

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Romantic Women Writers Reviewed (*RWWR*) is a work of recuperation. Typically that word designates efforts to bring forgotten texts *by* women back into view so that scholars and critics may revalue them. This is not the purpose of this edition, except incidentally. Certainly, in the cases of no-longer-extant texts by women, the extracts provided by contemporary reviewers act as our only evidence of the lost original; and in those cases, *RWWR* does indirectly recuperate that original. But the primary purpose of this edition is to bring to light the largely buried critical *reception* of women writers.

Editions of the critical reception of male authors have been in print since at least the late 1960s. For example, the long-running Critical Heritage series – volumes of selective edited contemporary reviews – boasted 104 volumes. But only eight of these volumes were devoted to the critical heritage of women authors: Jane Austen (2 volumes); the Brontës; Elizabeth Gaskell; George Eliot; Virginia Woolf; and Sylvia Plath. The collective title of the series and its choice of authors suggested that the critical heritage belongs almost exclusively to men. Even if we narrow our focus to the Romantic period, the same pattern applies, with volumes on twelve male authors (William Blake; George Gordon, Lord Byron; Robert Burns; John Clare; Arthur Hugh Clough; S. T. Coleridge; George Crabbe; John Keats; Walter Scott; Percy Bysshe Shelley; Robert Southey; William Wordsworth) and one woman, Jane Austen. The implication was clear: women in the Romantic period – other than Austen – had little *critical* importance. And that term ‘critical’ cut both ways, suggesting the women were of as little interest to the modern scholars who were the audiences of the volumes as to the contemporary critics who had ignored them in commentaries. From the Critical Heritage series, no one could know that Elizabeth Inchbald’s or Mary Robinson’s contemporary reviews would fill more than a volume each.

The impression that women had little or no critical heritage was reinforced, however inadvertently, by Donald Reiman’s 1972 *The Romantics Reviewed: Contemporary Reviews of British Romantic Writers, 1793–1824*. Reiman’s valuable facsimile edition – in nine big volumes – elides women’s reception almost entirely. Reiman’s work offers ‘comprehensive’ coverage of five male writers as

well as 'selective' coverage of another seven men – and one woman, Mary Shelley. The title, *The Romantics Reviewed*, however, implies to the unwary that the volumes offer full coverage of the period; and the contents, by including only one woman, encouraged readers to assume that women's works were not significantly reviewed in the periodical press. By offering such reviews in handy facsimile, Reiman's work also made the hard job of tracking down reviews less appealing: for critics who were working not on reviews themselves but on the major authors they illuminated, Reiman's work offered handy one-stop shopping, necessary for those working without convenient access to nineteenth-century periodicals.

Certainly it's not Reiman's fault that scholars seem largely to overlook the vast contents indexed in William Ward's four-volume *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1788–1826*. Rather, to Reiman we owe the publication of Ward's work. As Richard Havens notes in his review of Ward, Reiman drew from Ward's unpublished bibliography for the years 1798–1820 when developing his series. This allowed Reiman to move 'from proposal to publication' in only four years, a favour Reiman repaid by recommending Ward's work to his own publisher.¹ Ward's bibliography was published in three instalments: two volumes in 1972, covering the years 1798–1820, listed 17,000 reviews; a third volume, 1821–6, published in 1977, listed around 9,000 entries; and a final volume in 1979, covering 1788–97, listed roughly 8,000 entries. Though Ward excluded newspapers, except for the *Examiner* and the *Champion*, his bibliography remains as Havens described it in 1972 an 'impressive achievement'.²

However, 'the trouble of an index' (to borrow a phrase from Byron) is that few critics acknowledge the aid of bibliographical and other reference tools in their own works. As a result, evaluating Ward's impact on the field of Romantic studies is almost impossible.³ The 'scholarly invisibility', as Maura Ives describes it,⁴ of such bibliographical scholarship is strikingly apparent when one searches for uses of Ward in the only tools humanities scholars have for tracking citations: the *Arts and Humanities Citation Index* records only ten works which cite Ward's *Literary Reviews*; Google Books indicates another two, Google Scholar another four. Yet we see Ward's influence in virtually every study that includes reviews, including those which cite only Reiman. Ward attempted to survey the full field of Romantic journals, ultimately 134 magazines. Even Antonia Forster's 1997 *Index to Book Reviews in England, 1775–1800* does not supersede Ward for the thirteen years the two indexes overlap: Forster limited her focus to the twenty-six most significant magazines, all of which were already indexed in Ward. As a result, if a critic is quoting reviews and not citing Reiman's facsimile edition, it is fair to assume he or she used Ward as a guide.

With Ward's bibliography in hand, Romanticists could glimpse the possibilities that working with periodicals offered to literary scholarship. Organized by author, with a separate section for anonymous works, Ward's bibliography is an

amazing feat, particularly given that he lacked any of the tools we now take so for granted: spreadsheets, database programmes, even word processing. He compiled his work without recourse to online library catalogues, such as Worldcat, Eighteenth-Century Collections Online (ECCO), Google Books or the Internet Archive.⁵ Instead, Ward's bibliographical tools consisted of card catalogues, union lists on microfilm, notecards, mimeographs and achingly slow paper correspondence with librarians across the world. We have only begun to discover the woeful incompleteness of his bibliography, but Ward himself hints at the fact in the preface to his first volume:

most of the materials were gathered for a particular purpose a number of years ago. At that time my principal interest was in the criticism of poetry in British periodicals, though I did take notes on the locations of reviews and non-review articles on fiction, on drama, and on criticism, as well as on poetry.⁶

And again, in the preface to the third volume, Ward makes clear that his work as a bibliographer had come upon him unawares:

had I known more than five years ago when I was putting materials together for the two volumes that cover the years 1798–1820, that I would, as Byron says, 'seize the theme' again (this time in retirement) I might have delayed publication.⁷

I make this apologia for Ward because, for all the faults of his index (and there are many), which of us, in similar circumstances, would even have undertaken the task?

The deficiencies of Ward's index in part arise from its origin in personal research notes not intended for publication. Ward shortens titles of magazines, expecting readers to expand that shorthand with reference to his 1953 *Index and Finding List of Serials Published in the British Isles, 1789–1832*. But when preparing his *Literary Reviews* for publication, apparently even Ward did not verify his shortened titles against the full ones in his *Index and Finding Aid*. As a result, one often finds several magazines with very similar titles in the *Index*, any of which might be reasonably referred to by the shortened title provided in *Literary Reviews*, and Ward offers no help in determining which periodical he meant. He might not have even known.

