# "I'M YOUR MAN": HARRIET MARTINEAU AND THE *EDINBURGH REVIEW*

**Valerie Sanders**

"I'm your man" was Harriet Martineau's response in 1858, when the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, Henry Reeve, proposed an article on the repatriation of black African slave-labourers to Liberia (Sanders 158). Her situation by this time was complicated. Born in 1802, she had pursued a full career, initially as a populariser of political economy, then as a commentator on American society and politics. She had written two novels, been ill for five years and written about it, been allegedly cured by mesmerism and written about that too, travelled to the Middle East, and in 1852 begun writing regular "leaders" for the *Daily News*. In 1855, however, feeling unwell again, she had been told by doctors that she had an enlarged heart and might die at any moment. She therefore scribbled her *Autobiography* at breakneck speed in three months, cut down her other work, and prepared to die with her life in order. She was by then living in a house of her own in Ambleside, in the Lake District, tended by her devoted niece, Maria, and a set of equally loyal women servants.

In fact she did not die for another twenty-one years. She carried on writing for the *Daily News*, and in 1858 decided to contribute to the *Edinburgh Review*. The object of this discussion is to consider the ten-year period during which she contributed a total of twelve articles to the *Review*, and in particular to examine the nature of her relationship with its editor, Henry Reeve, who was also a distant cousin. Though Martineau asked her correspondents to destroy her letters to them, Reeve disobeyed orders and kept his. They now give us an important insight into the way editor and contributor worked together to produce major articles. I want specifically to consider why Martineau, who thought she was at the end of her career, decided at this point to negotiate entry into another leading periodical, and especially why, at this stage in her life, when she had already proved herself, she was so keen to disguise her writing as a man's—indeed to surround the whole venture in excessive secrecy. What this implies about the nature of mid-nineteenth-century journalism for women—even for a woman as self-confident and successful as Martineau had been—is a further reason for looking again at Martineau's fresh start in a new context.

The *Edinburgh Review* in the 1860s was very much a male stronghold. Though women sometimes edited smaller magazines aimed at their own sex (Charlotte Yonge was by this time well established as editor of the *Monthly Packet*), the big reviews of the age—the *Quarterly, Westminster Review, Edinburgh, Macmillan's, Cornhill, Fortnightly*—were all edited by men. Men also contributed most of the articles. Taking at random a page from the *Wellesley Index* listing articles for the *Edinburgh* in 1862-64, when Martineau was an active contributor, I find only two other female names: Charlotte Dempster, a young novelist who wrote mainly on lighter, literary topics such as "French anti-clerical novels" (October 1864) and "Contributions to the life of Rubens" (January 1863); and Caroline de Peyronnet, who was married to a French

baron, and was an expert on French literature. The *Edinburgh* was not an especially literary journal, and most of its articles were politically heavyweight, concerned with current affairs, history, and other parts of the world: in the 1860s it specialised in foreign affairs, Reeve's own area of expertise. He himself wrote about the Crimea, Japan, French politics, current affairs, and art. A man of cosmopolitan tastes, Reeve had partly been educated abroad (in Geneva), and had lived in France, Italy and Germany. Eleven years younger than Martineau, he had worked on the *Times* newspaper for fifteen years before becoming editor of the *Edinburgh* in 1855, the year Martineau decided her life was over. George Eliot's publisher John Blackwood was fairly unimpressed with him. He noted:

> He is a very singular instance of the success of self satisfied mediocrity. I remember [Laurence] Oliphant and I one night speculating at the Cosmopolitan, when Reeve was sitting opposite to us, smiling complacently as usual, as to what could be the secret of his permanent success and position in life. We could hit upon no theory, unless it was his imposing Paunch. (Haight 4: 353)

When Reeve died in 1895 the obituaries were somewhat more respectful. The *Edinburgh* loyally argued that "during the whole of his long life he was a powerful and living force in English literature. . . . [H]e exercised during many years a political influence such as rarely falls to the lot of any Englishman outside Parliament, or even outside the Cabinet" (183 [1896]: 267). A figure very much belonging to the establishment, Reeve said of himself: "Probably no one had ever written as much as I have done in the English press with equal opportunities of acquiring information on the subjects I professed to treat" (Laughton 1: 338). Reeve was also noted for his clear, cogent, impersonal writing, which his obituary describes as "a transparent, vivid, and restrained style" (270).

