of my book, the letters I've received and the invitations to lecture have made it apparent that my little trail is of interest to others, and not just Chinese-American women. When a white female student came up to me at the end of the semester to say that she, a senior, an English major, found the books in my course in "Asian-American Women Writers" the best she had read in all her university years, I felt vindicated, elated.

At these moments, I think of myself as a participant in a major social revolution, comparable to the one Galileo

brought about when he corrected humanity's perspective and presumption of importance by asserting that the earth revolved around the sun, instead of the other way around. All of us, products of the 1960s civil rights and women's liberation movements, are participating in a similar revolution: overturning the notion that the Eurocentric masculinist location is *the* universal perspective and recognizing the validity of multiple perspectives and locations. And though we've come a long way, we have still a long way to go. For example, on the required course list for doctoral candidates at UW Madison, all the cutting-edge areas—women's studies, cultural and ethnic studies, new critical theories—have been lumped together from which the student is to choose one elective. The core required curriculum remains unchanged: The century periods, the major male authors. This is not as much progress as I'd like to see.

What is it I want? I don't want to see any of the dead truly great white male writers—Shakespeare, Chaucer, Donne, and so forth—taken off the list; I was nourished and enriched by them. But I think there's room for compression so that more of the new truly great writers can be included. For example, do our students really need to spend two semesters on one Anglo-Saxon poem—one semester on the basics of the language and the other to read the text? A thoroughly indoctrinated former English major, I have enough enemy outposts in my head to feel that the statement I've just made is sacrilege, but I must persist—though *Beowulf* is undoubtedly a powerful work of great historical import, it is important to only one literary tradition and why should this one be so privileged? Is England the sun? What is the rationale for having departments of English rather than departments of Literature in English?

But more important than the inclusion of one or two texts or authors, I want to see a transformation of attitude. I want everyone who professes a knowledge and love of literature to recognize that theirs is but one perspective not *THE* perspective or, worse yet, the *TRUTH*, the *BEAUTY*, and the *LIGHT*. I want everyone to be sensitive to hegemonic attitudes in the texts they are teaching and in themselves, and to infuse into every period and every major author's course, textual evidence or at least an interpretive stance that recognizes that the world, including England and the United States, is and has always been an arena of multiple races, genders, and classes.

Viewed negatively and unproductively, difference can be the battleground of contesting forces, the source of competition and of war. Viewed positively, difference and multiplicity are sites of beauty, fascination, and instruction, which it is our duty and privilege as professors to profess.

Modern Language Association CD ROM

Bibliography

	<u>1/81-91</u>	<u>1/91 - 6/24/93</u>
Margaret Atwood	272	298
Jane Austen	699	760
Donald Barthelme		98
Ann Beattie	18	20
Beowulf	423	458
James Boswell		147
Charlotte Bronte	357	393
Emily Bronte	180	197
Elizabeth Browning		129
Robert Browning		515
George Gordon, Lord Byron	558	635
Albert Camus		548
Geoffrey Chaucer	1789	1988

Samuel Clemens	841	958
Joseph Conrad		970
James Fenimore Cooper		251
John Donne	520	555
Fyodor Dostoevsky	974	1029
T.S. Eliot	1204	1339
Louise Erdrich	32	47
F. Scott Fitzgerald	344	376
William Golding	149	177
Nathaniel Hawthorne		1029
Ernest Hemingway	970	1076
David Henry Hwang	6	7
Henry James	1404	1526
John Keats	458	518
Maxine Hong Kingston	64	94
Joy Kogawa	10	12
Norman Mailer	112	119
Herman Melville		1272
John Milton	1637	1784
N. Scott Momaday	65	70
Toni Morrison	228	269
Sylvia Plath	182	204
Thomas Pynchon	445	477
Kenneth Rexroth	65	70
William Shakespeare	6894	7549
Leslie Marmon Silko	60	64
Percy Shelly	529	579
William Thackeray	187	205
Leo Tolstoi	609	647
Anne Tyler	33	55
John Updike	154	164
James Welch	36	38
William Wordsworth	1125	1237
Anzia Yeziarska	20	23
Emile Zola	609	613

