

Wendy R. Katz & Kenna Creer Manos

Of Women Born: Children's Fiction and Its Female Authorship

Marsha Hewitt and Claire MacKay's *One Proud Summer* (1981) is one of the most recent in a long line of children's books written by women. It was published by a women's press and will be taught in children's literature courses unique for their preponderance of women, both professors and students. It has been or will be reviewed very likely by a woman in children's literature journals; and its very existence is owed to feminists who, for the last dozen or so years, have been examining children's literature as a particularly female entity and, thus, as part of a lost line of women's cultural history.

The connection between women and children's literature dates back to the eighteenth century and to what is perhaps the start of children's literature itself. (Before this children could read or be read fables, nursery rhymes, chapbooks, the seventeenth century Puritans Jane-way and Bunyan, or adapted versions of *Robinson Crusoe* or *Gulliver's Travels*, but they had no actual literature of their own.) While Henry Fielding was establishing credentials for the adult novel, his sister Sarah Fielding was writing the first novel for children, *The Governess* (1749). And so the female line of writers was begun and has run since then from the female rationalists of the eighteenth century to the women who wrote didactic evangelical and Anglican tales all the way to contemporary women writers.

We will be concerned here with examining some aspects, both literary and extra-literary, of this connection between children's literature and women, in particular the literary implications of the traditional woman's role as domestic keeper of either religious or moral purity. What develops from this examination is a retrospectively obvious but nonetheless interesting pattern of decreasing conservatism, a move, in the literature, from submission and subservience to quasi-sublimatory fantasy, to rebellion, and then to strength and affirmation. *One Proud Summer* will serve as an example of this most recent turn of events.

The question of woman as producer of children's literature is bound up with the question of children as readers. Children's literature, it should be noted, is a literature defined exclusively in terms of its readership. It presupposes certain readers in a more deliberate way than any other literature. Consequently, the writer's relationship to the reader—or to a particular concept of the reader, since the gap between adult writer and child reader is never bridged—is often closer than her relationship to the text itself. That is, the writer's awareness of these readers' presumed needs is paramount. Of course this relationship between reader and writer affects authors of both sexes. But women in particular, it seems clear, took upon themselves the job of writing for children just as they assumed the responsibility for caring for children in the home. Writing for children was, in fact, an extension of the domestic sphere—although it was also, we will suggest later, a way out of it.

That intrusive figure of the child naturally determined the character of the literature to be written. The child must be instructed; thus the writing must teach. Didacticism reigned. Even in *The Governess*, lightened by fairy stories that were later repudiated by rationalist and evangelical writers alike, the concerns of the text are those of self-discipline, obedience, veracity and restraint. Titles like Anna Barbauld's *Lessons for Children* (1778) and Maria Edgeworth's *Early Lessons* (1801) point to the didacticism characteristic of this lot. The chief concern of the very influential Mrs. Trimmer, herself a mother of twelve as well as a children's writer, is the proper education of the child. She brings education together with both children and women in *The Guardian of Education* (1802-06), the first periodical publication to explore writing on and for children, cautioning "Young Mothers, and others of the Female sex who are engaged in the important Business of Education, against the Attempts which are making to banish Christianity from the Nursery and the School."¹ Of course not all women writers agreed about what was good for children. Mrs. Trimmer, always ready to detect subversive writing in any form, thought Maria Edgeworth's stories godless; and the popular Mrs. Sherwood, happier with submission than with discussion, did not think children should be reasoned into obedience. Then, and now, strongly-felt opinions about children and their well being governed what was written. Nowhere is the issue of censorship more hotly debated outside of various law schools than in the classrooms of children's literature.

As an extension of the domestic sphere, then, women's affinity with children's literature is understandable; but for many women, the primary impetus for writing children's books was that of Sarah Fielding:

financial necessity. She was only one of many unmarried women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who found themselves either totally or partially dependent on male relatives. As she notes in the "Advertisement to the Reader" which appeared in her 1844 volume, *The Adventure of David Simple*, "Perhaps the best excuse that can be made for a woman's venturing to write at all, is that which really produced this book—distress in her circumstances, which she could not so well remove by any other means in her power." By the end of the eighteenth century, more and more women were taking to writing to supplement their incomes, as Sarah Fielding had done, or to provide the support for themselves and their families. Some, like Frances Browne (1816-1880), Charlotte Tucker (1821-1893), and "Hesba Stretton" (1832-1911), were unmarried women who wrote to escape dependence on male relatives. Others, like Helen Jackson (1831-1885), Margaret Gatty (1809-1873), E. Nesbit (1858-1924), and Mrs. Charlesworth (1842-1921), began writing either after the death of their husbands or because their husbands were financially unsuccessful. A fictional account of such "survival" writing occurs in Nesbit's *The Railway Children*, where the mother produces the stories that support her children after her husband, falsely accused of stealing, is sent to prison.