Harriet Martineau had been at the centre of political life in the 1830s, when her *Illustrations of Political Economy* attracted the support of Cabinet ministers and economists. She moved from her native Norwich to central London and mixed extensively in literary and political social circles, making no secret of her authorship. But she was a Unitarian by upbringing, deaf, and self-supporting; by 1858, moreover, she was a confirmed invalid, living miles away from London in an all-female household. On the face of it, therefore, her partnership with Reeve seems highly unlikely. Nevertheless, according to one editor of her letters, Elisabeth Arbuckle, they became "close friends and collaborators" (122).

Martineau's first experience of writing for a periodical was with the Unitarian *Monthly Repository* in the 1820s and 30s, when she formed a close professional relationship with its editor W.J. Fox. In 1829 she told him how much she longed for "a regular literary employment which will be improving as well as profitable.—While I *know* that the Edinburgh [Review] has been almost in despair for want of writers, & that mere boys send their first essays to the Quarterly, I think it is not presumptuous to wish to make trial of some well established Review. But I have not courage to pursue the

straight forward method of preparing an article & sending it to take its chance" (Sanders 19). Though Martineau later contributed to many major periodicals, including the *Westminster, Cornhill, Dublin University Magazine, Quarterly* and *Macmillan's*, she obviously felt diffident at this stage about approaching an editor other than Fox with an unsolicited manuscript. She also saw the situation in gendered terms: "mere boys" sending their first essays to the major journals, while she, as a young woman, felt unable. This remained her view in 1837, when she was offered the editorship of a new "Economical Magazine":

> "If I do this," she told herself at the time, I must brace myself up to do and suffer like a man. No more waywardness, precipitation, and reliance on allowance from others! Undertaking a man's duty, I must brave a man's fate. I must be prudent, independent, serene, good-humoured; earnest with cheerfulness. The possibility is open before me of showing what a periodical with a perfect temper may be:—also, of setting women forward at once into the rank of men of business. (*Autobiography* 2: 110)

In the event she declined the editorship because her brother James advised against it, but her comments on the issues reveal her conviction that journalists must be calm and self-controlled, and the ideal periodical "perfect tempered." Her next major skirmish with the papers nearly a decade later proved how difficult it was to attain this ideal. Having chosen the *Athenaeum* as the place to publish her *Letters on Mesmerism* (1844; republished 1845), she was subjected to a barrage of slanderous remarks within the paper itself by the editor, Charles Wentworth Dilke. Martineau ascribed the outcry to human pride and prejudice being unable to accept new ideas, and was happy to be a martyr for the cause. Twenty years later in 1868 she complained that the *Edinburgh* was sinking "lower and lower in its relations to science, and everything that requires manliness and courage" (Arbuckle 295). In the meantime she had seceded from *Household Words* in 1854 because of their anti-Catholic stance. Significantly, the disagreement had also been about women. The magazine's sub-editor William Henry Wills had proposed that Martineau write some articles on the employments of women, but had been "quite unable to see that every contribution of the kind was necessarily excluded by Mr. Dickens's prior articles on behalf of his view of Woman's position; articles in which he ignored the fact that nineteen-twentieths of the women of England earn their bread, and in which he prescribes the function of Women; viz., to dress well and look pretty, as an adornment to the homes of men" (*Autobiography* 2: 419). Martineau answered these objections in her own article "Female Industry," written for the *Edinburgh* in 1859. Meanwhile, she bailed John Chapman out of his financial difficulties with the *Westminster Review* in 1854 because she appreciated his support for "the cause of free-thought and free-speech" (*Autobiography* 2: 425).

