

The Brief Flowering of Women's Journalism and Its End around 1800

Ulrike Weckel

“The project of founding a journal for women failed owing to unknown obstacles,”¹ noted the biographer of actress, reciter, and author Elise Hahn Bürger, who as a divorcée needed to earn her own living. We do not know precisely when she planned such a journal project—sometime in the late 1790s or the first two decades of the nineteenth century—and even her 1868 biographer could not discover what factors ultimately thwarted her undertaking despite access to a manuscript diary now lost. All we know is that in 1804–5, Elise Bürger published two annual volumes under the title *Mein Taschenbuch, den Freundlichen meines Geschlechts geweiht* and that a new edition and a second printing appeared in 1809 and 1811.²

This footnote to the history of women's literature might not appear particularly remarkable were it not indicative of a significant trend: in the eighteenth century, the new genre of the women's journal emerged out of the moral weeklies, which had expressly addressed women readers and frequently fabricated fictitious female contributors.³ Such periodicals obviously found an audience. Throughout German-speaking regions, new if often short-lived moralizing literary weekly, monthly, and quarterly magazines for women were constantly springing up. In keeping with the late Enlightenment, they sought to combine usefulness with diversion. Between 1779 and 1796, after the genre had become established, at least seventeen women entered the literary market by editing and publishing ten different journals for their sex.⁴ There was, however, no continuous increase in either the number or the longevity of these periodicals. In fact, the opposite was the case. The tradition did not even survive the turn of the century. After 1800, women attempted only occasionally and with little success to establish jour-

nalistic enterprises.⁵ They were most likely to succeed—and in this Elise Bürger is also typical—if they compiled and edited annual anthologies.⁶ Such richly illustrated and often gilt-edged ladies' pocket books and almanacs, with their dainty formats and elaborate bindings, clearly corresponded to contemporary taste around 1800, and they made perfect New Year's gifts. In addition to the lyric and epic poetry and short essays on various branches of learning that the women's journals before 1800 had also offered, most provided calendars, tables for household bookkeeping, genealogies of the European noble houses, fashion advice, embroidery patterns, and sometimes concrete tips and instructions for housework and care of the body. Like the women's journals, which were founded far more rarely in the early nineteenth century, and the entertainment and fashion magazines directed at both sexes, which clearly lured customers away from the women's journals, the most popular of these almanacs were also edited almost exclusively by men.⁷ Women were now involved in these periodicals only as authors, albeit in increasing numbers. Only the Revolution of 1848–49 brought several female editors back into the literary arena, but their journals faded away during the subsequent period of restoration.⁸ A durable women's press developed only after 1865 with the establishment and diversification of the women's movement. These new periodicals had quite a different character, however, from the women's journals published by female editors a hundred years earlier. Although the later publications printed the occasional novella or poem for a bit of variety, the moral lectures of their predecessors had given way to discussions of the controversial "woman question" [*Frauenfrage*]. The women's journals of the late nineteenth century usually served as the organs of women's associations or their umbrella organizations. These publications represented the positions of the various wings of the movement on women's education, employment, suffrage, the sexual double standard, peace politics, and socialist theories of emancipation and reported on activities and congresses.⁹

For activists in the women's movement it probably went without saying that they would publish their journals themselves and fill them with contributions by mainly female authors. In the late eighteenth century, however, this practice had not been nearly as self-evident for women. Women editors of the period usually went to great lengths in their prefaces to justify their daring act of speaking out publicly, if only to their fellow women. Almost without exception, they professed that they would not allow such an unusual enterprise to stand in the way of

their domestic duties, nor should reading the journal encourage other women to do so. The conviction that “woman’s calling” was to be a wife, housewife, and mother, which was widespread in the educated strata in that era, may well have kept some women from entering the public arena—for example, by publishing diaries, novels, or periodicals. Most educated elite women probably were not hindered by time-intensive and laborious housework—servants would have taken care of most of those tasks. A far greater obstacle was the view that a virtuous woman should find her sole fulfillment in tirelessly caring for her loved ones and thus that journalistic ambitions suggested a lack of female vocation and a morally suspect thirst for fame. At the same time—and this may sound paradoxical—the restrictive discourse of a “female calling” also helped pave late-eighteenth-century women’s way into the (literary) public sphere.¹⁰ Since it was almost universally accepted that the two sexes had very different tasks to perform in society and that nature had wisely equipped them with opposite character traits, women logically might be able to inform their female compatriots of their duties more competently, sensitively, and above all effectively than men, who were so very different.¹¹

The turn from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, with the gradual transition from an estate-based society to bourgeois civil society, from the late Enlightenment and classicism to romanticism and the historical school, did nothing to change the premise of the polarized characters of the sexes and the attribution of gender-specific duties and fields of activity. Indeed, theories of equality grounded in natural rights even declined in influence. Thus, one might assume that a further need existed for “experts” on the interests of the female sex and that women would have continued to write and publish women’s journals. The striking fact that such was not the case provokes the question of what made it so difficult or unattractive for journalistically ambitious women between 1796 and 1830 to publish their own journals for the female reading public, which was continually expanding.¹² In this chapter, I will look for some answers to this question. Of course, methodological problems arise in studying the history of nonexistent journals, especially since the sources rarely document the reasons why plans for publication were never realized. A few detours consequently are necessary. I proceed from the proposition that the women’s journals edited by women in the late eighteenth century were by no means so rebellious or radical that men powerful in the literary market would have felt compelled to silence such publications. To bolster my thesis, I

will begin by comparing the journals edited by women with women's periodicals of the same era edited by men as a way of showing that men by no means invariably created more repressive images of femininity than women did. Only a very selective comparison is possible here, and I will concentrate on the particular theme of statements about female scholarship. Later in the chapter, I will examine why the two most successful women founders of journals in the eighteenth century—Sophie von La Roche and Marianne Ehrmann—gave up work on their periodicals. Finally, I will investigate what distinguished the enduring journalistic projects from the short-lived ones and the women's journals of the early nineteenth century from those of the late eighteenth century. The recipes for success point to an incipient commercialization of the press and an ongoing professionalization of editing and publishing that apparently had negative consequences for women's participation in journalism.

Cautiously Maneuvering Women and Valiant Male Advocates for the Female Sex

At the end of the eighteenth century, female authors in Germany by no means vigorously demanded equal participation in the new opportunities of the increasingly mobile society. While in France Olympe de Gouges set her *Déclaration des droits de la femme et de la citoyenne* article by article alongside the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*, and in England Mary Wollstonecraft presented the public with her *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, in Germany it was a male author who sought to apply the promise of equality derived from the ideas of the Enlightenment and natural rights to gender relations.¹³ Literary critics did not doubt that the anonymously published polemic *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Weiber* had been written by a man, whom they soon discovered to be Theodor Gottlieb von Hippel. Some observers, to be sure, wondered at first whether the work, with its daring argumentation and numerous, sometimes strange, references and interpretations from mythology, anthropology, the Bible, and poetry, might not be intended as a whimsical satire. Moreover, Hippel's critics often maintained that his recommended "improvements" went too far—particularly his argument for admission of women to all professions and political offices.¹⁴ Neither the confusion about his ideas nor the polemics of the critics prevented public discus-

sion of Hippel's work; indeed, both served to make his views more widely known.