Nor does Ward indicate how thoroughly he reviewed each issue of each periodical. In at least one case, he reproduced an error present in a magazine's yearly index to contents, suggesting that he might have – for some years of some magazines – relied on printed end-of-year indexes or monthly tables of contents, rather than on a page-by-page review of the actual contents. While the *Monthly Review* charged purchasers for the end-of-year indexes by including it in an end-of-year supplement with other content, with other magazines it is unclear whether publishers charged a fee or reduced the listing of their contents

to fit into whatever amount of paper they had allotted, or both. Ward could have remedied this deficiency in his bibliography by including in an appendix lists indicating which issues he reviewed first-hand, which contents were listed only from end-of-year indexes and which issues he never saw. As it stands, a user cannot know, for example, whether Ward indexed a particular issue or year. Ward appears to have seen (in some form) the contents of the *Aberdeen Magazine* for 1796, but he has no entries for that title for either 1788 or 1789; yet both those earlier years contain literary reviews. Nor can a reader know which magazines Ward reviewed carefully but found no reviews, as for example *RWWR* found with the run of *Genius of Kent*. Such lists would have allowed subsequent researchers to fill in or supplement his work, as necessary. These are significant deficiencies, particularly because most users, dipping into Ward to find lists of reviews for a particular author, have no idea how much they might be missing.

This leads to the most significant of Ward's deficiencies: scope. Ward defined 'literary' to mean poetry, drama or fiction. He excluded all other genres: memoir, travel journal, literary biography, non-fiction prose, children's literature, religious treatises and so forth – though by the last volume he did make exception for the 'prose of Mary Wollstonecraft and the non-belletristic prose of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and William Godwin' as well as for the raft of responses to Thomas Paine.⁸ As a result, Hester Lynch Thrale Piozzi receives not a single entry in any volume of Ward's bibliography, though as this first volume of *RWWR* reveals, her *Observations on a Tour through France* garnered six reviews in 1789 alone. Ward further excluded 'all foreign literatures (except American) as well as earlier English literature', a position he altered in his fourth volume by including in an appendix reviews of 'certain benchmark English authors, Milton, Shakespeare, Pope and Johnson.'⁹ (This decision mirrors *RWWR*'s determination that Romantic reviews of works from earlier periods offer important information about the literary, historical and cultural backgrounds against which Romantic writers wrote.) By including such materials, Ward gave the illusion of completeness to a project that lacked an overriding editorial policy.

Ultimately the problem with Ward's index is its very haphazardness. Ward gathered references to reviews based on his own research interests and on his perception of what he might later wish to know. His decisions when collecting the entries were not based on coherent, or even articulated, editorial principles, and at the point of publishing his research notes he chose not to address these questions in his prefatory materials. What he does well (poetry), he does very well. But there is no way to tell what he has not done or what he has only mostly done. Of course his tactic worked: for thirty-eight years, no one asked; and since its publication, users have treated Ward's index as a comprehensive lens to reviews in 134 magazines, forming a picture of the Romantic critical heritage. In the end, however, Ward's bibliography is by no means comprehensive.

The present edition addresses this shortfall, building on the entries Ward provided, but supplementing that information by a new examination of magazines, whenever possible. In terms of prose reviews alone, *RWWR*'s examination of the magazines has yielded 20–80 per cent more material (depending on which magazines we are consulting) than is listed in Ward. For example, in Volume 1 alone, *RWWR* provides 67 previously unnoted reviews. As such, *RWWR* provides a comprehensive collection of contemporary reviews of the works of Romantic women writers appearing in British periodicals between 1789 and 1819, dates corresponding to the beginning of the French Revolution through the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars. *RWWR* gathers works that Ward ignored because they were not clearly 'literary', such as Maria Edgeworth's *Practical Education* or Helen Maria Williams's *Letters from France* or Susanna MacIver's *Cookery and Pastery* or the various justifications published by the Countess Valois de la Motte or by Margaret Stewart. As a comprehensive collection, *RWWR* provides reviews both of women now receiving critical attention (whether or not those women were well reviewed in contemporary periodicals) and of women now unknown or nearly so, but who received considerable attention from contemporary reviewers. In doing so, *RWWR* provides reviews of books that appear to be no longer extant, allowing critics to examine what books have disappeared from view and perhaps why. By providing the critical reception of works by women, *RWWR* also helps critics identify books that need recuperation.

As an edition, *RWWR* enables scholars to interrogate the history of women writers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It provides the 'ongoing archival recuperation' that Kim Wheatley has identified as 'necessary' for the 'rediscovery of Romantic women writers, the main growth area in Romantic studies'.¹⁰ It aids scholars in combating the 'widespread social and scholarly amnesia', as Tracy C. Davis and Ellen Donkin described it in 1999, that still besets most of the women writers of the Romantic age regardless of their contemporary success.¹¹ More specifically, *RWWR* promotes greater examination of the responses of contemporary critics to individual women writers and their works, to women writers in the Romantic book trade and to categories of women writers (poets, dramatists, novelists, etc). *RWWR* allows critics and scholars to reconsider the following areas: the nature of women's writing (genres, range, amount, and so on); the reception of women writers across magazines; the relationship between women authors and periodical reviewers; and the nature of periodical reviewing in the early nineteenth century. *RWWR* broadens our understanding of the nature of literary authorship, of the history of the literary marketplace, and the role of gender in reception.

The World as We Know It: Women Writers and Contemporary Reviews

Most studies of Romantic periodicals focus on particular magazines themselves, often in terms of a historical examination of their practices and editorial staff as with John Clive's 1957 *Scotch Reviewers: The Edinburgh Review, 1802–1815*; Peter F. Morgan's 1983 *Literary Critics and Reviewers in Early Nineteenth-Century Britain*; Massimiliano Demata and Duncan Wu's 2002 collection *British Romanticism and the Edinburgh Review*; or Jonathan Cutmore's two works on the *Quarterly Review*, his 2007 essay collection *Conservatism in the Quarterly Review* or his 2008 study *Contributors to the Quarterly Review*. Other scholars place the magazines in broader cultural or political contexts such as Kim Wheatley's 2003 collection *Romantic Periodicals and Print Culture*; Kevin Gilmartin's 2007 *Writing against Revolution: Literary Conservatism in Britain, 1790–1832* or Mark Parker's 2000 *Literary Magazines and British Romanticism* which focuses on magazines as literary forms.

