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Introduction

I want to talk today about what a feminist history of printing could be and what we lose by thinking of it only as recovering the history of women printing.¹ My perspective here comes both from being a teacher who introduces students to book history through an exploration of how books are made in the first centuries of printing and as an author of a book that introduces basic bibliographical techniques and the operations of the hand-press in the early modern period.²

A few years ago I began writing in earnest a guide to how books were made in the first centuries of the printing press. I had been teaching bibliography and early modern book culture to undergraduates for a decade by then, and the whole time I struggled to find a suitable text to help them understand the common press. Some guides were entirely too brief, touching on imposition and stop-press changes, but nothing else. And then there was Philip Gaskell, who wrote a wonderful book, full of details about printing—so many details that it is unfair to call it an Introduction by today’s standards.³ For true beginners, the book shares its knowledge so authoritatively and densely that it can be hard to take hold of and find a purchase on it. You have to understand the full run of presswork before you can really appreciate the significance of format, for instance, and yet there is no helpful navigation system to let you move around the book as you might need. And so you follow Gaskell’s lead and if you read it enough times, or if you have a patient teacher to guide you through it, you might absorb enough of its subject to return to it on more equal footing.

So I set out to write what I referred to as “baby Gaskell”—a beginner’s level exploration of how the hand press worked and why bibliographic knowledge is a useful tool for understanding book history.

My classes were overwhelmingly taken by women. Your classes—whether in English, history, or library science—likely have the same dynamics, given recent trends in student population. Perhaps because of that, and perhaps because I am who I am—which is someone who is never not thinking about gender—our seminar discussions

¹ My thanks to Jesse Erickson for the invitation to deliver the 2018 Lieberman Lecture and to the Chesapeake Chapter of APHA and the Library of Congress for hosting the occasion. I am also deeply grateful to Brooke Pulmieri, whose editorial skills helped me clarify and shape my talk into a written article.
often turned to speculations about gendered reading habits or how print genders authorship.

And so as I was writing my book, I started to worry about how it was unthinkingly replicating a gendered printing. My first book was on Shakespeare and Feminist Performance; was I inadvertently writing a book that was Printing and Masculine Press? But since I was writing about printing, not printers, where were my opportunities to intervene? Mine wasn’t a work about books or about the book trade, so there wasn’t a focus on authors or printers or book sellers per se, just a lot of information on machines and processes and discussions of why it matters. So how could I bring my investment in feminist theory and practice to the forefront of this work?

Others have struggled with how to incorporate gender into print history without simply listing our foremothers. Leslie Howsam’s 1998 remarks for the Society for the History of Authors, Reading, and Publishing advocates for a more conceptual approach to gender’s impact on books; Helen Smith’s important 2012 book *Grossly Material Things*: *Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* wrestles with the ways in which the standard accounts of the communications circuit for printed book obscures the messy realities of the web of networks that shape women’s interactions with creating and using books. Their approaches have heavily influenced my own, but their solutions of interrogating the nature of the book trades did not feel fully applicable to my own work on this book. I tried to incorporate the presence of women in the book trades by constantly citing books written or printed by women, whether in the early modern period or by more recent bibliographers or book historians. But even with my conscience practice of citation, I still failed to reach a balance: when I counted up these citations while indexing, men outnumbered women by a count of almost 5 to 1. This new project, then, is a way of thinking through my own dissatisfaction with my practices and how I can counter the biases in my—and our—work.

In what follows, I start with a feminist understanding of printing history, one that works through the questions I’ve just outlined and argues that we need to think in terms of a structural and process-based account of printing. From there, I’ll look at some scholars who have worked with accounts of printing from the period and have argued that such knowledge has always been highly gendered. Finally, I’ll reflect on how we might use wrestling with these questions in our classrooms and field. We have a gap between the predominance of women in our classrooms and lower-ranked professional positions and the dominance of men in our readings and professional positions of power. A feminist

---

approach to printing history is one that addresses that imbalance and strengthens our field.

