

Stephanie Walker and Suzan van Dijk (Universiteit Utrecht)

What Literary Historians ‘Forgot’: American Women Authors in the 19th-Century Netherlands

In 1982 J.G. Riewald and J. Bakker published *The Critical Reception of American Literature in the Netherlands 1824-1900*. At the time, reception studies were still referred to in German as “Rezeptionsforschung” and were only starting to be recognized “as an important part of comparative studies” (6). The authors did have some predecessors who had worked on the reception of American literature in Germany and Russia, but were quite confident that their book-length study on the Netherlands was the first of its kind, unique in its scope and approach in an until then “much neglected field” (1). Right at the beginning of their preface, Riewald and Bakker make substantial claims regarding their project: “The purpose of this book is to explore the contemporaneous recognition of American literature in 19th-century Dutch periodicals and to assess its quality.” (1) They specifically emphasize that “in order to present a realistic picture of the Dutch response, it was vital to aim at *complete coverage*” (1, our italics). In the remainder of the preface, the authors continue to make reference to the uniqueness of their study, emphasising the inclusiveness of their research. They call it a “systematic presentation and analysis of a hitherto unexplored wealth of data” (3) in which “all known translations, including subsequent printings [...] have been recorded” (2). They also describe the way in which they have proceeded:

To locate the documentary evidence – mainly reviews, many of them anonymous and untitled, and scattered in defunct journals – we have read through the relevant magazines of the period, most of which had apparently not been so scrutinized by other investigators, and printed *all* those materials that seemed to be of *any* importance. (1, our italics)

This commitment to completeness and to thorough research will have inspired confidence. The book has long been (and possibly still is) considered as an important source of information regarding the reception

of American literature in the Netherlands. In fact, research carried out in the context of a preceding phase of our own project concerning the presence of foreign women's writing in the Netherlands, had also used this book in order to account for the international female context surrounding and possibly inspiring Dutch women who wanted to become authors.¹

However, since 1982 book history and reception studies have continued to develop, in particular since the expansion of the *WomenWriters* database (since 2004²), which made evidence concerning women authors' international reception more easily accessible. So much so that comparison between the listings provided in Riewald and Bakker's book and the present content of this database reveals that quite a number of traces of Dutch reception of American writers are, for one reason or another, lacking in this 'complete' inventory. The question to be discussed in this contribution, then, is double:

(1) as we are concerned with the reception of *women* authors, we need to investigate whether the work of these two male researchers is possibly gender biased as they were working in a period when issues regarding gender were less prominent than they are in 2008;

(2) as this Riewald-Bakker case is probably not an exception, what is the value, in this electronic age, of older 'hand-made' inventories which we still might want to use, and which might indeed be important enough to be transposed into online databases?³

American women authors in the Netherlands

The Critical Reception of American Literature is basically an inventory, per author, of references to articles published in the Dutch literary and 'general/cultural' press between 1824 and 1900. In a general introduction, the authors present their approach and comment on the most striking results (5-38), in particular a 'ranking' in which Harriet Beecher Stowe "with sixty reviews and articles to her name, scores the highest number of Dutch contributions devoted to a 19th-century American writer" (10), while Herman Melville and Edgar Allan Poe seem to be neglected (for each of them only two articles had been found (28)). The authors provide a list (39-297) containing references to, and "critical synopses" of, the 360 articles that had been found in 36 periodicals. For each American author there is also "a preliminary checklist of Dutch translations", established in part thanks to the review articles, most of which concern Dutch versions

of the works and provide references to the translations commented upon. The list contains 37 American authors whose works had been received in the Netherlands.

The number of women authors included in this list seems small: six out of the 37; 60 out of the 360 articles discuss their works. It may be objected that proportions do not differ very much from those on the production side: the online *American Literature Anthology Writers' Index* mentions 53 names of authors, born between 1750 and 1850, who may be supposed to have been active during the 19th century – ten of whom are women⁴. However, the recent increase of authors' names referenced in the database *WomenWriters*, as well as Riewald/Bakker's insistence on completeness,⁵ has necessitated comparison: therefore, let us have a look at the details, in both listings, concerning women.