In an article published in 1857, J.M. Kaye advanced literature as the "only profession . . . which does not jealously exclude women from all participation in its honour and profits."² Until the mid-nineteenth century, however, writing was not generally considered to be a respectable occupation for a woman. Eighteenth-century attitudes towards women writers are revealed by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, when she writes of her cousin Sarah Fielding: "I . . . heartily pity her, constrained by her circumstances to seek her bread by a method I do not doubt she despises."³ That many later women were equally uncomfortable with being forced to write from financial necessity is evident in the fact that so many refused publicly to admit authorship. From the unnamed "Lady" who was Sarah Fielding to "ALOE" "A Lady of England" (Charlotte Tucker) to "Hesba Stretton" (Sarah Smith), women tended to publish anonymously or pseudonymously.

One of the forces drawing women towards children's, rather than adult, fiction may well have been male hostility. In January 1855, Nathaniel Hawthorne wrote a protest to his publisher, which was often to be repeated, against the "d----d mob of scribbling women"⁴ whose presence, he remarked accusingly, ensured that his own work would "have no chance of success while the public taste is occupied with their trash."⁵ Similarly, in 1847, G.H. Lewes lamented that the profession of letters was becoming corrupted by the increasing numbers of "women,

children, and ill-trained troops."⁶ Indeed, Robert Southey's admonition to Charlotte Brontë in 1837 is a familiar one: "Literature cannot be the business of a woman's life, and it ought not to be."⁷ Perhaps it is not surprising to find the author of *The Angel in the House*, Coventry Patmore, maintaining that while "there certainly have been cases of women possessed of the properly masculine power of writing books . . . these cases are all so truly and obviously exceptional, and must and ought always to remain so, that we may overlook them."⁸ These quotations suggest that women writers were seen as threatening to men not only because women were thought to have deserted their proper domain of the home to challenge the exclusive right of men as writers, but also because they were seen as competing with men for a limited literary market.

It makes sense, then, that women should have sought their financial independence by turning to a literary field in which reviews could praise their domestic piety and the suitability of their role as educators of the young. But if women entered the domain of children's literature from financial necessity, it is equally true that writing for children satisfied the pressing need felt by many to be useful in the world and to serve as the spiritual and moral guides for the younger generation. The best of these writers successfully satisfied this need. Mrs. Trimmer's popular *The History of the Robins* (1786), includes, along with its main theme of kindness to animals, conventional reminders of filial duty and the inadequacy of handsome appearances through a well-individualized family of birds. Although most children's works of this period are distinguished by their obtrusive didacticism, some do manage to present life-like, ordinary children. In Maria Edgeworth's *Early Lessons*, for example, Frank and Rosamond play together, quarrel, and engage in other normal childhood activities without being presented as impossibly virtuous; yet their experiences are still morally instructive.

The careers of two of the most influential women writers for children—Hannah More and Mrs. Sherwood—in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries provide the most notable examples of women enacting their traditional roles as keepers of moral and spiritual virtue in the domestic sphere. Significantly, Hannah More and Mrs. Sherwood, like many other women writers for children who were related to clergymen, were themselves clergymen's daughters.

In the late eighteenth century, the plight of Hannah More's neighbours—impoverished and ill-used farmers and miners—induced her to solicit subscriptions to set up a Sunday School. Her main purpose was to teach children to read in order that, as George III was to declare in 1805, "Every poor child in my dominion should be taught

to read the Bible." Bible study, and therefore literacy, was the way to save one's soul. This new literate population created by the Sunday School prompted the question of what—besides the Bible—they were to read. The task for Hannah More was a huge one: it demanded the creation, not of two or three books, but of a substantial body of reading material for the rapidly increasing numbers of literate children. In 1795, she had the first batch of Cheap Repository Tracts ready. These tracts, as Gillian Avery notes in *Childhood's Pattern* (1975), were illustrated with appealing woodcuts and given inviting titles like *The Execution of Wild Robert*, *The Thunderstorm*, and *The Fortune Teller*.⁹ Their immediate popularity was enormous; according to Avery, "over 300,000 tracts sold in the first six weeks."¹⁰ The magnitude of Hannah More's contribution is as impressive as the sales figures: she was herself responsible for writing fifty-six volumes in the series. It was on the foundation of the Sunday Schools, then, established primarily through the efforts of women, that the children's book trade grew and flourished. Hence, women were directly responsible for creating a market for their work.