The relationship between gender and Romantic periodicals has also received some consideration, but typically this concern rests with women as writers and as critics. Alison Adburgham's 1972 *Women in Print* discusses popular magazines and the women who wrote for them or who appeared serialized in their pages.¹² Mary Waters's *British Women Writers and the Profession of Literary Criticism, 1789–1832* analyses women writers as critics, as does Gay Gibson Cima's 1999 "To be Public as a Genius and Private as a Woman": The Critical Framing of Nineteenth-Century British Women Playwrights'; several articles on Mary Wollstonecraft's work including Mitzi Myers's 2002 'Mary Wollstonecraft's Literary Reviews'; and Michael Gamer's discussion of Elizabeth Moody's critical review of James Thomson in *Romanticism and the Gothic*.¹³

But studies of the reception of Romantic women writers are strikingly absent, except of course for that of Jane Austen. Certainly Derek Roper's 1978 *Reviewing before the Edinburgh* offers a history of periodical reviewing and, in doing so, briefly examines reviews of several well-known women writers: Charlotte Smith, Ann Radcliffe, Mary Hays, Elizabeth Inchbald, Clara Reeve, Fanny Burney, Maria Edgeworth and Mary Wollstonecraft. But his work is the only full-length study to do so. Dishearteningly, of the 44 women writers who had more than five books reviewed between 1788 and 1826, only three have been subjects of reception studies, even though Ward's bibliography has listed reviews for each of these 44 for almost forty years. A search of the Modern Language Association International Bibliography produces only four articles: two on Amelia Opie, one on Madame de Genlis and one on Maria Edgeworth.¹⁴ And only Greg Kucich's 2000 'Reviewing Women in British Romantic Theatre' examines the reception of a class of writers: women dramatists. By bringing attention to reviews perhaps

otherwise inaccessible to critics, *RWWR* hopes to encourage further studies of women writers and their reception in the magazines.

Of course, the high regard for Austen is a positive development in the reconsideration of female authors in the period. But this attention to Austen may in fact have obscured many of the other women authors of her time and distorted our perceptions of the contemporary literary scene. Though scholars acknowledge Austen is not typical of the market, her experience has inadvertently shaped our narratives of how the early nineteenth-century book trade functioned and of how women writers fared within it. Austen published only six novels, and those novels collectively garnered only 17 reviews in her lifetime. Writing under the pseudonym 'A Lady', Austen earned little for her copyrights – only £110 for *Pride and Prejudice*. Based on the limited sample of Austen's experience as a novelist, critical discussion of women writers in the early nineteenth-century book trade often rests on four implicit assumptions:

1. Women did not publish as much as men did.
2. Women who did publish were not frequently reviewed in the periodical press.¹⁵
3. Women typically published under assumed names or pseudonyms.¹⁶
4. Women received poor compensation from publishers for their copyrights.

These assumptions do not take into account the realities of the marketplace, or that other women fared better in it than Austen did. Compare for example Austen's 17 lifetime reviews to Mary Robinson's 78, Maria Edgeworth's 77, Amelia Opie's 69, Elizabeth Inchbald's 64, Sydney Owenson's 62 and Jane West's 61, etc. Constructed without a full picture of the market, these implicit assumptions give a limited and distorted picture of women's production and reception. Yet these arbitrary narratives hold the status of such truth that few scholars have engaged in the primary research necessary to test their accuracy. As a result, assumptions such as these have set artificial limits on the studies done on Romantic women writers in particular and on the early nineteenth-century book trade in general.

Strikingly, however, a broader look at the market reveals women writers in numbers we have never before imagined. If we treat the entries in Ward's bibliography as data to be mined for information about the market, we find that between 1789 and 1824, 448 women wrote 997 texts reviewed or noticed in the British periodical press. Of these, 168 earned reviews for more than one book, and the number of reviews in total for women's works reaches over 3,700. Of course, these figures do not measure total production by women, since only a portion of published works garnered reviews. If, for example – using Peter Garside, James Raven and Ranier Schöwerling's two-volume bibliographical survey of prose fiction, *The English Novel, 1770–1829* – we compare the numbers of

novels reviewed against those not reviewed, we find that of the 772 novels published in the eleven years between 1789 and 1799, 689 were reviewed, or 89 per cent. The ratios for other genres are nearly impossible to estimate because no comprehensive bibliography for poetry, drama or non-fiction prose exists corresponding to Garside, Raven and Schowering's work for prose fiction. Further, though novels between 1789 and 1799 were reviewed 89 per cent of the time, we cannot assume that figure would hold true for any other genre. Unfortunately after 1799, we cannot even easily assess the ratios of novels reviewed, since Garside, Raven and Schowering eliminate notices of reviews in their second volume.

We can, however, assume the gap between reviewed and not-reviewed widens over time in part because of the increasing numbers of published works. For example, the number of novels published rises almost constantly in each ten-year period from 1770 to 1829: 297 in 1770–9; 334 in 1780–9; 405 in 1790–9; 705 in 1800–9; 682 in 1810–19; 824 in 1820–9. The growing numbers of publications to review would have made it harder for review journals like the *Analytical Review*, *Critical Review* and *Monthly Review* (which attempted to notice all published works) to keep up. Further, in 1802 with the appearance of the *Edinburgh Review*, selective reviewing became more and more the norm. Therefore, since only a portion of the published books gained critical attention, being reviewed indicates contemporary value or at least contemporary noteworthiness. By noteworthy, I mean literally worthy of notice for good or for ill. One can write a very good book that is ignored by the critics, and a very bad one that the critics love to bash. This noteworthiness helps us measure not so much the quality of women's production, perhaps, as the nature of literary taste in the period. And that taste differs remarkably from our own. The number of times a text was reviewed can also offer a guide to what the culture thought most worthy of comment.

We would recognize today perhaps only half of the names of women with more than ten titles reviewed: Charlotte Smith (22 texts), Eliza Parsons (19), Mary Pilkington (15), Jane West and Maria Edgeworth (14 texts each), Amelia Opie and Mary Robinson (13 each), Elizabeth Inchbald (12); Madame de Genlis, Lady Morgan and Mary Meeke (11 each). And we would certainly be hard-pressed to name more than one or two works by each woman – though it is highly likely that many could easily name *all* of Austen's works. Further, if we were to create a 'top twenty' list of most noteworthy women writers in the early nineteenth century, we would see even more unfamiliar names that few of us would recognize today: Eliza S. Frances, Mrs E. G. Bayfield, Margaret Holford, Anna Maria MacKenzie and Mrs John Hunter. All these women were frequently reviewed in the British periodical press, each receiving between 35 and 50 reviews between 1789 and 1819. But on that same list, women we find 'noteworthy' received less attention: Fanny Burney ranks 38th, Jane Austen 50th and Mary Shelley 151st.

