

Philosophy in a Feminist Voice

CRITIQUES AND
RECONSTRUCTIONS

JANET A. KOURANY, EDITOR

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

NOTE

1. William James, "The Sentiment of Rationality," in *Essays on Faith and Morals* (Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing, 1968), p. 63.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Disappearing Ink: Early Modern Women Philosophers and Their Fate in History

EILEEN O'NEILL

Even if forgetfulness affects the life of the dead in the Lower World,
yet even there, I would be able to remember Hypatia.

—Synesius, Letters (fifth century A.D.)¹

WOMEN ARE NOT included in the standard nineteenth- and twentieth-century histories of European philosophy as significant, original contributors to the discipline's past. Indeed, only a few women's names even survive in the footnotes of these histories; by the twentieth century, most had disappeared entirely from our historical memory. But recent research, influenced by feminist theory and a renewed interest in the history of philosophy, has uncovered numerous women who contributed to philosophy over the centuries.

Ancient Women Philosophers 600 B.C.–500 A.D., the first volume of Mary Ellen Waithe's *History of Women Philosophers*, has provided a detailed discussion of the following Greco-Roman figures: Themistoclea, Theano I and II, Arignote, Myia, Damo, Aesara of Lucania, Phintys of Sparta, Perictione I and II, Aspasia of Miletus, Julia Domna, Makrina, Hypatia of Alexandria, Arete of Cyrene, Asclepigenia of Athens, Axiothea of Philesia, Cleobulina of Rhodes, Hipparchia the Cynic, and Lasthenia of Mantinea.² In addition to the medieval and Renaissance philosophers discussed in the second volume of Waithe's *History* (Hildegard of Bingen, Heloise, Herrad of Hohenbourg, Beatrice of Nazareth, Mechtilde of Magdeburg, Hadewych of Antwerp, Birgitta of Sweden, Julian of Norwich, Catherine of Siena, Oliva Sabuco de Nantes Barrera, Roswitha of Gandersheim, Christine de Pisan, Margaret More Roper, and Teresa of Avila), such humanist and Reformation figures as Isotta Nogarola, Laura Cereta, Cassandra Fidele, Olimpia Morata, and Caritas Pickheimer have been the focus of attention by scholars like Paul O. Kristeller and Margaret King.³ The present essay, however, focuses on early modern women's published philosophical contributions, the recognition of this work in the seventeenth and

eighteenth centuries, and the subsequent disappearance of any mention of these contributions from the history of philosophy.

Perhaps it is wise to begin a discussion of women's inclusion in early modern philosophy with some reminders about women scholars' entrance into the academic institutions of Europe during this period. This material should prepare us for some of the upshots of this paper: women's scholarly contributions, especially in philosophy, have frequently been considered astounding feats, accomplished by "exceptional women," which, while of significant interest at the time of the circulation or publication of a text, have been taken to be of marginal value given "the long view" of history.

During the Middle Ages there had been a tradition of allowing a few women to attend or give lectures at the University of Bologna. And, in the early seventeenth century, Anna Maria van Schurman had attended (albeit behind a curtain) the lectures of the theologian Gisbertus Voetius at the University of Utrecht. But it was not until 1678 that the first woman received a university degree when the University of Padua conferred a doctorate of philosophy on Elena Cornaro Piscopia of Venice.⁴ It is difficult to overestimate the excitement that this produced; some twenty thousand spectators gathered to see the event. Immediately afterward, the university agreed to admit no more women.

On April 17, 1732, Laura Bassi defended forty-nine theses in natural philosophy in a public disputation with five professors of the University of Bologna. On the basis of this defense she was awarded a doctorate on May 12; on October 29 the senate decided to award her a university chair "on the condition, however, that she should not read in the public schools except on those occasions when her Superiors commanded her, because of [her] Sex."⁵ It had taken Herculean political efforts for Bassi to become the first woman to receive an official teaching position at a European university. Yet despite these efforts, and the academic privileges and channels of influence allowed Bassi, she held her lectureship at the university's Studium only in the capacity of a supernumerary. No other early modern woman would be granted such institutional power ever again in the sphere of scholarship. In 1750, when Maria de Agnesi of Milan, already a member of the Academy of the Institute for Sciences at Bologna, was awarded a position in mathematics at the University of Bologna, it was only an honorary chair.

While France could boast, at this same time, of such important natural philosophers as Émilie du Châtelet, women there were excluded from the universities and scholarly institutions, like the Académie Royale des Sciences or the Académie Française. It was, rather, the Academy of the Institute for Sciences at Bologna that admitted du Châtelet in 1746. Similarly, in the seventeenth century, Madeleine de Scudéry and Anne Dacier were nominated, but rejected, for election to the Académie Française, though both were accepted by the Accademia de' Ricovrati in Padua.⁶ With respect to university positions in France, it is noteworthy that the first woman to hold a chair at the Sorbonne was Marie Curie in the twentieth century.⁷

In England, in 1667, Margaret Cavendish became the first woman to visit the Royal Society of London, in order to see some of Robert Boyle's experiments. Her visit caused enormous controversy. Not only was she not permitted to join the society, despite the fact that she had published numerous books on natural philosophy, but no other woman became a full member until 1945.⁸ During the whole of the eighteenth century, to my knowledge, no university degrees were awarded to women in either England or France.⁹ This occurred only in Italy, as we have seen, and also in Germany. At the University of Halle, in 1754, Dorothea Erxleben became the first woman to receive a medical degree in Germany. The first doctor of philosophy awarded to a woman in Germany went to the mineralogist Dorothea Schlözer in 1787.¹⁰ But throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, such women were unable to establish precedents for the regular admission of women to universities.

Given the extremely limited access of early modern women to universities and other institutional spheres of scholarly activity, we might be led to think that these women could not have contributed to philosophy in any significant way. But this would be to forget the blossoming of philosophical activity outside of the schools since the Renaissance. Philosophy was being done in convents, religious retreats for laypersons, the courts of Europe, and the salons; philosophical networks, which stretched throughout Europe, communicated via letters, published pamphlets and treatises, and scholarly journals. What is surprising is the disappearance from our historical memory, until quite recently, of almost all trace of women's published contributions to early modern theoretical knowledge. Why do we no longer know *any* of the once praised, reprinted, translated, and commented upon books of philosophy by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century women? How is it that when Dorothea Erxleben wrote a defense of women's right to education in 1742, the preface noted that although Anna Maria van Schurman had published a book on this topic a century earlier, "it was not to be had"? Why, fifty years later, did Amalia Holst note in her book on this topic that Erxleben's text was "no longer available"?¹¹

Why were women's printed books treated as if written in disappearing ink—extant yet lost to sight? How many such books were there? Who were the early modern women philosophers? Why is it that, at best, we know no more of them than we do of Hypatia and Laura Bassi: their names and reputation, not their thought or works?

This paper will begin, to quote from French philosopher Michèle Le Doeuff's important 1977 article, "Women and Philosophy," "by recalling some women who have approached philosophy. Their very existence shows that the non-exclusion (a relative non-exclusion) of women is nothing new."¹² In the first section I provide an overview of the published philosophical writings by female authors from England, France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Mexico, and Switzerland. It will be shown that these women addressed a wide range of issues in metaphysics, epistemology, moral the-

ory, social and political philosophy, philosophical theology, natural philosophy, and philosophy of education. While many of these issues, hotly debated in the philosophical circles of their day, are now largely of historical interest only, some are the philosophical predecessors of topics of current interest. I also suggest that the relative nonexclusion of these women has sometimes been reflected in histories of philosophy, for a number of early modern historians were keenly interested in chronicling women's role in philosophy.