Table 1:
Female authors referenced by Riewald and Bakker

<i>Names (list 1982)</i>	<i>articles in the literary press</i>	<i>translations</i>	<i>period concerned</i>
Sedgwick, Catharine Maria	3	2	1837-1841
Sedgwick, Susan Ann Livingston	1	1	1840
Stowe, Harriet Beecher	60	36	1852-1896
Alcott, Louisa May	14	37 ⁶	1873-1897
Phelps, Elisabeth Stuart	1	1	1900
Hitchcock, Mary E.	1	–	1900

To begin with, *The Critical Reception of American Literature* lists 60 articles about the ever famous Harriet Beecher Stowe (1811-1896), and 14 on Louisa May Alcott (1832-1888), whose work is also still in print and requested by readers even now. As stated in the introduction, Stowe is regarded to be more popular than authors such as James Fenimore Cooper, Longfellow, Emerson and Hawthorne, while Alcott is on the same level as Mark Twain and still within the ten most 'popular' (with the Dutch public) American authors. The four other women would have been much less commented on in the Dutch press: three articles about Catherine Sedgwick

(1789-1867) and one for each of the following three: Susan Sedgwick (1788-1867), Elizabeth Stuart Phelps (1844-1911) and Mary Hitchcock (publishing *Two Women in the Klondike* in 1899). It is perhaps important to briefly note that certain male writers (nine in fact) also received only one article...

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that such names as Maria Susanna Cummins (1827-1866, author of *The Lamplighter*) and Fanny Fern (1811-1872) are lacking. Indeed, to anyone more or less familiar with Dutch 19th-century library successes, or with the literary taste of leading critic Conrad Busken Huet, it seems difficult to admit that neither Cummins nor Fern would have found any response in the Dutch press. And indeed, the *WomenWriters* database does inform us about the actual presence of their names in the Dutch press: their works are mentioned, commented upon, and discussed in several of the very periodicals perused by Riewald and Bakker: *Tijdspiegel* and *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen*.

Database outcome

Cummins and Fern are not the only ones missing: information included as of November 2007 in the *WomenWriters* database has provided the following overview of American women writers' presence in the 19th-century Netherlands. Table 2 follows the chronological order of publication of Dutch commentaries.

This overview shows a substantial increase. According to these data, between 1838 and 1899, 21 women authors had articles published about themselves, or were mentioned in articles discussing other authors, or even subjects other than those regarding American literature. Stowe, Alcott and Sedgwick still remain 'leaders', but it appears now that the two authors searched for in vain, Cummins and Fern, did in fact generate response with Dutch critics. Clearly, the corpus analysed is not identical with Riewald and Bakker's,⁷ as two of their authors are not present in this list (Susan Sedgwick and Mary E. Hitchcock).

Why these 17 names have been left out is not clear. The articles about them were, again, published in those very periodicals which Riewald and Bakker used and included in their list (329-336): *De Gids*, *De Portefeuille*, *De Tijd*, *Nederlandsche Spectator*, among other. Were the authors not really interested in women's literature? A broad and quite informative article they had found about "Woman in North American Literature", written by the

Table 2:
American WomenWriters' presence in the
19th-century Dutch press, as referenced in the
WomenWriters database (November 2007)