Clearly there is a gap between our modern valuing of these authors and the valuing of their contemporaries. This gap raises important questions about the interests and tastes of Romantic readers and about the dynamics of the Romantic literary marketplace. But we cannot answer these questions without a clearer sense of who was in that marketplace, what status they gained there and how their works were perceived by readers and reviewers of the day. To date, scholars have a remarkably difficult time addressing these issues, largely because the materials that would enable such studies have been inaccessible or unavailable. And for this reason, *RWWR* offers not an updated bibliography filling in what Ward overlooked but an edited collection of that expanded terrain.

Scope and Purpose

The title of this project – *Romantic Women Writers Reviewed* – suggests an orderly sort of Venn diagram with three circles: Romantic writers in one, women writers in another and reviews in the third. The overlapping bit between the three circles then would be the scope of this project. And, as far as it goes, that diagram is correct. The problems are ones of definition and category. What constitutes a woman writer? What constitutes a review? What constitutes Romantic? I will discuss each in turn.

What Constitutes a Woman Writer?

One might think that the category ‘woman writer’ is straightforward, including those works known to be by women authors. But known when? Is it sufficient that we *now* know the work to be by a woman – as for example with the 1812 novel *Says She to Her Neighbour, What?*, attributed on the title page to ‘an old-fashioned Englishman’ but later attributed to Barbara Hofland,¹⁷ or the anonymous 1790 *Delia* only attributed to Miss Pilkington by the 1814 publication of the *Minerva Catalogue*? Or must the writer’s identity have been known at the time of publication or reviews? And what does ‘known’ mean? Must the work be signed by the author on the title page of the first edition? (I mean signed here in the sense of a printed authorial attribution, rather than a handwritten signature.) Or can an author sign the title page of second and subsequent editions? Take for example the maddening string of attributions associated with M. Harley, later Mrs Hugill, who signs her first book as ‘by a young lady’, then signs the second book as ‘by the author’ of the first, and so on, until the fourth novel, which she signs with her name followed by ‘the author of’ the first novel. And is it the title page that must be signed or will other locations in the book do, such as a dedication or preface? What if the book itself is not signed, but a paratext in a signed work (such as a list of advertisements for ‘other works by the same author’) claims it? These last three, for example, are all favourite ploys

of Hannah More. Further, is an author's acknowledgement of an earlier anonymous work on the signed title page of a later one sufficient? Determining when a contemporary reader knew who authored what is complicated.

But of course the problem of time is not the only one: there is also the problem of attribution itself. Certainly, for *RWWR*'s purposes, it does not matter that Jan Fergus reattributed novels long thought to be by Eliza Kirkham Strong Mathews to Laetitia-Matilda Hawkins – both are named women writers, and as such would have been included in *RWWR*. But what about works that have never been attributed to a particular woman writer, but which were signed 'by a Lady'? Or works where the title page (or dedication, preface or even the advertisements) attributes the work to a woman but the actual author was a man, or vice versa? We believe that William Henry Hall wrote *Death of Cain*, but the original work signed its title page as 'by a Lady'. For contemporary readers, that text was considered as woman-authored.

Additionally, what about works published by the original author in a foreign language but translated into English by women? Certainly if the original text was woman-authored, we would include discussions of the text regardless of the translator. But what about texts authored by men, but translated by women: do reviews of Henrietta Colebrooke's translation of Rousseau matter?

In response to these questions about attribution, *RWWR* follows these two editorial principles.

- *RWWR* collects reviews of works by known women authors regardless of when the attribution to that woman occurred.
- *RWWR* collects reviews of works presented to their original audiences as woman-authored.

The first principle covers women masquerading as men: if we now know a woman wrote the text, then reviews of those works are included in *RWWR*. In the case of men cross-dressing as women, we go back to the gender provided to the original audience. If the work is presented as by woman, *RWWR* includes reviews of that work. In the case of translations, the reviewers make clear that translation is an intellectual activity that goes beyond copying and that there are good translations and bad; as a result, we include reviews of translations by women writers. (Given these complications to the category of 'woman writer', whenever I refer to 'women writers' or 'works by women writers', I do so as a shorthand for this complicated gender dynamic.)

What Constitutes a Review?

This answer shifts depending on the type of periodical. Antonia Forster in the preface to her *Index to Book Reviews in England, 1775–1800*, distinguishes between ‘review journals’ and ‘magazines’. Though I adopt her first term, for the latter I use the term *miscellanies*, preserving the term *magazine* for the general class of periodical in which both *review journals* and *miscellanies* fall.

Review journals are nicely consistent, even orderly. They tend to devote the majority of their pages to two sections: an initial section of long reviews, each containing substantive extracts from the work under review; and a ‘Catalogue’ of brief (sometimes very brief) notices of many works that typically contain no extracts, only summary and critique. In some magazines this catalogue is subdivided into general topics – ‘poetry’, ‘novels’, ‘medical’, ‘divinity’ or ‘religion’ – but those areas are fluid and idiosyncratic: The *Critical Review*’s 1789 catalogue also includes additional divisions for ‘miscellaneous’, ‘slave-trade’ and ‘controversial’, while the 1789 *Monthly Review* catalogue offers sections for ‘negroe-slavery’, ‘political’ and ‘education, school-books, etc.’. Some review journals may also include a brief concluding section for domestic or foreign affairs, or for birth and death data for the month. But the primary focus of a review journal is reviews. Further, these reviews look like what we would recognize today as reviews, or close to it. In most cases, reviewers give some sense of the content of the book under consideration (sometimes including a plot summary) and the quality of that work. Some reviews clearly see their purpose as to improve their audience’s taste, so they often will extract especially ‘beautiful’ passages for notice. In addition, in some cases, the reviewer offers advice to the author (correct your text more carefully, avoid this or that subject matter, or, as to Hannah Wallis on her publication of religious meditations, ‘pray more, write less’).¹⁸