Caribbean Literature

Barbara J. Webb

In preparing for this seminar, I was reminded of an essay by the Caribbean novelist Erna Brodber, "Fiction in the Scientific Procedure," where she describes her "ghost-like wanderings through disciplines" in search of a methodology that would allow her to combine her academic interests and her activist concerns about the people of the African diaspora. My own experience in academia has been a similar journey from English literature to Romance languages to Latin American and Caribbean studies to comparative literature and back to English literature again. Fortunately, my end was not by beginning, since English literary studies—though still hotly contested territory—is a much more open field. What motivated my own "wanderings through disciplines" was not a lack of focus, but what I perceived early on as a *lack* in the conception of academic disciplines and the practice of these disciplines, which until quite recently excluded the literatures, cultures, and concerns of so many of the world's people—especially Africans and people of African descent in the Americas.

My approach to literary studies has always been interdisciplinary and cross-cultural, and therefore suspect in most traditional literature departments. I have spent more time than I ever want to try to calculate justifying or defending my research and teaching interests in Caribbean, African-American, and African literature. Although I think we have come a long way since my undergraduate days when I was asked quite bluntly whether there really was such a thing as black culture, my experience on various curriculum committees suggests that this is still a ques-

tion in the minds of some of my colleagues. Their doubts and resistance to the inclusion of Caribbean, African-American, and African literatures into the regular course of study are rarely, if ever, based on any actual knowledge of the writers or texts; nonetheless the doubters and resisters express concerns based on the erroneous assumption that these literatures only deal with “narrow” issues (often characterized as resentment, oppression, victimization); that they lack the so-called universality and intellectual rigor of the “great” European traditions. What they fail to see is that these literatures address the most fundamental and urgent concerns of all people.

Caribbean literature is usually taught in black studies, Africana, or Latin American studies, primarily because of the initial indifference or outright hostility of traditional literature departments to the inclusion of such courses in their curriculum. Although lately some Caribbean writers—Jamaica Kincaid, Derek Walcott, Jean Rhys—regularly appear on some reading lists, or among those writers included in courses dealing with women’s writing, multicultural or postcolonial literature, Caribbean literature is rarely taught as a distinct course in its own right in traditional English literature departments. Hunter College, where I teach both Caribbean and African-American literature courses, is one of the exceptions.

The literature of the English-speaking Caribbean reflects the heterogeneity of its people and its culture. It is a literature that often combines old and new literary forms, the oral and the written, social realism, and mythic vision. It therefore does not easily fit into traditional classifications of literary movements or form. Like African-American literature, it is situated both inside and outside of Western history and culture. This dual perspective, more often than not, has resulted in an ongoing process of revision, challenging Western notions of history, culture, and wir-

ing—including modernist and postmodernist critiques based on Western history and cultural values. The redefinitions of self that are so central to Caribbean literature involve not only self-affirmation but also self-critical perspectives, which are especially important given the difficult challenges of postcolonial or neocolonial realities.

Because of the Caribbean's violent history of conquest, slavery, indenture, and colonialism, major themes in its literature are rupture, fragmentation, and dispossession. But an equally important focus is the process of creative transformations, the creation of new languages and cultures out of the very experience of rupture and fragmentation. As Derek Walcott said in his 1992 Nobel lecture, "Antillean art is this restoration of our shattered histories, our shards of vocabulary, our archipelago becoming a synonym for pieces broken off from the original continent. And this is the exact process of making of poetry, or what should be called not its 'making' but its remaking. . . . Deprived of their original language, the captured and indentured tribes create their own. . ." (*World Literature Today*, 262).

There are numerous parallels between recent developments in Caribbean and African-American literature (the fact that the Nobel prize for literature was won by a Caribbean writer, Derek Walcott, in 1992 and an African-American writer, Toni Morrison, in 1993, announced after this presentation, is just one notable example). New scholarship in Caribbean literature has traced its origins to the folklore, slave narratives, and European writings of the eighteenth century and earlier, but it is not until the twentieth century that a distinct body of literature giving voice to Caribbean culture and history emerges. The Jamaican poet and novelist, Claude McKay (1889-1948) was the first major writer from the Anglophone Caribbean. Although McKay is probably better known for his contributions to

