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PAN-HISTORIOGRAPHY: THE CHALLENGES OF WRITING HISTORY ACROSS TIME AND SPACE

Debra Hawhee and Christa J. Olson

What does it mean to practice "pan-historiography"? We pose this question as historians of rhetoric, each of us in the thick of researching and writing histories that spread across a vast expanse of time—one an examination of how topos of indigeneity helped shape national identity in Ecuador over more than a century (Olson); the other a consideration of animals in the history of rhetoric that spans the multicentury, multinational, and multiscopic life of the progymnasmata (Hawhee). Our respective projects have attuned us to the intricacies of what we term "pan-historiography": writing histories whose temporal scope extends well beyond the span of individual generations. Pan-historiography can also refer to studies that leap across geographic space, tracking important activities, terms, movements, or practices as they travel with trade, with global expansion, or with religious zealotry.

Though neither of us embarked on our current studies with the specific goal of pursuing pan-historiography, the process of shaping them has convinced us that such expansive histories, in their very expansiveness, make unique contributions to rhetorical studies and, as such, merit specific methodological reflection. Our move to theorize pan-historiography is all the more pressing since, in the course of mapping out our own pan-historiographies, we have noticed that such expansive histories run counter to a disciplinary trend. That is, histories in rhetorical studies seem to be moving away from broad-based ones, like George A. Kennedy’s many historical bird’s-eye views (for example, Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times, A New History of Classical Rhetoric, and Comparative Rhetoric) or Jeffrey Walker’s Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity, and toward more restricted or focused histories. It is far more common these days to see book-length rhetorical histories bound tightly by a short span of dates or by the lives of particular figures than to encounter texts that explain or explore the rhetorical histories of a concept or cultural group. And yet even scholars who focus on one or two decades might well skate across a continent, even an ocean or two, in the course of their history-telling; similarly, claiming larger relevance for specific histories often requires drawing parallels across time and place. Our field’s histories have a tendency to spread.

The move to restrictive, specialized histories may well reflect rhetoric’s coming-of-age as a discipline. Historians of rhetoric have begun to move away from disciplinary histories and have access to a number of more-or-less comprehensive histories of Western rhetoric. They are thus free to detail the contours and textures of a particular moment or place. The move toward narrow rhetorical histories also—perhaps relatedly—corresponds with a spike in historiographic scholarship, much of which, of late, focuses on archives. Or, more accurately, on “the archive,” a methodological and theoretical focus that lends itself to specific histories and carefully targeted scopes.

We open with this broad sketch of the state of history and historiography in the field to situate our own sense of the lingering usefulness of those histories that sprawl across long stretches of time and space and multiple archives, and the concomitant need to share methods and cautionary tales pertinent to writing such histories, to take preliminary steps toward a pan-historiography. From here, we would like to consider the rationale for pan-historiography, examining what expansive histories might have to offer rhetorical studies today. We do not wish to consider the merits of pan-historiography over and against more focused histories; rather, we believe the two work in tandem to provide comprehensiveness as well as depth. Indeed, a guiding assumption of our reflections is this: the expansion of the wide-ranging histories we are working on necessitates the contraction of more focused histories, and vice versa. In this way, disciplinarity breathes and moves through its histories, by turns zooming and hovering, simultaneously posing big-picture questions and fine-grained ones.

We suggest, therefore, that this moment of contraction toward predominantly close-range histories is a perfect time to consider the possibilities of expansion while also tapping into the insights of the narrow history, particularly the deeply textured contributions of archival work. We will assert the usefulness of sprawling histories by examining two central theoretical and methodological complications posed by pan-historiography and the potential dividends yielded by dwelling with those complications. After a brief section laying out justifications for the choice to span, we will consider, first, the risk of ahistoric skating across time and culture that thematically organized studies can pose, and second, the challenge of working with multiple archives of varying scales and types of materials. We will close with
reflections on how the strategies of pan-historiography can allow diverse archival materials to, in a sense, move. That is, by taking a wide scope, both of us strive to attend to that which is necessarily absent from or barely present in archival, documentary materials: bodies, habits, activities, or what performance theorist Diana Taylor calls “repertoires.” Underlying our discussion of widely flung histories, then, is a broader question: How can pan-historiography meet its own challenges and enliven its materials to create animated histories, histories that bear down even as they expand? A robust treatment of these questions and complications is, anyway, our goal. Our discussion, therefore, will meld theoretical and methodological inclinations: we will share our concrete approaches to and justifications for expansive histories and examine the conceptual orientations underlying and emerging from those historiographic practices.