Miscellanies, in contrast, offer a range of materials to appeal to a broad audience, and the extent of that range depends on the target audience. All miscellanies include articles on a range of topics, domestic and foreign news; births, deaths and marriages of eminent persons; sections for poetry, whether original or extracted from published works; and extracts from prose works. But some, like the *New London Magazine* and the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, included as well preferences, bankruptcies, prices of stocks, prices of corn, mortality bills and so on. As an example of the contents of a typical miscellany, in addition to the standard contents listed above, the January 1789 issue of the *Edinburgh Magazine and Literary Miscellany* included articles on the weather, antiquities, political news and legal decisions, religious affairs, reflections on world events (such as, in the January 1789 issue, an account of the earthquake at Lisbon) and parliamentary debates. A miscellany devoted to women, like the *New Lady’s Magazine*, offered articles on the royal family, deportment, fashionable dress, fiction and poetry (in

a much greater proportion than other miscellanies) – as well as puzzles, enigmas and rebuses for the reader to solve (or to propose) alongside answers to previous enigmas provided by readers, typically in original poetry. Miscellanies only rarely provided prose reviews of the type one finds in review journals. But if the volume under review was a work of poetry, miscellanies often provided a review *in verse*. In addition, one frequently finds sonnets to this or that poet and to a specific volume of recently published poetry (such as the sonnets to Anna Seward, to Ann Yearsley and to the ‘fair mourner’ Charlotte Smith, a reference to her *Elegiac Sonnets*).¹⁹

At the same time that miscellanies tend to avoid the standard prose review, they frequently offer materials that give a sense of the author’s reception in the broader marketplace. Significant books, even if that significance is popularity, are frequently extracted. With prose works, such as Elizabeth, Lady Craven’s *Journey through the Crimea to Constantinople* or Hester Piozzi’s *Observations and Reflections on a Tour*, those extracts appear in long sections across several monthly instalments. Often, the first instalment will offer a bit of critical commentary (such as ‘for the next several months, we will extract Mrs. Jones’s fascinating and useful book on ...’), but subsequent instalments provide the extract without any such introduction. With poetry volumes, miscellanies will often extract one or two poems, typically with no commentary at all, and often without any indication what book provides the extract. Yet to exclude this material – which a researcher is unlikely to find except by paging through each volume of each magazine as *RWWR* has done – would be to allow such valuable indicators of women’s significance in the marketplace once more to disappear from view. It would elide the multiple ways in which readers of magazines received women’s works and the multiple ways in which women’s fame was constructed.

In addition to extracted works, miscellanies also included original pieces by women, in prose, poetry and translation – which would not in themselves be noticed in *RWWR*. In many cases, these works – as in the case of novelist Anne Blower’s contributions to the *General Magazine* – are original works by a noted women writer, and they function as an indicator of her market value and status. But in other cases, the magazine becomes a microcosm of the processes at work in the marketplace at large: women write to the editors offering their works for publication (their acceptances and rejections are recorded in the correspondence columns). Once published, their contributions spur responses and commentary from other readers, including poetic reviews. We then have women writers being published and reviewed, though in a reduced context. Drawing a boundary between reviews of ‘external’ works and of ‘internal’ ones becomes difficult, particularly when women like Blower wrote on both sides of that boundary.²⁰

Given the diversity of kinds of reception to women’s texts, then, *RWWR* takes the following additional principle:

- *RWWR* includes not only traditional reviews, but also other texts that testify to the work of women writers in the period.

What Constitutes Romantic?

In asking what *Romantic* designates, I do not here enter the long debate over the meaning of the term *Romanticism* or *Romantic*. I share in the critical consensus that Romanticism is a useful term simply to designate a particular literary period, without also claiming that the term suggests a consistent perspective or content across its writers. I rather address *what is the relationship between the term Romantic and the term woman writer?* Is she an author writing in the period we designate for utility's sake as Romanticism? Romantic by birth, death or publication date? In that case, should *RWWR* exclude from inclusion the articles and reviews of women writers who clearly interested reviewers and their readers but who were not living (or even recently dead) at the time? Is it insignificant that Mary Queen of Scots, Margaret Roper or Margaret Cavendish, the Duchess of Newcastle all receive commentary in the period – and in the case of Mary Queen of Scots explicit reviews? Should we ignore the poetic reviews of Sappho? Given that Romanticists have long acknowledged the period's fascination with the past, it seemed somehow inappropriate – in period terms – to exclude from view these additional possibilities for study.

As a final principle, then:

- *RWWR* includes works of reception that indicate the importance of women writers for the Romantic period in general, regardless of the historical period in which the woman lived.

What RRWR Includes

In light of these principles, I offer the following descriptions of what *RWWR* provides:

1. *RWWR* provides in full all reviews of the work of women writers, whether those reviews appear as poetry or prose. Any extracted portions of the original text included in prose reviews are provided in full as well. The extracts a reviewer chose to include shaped how readers received the text; what the editor included and elided or edited are important parts of the reception history of the original text under review. While some reviews are so brief as to be more accurately described as notices (such as the reviewer's dictum to Hannah Wallis mentioned above), we make no attempt to distinguish between reviews and notices, finding like Ward such an attempt 'not only misleading but impossible'.²¹

2. *RWWR* provides in full any extract from the work of a woman writer that includes some critical commentary by an editor or reviewer. Long extracts are typically a feature of miscellanies, but one could easily argue that review journals frequently offer little beyond a series of extracts with a bit of critical commentary. Since we collect those extracts in full as ‘reviews’, we collect the extracts in the miscellanies in full as well, as long as that extract is accompanied by some piece of critical commentary. Under this rule we collect two additional categories of material: biographical notices of women writers and (some) theatrical reviews. Though critical commentary is more obvious with the biographical notices, the theatrical reviews invariably include some remark on the relationship between the writer’s text and that performed on the stage, or on the nature of the writer’s skill, such as the reviewer’s comment that Mrs Inchbald ‘has drawn from her own fertile imagination.’²² We also include critical articles discussing women writers in general, even when those articles do not mention a specific women writer’s name; these are typically provided at the start of each magazine’s section.
3. In the case of extracts (whether in prose or poetry) *without* critical commentary, *RWWR* provides enough information to allow researchers to identify whether they need to consult the original magazines in which the extracts occur. In the case of prose extracts, we provide a bibliographic citation and up to the first 50 words of the opening paragraph. In the case of poetic extracts, we provide a bibliographic citation, followed by the first and last lines of the poem. In doing this we make no distinction between extracts of externally published work and original work published in the magazine itself.
4. *RWWR* also provides some contextual information that enriches our understanding of the women being reviewed in these volumes and of the place of women’s works in the Romantic marketplace. This category is an *olla podrida*, including information from columns like ‘Notes to Correspondents’, ‘Catalogue of New Books’ and ‘Theatrical Register’. Each of these columns shaped the ways that readers saw the place of women writers in the magazine before them, and by extension in the marketplace at large. Notes to correspondents provided the editor’s correspondence with contributors, and one could easily argue that the insertions were in part advance advertising, calling attention to forthcoming contents in the magazine as well as shaping the sorts of contributions the editor wished to receive. For example, when the editor of the *New Lady’s Magazine* for March 1789 rejected contributions claiming that ‘the following pieces cannot with propriety be admitted into our Miscellany, by Reason of their various Defects’ or asserted that a particular piece ‘does not appear sufficiently interesting to our Readers, to warrant it’s [*sic*] Insertion’, that editor is articulating (however

