



PROJECT MUSE®

Bibliography and National Canons: Women Writers in France, England, Germany, and Russia (1800-2010)

Hilde Hoogenboom

Comparative Literature Studies, Volume 50, Number 2, 2013, pp. 314-341
(Article)

Published by Penn State University Press
DOI: 10.1353/cls.2013.0027



➔ For additional information about this article
<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/cls/summary/v050/50.2.hoogenboom.html>

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND NATIONAL CANONS:
WOMEN WRITERS IN FRANCE, ENGLAND, GERMANY,
AND RUSSIA (1800–2010)

Hilde Hoogenboom

Vashe prevoskhoditel'stvo derzhas' pravil'nogo mneniia, chto chislo pisatel'nits kakoi libo strany pokazyvaet osobuiu stepen' prosveshcheniia onoi, izvolili vozlozhit' na menia, vse tvoreniia Rossiiskikh pisatel'nits nakhodiashchiiasia v prekrasnoi vashei biblioteke otobrat' v osoboe otdelenie, i sostavit' tem pisatel'nitsam istoricheskii slovar'.

(Your Excellency, while holding the correct opinion that the number of any nation's woman writers shows its particular degree of enlightenment, has deigned to place on me the task of separating into a special section all the creations of Russian woman writers in your wonderful library and of compiling a historical dictionary of these women.)

—Stepan V. Russov, *Bibliograficheskii katalog rossiiskim pisatel'nitsam* (1826)

Many have written amply about women as authors, subjects, and readers of poetry, fiction, drama, autobiography, letters, nonfiction, and criticism, but another important genre, bio-bibliography, is often consigned to the realm of tools. Recent bio-bibliographic compilations of women writers display a critical awareness not only of literary history but also of the generic form of the bibliography, which by necessity is selective and thus like literary history likewise constructs narratives. Bibliographies came into their own as

classificatory tools in the nineteenth century and, as the epigraph indicates, a powerful impulse at the heart of bibliographies was the construction of narratives of nation, here through the international competition for learned women.¹ Yet issues that concern feminist bio-bibliographers today were recognized and addressed by their predecessors in innovative, substantial ways that are still relevant. Like any text, no compilation stands alone. This is especially true of bio-bibliographic and other compilations of women, which turn out to contain long-overlooked, rich, alternative narratives of women's transnational literary histories that go back centuries.

With Boccaccio's *De mulieribus claris* (*Famous Women* [1361–1375]), such compilations spread across Europe, country by country, becoming a tremendously varied national and European historical genre. This article is part of a book project that traces the development over the past six hundred years of a highly coherent yet dynamic genre. Compilations of women have taken many forms over the centuries: as anthologies of biographies and works, bio-bibliographies, bibliographies, literary histories, and recently as databases, and they often combine several subgenres. Still, it is not necessary to survey all such compilations of women, especially those of women writers, to demonstrate that they form a genre. They have essentially selected themselves for this study because they cite each other, thus participating in long-standing national and international debates about what constitutes notable women.² Compilers rely on, disagree with, and often simply borrow their predecessors' work—all basic features that make the genre cohere over centuries and across many nations. As compilers, these writers, antiquarians, bibliophiles, bibliographers, publishers, journalists, philosophers, priests, lawyers, and so on belong to the networks of cross-cultural transfers of texts in such diverse literary and especially nonliterary areas as medicine, science, travel literature, religion, politics, law, and history throughout Europe.³ Individual compilations then and now gain their full significance in a web of relationships with other such texts, forming a remarkably resilient discourse across centuries and national and linguistic boundaries.

This article emphasizes the quantitative, the extensive, the diversifying aspects of bibliographic compilations, which present a generically and geographically complex picture of women's literary history and strategically challenge the canonizing narratives of national literary history. Rather than dip in selectively, we ought to read bibliographies—especially those quantitative compilations that resist reading—from cover to cover, together with their titles, prefaces, illustrations, and other appendages, as whole texts. The generic conventions of paratexts are not a frame to skip over to get to the data but are essential means of historicizing the data. Bibliographies have long confronted such basic issues about the shape of women's literary

history as the categories of author, genre, publication, literature, and nation that continue to concern bibliographers today. The great variety of materials found in bio-bibliographic compilations of women writers, together with the diverse approaches that compilers have taken, destabilize the givens of women's literary history. How do literary histories handle women who wrote but did not publish? Women whose oral performances were transcribed? Who translated? Wrote about science, religion, or politics? Wrote in several languages? In several countries? In these gray boundaries lie other potential narratives of women's literary history.

The transnational nature of compilations makes it hard to generalize from the literary history of one nation and instead suggests that women's literary histories are relational, between nations. Feminist scholars in French literature object to a tendency to view the nineteenth-century English novel as the universal model, while those in other languages lament the focus on these two literatures.⁴ Nancy K. Miller bemoans "the old Franco-American game . . . as though there weren't also Italians, for instance" and longs "to see a more international geo-graphics in feminist writing."⁵ This transnational survey of compilations suggests that indeed the Italians were the first to categorize women as writers.⁶ Who was first though aside, such complaints are significant because they show that national literary histories have always been about other nations.

By refusing to generalize from England and France, a transnational perspective throws open the international literary field to many nations and women writers. The transnational impulse exists not just in the literary competitions *between* Italy and France, then France and England, and England and America, all countries that produce a lot of literature, but especially *within* the nations, beyond these cultural axes who were primarily consumers, where literary markets were inundated by foreign publications, many by women. For example, from 1750 to 1850, while Britain and France imported just 10 percent to 20 percent of their novels, Germany 40 percent, Italy 60 percent, and Denmark over 80 percent.⁷ My research indicates that Russia imported over 90 percent, an astonishing number that no Russian literary history acknowledges.⁸ A complete survey of novels in England (rather than just English novels) from 1770 to 1829 reveals that from the 1790s to around 1820, most novelists were women, and through the end of the 1820s, most novels were by women. The Corvey Library project in England and Germany also reveals that for a time, German rather than French novels dominated the market for translations. Among the most productive novelists throughout Europe were Stéphanie-Félicité de Genlis and the German sentimental novelist August Lafontaine.⁹ Such

quantitative approaches to literary history show that throughout much of Europe, women writers, but especially readers, of many nations participated in transnational dialogues at the cultural and geographical margins. Within peripheral nations that consumed French, English, and German literatures, all literature was relational and like the Russian compiler quoted in the epigraph, they measured their own literatures against “European” literature. These relational literary histories emerge from the juxtaposition of national narratives, including compilations of women, with quantitative surveys of the international literary marketplace. Taken together, they reveal how women writers, together with foreign literatures, were erased from nineteenth-century national literary histories.

Though most bio-bibliographic compilations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were limited to individual nations, they had their roots in international compilations and continued to circulate internationally.¹⁰ Like the international traffic in novels, many by women, lists and compilations of women also traveled throughout Europe from century to century. Beginning in the late fourteenth century, modeled on Boccaccio’s *On Famous Women*, compilations included notable women from all nations, even from mythology, often beginning with Eve, to emphasize links with the classical past in the tradition of *translatio studii et imperii*. In 1559, the new category of women writers appeared with the first compilation in Italy, and in the seventeenth century, the first national compilations of women appeared in France.¹¹ Around 1700, compilations from Denmark and Germany, and later England, began to engage in national preening in the international competition for notable and learned women, especially writers and women learned in languages, and for the first time included contemporaries.¹² Some of these works are in Latin and are titled “gynaeceum” or use the term in German “Frauenzimmer,” a room for women and female slaves in ancient Greek houses.¹³ Thus the bio-bibliographic subgenre of national women writers had various generic and international roots and only became strictly national in the nineteenth century. After a decline in the twentieth century, compilations of women writers revived in the 1970s, and in the 1990s, a new era began as databases of women writers were created to variously link biographies, texts, and criticism, resulting in new national and international literary histories.

This article looks at seventy-six bio-bibliographic compilations and databases of women writers from the last three centuries and their role in the literary histories of France, England, Germany, and Russia, which are among the largest producers of such texts and represent influential and contrasting transnational cultural nodes in a long historiography of women’s

writings throughout Europe. They indicate that compilers demonstrated their nation's excellence in two ways: by emphasizing either the quantity of their outstanding women, or their quality. To show their national greatness, German and Russian compilers used quantitative arguments to justify including women who wrote anything, who did not necessarily publish or write literature, and who did not even write in their native language or live in their native country, while the French and English made qualitative arguments, with some important exceptions. These two choices reflect the main tension of this second phase of compilations. It is significant that nations that were still building their national literatures chose quantitative narratives to measure the growth of their domestic versus imported literature, while the two nations at the center of literary production argued mainly with each other on the merits of selected women writers.