Mrs. Sherwood was also prompted to write in order to provide reading matter suitable for the instruction of young people. Her avowed intention in her most famous work, *The History of the Fairchild Family* (the first of the three volume series was published in 1818), was "to show the importance and effects of a religious education."¹¹ Mr. Fairchild, who governs his children's religious education, continually emphasizes their natural depravity along with his hope that they will understand their innate wickedness and come to know God. But the overbearing religious propaganda is alleviated by convincing accounts of the ordinary doings of real children. Six-year-old Henry, for example, may be inordinately given to prayers and smug religious comments, but he can also be playful, unruly, and quarrelsome. In fact, it is a minor squabble between Henry and his sister that provokes Mr. Fairchild, as an object lesson, to take his children to ponder the decomposing body of a man hanged for fratricide. Nor is this morbid scene the only instance in which a corpse provides a lesson in the novel. Although we are struck by the horror of such scenes, it is important to remember that Mrs. Sherwood's emphasis on death was not extraordinary. Funerals, bereavements, and graveyards had been staples in children's reading since the time of James Janeway's *Token for Children*, his 1672 martyrology of "holy lives" and "joyful deaths."

Although the didacticism of the successors of Hannah More and Mrs. Sherwood became gradually less overt, children's fiction continued to reflect women's role as keeper of morality and spiritual virtue in the domestic sphere. Catherine Sinclair's *Holiday House* (1839), for

example, is notable for its rambunctious, fun-loving children from whom little crockery escapes unscathed and its adults who enjoy rather than condemn the children's misbehaviour. Nevertheless, the book is not without its moral resolve. It concludes with Harry's and Laura's sudden turn to piety occasioned by the gradual death of their brother Frank.

Sometimes social conscience is mixed with religious zeal, as in the novels of "Hesba Stretton," whose phenomenally successful *Jessica's First Prayer* sold one and one half million copies in 1866. One of the founders of the London Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, "Hesba Stretton" wrote novels such as *Little Meg's Children* (1868) and *Alone in London* (1869), whose titles accurately suggest their depiction of uncared for children. Typically, a Bible story provides these children with the solace and strength necessary to endure their existence.

Other children's fiction continues to explore the domestic sphere. Charlotte Yonge's (1823-1901) *The Daisy Chain* (1856), one of the best known of her 160 books, is a family, albeit motherless, chronicle largely confined to the depiction of middle-class life, and the possibilities and trials of active—but always potentially good—children. At about this time a growing movement towards representing children as they really are, rather than as moral abstractions, comes into existence. Real life is observed, and real children become less subsumed in moralizing. Although the heroines in Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women* (1868), for example, are shown as being basically good, their goodness is not the obvious cause of the book's existence, and their ordinary activities give little hint of abnormal perfection. Similarly, in Mrs. Molesworth's *Carrots, Just a Little Boy* (1876), we have the characterization of real children with credible anxieties, mishaps, and shortcomings. Significantly, Mrs. Molesworth regards these as social deficiencies instead of mortal sins. In Mrs. Ewing's *We and the World* (1877), a novel exploration of the discord between parent and child is presented with a sympathy towards the child which would have been unthinkable in Mrs. Sherwood's time. These works still promulgate particular values, but they are presented with less vehemence and obtrusiveness. Increasingly, as J.S. Bratten remarks in *The Impact of Victorian Children's Literature* (1981), "the action displays not moral points to be learned but morally responsible human beings to be understood."¹²