Choosing to Span

Most frequently the advice to history writers is to “go small,” to eschew the unmanageable. But it might be better to pause and wonder about the function of a particular history before making this choice. What is the history’s central motivating question? What materials will help answer that question? Do the answers change across time, and if so, is there a particular time period that provides more insight than others, or is diachronic change itself of interest? Would understandings of the history at hand be better if slices of time were presented next to each other?

Both of us are working on questions not yet broached by scholars in our discipline, and we have each settled on a time-slicing approach for what it can reveal about the issues we are addressing across time. The particular contributions that our projects will make to understandings of rhetorical theory and practice are tied to questions of persistence and change which, therefore, take center stage in our analyses. As we discuss in the remainder of this section, the choice to take such an expansive, thematic approach is, at heart, a disciplinary move. The decision to span depends on and responds to the aspects of rhetorical history or theory that the study hopes to illuminate and the contributions a rhetorical perspective might make to clarifying the broad themes (in our cases, of nation formation, and of human/animal relations) under consideration.

The choice to span also recalibrates the distinction between diachronic and synchronic history that is the legacy of structuralism and poststructuralism (most notably de Saussure and Foucault). The distinction is drawn from de Saussure, who argued for both approaches to language and history—the synchronic to attend to political and cultural specificities in

a particular moment, and the diachronic to attend to long-view history. Foucault himself favors synchronic studies, which examine structures at a particular moment in time (with time), whereas the diachronic approach is more broadly historical (through time). A diachronic approach has too often been dismissed as what Jana Evans Brazil, a scholar of transnational literature, calls “a monolithic and homogeneous stretch of knowledge across time, across history” (105). We share in Brazil’s rejoinder to such criticisms and her view that synchrony and diachrony ought to be brought into balance, for as she puts it, “constructs (or signifiers) also attain and accrue meaning historically” (106). Together, both synchronic and diachronic approaches can offer a productive “historical reservoir of meaning... synchronically constructed and diachronically residual” (Brazil 106). In other words, contrary to the assumption that underwrites the command to “go small”—that short, synchronic histories are the only way depth can be achieved—the diachrony central to pan-historiography, with its attention to residual accumulation of topoi, beliefs, and strategic practices, brings its own kind of depth.

Hawhee’s study of animals in the history of rhetoric, for example, might be the first book-length, historical consideration of philosophical questions about animals and rhetoric. On the one hand, it might make sense to start small and build from there. But on the other hand, the story—or at least the story she will tell—promises to hew tightly to the school exercises known as the *progymnasmata*, in which animals feature prominently, and which persisted in rhetorical education practices for at least fourteen centuries. That is, the permutations—and surprising persistence—of animals in the history of rhetoric make a good deal of sense when followed in light of the *progymnasmata*. While the *progymnasmata* are not the exclusive object of the study (these exercises exhibited a remarkable consistency over such a long time span, and others have studied them in depth), they nevertheless form the unifying backdrop for what is turning out to be a bundled set of in-depth studies that together move across time. The study is therefore book-ended by two key *progymnasmatic* figures—Aesop, whose oric invention of the fable helped place animals at the fore of ancient rhetorical education, and Erasmus, whose early-sixteenth-century theories of *copia* and writings on animals bear the stamp of the *progymnasmata*. Such book-endings, believe it or not, provide a way to limit the study to pre- and early-modern rhetorics.

The modern counterpart to this history would also be fascinating, but the discourses of Enlightenment and evolution and their twin devotions to science would no doubt take the investigation in a completely different direction, one that would be more appropriate for a separate volume. Selecting pre-Enlightenment figures, texts, and practices opts for a stretch in
which rhetoric’s tendrils wended their way into cultural beliefs and practices. Furthermore, in the pre- and early-modern eras, nonhumans for the most part inhabit the domain of rhetoric in a lively, communicative, action-based way, whereas the dissection and evolutionary theory of the modern era tends to hold animals a bit more still. With such a selection, then, the prevailing logic is somewhat similar to that put forth by Jeffrey Walker in *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*, where he writes that he initially “cheerfully imagined” that his investigation would span both antiquity and modernity, “and soon discovered how impossibly large that subject really was, and is” (viii). He continues, “I have accordingly confined myself to rhetoric and poetics in antiquity, which already is a subject more than large enough, and indeed even here I have found it necessary to make selections” (viii).