Nevertheless, despite women's dominance over the national and international literary marketplaces, their increased bio-bibliographic presence, and their importance to nations' enlightened images, women became marginal to national narrative literary histories, which erased women writers together with the presence of foreign and translated literatures. Scholars have tried variously to trace this process of erasure by blaming markets in England; Nicolas Boileau's rejection of novels (most by women), the later pedagogical canon for French boys schools and the preponderance of women novelists in the French literary marketplace; Russia's first literary history, by Nikolai Grech in 1822; or in Germany, compilations that promoted gendered stereotypes of women's modesty from women's own writings.¹⁴ Bio-bibliographic compilations can reveal parts of this process. This survey indicates that most compilations historically are qualitative, and they provide selective narratives of women's writing that in many ways reaffirm stereotypes of femininity and difference, while quantitative compilations are rare and do not easily tell stories but instead disrupt ready categories and allow for multiple, noncanonical narratives that include more women, more kinds of literature, and more languages and nationalities. Born at the turn of the nineteenth century along with national bibliographies and literary histories, extensive quantitative compilations stand in tension with and can historicize these selective, canonizing national narratives and remind us of the variety of questions that remain for databases.

This article first examines questions that feminist literary historians raise today in relation to those debated in the past by compilers of women writers. The past debates among the principal men and women compilers who produced quantitative bibliographies in critical response to qualitative arguments that sought to limit women's participation in the life of their

nations are especially important. I conclude by suggesting how modern compilers, in dialogue with feminist literary debates, either build on and continue or counter their national traditions and by highlighting the potential for databases to offer greatly expanded, quantitative, noncanonical, transnational narratives for women's literary histories.

I

Over many centuries, as they differentiate, select and separate out women, compilers continue to create fuzzy boundaries that require explanations and offer opportunities to argue about women's history. In such paratexts as dedications, illustrations, prefaces, appendices, and indexes, compilers engage in international debates over categories other than sex as a means by which to include and exclude women. In the tradition of Boccaccio, compilers initially focused on exemplarity, choosing women who were famous historical or mythological figures and/or known for their virtue. By the seventeenth century, in the *querelles des femmes*, lists of learned women, modeled on compilations of international and national female worthies, emphasized exemplary knowledge, especially of languages, which was broadly termed "genius" in England.¹⁵ Compilers of women writers in the eighteenth century inherited these various discourses, while in the nineteenth century, there was renewed interest in quantity, with the result that women's writing became a broad activity that covered many nonliterary as well as literary genres, both published and unpublished. The messy quantitative potential of bibliography, what D. F. McKenzie calls bibliography's "indiscriminate inclusiveness," is evident in Sarah Hale's American compilation *Woman's Record* (1853), which lists twenty-five hundred women. In *The Literary Women of England* (1861), a selective compilation, Jane Williams derides Hale's lack of "original thought," but she adds that although "it is bare, bald, and often inaccurate, . . . it is of real value as a catalogue of names and dates."¹⁶ These quantitative bio-bibliographers stretched the boundaries of literature, of nationality, and of the author's identity to make nationalist arguments, in ways that remain relevant to feminist compilers today.

Bibliographers and literary historians today argue with the genre of women's bibliography itself, both as a record of "bare, bald" facts and as a narrative of women's literary history, raising issues that this comparative, historical survey indicates have long been of concern in the field. The 1990 *Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580-1720*, tries to do

nearly everything and “to create a book which self-consciously undermines its own authority.”¹⁷ Maureen Bell, George Parfitt, and Simon Shepherd systematically critique the production of literature and the idea of the author, which is especially problematic in the case of women authors given women’s various names (married names, pseudonyms, and anonymity). The editors compensate for the structural distortions of women’s literary history as viewed through bibliography by adding unpublished works, more variety—more writers, more social backgrounds, more genres—and six essays (on prophetic writing, Quaker women, petitions, letters, the role of men as “gatekeepers,” and women and publishing).¹⁸ England’s most prodigious compiler, Janet Todd, points out that bibliographies of women’s publications skew the picture toward what was deemed suitable for women to publish.¹⁹ Margaret Ezell argues that the boundary between manuscript culture and publication was porous, further questioning publication as the measurable bedrock of much feminist literary history and bibliographies.²⁰

The variety of genres included in the *Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, demonstrates that the most contentious issue in the historiography of compilations of women writers remains what counts as literature or writing. In *Writing Women’s Literary History*, Ezell argues that the almost exclusive focus on the novel in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has created the false impression of a dark age by completely ignoring earlier English women’s writing in such other areas as politics and religion, and such genres as pamphlets, letters, and diaries.²¹ In one of the few studies to address bio-bibliographical compilations as a genre, Paula McDowell, like Ezell (1993), points to *A Room of One’s Own* (1929) and Virginia Woolf’s sources in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century compilations and anthologies, which tend to reduce religious and political differences among women writers (and the writings those differences produced) and generalize the idealized portraits that made these volumes more viable commercially.²² Like Ezell and the editors of the *Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, Carla Hesse rejects the emphasis on the novel and concludes that in France during the Revolution, women published many more political documents than novels. She includes a bibliography of 329 women who published during the Revolutionary period.²³ However, French literary historians today, unlike their English counterparts, remain fixated on the novel and have yet to take up this and other quantitative challenges to the canon.

In contrast to Ezell and McDowell, Harriet Guest foregrounds definitions of nation in her discussion of notable eighteenth-century English compilations. She argues that generalizations are more important than the

particulars because “the memorable nature of the lives of women is much more directly concerned with the notion that their existence is a matter of national pride, which will be gratified by the number, the quantity of women worth writing about, rather than by their particular achievements.”²⁴ Like Guest, contemporary compilations also raise the question of nation and national boundaries, which do not coincide with, and are thus in tension with, cultural boundaries. Modern bio-bibliographies of women writers have their roots in both the international genre of female worthies and national subject bibliographies, with their questions of national identity, though only one history of national bibliographies mentions those of women (it is Russian).²⁵ This general problem for national literary bibliographies poses specific difficulties for women. What constitutes a woman’s nationality, when in France, for example, a woman legally assumed the husband’s nationality when she married?²⁶ The problem of nationality is further highlighted by such writers as Madame de Krüdener (1764–1824), author of the international bestseller *Valérie* (1803). Born in Riga, Latvia, she has been claimed as a Russian, French, and German woman writer.²⁷ Another example is Belle van Zuylen, a Dutch woman better known as the French writer Isabelle de Charrière (1740–1805). Catherine the Great (1729–1796) has been claimed as a German and a Russian woman writer, although she wrote a good deal in French. Most solve the issue by including women who wrote in the national language, even if they were not born in the country. This decision is reflected in such recent titles as *Women Writers in German-Speaking Countries* and *Lexikon Deutschsprachiger Schriftstellerinnen*.²⁸ The editors of *French Women Writers*, their title notwithstanding, state that “we have solved a traditional labeling problem in the broadest possible way, by considering French those who have written in French and identified themselves with French culture and intellectual life.”²⁹ In contrast, the editors of the *Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, “tried to observe a rule that the authors should be English in origin.”³⁰ On the other hand, true to the multilingual Russian nineteenth-century compilations of women, the *Dictionary of Russian Women Writers* addresses a major issue for post-Soviet Russian literary history by reuniting Soviet and émigré women writers, who took new nationalities and wrote in languages other than Russian.

In the past, compilers too raised these issues of what constituted literature including nonliterary as well as literary genres, along with manuscripts and such unpublished work as oral genres, as well as issues related to languages, nationalities, and authorial identity. Like the editors of the *Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, earlier compilers included unpublished works. DeJean notes that the eighteen French compilations from

1640 to 1715 that she consulted to compile her list of women writers contain women who did not publish or who talked rather than published: "The late ancien régime definitions of a woman writer was dictated by the concerns of the salons rather than by those of the academies."³¹ In England, John Duncombe equates manuscripts with performances in his preface to *Feminiad* (1751).³² Such early German compilers of women writers as Georg Christian Lehms (1715), Samuel Bauer (1790), and Carl von Schindel (1776–1830) included women who did not publish but had been read (1823–1825).³³ At the end of the nineteenth century, Sophie Pataky (1860–?) criticized Schindel for that decision and included only women who published. But at the same time, in Russia, Prince Nikolai Golitsyn (1836–1893) included women who did not publish (1889). In France, Fortunée Briquet (1782–1815) too included women's manuscripts as part of her overall goal of tracing women's influence in France (1804).³⁴

As might be expected, the largest compilations allowed the most diverse genres and specifically included nonliterary publications. In Germany, Bauer included translations (1790), while at the end of the nineteenth century, Pataky, who was part of the international feminist movement and viewed all women's writing as economic work, included not just literary genres but also cookbooks, household manual, and craft books. In France at the turn of the nineteenth century, Briquet included women in the sciences who published medical texts, translators, and women who were patronesses of the arts. In Russia, in his supplement to Golitsyn's dictionary, the bibliographer Stepan Ponomarev (1832–1913) makes a taxonomy of twenty-seven categories of writings: belles lettres, bibliography, drama, religious literature, natural sciences, Russian and general history, literary and educational history, criticism and reviews, mathematics, medicine, memoirs, music, folk education and literature, pedagogy, translation, political economics, poetry, journalism, travel, handwork, spiritualism, philosophy, (home) economics, arts, ethnography, jurisprudence, philology, publishers and editors, and bookstore owners and book publishers. Two categories have one woman each (spiritualism and political economics); "bibliographer" is a category of woman writer that only Ponomarev recognized.³⁵ Still, in 1892, Golitsyn's work was criticized for omitting the long tradition of women's oral contributions to folklore, a newly published genre of nineteenth-century national ethnography.³⁶