By the time she came to contact Henry Reeve, therefore, her relationship with the world of Victorian journalism had become distinctly quarrelsome, and largely because of issues of liberalism and free speech. Alternately lauded and vilified in the

papers, she continued wanting to write for them, but found herself repeatedly at loggerheads with her male editors. In June 1858 however, after cautiously testing him out in a general way, she wrote to Henry Reeve proposing an article on French invasion panics, a topic suggested to her by a friend who was a paper-manufacturer in Wales. Martineau typically saw this as being more than a piece of curious social history, but also an opportunity to discourse on economic issues: "If the materials were not already too abundant, the temptation would be strong to expatiate a little on the operation of progressive science on political relations" (Sanders 156). In fact this article never appeared in the *Edinburgh*—if indeed it was ever written. In the same letter Martineau says she is glad they seem to agree on American subjects, especially anti-slavery. This had been a favourite cause with Martineau since her two-year trip to America in 1834-36: in the 1850s she was writing *Daily News* articles about the progress of the abolitionist movement in the States. Her first article for the *Edinburgh* therefore became "The Slave-Trade in 1858," which appeared in the *Review* in October 1858.

Why *then*? Why the *Edinburgh*? She was hardly short of work that year: she was writing regularly for the *Daily News* and from 1859-65 for the journal *Once a Week*, where she felt her work was appearing a little too often. "I don't want to *appear* every week, and seem to take so large a part; so I have chosen a *nom de plume* under which a quite different sort of articles will appear," she told her friend Fanny Wedgwood in 1859 (Arbuckle 182). Her *nom de plume* was "From the Mountain": her *persona* that of an old hermit living out of the turmoil of society. In addition she told Reeve in 1858 that "nobody knows the fact of my entrance upon the American department of the 'Spectator'" (Sanders 159). As she proudly boasted to Fanny Wedgwood, in August of the same year there had been eight articles of hers in the last nine editions of the *Daily News*, and an additional one in the *Spectator* (Arbuckle 165). To Reeve in March 1859 she confided: "*Entre nous*, I have this morning accepted an engagement (dependent on my health) to supply the link wanted between European & American politics, by means of fortnightly letters to a really good New York weekly paper" (Sanders 175). This was the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* to which she contributed about ninety letters over three years. Including this last contract she was therefore by 1859 a more or less regular contributor to five papers, but actively disguising her involvement in as many of them as possible.

Martineau seems to have felt that working for the *Edinburgh* would give her a more authoritative voice than the other papers for which she wrote, and as a weighty quarterly it would have a longer shelf-life than a daily newspaper (her friends and relatives had actually thought it rather *infra dig* to write for *Household Words* [*Autobiography* 2: 418]). The topics for her three regular outlets often overlapped, but she was, in effect, able to have her say several times over in varying tones of voice, and to different audiences, American and British, high-brow and middle-brow. Her *Edinburgh* topics divide conveniently into what would have seemed "masculine" areas—Russian serfdom, the building trade, United States politics—and more "feminine" issues, such as "Female Industry," "Modern Domestic Service," and even the Salem witch trials of the late seventeenth century. What they all have in common is a concern with underclasses: servants, "negroes" (as she calls black African

Americans), the working classes, impoverished women, Russian serfs, convicts, women wrongly accused of witchcraft. Martineau was persistently interested in how these underclasses were treated by regimes or establishment cultures that failed to recognise their needs: most of her articles include some kind of historical summary of the abuses she wants to see corrected. Misunderstood as a child, deaf and sickly, she grew up courting controversy and feeling a natural kinship with all oppressed groups, of whom black slaves were the most urgent case. She also cared about domestic servants at home, telling Reeve the true story of a servant girl who had to take the household's sewing with her on the rare occasions when she was allowed out for the evening: "It did make my blood boil to witness the sanctimonious tyranny in that case" (Sanders 199). Even as a seasoned writer she seems to stress her own marginality—often mentioning her current frail state, and how it is all she can do to write at all. "I work by doing it the first thing in the day," she says in 1858, at the beginning of her new-found relationship with Reeve. "By evening, I have no memory & very little faculty of any sort" (Sanders 161). Her live-in niece Maria Martineau (who died in 1864 and was replaced by her younger sister Jane, or "Jenny") discussed her topics with her, did some of the research, and collated proofs with the manuscripts. "What can you think of us? We seem to be behaving like a couple of giddy girls," she admitted when a wrong date came up in the proofs of an article (Sanders 173). When she proposed writing her final article, on Salem witchcraft (1868), she led up to it with elaborate caution, giving Reeve every opportunity to refuse the article if he really felt she was too old or out of touch, while indicating that she was actually the only safe hand for the work: "I have studied the physiological aspect of the 'spiritual' & mesmeric phenomena so long & so much that I am not afraid of making a fool of myself or the review" (Sanders 217).