<i>Names</i>	<i>number of articles/ mentions in general/ literary press</i>	<i>period concerned</i>
Reed, Rebecca Theresa	2 art.	1838
Sigourney, Lydia	1 ment.	1838
Sedgwick, Catharine Maria	8 art./1 ment.	1838-1855
Macintosh, Maria Jane	4 art./1 ment.	1852-1859
James, Maria	1 art.	1852
Wheatley, Phyllis	1 art.	1852
Stowe, Harriet Beecher	29 art./25 ment.	1853-1887
Warner, Susan Bogert	2 art./2 ment.	1855-1863
Southworth, Emma D. E. Nevitte	1 art.	1855
Pike, Mary Hayden	2 art.	1855
Hale, Lucretia Peabody	1 ment.	1855
Parton, Sarah Payson Willis (Fern Fanny)	4 art./3 ment.	1857-1872
Cummins, Maria Susanna	3 art./2 ment.	1858-1865
Dorr, Julia Caroline Ripley	1 art.	1858
Lothrop, Amy	1 ment.	1858
Lewis, Harriet O'Brien	2 art./2 ment.	1872-1882
Alcott, Louisa May	14 art./4 ment	1873-1899
Prentiss, Elizabeth	2 art./1 ment.	1873-1876
Whitney, Adeline Dutton Train	1 art.	1875
Campbell Deland, Margaret Wade	2 art.	1890
Phelps, Elisabeth Stuart	1 art.	1890

American poet Helen Gray Cone (1859-1934) and presented in Dutch translation in *De Portefeuille* in 1891, is only abstracted and not used – as could have been done – to provide a context for their six women's names. Cone's 25 supplementary names of women authors are merely documented in their footnotes (306-309), but Riewald and Bakker simply dismiss some of her statements about them, considering these to have been "inspired by feminist zeal rather than by a balanced judgment" (29).

So possibly, we must indeed dare to speak of a gender bias in this book.⁸ It seems manifest in the introduction, where the most important texts are highlighted in different ways, depending on gender. Riewald and

Bakker show a tendency towards comparing articles on male authors to modern, positive, appreciation: 19th-century reactions to Walt Whitman for instance, “sound surprisingly modern” in their “broadminded and understanding attitude toward Whitman’s supposed immorality” (20), while D.E.W. Wolff’s “evaluation of Emerson as thinker and essayist still makes eminent sense” (21). For the female authors, those articles where a negative slant is predominant seem to receive more attention. Considering probably that their works are now outdated, the authors cite an 1853 comment of the *Leeskabinet*, which claimed that *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* “as a work of art, shows serious flaws. There is no unity” (10). Also, an 1879 article from the same journal about Alcott is quoted: “The plot [of *Work*] lacks harmony and unity, while the style is vulgar” (24). So much so that these two male historians, probably unhelped by sisters or daughters⁹ and in complete innocence as to recent editions, state “that her [Alcott’s] fame did not last much beyond the 19th century, neither in her own country, nor in the Netherlands” (24). The gender-bias is probably not particular to them, and may also be a sign of their adherence to the established literary canon, which kept them from recognizing those works whose existence they did not know of before.¹⁰

Anyway, it is evident from their own material that women – Dutch women in particular – had played a certain role. Although translators’ names are often unknown, clearly an important proportion of the translating – about 25 % – is known to have been done by women: Aleida Doedes and H. Koorders-Boeke, for instance, were particularly productive, translating books by men and women, from English as well as other languages. This could have invited Riewald and Bakker to not only to consider the general press, but also the female and feminist press, which was then emerging in the Netherlands.¹¹ It could have, but clearly it did not and it is fair also to accept the fact that their focus was different from that of the *WomenWriters* database.

By the inclusion of a third list based on the *present* content (July 2008) of this database, we want to show that in order to approach something like ‘completeness’ it can be important, in reception studies, not to restrict the sources to one type – such as the ‘critical reception’ –, but to also include other categories of evidence, which can complement the overall impression.

Table 3:
American women writers' presence in the 19th-century
Netherlands (press and translations), as referenced
in the *WomenWriters* database (July 2008)