**Feminist aesthetics**

Twenty years ago, Leslie Howsam published a brief but pointed call to arms in *SHARP News*. “In My View: Women and Book History” advocates for an explicitly feminist approach to studying book history. But Howsam isn’t interested in excavating women’s histories and she deliberately sets that approach aside:

[M]ost of the women whose work in the book cycle has been so painstakingly discovered by researchers have been atypical individuals, outstanding anomalies in a cultural field dominated by men.\(^6\)

I think she might be overstating the assumption that such women were entirely atypical. There’s evidence that in the first centuries of printing, women were an integral part of the daily work of book-making and -selling, if in small numbers, although there’s also evidence that their numbers dropped off in later centuries. The Lisa Unger Baskin Collection now at Duke University focuses on the many contributions women have made to book history, for instance, and is evidence that such work is not atypical.\(^7\)

But Howsam’s larger point is still germane: adding to the scant list of women known to have been involved in the book trades only makes it slightly less scant. And such recovery work doesn’t necessarily help us confront the social and political forces that shape women’s lives. There is, I sometimes find it necessary to say, a difference between “women and book history” and “feminist approaches to book history”; a catalog of women is not the same thing as enabling a critical examination of the history of books or the methodologies we’ve used to study that history.

Instead of fleshing out the list of women in the book trades, Howsam writes,

> I want to suggest that book historians think about how the book has been implicated in those structures of masculine power and authority known to feminist scholarship as patriarchy.\(^8\)

For her, in other words, the possibilities for feminist book history lie in working not with women, necessarily, but with gender. The questions to ask are not “who made these books” but “how are books conceived of as gendered.”\(^9\)

---

\(^6\) Howsam 1998 (1).


\(^8\) Howsam 1998 (1).

\(^9\) Howsam 1998 (1).
As an illustration of this avenue of investigation, Howsam points to the language of conquest and courting used by collectors as one potential avenue, such as this from Richard Curle in 1930: “Books without points are like women without beauty—they pass unnoticed in the crowd. But books with points excite immediate interest and everybody, so to speak, turns to gaze at them.”10 As Howsam suggests in response, “Perhaps we can also think about the gendered, possessive, not altogether unsexualised way that book collectors have fixed their gaze upon the object of desire.”11

(Don’t pat yourselves on the back; Curle’s 1930s attitude still shows up in today’s book catalogs. A number of women in the book trade have been keeping track of such descriptions in today’s catalogs. This one from a few years ago is a perfect companion to Curle’s “Prettier copies are out there, and even though I live in LA or maybe because I live in LA, I’ll take the girl with depth of soul over the ubiquitous superficially attractive ones.”12 That male gaze is still with us.)

The tool Howsam uses to think outside this gaze is Jane Marcus’s 1980s theorization of feminist aesthetics. As Marcus works through it, a feminist aesthetic is one that values process over product, one that avoids hierarchies and exclusions. For Howsam, this suggests a feminist praxis of book study that downplays possession in favor of utility. Instead of favoring first editions and famous authors, it might instead think in terms of less visible books that gain meaning through their social circulation. Perhaps, she suggests wryly, “the way large numbers of readers, both men and women, make use of books may be just as interesting as the ways in which small numbers of authors, publishers and collectors work together to create, fashion and preserve books.”13

Howsam’s desire to focus on utility and social circulation aligns closely with my own practice of studying books, one that tends to focus on things like Berlemonts, the very popular multi-lingual phrasebooks and dictionaries published across Europe in editions too numerous to count, and to express frustration with things like the obsessive tracking of Shakespeare’s First Folio. It’s not a novel approach to the study of books, by any means. There are books that tell the histories of commonly read texts, such as Isabel Hofmeyr on *The Pilgrim’s Progress* and Alan Jacobs on the *Book of Common Prayer*; others have focused on textual forms outside of the literary canon, such as Ann Blair on information systems and Adam Smyth on the forms of life-writing; beyond the early modern period, Leah Price takes a long view of the history of ordinary reading.14

---

11 Howsam 1988 (2).
12 Annirroc Rare Books, *Catalog V: The Fever of Unfulfilled Longing* (2016), describing Jim Morrison’s copy of *Moby Dick*. My thanks to Rebecca Romney and Fuchsia Voremburg for bringing this example to my attention.
13 Howsam 1998 (2).
But I want to look a bit more closely at how Howsam incorporates Marcus’s theory of aesthetics into her own speculations. Much of the work Howsam does draws on this excerpt from Marcus’s 1988 book, *Art and Anger: Reading like a Woman:*

This model of art, with repetition and dailiness at the heart of it, with the teaching of other women the patient craft of one’s cultural heritage as the object of it, is a female poetic which women live and accept. ... Transformation rather than permanence is at the heart of this aesthetic, as it is at the heart of most women’s lives. History is preserved not in the art object, but in the tradition of making the art object.\(^\text{15}\)

It’s this account of daily making that leads Howsam to the observation that feminist book history could attend to how books are used and attend to books that are part of the everyday and ordinary.