the Harlem Renaissance movement, his dialect verse had a strong influence on early performance poets such as Louise Bennett and opened the way for the innovative use of vernacular speech and oral traditions in contemporary Caribbean poetry and fiction. Individual writers such as Edgar Mittleholzer (Guyana), C.L.R. James (Trinidad), and Jean Rhys (Dominica) published important works in the 1930s and 1940s. It was not, however, until the 1950s that a significant number of writers, including George Lamming, V.S. Naipaul, Edward Kamau Brathwaite, and Derek Walcott, began to publish the texts that would establish an Anglophone Caribbean literary presence. This body of literature, written almost exclusively by men, dealt primarily with the legacy of colonialism and explored the problems of language and cultural alienation faced by the colonized intellectual.

With the end of colonial rule in the 1960s, there has been a shift away from a dominant focus on English literary traditions toward the creation of a Caribbean esthetics based on its New World cultural identity and its multiple heritage of native American, African, Asian, and European cultures. This has included the recovery and literary re-interpretation of the history, legends, and myths of the region, the creation of new cultural archetypes (e.g., the maroons, the Rastafarian, carnival), and experimentation with vernacular forms—from folk traditions to popular music (such as calypso and reggae) as sources of both theme and method.

Two important recent developments in Caribbean literature are the emergence of a new generation of Caribbean women writers and the exploration of linguistic models such as the process of creolization and code-switching in both creative writing and literary criticism. Since the 1980s, Caribbean women writers have played an increasingly important role in the literature of the region. The

poetry, fiction, and essays of women writers such as Olive Senior, Erna Brodber, Marlene Nourbese Philip, Lorna Goodison, Jamaica Kincaid, and Michelle Cliff, among others, have added the perspectives of women to the discourse on Caribbean history and culture. What the Guyanese novelist Wilson Harris once called the “masked presence of the female” in Caribbean culture is given a conscious presence of its own in literature of Caribbean women writers. Their writing expresses the need for a connection to the cultural landscape of the region and asserts the place of women in Caribbean struggles of resistance, endurance, and change.

Because of the history of racial oppression and colonial domination in the Caribbean, issues of race, ethnicity, and class have always been prominent in Caribbean literary discourse. And although women have always participated in the struggles of the region, and female characters have often played a central role in the fiction of male writers from Claude McKay to Wilson Harris, the lack of published women writers in any significant numbers until the 1980s has meant that women’s voices and feminist perspectives have been largely absent from colonial and postcolonial debates about cultural and national identity. Feminism and feminist theories formulated in Europe and the United States are as problematic in the Caribbean as they are among many African Americans here. With the publication of works by women writers such as Erna Brodber, Michelle Cliff, and Jamaica Kincaid, and the emergence of a women’s movement in the region, women writers and social activists have begun to extend, and more importantly, revise the terms of colonial and postcolonial discourse, pointing out the connections between colonial/neocolonial domination and gender oppression. The work of Brodber, Cliff, and Philip, in particular, examines the relationship between language and identity in the psychological and

sexual development of women, exploring the underlying structure of power relationships in the use of language.

In her essay, "Speaking in Tongues," Mae Henderson points out that through "interventionist, intertextual, and revisionary activity, black women writers enter into dialogue with the discourses of the other(s)" (30). A similar dialogue is characteristic of the process of creolization that informs the work of most Caribbean writers, male and female. The poet, historian, and cultural critic Edward Kamau Brathwaite's concept of creolization is useful for our discussions about diversity and multiculturalism in the college curriculum. For Brathwaite, creolization is not just *acculturation*, a homogenizing synthesis that tends to repress difference (i.e., the "melting pot"), but a process of *interculturalization*, the reciprocal interaction of cultures, where there are "infinite possibilities" within differences and "many ways of asserting identity," (*Contradictory Omens*, 11, 25). The cross-cultural poetics of Caribbean literature emphasizes the need for a vision of community based on the recognition of multiple voices, multiple forms, and multiple meanings. As such, this literature obliges us to rethink our assumptions about knowledge, culture, and writing.

Works Cited

Brathwaite, Edward (Kamau). *Contradictory Omens: Cultural Diversity and Integration in the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: Savacou Publications, 1974.