Her letters to Reeve showed that she often rehearsed her ideas with him informally first; she discussed what background reading she had been able to obtain, and checked to see whether he agreed with her before going to press. She borrowed books from Mudie's Library, got others through friends, and picked up the latest news from America from several contacts she had there. Occasionally she had to ask Reeve for further materials. Her tone in these letters is often ebullient, excitable, and opinionated, as she expresses her feelings in ways that would not have been acceptable in the formal restrained prose of the final article. Sometimes she was mildly flirtatious, coy or facetious—even wheedling. "And now for another topic—" she announced in a letter of 1859. "Don't be alarmed:—I am not going to offer another article" (Sanders 170). The awkward jokes were partly because Martineau seems to have felt diffident about pressing unsolicited articles on the great man, her younger cousin, while at the same time she often felt highly excited by new discoveries she had made about illegal practices, and really believed she was the best person to expose them. She ran into a threatened libel action with her first article on the disguised French slave-trade, but felt confident she had always given her authorities from published material whenever a named person was involved. In the end there were no legal proceedings, but the article was attacked in the press, and she subsequently had to convince Reeve of the truth of her position on American subjects before he was entirely happy with her work. To Fanny Wedgwood she confessed that he had been "very half-hearted" about her 1864

piece on "The Negro Race in America," but was "now as hearty as possible" (Arbuckle 244). He turned down a proposed article on Florence Nightingale's *Notes on Nursing* allegedly because he had too much material: perhaps too it was a more overtly female subject than Reeve wanted to include too often (and it would have followed fast on the heels of "Female Industry").

New subjects for articles arose from the regular correspondence she had with Reeve. Even while she was working on one topic, another would emerge. While collecting materials for her celebrated article on "Female Industry"—the best known of her *Edinburgh* pieces—she was thinking about the behaviour of trade unions, prompted by something Reeve had written to her: "The subject of your penultimate letter,—the tyranny of a portion of the working-classes—wd, from its great importance, be exceedingly interesting & an orderly way of treatment" (Sanders 174). Her only concern was that she and Reeve would disagree over the issue of working men's suffrage, which she favoured, and he apparently did not. Even this was safely ironed out in their correspondence before the article was published: "Come—we shall do,—about the 'Workies.' I am not for an 'indiscriminate admission' of them to the suffrage: & you are not for an indiscriminate exclusion of them" (Sanders 176). If he needed further evidence of her views she referred him to a forthcoming article of hers in the *Daily News* on Sweden and Norway: "(but don't tell, please)" (176).

What kind of *persona* does Martineau project in her letters? Busy, certainly; professionally engaged, constantly thinking and picking up information from every available source; gossipy; conspiratorial. "I have just got scent of a new trick, which I perceive is not suspected yet," she says abut her first article: "—that the *Liberia* shipments are, in fact, a slave-trade between the *American planters* & the French" (Sanders 158-59). But the strangest characteristic of her correspondence with Reeve which deserves closer discussion is her constant emphasis on the need for *secrecy*. This was despite the anonymity of *Edinburgh* articles, which spoke with the collective and impersonal authority of the editorial "we"—and despite Martineau's own position as an established journalist. The tone of her political articles for the *Edinburgh* is indeed confident and authoritative, full of assertive statements. She advises working men not to join trades unions, and urges judges to act consistently in dealing with convicts; she insists that "the only possible security for society is in the reformation of its criminals" (117 [1863]: 263); or asserts of the Americans: "The existence of slavery in their nation is their misery and their shame. It has lowered their reputation, degraded their national character, barred their progress, vitiated their foreign policy, poisoned their domestic peace, divided their hearts and minds; and may ultimately explode their Union" (108 [1858]: 586). Martineau signed the women's suffrage petition of 1866 but in most of her articles she writes as if she is a full participant in political organisation, examining the case of those who lack her opportunities. Again and again she returns to the problems of the disenfranchised, as if unconscious that she herself is one of them. In "Co-operative Societies in 1864," for example, she praises the Rochdale Association for setting up a working men's reading room and library. She was all for working men becoming educated for the political role she felt would soon accrue to them: "We ought all to rejoice at seeing a hundred thousand of the working men obtaining 'a stake in the