Nationality was already an issue at the turn of the nineteenth century. Briquet included naturalized foreigners in the title of her quantitative compilation: *Dictionnaire historique littéraire et bibliographique des françaises et des étrangères naturalisées en France*. In Germany, Bauer included women

who wrote in French, which was the second language of the German elite. Golitsyn made a separate bibliography of seventy-three Russian women who wrote in French; his bibliographic predecessor was Ghennady's compilation of Russians who published in French (1874).³⁷

Among recent bibliographers, the author and authorial identity interest the editors of the *Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, but this issue generated more interest in the past, especially among the quantitative compilers. Schindel brushed aside scruples about revealing the identities of anonymous German authors and those who used pseudonyms; likewise he raised the question of the unusual situation of women who were well known under their own names and then switched to anonymity.³⁸ Pataky followed up on his interest in pseudonyms and is unique among bibliographers for including men who used female pseudonyms.³⁹ In Russia, Golitsyn's dictionary contains pseudonymous and anonymous writers. These nineteenth-century feminist compilers expanded the categories of literature, nationality, and the author because they connected the ethnographic aspect of cataloguing as many women writers as possible with their nation's concomitantly higher degree of enlightened civilization and culture.

2

Like today's bibliographers, who share an international feminist mission, their eighteenth- and nineteenth-century predecessors were also internationalists, but they took up their task in a spirit of nationalistic competition. The opposition between "us" and "them" is most evident in compilers' introductions, where it also becomes clear that principles of selection and numbers of writers are measurable evidence for national superiority. In 1752, George Ballard begins his *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain Who Have Been Celebrated for Their Writings or Skill in the Learned Languages, Arts and Sciences* as follows: "When it is considered how much has been done on this subject by several learned foreigners, we may justly be surprised at this neglect among the writers of this nation, more especially as it is pretty certain that England has produced more women famous for literary accomplishments than any other nation in Europe."⁴⁰ Like his predecessors, he lists fourteen Italian, French, and German compilers from 1497 to 1692. Ballard heavily influenced the contents and the competitive thrust of a 1766 compendium, *Biographium Feminum: The Female*

Worthies; or, Memoirs of the Most Illustrious Ladies of All Ages and Nations, Who Have Been Eminently Distinguished for the Magnanimity, Learning, Genius, Virtue, Piety, and other Excellent Endowments, Conspicuous in All the Various Stations and Relations of Life, Public and Private. As it continues, the long title proclaims the special place of British women: *Containing (Exclusive of Foreigners) the Lives of Above Fourscore BRITISH LADIES, Who Have Shone with a Peculiar Lustre, and Given the Noblest Proofs of the Most Exalted Genius, and Superior Worth; Collected from HISTORY, the Most Approved Biographers, and Brought Down to the Present Time.*⁴¹ Of the 193 women in this volume, the anonymous author included 60 of the 63 women in Ballard's volume without acknowledging Ballard, which was typical.

For the next generation of compilers in England, the standard would be set by France, not Italy. In 1780, in *Sketches of the Lives and Writings of the Ladies of France*, Ann Thicnesse notes some of Ballard's learned women (without acknowledging Ballard) but claims that England has few, while "in France not less than four hundred women, some of very high birth, have been renowned for their literary talents."⁴² Her unacknowledged source for much of her work is Joseph La Porte's *Histoire littéraire des femmes françaises* (1769), a companion to Jean François de La Croix's *Dictionnaire historique portatif des femmes célèbres, contenant l'histoire des femmes savants, des actrices, et généralement des dames qui se sont rendues fameuses de tous les siècles par leurs aventures, les talents, l'esprit et le courage* (1769).⁴³ A century later, in two English compilations of women novelists, *French Women of Letters* (1862) and *English Women of Letters* (1863), Julia Kavanagh links "the two great literatures of modern times": "No French novelists were more eminent or more popular in their day than Mademoiselle de Scudéry or Madame de Staël, though two centuries divided them; and if we dare not say as much of our own Miss Edgeworth, spite her genius, we cannot forget that she helped to raise the European fame which eclipsed her own."⁴⁴ A second competition, between England and America appeared, but the English compilers expressed no such fears of inferior status. Jane Williams disdains the American compiler John Hart (as well as Sarah Hale): "America has ostentatiously marshaled for the Elysian field of fame the battalions of her 'Female Prose Writers.'"⁴⁵ American compilers, like their colleagues in Germany and Russia, had much to prove quantitatively as they tried to measure up to the idea of Europe, while England would continue to argue with France for the quality of its national, canonical writers.

The largest nineteenth-century quantitative bio-bibliographies appeared first in France by Briquet, then in Germany by Schindel and later by Pataky, and finally in Russia by Golitsyn and Ponomarev; significantly,

England did not produce any such compilations. They appeared in the same century as national bibliographies and literary histories that established literary canons, and in their critical arguments regarding the limitations of qualitative compilations, they posit other possible transnational, noncanonical narratives. In France, the Revolution led to the very first extensive national bibliography of women writers. Briquet compiled 565 writers, which in 1804 signaled the real beginning of listing every woman who wrote in any form whatsoever. Briquet acknowledges her many sources, including the four major compilations of women that directly preceded hers: La Porte's *Histoire littéraire des femmes françaises*, La Croix's *Dictionnaire portatif des femmes célèbres*, Billardon de Sauvigny's *La Parnasse des Dames* (1773), which includes Greek, English, Italian, Danish, German, as well as French women, and Louise de Keralio's *Collection des meilleurs ouvrages françois, composés par des femmes* (1786–89).⁴⁶ Notwithstanding Briquet's reliance on past compilations, *Dictionnaire historique littéraire et bibliographique des françaises et des étrangères naturalisées en France* is a unique document in France and elsewhere. Nicole Pellegrin notes that it is original for including contemporary women.⁴⁷ Indeed, when she published the *Dictionnaire historique* at age twenty-two, Briquet herself was already a published author of four odes, assorted poems, translations, and articles and was also a member of two literary societies.⁴⁸ Pellegrin explains the genesis of this project, which began with a revolutionary calendar published by her husband (*L'almanach des muses de l'école centrale du département des Deux-Sèvres*) that Briquet wrote, the subjects of which were plants in 1799, "les françaises célèbres par leurs écrits" ("French women famous for their writings") in 1800, and women artists and patrons of the arts in 1801. These 365 women replaced the men and women saints of the traditional calendar and of the many compilations that had followed in the models of Boccaccio and Pizan.⁴⁹ The *Dictionnaire historique* remains original today because in addition to noting women who were patronesses but not necessarily writers, Briquet combined her interests in literature and sciences by listing women who wrote in these areas, a testament to the broad understanding of "literature" in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

In her dedication, Briquet describes her expansive conception of women in the French literary field as a measure of French enlightened civilization. She dedicates her "ouvrage national" ("national work") to Napoleon Bonaparte, and the texts of both the dedication and the foreword make clear that it is a political and historical document with a national agenda and an author.⁵⁰ The last line of the foreword—"les siècles ou les femmes ont eu le plus d'empire, sont presque toujours ceux qui ont jeté le plus d'éclat"

("the centuries in which women have had the most influence are almost always those that were the most brilliant")—shows Briquet's Enlightenment goal of making the maximum number of women who were influential in literature numerically visible.⁵¹ Thus she includes those who did not write but were patronesses, as well as those who wrote (though they did not necessarily publish) in politics, history, philosophy, pedagogy, and the sciences, as well as literature.

In France's tradition of women of letters, Briquet's foreword, epigraph, and the contents indicate that *Dictionnaire historique* argues against the canonizing literary historical treatises that excluded women. In the manner of the epistolary novel of ideas and the centuries-long debate about the merits of learning for women, Briquet addresses two letters to an eighteen-year-old Élise with an outline of the history of women's influence on French literature, politics, and culture. She quotes Racine, La Fontaine, Horace, Cornificie, Voltaire, Molière, and Anacreon. She takes her epigraph, "Les ames n'ont point de sexe" ("Souls have no sex"), from Rousseau, an idea he borrowed from François Poullain's *De l'égalité des deux sexes* (*On the Equality of the Two Sexes*) (1673). She twice quotes the eminent French literary historian La Harpe to promote her idea that learning is good for women, although neither he nor Rousseau supported her cause. Rousseau took the maxim of the *querelle des femmes* and restated it as a question by St. Preaux in *Julie; ou, La nouvelle Héloïse* (1761). La Harpe had recently published his sixteen-volume *Lycée ou cours de littérature ancienne et moderne* (1797–1803), which included eleven women from the seventeenth century (most "boring," "forgotten," and "no longer read") and only four eighteenth-century women writers. Briquet's quantitative work handily rebuts La Harpe's canonical literary history written for the French education system for boys, which Joan DeJean argues excluded women on a qualitative basis and set the standard for subsequent such French literary histories.⁵² Briquet's pioneering quantitative bio-bibliography of women writers was a political document, part of the continuous back and forth of the battles of feminism that Karen Offen documents in *European Feminisms, 1700–1950: A Political History* (2000), in which she argues that no one, especially Rousseau, had the last word: "In particular, I try to shrink the long shadow of Jean-Jacques Rousseau."⁵³

Briquet viewed her work on an international scale. She knew German, English, Italian, and perhaps Latin, and in her entries on women, she notes their knowledge of languages.⁵⁴ In the entry on the historian Louise de Keralio (under her married name Robert) (1758–1821), one of her acknowledged predecessors, Briquet notes that in her massive projected thirty-six-volume *Collection des meilleurs ouvrages françois, composés par des femmes*, Keralio

envisioned similar historical compilations of works by English and Italian women.⁵⁵ These two women clearly shared an international understanding of women writers to which their enormous projects stood as national public monuments.