None of the German women's journals of the late eighteenth century can be characterized as protofeminist in the egalitarian sense.¹⁵ They were largely literary and sought to provide moral instruction and cultivated entertainment in agreement with the prevailing notion that the two sexes had complementary roles to play. Since women derived from this concept permission to speak out yet were also eager to disperse any suspicions that they might be bad housewives, their forays into the public sphere were far more defensive than those of male authors, whose right to express themselves no one disputed.¹⁶

Given the ever-present danger of being ridiculed as a "female scholar [*weibliche Gelehrte*]" when presuming to know more than was regarded as proper, all female editors did their best to distance themselves demonstratively from any claim to "scholarship," although what this might have meant for a woman was not clearly defined.¹⁷ The young Ernestine Hofmann was particularly rigorous in her rejection of "excessive" education for women. Her reputation was not even at stake here, since she edited the weekly magazine *Für Hamburgs Töchter* for a year in 1779 under the guise of a fictitious elderly man. She nevertheless had the old man admit that although he did not precisely hate learned females, he was not fond of them and could not bring himself to consider them as part of the female sex. In his eyes they constituted "a sort of hermaphrodite."¹⁸ Marianne Ehrmann adopted quite an ambivalent stance. In her confrontational "inaugural address" as editor of *Amaliens Erholungsstunden*, she argued against the inflationary use of the derogatory term *female scholar*, since she thought that it hindered young girls in their virtuous pursuit of education. Such insight did not, however, prevent her from viciously caricaturing in her journals women obsessed with learning¹⁹ or from taking the occasional swipe at "pedantic female scholastics [*pedantische Schulgelehrte*]."²⁰ She needed this technique above all as a foil to define its opposite, her educational ideal of the "thinking woman [*Denkerin*]," with a noble heart, a practical understanding of human nature, and firm moral principles.²¹ Sophie von La Roche, in contrast, so deftly staged the obligatory denial of learning that she nevertheless managed to hint with a certain pride at her own extensive knowledge. For example, she demonstratively broke off a list of ancient historians with the remark that she did not wish to give herself the appearance of a scholar, thus

subtly demonstrating that her knowledge was by no means exhausted.²² Another technique was to have fictional characters express the suspicion that La Roche was doubtless a learned woman, only to correct this “misunderstanding” in a not very convincing manner.²³ Whatever strategies female journalists chose for dealing with the topos and whatever their view of the proper latitude for women’s education, all of them asserted that the duties of a wife, housekeeper, and mother took priority. The female editors publicly confirmed for their audience the mainstream discourse while in practice moving beyond the prescribed female sphere. We can only speculate whether some female readers learned the lesson of this paradox that women could do and study much more as long as they also gave credit to the prevailing idea of a virtuous woman and as long as they avoided being caught in the act of violating it.

The late-eighteenth-century women’s journals edited by men took similar positions in regard to female education and erudition. The difference was that men’s authority and masculine honor did not depend on what scope they allowed to women. Thus, some male editors—at least in their general public statements—expressed a certain chivalrous acknowledgment of women’s outstanding past and present achievements.²⁴ Christian Gottfried Schütz, who edited the *Akademie der Grazien* from 1774 to 1780, believed that only rational women of the upper ranks should be allowed to read and that even among them it should not become a “chief pastime.” He nevertheless dispensed with the popular bugbear of the bluestocking: the few “learned ladies” whom one encountered from time to time were admittedly not models to be emulated but deserved unconditional respect, since they proved by their example “that great intellectual gifts are not the sole province of male persons.”²⁵ How women were to discover and cultivate their intellectual gifts when thorough and systematic reflection was unsuitable for them was clearly a matter to which Schütz, for his part, had not devoted much thought. David Christoph Seybold, who was present on the market of women’s journals from 1782 to 1791 with his *Magazin für Frauenzimmer* and *Neues Magazin für Frauenzimmer*, gently pointed out to the opponents of women’s learning a minor weakness in their argument: despite claims that learned women could not be good housekeepers or mothers, he declared, learning in itself surely would not keep women from their female duties; on the contrary, it encouraged their fulfillment. Many women, moreover, also woefully neglected their proper sphere without any distraction whatsoever from reading.²⁶

The harshest critic of the enemies of so-called learned females was the editor of the *Museum für das weibliche Geschlecht*, August Heinrich Lafontaine. As he noted in 1792, such men all too often denounced an intelligent woman as learned simply because she did not appreciate their shameless jokes and foolishness or did not take part in the vicious gossiping of their fellow females. The polemic was misdirected, “since our ladies do not often tend to indulge in excesses of learnedness.” In view of the fact that most women of the higher ranks delegated their housework to servants and instead played cards and engaged in superficial conviviality, they should be encouraged to regard the “most mature education of the mind” as “a natural duty of the female sex.”²⁷

One could cite differently accentuated and even opposing statements from the same journals and the same authors. Feminist scholars have tended to cite statements by women that sounded emancipatory and misogynistic proclamations by men. I intend not to replace such a selective reading of the sources with one of a different bias but rather to point out the multivocal and ambiguous nature of the discourse. This complexity demonstrates that simplistic conspiracy theories as well as claims that men deliberately pushed women editors out of their positions are untenable.

Ousted by Men? The End of Two Female-Edited Women's Journals

Two such theories have grown up around the end of *Pomona* (1783–84), edited by La Roche, and *Amaliens Erholungsstunden* (1790–92), edited by Ehrmann. According to Barbara Becker-Cantarino, La Roche's former fiancé and literary mentor, Christoph Martin Wieland, supported her women's journal only halfheartedly and—after he noticed the growing demand for women's literature—even conceived the project of a competing periodical. Becker-Cantarino points to a February 1785 letter in which Wieland informed his old friend in passing that he, as she might have discovered from public advertisements, had taken over the editorship of a forthcoming German translation of the *Bibliothèque universelle des dames*. He hoped that this enterprise would not conflict with her *Bibliothek der Lina*.²⁸ Becker-Cantarino comments on Wieland's letter briefly but significantly, “Sophie's planned ‘Bibliothek,’ a continuation of *Pomona*, never appeared, and the lucrative trade in ladies' calendars, women's magazines, and pocket books for ladies was undertaken by

others.”²⁹ She implies that La Roche abandoned her plans after Wieland’s announcement. However, does such an interpretation correspond to the verifiable facts?

In the period that followed, the trade in almanacs was indeed all but monopolized by men. The age of women’s journals with female editors was, nevertheless, not in the slightest terminated, nor did La Roche stop publishing altogether. Following the example of *Pomona*, various women, alone or in groups, founded seven new women’s periodicals. As for La Roche, in the tradition of the moral weeklies, she had written the contributions to *Pomona* largely on her own. When she decided to establish the journal, a number of edifying “Letters to Lina” had already been composed, along with various moral tales. Now, however, she had to write more of them each month, along with instructive articles, essays on nature and cultural history, reports on European countries, and replies to readers’ letters, which together with a few poems and shorter contributions by outside authors filled nearly one hundred pages in octavo format. After seven issues had appeared, she confessed to a friend, “The daily work on my *Pomona* is becoming somewhat more laborious, because my stock of random ideas is no longer so rich.”³⁰ The following year, another factor entered the picture. La Roche spent several weeks traveling through Switzerland, considerably delaying her editorial work. More importantly, however, she had been bitten by the travel bug. The end of *Pomona* enabled her to engage in foreign travel several times in the years that followed. She eventually processed her impressions in a series of weighty travel tomes: because writers were paid by the printed sheet in those days, these works were probably more lucrative than a self-published monthly magazine. La Roche also brought out several different editions of her collected moral tales and “Letters to Lina” from *Pomona* and published excerpts from her travel accounts in various periodicals.³¹ However, plans for a *Bibliothek der Lina*, devoted to the education of daughters and composed of individual volumes, and a periodical, *Briefwechsel der Pomona*, that would have continued the popular public correspondence with readers and that Johann Georg Hutten, La Roche’s assistant in the business side of self-publishing, announced in the final issue of *Pomona*, never came to fruition.³² It seems far more plausible that instead of retreating in resignation, La Roche simply changed her plans and chose forms of publication that were easier to combine with her other activities.