In the second section I discuss "the problem of disappearing ink": Why have these philosophers' writings become lost to sight? In addition to the problems generated by the standard practice of anonymous authorship for women, I argue that many of the broader theoretical frameworks in which women's philosophical views had a place, and some of the major motivations for their philosophical arguments, were relegated to the status of non-philosophy by the nineteenth century. I try to show that the feminine gender has traditionally been aligned with philosophical positions, with styles of philosophizing, and, indeed, with underlying forms of episteme, that were not to "win out" in the history of philosophy. This factor, together with slippage between gendered styles of philosophy and the sex of those doing the philosophizing, accounts for a good deal of the disappearance of the women's writing. But I also stress that perhaps the most significant reasons for the erasure of women's philosophical publications from the historical record were the social and political events surrounding the French Revolution.

Finally, I suggest that philosophers, however important their contributions are to contemporary philosophical concerns, not only must produce followers and critics but also must find a place in an influential history of philosophy, if they are to remain in the discipline's memory. To my knowledge, no one has yet written a general history of early modern philosophy in which it is argued that some women deserve preeminent places either because of the important role they played in past debates or because their work, in part, has moved thought along to the place where we now are. In the final section, I turn to the issue of the revision of the history of philosophy. After briefly outlining some historiographical methods, I suggest that given some of our current philosophical interests, and given the recent recovery of women's philosophical contributions to the debates of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it would seem to be high time that women be given their rightful places in the histories of our discipline.

THE INCLUSION OF WOMEN IN EARLY MODERN PHILOSOPHY

Voltaire, in a dedicatory epistle to Madame du Châtelet, wrote: "I dare say that we live in an era when a poet ought to be a philosopher and when a woman can boldly [*hardiment*] be one."¹³ The seventeenth century already

found women, throughout Europe and the New World, replacing the humanist formulas for texts addressing the *querelle des femmes*, or woman question, with philosophical argumentation. Thus, in *The Equality of Men and Women* (1622), Marie de Gournay, the adopted daughter of Montaigne, replaced the exaggerated claims about women's superiority to men, and persuasive force based on example, with the use of skepticism as a philosophical method.¹⁴ Later in the seventeenth century, Anna Maria van Schurman, the "Star of Utrecht," and Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz of Mexico discussed woman's nature and argued for her fitness for learning. Schurman, in *Whether a Maid may be a Scholar? A Logick Exercise . . .* (1659),¹⁵ presented fifteen syllogistic arguments, which drew on Aristotelian views and responded to the woman question in the moralistic writings of the period. In an attempt to defend her own scholarly activity from the criticism of the Inquisition, Sor Juana, in "Response to Sor Filotea de la Cruz" (1691; published posthumously in 1700), offered theological and political defenses of women's natural inclination and suitability for learning.¹⁶ Her discussion drew on Scholastic, as well as Neoplatonic hermetic sources. By 1673, when Bathsua Makin published *An Essay to Revive the Antient Education of Gentlewomen*, an unbroken line of influence, explicitly acknowledged in the texts, ran from Lucrezia Marinelli's *The Nobility and Excellence of Women* (1600), through Gournay and Schurman, to Makin.¹⁷ Interest in woman's nature, her place in society, and her fitness for education led women in the second half of the century to proffer large-scale views about the relation of education to religion and to society. Detailed accounts of how girls should be educated appeared. Noteworthy among such philosophies of education are the *Rule for the Children of Port Royal* (1665) by the Port Royal educator Sister Jacqueline Pascal,¹⁸ and the letters and conversations on education of Madame de Maintenon.¹⁹

In the second half of the Age of Reason, women also produced a number of works on morals and the passions. For example, we have the maxims of Marguerite de la Sablière, the marquise de Sablé, and the comtesse de Maure, two series of maxims by Queen Christina of Sweden, and the latter's "Remarks on the Moral Reflections of La Rochefoucauld."²⁰ But perhaps the most well known seventeenth-century woman writer of moral psychology is the *précieuse*, Madeleine de Scudéry. Leibniz, in discussing a debate on the nature of divine love, said "Of all of the matters of theology, there aren't any of which women are more in the right to judge, since it concerns the nature of love. But . . . I would like [women] who resemble Mlle de Scudéry, who has clarified the temperaments and the passions in her novels and conversations on morals. . . ."²¹ In her two sets of conversations (1680; 1684), her two sets of moral conversations (1686; 1688), and her *Talks Concerning Morals* (1692), Scudéry discusses such issues as "Uncertainty," "Of the Knowledge of Others and of Ourselves," and "The Passions That Men Have Invented." Her style of philosophizing is quite different from that of the maxim writers or of the earlier moral didactic writers. Closer to the

dialectical strategies of Montaigne, Scudéry presents vignettes to make certain points and adduces arguments for the possible positions, but she draws no explicit conclusion. The reader must make up her own mind about the issue. Her works were discussed in Le Clerc's *Bibliothèque universelle et historique* (1699) and in the *Mercure* (1731), mentioned in Bayles's *Dictionary*, and reprinted and translated until the end of the eighteenth century.

Another type of philosophical writing by women begins to appear after 1660, to wit, the treatment of natural philosophy. In Paris, sometime after 1680, Jeanne Dumée published *A Discussion of the Opinion of Copernicus Concerning the Mobility of the Earth . . .*, in which she explains in detail the three motions attributed to the earth and provides the arguments that support and those that militate against Copernicus's system. The English playwright and fiction writer Aphra Behn translated Fontenelle's popularization of Cartesian philosophy, *A Discovery of New Worlds*, in 1688. In her preface she discusses Copernicus's system and argues that it "saves the phaenomena" better than Ptolemy's system; the only serious challenges to Copernicus's picture, she claims, are the arguments that attempt to show that it is inconsistent with Holy Scripture. Behn gives the details of these arguments and charges that, given the best contemporary biblical exegesis, Holy Scripture is as compatible with Copernicus's view as with Ptolemy's. She concludes by noting that Scripture was never meant to teach us astronomy, geometry, or chronology.²²

But by far the most prolific female writer of natural philosophy was Margaret Cavendish, duchess of Newcastle. The earliest influence on her ideas seems to have come from Hobbes, tutor to her husband's family. She became a member of the "Newcastle Circle," which included Hobbes, Charleton, and Digby. This group of philosophers had a strong interest in materialism and had been influenced by contact with Gassendi and Mersenne during the English civil war years. While exiled in Paris and Antwerp, Cavendish met Descartes and Roberval. From 1653 to 1671, she published numerous books that dealt in some way with natural philosophy. In her first work, *Poems and Fancies* (1653), Cavendish presented a fanciful atomism in rhymed verses. It appears that it was this book, along with her other early works, namely, *Philosophical Fancies* (1653), *The World's Olio* (1655), the first edition of *The Philosophical and Physical Opinions* (1655), and *Nature's Pictures Drawn by Fancie's Pencil to the Life* (1656), on which most of Cavendish's critics based their responses. The responses themselves were frequently full of invective and wildly contradicted each other. For example, her friend the Epicurean Walter Charleton told her that her imaginative atomism proceeded from an "Enthusiasm" which scorned "the control of reason"; on the other hand, a number of critics argued that her work must have been plagiarized since no lady could understand so many "hard termes." In consequence, Cavendish's husband felt compelled to defend his wife's authorship in an opening "Epistle" to her *Philosophical and Physical Opinions*. Either way, the upshot was that no one took the duchess seriously as

an aspiring philosopher. Thus, the Cambridge Platonist Henry More wrote to the philosopher Anne Conway (who will be discussed shortly) of his amusement at hearing that in *The Philosophical Letters* (1664) Cavendish had attempted to confute Hobbes, Descartes, van Helmont, and More himself. Later More accurately predicted to Conway: "She [the duchess] is affrayed some man should quitt his breeches and putt on a petticoat to answer her in that disguise. . . . She expresses this jealousie in her book, but I believe she may be secure from any one giving her the trouble of a reply."²³ Cavendish makes clear, in the preface to her *Philosophical Letters*, that she had written her responses to some famous philosophers in the form of letters and "by so doing, I have done that, which I would have done unto me." Her letters are written to a fictitious noblewoman. There are few moments in the history of women philosophers more poignant than in the letter on identity and the Trinity, where Cavendish writes to her imaginary noblewoman about another philosophical friend, Lady N. M., and concludes: "I wish with all my heart, Madam, you were so near as to be here at the same time, that we three might make a Triumvirate in discourse as well as we do in friendship."²⁴ Lady N. M. may well be Lady Newcastle, Margaret. Cavendish may have been aware that by 1664 she was reduced to writing philosophy for the trinity of her own personae.