vaguely) a set of criteria that other contributors would do well to follow. For scholars of the book trade, these columns indicate something of the ways in which the business of literary periodical publishing was conducted. When those notices extend to works submitted by women, we include them. Catalogues of new books offered a selective list of the month's most noteworthy publications and because those lists were selective, we notice them only for the women listed; we do not reproduce these lists in full. Theatrical registers are treated similarly to the catalogues of new books; because they indicate the place of women's works in the broader theatrical market and often suggest the motivations of specific *book* reviews being published at the time, we digest the relevant portions.

What RWWR Excludes

Though it seems we have cast our net widely, *RWWR* does not include a great deal of information relative to women generally. For example, we do not in any way collect references to women who are not writers, such as biographies of famous women like the Duchess of Kingston. We do not collect enigmatical questions posed by women or answers to those questions by women, even when those questions or answers take the form of original poetry by women (though in this latter case, we do try to offer footnotes indicating the presence of those original works by women). Though we have included a notice of a book attributed to Dorothy Jordan, we do not include notices of women actors unless they appear in a review of a play written by a woman. In the cases where, to the best of our knowledge, books remain unsigned and unattributed – the 'truly' anonymous works – *RWWR* does not include reviews of or references to those texts. In gleaning information from columns such as 'correspondence', we do not include notices to women who asked for information not related explicitly to the book trade, such as the woman who wrote to the editor of the *Lady's Magazine* asking for medical advice (she wanted to know how to get rid of a beard and was referred to a doctor). I should also note here that *RWWR* only includes reviews from magazines; it does not collect reviews from newspapers, though newspapers consistently provided reviews in their pages. The reasoning is simple: including reviews from newspapers, for which there is not even an unreliable index, expands the scope of *RWWR* impossibly. We leave that edition to someone else. As does Ward, reviews from newspapers are only included if they appear in extract in a reviewing journal or miscellany.

Organization of Each Volume

RWWR is organized by year, then by magazine, and within magazine, by woman alphabetically. Inside each woman writer's section, commentary on her works is organized chronologically, allowing researchers to trace the development of a text's reception across the year and to see the interrelationships of reviews and other types of reception. A chronological organization encourages critics to understand the reception of an individual author as part of a larger market for each year, and the organization by magazine encourages users to consider how the agendas of those periodicals influenced the reviews within them. At the end of each set of volumes, we include headnotes for authors and for magazines, giving an overview of political, religious or social agendas.

Organization of Individual Entries

Each entry is headed by a bibliographic citation including three segments of information:

1. The volume and issue number, separated by a colon, followed by the part number (which is introduced by the abbreviation 'no.').
2. Inside parentheses, the day (if provided) and month.
3. The inclusive page numbers for the span of the article in the magazine.

Thus, a full bibliographic entry would look like this:

17:1, no. 3 (27 March), pp. 21–2.

The review described by this citation appeared in volume 17, issue 1 of a magazine published on 27 March, and that article spanned pages 21 and 22. Because *RWWR* is organized first by year, then by magazine, bibliographic citations do not repeat the magazine title or the year.

When a magazine does not provide particular pieces of information, such as issue or part numbers, *RWWR* simply omits that data from the bibliographic citation. For example, for annuals, an *RWWR* bibliographic citation includes only the volume (if designated) and page numbers.

If the bibliographic citation is preceded by an alphabetical code, then the text that follows is not a review *per se*. The following codes indicate what type of material follows:

- B. – biographical notice, or memoir.
- C. – correspondence, notes to correspondents, etc.
- E-D. – dramatic extract without commentary.
- E-Po. – poetic extract without commentary.
- E-Pr. – prose extract without commentary.
- Ref. – reference to an author in an article not examining her work *per se*.
- T. – Theatrical review.

Reviews in prose or poetry do not receive any special code, only a bibliographic entry.

Following the bibliographic citation is the title which appeared in the review journal or miscellany. We provide titles of works as they are represented by the review, not as the title appears on the title page of the work in question: for example, if the title of the work on its title page appears as *The Priory of St. Bernard*, but the review lists it as *St. Bernard's Priory*, we follow the information in the review itself. In terms of typography, we format titles for consistency across *RWWR* which does not reflect the formatting or typography of the text being reviewed. Retaining such a variety of formatting in house styles – for example 12mo, *12mo*, *12 mo*, and 12 mo – offers little material value for the user. Book and print historians would be more likely to consult the volumes themselves for such information. As a result, we regularize all titles to eliminate idiosyncratic formatting (save capitalization of words); and we retain (or add) italics to indicate the title of the text under review and any other texts mentioned in the heading, such as lists of texts also written by a particular author. *RWWR* does not place these titles in single quotation marks for several reasons, not the least of which being a desire to keep the transcribed text clean of unacknowledged editorial interventions. The magazines themselves add information to the title such as bibliographic format, price, number of pages and publisher, which few researchers would consider part of the book's title. We include that data as well.

Further, some columns are less 'columns' than a distinct set of paragraphs with a common focus, such as notes to contributors or theatrical notices. Magazines tend to use generalized titles for such omnibus columns, but those titles are not always provided as specific headers to the reviews, but sometimes appear only in the running head. Take for example a theatrical review of Ann Yearsley's *Earl Goodwin* which appears on page 381. The title header for the column – Theatrical Journal – appears on page 380; another title header – Bath – appears at the top of page 381, and the review of Yearsley's play (several paragraphs down) begins simply with the words, 'November 2' flush left on the same line as the sentence of the review: 'Earl Goodwin, a Tragedy by Mrs Yearsley, was acted here the first time'.²³ Which of these units is the title? Or are all of them? Since November 2 would not by itself indicate that these are theatre reviews, nor would the single word Bath, *RWWR* provides all these units, separated by full stops. With some 'columns', as with correspondence, paragraphs are dropped into the text wherever the publisher finds room, sometimes with only a rule above and below to set it apart from the surrounding text, sometimes not even with that. When no title is provided in the magazine, *RWWR* provides none as well.