It is worth noting here that even the most expansive histories still work within set parameters (historical, thematic, or, more usually, both): historiography always involves making selections. With more expansive histories, those selections slice up time, selecting representative figures or movements in order to create a larger narrative arc. In any event, the resulting book on animals in the history of rhetoric will hopefully function, much as Walker’s *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity* does, as both a commentary and a resource, a suasive starting point for those interested in the questions it engages. In this instance, the guiding question centers on the roles nonhuman animals have played—culturally, politically, historically—in the shaping of rhetoric, a decidedly human (and humanist) art. The story promises to be one of both surprising thematic durability and contextual, cultural mutation.

That emphasis on thematic durability and contextual mutation across time has been a shared interest for us. In sketching the contours of Ecuadorian national identity as it developed from independence through the present, Olson was struck by an apparent contradiction between the visibility of indigenous people in images of the nation and their exclusion from equal participation in the republic. Her analytical approach therefore emphasizes the work those recurring images of indigenous people did for the artists who made them and for the Ecuadorians who purchased and circulated them. It aims to uncover the connections between indigenous visibility and indigenous marginality. In that context, focusing on a single period or organizing the study around period case studies would limit its ability to treat nationalism as a sustained and sustaining rhetorical process. A thematic approach that lays slices of time alongside one another better reveals patterns of continuity and rupture in depictions of indigenous people and indigenous political agency. The study thus emphasizes what Michael Warner calls the “concatenation of texts through time” (“Publics” 62) that, in this case, created and sustained the idea of the Ecuadorian nation and convened a national public. It traces accumulations of rhetorical artifacts around a handful of themes that have been used to invoke the nation even in distinctly changed contexts. Examining those themes as rhetorical *topoi*, the study focuses on the common sense force that repeated, resilient images acquire over time and allows insight into the particularly rhetorical nature of national identity. As we will discuss below, that turn to *topoi* also lends methodological coherence to the temporal and archival span.

Examining shifting common sense over time allowed Olson’s study to engage disciplinary understandings of publicity and rhetorical constitution. It demonstrates that rhetorical theories of identification and publics formation must pay close attention to both stability and fluidity, both momentary actions and accumulated sensibilities. Such a focus keeps in mind Jeremy Adelman’s argument that studies concerned with continuity must also “contend with the indeterminacies of life if they are to mean anything historically” (12). It also situates the creation and maintenance of national identity as a process of rhetorical constitution that brings a nation into awareness of itself through repeated, accumulated narratives. The study examines how both political Constitutions and the wide array of artifacts that Kenneth Burke calls “constitutions—behind-the-Constitution” undergird common-sense arguments about who and what the nation is (*Grammar* 562). Expansive pan-historiography makes sense for studies of national identity formation, then, because it brings attention to the consistencies and ruptures that characterize nationalisms as they develop diachronically and function on multiple planes of symbolic action. A widely flung approach makes space for the overlapping and contradictory forces that nationalisms wield. This expansive history, then, is able to uncover some of the macro-level rhetorical workings of national publicity but also pay attention to how local conflicts and subaltern resistance contest, shape, and appropriate those overarching narratives of the nation.

As the previous pages have suggested, both our studies turn toward the expansive for a combination of conceptual, theoretical, and practical reasons. Our guiding questions bring us face-to-face with issues of continuity and change, and we could not pursue them in the narrow frame. Similarly, our disciplinary interest in bringing rhetorical insights to bear on topics such as national identity and human-animal relations pulls us toward the expansive history. Understanding how each of our objects of study engages a range of communicative actions in the effort to “make things matter” (T. Farrell) requires looking at processes and accumulations of artifacts and actions through time. For each of our topics, the making of meaning and
of influence is an expansive project, one whose contours and complexities would be lost if pursued only in the scope of a few years or a single figure.