This is particularly unfortunate since, as I hope to show in a future essay, Cavendish's *Philosophical Letters* and *Grounds of Natural Philosophy* (1668) constitute extremely interesting philosophical contributions. In these works she abandons her earlier commitment to atomistic materialism and embraces a possibly Stoic-inspired materialist organicism. On this view, matter intrinsically possesses some degree of vital force, sense, and intellect. The view is organicist in that causation is understood through the vital affinity one part of matter has for another, rather than via a mechanical model. Some of Cavendish's major criticisms of Descartes and Hobbes turn on showing how the mechanical philosophers have failed to provide a satisfactory model of causation. According to Cavendish, the mechanists' talk of the translation of motion, or of the imprinting of an image in perception, can only be interpreted in terms of a transfer model. Such a causal model, she argues, is far too crude to account for sensation and memory, and is inconsistent with a substance/accident ontology.

Another English philosopher, Viscountess Anne Conway, wrote *The Principles of the Most Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, which was published posthumously in Latin in 1690 by the cabalist "scholar Gypsy," Francis Mercurius van Helmont and was translated into English in 1692. In this metaphysical treatise, Conway argues against Cartesian dualism, Spinoza's pantheistic monism, and Hobbes's materialism in favor of a Neoplatonic triad of substances: God, Christ, and creatures. In her analysis of creaturely substance, Conway argues that what many philosophers take to be distinct essences (e.g., Descartes's mind and body, or Aristotelian natural kinds) are just accidental properties of a single substance; they differ from

one another only in terms of degree, not essentially. As for creaturely substance, she holds that all of its species are gradations from active spirit to vital matter. Thus, in opposition to the view of certain Cambridge Platonists, the active principle is not a separate incorporeal substance pervading inert matter. Conway agrees with Descartes that "all natural motions proceed according to rules and laws mechanical." But she charges that nature is "a living body, having life and sense, which body is far more sublime than a mere mechanism, or mechanical motion."²⁵

On the Continent, Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia, whose letters to Descartes had exposed the weakness of the latter's published views on mind-body interaction and free will, discussed Conway's views with her Quaker correspondent, Robert Barclay.²⁶ Leibniz and the Electress Sophie of Hanover were introduced to Conway's *Principles* by van Helmont, sometime around 1696. The following year, Leibniz wrote to Thomas Burnet:

My views in philosophy approach somewhat closely those of the late Countess of Conway, and hold a middle position between Plato and Democritus, since I believe that everything happens mechanically as Democritus and Descartes maintain, against the opinion of Monsieur More and his like, and I believe that nevertheless everything also happens vitally and according to final causes; everything is replete with life and perceptions contrary to the opinion of the followers of Democritus.²⁷

Unfortunately, as Carolyn Merchant has argued, Heinrich Ritter, the nineteenth-century historian of philosophy, incorrectly attributed the *Principles* to van Helmont. In consequence, later scholars like Ludwig Stein, who argued that Leibniz's concept of the monad owed much to the *Principles*, took it that van Helmont was the one who had influenced Leibniz. Because of this historical error, neither the late-nineteenth-century revival of interest in Leibniz nor the twentieth-century interest in essentialist metaphysics has, until quite recently, given Conway's philosophy the attention it deserves.²⁸

Turn-of-the-century England produced Mary Astell, who in the *Letters Concerning the Love of God between the Author of the Proposal to the Ladies and Mr. John Norris* (1695) discussed Norris's Malebranchian view that God alone is the cause of all things, including all of our pleasant sensations. Norris concluded from this that God should be the sole object of our love. Astell argued against Norris's occasionalism and maintained that sensation is directly caused by the interaction of mind and body, and indirectly and mediately caused by God. So far, the account is basically Cartesian. But Astell further suggests that something like More's "plastic part of the soul" might be used to explain the agreement between external objects and sensations. This Neoplatonic plastic spirit was traditionally a third substance—according to More both immaterial yet extended—that mediated between inert matter and the rational soul. Thus, like the early More, Astell here proffers an amalgam of Cartesian and Neoplatonic metaphysics.

In *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, Part II. Wherein a Method is offer'd for the Improvement of their Minds* (1697), Astell realized that her 1694 proposal for founding a women's college would not be realized. She offered women, in this second part, a manual for improving their powers of reasoning, which drew on Lockean and Cartesian views about knowledge, Cartesian "method," and insights from the Cartesian-inspired Port Royal textbook, *La Logique, ou l'art de penser* [*The Logic, or The Art of Thinking*] (1662), penned by Nicole and Arnauld. By this stage of her philosophical development, Astell had emerged as more solidly Cartesian, as evidenced by her endorsement of clarity and distinctness as the mark of indubitable propositions, mechanism as the model for purely bodily change, dualism, and Cartesian views on sense perception and judgment.²⁹

Lady Damaris Cudworth Masham also argued against Norris's occasionalism in *A Discourse Concerning the Love of God* (1696). There she criticized the Malebranchian picture of seeing all things in God not on the basis of purely metaphysical considerations but because she saw this as an unsatisfactory grounding for the Christian faith—which was part of Norris's motivation for appropriating occasionalism. In 1693, while living with Masham and her family, Locke himself had written *An Examination of P. Malebranche's Opinion of Seeing all Things In God and Remarks upon Some of Mr. Norris' Books, wherein he asserts P. Malebranche's opinion of our seeing all things in God*.

In 1705, Astell responded to both Locke and Masham with *The Christian Religion as Profess'd by a Daughter of the Church* (1705). She argued that the highest purpose of thought was to contemplate abstract ideas that would bring the mind in contact with the Good, which was immaterial and not sensory. Locke, in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, had rejected abstract thought as necessary for understanding Christianity. Astell also discussed Locke's treatment—in both his *Essay* and the *Correspondence with Stillingfleet*—of the possibility of "thinking matter," arguing that there was a tension between his two accounts.

Several months after Astell's *The Christian Religion* came out, Masham published her own account of Christian theology for women: *Occasional Thoughts in Reference to a Vertuous or Christian Life* (1705). She argued for the importance of education for women and set into relief the difficulties facing a woman who educated herself about Christian theology. She also defended a number of Lockean views on knowledge, education, and the relative merits of reason and revelation. Concerning the popular topic of the basis for moral virtue, Masham argued that since our passions frequently blind us to the light of nature, the latter is an insufficient foundation for morality. What is needed is reason assisted by revelation.