So where does Marcus get “this model of art” from? Here’s the full passage, taken from “Still Practice, A/Wrested Alphabet: Toward a Feminist Aesthetic,” the 1984 article that is one of the three pieces forming the basis of her book. “Lipking” in this quote refers to Lawrence Lipking’s “Aristotle’s Sister,”\(^\text{16}\) in which he argues for a feminine poetics of abandonment, an important foil for Marcus in this passage:

We could imagine another aesthetic, call it Penelope’s, which grew out of a female culture. Lipking says that Arimneste’s “cannot compete, of course, with her brother’s tradition.” Penelope’s aesthetic does not wish to compete, is anti-hierarchical, anti-theoretical, not aggressively exclusionary. *A real woman’s poetics is a poetics of commitment, not a poetics of abandonment.* Above all, it does not separate art from work and daily life. Penelope weaves her tapestry by day and takes it apart by night. Could Aristotle destroy his lectures and start over again each day? This model of art, with repetition and dailiness at the heart of it, with the teaching of other women the patient craft of one’s cultural heritage as the object of it, is a female poetic which women live and accept. Penelope’s art is work, as women cook food that is eaten, weave cloth that is worn, clean houses that are dirtied. Transformation, rather than permanence, is at the heart of this aesthetic, as it is at the heart of most women’s lives.\(^\text{17}\) (emphasis original)

---


The ellipses in Howsam—the bits of the weaving that she has unpicked from this argument—are all the parts that are about Penelope. I can see why they might be cut: it could be a distraction, it could take too much explanation to give it proper context, it could explicate a politics of domesticity or abandonment that Howsam doesn’t agree with. But that this passage is about Penelope undoing her weaving every night makes it, for me, all the more about printing.

As an aesthetic about printing, Marcus’s account here works shockingly well. Printing is entirely a process not only of repetition but of breaking down and starting over. Dab ink on the balls, work the ink, dab ink on the forme, dab, work, dab, and at the end of the day, take the stuffing out of the balls, soak the leather, and the next morning reassemble and start again. Pick the piece of type up, place it in the stick, place another, place another, put the line on the stone, put another, put another, tie it up, tie up another page, tie up another, lock it up, print it off, distribute the type back into its boxes, start all over again. Place the paper on the tympan, fold the frisket down, fold the whole thing down, roll it under the platen, pull the bar, roll in once more, pull again, roll it out, open the frisket, take the paper off, put the paper on, fold it down, fold it down, roll, pull, roll, pull, roll, open, hang the paper, go home, come back the next morning and do it all again.

Penelope’s weaving disappears every night, and a printer’s work does not, since the printed paper remains in heaps and gatherings, but the unmaking of the press’s parts are a key component to keeping the work going and the debtors at bay. And if you are, as I am, committed to the belief that every single copy of a text is unique, thanks both to inevitable printing variants and to the vagaries of its individual life, then an awareness of repetition and variation makes an aesthetic based on Penelope’s weaving all the more compelling.

**Gender and printing**

So let’s talk about actual hand-press printing for a moment. If I’m only interested in the mechanics of printing, need I think about gender at all? Well, yes, always yes, but especially yes in Renaissance England, where the word “press” was a term that could be used both to refer to printing but also to a physical pressing of a man into a woman, that is, an act of sexual penetration and deflowering. Eric Partridge, in his invaluable *Shakespeare’s Bawdy* points to Mercutio’s speech on Queen Mab in *Romeo and Juliet* as an illustration of the bawdiness possible in “press”:

> This is the hag, when maids lie on their backs,  
> That presses them, and learns them first to bear,

---

18 Eric Partridge, *Shakespeare’s Bawdy* (Routledge, 2001), see the definitions for “press” on p. 215 and for “lie on one’s back” on p. 176.
Making them women of good carriage.\textsuperscript{19}

And while the \textit{OED}, in its characteristic timidity, does not specific sexual slangs in its definition of “press”, the 1567 edition of Lily’s Grammar is quite clear on the connections between pressing and sex in its definition of “premo”: “Premo, To presse, to be againste, and to vexe, to pursue and to be harde at hande with, to drieue, to bide, to expell, to shutte, to deflowre, to kil, &c.”\textsuperscript{20}