Following the title is the text of the review. Within the text of the review, *RWWR* reproduces typographical formatting, including italics, full and small capitals, with the exception of drop caps on first letters or all caps on first words.

When entries span no more than a single page, the page number appears only in the bibliographic citation at the top of the entry. For items spanning more than one page, page numbers are provided in square brackets at the *end* of each page of the original text.

Cross-Referencing within Magazines

Within each magazine, *RWWR* cross-references allusions to or explicit mentions of women writers. When a reference to a woman writer appears in a review of a male or anonymous writer's works, we provide the relevant portions of that review under the name of the woman mentioned. For example, a reference to Hester Piozzi in the *Critical Review's* 1789 notice of Della Crusca's *Diversity: A Poem* would be indicated as follows:

Ref. 67 (January), pp. 129–30.
Diversity: A Poem. By Della Crusca. 4to. 2s. 6d. Bell.
 [Extracted portion of Della Crusca review.]

The first line of the entry would provide the bibliographic citation preceded by the word Ref. The second line would provide the magazine's title for the review of Della Crusca's text, followed by the extract itself which provides that portion of the review that mentions or discusses Piozzi. Since the article itself is concerned with another topic, we will when necessary use ellipses to make clear that the quoted section is only a portion of a review, and not simply a short notice.

When a reference to a woman writer appears in a review of the work of another woman writer, we provide a reference to the review and its location in *RWWR*. For example, a reference to Anna Laetitia Barbauld in the *Analytical Review's* 1789 notice of Miss Lewis's *Poems, Moral and Entertaining* would be placed under Barbauld's name as follows:

Ref. See Lewis's *Poems*, 3 (January), pp. 74–6.

Users then would consult Lewis's section for the mention of Barbauld.

Cross-Referencing across Magazines

For references across magazines, users – depending on their research needs – should consult each magazine individually, the index of women reviewed appearing in each volume or the cumulative index at the end of each set of volumes.

Additional Technical Notes

Treatment of Prose Extracts

E-Pr. provides a quotation of the first 30–50 words of the article in extract. If the portion *RWWR* quotes appears on the first page of the article, we do not provide the page number, it being understood that the quoted portion comes from the first page of the article in extract. If the portion we quote crosses a page break, then we provide page numbers in square brackets. We include ellipses only if the extract does not end on a full stop.

Treatment of Poetic Extracts

Poetic extracts provide the first and last lines of the poem extracted in the magazine. We exclude introductory epigraphs from other authors, but include – as being the author's own composition – the first sentence of any prefatory prose argument. Since we provide the page numbers in the bibliographic citation, and first lines will appear on the first page listed, and last lines on the last page, we do not repeat the page numbers in the quoted portion of the poem.

Anonymous, Pseudonymous and Attributed Titles

Anonymous and pseudonymous texts attributed to particular authors are listed under that author's name, regardless of when the attribution occurred. Unattributed anonymous and pseudonymous texts presented to audiences as woman-authored (such as 'by a lady', 'by a young lady', 'by a mother', 'by the authoress', 'young female foreigner', etc.) are grouped each year under the generic term 'Lady'. This grouping allows users an ease of searching, placing all gendered titles in a single location within a magazine's entries, rather than distributing them across the magazine according to their various authorial designations.

Making Attributions

RWWR uses a number of sources to make attributions for anonymous and pseudonymous texts. Our original database drew entries for women's texts from Williams Ward's *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1789–1826*; therefore, we began with his attributions. Whenever possible, we have verified attributions of books by recourse to page images of title pages, prefaces and dedications available in electronic resources such as ECCO, the Internet Archive and Google Books. For works for which we have been unable to access page images, we have drawn on attribution information in a variety of reference tools and catalogues: Virginia Blain, Patricia Clements and Isobel Grundy's *Feminist Companion to Literature in English*; Dorothy Blakey's *The Minerva Press, 1790–1820*; COPAC National, Academic and Specialist Library Catalogue (<http://copac.ac.uk/>);

Gwenn Davis and Beverley A. Joyce's *Poetry by Women to 1900: A Bibliography of American and British Writers*; Antonia Forster's *Index to Book Reviews in England, 1775–1800*; Peter Garside, James Raven and Rainer Schöwerling's *The English Novel 1770–1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles*; the English Short-Title Catalogue; Samuel Halkett and John Laing's *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature*; Charles Hogan's *The London Stage, 1600–1800: Part 5, 1776–1800*; J. R. de J. Jackson's *Romantic Poetry by Women*; Robert D. Mayo's *The English Novel in the Magazines, 1740–1815*; the *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*; Allardyce Nicoll's *A History of English Drama, 1660–1900*, vol. 6: Alphabetical Catalogue of Plays, 1660–1900; and Cambridge University Press's Orlando database; as well as some specialized articles on individual authors. See Bibliography for full source information.

Whereas other reference tools use question marks or square brackets to designate questionable attributions, we indicate how we have determined authorship for each work in an appendix to the final volume of each set. We have not tried to identify authorship for the non-review items indicated by codes before the bibliographic citations.

Signatures on Items

How extracts and original works are attributed to authors is important to understanding the role of women writers. As a result, we include all attributions internal to magazines, such as authorial signature at the beginning or end of the extract. Further, extracts will often identify their authors in more than one way. For example, the title of an extract might indicate its author is 'a lady', but also provide at the end of the extract an actual name or pseudonym, or vice versa. We provide both identifiers. Since not all poems provide dates of composition (or reputed dates of composition) or locations, we retain those as information that researchers might find useful or important.

Women with Multiple Names

Several women publish under multiple names, often a result of marriage. While the elegant solution would be to pick one of those names and index to that name consistently, doing so would obscure the name used in contemporary works and which a researcher might need to find additional information in contemporary materials. For example, though Anna Maria Mackenzie ends her career as a Mackenzie, she had previously published as Mrs Johnson, Anna Maria Johnson, and A. M. Cox (in addition to her pseudonym Ellen of Exeter). To find references to her works in advertisements, letters and journals, or other ephemera, one would need to use the name by which she was known in a spe-

cific year. We use – as best as we can predict or confirm – the name appropriate to the year being consulted. So, in 1789 she is alphabetized by Johnson, and in 1798 by Mackenzie. All those names appear in the index with appropriate cross-references, and the authorial note on Mackenzie provides all names.