Wieland indeed distanced himself over the years from the friend of

his youth and from her literary production. He had initially encouraged La Roche's writing and edited and published her first novel. Even then, however, his at times rather sarcastic remarks betray a certain inner reserve toward what he saw as her excessive moralizing.³³ By emphasizing that the same strict standards of literary criticism should not be applied to women's literature and female authors, he helped La Roche's novel to be well received. Nevertheless, Wieland himself soon lost interest in such female writings. Despite her requests, he never commented in detail on La Roche's subsequent publications but rather passed them on to his wife and daughters, as he noted in his letters. He collected subscriptions for *Pomona*, but he did not review the journal regularly in his *Teutscher Merkur*. Only once did the issues of the second volume receive a brief announcement in his journal.³⁴ As for even this rather laconic notice, he informed the disappointed La Roche that friendship had caused him to "set the tone somewhat higher than cold justice would have."³⁵ La Roche continued to write in the style of sentimentalism and felt bound by the precepts of female virtue. Wieland, in contrast, had quickly passed through this phase and showed himself more liberal in moral questions, which was naturally easier for him as a man, although it gained him the reputation among many moralists of being an excessively easygoing and frivolous author. The estrangement between the two, however, by no means thwarted La Roche's literary career.³⁶ Her 1771 novel, *Die Geschichte des Fräuleins von Sternheim*, had helped establish a market for literature by and for women that flourished for a good ten years after the demise of *Pomona* and in which La Roche, while appearing increasingly old-fashioned, remained the most celebrated female author.

The case of Marianne Ehrmann and the end of *Amaliens Erholungsstunden* in autumn 1792, after three years of publication, is more complicated. A violent dispute arose between her, or her husband, and publisher Johann Friedrich Cotta, who had taken on the monthly journal in 1791, and his partner, Christian Jakob Zahn. The matter ended with the dissolution of their business partnership, after which each party entered the market with a new journal for women. Ehrmann edited *Die Einsiedlerin aus den Alpen*, published by Orell, Geßner, and Füssli in Zurich, for another two years, and Cotta continued with the publication of *Flora* under various male editors until 1803. For some time, feminist scholars have been largely unanimous in their interpretation of the situation: the influential Tübingen publisher of classical works sought to silence an early feminist and a valiant critic of men.

According to this view, business differences over the low number of subscribers and the slow flow of manuscript pages merely represented an excuse on Cotta's part: the real bone of contention was the magazine's contents.³⁷ Ehrmann's bitter complaints about "masculine despotism" and her ridicule of the "oh-so-wise little band of men [*hochweise Männervölkchen*]" and of effeminate dandies in the first two years of *Amaliens Erholungsstunden* are usually cited as evidence and are contrasted to the bland literary program of *Flora*, which aimed only to entertain. Helga Madland points in particular to an article, "Schönheit über Geist [Beauty over Mind]," which appeared immediately after Ehrmann left her post as editor and which declared men's preference for outward charms to be a timeless natural instinct. This piece, Madland claims, should be read as a spiteful swipe at Ehrmann and her educational goal of the "thinking woman."³⁸

A thorough reading of all three journals shows that the matter is not quite as clear-cut as might first appear to be the case. Certainly, Ehrmann sometimes used her journals for vigorous attacks on men and their seductive arts, and she repeatedly made fun of unmanly males who succumbed to fashion mania or puttering about in the kitchen. Much more frequently and with at least as much vehemence, however, she criticized her sex, accusing women of being gossipy, envious, vain, and complacent. And as I have already shown, she was not above lampooning "female scholars." Caricature, negative example, and drastic language were her trademarks and didactic strategies. Bearing in mind that her polemics against effeminacy did not attack hierarchical gender relations but rather painted the dangers of blurring the lines of gender difference, the interpretation of Ehrmann as a sort of early feminist appears a bit hasty. Thus it seems to me virtually symptomatic of the selective reading of her journals by feminist scholars that Edith Krull mistakenly cites an article by Ehrmann as an example of how Cotta sought through outside contributions to undermine the journal's "women's rights" approach.³⁹ Madland, for her part, does not mention that "Schönheit über Geist" was sharply criticized in a total of three articles that appeared in the next volume of *Flora*, with one of the critics considering the anti-intellectual statements a parody, which he however found all too easily misconstrued and therefore unsuccessful.⁴⁰

Because both parties carried their dispute into the public arena, several published accounts of the situation exist. The contract with two amendments as well as a letter from the editor's husband to the pub-

lishing company have also survived, enabling at least the partial reconstruction of the end of the business partnership.⁴¹ According to the documents, the conflict involved both financial matters and the contents and style of the journal. The Ehrmanns⁴² denied neither that the number of subscribers was smaller than had been assumed when the contract was signed nor that it was falling. Instead, they tried to explain the reasons for decline in subscriptions and to compensate by working for a lower fee. The publisher's accusation that the editor had provided fewer sheets of manuscript than agreed by contract was also not unfounded, since Marianne Ehrmann was ailing and never disputed that she had initially welcomed the publisher's recruitment of outside contributors.⁴³ Disagreement did arise over the extent of such contributions by authors whose work Cotta published anyway in most cases and about their publication in the journal without first consulting the editor. Ehrmann distanced herself especially from the lengthy book reviews⁴⁴ and endless serialized novels. Her part in the journal diminished continuously beginning late 1791, but open conflict apparently did not erupt until Zahn rejected some of her contributions. Because the publishing company refused to return sole editorial responsibility to her, a parting of the ways resulted.⁴⁵ Their reciprocal public accusations served not least the struggle over subscribers, in which Cotta was clearly in a better position since he had organized the distribution of *Amaliens Erholungsstunden* and could simply send his *Flora* to the addresses on his subscription list just as if it were the old journal's legitimate successor.⁴⁶ Cotta thus jettisoned Ehrmann, but far from giving up, she returned with a new journal and a new publisher to her original concept of a "moral journal for women [*moralische Zeitschrift für Frauenzimmer*]." ⁴⁷ That this new enterprise lasted only two years was a consequence of Ehrmann's failing health and her death in 1795.

I consider it highly improbable that the publisher was offended by the few verbally radical critiques of men in Ehrmann's articles. If even contemporary literary critics, who were not exactly gentle in their treatment of so-called women's literature, utterly ignored these polemical attacks while almost universally noting with relish Ehrmann's satirical jabs at her own sex, it is unlikely that Cotta took a harsher view.⁴⁸ If, however, Ehrmann was apparently not regarded as a pugnacious critic of men in her time, it was doubtless mainly because she, too, assumed that woman was "destined by nature" to be a wife, housekeeper, and mother and supported clearly separate spheres of activity for the two sexes. Here she followed the line of the dominant

discourse, and she could have reached a quick agreement with Cotta in this matter if the publisher had shown any interest in such positions within the gender debate. As I see it, the publishing company's primary concern was to produce a lucrative literary magazine with many (of its own) well-known authors that would offer readers primarily entertainment and suspense rather than information or moral polemics and thus keep them coming back for more. Because Ehrmann was not only a little-known author but one given to frequent moralizing as well as crude and exaggerated language and was willing to sacrifice reading pleasure to harsh admonition, she was only too dispensable as an editor and contributor.⁴⁹

Changes in the Literary Market

Cotta's successor magazine, *Flora*, represents the prototype of a successful women's journal at the end of the eighteenth century. It survived the turn of the century, which marked a sharp caesura for female editors. With numerous contributions by a wide variety of authors, this monthly already had the character of a magazine and no similarity whatsoever with the eighteenth-century moral weeklies.⁵⁰ In that journalistic genre, which was widespread in the German-speaking region between 1725 and 1765, generally one fictitious (or real) author chatted familiarly with the readership in contributions that were rarely divided into separate articles, with the objective of instructing them in a playful manner on various questions of middle-class everyday life. In 1779 and the years that followed, the first female editors again took up this genre; however, the concept was already outdated. Literary journals had replaced it, and moral edification had gone out of fashion, at least among the male reading public. Instead of always the same tone and a quasi-familial relationship between the author figure and his readers, the more experienced public now demanded variety in literary forms, language, and contents. Magazines that assembled diverse contributions corresponded far better to the taste of the times and the growing anonymity of the literary market. The reading public and along with it the number of periodicals had grown. Potential buyers now made their choice by surveying the expanded offerings in retail bookshops, where prominent authors and well-known publishing houses functioned as marks of quality. It therefore became an increasingly hopeless undertaking to self-publish a journal via personal subscriptions based on

advertisements (let alone to secure the financing through prepaid subscriptions) and to distribute it through the post office. Women initially succeeded to a certain extent through this model. They were newcomers to the literary business, and female readers in particular gave women's works attention and trust.⁵¹ In previously unheard-of numbers, women signed their own names to subscriptions for journals edited by women. On the printed subscription lists, they were visibly assembled as both an educated female public and a collective patron of the female editor.⁵² However, the professionalization and commercialization of the book trade—which in general increased the number of women authors⁵³—ultimately affected female editors adversely. The single-author journal became less common, and women writers more frequently banded together to begin journalistic projects. With time, all of them accepted growing numbers of contributions from outside authors and sought to bring more variety into their publications. It is striking, however, that female editors continued to give their journals a more personal tone than the nonfictitious male editors of the eighteenth century ever had. Female editors now, too, looked for publishers who could finance illustrations and sheet music inserts if necessary. Only under such conditions could a monthly hope to compete with showy pocket books and almanacs.