<i>Names</i>	articles/ mentions in the press	translations ¹²	presence in library	<i>period concerned</i>
Reed, Rebecca Theresa	2	1	—	1837-1838
Sedgwick, Catharine Maria	9	2	—	1837-1855
Sigourney, Lydia	1	1	—	1838
<i>Sedgwick, Susan Ann Livingston</i>	1	1	—	1840
<i>Kirkland, Caroline Matilda Stansbury</i>	2	—	—	1841-1842
<i>Ward, Maria</i>	2	—	—	1851
Macintosh, Maria Jane	5	4	3	1851-1859
James, Maria	1	—	—	1852
<i>Lippincott, Sarah Jane</i>	<i>1</i>	—	—	1852
<i>Moreton, Clara</i>	2	—	—	1852
Wheatley, Phyllis	1	—	—	1852
Stowe, Harriet Beecher	97	22	31	1852-1896
Southworth, E.D.E.N.	1	3	3	1854-1861
Cummins, Maria Susanna	5	5	10	1854-1886
Pike, Mary Hayden	2	2	3	1855-1860
Hale, Lucretia Peabody	1	—	—	1855
Parton, Sarah Payson Willis (Fern, F.)	14	8	12	1855-1886
Warner, Susan Bogert	4	4	10	1855-1866
Dorr, Julia Caroline Ripley	1	1	1	1858-1859
Lothrop, Amy	1	—	—	1858
Lewis, Harriet O'Brien	4	4	4	1859-1882
<i>Evans Wilson, Augusta Jane</i>	—	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1860-1861</i>
Prentiss, Elizabeth	3	2	—	1871-1876
Phelps, Elisabeth Stuart	4	2	—	1871-1900
Alcott, Louisa May	31	17	16	1873-1899
Whitney, Adeline Dutton Train	1	—	—	1875
<i>Paton, Agnes</i>	<i>1</i>	—	—	<i>1886</i>
Campbell Deland, Margaret Wade	2	1	1	1889-1896
<i>Cone, Helen Gray</i>	<i>1</i>	—	—	<i>1891</i>
<i>Barnett, Edith A.</i>	—	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1895-1900</i>
<i>Gilman, Charlotte Perkins</i>	—	<i>1</i>	—	<i>1899</i>
<i>Hitchcock, Mary E.</i>	1	—	—	1900

Compared to Riewald and Bakker's initial list of six authors as well as to the previous database listing containing 21 authors' names, this table again shows a considerable increase of and contains no less than 32 names. The two most appreciated authors are visibly maintaining their position, but it is less and less clear why the four other authors were selected, rather than Susan Warner or Maria Jane Macintosh.

The new figures are more impressive for several reasons. Firstly, a greater variety of source materials have been included. In particular, the database includes publications from the women's press, as well as translations that were published not as volumes but in the periodical press (addressing the general public as well as female audiences). This provides a more complete impression, although further analysis with regard to specific authors is still needed. What we show in the rest of the paper are just two short examples that might further illustrate our argument. Secondly, the information as provided by Riewald and Bakker has, of course, also been included in this database – the principle being that any information be integrated, with due reference to its origins. Still, this is certainly a provisional view of the matter. In the near future it will, for instance be possible to also benefit from online accessible daily newspapers, which must be considered to provide further evidence.

Fanny Fern (1811-1872) and Maria Susanna Cummins (1827-1866)

In this last section we want to show the relevance of pursuing an account complete as possible of the reception of 19th-century American women's literature in the Netherlands – and in particular of going beyond relatively 'innocent' cases as those of Harriet Beecher Stowe (about whose work the consensus was global) and of Louisa Alcott (addressing young girls). By way of examples, we will discuss very briefly some aspects of the Dutch reception of Fanny Fern and Maria Susanna Cummins. Their published output was considerably smaller than those of Stowe, Alcott and others, which of course contributed to their apparently 'smaller' reception, and must be kept in mind in order to understand the figures. These observations, based on the present database content, are supposed to show how this database provides a first overview and stepping stone for further research.