Masham also conducted an intellectual correspondence with Locke, wrote to Leibniz on a number of metaphysical issues, and sent both Leibniz and Jean Le Clerc a defense of Cudworth's views against Bayle's criticisms.³⁰

She wrote an essay on Locke for the *Great Historical Dictionary*, and we have her biography of Locke in manuscript.³¹ Finally, her work received critical notice in such scholarly journals as the *Bibliothèque Choisie*.³²

Yet despite this scholarly career, Masham stood in need of defense against Thomas Burnett's charge that her arguments addressed to Leibniz seemed to have come from a hand other than her own.³³ It was the philosopher Catharine Trotter Cockburn who came to her defense. Trotter Cockburn published a number of philosophical works, including *A Defence of Mr. Locke's Essay of Human Understanding* (1702), which was praised by Toland, Tyrell, Leibniz, and Norris, as well as by Locke himself. Her *Remarks upon some Writers in the Controversy concerning the Foundation of Moral Virtue and Moral Obligation . . .* (1743) argued in support of a theistic, though nonvoluntarist, theory of the grounds of moral goodness and obligation. Her final philosophical work was a defense of Clarke's moral views entitled *Remarks upon the Principles and Reasonings of Dr. Rutherford's Essay . . .* (1747).³⁴

Locke also influenced Judith Drake, who, in *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex* (1696), used a number of his epistemological principles to argue that women's intellectual inferiority resulted from their lack of education and intellectual experience rather than from a lack of intellectual powers.³⁵ The views of Locke, as well as those of Descartes and Malebranche, are also drawn upon by Lady Mary Chudleigh in her discussions of knowledge, education, and the passions in *Essays upon Several Subjects in Prose and Verse* (1710).³⁶ Chudleigh corresponded with John Norris, Mary Astell, and Leibniz's philosophical interlocutor, Electress Sophie of Hanover.³⁷

In France, in the final years of the seventeenth century, Gabrielle Suchon published an ambitious philosophical text, *Treatise of Morals and of Politics*, containing three book-length parts devoted, respectively, to a treatment of "liberty," "learning," and "authority."³⁸ In this work Suchon argues that although women are in fact deprived of access to all three, they are, by nature, qualified to have access to them. Her arguments display an understanding of the views of the ancient Stoics, Cynics, and Skeptics, and of Scholastics, like St. Thomas and St. John of the Cross. She also responds to arguments found in the highly influential feminist treatise *Of the Equality of the Two Sexes* (1673) by the Cartesian François Poulain de la Barre. Excerpts of the *Treatise* appeared in the influential *Journal des Savants* (1694); excerpts from a second work by Suchon, *Treatise of the Willing Single Person*, appeared in the equally influential *Nouvelles de la Republic des Lettres* (1700). Unfortunately, since the *Treatise of Morals and of Politics* was published under the pseudonym "G. S. Aristophile," Suchon fell into oblivion by the late eighteenth century.³⁹

My overview of women's philosophical publications in the seventeenth century would be incomplete if I did not say something about those women who constituted the bulk of women writers in the second half of the century, namely, the women prophets and preachers. In England alone, during the

tumultuous civil war years, there are publications by, or accounts of, over three hundred women prophets from the radical religious sects, of which some two hundred were Quakers.⁴⁰ While the pure description of visions by such popular mystics as Jane Lead are philosophically barren, religious spokeswomen like the Quaker Margaret Fell Fox, in her *Women's Speaking Justified* (1666), provided a series of arguments for women's right to take part in public discussions of religious matters.⁴¹ On the Continent, the quietism of Jeanne-Marie Guyon's philosophical theology and the Pietism of Anna Maria van Schurman's theological writings, after her conversion to Labadism, won both the label of "mystic" by their contemporaries.⁴² I want to emphasize here that, in the seventeenth century, mystical theology was considered a part of philosophy. But the supporters and followers of these women, and indeed *the women themselves*, justified both the truth of their views and their right to speak on the following claim: the women were mere instruments through which God *directly* spoke.⁴³ The upshot was that the women's writings did not issue from their intellects. In sum, in the seventeenth century, mystical writings were considered to be "real" philosophy, but they were not "really" written by women. (Ironically, as we shall see in a moment, by the time freethinking historians acknowledged these women as the true authors of the mystical works, such material would no longer be deemed "philosophical.")

Given the number of female contributors to philosophy in the seventeenth century and the scope of their works, the eighteenth century has often been seen as something of a disappointment. For example, the nineteenth-century historian of philosophy Victor Cousin said that the women writers of the French Enlightenment knew a little math and physics, and had some wit, but had "no genius, no soul, and no conviction."⁴⁴ In mid-eighteenth-century England, the rather conservative Bluestockings who included Hester Chappone, Elisabeth Montagu, Hannah More, and Elizabeth Carter, were the women who dominated the philosophical scene, producing a number of moral and religious works, as well as treatises on the need for women to be educated.⁴⁵ While it must be admitted that the philosophical content of the writings of the Bluestockings was a bit thin, this was more than made up for by the surge of philosophical writing by women in England during the second half of the eighteenth century.

In 1767, Catharine Macaulay's pamphlet entitled *Loose Remarks on . . . Hobbes' Philosophical Rudiments of Government and Society* was published. Here Macaulay challenged a purely contractarian picture of the emergence of civil society, a purely rationalist grounding of parental rights, and arguments in support of absolute monarchy. This text was followed by several political pamphlets, an eight-volume history of England (which won the admiration of such figures as Madame Roland), and her philosophical magnum opus, *Letters on Education, with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects* (1790). In the tradition of Locke, this work treats education as the major test case for one's views about epistemology, meta-

physics, and morals. After a detailed exposition of her theory of education, Macaulay turns, in part 2, to a historical and theoretical account of the effects of education on manners, morals, and culture in various civilizations. Part 3 contains her sustained discussion of the metaphysical and moral views that underlie her theory of education: views on the origin of evil, free will and necessity, and the role of revelation in the grounding of moral duty. In the course of her discussion, Macaulay critically evaluates Bolingbroke's moral theory and that of the ancient Stoics.⁴⁶

Mary Wollstonecraft's early *Thoughts on the Education of Daughters* (1787) was strongly influenced by Macaulay's work. In her *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), Wollstonecraft argues against Rousseau's views about women's nature, their role in society, and how they should be educated; she criticizes Madame Genlis's *Adele and Theodore, or Letters on Education* (1782) and finds only portions of Hester Chapone's *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind . . .* (1773) helpful. But she acknowledges that her opinions on education so coincide with those of Catharine Macaulay that she will simply refer the reader to her work rather than quote her at length. A review of Macaulay's *Letters on Education . . .* by Wollstonecraft appeared in the journal *Analytical Review*.⁴⁷

Mary Hays echoed the feminist social and political concerns of both Macaulay and Wollstonecraft in her *Letters and Essays Moral and Miscellaneous* (1793) and the *Appeal to the Men of Great Britain in Behalf of Women* (1798). Her discussion of the works of Mary Astell, in her six-volume *Female Biography . . .* (1803), demonstrated that by the end of the eighteenth century English women were beginning to trace a history of feminist social and political philosophy that reached back about one hundred years.⁴⁸

With the growing professionalization of philosophy, and the placement of it over against the belles lettres and religion, we also find for the first time in England "pure" philosophical writing by women. That is, we find philosophy stripped of its moorings within discussions of the woman question and theology, expressed in technical language, and written in a journalistic style. In short, we find a corpus like that of Lady Mary Shepherd, which includes *An Essay upon the Relation of Cause and Effect, controverting the Doctrine of Mr. Hume . . .* (1824); a discussion of Berkeley, among other topics, in *Essays on the Perception of an External Universe . . .* (1827); a review of John Fearn's book on epistemology; and an article summarizing her metaphysics for *Fraser's Magazine*. Interestingly enough, these significant contributions to professional philosophy have disappeared from historical accounts of early modern philosophy even more completely than some of the mystical, feminist, or largely literary endeavors of some of Shepherd's predecessors. I shall briefly explore why this is so in what follows.⁴⁹