The ripples of a French wave of popular compilations of women spread to Germany and then Russia. Both Girard de Propiac's compilation of *femmes fortes* (1806) and Pierre Blanchard's compilation of illustrious men, *La Plutarque de la jeunesse* (1803) were translated first into German (1806–1807) and then into Russian (1816–17); in the Russian version, Blanchard's work was published with an addendum of illustrious women from Propiac.⁵⁶ In 1819–20, Russians published their first *femmes fortes* collection, compiled by anonymous Russian women, as two additional volumes to the translated French compilation by Blanchard and Propiac.⁵⁷ At this time in Germany, Schindel listed 550 women writers, which he found in twenty sources that had been published since 1780. In 1826 in St. Petersburg, Stepan Russov published his Russian catalogue of ninety-seven women listed alphabetically, while in Moscow, independently of Russov, *Damskii zhurnal* (*Ladies' Journal*), Mikhail Makarov published a chronological, historical compilation of sixty-eight women beginning in 1830.⁵⁸ In the second half of the nineteenth century, German and Russian compilers put together heavily quantitative bio-bibliographic compilations based on these works.

In contrast to the English compilers' preoccupation with the French on the one hand and with the Americans on the other, Russian and German compilers betray anxiety about developing a national culture compared with other "European" nations. Quantitative compilers were the most interested in expanding notions of literature, nationality, and the author, especially nineteenth-century Russian compilers, who had the most to prove nationally and internationally, with German compilers close behind.

German compilers focus on German unity, which is represented by the steadily increasing number of bibliographies of German women writers, as opposed to the more common bibliographies of women of individual German states. In *Deutsche Dichterinnen und Schriftstellerinnen in Wort und Bild* (1885), which came after German unification in 1871, Heinrich Gross counted 230 women as evidence of women's "contribution to the great cultural work of the German nation."⁵⁹ Qualitative judgments have a limited role in these heavily quantitative arguments, as Gross concedes that not all the works are "pearls."⁶⁰

At the end of the nineteenth century, Pataky published an extensive bibliography, *Lexikon deutscher Frauen der Feder: Eine Zusammenstellung der seit dem Jahre 1840 erschienenen Werke weiblicher Autoren, nebst Biographien*

der lebenden und einem Verzeichnis der Pseudonyme (1898), of over six hundred women that, like Briquet, she positions with respect to historical events that were significant for women. Inspired by the 1896 International Women's Congress in Berlin, Pataky compiled this bibliography of women's writing since the 1840s to document the tremendous changes in German women's lives. Pataky wryly notes that Schindel found 550 women for the first quarter of the nineteenth century, whereas more recent bibliographers concurred that it was closer to 48: "Allerdings verzeichnet Schindel auch jene Frauen, die irgend ein ungedruckt gebliebenes Gelegenheitsgedicht verfasst haben" ("Schindel listed any woman who had written any kind of unpublished occasional verse").⁶¹ However, in his introduction, Schindel poses as an amateur who began collecting information "ohne eine bestimmte Idee" ("without any particular idea").⁶² But Pataky's criticism was also directed at the excessively literary nature of Schindel's compilations.

In contrast to previous bibliographers but like feminist compilers today, Pataky was explicitly conscious of writing as a form of labor and production. For this reason, she treats all areas of women's writing, not only the writing of books, as work and includes editing and translating, often done anonymously. Pataky's emphasis on the economic function of pseudonyms rather than on their use as an expression of modesty, is echoed in Hesse's work on French women writers a century later.⁶³ In addition to the usual fiction and poetry, Pataky includes children's literature and such nonfictional genres as feminist pamphlets, religious writings, medical texts, cookbooks, craft books, and translations as work, thus reflecting the extensive nature of quantitative compilations. Pataky greatly expanded the scope of quantitative compilations without resorting to unpublished works, and indeed, her emphasis on writing as work makes publication itself an important economic activity for women. Like compilers today, she defined "German women" linguistically to include women in Austria and Switzerland, which allowed her to include more than just German women. As another quantitative measure of the achievements of German women writers, she envisioned creating a lending library, a "Bibliothek deutscher Frauenwerke" ("library of German women's works"), for which she assembled 1,030 books from the women to whom she sent out requests for information.⁶⁴

By the close of the nineteenth century in Russia, the great bibliographer Avgusta Mez'er (1869–1935) made a separate bibliography of six bibliographies of women writers, already the third such bibliography of Russian bibliographies.⁶⁵ Although Russians began writing and compiling later, by the end of the nineteenth century, the combined work of Golitsyn and Ponomarev was by far the largest such compilation, with a total of 1,705

women. The Russians worried about their reputation in Europe as a whole, and this is evident in the title of Ponomarev's essay on Golitsyn's dictionary: "Our Women Writers" ("ours" vs. "theirs"). A conservative civil servant with degrees in philology and law (1858), writing under the humorous pseudonym Knizhnik ("the Bookish One"), Golitsyn published increasingly larger compilations of women, beginning in 1857 (314 writers through 1855), then 1865 (440 writers through 1859), and in 1880 (1,043 writers through 1875).⁶⁶ In his final work, *Bibliograficheskii slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits* (*Bio-bibliographic Dictionary of Russian Women Writers*) (1889), he listed 1,286 writers, with pseudonyms, biographies, and lists of all publications in all languages and disciplines, in addition to references for translations, reviews, and essays about the writers. In 1891, Ponomarev added 419 writers to Golitsyn's dictionary, including women booksellers, publishers, and bibliographers. Golitsyn took up his work in response to political debates about women's place in Russian society:

Vmeste s bol'shinstvom nashego mysliaščego obščestva ia schitaïu znakomstvo s umstvennym razvitiem russkoi zhenshchiny stol'ko zhe neobkhodimym, kak i vsiakoe stremlenie k vozstanovleniiu ee znachenii i prizvaniia v russkom obščestve. . . . Zankomstvo s literaturnoi deiatel'nost'iu nashikh pisatel'nits v predshestvuiushchee vremia, mozhët byt', otchasti primirit' nas nemnogo s ee proshedshim i eshche bolee zastavit' nas uvazhat' ee v nastoiashchem.⁶⁷

(Along with the majority of our thinking public, I consider it absolutely necessary to acquaint oneself with the mental development of the Russian woman and with any attempt to establish her significance and purpose in Russian society. . . . Knowledge of the literary activity of our women writers in the past may reconcile us with her past and force us all the more to respect her in the present).

By 1889, with so many writers, Golitsyn simply concluded that his bibliography was "dlia izuchenii istorii russkoi slovesnosti" ("for the study of the history of Russian literature").⁶⁸ In 1891, Ponomarev challenged Russian women writers to write their own compilation, arguing that "sily mezhdu nimi naidutsia" ("they will find strength in numbers").⁶⁹ In his attempt to measure the achievements of Russian women and Russia's enlightenment in its cultural and intellectual life, Ponomarev catalogues such genres as spiritual writings and activities as editing, publishing and bookselling, and such topics as family dynasties of women writers, class origins, provincial towns,

and salaries that prefigure some of the concerns of the recent *Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, and the database Orlando.

Thus the three main quantitative compilations of the nineteenth century, by Briquet, Pataky, and Golitsyn and Ponomarev, have clear roots in feminist movements in France, Germany, and Russia and in the international feminist movement, as well as in the international Enlightenment ideals of civilization. They raise questions about genre, literature, publication, nationality, and authorial identity that concern feminist compilers today, especially those of English women writers, who lack a nineteenth-century quantitative bio-bibliography. Elsewhere in Europe in the nineteenth century, as the French (and Italian) traditions of women writers seemed to wane, so did compilations of women writers after the publication of a major French retrospective literary bibliography of the time.⁷⁰ The English (and American) traditions of compilations of women writers coalesced in a handful of works around 1860. The recent renewed international interest in feminist compilations of women and the new potential of digital humanities databases offer possibilities for other quantitative, noncanonical, transnational narratives for women in literary history.