As Wendy Wall shows in \textit{The Imprint of Gender}, the potential effemination of male authors being pressed was some source of anxiety, one that Anthony Scoloker deploys in the introduction to his 1604 \textit{Daiphantus}:

He is A man in Print, and tis enough he hath under-gone a Pressing (yet not like a Ladie) though for your sakes and for Ladyes, protesting for this poore Infant of his Brayne, as it was the price of his Virginitie borne into the world in teares. . . . Thus like a Lover wooes he for your Favor, which if You grant then Omnia vincit Amor.\textsuperscript{21}

The author might be a man in print, but he is not pressed as a lady is pressed—it is the book that is pressed, and the author who does the pressing.

But there need not be winks and nudges for sex to be brought into the topic. Lisa Maruca’s 2003 “Bodies of Type” is the rare piece of scholarship that reads printers’ manuals not as transparent printing lessons, but for their rhetorical and ideological practices.\textsuperscript{22} In her hands, we are brought to see the gendered and sexualized language that is repeatedly drawn on in these manuals.

Take, for instance, this passage from Joseph Moxon’s 1683 \textit{Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing} in which he describes the component parts of a letter mold:

When his Stick of Letters is thus transfer’d to the Male-Block, He elaps the middle of the Male-Block in to his left-Hand, tilting the Feet of the Letter a little upwards, that the Face may rest upon the Tongue, and then takes about the middle of the Female-Block in his right-Hand, and lays it so upon the Male-Block, that the Tongue of the Male-Block may fall into the Tongue of the Female-Block . . . So that when the Knot of the Male-Block is lightly drawn towards the


\textsuperscript{20} William Lily, \textit{A shorte introduction of grammar: generally to be vsed: compiled and set forth, for the bringing vp of all those that intend to attaine the knowledge of the Latine tongue}. STC 15614.2. (London: Reynor Wolfe, 1567), sig. I4r.

\textsuperscript{21} Anthony Scoloker, \textit{Daiphantus, or the passions of love. Comicall to reade, but tragicall to act: as full of wit, as experience}. STC 21853. (London: Thomas Creede for William Cotton, 1604), sig. A2v.

Knot of the Female-Block, or the Knot of the Female-Block lightly thrust toward the Knot of the Male-Block, both Knots shall squeeze the Letter close between them.  

The language of the human body is used throughout Moxon’s book: pieces of type have feet, shoulders, heads, bodies. But Maruca points out that such language emerges in this period. The OED traces the use of “male” and “female” as adjectives for objects with projecting or hollow ends to the late 16th century (“male” III.6); the first entry for “male gauges” is Moxon’s passage earlier in this section about “male gauges falling into female gauges” (sig. AA1v). These are not just bodies, but bodies that are being sexed.

In John Smith’s 1755 The Printer’s Grammar the laboring bodies have disappeared, as Maruca points out, but a rigid gender hierarchy remains to govern appropriate typeface choices: the strong, upright roman face should be used for the main text, with the delicate, flowing italic used only to decorate within the roman context.

Maruca’s project in The Work of Print (the 2007 book into which her article is incorporated) is to consider the many ways in which the acts and agents of book making create an ideology of authorship that is gendered and politicized. But what I want to call attention to is how effectively she puts down the wishful thinking that we can treat printers’ manuals as transparent windows onto early modern acts of printing. So much of what we know about how books were made in the hand-press period are based on Moxon and Smith and Fertel and the Encyclopédie; those are the texts that bibliographers draw on to produce the works that become the basis of our study, works like those of McKerrow and Gaskell.

Given the emphasis our field places on these source materials, which in turn place much emphasis on gender, how do we restructure the imbalances that are so deeply embedded into what we know about printing?

One possibility is to use Diana Taylor’s notions of archive and repertoire as a way to deal with the tensions between reading ideological texts and a desire to recover acts of printing. Taylor’s concepts are based in performance studies and geared towards recovering Latin American cultural histories. While her dichotomy is sometimes not as nuanced as I’d like, it is also generative.