Avoiding the Sweep

Because of their orientation toward continuities and developments, expansive histories always run the risk of slipping from wide-angle views of indeterminacy to totalizing narratives. Their very strengths, the ability to account for change over time and demonstrate the cumulative nature of rhetorical practice, can put them at risk. "The sweep," that tendency to homogenize whole eras, places, and controversies into manageable and misleadingly coherent terms, must be counterbalanced by theoretical, methodological, and structural practices designed to keep texture and complexity in the foreground. Expansive rhetorical histories cannot merely acknowledge that change happens or that the rhetorical situation of one moment is distinct from that of another; they must have theoretical and methodological orientations that make those evolutions and breaks integral to the analyses they forward.

The "time-slicing" strategy that we reference in the previous section is one approach to that task. By selecting key historical-cultural moments to anchor individual chapters or fix the exploration of themes, we attempt to prevent the kind of ahistoric skating that all historians want to avoid. Those slices, chosen to reveal "continuity in... dialectical terms—as the products of interaction, even conflict" (Adelman 2), give our pan-historiography texture. Pairing fine-grained analysis of the complexities in those slices with comparisons across slices helps ensure that our claims, though broad, are grounded.

For one of us (Olson), that orientation toward change takes theoretical form in explorations of rhetorical _topoi_. Looking at how _topoi_ cultivate and sustain national common sense and how such common sense invokes publics and counterpublics lends a dynamic orientation to her expansive history, helping avoid the traps of homogeneity and teleology that might otherwise plague a study of national identity. Wide-ranging archival research, in turn, lends that theoretical orientation methodological heft and structural complexity.

Evidence of the commonplaces of national identity circulating across visual and textual forms appears in an array of Ecuadorian archives. Moving among archives, like moving among periods, uncovered both consistencies over time and conflicts within particular moments. In particular, the accumulations of texts and performances generated across archives and eras pointed toward the myriad ways that elites and subalterns all participated in calling national identity into being and wielding it for rhetorical advantage.

Similarly, research in different archives demonstrated that many of the _topoi_ under consideration worked simultaneously in rhetorical contexts eventful (that is, intentionally constitutive paintings, speeches, and texts) and everyday (that is, quotidian administrative missives, petitions, and sketches). Without a theoretical orientation toward change and a methodological commitment to encountering archival contradictions, the resulting history of Ecuadorian national identity could have easily fallen into a deceptively coherent narrative of white- _mestizo_ dominance and one-dimensional nation building. Theoretical and methodological orientations toward change, however, kept in the foreground those indeterminacies that underlie the appearance of continuity, persistence, and development over time.

While Olson’s study demands attention to multiple voices, Hawhee’s time-slicing technique arises from the markedly different contexts in which animals and rhetoric meet across time and place. How does one decide where to make these slices? The question is difficult to answer separate from a particular project, but it does involve looking askew at existing disciplinary narratives. Hawhee decided on each chapter’s focus by first noticing mentions of nonhuman animals in rhetoric’s traditional texts while teaching a survey titled "The Rhetorical Tradition," and then by later taking an inquisitive view of rhetoric’s existing histories, from which animals are largely absent. She discovered not only that animals are used as literary stand-ins for difference in school exercises, and teachable metaphors in theoretical treatises and philosophical dialogues, but also that actual animals and depictions of them reach prominence in trends and practices that barely receive mention in rhetorical studies. For example, much has been written in legal studies about the medieval practice of bringing animals—pigs, locusts, dogs, and rats—to trial in ecclesiastical and secular courts, and yet no one has examined remaining accounts of and testimonies in these trials. The trials, which provide the focus of a chapter in the middle of the book, read quite differently when situated in relation to the longstanding practice of featuring animals in fable and encomia (two of the _progymnasmata_ exercises), and school declamations or practice speeches, where students regularly ascribe to animals the twin qualities of agency and culpability, at times even speech.