Eighteenth-century France provides us with an equally impressive group of women philosophers. Anne Lefèvre Dacier, a classicist by training, was

regarded in the eighteenth century as one of the most learned women in Europe. In 1691 she and her husband translated the writings of Marcus Aurelius, with Madame Dacier supplying a commentary called "Remarks on the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius." In this commentary, she criticizes, albeit sympathetically, the writings of the ancient Stoics from the point of view of her own Christian Stoicism. Dacier actively participated in the salon of Madame de Lambert and thus was exposed to the great intellectual controversies of her day. In 1714, in response to an attack on Homer, Dacier entered the debate between the ancients and moderns; in her book *The Causes of the Corruption of Taste*, she argued in favor of the values of the ancients. So closely was the name "Dacier" associated with ancient thought, and with Stoicism in particular, that the earliest history of women philosophers produced in the modern era was dedicated to her—namely, the history of Gilles Ménage.⁵⁰

Dacier's friend the renowned salonist Anne Thérèse, marquise de Lambert, published a number of works on education and morals, which reflect the style of addressing such philosophical issues that prevailed in her salon—a salon frequented by such figures as Madame Dacier, Fontenelle, Mairan, Montesquieu, Marivaux, and La Motte. Hers is the art of persuasion and suggestion, enlivened by wit, which eschews all pedantry and dogmatism. Like her predecessors Montaigne and Gournay, she rejected idle metaphysical speculation in favor of "the fields of study useful to our perfection and our happiness." And yet in the debate between the ancients and moderns on the question of taste, Lambert was clearly on the side of the moderns. She attempted to show that taste is much more a matter of sentiment than of reason. And her style was decidedly modern: refined, but concise, and not averse to novelty. Indeed, Sainte-Beuve saw her as an intermediate figure between the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment: "She is midway between them and is already turning her eyes in the direction of the more modern."⁵¹ *Letters on True Education* (1728/1729), much praised by Fénelon, shows the influence of Locke on Lambert's views on education. It also exemplifies her reliance on secular morality, which she saw as a substitute for the no longer effective traditional piety. *New Reflections on Women* (1727), arguably her most important work, also appeared under the title *Metaphysics of Love*. In this influential protofeminist text, which was read with interest by Montesquieu, Lambert discusses the ways social customs and institutions, including the educational and legal systems, and heterosexual love, are designed to maintain male hegemony. She rejects what she takes to be the male-centered construction of heterosexual love in her time and offers an alternative conception, which she deems more favorable to women. Finally, Lambert also wrote moral treatises, including *Treatise on Friendship* (1732) and *Treatise on Old Age* (1732).⁵² These works exemplify early-eighteenth-century France's interest in blending a Cartesian theoretical paradigm with a provisional morality based on readings of the Stoics, Plato, Cicero, and

other ancient authors. Some of Lambert's works continued to be published a century after their original publication and went into as many as fifteen editions.⁵³

In eighteenth-century France, the old *querelle des femmes*, which had questioned woman's moral and intellectual faculties, and which debated *whether* she should be educated, was replaced by a new set of issues on the "woman question." Now, not woman's soul but the relative inputs of nature and nurture were examined in relation to woman's character. It was *assumed* that women should receive *some* education. But woman's role in society needed to be debated since this would determine the *type* of education that she should receive.

In 1772, Antoine Thomas published his *Essay on the Character, Morals and Mind of Woman in Different Centuries*. Diderot responded in his *On Women*, and Louise d'Épinay registered her reactions to Thomas in her letter to the Abbé Galiani in the same year. D'Épinay was a member of philosophical networks that included such figures as Hume, D'Holbach, Diderot, and Rousseau. Her most important philosophical contribution was her treatment of woman's nature and education, *The Conversations of Émilie* (1774), which, like the work of Madame Panckoucke, was a response to Rousseau.⁵⁴ Numerous treatises on education were written by women in Enlightenment France.⁵⁵ Of special note is Stéphanie Félicité de Genlis's *Adèle et Théodore* (1782), which provided a Rousseau-inspired philosophy of education for girls. Genlis, however, models the education of a girl more on Rousseau's program for Émile than for Sophie.⁵⁶ In addition to an essay on education, Louise-Marie Dupin left an extensive manuscript, *Observations on the Equality of the Sexes and of Their Difference*, which she dictated to her secretary, Jean-Jacques Rousseau.⁵⁷

The period of the French Revolution spawned numerous works, now not only on woman's character and social duties but on her rights as a citizen as well. This genre includes Olympe de Gouges's *Declaration of the Rights of Woman* (1791) and Fanny Raoul's *Opinion of One Woman on Women* (1801).⁵⁸

While Madame Roland, the Girondist friend of Wollstonecraft and admirer of Macaulay, did not publish works on women, her early philosophical essays "On the Soul," "On Liberty," "On Luxury," and on "Morality and Religion" were published in the nineteenth century.⁵⁹

In the area of natural philosophy, there is no question but that Émilie du Châtelet deserves recognition as an important figure of the eighteenth century. Du Châtelet's philosophical erudition, as well as her training in mathematics—received in part from Maupertuis—enabled her to make interesting contributions to the contemporary debates: force and its metaphysical status, and the precise formulations of the laws of motion and gravity. In *Institutions of Physics* (1740), she sides with the Newtonians on some of the details of the laws of nature but attempts to provide a metaphysical foundation for Newtonianism. Thus, her position can be seen as an attempt to

reconcile what she takes to be most useful in Newtonian mechanics and Leibnizian philosophy. The 1742 edition of the *Institutions* also included a text on the *vis viva*, or active force controversy, which she wrote in response to the philosopher Jean Jacques Dortous de Mairan. This was followed, in 1744, by her essay *On the Nature and Propagation of Fire*, and at the end of her life she produced the translation of Newton's *Principia* (with commentary) that remains the standard French edition of his work. Besides her writings in natural philosophy, du Châtelet also published an expansive *Reflections on Happiness* (1796), and her essays on such topics as the existence of God, the formation of color, and grammatical structure were published posthumously.⁶⁰

The anatomist and author of an empirical study of putrefaction, Marie Thiroux d'Arconville, left us no texts on natural philosophy, but she did publish texts on moral psychology such as *On Friendship* (1761), *Of the Passions* (1764), and *Moral Thoughts and Reflections* (1775).⁶¹

And Sophie de Grouchy, the marquise de Condorcet, having first produced translations of Adam Smith's *Theory of the Moral Sentiments* and *Dissertation on the Origin of Languages*, went on to write her own blend of rationalist and moral sentiment ethics in her *Letters on Sympathy* (1798).⁶²

By the end of the eighteenth century, French women were producing broad critiques of culture and the arts, as is evidenced in the mathematician Sophie Germain's *General Considerations on the State of the Sciences and Letters . . .* (1833).⁶³ In this text, much praised by Auguste Comte, Germain argues that there is no essential difference between the arts and sciences. But perhaps the most influential of the French cultural critics was Anne Louise Germaine Necker, baronne de Staël-Holstein, who published a number of works about the interrelations among politics, morals, and the arts in the new republican era, including *On the Influence of the Passions on the Happiness of Individuals and Nations* (1796) and *On Literature Considered in Relation to Social Institutions* (1800). Her first published work was *Letters on the Character and Writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (1788).⁶⁴

Eighteenth-century Germany spawned a number of critical treatments of Kant's views on women, including one by an unidentified "Henriette" and a second by Amalia Holst—both published in 1802.⁶⁵

The Swiss Isabelle de Charrière also criticized Kant's moral views in some of her novels and published a *Discourse in Honor of Jean-Jacques Rousseau . . .* (1797).⁶⁶ Marie Huber, also of Switzerland, published three Enlightenment texts in which she added her voice to the contemporary debates concerning the principles of natural religion, the controversies over disembodied souls, whether eternal damnation is compatible with God's goodness, and the relation of science to faith. These texts are *The World Unmasked* (1731), *System of . . . the Soul Separated from Their Bodies* (1733), and *Letters on the Religion Essential to Man* (1738).⁶⁷