country,' as our fathers used to say." This "new order of working men," as she called them, "cannot but be on the point of entering the constituency of the country" (120 [1864]: 430). In "Life in the Criminal Class" (1865) she pretended to be a Member of Parliament alongside two respectable men in public life who had subsequently become criminals: "We perhaps remember many an evening in the House when the one was sitting at our elbow, or talking within our hearing; and many a charity meeting when the other was busy on the platform, and listened to with sympathy and respect" (122 [1865]: 338). The irony of this—written by a woman without a vote—hardly needs stating.

In 1858 she was fifty-six, with a varied and successful career behind her. Nevertheless she implored her correspondents, including Reeve, to give nothing away about her authorship of the articles. Her *Autobiography* (published 1877, but written in 1855) recounts a similar instance of secrecy in 1822 when her first article appeared in the *Monthly Repository* under the humble pseudonym "Discipulus," and she let her eldest brother read it aloud to the family without admitting it was hers until he noticed her apparently uncharitable silence. "I never could baffle any body," she told him. "The truth is, that paper is mine" (1: 120). The significance of that experience was that her brother gave her permission to write professionally, having genuinely admired her work without knowing it was hers. As she put it dramatically, "That evening made me an authoress." Martineau evidently continued to desire genuine applause (especially from men) without special favours: it was as if the praise was worthless unless it was given solely on the strength of the writing itself, and not on the knowledge of her reputation. A further clue perhaps lies in what she says to her friend Fanny Wedgwood about a later article, "The Negro Race in America" (1864):

> Of course you will remember not to tell the authorship; and do, when the time comes, see whether any effect is produced. We (H. Reeve, M[aria] and I) expect that there will be from the history being so little known. At the same time, we are very anxious to have producible authority for every considerable statement: and H. Reeve impresses upon me that *he* is utterly dependent on me for this. (Arbuckle 242).

Martineau seems to have been chiefly interested in testing whether her articles were effective in *themselves*, without the positive or negative associations that her name would carry. After all, she had already been involved in enough controversies for one lifetime: her "coming out" as an abolitionist in America in the 1830s; her pro-Malthusian ideas about birth control revealed in her *Illustrations of Political Economy*; her public espousal of mesmerism in 1845; and the subsequent breach with her brother James over her 1851 collaboration with the cranky phrenologist, Henry Atkinson, on the *Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development*. Martineau never forgot the hostility of her earliest critics towards her reflection of Malthusian ideas in her political economy tales, and the particular vilification directed against her as a woman writing about unwomanly subjects: "for every thing was done that low-minded recklessness and malice could do to destroy my credit and influence by gross appeals to the prudery, timidity, and ignorance of the middle classes of England" (*Autobiography* 1: 199). In

1855 she believed there was "some lingering feeling still" about her being a Malthusian—quite apart from the continuing suspicions and prejudices that clung to her from her other skirmishes with the press. Incisive and sure of herself, Martineau nevertheless wanted to shake off her own reputation as a journalist known to have particular views. She wanted *Edinburgh* readers to judge all her work, whatever the subject, without any preconceptions about the author's political or social allegiances.[1]

When her first *Edinburgh* article was published, she was highly amused by her friends' attempts to guess who had written it:

> One droll thing I saw about our article in a letter from Richd Martineau's wife to my cousin, Mrs Turner, who has just left me. Sending us some money, she says they have read the Ed: article & think it is excellent: that her son John says it is by "his friend Hurlbut"[2] (a new friendship, from meeting in Switzd:) that they *had* thought there were some things "like Harriet" in it: but Mr H. told John that he *was* to have an article in the Octbr No of the Ed: & "so it *must* be his." Funny. (Sanders 163)

The fact that she calls it "our" article further minimises her sole responsibility for it. Divested of any specific individual authorship, it can be freely praised and even joked about.