We are following Nina Baym's interpretation of American women's fiction of the period 1820-1870, which she presents as "a protest against

long-entrenched trivializing and contemptuous views of women that animated the fiction of Richardson and other later 18th-century fiction of sensibility" (29). These authors were so numerous that Nathaniel Hawthorne complained that

America is now wholly given over to a d-d mob of scribbling women, and I should have no chance of success while the public taste is occupied with their trash – and should be ashamed of myself if I did succeed. What is the mystery of these innumerable editions of the *Lamplighter*, and other books neither better nor worse? – worse they could not be, and better they need not be, when they sell by 100,000.¹³

The situation in the Netherlands was completely different and critics were bound to be surprised at the great number of women writing in the United States (as well as in other countries). In the Netherlands, women generally did not write with the express goal to earn money,¹⁴ while in contrast "most of the American authors were middle-class women who needed money. As a general rule [...] only middle-class women had sufficient education to know how to write books, and only those who needed money attempted it" (30). Because of this, it is not surprising that "most of their heroines had to support themselves and often dependents as well for some period of time. Examples of professional women, such as teachers and authors, are found in the fiction frequently and are presented with the greatest respect and admiration" (28). The content of these novels could have been seen as conflicting with dominant Dutch customs and practices of the time. It is therefore important to know whether the reception of these authors was indeed so limited, or if their works may have contributed to the first feminist wave, visible also in the Netherlands at the end of the 19th century.

Maria Susanna Cummins, the author of *The Lamplighter* (1854) and whom Hawthorne did not admire, was also very successful in the Netherlands. All four of her novels were translated immediately, but especially *The Lamplighter* was reprinted many times, well into the 20th century; was translated time and again, and adapted into a version for children. Copies of her books were present in the commercial library of the Van der Hoek brothers in Leiden – not only in Dutch, the original English versions and French translations were present as well. *The Lamplighter* was also, somewhat later, part of the collection of the Ladies Reading Museum in Amsterdam.

Critics did not always agree with the general preferences of the readers for *The Lamplighter*. For example, in the *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen*, Cummins' second novel, *Mabel Vaughan*, received higher praise.¹⁵ In the same periodical, *Haunted Hearts* was predominantly appreciated because the subject of love was approached and treated differently than in French novels. Cummins' work is admired for its "pure, thoroughly healthy morality" and for the "powerfully sound religious life," that "speaks to us from almost every page".¹⁶ At least from these references it seems clear that there was little attention for what Baym considers to have been Cummins' intention: "to persuade women that she is responsible for saving herself and equal to the demand" (166).

With regard to Fanny Fern, the information that is now available in the *WomenWriters* database tells the following story. Her newspaper columns, which were collected and published in book form from 1853 onwards, were quite popular with the Dutch readers. Starting in 1855, translations of these collections were also available. The same was true regarding her novels, *Ruth Hall* (1855) and *Rose Clark* (1856). Both appeared in Dutch translations (by still unknown translators) in the same years as their American publication. The magazine *Europa* published her texts regularly between 1856 and 1875. Eight copies of her books were present in the Van der Hoek commercial library, both in translation and the original English version. The later established women's libraries in The Hague and Amsterdam also carried her work. It is interesting to note here that the library in The Hague, which was certainly more sophisticated than the one in Amsterdam, however, did not carry Cummins' work.

At the time, various translators – positively evaluated by critics – were publishing Fern in Dutch, and as a result several volumes were published. Some of these may have contained, at least partially, the same texts. Fern's writings for children were published in 1856 in a translation by the well-known poet J.J.A. Goeverneur. As there appeared to be a female audience who appreciated Fern's writing, there were also several women who took it upon themselves to translate her work. This is perhaps not surprising in view of the way Fanny Fern presented herself in her preface:

I never had the slightest intention of writing a book. Had such a thought entered my mind, I should not long have entertained it. It would have seemed presumptuous. What! I, Fanny Fern, write a book? I never could have believed it possible. [...] (v)

Here it is clear that she is parodying the longstanding topos of feminine modesty – and it is important to keep in mind that she and her two children lived from her pen, and quite well at that, due to the success of her writing.¹⁷

One of Fern's women translators was the wife of Conrad Busken Huet, Anne van der Tholl. She had also decided to use her pen to earn money and was greatly enthusiastic about *Fern Leaves*. She was, however, *really* insecure, which allowed for her husband to intervene in the translation to such an extent that it was eventually published under his name.¹⁸ This, in turn, strongly suggests that he himself was also interested in Fern's work.