Brodber, Erna. "Fiction in the Scientific Procedure," *Caribbean Women Writers*, ed. By Selwyn R. Cudjoe. Wellesley and Amherst: Callaloux Publications and University of Massachusetts Press, 1990.

Henderson, Mae Gwendolyn. "Speaking in Tongues: Dialogics, Dialectics, and the Black Woman Writer's Literary Tradition," *Changing Our Own Words: Essays on Criticism, Theory, and Writing by Black Women*, ed. By Cheryl A. Wall. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 1989.

Walcott, Derek. "The Antilles, Fragments of Epic Memory: The 1992 Nobel Lecture." *World Literature Today* 67:2 (Spring 1993): 261-67.

Recommended Recent Caribbean Literature: Anthologies and Criticism

Brown, Stewart, *et al.* *Voice Print: An Anthology of Oral and Related Poetry from the Caribbean*. Longman, 1989.

Cudjoe, Selwyn R., ed. *Caribbean Women Writers (Essays)*. Wellesley & Amherst: Callaloux Publications and University of Massachusetts Press, 1990.

Dance, Daryl Cumber, ed. *Fifty Caribbean Writers: A Biobibliographical Critical Sourcebook*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Davies, Carol Boyce and Fido, Elaine Savory, eds. *Out of the Kumbla: Caribbean Women and Literature*. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1990.

Espinet, Ramabai, ed. *Creation Fire (A CAFRA Anthology of Caribbean Women's Poetry)*. Toronto: CAFRA and Sister Vision, 1990.

Esteves, Carmen C. And Paravisini-Gebert, Lisabeth, eds. *Green Cane and Juicy Flotsam (Short Stories by Caribbean Women)*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Gikandi, Simon. *Writing in Limbo: Modernism and Caribbean Literature*. Ithaca, N.Y. and London: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Glissant, Edouard. *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*.
Translated by J. Michael Dash. Charlottesville: University
Press of Virginia, 1989.

Morris, Mervyn, ed. *The Faber Book of Contemporary
Caribbean Short Stories*. London: Faber and Faber, 1990.

Webb, Barbara J. *Myth and History in Caribbean Fiction*.
Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

Contributors

Note: These biographical notes were current as of 1993 when these essays were first published.

DAISY COCCO DE FILIPPIS is Professor of Spanish in the Department of Foreign Languages and Associate Dean and Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs at York College. Her Ph.D. in Spanish is from the City University of New York. She is author of *From Desolation to Compromise: The Poetry of Aida Cartagena Portalatin* and editor and translator of *Sin Otra Profeta Que Su Canto: antologia de la poesia escrita por Dominicanas* and *Combatidas, Combativas, y Combatientas: antologia de cuentos escritos por Dominicanas*.

JOAN E. HARTMAN is Professor of English at the College of Staten Island. Her Ph.D. is from Radcliffe College. She coedited *Women in Print I* and *Women in Print II* and *The Norton Reader* (3 editions). Her articles deal with seventeenth-century English literature, women's studies, and professional issues. She has coedited *(En)Gendering Knowledge: Feminists in Academe* and is the editor of *Concerns*, journal of the Women's Caucus for Modern Languages.

DOROTHY O. HELLY is Professor of History and Women's Studies at Hunter College. She has worked with CUNY curriculum transformation projects since 1983 and cofacilitates the CUNY Faculty Seminar in Balancing the Curriculum for Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class. She began the Academy Seminar in 1988–89 to provide a general forum for these issues. She is author of *Livingstone's Legacy: Horace Waller and Victorian Mythmaking*, coauthor of *Women's Realities, Women's Choices: An Introduction to Women's Studies*, and coeditor of *Gendered Domains: Rethinking Public and Private in Women's History*.

STEVEN F. KRUGER is Associate Professor of English at Queens College, a member of the faculty in the Certificate Program in Medieval Studies at the CUNY Graduate School and the CUNY Ph.D. Program in English. He earned his Ph.D. from Stanford University and is author of *Dreaming in the Middle Ages*. He is at work on *Gender and Sexuality in the Literature of AIDS*. His published articles include "The Bodies of Jews in the Late Middle Ages," "Racial/Religious and Sexual Queerness in the Middle Ages," and "Claiming the Pardoner: Toward a Gay Reading of Chaucer's Pardoner's Tale."