---

23 Joseph Moxon, Mechanick exercises: or, the doctrine of handy-works. Applied to the art of printing. The second volume [sic]. (London: Joseph Moxon, 1683), sig. 2C4r.
24 John Smith, The printer’s grammar: wherein are exhibited, examined, and explained, the superificies, gradation, and properties of the different sorts and sizes of metal types, cast by Letter Founders (London: John Smith, 1755).
26 Moxon 1683; Smith 1755; Martin-Dominique Fertel, La science pratique de l’imprimerie (St Omer: Martin-Dominique Fertel, 1733); Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d’Alembert, Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des science, des arts et des métiers, par une Société de Gens de letters (Paris, 1751–1772); R. B. McKerrow, An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students (Clarendon Press, 1927); Gaskell 1973.
Here’s a quick and superficial description of her concepts: cultural memory is contained both in written archives and in bodily repertoire. When the dominant history of conquest has been preserved in archival documents, where can you find indigenous culture and history in its own voice? For Taylor, it’s in the embodied history of experience passed down from one generation of survivors to the next. Theater, dance, gesture—all can be valid forms of knowledge and history that capture what written documents do not.

If printer’s manuals are part of the written archive of printing history, and if they have an ideological slant—as Maruca’s reading says they do, and as all things do—can we counter that bias in the physical repertoire of printing? Should we try thinking of a feminist praxis of printing history one that emphasizes doing over reading?

Although printing practices have changed over the centuries, scholar-printers have long been interested in early techniques of book making, debating finer points, rebuilding presses, and relearning what was once known. There might not be an embodied repertoire that’s been handed down to us in a direct line from London’s printers in the 17th century, but there is an active repertoire living in bodies printing on wooden hand presses today, bodies of people who are often eager to share what they know. It isn’t only muscle memory involved in being able to pull the bar to lower the platen just smoothly and hard enough, but a physical knowledge that is expressed by doing rather than writing. And that repertoire of knowledge through doing is a central part of exploring how hand-press printing worked.

On the other hand—and this is no small point when we’re thinking about equity and inclusion—books can be significantly more accessible than bodies and printing presses. There are only so many printers and so many presses; printers deserve to be paid for their time; replica presses are much too heavy to travel. How many educators work at a place where printing on a common press can easily be incorporated into your classroom practice? How many educators are active printers or have access to funds to pay printers a decent fee for working with their students? How many of us have bodies that can do the work that the common press asks of us?

But books can be priced affordably (especially if authors make a stink: mine is under $30); they can be resold for even less; they can often exist in digital form, making them more accessible to a wide range of abled and disabled users. You can take them home and revisit them on your own time if you didn’t understand what happened in the classroom, you can argue with them in the margins, and you can keep them until you’ve used them to pieces. Reading itself can be a destabilizing act: you can be a resistant

---

reader, you can read against the grain, you can disidentify with what you’re reading, you can find companion texts to resituate what you’re reading. You can rewrite what you’re reading or even literally remake one text into a new one.29

There are good reasons why we teach history from the archive and not through repertoire, and among them is that documents are more conducive to how universities are set up, and we should never forget the material conditions that inform what we do. If we’re historians and bibliographers, in fact, our training should mean that we always keep those material conditions at the forefront of our thoughts.

**Recovery and inclusivity**

Let’s go back to where this started: What is a feminist history of printing and what do we lose by thinking of it primarily as the history of women printing?

I have had to think about my own feminist praxis outside of recovering women’s history because of my recent focus on explicating the workings of presses and libraries. But maybe that’s only my problem. Why not look in the archives to recover who the early women printing in France were? Why not compile a catalog of books printed by women in early America? How is that not a feminist practice of book history?

It can be. I can think of plenty of works of printing history that I would say are doing feminist work. And I can absolutely think of works about equivalent modern technologies—like Mar Hicks’s *Programmed Inequality*—that are field-changing in profoundly feminist ways.30 So I am not saying that such recovery isn’t valuable.

But it cannot be the only feminist work that print historians are doing. Let’s talk about recovery history for a moment—why we do it and what we’re missing.

Today’s drive to recover the history of women’s activities has a long history in the feminist movement. To use the words of the early 1970s radical Robin Morgan, we need to tell herstory, not history. But let’s look at the context for the first appearance of “herstory” in print as part of the byline for Morgan’s *cri de coeur*, “Goodbye to All That,” the editorial she published in the January 1970 issue of *RAT: Subterranean News*. RAT was an underground newspaper in New York City that was one of the important voices of the counter-cultural left, with inside scoops on the Columbia University student uprising in 1968 and coverage and editorials on other radical left politics. But RAT was also driven by male politics, and it was taken over in 1970 by a group of radical feminists in protest of the male editorial staff’s misogyny. If Morgan was a “Woman Inspired to Commit Herstory,” as she signed her inaugural editorial, her readers were ready for it—

---


as evidenced by the frequency with which her editorial has been reprinted—ready to stop believing the stories they’d been told about what was good behavior and what was bad, what counted and what didn’t.