3

Only in the 1970s, after decades of little activity, did bio-bibliographic compilers of women writers again take up the work of their nineteenth-century predecessors, and from an international perspective. Still, we can clearly see that compilers have inherited historical tendencies toward either extensive or intensive narratives from their national traditions, while other possibilities have gone unexplored. In the 1990s, databases began to develop the potential of quantitative approaches to connect women, their writings, readers, and nations in new ways. But with a few important exceptions, most databases tend to enhance rather than transform the national narratives they have inherited.

Beginning in the 1970s, series of compilations appeared that expanded the national literatures and languages available. They are nevertheless mostly limited in scope and thus stand as selective, qualitative compilations. The series from Greenwood Press and Garland Publishing with biographies and limited bibliographies came out of the Modern Language Association's Division of Women's Studies in Language and Literature in 1976.⁷¹ The former includes two appendices, a historical timeline, and a chronology of women writers, while the latter, a series called "Women Writers of the

World” with volumes devoted to women writing in Dutch, French, Latin, and Russian, includes a translated selection. Greenwood continues to publish bio-bibliographic sourcebooks, which include a handful about women scientists, as well as many about women artists and writers—by nation (Irish), by region (Scandinavia), by continent (Spanish America), by period (1900–1945), by genre (plays), by religion (Catholic), and combinations of these categories in a format that limits editors to fifty to sixty entries.

Many other bio-bibliographic compilations have also appeared, and overall, the decision to embrace writing as broadly as possible seems more problematic for French and German women’s literatures than for English and Russian literatures. Traditionally, and at present, Russian and French compilations are at the opposite ends of the spectrum: the Russians list the most and the French list the fewest women writers. The editors of the *Dictionary of Russian Women Writers* (1994), like Golitsyn and Ponomarev (1,705 writers), might have included “*thousands*” (emphasis in original) of writers but instead settled on 448, making it second only to Todd’s *A Dictionary of British and American Women Writers* (1985) with 452 women.⁷² *French Women Writers* has the fewest, 52, despite another possible model, Briquet’s extensive bibliography with 565 writers; it begins with a quote from George Eliot on the importance of French women writers for English women writers, signaling its focus on canonicity and on its traditional relations with England.⁷³

Indeed, French literature scholars continue to historicize literary history in order to recuperate canonical women writers rather than dramatically expand the notions of woman author and literature. With the exception of Briquet, Hesse, and an online project at the University of Ottawa (Les écrits féminins non-fictionnels du Moyen Âge au XVIIIe siècle [2001–2005]), French scholars have yet to go down the path of English literary scholars and produce extensive bibliographies that include genres other than fiction and poetry.⁷⁴ For example, the ARTFL database from the prestigious Centre national de la recherche scientifique reincorporates canonical women writers to create a new dictionary of the French language.⁷⁵ DeJean is hopeful that students may take the word of the Internet (“without a critical apparatus to direct their judgment”) that these women are classics.⁷⁶ DeJean remains focused on the novel, as does Naomi Schor in her study of George Sand (1993), while Margaret Cohen argues for a reevaluation of the history of the sentimental novels of forgotten French women writers (1999). Cohen and Carolyn Dever’s collection *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel* (2002) reaffirms France’s role in shaping the nineteenth-century (English) novel.

In contrast to recent French and Russian bibliographies, German and English collections appear to be reexamining their inherited traditions, the latter in an extensive way and the former in an intensive way. In contrast to the nearly 600 women from many areas of writing in Pataky's *Lexikon, Lexikon deutschsprachiger Schriftstellerinnen, 1800–1945* (1986) has 200 writers, *Women Writers of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland* (1989) has 185 writers, and the more recent *Women Writers in German-Speaking Countries* (1998) has 54 writers, the last being accompanied by extensive essays. Elke Frederiksen, the editor of the first two volumes, notes the tendency to focus on major authors.⁷⁷ The exception is Elisabeth Friedrichs's bibliography for four thousand women (1981), probably the record for any literature. But Friedrichs focuses on belles lettres to limit the size of her *Lexikon*, and the biographical information she provides is minimal, although, like Ponomarev in the nineteenth century, she lists family dynasties of writers. "So nahm ich reine Reiseschriftstellerinnen, Briefschreiberinnen, Geographinnen, Frauenrechtlerinnen, politische, wissenschaftliche und geistliche Schriftstellerinnen, soweit ich nicht wenigstens ein Gedicht von ihnen fand, nicht auf" ("I did not include women writers of purely travel literature, letters, biographies, women's rights, politics, learning, and religion if I could not find at least one poem").⁷⁸ Ruth-Ellen Bötcher Joeres criticizes Friedrichs's bibliography as not sufficiently feminist because she excludes such genres as travel writing, letters, and spiritual writings, and identifies women briefly by their fathers and husbands.⁷⁹ Since then, travel literature has become an important theme in German women's literary history, and the compilations that have followed complement Friedrichs's *Lexikon* and take up such nonliterary narratives, thereby expanding the groundwork for integrating recovered writers into literary histories. For example, the collection *A History of Women's Writing in Germany, Austria and Switzerland* fills out biographies with historical background.⁸⁰ Thus the differences among compilers over the category of literature remain as contentious now as they were a century ago among German compilers.

Current English bibliographies are relatively extensive by English standards and show a productive dialogue between literary history and bibliography. In 1978, Elaine Showalter set the literary historical agenda, providing a biographical appendix that includes 213 women writers since 1800.⁸¹ Compilers acted on Showalter's challenge and moved back before 1800 and beyond novels to provide the extensive bibliographies that a survey of past compilations shows British women writers have never had. For example, the *Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, true to its narrative that challenges bibliography for its "modern (capitalist)

definition of the literary commodity which is inapplicable to this period," has 400 writers, including 150 who wrote, but did not publish at the time or at all.⁸² Todd's *A Dictionary of British and American Women Writers* has the record, at 452; her *British Women Writers* (1989) has 440.⁸³ She calls for more diversity to disrupt postmodern and psychoanalytic theorizing of feminism that relies on a few key texts.⁸⁴ With a focus on published works, four volumes subtitled *Bibliographies of American and British Writers* cover personal writings, poetry, drama, and short fiction by women to 1900 and include over six thousand works per volume.⁸⁵ Showalter too has gone back to the seventeenth century in a popular literary history that covers the period from 1650 to 2000 and over 250 women writers.⁸⁶ In 1978, Showalter's subtitle was "from Brontë to Lessing," two names that needed no introduction, while in 2009, she provides first names for her subtitle, "from Anne Bradstreet to Annie Proulx"; Showalter's decision to foreground Bradstreet, a lesser known seventeenth-century poet, in a popular history shows that much has changed in English and American women's literary history since 1978.

Since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, the reevaluation of Russian literary history as a whole has included women in important ways. The enormous bio-bibliographic project *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917* (*Russian Writers*) addresses the problems of Soviet and prerevolutionary Russian literary history by noting lack of access to archives for political reasons, a politicized canon and deification of literary stars, and the disappearance or distortion of writers who had fallen out of political favor.⁸⁷ *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917*, contains many more women writers than earlier compilations—286 women (out of 2,377 writers, midway up through "S" with two more volumes planned and a projected total of 3,500 writers to be included)—and already has more than the approximately 250 writers that *Dictionary of Russian Women Writers* lists for this period. Thus far, their lists overlap only 45 percent, which indicates they have different aims. Both include translators, children's writers, publishers, political activists, educators, and religious figures. *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917*, however, includes more memoirists (often writing about male writers), as well as the wives and sisters of male writers, uncovering many additional literary relationships and a richer literary culture. This extensive Russian bio-bibliographic tradition appears to continue independent of literary histories, which are mainly collections of essays on some literary aspects of this diverse information, with an emphasis on common themes for women who wrote "as women" with an interest in women's issues.⁸⁸

Meanwhile, feminist bibliography has entered the computer age, which, as happened when the printing press was invented, has drastically

increased results and has made selection all the more important. Feminist bibliographers have focused on improving selection by making the restricted vocabulary of subject indexing more flexible and capacious to better reflect the new topographies of literary history.⁸⁹ The largest new area of feminist work online has been text projects to make rare or inaccessible works by women available and searchable, including some compilations mentioned in this article, mainly from the nineteenth century. Projects such as the Brown University Women Writers Project (English women's texts from 1400 to 1850), Brigham Young University's SOPHIE (a digital library of works by German-speaking women), DIOTIMA: Material for Study of Women and Gender in the Ancient World, and the University of Chicago's ARTFL French Women Writers (Project for American and French Research Treasury of the French Language) are therefore an outgrowth of feminist bibliographic work but not in themselves bibliographic.⁹⁰ The online feminist bibliographic project has mainly take the form of bibliographies of secondary feminist literature, while the primary sources of older compilations that comprise this project remain less accessible.