While teaching a seminar on Aristotle’s _Rhetoric_ and attending to that text’s manuscript tradition, Hawhee noticed that late manuscripts and early print editions of the treatise are elaborately decorated with animals, especially scorpions, and so she is now planning a chapter that will examine rhetoric’s emblems. The chapters mentioned here take as their focus a wide range of objects and cultures—from lighthearted schoolroom arguments praising flies and parrots, to religious and legal arguments premised on
DEBRA HAWKES AND CHRISTA J. OLSON

human accountability, to emblems and book culture. Each one is planted
in a different historical and cultural context and contains its own set of
specific argumentative roots. When examined from the perspective of rhe-
torical history, they help provide a long view of rhetoric's shape-shifting,
immigratory, nonhuman participants, but it is a long view that is held in check
by careful attention to the particular conditions of the objects/practice/
movements under scrutiny. All the chapters are guided by versions of the
questions: How did images of/arguments about animals take hold? What
do they achieve rhetorically, and what can they tell us about rhetoric's history
and the rhetorical theories we have inherited? About human and animal
relations in that particular cultural context? About identity and difference?

Symbols and strategies?

In each of our manuscripts, a set of coherent, open-ended questions helps
to rein in and unify a study in which the objects—and their answers—can
be wildly incongruous. The net effect can be a study that both ranges and
slices, a study, that is, composed of miniature studies, each making its own
point that contributes to, even as it complicates, the longer view. This rang-
ing and slicing brings together the diachronic and synchronic movements
discussed earlier. Combining synchronic slices in a diachronic narrative
effectively temporalsizes the perspectiveism favored by the likes of Fried-
rich Nietzsche and Kenneth Burke. As Burke puts it, "the universe would
appear to be something like a cheese; it can be sliced in an infinite number
of ways" (Permanence and Change 103). Pan-historiography, as we envision
it, emphasizes deliberate slicing—and a piecing together of slices—even as
it resists beginning or ending with anything like a whole cheese.

Rethinking "The Archive"

As hinted at in the above discussion, pan-historiography brings with it the
necessity of consulting multiple archives. For the past decade or so,
scholars in rhetorical studies trained in both English and communication
departments have begun examining "the archive," and noting the need for
more thorough and rigorous training in archival methods.7 While we are
proponents of both archival research and greater emphasis on research peda-
gogies, we wish to use this discussion of pan-historiography to reconsider
the tendency in rhetorical studies to speak of "the archive." Cheryl Glenn
and Jessica Enoch, despite a titular reference to "archives" ("Drama") and
discussions of their and others' need to work in multiple archives ("Invigo-
rating" 13; "Drama" 326–28), still use "archive" in the singular (328, 333). The
editors of two recent collections about archival research (Working in the
Archives and Beyond the Archives) similarly title their books in the plural,
but the essays tend again toward writing about "the archive" in the singular
(Ramsey et al.; Kirsch and Rohan). Likewise, contributors to the 2006 forum
in Rhetoric and Public Affairs on archival research speak almost uniformly
about "the archive" ("Forum"). C. Breton writes of "our archive," suggesting
that the discipline (in this case, of rhetoric and composition) uses a select set of materials, but one that "has been expanding dramatically"
of late (574). It is difficult to determine the guiding rationale for the use of
"the archive" in the singular, but it seems to arise when authors are at their
most theoretical, at which point "the archive" tends to recede a notch from
material spaces. We prefer to follow Linda Ferreira-Buckley in speaking
of archives in the plural ("Rescuing"), but for perhaps different reasons.8

Moving from the plural buildings and rooms in which we conduct re-
search to the singular conceptual realm of available resources—from
archives to "the archive"—encourages, or at least allows, a homogenization
troublingly similar to "the sweep" we discuss above. We don't wish to bel-
labor the grammatical point, but our experiences researching and writing
pan-historiographies have made clear to us that archives, especially those
chronicling different times and places, are most productively approached
in the plural. This is not just because writers of expansive history must
consult multiple archives—writers of more tightly bound histories often do
the same. Rather, our need to discuss archives in the plural stems from our
encounters with one of the major challenges posed by pan-historiography:
the challenge of what we call archival incongruity. Archival incongruity
names the dissonance that can result from working with the media and
material available in different periods and locations. As media preferences
shift and change across decades or centuries, so do the materials found in
(and outside of) archives. We have found, in other words, that even archives
treating the same discrete topic, if they are spatially or temporally expansive,
do not cohere either materially or conceptually into a single conceptual
archive. They are resolutely plural.