It is doubtless easy to heap ridicule on the overt didacticism of early novels like *The Fairchild Family* and even on the less, but still present, moralism of the later novels, but these works must be seen in the historical perspective of nineteenth-century attitudes towards litera-

ture as a whole—that seemingly omnipresent Victorian penchant for judging all literature according to the moral values contained therein. From Trollope's self-congratulatory statement that he has "made nothing known which the purest young girl could not have read,"¹³ to Robert Louis Stevenson's complaint about the "incompetence" of English fiction where we see "the moral clumsily forced into every hole and corner of the story,"¹⁴ reviewers, critics, and authors themselves call attention to the constant preoccupation with the moral tone of imaginative works. Until the late nineteenth century, opinion seems relatively supportive of the sentiment expressed by an *Athenaeum* reviewer who explained the unfairness of discussing "all the literary shortcomings of the book as a story" because "the lesson intended is excellently brought out."¹⁵ Indeed, there is much truth in Lytton Strachey's assertion that the Victorian critic always seems to be saying "No one in his senses . . . would discuss anything so impalpable and frivolous as a work of art; and yet it is our painful duty to do so; therefore we shall tell you all we can about the moral lessons we can draw from it . . ."¹⁶

Thus far we have looked at women's entry into the field of children's literature as an extension of their work in the domestic sphere, as a legitimate way to make money, and as a profession consonant with the maintaining of women's role as preserver of moral and spiritual purity. There is an intriguing, however speculative, psychological dimension to this writing that remains to be discussed, if only briefly. According to the nineteenth-century American popular novelist Fanny Fern, women's writing could be therapeutic. It could liberate women from the narrow confines of the home rather than reinforce her place within them. "Write," she says, "to lift yourselves out of the dead-level of your lives . . . to lessen the number who are daily added to our lunatic asylums from the ranks of the misappreciated, unhappy womanhood, narrowed by lives made up of details. Fight it!"¹⁷ Although her tone is perhaps overwrought, one is reminded inevitably of a writer such as Beatrix Potter, or even Lucy Maud Montgomery. A good education followed by a heavy dose of intellectual frustration led many women to take up their pens. J.S. Bratten's description of the phenomenon of women writing evangelical stories as "the aspiring intellect [seeking] a way round female dependence and impotence,"¹⁸ suitably describes non-evangelical women writers as well. Anglican writer Elizabeth Sewell, who at thirteen planned a college for girls similar to Oxford, explains in her autobiography that she had "vague dreams of distinction, kept under from the sense of being a girl."¹⁹ If we are willing to assume a certain degree of repression among women raised to be patient, tolerant, generous, and forgiving, then we may be willing to

see their literary efforts as a route to escape. We may also be willing to see strange signs of anger, passion, and disobedience in their works; and likewise, we may query the absence of these signs. We may wonder at some women writers' eagerness to be in the forefront of conservatism in their lives as well as in their works. Why do so many combine authorship with selfless and seemingly inexhaustible social work? Why does well-born Charlotte Tucker, raised in comfort in Upper Portland Place, convert to Evangelicalism, become a regular visitor at Marylebone Workhouse, and give away her earnings to charity? (Charlotte Yonge, who "had no hesitation in declaring [her] full belief in the inferiority of women,"²⁰ gave away her profits as well.) What propelled Mrs. Sherwood, for that matter, raised on fables, fairy tales, *Robinson Crusoe*, and Mrs. Fielding's *The Governess*, educated in Latin and Greek with her brother, and given complete access to her father's library, to find the doctrine of human depravity attractive and become one of its leading literary exponents?

In the literature itself, these psychological particulars assume a more consistent pattern. The pattern follows a line, as we observed earlier, from the moral tale of submission and subservience, to the more playful and unrestrained fantasy, to stories of rebellion and affirmation. The most conservative books for children, that is, those encouraging submissive obedience, were the first. The distinguishing feature of these works, published from about 1750 to 1850, is that they concentrate upon what the adult wanted the child to *become* rather than upon what the child *was*. Their fictional narratives are designed to urge readers to curb their immoderate childish ways and to cultivate the thoughts and habits, both temporal and spiritual, of a responsible adult. The fiction of Sarah Fielding, Maria Edgeworth, Mrs. Trimmer, and Mrs. Sherwood fits into this early period. Even by the 1850s Mrs. Gatty and Charlotte Yonge were still exhorting children to be dutiful and submissive. By the 1870s, however, religion had lost its grip on children's literature and the hitherto duty-bound child began to assert an independent will and spirit. Helen Mathers' *Comin' Through the Rye* (1875), like Mrs. Ewing's *We and the World*, concerns itself with the criticism of the Victorian father. This is a sizeable step away from the ideological giant of subservience, but still a considerable distance from the view that a child must be emancipated from parents to do and think independently such as one gets in Butler's frontal attack on Victorian patriarchy, *The Way of All Flesh*, that adult novel invigorated by its remarkable sense of childhood.