Two large projects are, however, innovative in ways that create new connections between bio-bibliographical categories. The most extensive English compilation thus far, *Orlando: Women's Writing in the British Isles from the Beginnings to the Present* (Research Institute for Women's Writing, University of Alberta) is a very large tagged text-based project launched in 2006 with necessarily extensive paratexts.⁹¹ The life and writing tagsets of 205 tags, with 114 subtags, and a further set of 635 subsubtags, have been applied to text selections from critical commentaries on 1,253 entries (950 British women writers, 164 male writers, 139 other women writers), with a bibliography of 20,000 entries, which would add up to over fifty printed volumes. The editors argue for "the unquantifiable" and the interrelationships that will yield many histories, and include not only British (and Irish) women, but handle the nuances of nationality and Britain as a place for writings by men and women from abroad in languages other than English. They include nonliterary writings and manuscripts. The size and architecture of this project, which will include three overview volumes that will be available online and in print, precludes the stereotypes of women's writing, feminist and otherwise, that can affect qualitative compilations. The focus on writing production lends itself to more extensive, quantitative women's literary history as the editors note in the scholarly introduction: "The chronological material also covers publishing and book-trade issues, general social, cultural, and political history, and every kind of development felt to be inextricable from the study of women's experience and women's

writing. Any expectation of redrawing the profile of history to play down such 'masculine' events as battles, treaties, etc. was deflected by the fact that a good deal of writing by women addresses these very topics." Bigger is clearly better when the goal is to decanonize literature, historicize national literary histories, and open these narratives to many more nations and writers internationally. Yet the size of the research team required for such a project, not to mention the humanities computing expertise, is formidable.

WomenWriters, an interactive international database project launched by New approaches to European Women Writers (NEWW) at the Huygens Institute in 2001, documents the reception networks of women writers transnationally before 1900 using new sources and some of the compilations in this study.⁹² In its current phase, under a four-year grant (2009–2013) from European Cooperation in Science and Technology, this project significantly expands the scope of such projects as *The Literary Channel's* examination of literary relations between England and France in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Brown University Women Writers Project's foray into the transatlantic reception of women's writings between Britain and America, and Franco Moretti's *Atlas of the European Novel, 1800–1900*. It includes many other nations, especially such smaller ones as Belgium, Switzerland, Portugal, and Spain, which like the Netherlands were much more active as receptors than England and France in transnational literary networks. With over 120 participants from twenty-six countries, this diversification of transnational dialogues beyond the usual one between England and France seems modern but turns out to have historical roots that are central to this comparative historiography of compilations of women.

Diverse recent bibliographic solutions to different problems of feminist literary history echo similar problems and solutions that were recognized over two centuries ago. Databases such as NEWW and Orlando offer the potential for large projects to change literary historical models by expanding the nations, languages, genres, and the possible range of connections between these categories in order to trace the presence of women in the international literary field over centuries. Yet even projects of this scope had a predecessor in Keralio's planned thirty-six-volume *Collection des meilleurs ouvrages françois, composés par des femmes*.

This comparative overview of bibliographic compilations of women writers as part of the historiography of women's literary history yields a dynamic model of interconnected moving parts. Such classification categories as author, woman writer, nationality, literature, and publication turn out to have been matters of debate among compilers for several hundred

years. Those debates took place both in the selections and the paratexts of compilations, as compilers turned to colleagues for sources and forged a national, transnational, and European, genre. As authors and literary historians, compilers in the past recognized similar issues that concern feminist bio-bibliographers and literary historians today and provided some provocative solutions that prefigure current projects. Yet while bio-bibliographic compilations and literary historical essays participate in national conversations, few engage in the newly rediscovered transnational dialogues that in fact have been an aspect of such texts since their debut in fourteenth-century Italy. These transnational networks offer the possibility of large-scale narratives that could temper qualitative national narratives and allow many more women, works, and nations to participate in histories of literature in Europe.

The surprise in this survey, I argue, is the historical importance and persistence of quantitative compilations as strategic interventions (most recently, Hesse) in the qualitative canon making of national literary historical narratives. Bio-bibliographic compilations have long been historical, political, and even literary writings, but with the advent of national literary historical narratives in the eighteenth century, quantitative bibliographies acquired newly important diversifying functions in their wealth of details. Historicizing centuries of transnational compilations of women continues to offer fresh approaches to feminist literary history.

Notes

1. Ann M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), 161–64.

2. Lists consulted include, in English literature, Paula McDowell, “Consuming Women: The Life of the ‘Literary Lady’ as Popular Culture in Eighteenth-Century England,” *Genre* 26.2–3 (1993): 246–48, and Jane Williams, *The Literary Women of England, Including a Biographical Epitome of All the Most Eminent to the Year 1700 and Sketches of the Poetesses to the Year 1850 with Extracts from Their Works, and Critical Remarks* (London: Saunders, Otley, 1861), 1–13; in French, “Dictionnaires anciens,” SIEFAR: Société internationale pour l’étude des femmes de l’ancien régime, www.siefar.org, and Joan DeJean, *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 219–21; in German, Dorothea Behnke, “Dass weiblichen Geschlechte an Tapfferkeit/Klugheit/Gelehrsamkeit und andern Haupt-Tugenden, gar nichts fehle”: *Lexika zu Schriftstellerinnen aus dem deutschsprachigen Raum* (Osnabrück: Zeller, 1999), Carl Wilhelm Otto August von Schindel, *Die Deutschen Schriftstellerinnen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (New York: Georg Olms, 1978 [1823–25]), xxix–xxxii, Sophie Pataky, *Lexikon deutscher Frauen der Feder: Eine Zusammenstellung der seit dem Jahre 1840 erschienenen Werke weiblicher Autoren, nebst Biographien der lebenden und einem Verzeichnis der Pseudonyme* (Berlin: Carl Pataky, 1898), xiii–xv, and Elisabeth Friedrichs, *Die deutschsprachigen Schriftstellerinnen des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Lexikon* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1981), ix–xxi; and in Russian, Avgusta V. Mez’er, *Russkaia slovesnost’ s XI po XIX stoletiiia vkhliuchitel’no. Bibliograficheskii ukazatel’ proizvedenii russkoi slovesnosti v sviazi s istoriei literatury i kritiki*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg: A. Porokhovshchikov, 1899), 1:16.

3. Ann Thomson, Simon Burrows, and Edmond Dziembowski, eds., *Cultural Transfers: France and Britain in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, UK: Voltaire Foundation, 2010); Stefanie Stockhorst, ed., *Cultural Transfer Through Translation: The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by Means of Translation* (New York: Rodopi, 2010).
4. DeJean, *Tender Geographies*, 6–7; Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Dever, introduction to *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel*, ed. Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Dever (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 1–34; Naomi Schor, *George Sand and Idealism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 119; Amy Kaminsky, “Issues for an International Feminist Literary Criticism,” *Signs* 19.1 (1993): 213–27.
5. Nancy K. Miller, *Subject to Change: Reading Feminist Writing* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 17–18.
6. Conte Pietro Leopoldo Ferri, *Biblioteca femminile italiana* (Padua: Crescini, 1842).
7. Franco Moretti, *Atlas of the European Novel, 1800–1900* (New York: Verso, 1998), 152.
8. Aleksandr Smirdin, *Rospis’ rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia, iz biblioteki Aleksandra Smirdina, Sistematicheskim poriadkom raspolzheniia, v chetyrekh chastiakh, s prilozheniem: Azbuchnoi Rospisi imen sochinitelei i perevodchikov, i Kratkoj Rospisi knigam po azbuchnomy poriadku* (St. Petersburg: Aleksandr Smirdin, 1828); Aleksandr Smirdin, *Pervoe pribavlenie k rospisi rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia iz biblioteki Aleksandra Smirdina* (St. Petersburg: Aleksandr Smirdin, 1829); Aleksandr Smirdin, *Vtoroe pribavlenie k rospisi rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia iz biblioteki Aleksandra Smirdina* (St. Petersburg: Aleksandr Smirdin, 1832); Aleksandr Smirdin, *Tret’e pribavlenie k rospisi rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia iz biblioteki Petra Krashennnikova, Prodolzhenie k prezhde-izdannym rospisiam A. F. Smirdina* (St. Petersburg: Iakov Trei, 1852); Aleksandr Smirdin, *Chetvertoe pribavlenie k rospisi rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia iz biblioteki Petra Krashennnikova, Prodolzhenie k prezhde-izdannoj rospisi A. F. Smirdina* (St. Petersburg: Eduard Veimar, 1856).
9. Peter Garside, James Raven, and Rainer Schöwerling, eds., *The English Novel 1770–1829: A Bibliographic Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles*, 2 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:64, 74.
10. Hilde Hoogenboom, “The Community of Letter and the Nation State: Bio-Bibliographic Compilations as a Transnational Genre around 1700,” paper presented at “Women Telling Nation” conference, Madrid, November 2010.
11. Lodovico Domenichi, *Rime diverse d’alcune nobilissime e virtuosissime donne* (Lucca: Vincenzo Busdragho, 1559); Francesco Agostino della Chiesa, *Theatro delle donne letterate con un breve discorso della preminenza, e perfectione del sesso donnesco* (Mondovì: Giovanni Gislandi and Gio. Tomaso Rossi, 1620); Pierre de Bourdeille, *Les vies des dames illustres de France de son temps* (Leiden: Jean Sambix le jeune, 1665).
12. Matthias Henriksen Schacht, “Schediasma, exhibens Specimen de Eruditis Mulieribus Daniae,” *Nova literaria Maris Baltici et Septentrionis* (Lübeck, 1700): 209–19; Georg Christian Lehms, *Deutschlands galante Poetinnen Mit Ihnen sinnreichen und netten Proben: Nebst einem Anhang Ausländer Dames, so sich gleichfalls durch Schöne Poesien Bey der curieusen Welt bekannt gemacht, und einer Vorrede. Dass das Weibliche Geschlecht so geschickt zum Studiren als das Männliche* (Frankfurt am Main: Anton Heinscheidt, 1714–15); George Ballard, *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain Who Have Been Celebrated for Their Writings or Skill in the Learned Languages, Arts, and Sciences*, ed. Ruth Perry, (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1985 [1752]).
13. Albert Thura, *Gynaeceum daniae literatum* (Altona: Joham Korte, 1732).
14. McDowell, “Consuming Women,” 223; Joan DeJean, “Classical Reeducation: Decanonizing the Feminine,” in *The Politics of Tradition: Placing Women in French Literature*, ed. Joan DeJean and Nancy K. Miller, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988), 26–39; Anne-Marie Thiesse and Helene Mathieu, “The Decline of the Classical and Birth of the Classics,” in *The Politics of Tradition*, 208–28; Margaret Cohen, *The Sentimental Education of the Novel*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 15; Nikolai Grech, *Opyt kratkoi istorii ruskoi literatury* (St. Petersburg: Nikolai Grech, 1822); Hilde Hoogenboom, “The Non-Canonical Canon: From Nikolai Novikov’s *Historical Dictionary to Dictionary of Russian Women Writers*,” in *Mapping the Feminine: Russian Women and Cultural Difference*, ed. Hilde Hoogenboom, Catharine Nepomnyashchy, and Irina Reyfman (Bloomington, IN: Slavica,