Dutch reviewers emphasized the American roots and Fern's work was favourably compared to fiction coming from France. The perceived difference between American and Dutch women is implicitly present: the Dutch publishers are urged "to offer the masculine work of the American beauties to our own women and girls, who are fortunately still feminine".¹⁹ In 1859, reviews stated that "Fanny Fern, for quite some time now, has become familiar to us", and that "her multi-faceted talent, her utterly captivating style, her insightful view into human nature, and especially her fine, deep sense of humor that so masterfully plays the stings of our hearts, has found numerous Dutch admirers."²⁰ Many of these admirers were women: the feminist journal *Ons Streven* regularly praised Fern's work in the 1870s and valued, more than other periodicals, her "portrayal of a woman as the self-reliant American individualist," as well as the fact that *Ruth Hall* ends, not with the protagonist's marriage, "but with her acquisition of ten thousand dollars in bank stock" (Warren 2). Both contemporaneous periodicals, *Ons Streven* and *Onze Roeping*, were of the opinion that women had the right to an independent income derived from their work. Fern served as a good role model indeed. However, it is relevant to note that men also wrote for these women's journals: sometimes they clearly felt under attack by Fern's writing.²¹

To be continued

It is clear that these two women writers cannot be missed in a survey of American literary presence in 19th-century Netherlands. This is what the increase in the number of sources leads us to conclude. However, this increase in sources also makes research more complex. What we have shown here is just a beginning; even more so as the database *WomenWriters* continues to accumulate data.

Bibliography

- Baym, Nina. *Woman's Fiction. A Guide to Novels by and about Women in America 1820-70*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993. [1st ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.]
- Fern, Fanny. *Fern Leaves from Fanny's Portfolio*. Auburn: Durby and Miller, 1853.
- Fleming, Bill. *Sources in American literature*. Sam Houston State University. 5 July 2008 <http://www.shsu.edu/~eng_wpf/amlit-sources.html>.
- Jensen, Lotte. "Bij uitsluiting voor de vrouwelijke sekse geschikt." *Vrouwentijdschriften en journalisten in Nederland in de achttiende en negentiende eeuw*. Hilversum: Verloren, 2001.
- NEWW project (New approaches to European Women's Writing, dir. Suzan van Dijk). *Women Writers' Networks*. Utrecht, Igitur Utrecht Publishing & Archiving <<http://www.womenwriters.nl>>.
- Praamstra, Olf. *Busken Huet. Een biografie*. Amsterdam: SUN, 2007.
- Riewald, J.G. and J. Bakker, eds. *The Critical Reception of American Literature in the Netherlands 1824-1900. A Documentary Conspectus from Contemporary Periodicals*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1982.
- Visser, Irene. "American women writers in the Dutch literary world 1824-1900." *"I have heard about you". Foreign women's writing crossing the Dutch border: from Sappho to Selma Lagerlöf*. Eds. Suzan van Dijk, et al. Hilversum: Verloren, 2004. 281-299.
- Warren, Joyce. *Fanny Fern: An Independent Woman*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1992.

Notes

¹ See, for example, Irene Visser's essay on "American women writers in the Dutch literary world".

² Thanks to the digitizing project "The International Reception of Women's Writing", funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) from 2004 until 2007. In this context a number of Dutch large-scale reception sources was perused and data were integrated in the database. See also the introductory article of the present section.

³ Actually, at the Huygens Institute in The Hague, a project is now being prepared that aims to digitize information found in Dutch literary press of 1760-1840 and stored in a card system prepared in the 1960s and 70s.

⁴ *Sources in American literature*. This list corresponds, of course, to present perspectives on the literary canon: 12 out of the 31 male authors received in the 19th-century Netherlands do *not* figure there, for example.

⁵ The "completeness" is qualified by the scrutinizing of "well over a hundred and fifty Dutch periodicals", of which "thirty-six were found to yield material of interest. The most important of these [sixteen] have been selected for inclusion" in an "Annotated list", in order "give the reader an adequate idea of their character and quality" (329).

⁶ Translations were also checked checked in national library catalogues, which explains the important numbers.