We first noticed this when one of us (Olson) was researching and organiz-
ing her dissertation. Her interest in visual culture, in particular, brought
the incongruous nature of archives and archival materials across time starkly
to light. Even putting aside the different realities of print culture in the
late nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries, the technologies available
to authors and artists meant that understanding and describing "what is
seen" (Roeder 275) posed a serious challenge. How might she talk about
the pervasive presence of images of indigenous people when comparing hand-
produced and copied watercolor paintings with mass-reproduced photo-
graphs and prints? Her solution lay in elaborations of the same strategies
for pan-historiography that we have invoked already: focusing her analysis on the circulation of *topoi* rather than the circulation of specific images or artifacts, she is able to account for changes in archival practices, technical capabilities, and reporting systems over time. Thus, her emphasis on *topoi* gat hered from the concatenations of disparate artifacts allows her to advance an archives-based history of the conceptual resources on which elites and subalterns drew in their arguments about the nature of the nation.

Archival incongruity was something Hawhee was, at the time when Olson began encountering it, fairly familiar with without having a name for it, having experienced the incongruity most acutely in the transition from her first to second book. While both books posed questions about bodies in rhetorical history, the radically different time periods and locations (fifth- and fourth-century Greece and twentieth-century US) yielded different materials that demanded radically distinct and flexible methods. The different materials and methods also called for a rethinking of each study's guiding concepts and questions. Two representative images will need to suffice. The first book, *Bodily Arts: Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece*, begins with an image of a statue found in the shipwreck off the coast of Kythera (2). Hawhee first saw a photograph of this statue in a book and then visited a replica of it at the National Archaeological Museum of Athens. The identity of this statue is contested, but theories that it represents on the one hand an athlete and on the other hand an orator helped her to launch her argument about these intertwined, bodily arts. An equally representative but vastly different image features in chapter 4 of her book *Moving Bodies: Kenneth Burke at the Edges of Language* (81). The image is taken from Walter B. Cannon's 1915 book *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear, and Rage* and is a diagram of the autonomic nervous system, with the brain and spinal cord represented by a long, thin line that looks something like a thermometer, and with pre- and post-ganglionic fibers represented by lines. Tiny sketches of organs connect to the fibrous lines, and the whole thing looks something like a telephone system. The image of a bodily system without a body, when considered next to the muscular, nearly (and once) whole statue that inspired *Bodily Arts*, provides a useful shorthand for the radically different bodies and approaches to bodies available in the respective eras' archives. The available means of research, and the cultural shifts those means bespeak, helped Hawhee tweak her research questions. While both books began with the same general question—"how do bodies and rhetoric come together?"—the available materials refined the questions even as they began to answer them.

The archival incongruity across her first two books helped prepare Hawhee to write the book on animals in rhetoric. As the last section's discussion of time slicing indicates, animals appear in different milieu, in vastly different forms: at times mute defendants, at other times still artistic renderings. They also frequently appear in theoretical texts as analogies and counter-analogies to human animals, and those appearances help frame the other shapes taken by animals in rhetoric's history. From Aesop's use of animals as the stand-in for difference to Erasmus's brush with rights-based arguments, and to all the fabulous, visual, and jurisprudential renderings in between, rhetoric's beasts provide both shifting and remarkably durable means of thinking about humans and nonhumans alike, as well as about the art of rhetoric itself.

The realities of archival incongruity aid in the pan-historiographer's efforts to avoid the context-blurring, sweeping conclusions that we discussed above. Keeping track of the different sorts of artifacts that populate our slices of time and carefully tracing the sorts of arguments than can be made using those different artifacts in effect keeps the rhetorical historian both grounded and humble. To do pan-historiography is to be constantly confronted with the parallels that cannot be drawn and the changing details that bring texture even to apparent continuities in argument and identification.

**Getting Documents and Artifacts to Move**

In the thick of researching and writing pan-historiographies, we have both tried not to lose sight of what is rhetorical: that which moves. And here we mean "moves" in its fullest (and most multiple) sense, physically and emotionally. Lester Olson points out that several of the key English-language terms of rhetoric derive etymologically from the Latin root *movere* (*Emblems* xvii). Move, motive, and motif all invoke a sense of action, and their centrality to the theory and practice of rhetoric urges rhetoricians to be sure that our historical studies keep an ear open for and an eye on the live and the lived. For that reason, even as we advocate archival activity, we urge attention to Diana Taylor's important reminder that archives are stone silent, their data comparatively immobile, and their contents often inextricably tied to official narratives. Our studies attempt to keep track of pan-historical movements, motives, and motifs by considering the bodily residues that may be found in archives.