If Martineau was secretive about her authorship of the American articles, when she was writing about women her passion for concealment intensified, as she insisted on the authorship being taken for a man's. Occurring at the same time as George Eliot's choice of a male identity for the authorship of *Scenes of Clerical Life* (1858) and *Adam Bede* (1859), Martineau's stance is harder to understand than Eliot's. She had no complicated private life to hide, and she was already well established as a journalist. Apart from "Discipulus" and occasionally "V" of Norwich back in the 1820s, "P.F. Murray," the proposed pseudonym for a novel, *Oliver Weld*, which she suppressed in 1851, and finally "From the Mountain" for her *Once a Week* articles, Martineau had never been a great user of literary *noms de plume*, and never for any major work. Her *Illustrations of Political Economy* (1832-34), which had launched her career, had always been known to be hers, and indeed, as she notes in her *Autobiography* (1: 178), "the entire periodical press, daily, weekly, and as soon as possible, monthly," pronounced in her favour. Now, in writing about women, she was purposely disclaiming the additional expertise she would have as a woman with a professional career behind her.

The article famously announced it as new fact that "a very large proportion of the women of England earn their own bread" (109: 214), and attacked male monopolies

---

[1] Anthony Trollope serves as an interesting analogy here. He published two of his tales, "Nina Balatka" (1866-67) and "Linda Tressel" (1867-68) anonymously in *Blackwood's Magazine* so as to see how they would be judged as works in their own right, separated from his authorship.

[2] William Henry Hurlbert (1827-95), an American journalist at this time employed on the *New York Times*.

in industry. Martineau was especially keen to write this article, and dismissive of men like Lord Brougham and Lord John Russell who were concerning themselves with aspects of women's welfare such as a burgeoning movement for women's lodging houses: "Ld B. has a good deal of 'imagination' in some directions," she told Reeve in 1858; "but I don't believe the one indispensable conception for this task ever entered his mind,—that of a respectable woman. . . . And Ld John has been among women whose interests take the turn of feeble feminine political partisanship" (Sanders 164). (This last comment implies that as women who mix with politicians like Russell were politically uneducated, Martineau was keen to dissociate herself from them.) Though otherwise confident about the thrust and accuracy of her article (Martineau called it "very good"), she was absolutely insistent on the male persona and prose style: "I do hope you will like it, & that you will think I have succeeded in making it look like a man's writing," she told him when she was about to post it (Sanders 167). One of the books she was reviewing—*The Industrial and Social Position of Women in the Middle and Lower Ranks* (1857)—she believed to be by a man, though it was assumed to be a woman's: "& I wish the author wd put his name to it. It is only fair compensation that my article shd be taken for a man's" (168).

Her verbal cross-dressing was quite unnecessary, as the "house style" of the *Edinburgh* was already neutral: her articles on Russian serfdom, for instance, or on the United States under President Buchanan, would be impossible to identify as a woman's without prior knowledge that Martineau had written them. Nevertheless Margaret Oliphant, a *Blackwood's* author around the same period, also used a male persona specifically when she was writing about women's emancipation (for example, in "The Laws Concerning Women," in 1856, and "The Condition of Women," 1858). Both journalists apparently felt the need for additional protection when women's political or employment status was their subject, even though—or perhaps especially because—this was the decade when the Victorian women's movement based at Langham Place began to campaign actively for better employment opportunities for women, together with property rights and more accessible divorces. Never easy to label as an unequivocal feminist, though she clearly exemplified in her own lifestyle most feminist principles, Martineau chose to support the women's cause in a major male-dominated journal, while evading open identification with it as a woman prominent in public life.