AMY LING is Associate Professor and Director of Asian-American Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her Ph.D. in Comparative Literature is from New York University. She has published widely, including translations, articles, and essays, and her creative work includes television scripts, poetry readings, painting activities, and acting/dramatic readings. She is the author of *Between Worlds: Women Writers of Chinese Ancestry* and

Chinamerican Reflections Chapbook of Poems and Paintings and coeditor of six books, including *Reading the Literatures of Asian America*, *Visions of America: Personal Narratives from the Promised Land*, and *Oxford Companion to Women's Writing in the U.S.*

SALLY O'DRISCOLL is an Assistant Professor of English at Fairfield University. Her Ph.D. is in Comparative Literature from the City University of New York. She is publishing a translation of Catherine Clement's *La Syncope*. Her articles and papers deal with later seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English writers Aphra Behn and Eliza Haywood, methodological issues, and a study of Tsitsi Dangarembga's "Nervous Conditions: Colonizing the Body."

BARBARA J. WEBB is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at Hunter College and has also taught at Queens College. Her Ph.D. is in Comparative Literature from New York University, with Language Certification in Spanish, French, and Portuguese. She is the author of *Myth and History in Caribbean Fiction: Alejo Carpentier, Wilson Harris, and Edouard Glissant* and regional editor, Anglophone Caribbean Section, *The HarperCollins World Reader*. Recent essays are: "The Daughters' Refusal: Gender, History and the Politics of Decolonization in the Fiction of Maryses Conde, Michelle Cliff, and Paule Marshall" and "Exile and New World Allegory in the Recent Fiction of Wilson Harris."

Reader Comment

Rethinking the Disciplines: Literature

Thank you for taking a few minutes to provide us with your response to this group of essays. If you have shared it with others, please feel free to copy this form and provide it to them.

Circle the appropriate number:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
♦ These essays informed me about the analysis of gender, race, and class in literature	1	2	3	4	5
♦ These essays pointed out how theories, concepts, and methods have or have not changed	1	2	3	4	5
♦ Concepts and vocabulary were easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5
♦ The information in the main body of the essay was useful for course revision	1	2	3	4	5
♦ The references were very useful	1	2	3	4	5

How did you learn about this essay? Check all that apply.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publication notice | <input type="checkbox"/> Internet listing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty workshop | <input type="checkbox"/> Summer institute |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conference presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (what? _____) |

What use did you make of the essay? Check all that apply.

- Read it for my own knowledge
- Used to revise a course
- Shared with colleagues
- Assigned as classroom reading

Please tell us something about your institution. Is it a:

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> high school | <input type="checkbox"/> four-year college | <input type="checkbox"/> other (what? _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> two-year college | <input type="checkbox"/> research university | _____ |

Also tell us something about yourself. Are you: (check all that apply)

- a faculty member (If so, what is your discipline of training? _____)
- a student (If so, what is your major? _____)
- an administrator other (what? _____)

How much formal academic training have you received in this discipline?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> none | <input type="checkbox"/> some graduate training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> one or two courses as an undergraduate | <input type="checkbox"/> master's degree training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> undergraduate major | <input type="checkbox"/> Ph.D. degree training |

For additional comments, please write on the back of this card or attach additional pages.

Name:

Address:

City/State/Zip:

Phone:

66

Email:

Thanks!

TAPE HERE

TAPE HERE

Comments: We would welcome additional comments. Please be specific. Write in the space below, or use additional pages if necessary. Thank you!



NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES



BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO. 9560 BALTIMORE, MD.

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University
Towson, MD 21252

67

Publications of the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women

WOMEN IN THE CURRICULUM

The following publications consist of directories, manuals, and essays covering the primary information needed by educators to transform the curriculum to incorporate the scholarship on women. The publications have been designed to be brief, user friendly, and cross referenced to each other. They can be purchased as a set or as individual titles. Tables of contents and sample passages are available on the National Center Web page: <http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw/>.