Amaliens Erholungsstunden (1790–92), *Die Einsiedlerin aus den Alpen* (1793–94), and *Unterhaltungen in Abendstunden* (1792–93) by Katharina von Hesse and her collaborators already show elements of a magazine character. When it came to this form of journal, however, the working conditions for women were far less favorable than for men. Female authors were not as well known and were not considered suitable for all literary genres. Moreover, they exercised less influence over style and the canon. They also generally had fewer contacts with other writers from whom they could solicit contributions as well as with publishers. Despite her serious disputes with the Cotta publishing house, Marianne Ehrmann at least succeeded in establishing herself as an editor for five years. She was also the only woman who tried again after the failure of her first journal project, as almost all male journalists did. Most of them stayed in the business for many years—often all their lives—founded several periodicals, formed new editorial staffs, and passed flourishing journals on to other editors when necessary. No comparable network developed among women writers in either the eighteenth or the early nineteenth century. To be sure, individual

women editors helped female colleagues and beginning writers by publishing texts in their periodicals, but they could never do as much for them as a famous male editor could.⁵⁴

After the almost total disappearance of female editors from the periodicals market, women remained in demand as contributors, particularly to women's journals, if only for the sake of variety. Thus, for example, after the break with Ehrmann, *Flora* at first had tried to attract the public by mentioning only the best-known male contributors who had promised to write. Just two months later, however, an advertisement appeared in which the publisher assured readers that apart from the male authors mentioned, "some ladies of wit had also agreed to contribute," and *Flora's* editors hoped "in every respect to earn the good reception" that *Amaliens Erholungsstunden* had once enjoyed.⁵⁵ The publisher apparently assumed that the female segment of the public in particular appreciated women authors and was eager to read what they wrote.

The motivations that brought together Johann Friedrich Rochlitz, Christoph Martin Wieland, Johann Gottfried Seume, and Friedrich Schiller as editors of the *Journal für deutsche Frauen* in 1805–6 remain somewhat obscure. The title page of the first issue carried the subtitle "written by German women," and in fact during the first year nearly all of the contributions (generally published under cryptonyms or female first names) came from women authors.⁵⁶ The male author of a marginal piece expressly justified his exceptional "penetration" of the circle of women.⁵⁷ Surprisingly, the editors felt moved to comment neither on the exclusive collection of texts by women nor on the fact that they were all men and that not long before, women had run this business for themselves.⁵⁸ The men dispensed with any demonstrative paternalistic gesture of "helping the ladies" and in a preface compared their journal to a well-mannered, trustworthy male companion: one might desire a bit more from him but would never be offered anything undesirable. The editors promised to remove this companion from society the moment he no longer accomplished what they expected of him.⁵⁹ In the name of continual improvements, at the end of the first year the editors assured readers that after their "first attempt" the journal would become better and more varied, with more contributors and more "edifying and decorative" engravings.⁶⁰ What they did not say was that they had abandoned the plan of publishing only female authors. In 1806, again without any explanation or justification,⁶¹ the subtitle "written by German women" disappeared, and thereafter the over-

whelming majority of texts in the journal appeared under the names of more or less famous male authors, particularly that of coeditor Rochlitz. The copperplate engravings—mainly images of the constellations—became an occasion for educated men to convey basic information about the planets, stars, and seasons to female readers. The journal thus quietly relinquished its specificity. If the publisher is to be believed, the female readership responded positively to the changes. In a late 1806 announcement that the journal could continue in such uncertain times only if subscribers paid in advance, the publisher emphasized that there had been no lack of acclaim from the “truly admirable part” of the public, “to work for whom is a pleasure for any man of wit and heart.” Only “political circumstances and their inevitable consequences” made such advance payment necessary.⁶² The demand apparently existed: from 1807 to 1808, Rochlitz edited *Selene*, whose contributors were largely the same overwhelmingly male authors and which, logically enough, having dispensed with the word *journal* now had the character of a pure literary anthology.⁶³ Apart from the eponymous *Selene*, described in the introduction as the “serious, chaste goddess” who sought to shine only with a “silent light” and gladly promoted domestic happiness, a female public was not explicitly addressed.⁶⁴

The fact that this rather undistinguished literary anthology managed to survive for four years appears to indicate that women readers took no offense at the expansion of the circle of collaborators to include men or at the ensuing male dominance. Wilhelm Gottlieb Becker was even more successful with the continuation of his *Leipziger Monatsschrift für Damen* after two years as a quarterly under the title *Erholungen*. In the latter guise the journal ran from 1796 to 1810. Here, too, no trace of the women's journal remained except perhaps for the fact that, as the preface noted, the periodical excluded “anything political or scholarly” and thus differed from others of its kind.⁶⁵

Although political and scholarly matters were considered dispensable in broad segments of popular journalism in the early nineteenth century, a certain emphasis on current issues seems increasingly to have been expected. The previously described journals had largely done without any contemporary focus and showed at most the rudiments of recurring rubrics. In contrast, the semiweekly *Allgemeine deutsche Frauenzeitung* (1816–18) and the *Damenzeitung: Ein Morgenblatt für das schöne Geschlecht* (1829–30), four pages in quarto published daily, were clearly presented in magazine style. The *Allgemeine*

deutsche Frauenzeitung was compiled by Erfurt bookseller-publisher Friedrich Keyser and J. M. Laubling and after 1817 by Friedrich Gleich. The editors, who had more the quality of entrepreneurs than of authors, were clearly trying to ride the wave of new patriotic journalistic projects. According to their declaration, they sought to provide a forum for the patriotic women's associations that had formed during the Napoleonic Wars and to preserve a patriotic and "better spirit of the times [*einen vaterländischen, besseren Zeitgeist*]."66 Doubtless not least because most of these organizations ceased their activities in peacetime, the reports of local associations became ever more rare. Here, as in the later *Damenzeitung*, female authors remained clearly in the minority. The *Damenzeitung*, edited by Carl Spindler, was firmly devoted to entertainment. As was clear not merely from its title (Ladies' Newspaper) but also from such rubrics as the "Gallery of Remarkable Women and Their Times,"67 however, the journal eagerly sought to attract female readers. Whether the editors of both magazines just happened to know and contact very few women writers or whether some of them refused to contribute because they preferred to publish in periodicals not devoted to their own sex remains unexplored, as does the matter of the preferences of early-nineteenth-century women readers. The trend from the edifying moral and literary journal to the entertaining magazine had essentially made it unnecessary to address women separately. Thus, around 1800, not only did female editors of women's journals disappear from the market, but literary women's journals themselves became rare.

If we can generalize from one of the few sources relating to the failure of a women's journal, it appears quite probable that early-nineteenth-century educated women may have rejected a special literature written for their sex. In 1821, Johanna Schopenhauer was asked whether she would accept the editorship of a planned journal for women. In her reply, the author expressed skepticism:

The days are long past in which it made sense to write special books for women, as one does for children. The feminine mind now grasps every bloom in the realm of belles lettres, examines everything and keeps the best, with no less success and no less selectivity than the masculine mind, and the presumption of writing solely for women would frighten away from us the most educated and gifted female readers, for they would sense from afar the ennui and moral chatter that they have already experienced ad nauseam.⁶⁸

She could imagine at most helping to found a journal that offered its readers cheerful, warmhearted, and intelligent diversion; that did not preach; and that bore the title of a women's journal only to the extent that it contained not a line that offended "women's sense of morality, propriety, justice, and injustice."⁶⁹ Schopenhauer made a number of concrete suggestions and sketched very matter-of-factly and self-confidently the possibilities of a business agreement with the publisher, but the plan never came to fruition. Her distaste for a separate niche may seem understandable, especially in retrospect with the knowledge of its traps. However, Schopenhauer overlooked the fact that a special literature for the female sex had offered eighteenth-century women writers opportunities in the literary marketplace that disappeared immediately with the ostensibly gender-neutral press of the early nineteenth century.