A more muted form of defiance came in the shape of fantasy. The otherwise unthinkable and socially unacceptable passions and improprieties of childhood were temporarily unleashed—and then re-

strained—in fantasy. In Christina Rossetti's *Speaking Likenesses*, a trio of short stories published in 1874, Rossetti uses a fantasy world as a vehicle for the subconscious and its unknown or outlawed emotions. In the main story, Rossetti throws her principal character, Flora, into a mirrored room, and, through images fanciful and grotesque, discloses her inner being. Both victim and victimizer, Flora sees her alter ego character, and thus herself, as selfish and demanding. After an attack from one boy bristling with porcupine quills, another one faceted with sharp angles, and still another hung round with fish-hooks, she fights back by being totally passive. The fantasy suggests tremendous and unsatisfied yearning, and lends support to the intriguing argument of U.P. Knoepfelmacher who, in his article on female aggression in Victorian children's literature, claims that "fantasy . . . freed the same aggressive impulses that their fictions tried to domesticate."²¹ Victorian women writers, he says, far more than their predecessors, "needed to maintain strength and decorum."²² Their forays into fantasy were paradoxical and unwitting acts of sublimation. The stories Knoepfelmacher uses as examples are Juliana Horatia Ewing's "Amelia and the Dwarf" (1870) and Frances Hodgson Burnett's "Behind the White Brick" (1874). These stories, he explains, allow their girl characters to vent their hostile behavior through the fantasy and then return to a realistic world to be socialized. Both stories, he argues, contain energies "made possible by the indulged wish of female aggression in defiance of Victorian taboos . . . [Both] allow free play to the very anarchy that each work tries to domesticate."²³ All three stories play off the world of fantasy against the world of reality.

The patterns after the 1870s are more familiar to contemporary readers. With the Education Acts of 1870 and 1876, and the new wide readership that followed, children's literature became extraordinarily varied. Late nineteenth-century liberal and socially progressive views allowed for more independence in both subject matter and form. Many of us may be familiar with the names of such twentieth-century children's writers as Laura Ingalls Wilder, Lucy Boston, Mary Norton, and Phillipa Pearce. Increasing independence for the child protagonist and an increasingly impressive devotion to the craft of writing characterize the writing of this century, especially that after the 1960s. Other writers, it should be noted, like Marsha Hewitt and Claire MacKay, have taken children's literature along a slightly different track. Their child protagonists are not any less independent than others, but they have been returned to a carefully defined and broadened social context, a world that requires more than the family and the home. Hewitt and MacKay are serious about their writing as well as about their ideology, but they are not free to write without a purpose.

Not until the twentieth century does children's fiction come under extensive scrutiny as literature rather than as a sub-department of education, religion, or morality. As the editors of *Only Connect*, a well-known anthology of readings on children's literature, put the matter, "Children's literature [is] an essential part of the whole range of literary activity, to be discussed in the same terms and judged by the same standards that would apply to any other brand of writing. We do not subscribe to the view that the criticism of children's books calls for the adoption of a special scale of values."²⁴ Children's books must be taken seriously as literature, and this means that the criticism must rise above vague approval, plot summaries, and gift-giving advice.

Since the 1960s, children's books have acquired a respectability never before contemplated—space in national newspapers has been given to them, special journals are devoted to them. However, those willing to discuss children's literature as a serious matter are still predominantly women: teachers, librarians, reviewers, and critics. Jane Resh Thomas, the children's book critic for the *Minneapolis Tribune*, protests: "Adults respect what I'm doing when I review adult books. They do not respect what I'm doing when I review children's books. It's as if I were making mud pies for my life's work."²⁵ Thomas stresses that her judgments about children's literature arise not from an interest in child development or education or history (which seems to be generally accepted as a legitimate mainstream activity—witness the respect given to Arie's or Bettelheim's work), but from interest in all literature. "I think it is a feminist act," she argues, "to treat children's books as literature, to take them seriously."²⁶ Thomas concludes: "Fine children's literature shares with literature for other audiences the characteristic of faithfulness to the sense and feeling of life. The sentimentality which denies all the world's problems is no more valid—and children know it—than a horrific view of the world that refuses to acknowledge goodness and joy."²⁷

It is precisely this faithfulness to life, combined with a moral seriousness far removed from the bland trifles of much work for children, that characterizes *One Proud Summer*. Though it is a novel dealing with ideas and history, its life is not sacrificed to its ideas. Lucie, the central character, is an adolescent struggling to come to terms with her own attitudes and beliefs, not a cipher who merely illustrates the young-girl-working-in-a-sweat-shop-who-gains-dignity-and-self-worth-through-becoming-involved-in-a-strike. Though we would not wish to make extravagant claims for the novel, it serves as a telling reminder that books for children need be neither obtrusively moralistic nor lightweight.