2008), 281–300; Gisela Brinker-Gabler, “Die Schriftstellerin in der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft: Aspekte Ihrer Rezeption von 1835 bis 1910,” *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German* 9.1 (1976): 15–28; Helen Fronius, “Der reiche Mann und die arme Frau: German Women Writers and the Eighteenth-Century Literary Marketplace,” *German Life and Letters* 56.1 (2003): 1–19.

15. Brita Rang, “A ‘Learned Wave’: Women of Letters and Sciences from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment,” in *Perspectives on Feminist Political Thought in European History: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Tjitske Akkerman and Siep Stuurman (New York: Routledge, 1998), 50–66.

16. D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London: British Library, 1986), 20; Sarah Josepha Hale, *Woman's Record; or, Sketches of All Distinguished Women from “The Beginning” till A.D. 1850, Arranged in Four Eras with Selections from Female Writers of Every Age (Illustrated by Two Hundred and Thirty Portraits)* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1853); Williams, *The Literary Women of England*, 12.

17. Maureen Bell, George Parfitt, and Simon Shepherd, eds., *A Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1990), xii.

18. Bell, Parfitt, and Shepherd, *A Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, xiii.

19. Janet Todd, ed., *A Dictionary of British and American Women Writers, 1660–1800* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld, 1985).

20. Margaret J. M. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

21. Margaret J. M. Ezell, *Writing Women's Literary History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

22. Ezell, *Writing Women's Literary History*, 221; Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1989 [1929]).

23. Carla Hesse, “French Women in Print, 1750–1800: An Essay in Historical Bibliography,” *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 359 (1998): 65–82; Carla Hesse, *The Other Enlightenment: How French Women Became Modern* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).

24. Harriet Guest, *Small Change: Women, Learning, Patriotism, 1750–1810* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 51–52.

25. Nikolai V. Zdobnov, *Istoriia russkoi bibliografii do nachala XX veka* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1951), 360–61.

26. Hesse, “French Women in Print, 1750–1800,” 35.

27. Nikolai N. Golitsyn, *Bibliograficheskii slovar' russkikh pisatel' nits* (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1974 [1889]), 296–98; Stepan Russov, *Bibliograficheskii katalog rossiiskim pisatel' nitsam* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia meditsinskogo departamenta Ministerstva vnutrennikh del, 1826), 27–28; Eva Martin Sartori and Dorothy Wynne Zimmerman, eds., *French Women Writers: A Bio-Bibliographic Source Book* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991), 253–61; Pataky, *Lexikon deutscher Frauen der Feder*, 460.

28. Elke Frederiksen and Elizabeth G. Ametsbichler, eds., *Women Writers in German-Speaking Countries: A Bio-Bibliographic Critical Sourcebook* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998); Gisela Brinker-Gabler, Karola Ludwig, and Angela Wöffen, eds., *Lexikon deutschsprachiger Schriftstellerinnen 1800–1945* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch, 1986).

29. Sartori and Zimmerman, introduction to *French Women Writers*, x.

30. Bell, Parfitt, and Shepherd, *A Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, xv.

31. DeJean, *Tender Geographies*, 201.

32. John Duncombe, *The Feminiad: A Poem* (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1981 [1754]).

33. Samuel Bauer Lehms, *Deutschlands Schriftstellerinnen: Eine charakteristische Skizze* (Stuttgart: Heinz, 1990 [1790]).

34. Fortunée B. Briquet, *Dictionnaire historique, littéraire et bibliographique des françaises et des étrangères naturalisées en France, connues par leurs écrits, ou par la protection qu'elles ont accordée*

aux gens de lettres, depuis l'établissement de la monarchie jusqu'à nos jours, dédié au premier consul par Mme Fortunée B. Briquet, de la société des belles lettres, et de l'Athénée des Arts de Paris (Paris: Indigo and Côté-femmes éditions, 1997 [1804]).

35. Stepan I. Ponomarev, "Nashi pisatel'nitsy," in *Sbornik otdelenii russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti* (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1974 [1881]), 1–22.

36. Petr V. Vladimirov, *Pervye russkie pisatel'nitsy XVIII veka i uchastie russkoi zhenshchiny v razvitií narodnoi slovesnosti i drevne-russkoi pis'mennosti (kritiko-istoricheskii ocherk)* (Kiev: Tip. Imp. Universiteta sv. Vladimira, 1892).

37. Grégoire Ghennady, *Les écrivains franco-russes: Bibliographie des ouvrages français publiés par des russes* (Dresden: Blockmann et fils, 1874).

38. Schindel, *Die Deutschen Schriftstellerinnen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, xix–xxv.

39. Pataky, *Lexikon deutscher Frauen der Feder*, 1.

40. Ballard, *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain Who Have Been Celebrated for Their Writings or Skill in the Learned Languages, Arts, and Sciences*, 53.

41. *Biographium Femineum: The Female Worthies; or, Memoirs of the Most Illustrious Ladies of All Ages and Nations, Who Have Been Eminently Distinguished for the Magnanimity, Learning, Genius, Virtue, Piety, and other Excellent Endowments, Conspicuous in All the Various Stations and Relations of Life, Public and Private*, 2 vols. (London: S. Crowder and J. Payne, 1766).

42. Ann Thickett, *Sketches of the Lives and Writing of the Ladies of France* (London: Dodsley and W. Brown, 1780), xx.

43. Joseph La Porte, *Histoires littéraire des femmes françaises; ou, Lettres historiques et critiques, contenant un précis de la vie et une analyse raisonnée des ouvrage des femmes qui se sont distinguées dans la littérature française, par une société de gens de lettres* (Paris: Lacombe, 1769); Jean-François de La Croix, *Dictionnaire historique portatif des femmes célèbres*, 3 vols. (Paris: L. Cellot, 1769). Suzan van Dijk pointed out this connection to me.

44. Julia Kavanagh, *French Women of Letters: Biographical Sketches*, 2 vols. (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1862), vi, v–vi; Julia Kavanagh, *English Women of Letters: Biographical Sketches*, 2 vols. (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1863).

45. Williams, *The Literary Women of England*, 11.

46. Billardon de Sauvigny, *Le Parnasse des Dames*, 9 vols. (Paris: Ruault, 1773); Louise de Keralio, *Collection des meilleurs ouvrages françois, composés par des femmes, dédiée aux femmes françaises*, 14 vols. (vols. 1–4, 9–14, Paris: Lagrange, 1786–88; vols. 5–6, Paris: Claude-François Marande, 1789).

47. Nicole Pellegrin, "Entre local et international, botanique, poésie et 'féminisme': Fortunée Briquet (Niort 1782–1815)," in *Les apports de l'histoire des provinces et des régions à l'histoire nationale: VIIe Assises Nationales de l'Union Française des Universités de Tous Ages, Mai 13–15, 1993* (Versailles: UFUTA, 1993), 97–110; "Marguerite-Ursule-Fortunée Bernier," http://www.siefar.org/dictionnaire/fr/Marguerite-Ursule-Fortun%C3%percentAge_Bernier.