Finally, eighteenth-century Italy was the home of a number of women natural philosophers, including Laura Bassi of Milan, who was mentioned

earlier. Her forty-nine published theses (1732), which she debated for her doctorate at the University of Bologna, and her published theses concerning the nature of water (1732) can be found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Four papers in natural philosophy were published in the *Commentaries of the Bologna Academy and Institute of Arts and Sciences*.⁶⁸ The mathematician Maria Gaetana de Agnesi discussed topics in logic, metaphysics, and Cartesian physics in her treatise *Philosophical Propositions* (1738).⁶⁹ In 1722, Giuseppa-Eleonora Barbapiccola, friend of the daughter of the Cartesian critic Giovanni Battista Vico, published a translation and critical introduction for Descartes's *Principles of Philosophy*. In her introduction, Barbapiccola examined the relation of Descartes's views, particularly on motion and form, to those of Aristotle.⁷⁰

EXCLUSION: THE REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN PHILOSOPHERS IN MODERN HISTORIES OF PHILOSOPHY

Why have I presented this somewhat interesting but nonetheless exhausting bibliographic and doxographic overview of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century women philosophers? Quite simply, to overwhelm you with the presence of women in early modern philosophy. It is only in this way that the problem of women's virtually complete absence in contemporary histories of philosophy becomes pressing, mind-boggling, possibly scandalous. So far, my presentation has attempted to indicate the quantity and scope of women's published philosophical writing. It has also been suggested that an acknowledgment of their contributions is evidenced by the representation of their work in the scholarly journals of the period and by the numerous editions and translations of their texts that continued to appear into the nineteenth century. But what about the status of these women in the histories of philosophy? Have they ever been well represented within the pre-twentieth-century histories?

A quick look at some of the standard histories indicates a lively interest in the topic of women philosophers in France in the late seventeenth century. In 1690 Gilles Ménage wrote *The History of Women Philosophers*, which he dedicated to Madame Dacier. It was a doxography of some seventy women philosophers of the classical period.⁷¹ And the most widely read history of philosophy in the seventeenth century, Thomas Stanley's, contains a brief discussion of some twenty-four women philosophers of the ancient world.⁷² With respect to the "moderns," in 1663, Jean de La Forge produced *The Circle of Women Scholars*, and five years later Marguerite Buffet published her *New Observations on the French Language . . . with the Elogies of Illustrious Women Scholars Ancient as Well as Modern*.⁷³ And this is just the tip of the iceberg; numerous compendia of *femmes savantes* appeared at this time. But this long list of women philosophers gets narrowed to the mention of a handful by the nineteenth century. Most of the standard

eighteenth- and nineteenth-century histories mention Queen Christina of Sweden as the patroness of Descartes. She is not, however, described as a philosopher, and no reference is made to her writings. Tennemann's eighteenth-century history mentions the English mystic Jane Lead; Hegel tells us that Leibniz dedicated his *Theodicy* to Sophie Charlotte; and Renouvier, in the nineteenth century, quotes at length from the correspondence of Descartes and Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia.⁷⁴ Victor Cousin, in his nineteenth-century *Course of the History of Modern Philosophy*, discusses four women: the mystic Madam Guyon, Damaris Masham, Jacqueline Pascal, and finally the one woman who appears in a number of the standard histories of philosophy and who is now known to almost no one: Antoinette Bourignon.⁷⁵ The Belgian Bourignon was a seventeenth-century itinerant writer of theology whose career Leibniz and Trotter Cockburn followed with interest. She produced a large corpus, parts of which she disseminated to her followers by means of a printing press that she carried with her. A Cartesian, Pierre Poirer, renounced his former philosophical commitments, became her disciple, and published her collected works in nineteen volumes after her death. Bourignon discusses such issues as free will and predestination, and the nature of divine cooperation with respect to secondary causes, with the result that Trotter Cockburn's friend Thomas Burnet attributed to her "solid judgment (in the greatest matters of theology oftentimes)."⁷⁶ But Bourignon's unorthodox quietism, as well as much of her rhetoric, got her labeled, even in her own time, as a mystic first and foremost.

So it was a handful of women—largely mystics—who figure in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century histories of philosophy. Let me stress that this absence of women in the histories is not due to ignorance about the existence of the women. In the nineteenth century, Lescure published *The Women Philosophers* (1881), in which chapters were devoted to such eighteenth-century figures as Mesdames du Châtelet, de Lambert, d'Épinay, and de Staël.⁷⁷ Foucher de Careil wrote books on Descartes's relationships with Princess Elisabeth and Queen Christina, and on Leibniz's relationships with Electress Sophie and Sophie Charlotte.⁷⁸ Cousin even wrote books on Scudéry and Sablé, yet he failed to mention them in his own history of philosophy.⁷⁹ Why? What were the factors that led to the ink of these women's published texts disappearing in the nineteenth century? Why was any mention of these women's important contributions omitted from the general histories of the discipline?

To begin with, the socially encouraged practice of anonymous authorship for women clearly did not help to put them on the map of philosophy. Instead, it frequently led to misattributions (Conway), charges of plagiarism (Cavendish), charges that the woman philosopher had been "helped" by a prominent male philosopher (du Châtelet), or, most commonly, neglect pure and simple. But this cannot account for our almost complete ignorance of the large number of published texts that bore the women philosophers' names and were evaluated in contemporary journals.

Other factors that must be considered are those that might be termed "internal to philosophy as a scholarly enterprise," like the effects of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries' "purification" of philosophy. As I indicated earlier, either the bulk of early modern women's philosophical writing directly addressed such topics as faith and revelation, and "the woman question," or these topics were addressed within a larger philosophical context. But by the nineteenth century, philosophy had "confined theology to its own domain," as Cousin put it.⁸⁰ Indeed, the story of the purification of philosophy from the taint of religion is an interesting and complex one, which goes far beyond the limits of this essay. Suffice it to note that Tennemann's *Manual of the History of Philosophy* (1832) contains a classification called "supernaturalists and mystics."⁸¹ Included under this head are not only true mystics like Jane Lead, who simply wrote of her visions and attempted no philosophical speculation or analysis, but scholars who were once taken to be major *philosophical* thinkers, like More and Cudworth. By allying philosophy motivated by religious concerns with an unreflective mysticism, eighteenth-century historians excised whole philosophical schools, and the work of many women, from philosophy proper. In addition, German historians, taking Kantianism as the culmination of early modern philosophy and as providing the project for future philosophical inquiry, viewed treatments of "the woman question" as precritical work, of purely anthropological interest. In sum, by the nineteenth century, much of the published material by women, once deemed philosophical, no longer seemed so.

But what about those texts that were solidly philosophical from the post-eighteenth-century vantage point? Here we have to admit that a number of the women's works have dropped out of sight simply because their views or underlying *episteme* were ones that simply did not "win out." Thus, the writings of Schurman and Suchon, because of the Scholastic exposition, or of Scudéry and Conway, with their underlying Neoplatonic *episteme*, may seem too removed from our present philosophical concerns to gain a position in our histories. Notice that such a decision assumes that our histories of philosophy take present philosophical concerns as their main point of departure in reconstructing philosophy's past. I will return to methodology in the history of philosophy in a moment, but first I want to point out an odd feature of "philosophical views that did not win out," namely, that they have frequently been characterized as "feminine." For example, as Benjamin Farrington has shown, Francis Bacon's description of ancient—particularly Aristotelian—philosophy as "feminine" is meant to convey that it is weak and passive as opposed to the active, potent experimental philosophy that Bacon introduces.⁸² I have tried to show elsewhere that the Neoplatonism of the seventeenth-century French salonists and of the Cambridge Platonists, as well as of the Hermeticists, came to be regarded, at the end of the seventeenth century, as "feminine."⁸³ Here again, the point was not that it was the philosophy of women but rather that it was a degenerate philosophy of both

men and women, which was on its way out. But given that one meaning of "feminine" is "that which befits a woman," will there not be some slippage between "feminine" (i.e., outdated) philosophy, which perhaps "deserves" to be left out of the canon, and philosophy written by women? Might there not be an unarticulated presumption that women's philosophical work is "feminine" philosophy par excellence, and thus worthy of forgetting? I think my speculation may be supported by an examination of yet another factor, namely, philosophical form or style.