➤ ***Directory of Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities in the U.S.***

The *Directory* provides brief descriptions of 237 curriculum transformation projects or activities from 1973 to the present. It is intended to help educators review the amount and kinds of work that have been occurring in curriculum transformation on women and encourage them to consult project publications (see also *Catalog of Resources*) and to contact project directors for more information about projects of particular interest and relevance to their needs.

386 pages, 8½ X 11 hardcover, \$30 individuals, \$45 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-07-6

➤ ***Catalog of Curriculum Transformation Resources***

The *Catalog* lists materials developed by curriculum transformation projects and national organizations that are available either free or for sale. These include proposals, reports, bibliographies, workshop descriptions, reading lists, revised syllabi, classroom materials, participant essays, newsletters, and other products of curriculum transformation activities, especially from those projects listed in the *Directory*. These resources provide valuable information, models, and examples for educators leading and participating in curriculum transformation activities.

(Available fall 1997)

➤ ***Introductory Bibliography for Curriculum Transformation***

The *Introductory Bibliography* provides a list of references for beginning curriculum transformation on women, especially for those organizing projects and activities for faculty and teachers. It does not attempt to be comprehensive but rather to simplify the process of selection by offering an "introduction" that will lead you to other sources.

15 pages, 6 x 9 paper, \$7, ISBN 1-885303-32-7

➤ ***Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation***

Planning Curriculum Transformation describes the major stages and components of curriculum transformation projects as they have developed since about 1980. Written by Elaine Hedges, whose long experience in women's studies and curriculum transformation projects informs this synthesis, *Getting Started* is designed to help faculty and administrators initiate, plan, and conduct faculty development and curriculum projects whose purpose is to incorporate the content and perspectives of women's studies and race/ethnic studies scholarship into their courses.

124 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, \$20 individuals, \$30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-06-8

➤ ***Internet Resources on Women: Using Electronic Media in Curriculum Transformation***

This manual gives clear, step-by-step instructions on how to use e-mail, find e-mail addresses, and access e-mail discussion lists relevant to curriculum transformation. It explains Telnet, FTP, Gopher, and the World Wide Web, and how to access and use them. It discusses online information about women on e-mail lists and World Wide Web sites. Written by Joan Korenman, who has accumulated much experience through running the Women's Studies e-mail list, this manual is a unique resource for identifying information for curriculum transformation on the Internet. Updates to this manual will be available on the World Wide Web at <http://www.umbc.edu/wmst/updates.html>.

130 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, \$20 individuals, \$30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-08-4

➤ ***Funding: Obtaining Money for Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities***

This manual is intended to assist educators who lack experience in applying for grants but are frequently expected to secure their own funding for projects. The manual provides an overview of the process, basic information and models, and advice from others experienced in fund raising.

150 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, \$20 individuals, \$30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-05-x

➤ ***Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation***

This manual outlines several designs which could be used when assessing the success of a project. *Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation* is written by Beth Vanfossen, whose background in the teaching of research methods as well as practical experience in conducting evaluation research informs the manual's advice. Evaluation is an increasingly important component of curriculum transformation work on which project directors and others often need assistance.

(Available fall 1997)

➤ ***Discipline Analysis Essays***

Under the general editorship of Elaine Hedges, the National Center has requested scholars in selected academic disciplines to write brief essays summarizing the impact of the new scholarship on women on their discipline. These essays identify and explain the issues to be confronted as faculty in these disciplines revise their courses to include the information and perspectives provided by this scholarship. The series is under continuous development, and titles will be added as they become available. See order form for essays currently available.

27 - 60 pages, 6 x 9 paper, \$7 each

➤ ***CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines***

Panels of scholars in seven disciplines address questions about the impact on their disciplines of recent scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. The panels were developed under the leadership of Dorothy O. Helly as part of the Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class within The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences. For this seminar CUNY received the "Progress in Equity" award for 1997 from the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

56 - 85 pages, 6 x 9 paper, \$10 each

ORDER FORM 1-800-847-9922, 8:30-4:00 EST, M-F or Fax: 1-410-830-3482

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Towson University, Baltimore, MD 21252

SHIP TO:

Name _____
 Institution _____
 Address _____ (no P.O. Boxes)
 City _____ State _____ Zip _____
 Phone _____ Fax _____ E-mail _____

All orders must be prepaid by charging the total to a credit card by phone, fax, or mail or by enclosing a check for the total amount with the order form. No purchase orders.