Let it all hang out. Let it seem bitchy, catty, dykey, Solanisesque [sic], frustrated, crazy, nutty, frigid, ridiculous, bitter, embarrassing, man-hating, libelous, pure, unfair, envious, intuitive, low-down, stupid, petty, liberating. WE ARE THE WOMEN THAT MEN HAVE WARNED US ABOUT.31

That drive to look back at the stories we’ve been told and to see the gaps where we’ve been removed is powerful. We were there all along. That witch in the corner of your eye is the widow who won’t marry, that scandalous behavior is running a profitable business on her own. We are the women that men have warned us about, and we have always been part of history.

It’s powerful to feel that rush of connection to the past. Recovering the history of women printing does that for us. But are we only recovering the history of women? What does that category of “women” encompass? What about the history of enslaved women in the book trades? Where’s the queer history of printing? The trans history? The studies of indigeneity and the press?

You tell me you’ve recovered the history of a previously hidden group in the book trades, and I will ask you about another group: where are they and what’s the connection between them? If we are recovering history in order to make it all of our history, we are faced with the choice of either ignoring who is excluded from “all” or searching for more and more firsts and more and more histories to make the past more equitable.

But you cannot keep adding recovered histories and think that it will take care of the problems our overwhelmingly white male field faces today. If you are recovering history, are you also opening doors and inviting in new people to write new histories? It can be a lot safer to look at the past than it can be to look at ourselves, easier to fault past actions than to open our doors. We cannot understand the significance of these “bibliographies of the oppressed” (as Brooke Palmieri calls them in workshops) without building the tools to act on them to create a more equitable field.

It’s an odd thing, isn’t it, that I started off by talking about how largely female the classroom is and yet here we are, nearing the end, and I’m talking about how male the field is? But in this, book history follows the pyramid of academia, and libraries, and book dealing, in which there are large numbers of women studying and working at the lower levels of a field, but the higher the status of the job, the fewer women there are.

When I suggest that our field is facing problems today because it is white and male, what I want to focus on is how much knowledge and experience we are missing and how unsustainable this pattern is. Think about Dorothy Porter at Howard University and how she saw what the white librarians in her era did not, that the Dewey classification system collapses any possibility of blacks being seen through the lens of either slavery or colonization. What about Paula McDowell’s revelations about women’s participation in public print and debate in the 18th century? How could we even begin to think about book history as a discipline without Elizabeth Eisenstein? Our world would be immeasurably poorer without them. The future of printing must be written by a much broader range of people if our field is going to not only be relevant and exciting, but if it is going to survive. Bibliographers are a small group of scholars heavily indebted to the past, a past when women could barely squeeze through the entrance into Fredson Bowers’s classes. And it’s a past of male scholars and female typists that still determines how we understand and describe books.

So why do we need a feminist praxis of printing history? We need it so we can thrive. The questions that a feminist analysis asks of books are aligned with the systemic critiques that book history should be making: what are the social, political, and economic conditions of their production and consumption? If there are categories of analysis that have been excluded, that is the fault that book historians must correct. As Helen Smith has deftly shown, all the material history that is part of Robert Darnton’s “communications circuit” is aligned with feminist analysis. In other words, all printing histories should also be feminist histories.

But feminism is a movement intertwined with other political movements, one that not only has its debts to other social justice actions, but that should have as its subject the connections between sexism and classism, racism, homophobia, and transphobia. And just as social justice movements strive to bring more people into the fold, so a true feminist printing history needs to bring more people into our field.

The practices of printing and weaving offer a model of how we might become more welcoming: through a willingness to remake our work, to spot errors and pick them out, to adjust our bodies and machines to the daily joy of creation. A feminist pedagogy that centers asking questions instead of mastering knowledge welcomes in newcomers to the field. A feminist pedagogy that models the act of learning makes it possible for students to become teachers. And then our bibliographies and analyses can become the groundwork for exciting new histories.


33 Smith, 2012 (pp 6-8).