Historians of the German press have not viewed the abrupt end to the early flowering of women's journalism as a loss. Rather, it appears as part of the irresistible march of progress: periodicals became more diverse and current and reached a constantly growing reading public with increasing speed. The work of editing, publishing, and distribution was more and more specialized, developing into separate professions that offered livelihoods to larger numbers of people. The transformation of the literary market was precisely not channeled or justified by enlisting gender stereotypes (as the case studies in this volume document for other areas of society). In fact, the opposite held true. The previously common, deliberate gender segmentation of the public was relinquished in favor of a permanent expansion of the target group. In practical terms, journalism thus increasingly became the domain of male professionals, and it remained so for a long time.

Notes

Translated by Pamela Selwyn.

1. Friedrich W. Ebeling, *Gottfried August Bürger und Elise Hahn: Ein Ehe-, Kunst-, und Literaturleben* (Leipzig, 1868), 206.

2. The second edition appeared under the title *Mein Taschenbuch erwachsenen Mädchen und jungen Frauen gewidmet* (Pirna, 1809–11).

3. Wolfgang Martens, *Die Botschaft der Tugend: Die Aufklärung im Spiegel der deutschen Moralischen Wochenschriften* (Stuttgart, 1968); Regina Nörtemann, "Schwache Werkzeuge als öffentliche Richterinnen: Zur fiktiven weiblichen Herausgeberschaft in Moralischen Wochenschriften des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 72 (1990): 381–403.

4. Ulrike Weckel, *Zwischen Häuslichkeit und Öffentlichkeit: Die ersten*

deutschen Frauenzeitschriften im späten 18. Jahrhundert und ihr Publikum (Tübingen, 1998). See also Edith Krull's pioneering "Das Wirken der Frau im frühen deutschen Zeitschriftenwesen" (PhD diss., Universität Berlin, 1939). On the better-known periodicals, see also Ruth P. Dawson, "Women Communicating: Eighteenth-Century German Journals Edited by Women," *Archives et Bibliothèques de Belgique* 54 (1983): 95–111; a shorter version appeared in *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 216, *Transactions of the Sixth International Congress on the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1983), 239–41; Ulrike Böhmel Fichera, *Kein Werk des Zufalls: Frauen als Herausgeberinnen von literarischen Frauenzeitschriften im späten 18. Jahrhundert* (Naples, 1990); Helga Neumann, *Zwischen Emanzipation und Anpassung: Protagonistinnen des deutschen Zeitschriftenwesens im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert (1779–1795)* (Würzburg, 1999).

5. Amalia Bernhardt allegedly edited the weekly *Die Beobachterin an Spree und Havel* from 1819 to 1820. The name may well have been a female pseudonym for the male editor of the *Beobachter an der Spree*, however, which appeared at the same time. In 1820, Helmina von Chézy and Fanny Tarnow lent their names to an Association of German Female Authors, which published the journal *Iduna: Writings by German Women, Dedicated to Women*. Only two issues appeared. The most successful of the women editors was Louise Marezoll, otherwise a complete literary unknown. In the years before the Revolution of 1848, she edited first the *Frauenzeitung*, an "Entertaining Paper by and for Women [*Unterhaltungsblatt von und für Frauen*]" that appeared three times a week, and then the quarterly *Frauen-Spiegel*. See Ulrike Weckel, "Öffentliches Raisonement über die gesellschaftliche Stellung der Frau: 'Frauenzeitung' und 'Frauen-Spiegel,' 1838–1841," in *Frauen und Öffentlichkeit: Beiträge der 6. Schweizerischen Historikerinnentagung*, ed. Mireille Othenin-Girard, Anna Gossenreiter, and Sabine Trautweiler (Zurich, 1991), 161–83.

6. Between 1798 and 1800, Sophie Mereau edited the first three volumes of the *Berlinischer Damenkalender*. Then, independently of a publisher, she tried her hand at an anthology of her own, *Kalathiskos*, one volume of which appeared in 1801 and 1802. (The anthology was reprinted with an afterword by Peter Schmidt [Heidelberg, 1968].) Therese Huber initially participated in editing the *Taschenbuch für Damen*, which was published by Cotta beginning in 1798. In 1801, Eulalia Gutwill compiled a *Neuestes Taschenbuch für Frauenzimmer edlerer Bildung*, and from 1800 to 1810, Johanna Caroline Wilhelmine Spazier was responsible for a *Taschenbuch* "dedicated to love and friendship."

7. See Maria Gräfin Lanckoronska and Arthur Rümman, *Geschichte der deutschen Taschenbücher und Almanache aus der klassisch-romantischen Zeit* (Munich, 1954), esp. 59–79; York-Gothart Mix, *Die deutschen Musenalmanache des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1987); Pia Schmid, "Hausfrau, Gattin, Mutter: Zur bürgerlichen Definition von Weiblichkeit um 1800 im Spiegel einiger deutschsprachiger Zeitschriften," in *Die ungeschriebene Geschichte: Historische Frauenforschung: Dokumentation des 5. Historikerinnentreffens in*

Wien im April 1984 (Vienna, 1985), 169–86; Pia Schmid, “‘O, wie süß lohnt das Muttergefühl!’ Die Bestimmung zur Mutter in Almanachen für das weibliche Publikum,” in *Tugend, Vernunft, und Gefühl: Geschlechterdiskurse der Aufklärung und weibliche Lebenswelten*, ed. Claudia Opitz, Ulrike Weckel, and Elke Kleinau (Münster, 2000), 107–25; Helga Madland, “Three Late Eighteenth-Century Women’s Journals: Their Role in Shaping Women’s Lives,” *Women in German Yearbook* 4 (1988): 167–86.

8. Of the four journals edited by women, only one was clearly intended for a female public. Mathilde Franziska Anneke did call the paper she edited *Frauen-Zeitung* but emphasized in the preface to the first issue that this was a probably not very promising attempt to continue the recently banned *Neue Kölnische Zeitung*, which she had produced together with her husband and another male fellow democrat. In fact, the third issue of the paper was confiscated. *Der Freischärler: Für Kunst und sociales Leben*, in which editor Louise Aston commented on the stance of the democratic women’s clubs but otherwise dealt with the political, social, cultural, and military situation without a gender-specific slant, survived a mere six weeks. Louise Dittmar’s monthly journal, *Soziale Reform*, also was not directed primarily at women. Only the longest-lived of the four journalistic projects, Louise Otto’s *Frauen-Zeitung*, targeted a female readership. Otto encouraged her readers to intervene politically and promote their rights since they could not expect men to do so. See Ute Gerhard, “Über die Anfänge der deutschen Frauenbewegung um 1848: Frauenpresse, Frauenpolitik, und Frauenvereine,” in *Frauen suchen ihre Geschichte: Historische Studien zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Karin Hausen (Munich, 1983), 196–220; Ulla Wischermann, “‘Das Himmelskind, die Freiheit—wir ziehen sie groß zu Haus’: Frauenpublizistik im Vormärz und in der Revolution von 1848,” in *Geschichte der Mädchen- und Frauenbildung*, ed. Elke Kleinau and Claudia Opitz (Frankfurt, 1996), 2:35–50; Ulla Wischermann, *Frauenpublizistik und Journalismus: Vom Vormärz zur Revolution von 1848* (Weinheim, 1998).

9. See Ulla Wischermann, “Die Presse der deutschen Frauenbewegung, 1848–1918: Anregung zur Erforschung einer fast vergessenen Öffentlichkeit,” in *Presse und Geschichte*, vol. 2, *Neue Beiträge zur historischen Kommunikationsforschung*, ed. Elger Blühm and Hartwig Gebhardt (Munich, 1987), 349–63.