Check enclosed Visa Mastercard Discover
 Account # _____ Exp. Date ____/____/____
 Signature _____
 Printed Name _____

CUT HERE

WOMEN IN THE CURRICULUM

<u>Title</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>																		
Complete SET of all titles listed below at 10% discount \$251 set (individuals); \$292 set (institutions) + \$20 shipping		\$																		
• Directory of Projects & Activities, Hardcover: \$30 (individual); \$45 (institutions)		\$																		
• Introductory Bibliography, Paper: \$7		\$																		
• Getting Started, Hardcover: \$20 (individual); \$30 (institutions)		\$																		
• Internet Resources on Women, Hardcover: \$20 (individual); \$30 (institutions)		\$																		
• Funding for Projects & Activities, Hardcover: \$20 (individual); \$30 (institutions)		\$																		
• Discipline Analysis Essays, Paper: \$7 each		\$																		
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>___ Anthropology</td> <td>___ Education</td> <td>___ Philosophy</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___ Art</td> <td>___ European History</td> <td>___ Political Science</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___ Biology</td> <td>___ Geography</td> <td>___ Psychology</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___ British Literature</td> <td>___ Health</td> <td>___ Sociology</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___ Composition</td> <td>___ Music</td> <td>___ U.S. History</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___ Economics</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	___ Anthropology	___ Education	___ Philosophy	___ Art	___ European History	___ Political Science	___ Biology	___ Geography	___ Psychology	___ British Literature	___ Health	___ Sociology	___ Composition	___ Music	___ U.S. History	___ Economics				
___ Anthropology	___ Education	___ Philosophy																		
___ Art	___ European History	___ Political Science																		
___ Biology	___ Geography	___ Psychology																		
___ British Literature	___ Health	___ Sociology																		
___ Composition	___ Music	___ U.S. History																		
___ Economics																				
• CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines, Paper: \$10 each		\$																		
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>___ Anthropology</td> <td>___ History</td> <td>___ Sociology</td> </tr> <tr> <td>___ Biology</td> <td>___ Literature</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>___ Education</td> <td>___ Psychology</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	___ Anthropology	___ History	___ Sociology	___ Biology	___ Literature		___ Education	___ Psychology												
___ Anthropology	___ History	___ Sociology																		
___ Biology	___ Literature																			
___ Education	___ Psychology																			

Subtotal	\$
Sales Tax (MD residents add 5%)	\$
Shipping/Handling (UPS, \$4 first book, \$1 ea. addl.)	\$
TOTAL	\$

Make checks payable to: **TU UNIVERSITY STORE**
 Mail order to: **University Store, University Union Bldg,**
Towson University, 8000 York Rd., Baltimore, MD 21252
 Phone orders: **1-800-847-9922**



Panels of scholars in seven disciplines address questions about the impact on their disciplines of recent scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. The panels were developed under the leadership of Dorothy O. Helly as part of the Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum within The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences. This series received the 1997 "Progress in Equity" award from the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

Publications available in **WOMEN IN CURRICULUM** series

- ⊙ Directory of Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities in the U.S.
- ⊙ Catalog of Curriculum Transformation Resources
- ⊙ Introductory Bibliography: Basic References for Curriculum Transformation
- ⊙ Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation Work
- ⊙ Internet Resources on Women: Using Electronic Media in Curriculum Transformation
- ⊙ Funding: Obtaining Money for Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities
- ⊙ Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation
- ⊙ Essays on Selected Topics and Issues

⊙ Discipline Analysis Essays:

Anthropology	Education	Political Science
Art	European History	Psychology
Biology	Geography	Sociology
British Literature	Health	U.S. History
Composition	Music	
Economics	Philosophy	

⊙ CUNY Panels:

Rethinking the Disciplines

Anthropology	Literature
Biology	Psychology
Education	Sociology
History	

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women

Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University

ISBN 1-885303-13-0



9 781885 303134

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

71



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS



This document is covered by a signed “Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a “Specific Document” Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either “Specific Document” or “Blanket”).

EFF-089 (9/97)