Londa Schiebinger, in her illuminating study *The Mind Has No Sex? Women in the Origins of Modern Science*, has recently shown that "poetic" style in the eighteenth century was identified with the feminine, at the same time that it was being ushered out of the domains of philosophy and science. So, for example, in the middle of the eighteenth century, the natural historian Buffon was hailed as combining the rigors of mathematics with rhetorical and poetic style. But by the end of the century, Madame d'Épinay expressed the general consensus that Buffon's work was more "poetic" than "true."⁸⁴ By the end of the century, the salonists would be seen as literary figures and, by that very fact, not philosophers. It would seem, then, that feminine style could be had by men or women, and that it once again signaled an exclusion from the sphere of the philosophical. But Rousseau's attack on the scholarly style issuing from the French salons, in his "Letter to M. d'Alembert on the Theater" (1758), raises my earlier concerns. For it is not feminine style per se that he attacks but the influence of women on style. He charges that the decadence of arts and letters in France is due to men's practice of "lowering their ideas to the range of women," since "everywhere that women dominate, their taste must also dominate; this is what determines the taste of our age."⁸⁵ At the end of the century, Louis Sébastien Mercier will make the point explicitly with respect to philosophy: "What claim to fame has the woman who suddenly decides to make her entrance into the sanctuary of the muses and philosophy? She has ogled, bantered, simpered, made silk knots and little nothings."⁸⁶ It would seem that the end of the eighteenth century in France not only marked the end of the feminine poetic style in philosophy but also signaled a material change in women's acceptance into philosophy's domain. In her *New Reflections on Women*, Madame de Lambert lamented: "There were, in an earlier time, houses where [women] were allowed to talk and think, where the muses joined the society of the graces. The Hôtel de Rambouillet, greatly honored in the past century, has become the ridicule of ours."⁸⁷ In short, Lambert no longer lived in that era in which women could boldly be philosophers.

In Germany, which was to become arguably the hub of philosophy by the nineteenth century, the historian of philosophy Karl Joël described the French Enlightenment as a time when "woman was philosophical and philosophy was womanly."⁸⁸ He viewed this period as an interregnum between the "manly" philosophy of the English Enlightenment and the "masculine

epoch" of the German philosophy introduced by Kant. Notice that Joël juxtaposes and possibly elides feminine philosophy and women's presence in philosophy. When Kant himself describes the masculine character of the profundity of philosophy, he refers not to gendered systems or styles but to sexual difference: "A woman who has a head full of Greek, like Madame Dacier, or one who engages in debate about the intricacies of mechanics, like the Marquise du Châtelet, might just as well have a beard; for that expresses in a more recognizable form the profundity for which she strives."⁸⁹

Let me sum up the hypothesis I have presented so far about the absence of women in the history of philosophy. In the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, there were a number of developments, internal to philosophy, regarding what constituted the main philosophical problems, the proper method of inquiry, and the appropriate style of exposition. In consequence of these developments, numerous men, as well as women, came to disappear from our historical memory. But the alignment of the feminine gender with the issues, methods, and styles that "lost out," together with a good deal of slippage between gender and sex, and the scholarly practice of anonymous authorship for women, led to the almost complete disappearance of women from the history of early modern philosophy.

But there would also seem to be another factor that plays some role in accounting for the absence of any mention of early modern women philosophers' published texts in the general histories of philosophy. I shall call it the "oxymoron problem": early modern European thought has generally presupposed that a woman philosopher is something barely possible and always unnatural. As Bathsua Makin, in her *An Essay to Revive the Antient Education of Gentlewomen*, observed in the seventeenth century: "The Barbarous custom to breed Women low, is grown general amongst us, and hath prevailed so far, that it is verily believed . . . that women are not endued with such Reason, as Men; nor capable of improvement by Education as they are. It is lookt upon as a monstrous thing; to pretend the contrary. A Learned Woman is thought to be a Comet, that bodes Mischief, when ever it appears."⁹⁰ A full century later, Samuel Johnson, who in fact did much to encourage the writing of the Bluestocking philosophers, commented that "a woman's preaching is like a dog's walking on his hind legs. . . . you are surprised to find it done at all."⁹¹ By the nineteenth century, Proudhon would pithily state: "The woman author does not exist; she is a contradiction. . . . [A] woman's book . . . is . . . philosophy on nothing."⁹² Because philosophy written by a woman has been so difficult for early modern culture to conceive of as possible—and thus because the reality of it has always come as something of a shock—history has deemed it sufficient to note that it has been done by some "Tenth Muse," some time ago. Thus, Hypatia and a few other Titans get mentioned. These exceptional authors need not be read; it is enough that philosophy was ever done by a woman at all. In this way, the inclusion in the standard histories of philosophy of one or two women of mythic proportions acts as a strategem of exclusion.

But the account I have given so far still does not explain the extent of the disappearance of women's published contributions from the histories of philosophy. My hypothesis, about the alignment of the feminine gender (and women) with ultimately unsuccessful philosophical topics and methods, applies equally well to the erasure of some women from seventeenth-century histories as it does to the more extensive disappearance of women philosophers in subsequent centuries. And while my focus on the rise of Kantian critical thought and the "purification" of philosophy does identify the nineteenth century as the pivotal era of disappearance, it is unable to explain why virtually *all* women's philosophical contributions are lost to sight at this point. In short, I have not yet explained what happened in the nineteenth century. Why did this century not produce texts like Stanley's seventeenth-century history, which included numerous female contributors to the discipline?

To satisfactorily answer these questions I believe we must look far beyond developments internal to philosophy proper. In addition, such a factor as the "oxymoron problem" itself requires an explanation, pointing beyond the dialectics internal to Enlightenment arts and letters more generally. The dramatic disappearance of women from the histories of philosophy in the nineteenth century can be fully understood only against the political backdrop of the aftermath of the French Revolution.⁹³

It is difficult to overestimate the perceived social and political threat that the woman author—particularly the female *theoretical* author, and most particularly the female *philosophical* author—represented for Western culture at the very commencement of modern democracy. Here I can give only a cursory sketch of the thesis artfully defended by the philosopher Geneviève Fraisse in *Reason's Muse: Sexual Difference and the Birth of Democracy*. Fraisse demonstrates, through an analysis of a wide range of late-eighteenth-century and early-nineteenth-century French texts, the crisis of culture at that time: How to embrace the ideals of a common humanity and egalitarian social order while at the same time preserving a system of sexual difference that underpins masculine hegemony? Since reason was the property essential to human nature, and since it was the sole requirement needed by a man to be admitted as citizen, the texts of this period are filled with debates about the precise character of woman's exercise of reason, and thus her rightful role as citizen. A few voices, like those of the marquis de Condorcet, Madame Clément-Hémery, and Charles Fourier, would argue for women's rights as citizens—particularly their right to education. Their arguments were based on the demonstrated reason and accomplishments of women who had been given the requisite opportunities. But the majority of voices would argue either for the limited participation of women in public life based on social utility, as did Madame Gacon Dufour, or, as in the case of Sylvain Maréchal, for the radical exclusion of women from the public sphere. Culture's anxiety was focused on whether women's limited entrance into the newly democratized public sphere would lead to women's equal

participation in civic, economic, and political power. Thus, even such figures as Constance de Salm and Madame de Staël, who boldly entered this public sphere via their writings and salons, and who advocated the education of women, would retain assumptions about sexual difference entailing that any claim to such power for women be rejected. Madame de Staël would write: "It is right to exclude women from political and civic affairs. Nothing is more opposed to their natural vocation than those things that would set up a rivalry with men; and for a woman, fame itself can only be a source of grief bursting forth in the form of happiness."⁹⁴ And Stendahl, the Enlightenment defender of women's education, added that only the economic necessity of having to support a family could provide a justification for a woman to be an author.⁹⁵ As Fraisse argues, by 1800, the woman author came to epitomize a new phenomenon: all women's increasing access to "individual autonomy and economic independence." The woman author thus became an "emblem of social transformation."⁹⁶ She symbolized the possibility of dismantling the patriarchal order.