10. Using a quotation of Olympe de Gouges for her title, Joan Wallach Scott understands the “paradoxes” of feminists in a different way: “In order to protest women’s exclusion, they had to act on behalf of women and so invoked the very difference they sought to deny” (*Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man* [Cambridge, 1996], x). The German female editors of women’s journals took another approach. Far from denying difference and asking for equal rights, they took the discourse of difference as an invitation to participate in it, often by publicly praising the value of female domesticity.

11. For evidence of such argumentation in prefaces by women journal edi-

tors and in contemporary reviews of their periodicals, see Ulrike Weckel, “Lehrerinnen des weiblichen Geschlechts: Die ersten Herausgeberinnen von Frauenzeitschriften und ihr Publikum,” in *Geschichte der Mädchen- und Frauenbildung*, ed. Kleinau and Opitz, 1:428–39.

12. As in France and Great Britain, the number of female German writers increased remarkably with the expansion of the literary market. Carla Hesse, *The Other Enlightenment: How French Women Became Modern* (Princeton, 2001), has pointed out that in France, in spite of tendencies to exclude women from the Enlightenment project, women did participate in the new commercial public as authors. This chapter, however, focuses on one specific genre—women’s journals—which in Germany opened ways for female authors to become published and even to appear as independent editors. At the turn of the century, this genre was on the decline. Unlike in France and Great Britain, where female journalists did not choose to write primarily for their own sex, the end of the women’s journals in Germany made it very difficult for women to establish themselves in journalism.

13. These three authors also by no means supported their demands for equal rights for women solely by noting that men and women belonged equally to the human race and thus possessed the same potentials and capacities. Rather, at different points in their arguments, these authors cited women’s particular qualities. On Olympe de Gouges, see Ute Gerhard, “Menschenrechte—Frauenrechte 1789,” in *Sklavin oder Bürgerin? Französische Revolution und Neue Weiblichkeit, 1760–1830*, ed. Viktoria Schmidt-Linsenhoff (Marburg, 1989); Scott, *Only Paradoxes*, 19–56. On Mary Wollstonecraft, see Claudia L. Johnson, *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s: Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen* (Chicago, 1995), 23–46. On Theodor Gottlieb von Hippel, see Isabel V. Hull, *Sexuality, State, and Civil Society in Germany, 1700–1815* (Ithaca, 1996), 323–32.

14. On contemporary audience receptions to both Hippel and Wollstonecraft in Germany, see Ulrike Weckel, “Gleichheit auf dem Prüfstand: Zur zeitgenössischen Rezeption der Streitschriften von Theodor Gottlieb von Hippel und Mary Wollstonecraft in Deutschland,” in *Tugend, Vernunft, und Gefühl*. ed. Opitz, Weckel, and Kleinau, 209–47.

15. In this judgment I differ from Ruth Dawson. She also sees that German “eighteenth-century profeminism rarely explicitly argued that men and women, equal as persons, should have equal rights,” but she distinguishes between objection to oppression and objection to subordination. In her reading, German “profeminists” (in which she includes journal editor Marianne Ehrmann in particular) objected to male oppression but not to female subordination. See Ruth P. Dawson, *The Contested Quill: Literature by Women in Germany, 1770–1800* (Newark, 2002), esp. 274–85.

16. The prefaces make this obvious. While female authors used this obligatory genre for an explicit justification of their literary work, male writers generally felt no need to comment on their appearance before the public, instead

proceeding immediately to explanations of journal titles and agendas. On prefaces by female novelists, see Magdalene Heuser, "'Ich wollt' dieß und das von meinem Buche sagen, und gerieth in ein Vernünfteln': Poetologische Reflexionen in den Romanvorreden," in *Untersuchungen zum Roman von Frauen um 1800*, ed. Helga Gallas and Heuser (Tübingen, 1990), 52–65.

17. See Susanne Kord, "Die Gelehrte als Zwitterwesen in Schriften von Autorinnen des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts," *Querelles: Jahrbuch für Frauenforschung* 1 (1996): 158–90; Ulrike Weckel, "Der Fieberfrost des Freiherrn: Zur Polemik gegen weibliche Gelehrsamkeit und ihren Folgen für die Geselligkeit der Geschlechter," in *Geschichte der Mädchen- und Frauenbildung*, ed. Kleinau and Opitz, 1:360–72.

18. *Für Hamburgs Töchter* 1 (1779): 3–13.

19. See esp. the short story that appeared in the successor journal, "Der Schuzgeist: Eine italienische Geschichte," *Die Einsiedlerin aus den Alpen*, 1.2, no. 4 (1793): 3–38. An abridged version of the journal, edited by Annette Zunzer, has recently been reprinted (Berne, 2002). As usual in this controversy over "female scholars," the "Lady Biankini" is equipped with masculine attributes as a sign of her assault on a male monopoly. She stubbornly disputes male colleagues, shouting them down in her insatiable ambition, becoming red and blue in the face and gesticulating with her arms, hawking in their faces, and even sinking her teeth into their necks. She does not have a beard like the usual caricature of a bluestocking, but her nose is crooked and coal black from taking snuff (13–14).

20. The polemic against so-called female scholars was not simply part of the critique of "dry scholasticism" common in educated circles in the eighteenth century. Male pedants or armchair scholars (*Schul- oder Stubengelehrte*) were accused of being withdrawn, unworldly, and misanthropic. Female scholars, in contrast, were described as constantly annoying their companions at parties with pretenses of book learning.

21. See Ulrike Böhmel Fichera, "'Keine eigentliche Schulgelehrsamkeit': Marianne Ehrmanns Begriff der 'Denkerin,'" *Querelles: Jahrbuch für Frauenforschung* 1 (1996): 142–57; Heide von Felden, "Marianne Ehrmann und die Bildung der Frauen durch Schriften im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert," in *Frauen in pädagogischen Berufen*, ed. Elke Kleinau (Bad Heilbrunn, 1996), 1:39–55.

22. She decided confidently which were the "most excellent" among the historians and explained to her female readers who Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plutarch, Pausanias, Cornelius Nepos, Livy, Sallust, Julius Caesar, Polybius, and Tacitus had been; what works they had written; and why they remained of interest for the present. Then she paused for a moment: "There are many other famous names, but I would appear too learned." After this gesture of apparent modesty, she proceeded coolly to introduce the prominent historians of her own day ("Von der Geschichte," *Pomona* 1.7 [1783]: 658–64).

23. See “Veranlassung der Pomona,” *Pomona* 1.1 (1783): esp. 14–15; “Briefe an Lina 22,” *Pomona* 2.10 (1784): esp. 931–32. A female reader who suspected with some justification that La Roche was avoiding merely the appearance of being learned, received the published reply that the editor by no means claimed the dignity of learned men. She had mastered neither the most important disciplines nor the ancient languages. Then, however, La Roche admitted that “if what one means by *being learned* is that one knows more than one was required to, then I am almost learned—but, oh, how far removed from the shining, glorious goal of true manly learning, which, if everything is to be in order, is not, and cannot be, our affair” (“Noch zwei Fragen,” *Pomona* 1.10 [1783]: 924–25). On La Roche’s educational vision in *Pomona* and her cunning hints at her broad knowledge, see also Dawson, *Contested Quill*, 122–31.

24. Such public appreciation was in the tradition of the profemale party in the *querelle des femmes* as well as of the male authors of lexicons of famous women. See Katharina Fietze, “Frauenbildung in der ‘Querelle des femmes,’” in *Geschichte der Mädchen- und Frauenbildung*, ed. Kleinau and Opitz, 1:237–51.

25. They should be regarded as “heroines” who exceeded their “true calling . . . to do honor to their entire sex” (“Vorläufige Tractaten mit unsern Leserinnen,” *Akademie der Grazien* 1.1 [1774]: 11–12).

26. “Biographische Nachrichten von merkwürdigen Frauenzimmern,” *Magazin für Frauenzimmer* 2.1 (1783): 47.

27. “Vorerinnerung für die Leserinnen dieses Magazins,” *Museum für das weibliche Geschlecht* 1.1 (1792): 4, 12.