⁷ For information about the sources used, see the section on "Sources" on the corresponding website: *Women Writers' Networks*.

⁸ Probably the category of male authors has equally suffered, see for example the difference between the Riewald-Bakker list and the online presentation of American literature (n. 4).

⁹ Exceptions do exist, however. Berteke Waaldijk, studying the authorship of Anne Frank, held the female gaze of the German translator responsible for the detection of an important female influence on her diary: the one exerted by a Dutch woman author, writing for girls, Cissy van Marxveldt, in particular by her *De H.B.S. tijd van Joop ter Heul*, published in

1919, and still in print today (cf. Berteke Waaldijk, "Reading Anne Frank as a Woman", in *Women's Studies International Forum* (Autumn 1993), and reprinted in: Hyman A. Enzer and Sandra Solotaroff-Enzer (eds.), *Anne Frank. Reflections on Her Life and Legacy* (Chicago/Urbana: UIP, 2000. 110-120). Later on Gerrold van der Stroom demonstrated that in fact Theodor Holman was the one who discovered the link between Van Marxveldt and Frank (cf. Gerrold van der Stroom, *De vele gezichten van Anne Frank; visies op een fenomeen*, (Amsterdam: De Prom, 2003. 106-122)). We thank Monica Soeting for these details.

¹⁰ Most of these novelists were presented and discussed in Nina Baym's *Woman's Fiction. A Guide to Novels by and about Women in America 1820-70*, the first edition of which had been published (Cornell University Press) in 1978; the second (University of Illinois Press) in 1993.

¹¹ Admittedly, this press was not yet much studied in 1982. See Jensen "Bij uitsluiting voor de vrouwelijke sekse geschikt". *Vrouwentijdschriften en journalistes in Nederland in de achttiende en negentiende eeuw*, Hilversum: Verloren, 2001.

¹² Figures according to current database content, not yet systematically checked in national library catalogues.

¹³ Letter to his publisher and friend William D. Ticknor on January 19, 1855.

¹⁴ There were some exceptions, such as Barbara van Meerten-Schilperoort.

¹⁵ *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* (1859-1): 91.

¹⁶ "Zuivere, door en door gezonde moraal zit er niet op, maar in de gansche voorstelling. [...] Krachtig, gezond godsdienstig leven spreekt ons bijna van elke bladzijde toe" (*Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* (1865-1): 437).

¹⁷ It is also important to realize that Hawthorne, after getting to Fanny Fern's work, partially retracted his previous statement regarding the "scribbling women": "In my last, I recollect, I bestowed some vituperation on female authors. I have since been reading *Ruth Hall*; and I must say I enjoyed it a good deal. The woman writes as if the devil was in her; and that is the only condition under which a woman ever writes anything worth reading. [...] Can you tell me anything about this Fanny Fern? If you meet her, I wish you would let her know how much I admire her" (Letter to William Ticknor, 1855, quoted in Warren (1).

¹⁸ See Praamstra's *Busken Huet* (217).

¹⁹ "Wat mij betreft, men ga gerust voort, mits niet al te doldriftig om den mannelyken arbeid der Amerikaansche schoonen, aan onze, gelukkig nog vrouwelijke, vrouwen en meisjes aan te bieden" (*Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* (1857-1): 244-45).

²⁰ "Al is gelukkig Fanny Fern ook sinds lang geene vreemde meer in ons midden; al heeft haar veelzijdig talent, haar uiterst boeiende schrijftrant, haar geoefende menschkundige blik en vooral haar fijne, diepe humor, waardoor zij zoo meesterlijk de toetsen van ons hart weet te bespelen, reeds sinds geruimen tijd ook hier te lande eene menigte bewonderaars uitgelokt [...]" (*Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* (1859-1): 189).

²¹ *Ons Streven* (25 May 1870, 75): "[...] ik heb werkelijk eene ernstige beschuldiging tegen Fanny Fern in te brengen. Ik beschuldig haar namelijk van onrechtvaardigheid jegens de mannen. [...]". See also Jensen (205).