Without sacrificing aesthetic values, *One Proud Summer* is responsible fiction. Most characters are fully rounded, the situation strongly conceived, the sense of place well established. The feminist material includes three generations of women workers, adolescent sexual harassment, thwarted intellectual aspirations and a community of women who work, unionize, and ultimately win together. *One Proud Summer* challenges the state and the Catholic Church, and might well be charged with being excessively propagandist if it were not so carefully rooted in Canadian history and the Montreal Cottons Strike of 1946 in Valleyfield, Quebec. Nor are the moral complexities of a strike avoided: Lucie, confronted with a constable threatening to arrest the picketers, ponders: "But . . . he'd probably get fired if he didn't do what he was told, wouldn't he? And he's married. With a new baby . . ." ²⁸ And, after the initial buoyancy created by taking strike action, Lucie is worn down by continual clashes. On more than one occasion she wants to run home, "where the only one who yell[s] [is] her grandmother." ²⁹ Her pleasures are often those of ordinary children, like her readers: her fingering of her "favourite" photograph from a Montreal paper, with the "blurry and small" figure of herself "down in one corner." ³⁰ And yet with all of its virtues and its modernity, *One Proud Summer* is still a book that resembles its progenitors. Its authors are serious; they care about what children think and how they grow. The perceived needs of children are the key to and impetus for the text. Although *One Proud Summer* is as much of its period as the *History of the Robins*, both works have shaped visions of a children's world from adult female matter.

NOTES

1. Quoted in Gillian Avery, *Childhood's Pattern* (London, 1975), p. 45.
2. J.M. Kaye, "The Employment of Women," *North British Review*, XXVI (1857), 177.
3. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, *Complete Letters*, ed. Robert Halsband, Vol. III (Oxford, 1967), p. 67.
4. Caroline Ticknor, *Hawthorne and His Publisher* (1913; Port Washington, N.Y., 1969), p. 141.
5. *Ibid.*
6. G.H. Lewes, "The Condition of Authors in England, Germany, and France," *Fraser's Magazine*, XXXV (1847), 285.
7. Elizabeth C. Gaskell, *The Life of Charlotte Bronte*, Vol. I (London, 1857), p. 178.
8. Coventry Patmore, "The Social Position of Women," *North British Review*, XIV (1851), 281.
9. Avery, p. 59.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
11. *The History of the Fairchild Family* was subtitled *The Child's Manual, being a collection of stories calculated to show the importance and effects of a religious education*.
12. J.S. Bratten, *The Impact of Victorian Children's Fiction* (London, 1981), p. 161.

13. Anthony Trollope, *An Autobiography*, ed. Michael Sadler (London, 1947), p. 167.
14. [Robert Louis Stevenson], "Victor Hugo's Romances," *Cornhill Magazine*, XXX (August 1874), 192.
15. "Current Novels," *Athenaeum*, (30 March 1861), 430.
16. Lytton Strachery, *Literary Essays* (London, 1946), p. 211.
17. Fanny Fern, *New York Ledger*, 10 August 1867; quoted in Ann D. Wood. "The 'Scribbling Women' and Fanny Fern: Why Women Wrote," *American Quarterly*, XXIII (1971), 24.
18. Bratten, p. 164.
19. Eleanor C. Sewell, ed. *The Autobiography of Elizabeth M. Sewell* (London, 1908), p. 16.
20. Georgiana Battiscombe, *Charlotte Mary Yonge* (London, 1943), p. 61.
21. U.P. Knoepfmacher, "Little Girls Without Their Curls: Female Aggression in Victorian Children's Literature," *Children's Literature*, XI (1983), 14.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
24. Preface to *Only Connect*, eds. Sheila Egoff, G.T. Stubbs, and L.F. Ashley (Toronto, 1969), xv.
25. Kathy Piehl, "Jane Rosh Thomas, Feminist as Children's Book Reviewer, Critic, and Author," *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, VII (1982), 16.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. Marsha Hewitt and Claire MacKay, *One Proud Summer* (Toronto, 1968), pp. 52-53.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 49.