Taylor reminds historians that "[e]mbodied performances have always played a central role in conserving memory and consolidating identities in literate, semiliterate, and digital societies" (xviii). Therefore, according to Taylor, "it is vital to signal the performative, digital, and visual fields as separate from, though always embroiled with, the discursive one so privileged by Western logocentrism" (6). To this end, she suggests that examining
performances allows a way beyond logocentric biases and encourages attention to scenarios as well as narratives. Scenarios, she explains, need not "reduce gestures and embodied practices to narrative description" (16). Embedded in Taylor's idea of repertoire is Foucault's Nietzschean approach to history as ever-articulated with bodies ("Nietzsche," Language 148).

Similarly, Taylor's ventures into Latin American colonial performances demonstrate the interconnectedness of archive and repertoire and the challenge of telling stories about the past without inevitably making them into narratives that serve Western purposes. Historians must often dig through narratives in order to allow scenarios to emerge. Especially when the scenarios sought are those staged or inhabited by marginalized or subaltern populations, however, they are most often found by reading against the grain, finding gestures in omissions, or looking backward from today's scenarios. In this way, we attempt to write histories that strive to become what Foucault calls the "differential knowledge of energies and failings, heights and degenerations, poisons and antidotes" ("Nietzsche," Language 156). We contend, that is, that archives can in fact be brought to life, animated by the right mix of scholarly rigor and imagination, the right mix of a long, diachronic view and a more tightly attenuated synchronic perspective. Such an approach allows a broad cultural context even as it offers an opportunity to ask what sense of movement a rhetorical perspective might add to the conversations.

For both of us, finding movement and bodies in the archives has presented both challenges and opportunities. In Olson's study of Ecuadorian national identity, that search has been especially important to the task of seeking out subaltern performances. Faced with archives that privilege the voices of light-skinned, urban elites, she has looked for the scenarios of resistance that lurk beneath those written documents. Reports of administrative failure have been one surprisingly rich venue for encountering the indigenous actors who, over time, challenged, shaped, and appropriated discourses of national identity. For example, indigenous agency pushes to the surface in documents that communicate elite frustration with recalcitrant indigenous labor conscripts. Public works projects in nineteenth-century Ecuador often relied on indigenous laborers who were (often forcibly) recruited from outlying communities, but the residents of those indigenous communities did their best to make conscription difficult. That resistance appears again and again in public records as local authorities report their inability to recruit laborers. Gleaning through reports of failed recruitment, and placing them alongside archival records of indigenous petitions against labor conscription and oral histories of indigenous resistance, yields rich scenarios of contestation. Taking seriously the evidence of indigenous objection that spans texts, performances, and memory emphasizes the conflicts and negotiations endemic in nineteenth-century Ecuador that, in turn, laid the groundwork for later arguments about the nature of the nation.

In researching animals in the history of rhetoric, Hawhee has been surprised to discover just how frequently they come up. They often appear in the service of bolstering the human art, or even, as in Plato's dialogues, to denigrate particular humans in his company, and yet at times they stand as models of training. One challenge of this study is to take care to attend to the lifeworld of its subjects. For example, the political circumstances of conquest that led to Aristotle's having access to elephants (Bigwood; G. E. R. Lloyd) are no doubt worth minding.

The challenges of animating rhetoric's animal life, then, are plain. From animal trials to animal metaphors in rhetorical texts, nonhuman animals are always spoken about and for. And yet the residue of their energy remains in the story of the quail bursting from Alcibiades' cloak when he addressed the assembly (Plutarch 10.1), and in the flame-tongued serpents that twist across early print editions of rhetorical texts. Indeed, it was often the function of animals to enliven and to physicalize ancient rhetorical theory and education, as when Quintilian uses an analogy of birds when discussing the difference between modeling and forcing particular behaviors (2.6.7). One of the functions of the earliest rhetorical exercise—fable—is to breathe life, and words, into the form of animals. Attending to animals, their scurrying and flapping, their barking and cawing, might well fill the archives of rhetoric with more noise and physical life than we could imagine when restricting it to the confines of the human.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have laid out the case for the relevance of pan-historiography, attended to its challenges and opportunities, and offered strategies for meeting both. Finally, we have raised the degree of difficulty by adding one more aim in the final section: to approach documents and materials, however incongruous, with an eye toward making those materials move, reanimating them in a way that renders visible, audible, and lively a variety of historical figures, voices, and viewpoints. Such an approach requires a combination of patience, imagination, and rigor. We have by necessity discussed our approaches through our current research, since archival, documentary details guide the choices we have made along the way. Our hope is that the vastly different foci of our respective studies help to bolster the theoretical dimension of this chapter by uniting the otherwise quite distinct studies under a banner of pan-historiography.
Notes