28. “Hoffentlich wird diese Entreprise nicht Ihre *Bibliothek der Lina* croisieren?” Christoph Martin Wieland to Sophie von La Roche, 16 February 1785, in *Neue Briefe Christoph Martin Wielands vornehmlich an Sophie von La Roche*, ed. Robert Hassenkamp (Stuttgart, 1894), 277.

29. Barbara Becker-Cantarino, “‘Muse’ und ‘Kunstrichter’: Sophie von La Roche und Wieland,” *Modern Language Notes* 99.1, no. 3 (1984): 586. This thesis is adopted almost verbatim in Ingrid Wiede-Behrendt, *Lehrerin des Schönen, Wahren, Guten: Literatur und Frauenbildung im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert am Beispiel von Sophie von La Roche* (Berne, 1987), 256.

30. Sophie von La Roche to Elise zu Solms-Laubach, 2 August 1783, in “*Ich bin mehr Herz als Kopf*”: *Sophie von La Roche: Ein Lebensbild in Briefen*, ed. Michael Maurer, 2nd ed (Munich, 1985), 255.

31. Barbara Becker-Cantarino, “Sophie von La Roche (1730–1807): Kommentiertes Werkverzeichnis,” *Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert: Mitteilungen der deutschen Gesellschaft für die Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts* 17.1 (1993): 28–49.

32. “Anzeige an das Publikum,” *Pomona* 2.12 (1784): n.p. Instead of continuing her correspondence with real readers, in 1791, after a considerable time lapse, La Roche published *Briefe über Mannheim*, in which she once again turned to the lively “Karoline,” a fictional character whom La Roche had

made an occasional collaborator on *Pomona*. The letters describe the events of the winter season of 1784–85, which La Roche's family had spent in the princely residence and theater city of Mannheim. La Roche claimed that Karoline had requested the letters as a replacement for the journal, which had ceased publication. The author's travels and travel accounts apparently prevented an earlier publication date.

33. See Guy Stern, "Wieland als Herausgeber der Sternheim," in *Christoph Martin Wieland: Nordamerikanische Forschungsbeiträge zur 250. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages 1983*, ed. Hansjörg R. Schelle (Tübingen, 1984), 195–208. See also Wieland's letters concerning the novel *Geschichte des Fräuleins von Sternheim* in "Ich bin mehr Herz als Kopf," ed. Maurer, esp. 114–15.

34. "Anzeige der Pomona," *Der Teutsche Merkur (Anzeiger)* 1 (1784): xv. This notice stated that *Pomona*, with which La Roche "had won all the love of Germany's daughters that an excellent and tender mother could earn," was now appearing in the first issue of the second and unfortunately probably last volume: "Need I say more to those who subscribed to the first volume?"

35. Christoph Martin Wieland to Sophie von La Roche, 29 February 1784, in *C. M. Wieland's Briefe an Sophie von La Roche, nebst einem Schreiben von Gellert an Lavater*, ed. Franz Horn (Berlin, 1820), 250–51.

36. Only widowhood and the political upheavals of the revolutionary wars brought an end to her wealth and optimism. See Michael Maurer, "Einleitung: Sophie von La Roche—Leben einer empfindsamen Aufklärerin," in "Ich bin mehr Herz als Kopf," ed. Maurer, 29–33.

37. Krull, "Das Wirken der Frau," 236–76, esp. 252–66; Sabine Schumann, "Das 'lesende Frauenzimmer': Frauenzeitschriften im 18. Jahrhundert," in *Die Frau von der Reformation zur Romantik: Die Situation der Frau vor dem Hintergrund der Literatur- und Sozialgeschichte*, ed. Barbara Becker-Cantarino (Bonn, 1980), 158; Helga Madland, "An Introduction to the Works and Life of Marianne Ehrmann (1755–95): Writer, Editor, Journalist," *Lessing Yearbook* 21 (1989): 171–96. In her subsequent monograph, Madland modifies her radical thesis, noting that "financial considerations undoubtedly were an issue in the Ehrmann-Cotta debacle" (Helga Madland, *Marianne Ehrmann: Reason and Emotion in Her Life and Works* [New York, 1998], 220); Böhmel Fichera, *Kein Werk des Zufalls*, 107–8, 115, 138; Lisbeth Herger, "Frauenpublizistik am Beispiel von Marianne Ehrmann (1755–1795)," in *Alltag in der Schweiz seit 1300*, ed. Bernhard Schneider [Zurich, 1991], 192). A work that provides abundant quotations from the sources but little precise interpretation is Britt-Angela Kirstein, *Marianne Ehrmann: Publizistin und Herausgeberin im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1997), 91–111. Becker-Cantarino mentions the end of *Pomona* and *Amaliens Erholungsstunden* in one breath, without explanation, declaring both editors to have been the victims of the same triumphal march of the popular almanacs and their "famous male authors, including Wieland, Goethe or Schiller" ("'Muse' und 'Kunstrichter,'" 586).

38. Madland, "Introduction," 185–86. See Antinoa, *Syndicussin der Schö-*

nen, "Schönheit über Geist," *Amaliens Erholungsstunden* (hereafter cited as *AE*) 3.12 (1792): 201–4.

39. Krull, "Das Wirken der Frau," 254, cites from the second installment of "Gedanken über den Umgang eines bürgerlichen Frauenzimmers mit einem Offizier," which urgently admonished young women not to give military men the impression of consent (*AE* 2.8 [1791]: 123–29). The first installment (*AE* 2.7 [1791]: 31–38) was signed with the shorthand for Ehrmann's name.

40. Philonous L., "Venus Urania oder Giebt es Schönheit ohne Geist? Ein Traum: An Antionoa," *Flora*, 1.3 (1793): 73–92. The other two rebuttals were Lps, "Geist über Schönheit," *Flora* 1 (1793): 209–15; Yz, "Ein Wort an die Schönen und Nichtschönen," *Flora* 4 (1793): 175–78. Dawson discovered some occasional "protofeminist voices" even in *Flora* (*Contested Quill*, 278–81).

41. For a detailed account with numerous citations from primary sources, see Weckel, *Häuslichkeit und Öffentlichkeit*, 282–305.

42. The husband's involvement throughout this business conflict resulted from the editor's limited legal responsibility as a married woman. Hesse (*Other Enlightenment*, 56–78) has argued that in France this sort of legal situation obstructed married women's access to the literary public—publications required a husband's permission, and husbands were entitled to publish wives' works without their consent. Comparison with Germany is difficult because laws varied among the hundreds of small states. Nevertheless, I would argue for not overestimating the power of a legal situation, since laws do not necessarily determine what people actually do. In this case, for example, Theophil Ehrmann seems not to have used his legal entitlement against his wife's business interests; indeed, he shared them. Conversely, some women may well have been reluctant to publish their texts under their husbands' family names although legally allowed to do so without the husbands' permission.

43. After Ehrmann left the editorship, Cotta's publishing company quoted from a letter by her in the October 1792 issue of *Amaliens Erholungsstunden*. The tenor of the quoted letter is substantiated by an open letter defending her as editor. J. G. Cottaische Buchhandlung, announcement in *AE* 3.4, no. 10 (1792): 104; Meiburg, "An die Leserinnen des Journals Amaliens Erholungsstunden betitelt. Eine Notwehr für die boshaft angegriffene Verfasserin und ihren Gatten," in Krull, "Das Wirken der Frau," 260–65.

44. Marianne Ehrmann, "Erklärung," *AE* 2.3, no. 8 (1791): 173–74. In the studies mentioned earlier, Ehrmann's disapproval is traced mainly to the limited reading program that the reviewer had assigned to women in the month before this declaration. However, this perspective overlooks the fact that Ehrmann's own recommendations were also restrictive. See, for example, Marianne Ehrmann, "Kurze Bücheranzeigen," *AE* 2.3, no. 7 (1791): 80–86; Marianne Ehrmann, "Über die Lektür," *AE* 1.1, no. 1 (1790): 12–29. It is at least equally probable that Ehrmann objected to the bias of the reviewer, who, until Ehrmann's complaint, had disproportionately discussed and praised books published by Cotta. The book reviews also marked the beginning of the

publisher's unauthorized editorial interventions, which also could explain Ehrmann's explicit distancing of herself from the journal's content.