With "Female Industry" Martineau set up elaborate precautions against being found out. "As we earnestly wish the authorship not to become known," she told Reeve, "I have used the mannish way of talking about needlework—I mean the technical terms are avoided, & the 'distinctions & differences' of stitches are not too nicely observed" (Sanders 169). In fact, "Female Industry" and a later article on "Modern Domestic Service" (1862) actually reveal a considerable interest in the minutiae of housework, which Martineau was unable to repress even in the interests of constructing a "mannish" identity. Her review of servants' declining skills draws vividly on the language of below and above stairs: "The morning rolls are bitter; the potatoes have 'a bone,' in them; the soup is sour;—something is wrong at every dinner. Upstairs, there is 'slut's wool' under the beds" (115: 410). Elsewhere she mimics the way mistresses complain about their servants: "the girl requires more teaching than she is worth"; "but what can you expect?

Few of them have had any proper training" (410-11). This time she specifically refers the piece to "Mrs H. Reeve" for womanly objections to "anything she thinks wrong in this article" (Sanders 200). Having prided herself all her life on her housewifely skills, Martineau makes an unnecessary display of self-doubt here—pursuing her identity as a man to the point of checking for accuracy on domestic details with a married woman.

As for her precautions about needlework, when she discusses women's declining knowledge of sewing she writes of it from the implied viewpoint of a husband, but a husband who takes an unusually close interest in the state of his shirts: "we must have a release from the ragged edges, loose buttons, galling shirt-collars, and unravelled seams and corners which have come up as the quality of needlework has gone down. Let our wives undertake the case of the remnant of the poor sempstresses,—the last, we hope, of their sort" ("Female Industry" 328). Martineau also suggests that as a mere man she has insufficient knowledge of how women feel about specific issues, and has to ask them, as when she is dealing with women who are too old to work: "Our readers must be aware that this is one of the points on which we have found it necessary to consult the female members of the family council" (307). Elsewhere she refers to "our wives" discouraging women from serving behind the counter in shops, or complaining they have never learnt how to cook. By contrast, she positions herself with the male ascendancy—"us 'the breadwinners,'" recommending the female-authored texts she reviews as particularly "worthy of attention as being by women, who best know their own cause, though they must appeal to us to aid them in obtaining free scope for their industry" (336). In a way she was right: they were dependent on breadwinners like Martineau for action on their behalf, but it is hard to believe that she would not have done more for their cause by advertising her authorship—among friends if the article itself had to be anonymous. Evidently not. She believed that she must change male opinion in order to shift male monopolies, and the best way to do this was apparently by speaking to them as a man to men.

Pursuing the disguise still further she cites a book called *Mind Among the Spindles*, which she herself had edited: "Prefixed to that volume was a letter from Harriet Martineau" (323). She quotes Sarah Austin on "Miss F Martineau's school" at Bracondale—a cousin's establishment, which taught girls good domestic habits. Going further still, she refers to a "narrative published in 'Household Words,' we remember, some years ago, which afforded great encouragement" (324). This article had been written by Martineau herself: it was "The New School for Wives" (10 April 1852), about evening classes in domestic skills for Birmingham factory women. In her *Edinburgh* article she repeats several examples from her *Household Words* piece (also written from a male perspective) more or less word for word. Overall in "Female Industry" she reinforces her own credentials by plagiarising from herself, reviewing work in which she had been directly involved, citing her own cousin's school with approval, and seeking support from other female authorities. All of this would have been much harder to justify if she had been known as the author of the article. On the other hand, her need to "make assurance doubly sure" by recycling old material implies that she was unsatisfied with its effects the first time round. Maybe the spectre of Dickens's anti-feminist articles in *Household Words* continued to haunt her,

undermining the efficacy of her own articles on the Birmingham industrial scene. The *Edinburgh* article becomes an exercise in reinforcing her own authority, in secretly citing herself as an expert whose wisdom needs further dissemination in the face of continuing male conservatism.