1. Recent exceptions include Joshua Gunn's Modern Occult Rhetoric, which spans most of the twentieth century, with important discussions that hearken back to premodern eras, and John Durham Peters's Speaking into the Air: A History of the Idea of Communication.

2. Examples here include Wendy B. Sharer's Vote and Voice; Kirt Wilson's The Reconstruction Desegregation Debate; Patricia Roberts-Miller's Fanatical Schemes; Mark Garrett Longaker's Rhetoric and the Republic; Michelle Hall Kell's Hector P. Garcia; Cara A. Finnegans's Picturing Poverty; Ann George and Jack Selzer's Kenneth Burke in the 1930s; Jordynn Jack's Science on the Home Front; and Lester C. Olson's Benjamin Franklin's Vision of American Community, to name just a few.

3. The best example here is Jessica Enoch's Refiguring Rhetorical Education, which draws together analyses of teachers teaching racially and ethnically diverse student populations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

4. Charles E. Morris III notes that while "any cursory survey of the field's best scholarship . . . reveals the archive as a long-standing habitat of the rhetorical critic and theorist . . . the archive itself, chief among the conventional sites of rhetorical pasts, has yet to be subjected to sustained critical-rhetorical reflection by scholars in this discipline" ("Archival Turn" 113). Such an observation holds in communication—rhetoric scholarship, but rhetoric and composition scholars have for the past decade or longer been reflecting on their archives. See, most recently, Glenn and Enoch, "Drama"; the special section of College English entitled "Archivists with an Attitude"; Rhetoric Society Quarterly's special issue on feminist historiography; and a number of edited collections (Ramsey et al.; Kirsch and Rohan; Enoch and Anderson; and Vitanza, Writing Histories).

5. Cf. Foucault, Archaeology of Knowledge (186) and Saussure (81–90).

6. Our claim about Foucault calls for qualification. Foucault's notion of genealogy (laid out most plainly in "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History") would be a fruitful place to explore his working between the movements of synchronic and diachronic. There, Foucault notes how genealogy "must record the singularity of events outside of any monotonous finality; it must seek them in the most unpromising places, in what we tend to feel is without history—in sentiments, love, conscience, instincts; it must be sensitive to their recurrence, not in order to trace the gradual curve of their evolution, but to isolate the different scenes where they engaged in different roles" ("Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" 76). Genealogy, that is, favors synchronic movement even as it acknowledges the need for—yet perhaps in its own way resists—a clean diachronous movement. It is rather common to read Foucault as writing histories with a diachronic tendency, such that Discipline and Punish is at times taken to be a history of prisons writ large. We should point out that the diachronic effect (as with History of Sexuality, vol. 1) is achieved through synchronic comparison—the visceral opening scene of a human body being drawn and quartered contrasts with the in-depth commentary on a panoptic structure issuing from a particular inventor at a particular moment (Jeremy Bentham, late eighteenth century). Foucault's engagement with history writing in the College de France lectures transcribed and translated as the volume "Society Must Be Defended" is interesting for the enduring (diachronically so) connections he draws between history and war. A good instance of a diachronic move in Foucault would be his tracing of the evolution of parrhesia in Fearless Speech (20–24). We are grateful to the anonymous reviewer for requesting clarification on this question and for suggesting possible directions.

7. See especially Ferreira-Buckley's "Rescuing the Archives from Foucault."

8. Ferreira-Buckley does not call attention to this choice, but the fact that she is building a theoretical/methodological argument on the writings and practices of a number of historians seems to necessitate the eschewing of an all-encompassing singular and generic "archive."