45. Kirstein shows on the basis of previously unknown sources that the Ehrmanns broke with Cotta only when they had an offer from a new publisher (*Marianne Ehrmann*, 102–11, esp. n. 140).

46. The publishing house claimed that it had essentially already borne sole responsibility for the journal throughout 1792 so that the subscribers would continue to receive what they had clearly approved. Allegedly to avoid confusion, in November and December Cotta titled the journal *Amaliens Erholungsstunden nicht von Marianne Ehrmann oder Flora* (Amalia's Leisure Hours not by Marianne Ehrmann, or Flora). Some eighteenth-century literary observers criticized this unusually brutal practice. Madland's interpretation of this as an "exorcism" seems to be going a bit too far, however ("Introduction," 183).

47. Marianne Ehrmann, "Vorrede" and "Einleitung," *Die Einsiedlerin aus den Alpen* 1.1 (1793): 15.

48. See esp. the review of *Amaliens Erholungsstunden* 2.1–6 in *Oberdeutsche allgemeine Litteraturzeitung* 1.2 (1792): 25–28. On contemporary reviews of Ehrmann's two journals as well as *Flora*, see Weckel, *Häuslichkeit und Öffentlichkeit*, 429–38.

49. The new editor, presumably Zahn, made no bones about this in his preface to the first issue of the journal now called *Flora: Amaliens Erholungsstunden* was now a closed chapter. Consequently, Ehrmann, who had provided far fewer contributions for the last volume than her contract stipulated, would write "not one line" in the new journal: "It is wholly up to my lovely readers to judge the extent to which this is your loss" (editor's preface, *Flora* 1.1 [1793]: 10).

50. Thus, Ehrmann's successor no longer signed himself as the author (*Verfasser*) but rather as the editor (*Redakteur*) (*Flora* 1.1 [1783]: 10). On *Flora*, see also Madland, "Three Eighteenth-Century Women's Journals."

51. For this reason, several late-eighteenth-century men assumed female pseudonyms as authors or editors. They presumably also hoped for gentler treatment at the hands of critics.

52. In the subscription lists of journals edited by women, the proportion of female names generally topped 50 percent, far higher than the tiny percentages of women who usually appeared as subscribers in the second half of the eighteenth century (Reinhard Wittmann, "Subskribenten- und Pränumerantenverzeichnisse als Quellen zur Lesergeschichte," in *Buchmarkt und Lektüre im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert: Beiträge zum literarischen Leben, 1750–1880* [Tübingen, 1982], 46–68).

53. See Sophie Pataky, ed., *Lexikon deutscher Frauen der Feder*, 2 vols. (1889; Pforzheim, 1987); for figures of French and British women writers, see Hesse, *Other Enlightenment*, 37, 39.

54. See Ruth P. Dawson, "'Der Weihrauch, den uns die Männer streuen': Wieland and the Women Writers in the *Teutscher Merkur*," in *Christoph Mar-*

tin Wieland, ed. Schelle, 225–49. Dawson, *Contested Quill*, 131–41, rightly emphasizes that La Roche motivated several women to send contributions to *Pomona* (mostly letters to the editor and poems, as mentioned earlier) and that the journal fostered communication between readers and contributors. However, I cannot see what one gains by labeling this phenomenon a “literary group.” I have analyzed it as a “female public” that gathered around the journal (Weckel, *Häuslichkeit und Öffentlichkeit*, 213–56, 318–454).

55. J. G. Cottaische Buchhandlung, announcement, *AE* 3.4, no. 12 (1792): 291.

56. *Journal für deutsche Frauen, von deutschen Frauen geschrieben: Besorgt von Wieland, Schiller, Rochlitz, und Seume*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1805–6) (hereafter cited as *JfdF*). The only women who signed contributions with their full names during the two years the journal appeared were Louise Brachmann, who published several poems, and Karoline Stosch, Julie von Bechtolsheim, and Karoline Woltmann, who published one prose text each. The three-part series on female education (“Über weibliche Erziehung”) was by Karoline Rudolphi, as a comparison with the (identical) text of her 1807 book, *Gemälde weiblicher Erziehung*, shows. See Elke Kleinau, “Pädagoginnen der Aufklärung und ihre Bildungstheorien,” in *Tugend, Vernunft, und Gefühl*, ed. Opitz, Weckel, and Kleinau, 309–38.

57. “The ladies will forgive a friend of that excellent man for bursting in on them and bringing a small wreath of forget-me-nots” (*JfdF* 1.1 [1805]: 160). The reference here is to an obituary for the author Christian Felix Weisse. The first volume also contained a poem by Seume on his late fellow editor, Schiller.

58. The concept of a periodical literary anthology with texts only by women authors had already been the basis of the 1790 *Museum für Frauenzimmer*, “by some of their co-sisters.” The quarterly journal, whose editors remained anonymous, ran for only four issues. Rochlitz, Seume, Wieland, and Schiller also did not see fit to elucidate the fact that the journal was addressed patriotically to “German” women from “German” women.

59. “An die Leserinnen,” *JfdF* 1.1 (1805): 3–4.

60. “Nachschrift,” *JfdF* 1.12 (1805): 127–28.

61. Somewhat misleadingly, the “Nachschrift” announced that in the next volume, two clever “German ladies” currently residing in Paris would be reporting on the “feminine world of that imperial city” (*ibid.*, 128).

62. Georg Joachim Göschen, “Nachricht wegen der Fortsetzung des Journals,” *JfdF* 2.12 (1806): n.p.

63. *Selene: Zugleich als Fortsetzung des Journals für deutsche Frauen*, ed. Friedrich Rochlitz, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1807–08). The only identifiable woman contributor again was Brachmann.

64. “She . . . steps amiably, bringing delight into the homes of humanity. . . . She loves the maiden, warns the wife, is helpful to the expecting mother, protects the infant, and preserves for the man of the tribe honor and the joy of life” (“Selene,” *Selene* 1.1 [1807]: 3).

65. "Vorbericht," *Erholungen* 1 (1796): n.p.

66. "Weihe," *Allgemeine deutsche Frauenzeitung* 1.1 (1816): 2–3. See also the advertisement in *Zeitblüthen* (1815): 343, quoted in Alfred Estermann, *Die deutschen Literatur-Zeitschriften 1815–1850: Bibliographien, Programme, Autoren* (Nendeln, 1978–81), 2:56–58. On this journal, see Dirk Alexander Reder, *Frauenbewegung und Nation: Patriotische Frauenvereine in Deutschland im frühen 19. Jahrhundert (1813–1830)* (Cologne, 1998), 364–66, 470–75; Karen Hagemann, "*Männlicher Muth und Teutsche Ehre*": *Nation, Militär, und Geschlecht zur Zeit der Antinapoleonischen Kriege Preußens* (Paderborn, 2002), esp. 389–90.

67. On women's contemporary attempts to write women's history, see Angelika Epple, *Empfindsame Geschichtsschreibung: Eine Geschlechtergeschichte der Historiographie zwischen Aufklärung und Historismus* (Cologne, 2003).

68. "Die Zeiten, wo man für Frauen wie für Kinder eigene Bücher schreiben durfte, sind längst vorüber. Der weibliche Geist ergreift jetzt jede Blume im Gebiet der schönen Literatur, betrachtet alles und behält das Beste, mit nicht minderen Gelingen und nicht minderer Auswahl als der männliche, und schon die Anmaßung, nur für Frauen schreiben zu wollen, würde die gebildeten und geistreichsten Leserinnen uns verscheuchen, weil sie schon von weitem Langeweile und zum Überdruß wiederholtes moralisches Geschwätz zu wittern glauben würden" (Johanna Schopenhauer to an unnamed privy councilor, 2 December 1821, in *Damals in Weimar! Erinnerungen und Briefe von und an Johanna Schopenhauer*, ed. Heinrich Hubert Houben [Leipzig, 1924], 141–42).

69. *Ibid.*