48. Pellegrin, "Entre local et international, botanique, poésie et 'féminisme,'" 102.

49. Pellegrin, "Entre local et international, botanique, poésie et 'féminisme,'" 103.

50. Briquet, *Dictionnaire historique, littéraire et bibliographique des françaises et des étrangères naturalisées en France*, vii.

51. Briquet, *Dictionnaire historique, littéraire et bibliographique des françaises et des étrangères naturalisées en France*, xxxiv.

52. DeJean, "Classical Reeduction," 37.

53. Karen Offen, *European Feminisms, 1700–1950: A Political History* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), 28.

54. Pellegrin, "Entre local et international, botanique, poésie et 'féminisme,'" 98.

55. Briquet, *Dictionnaire historique, littéraire et bibliographique des françaises et des étrangères naturalisées en France*, 284.

56. Catherine-Joseph-Ferdinand Girard de Propiac, *Plutarque des jeunes demoiselles; ou, Abrégé des vies des femmes illustres de tous les pays, avec des leçons explicatives de leurs actions et de leurs ouvrages*, 2 vols. (Paris: Gérard, 1806); Pierre Blanchard, *Plutarque de la jeunesse; ou, Abrégé des vies des plus grands hommes de toutes les nations, depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours*

(Paris, le Prieur, 1803–4); Pierre Blanchard, *Neuer Plutarch; oder, Kurze Lebensbeschreibungen der berühmtesten Männer aller Nationen von den ältesten bis auf unsere Zeiten* (Vienna: Anton Doll, 1806–7); Pierre Blanchard and Catherine-Joseph-Ferdinand Girard de Propiac, *Plutarkh dlia prekrasnogo pola, ili zbiznepochisania velikikh i slavnnykh zhen vsekh natsii, drevnikh i novykh vremen*, 4 vols. (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1816–17).

57. *Plutarkh dlia prekrasnogo pola, ili gallereia znamenitykh Rossiianok*, vols. 5–6 (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1819–20).

58. Russov, *Bibliograficheskii katalog rossiiskim pisatel'nitsam*; Mikhail N. Makarov, "Materialy dlia istorii russkikh zhenshchin-avtorov," *Damskii zhurnal* 29.1 (1830): 1–5, 29.2 (1830): 17–23, 29.3 (1830): 33–5, 29.7 (1830): 97–102, 29.10 (1830): 145–51, 29.13 (1830): 193–8, 30.15 (1830): 17–20, 30.16 (1830): 33–9, 30.17 (1830): 49–58, 30.18 (1830): 65–76, 30.19 (1830): 81–83, 30.21 (1830): 113–21, 30.25 (1830): 177–85, 31.27 (1830): 1–8, 31.29 (1830): 33–44, 31.30 (1830): 49–55, 31.39 (1830): 193–201, 32.51–52 (1830): 113–20, 35.37 (1831): 161–66, 44.51–2 (1833): 145–50.

59. Heinrich Gross, *Deutsche Dichterinnen und Schriftstellerinnen in Wort und Bild*, 3 vols. (Berlin: Fr. Thiel, 1885), iv.

60. Gross, *Deutsche Dichterinnen und Schriftstellerinnen in Wort und Bild*, iv.

61. Schindel, *Die Deutschen Schriftstellerinnen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, ix.

62. Schindel, *Die Deutschen Schriftstellerinnen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, xiii.

63. Hesse, *The Other Enlightenment*, 74–76.

64. Dagmar Jank, "Anmerkungen zum Teilnachlass von Sophie Pataky (1860–?) im Archiv der deutschen Frauenbewegung in Kassel," http://forge.fh-potsdam.de/~ABD/jank/sophie_pataky.pdf.

65. Mez'er, *Russkaia slovesnost' s XI po XIX stoletiiia vkluchitel'no. Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' proizvedenii russkoi slovesnosti v sviazi s istoriei literatury i kritiki*, 16.

66. Nikolai N. Golitsyn, "Spisok russkim pisatel'nitsam 1759–1857," *Molva* 28–30, 32, 34, 35 (1857); Nikolai N. Golitsyn, "Slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits," *Russkii arkhiv* 9.10–11 (1865): 1139–1232; Nikolai N. Golitsyn, "Slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits," *Varshavskii dnevnik* (1880): 176, 178, 180, 182, 183, 185, 186, 188, 189, 194, 196–98, 202, 209–12 (1880): 137, 138, 140, 141, 143, 144, 146, 148–51, 155–57, 159, 161, 162, 165–67, 171, 173, 177–84, 186, 187, 191.

67. Golitsyn, "Slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits," 1141.

68. Golitsyn, "Slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits," vi.

69. Golitsyn, "Slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits," 22.

70. Jules Boilly and Albert de Montferrand, eds., *Biographie des femmes auteurs contemporaine françaises* (Paris: Armand Aubrée, 1836); *Galerie des dames françaises distinguées dans les lettres et les arts ancienne monarchie; empire; restauration; époque actuelle*. (Paris: Dussillon, 1840s).

71. Elke Frederiksen, ed., *Women Writers of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland: An Annotated Bio-bibliographical Guide* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1989), viii.

72. Marina Ledkovsky, Charlotte Rosenthal, and Mary Zirin, eds. *Dictionary of Russian Women Writers* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994), xxiv.

73. Sartori and Zimmerman, introduction to *French Women Writers*, xv.

74. "Les écrits féminins non-fictionnels du Moyen Âge au XVIIIe siècle," University of Ottawa, <http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~margirou/index.htm>.

75. ARTFL French Women Writers: The Project for American and French Research Treasury of the French Language, University of Chicago, <http://artfl-project.uchicago.edu>.

76. DeJean, "Classical Reeducation," 38–39.

77. Elke Frederiksen, "The Challenge of 'Missing Contents' for Canon Formation in German Studies," in *Gender and Germanness: Cultural Productions of Nation*, ed. Patricia Herminghouse and Magda Müller (Providence, RI: Berghahn, 1997), 101–12.

78. Friedrichs, *Die deutschsprachigen Schriftstellerinnen des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, vii.

79. Ruth-Ellen Bötcher Joeres, "German Women in Text and Context of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: A Review Essay of Feminist Criticism," *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der Deutschen Literatur* 11 (1986): 236.

80. Jo Catling, ed., *A History of Women's Writing in Germany, Austria and Switzerland* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

81. Elaine Showalter, *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Brontë to Lessing* (London: Virago, 1979).
82. Bell, Parfitt, and Shepherd, *A Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580–1720*, xiv.
83. Janet Todd, ed., *British Women Writers: A Critical Reference Guide* (New York: Continuum, 1989).
84. Janet Todd, *Feminist Literary History: A Defence* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), 15–16.
85. Gwenn Davis and Beverly A. Joyce, *Drama by Women to 1900: A Bibliography of American and British Writers* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992); Gwenn Davis and Beverly A. Joyce, eds., *Personal Writings by Women to 1900: A Bibliography of American and British Writers* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989); Gwenn Davis and Beverly A. Joyce, eds., *Poetry by Women to 1900: A Bibliography of American and British Writers* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991); Gwenn Davis and Beverly A. Joyce, eds., *Short Fiction by Women to 1900: A Bibliography of American and British Writers* (New York: Mansell, 1999).
86. Elaine Showalter, *A Jury of Her Peers: American Women Writers from Anne Bradstreet to Annie Proulx* (New York: Knopf, 2009).
87. Petr A. Nikolaev, ed., *Russkie pisateli 1800–1917: Biograficheskii slovar'*, 5 vols. (Moscow: Bolshaia rossiiskaia entsiklopediia, 1989–).
88. Adele Marie Barker and Jehanne M. Gheith, eds., *A History of Women's Writing in Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Catriona Kelly, *A History of Russian Women's Writing 1820–1992* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
89. Ruth Salvaggio, "Interpreting the MLA Bibliography," *Scholarly Publishing: A Journal for Authors and Publishers* 14.4 (1983): 363–68; Reed Way Dasenbrock, "English Department Geography: Interpreting the MLA Bibliography," *Pedagogy Is Politics: Literary Theory and Critical Teaching*, ed. Maria Regina Knech (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 193–214; Hope A. Olson, "The Power to Name: Representation in Library Catalogs," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 26.3 (2001): 639–68; McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*.
90. Women Writers Project. Brown University, <http://www.wwp.brown.edu>; SOPHIE: A Digital Library of Works by German-Speaking Women, Brigham Young University, <http://sophie.byu.edu>; DIOTIMA, Material for Study of Women and Gender in the Ancient World (1995–), <http://www.stoa.org/diotima>.
91. Orlando: Women's Writing in the British Isles from the Beginnings to the Present, Research Institute for Women's Writing, University of Alberta, <http://orlando.cambridge.org>.
92. New approaches to European Women Writers (NEWW), Huygens Institute, www.womenwriters.nl; Suzan Van Dijk, Anke Gilleir, and Alicia C. Montoya, "Before NEWW (*New Approaches to European Women's Writing*): Prolegomena to the Launching of an International Project," *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 27.1 (2008): 151–57.