When Martineau began writing for the *Edinburgh* there was no contract for so many articles or for so many years. She continued writing as more topics excited her—while also telling people that she had stopped. In 1867, the year before she wrote "Salem Witchcraft," she told one correspondent: "No,—I write nothing whatever,—had to stop long ago" (it was the previous year she had officially ended her run with the *Daily News*). Nevertheless, topics continued to press upon her. Her comments on one serve as a guide to understanding something of *why* she was so keen to write. It was not so much that she wanted the fame and distinction: it was more that certain things needed saying: "I am so struck by a topic & materials for its treatment in one of our great Quarterlies that I shall be haunted by it till I have suggested it to an Editor or two," she wrote to Reeve in 1871. "I need hardly explain that I am not thinking of writing it myself. I cd no more do it than I cd mount Helvellyn" (Sanders 227). This time she was concerned at the number of Irish and English workpeople who were emigrating to the United States, rather than Canada, while utterly unaware of the declining conditions and crushing taxation there. She had seen the Second Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Labour Statistics, and was already mentally constructing an article from it, which she maps out to Reeve in this letter, each section of the report "involving a story of strong interest" (Sanders 228). "I do think it of importance that the attention of the largest number of people shd be drawn to the facts of the actual state & near prospect of Industry in New England, & their interest fixed on the remarkable story of the Masstts Crispius, the Millpeople, the Fisherfolk of Masstts Bay, with their traditional notions of life, & the sinking peasant-farmers, who till lately wd exchange positions with nobody" (229). At the end of her life Martineau was reverting to the kind of story that had attracted her in her *Illustrations of Political Economy*: everyday tales of ordinary people struggling with difficult working and living conditions. In practically writing the article in her letter to Reeve she gives further demonstration of the role her correspondence with him played in the interface between her private and public roles as one of Britain's few regular women journalists in the mid-nineteenth century, and certainly the one with the widest social and political range.

The story of Martineau's ten-year professional relationship with Henry Reeve adds to our understanding of how Victorian women handled the problematic conditions of entry (or in this case re-entry) into what had hitherto been a strongly male-dominated world. Her letters reveal her uneven mixture of confidence and self-doubt: her traditional assumption of powerlessness in soliciting acceptance from Reeve, and her elaborate strategies to make him take her work on her terms rather than on his. Why she went to such lengths to feign masculinity when writing about women—despite her mastery of a "masculine" or neutral style in her articles about international affairs—is a complex issue which remains something of a puzzle in a life full of controversy. Temperamentally both outspoken and secretive at different stages of her life, she enjoyed the thrill of plotting another journalistic come-back, of outwitting her friends

and the public, whose loyalty had been so often unreliable. This is not the behaviour of someone who feels entirely comfortable with the professional world she inhabits. Taken with her elderly hermit disguise for *Once a Week*, her taste for a kind of cross-dressed ventriloquism implies that for all her personal power, she expected to be more influential writing as a middle-class man with a hazy knowledge of household affairs, than as a successful, professional woman fully conversant with all the niceties of needlework and housework. If writing for a major journal like the *Edinburgh* seemed to her to require "manliness and courage," and arguably the most confident nineteenth-century female journalist felt nervous of writing about women's employment opportunities in a woman's voice, Martineau's experience with the *Edinburgh Review* testifies—even in this decade of female activism—to her underlying consciousness of outsider status in the mid-century world of male-dominated magazine journalism: a world in which she had been active for thirty-five years when she decided to assail one of its stoutest male strongholds.

## Works Cited

Arbuckle, Elisabeth Sanders, ed. *Harriet Martineau's Letters to Fanny Wedgwood.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1983.

Haight, Gordon S., ed. *The George Eliot Letters*. 9 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1954-78.

"Henry Reeve." *Edinburgh Review* 183 (1896): 267-71.

Laughton, John Knox. *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Henry Reeve.* London: Longmans, 1898.

Martineau, Harriet. "Convict System in England and Ireland," *Edinburgh Review* 117 (1863): 241-68.

---. "Co-operative Societies in 1864," *Edinburgh Review* 120 (1864): 407-36.

---. "Female Industry." *Edinburgh Review* 109 (1859): 293-336.

---. *Harriet Martineau's Autobiography*. 2 vols: London:Virago, 1983.

---. "Life in the Criminal Class," *Edinburgh Review* 122 (1865): 337-71.

---. "Modern Domestic Service." *Edinburgh Review* 115 (1862): 409-39.

---. "The New School for Wives," *Household Words* 5 (1852): 84-89.

---. "The Slave-Trade in 1858." *Edinburgh Review* 108 (1858): 541-86.

Sanders, Valerie. *Harriet Martineau: Selected Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.