We have included some works for which authors have not been identified, but which are gendered female by reviewers. These are placed chronologically under the general author, Lady. We choose chronological order because those interested in a single title will use the indexes to find the page numbers on which that review appears, so it does not matter to those researchers what comes before and after in the list. But researchers of women writers more generally or of the book trade might find the chronological arrangement evocative or suggestive. Without organizing chronologically for example one could not make the preliminary observation we have that for most review journals more reviews of anonymous women's works appear in the second half of the year, suggesting that named authors were published earlier in the year, and anonymous women writers fitted in as space permitted.

Memoirs and Putative Memoirs

A number of works present themselves as being written by 'real' woman – such as those of Miss Julia Frank or Miss Catlane. Since those are presented as by women to their readers, we include reviews of them.

Brackets

Some reviews provide interpolations using square brackets ([]), we have changed those to angled brackets (< >), and retained square brackets for our editorial and bibliographic interpolations. Speculative interpolations use curly brackets ({ }).

Appendix on Editorial Process

RWWR based its primary list of reviews from Ward's index, then supplemented that list with Forster and with our own page-by-page examination of the magazines. However, it is not always possible, despite our best efforts, to reproduce everything Ward listed. In some cases, the holding libraries Ward indicated no longer own the journals, and we can find no alternative holders. However, in an appendix we include explicit statements about what we were unable to examine ourselves, what Ward listed that we have been unable to acquire and what magazines we have additionally examined but found no reviews. Given that we cannot always know what exactly Ward examined, we take those opportunities that arise to examine additional titles. If those titles contain reviews, they are included in the body of the work; if they do not, we indicate that information in the appendix.

Notes:

1. R. Haven, Review of William S. Ward, *British Periodicals and Newspapers, 1789–1832, A Bibliography of Secondary Sources*, 1973; William S. Ward, *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1798–1820, A Bibliography*, 1972; Donald H. Reiman, ed. *The Romantics Reviewed*, 1972, *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, 6:20 (June 1973), pp. 46–8, on p. 46.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
3. Greg Kucich goes against this trend by treating Ward as a body of material to be analysed, rather than a reference tool. See G. Kucich, 'Reviewing Women in British Romantic Theatre', in C. Burroughs (ed.), *Women in British Romantic Literature: Drama, Performance and Society, 1790–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 48–76.
4. M. Ives, *Personal Correspondence*, 2010.
5. ECCO is a subscription service as is Worldcat, but Worldcat allows some public searching at <http://www.worldcat.org/>. At the time of this writing Google Books remains a free service: <http://books.google.com/>; the Internet Archive is publicly funded: <http://www.archive.org/>.
6. W. S. Ward, *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1798–1820: A Bibliography*, 2 vols (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1972), vol. 1, p. xii.
7. W. S. Ward, *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1821–1826: A Bibliography* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1977), p. vii.
8. W. S. Ward, *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1789–1797: A Bibliography* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1979), p. viii.
9. Ward, *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1821–1826*, p. x; Ward, *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1789–1797*, p. viii.
10. K. Wheatley, 'Introduction', in K. Wheatley (ed.), *Romantic Periodicals and Print Culture* (London: Frank Cass, 2003), pp. 1–18, on p. 3.
11. T. C. Davis and E. Donkin, 'Introduction', in T. C. Davis and E. Donkin (eds), *Women and Playwriting in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 1–12, on p. 2.
12. A work like Ann H. Jones's 1986 *Ideas and Innovations: Bestsellers of Jane Austen's Age*, which offers substantive chapters to seven relatively unknown women novelists – Elizabeth Hamilton, Amelia Opie, Mary Balfour Brunton, Jane Porter, Anna Maria Porter, Sydney Owenson (Lady Morgan) and Charlotte Dacre – is of interest here, but her focus is ultimately biographical and historical, not concerned with reception except tangentially.
13. See M. Gamer, *Romanticism and the Gothic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 37–42. Cima's article appears in Davis and Donkin (eds), *Women and Playwriting*, pp. 35–53; and Myers's in C. L. Johnson (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 82–98.
14. See A. Bradley, 'Correcting Mrs. Opie's Powers: The *Edinburgh Review* of Amelia Opie's *Poems* (1802)', in Wheatley (ed.), *Romantic Periodicals*, pp. 41–61; S. King, 'Politics, Poetics and Propriety: Reviewing Amelia Opie', *Romanticism on the Net*, 29–30 (February–May 2003), at <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ron/2003/v/n29-30/index.html>; G. Dow, 'On Reviewing Mme de Genlis', in J. Mallinson (ed.), *Correspondence; Images of the Eighteenth Century; Polemic; Style and Aesthetics* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation; 2004), pp. 133–43; and A. Monnickendam, 'The Odd Couple: Christian Isobel Johnstone's Reviews of Maria Edgeworth and Walter Scott', *Scottish Literary Journal*, 27:1 (Spring 2000), pp. 22–38.

15. Kucich acknowledges that 'the amount of reviewing space devoted to women dramatists in most periodicals, according to William Ward's compilations, falls disproportionately short of the attention bestowed on male dramatists', but he adds that 'nevertheless, the vast majority of reviews of women dramatists assume an inviting tone and express [a] kind of eagerness to recognize female talent' ('Reviewing Women in British Romantic Theatre', p. 50).
16. Paula Feldman opposes this assumption, arguing that 'during the period 1770–1835, women *rarely* published books of verse anonymously. With surprisingly few exceptions, women who published poetry books proudly placed their real names on the title page from the very outset of their careers' (P. R. Feldman, 'Women Poets and Anonymity in the Romantic Era', in E. J. Clery, C. Franklin and P. Garside (eds), *Authorship, Commerce, and the Public Scenes of Writing, 1750–1850* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 44–53, on p. 44). Stephanie Eckroth's work on women and anonymity, forthcoming in the Ashgate collection *Women Writers and the Artifacts of Celebrity*, indicates a similar pattern among women novelists.
17. Thanks to Stephanie Eckroth for this example of a male to female reattribution.
18. *General Magazine*, 3 (1790).
19. See *Gentleman's Magazine* (January 1789), below, p. 248; *European Magazine*, 16 (November 1789), below, pp. 194 1–5; *Gentleman's Magazine* (September 1789), below, p. 249.
20. I list only those contributions *presented* to contemporary readers as by women or women's pseudonyms. I have made no attempt to list anonymous contributions identified as by women in Robert D. Mayo's *The English Novel in the Magazines, 1740–1815* (Evanston, IL: Northwest University Press, 1962).
21. Ward, *Literary Reviews in British Periodicals, 1789–1797*, p. xv.
22. *Monthly Review*, 80 (January 1789), below, p. 320.
23. *European Magazine*, 16 (November 1789), below, p. 193.