It is not surprising, then, that the nineteenth century is filled with invective against the female author. Fraisse's analysis helps us to make sense of the seemingly bizarre text of Maréchal, *The Proposed Law Prohibiting Women from Learning to Read* (1801). Why would one want to prevent women from learning to read? Because "reason does not desire, any more than French grammar, that a woman be an author" and "reading is extremely contagious; as soon as a woman opens a book, she believes she can write one."⁹⁷ We are also in a better position to understand what is motivating the earlier quotation from Proudhon about the woman author as a contradiction. I would add that while women authors in general were scoffed at, female theoretical authors—especially philosophers—received a particularly nasty reception in the nineteenth century. The following remark by Proudhon is indicative of the level of invective I have in mind: "It may be affirmed without fear of calumny, that the woman who dabbles with philosophy and writing destroys her progeny by the labor of her brain and her kisses which savor of man; the safest and most honorable way for her is to renounce home life and maternity; destiny has branded her on the forehead; made only for love, the title of concubine if not of courtesan suffices her."⁹⁸ The woman philosopher, by the nineteenth century, is to be compared to the courtesan, for the latter is one of the few classical roles open to women in the sphere of the polis.

In the nineteenth century, philosophy was still considered the pinnacle of theoretical knowledge; it was seen to have the power to demarcate and distinguish all the other branches of knowledge, to decide the value of alternative avenues of inquiry and methodology. To be admitted into the sphere of philosophy, publicly via published texts, was to partake of a singular form of public power: to be a philosopher was to be a shaper of culture. But what if the sphere of philosophy became democratized? What if, for example, "philosopher queens" ruled in the polis? To imagine such a dismantling of

male hegemony at the birth of modern democracy was more than even Condorcet, its staunchest supporter, could manage. Even he claimed that while women had displayed "genius" in a number of fields, so far none had done so in philosophy.⁹⁹ He says this, while also citing Catharine Macaulay, Marie de Gournay, Madame du Châtelet, and Madame de Lambert as examples of women lacking "neither force of character nor strength of mind."¹⁰⁰

My examination of the reasons for the absence of women in modern histories of philosophy has moved us from a consideration of reasons internal to philosophy's own development to reasons ultimately rooted in the emerging democratic political order. In part, my aim has been to show that while *explanations* are readily available for the disappearance of women from our histories, only rarely are there *justifications* for the exclusion of specific women. And, as we might have expected, *no* justification exists for the wholesale exclusion of women philosophers from the history of our discipline. Perhaps all of this should make us suspicious about our histories; about the implicit claim that our criteria of selection justify our inclusion of philosophers as major, minor, or well-forgotten figures; about our ranking of issues and argumentative strategies as central, groundbreaking, useful, or misguided. The historiography of philosophy is an important and thorny subject, which I cannot hope to tackle here. But I do wish to conclude this essay with some notes on the subject, in relation to the project of making women's philosophical contributions visible once more in history.¹⁰¹

THE RECOVERY OF WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE REWRITING OF HISTORY

In this section I sketch three models for the historiography of early modern philosophy. Two of these models are useful ideals, a mixture of which usually underlies any given attempt at doing such history—or so I shall suggest. But the third model will not be particularly attractive to a philosopher who is doing the history of philosophical thought.

Let me begin with the latter model, which I shall term the "pure history" model. According to this historiographical method, *evaluations* of philosophical arguments and projects, while crucial to philosophy, are irrelevant to the history of philosophy. Scholars who use this model, like the nineteenth-century historian of ancient philosophy Eduard Zeller, see the history of philosophy as a dispassionate *chronicling* of every move in the dialectic of philosophy. Of course, for all their attempts at writing the "pure history" of philosophy, even the followers of Zeller omitted the women, who were seen as significant contributors to the field in their own time. This suggests that the particular interests and blind spots of the historian, and of the era in which the historian lives, will come into play—come what may. But, of

course, the real issue is not what the history of philosophy is like, come what may, but which methodology we ought to take as our ideal—even if this ideal is never achieved. Still, it is not entirely clear what the point would be of chronicling *every* position in the endless dialectic (*per impossible*), in accordance with this first method. For this model might be characterized, as Walter Benjamin noted, as one “which despairs of grasping and holding the genuine historical image as it flares up briefly. Among medieval theologians it was regarded as the root cause of sadness.”¹⁰² Perhaps a philosopher might think that, with this detailed “pure history” of philosophy before her, she would be in the best position to evaluate philosophical arguments and projects, for she then would be able to judge which were the most innovative, strategically useful, and elegant moves in the game called “philosophy.” But, of course, this historical narrative itself never attains closure; it must be revised as philosophy itself changes its rules and even, perhaps, the very goals of the game. The evaluation of moves in the game, thus, cannot be made after the detailed history is completed; the evaluations must be made as we go along rewriting the history of the discipline—as we “brush history against the grain.”¹⁰³ So, what might look like a philosophical interest in having a “pure history” of philosophy turns out to be a nonstarter.

Suppose, then, that we are interested from the start in a “philosophical history” of philosophy, one that attempts to justify the merits of both the larger philosophical projects in which arguments are embedded and the methodological strategies relative to the philosophical goals. There are at least two models of the history of philosophy that attempt such justifications. The “internal history” model would offer a detailed historical account of the interrelations among the arguments of the women philosophers and those of their philosophical predecessors, contemporaries, and successors.¹⁰⁴ It would attempt to provide the philosophical source of the women’s views by discovering their place within an ongoing dialectic internal to philosophy. Notice how different this is from the first model: we are not dispassionately chronicling philosophical views, without regard to the truth of the views or the validity of the arguments. This is also a different matter from simply providing “historical reconstructions” of philosophical views, as Richard Rorty has termed it. For here we are not attempting to make philosophical views (which we might take to be false) intelligible, by placing them in the context of the less enlightened times in which they were produced. To the contrary, this second method of historiography attempts to make past views intelligible by painstakingly piecing together the rational grounds for them. A Rortyan historical reconstruction of, say, texts about the *querelles des femmes* might situate these views about woman’s nature in the context of the quaint medical and religious debates of the early modern period. But the “internal history” model of historiography would be at pains to show that discussions about woman’s nature were of central *philosophical* concern—interrelated as they were to broader meta-

physical, social and political, and epistemological issues. By chronicling how the women’s contributions increasingly raised the level of intelligibility about these issues, and by showing the wide-ranging philosophical implications of their views for such areas as the philosophy of education, a case could begin to be made for the inclusion of these women authors in the history of philosophy.

The third type of history of philosophy is what Richard Rorty, taking Hegel as a master of the genre, has termed *Geistesgeschichte*. This genre of history of philosophy

works at the level of problematics rather than of solutions to problems. It spends more of its time asking “Why should anyone have made the question of _____ central to his thought?” . . . rather than on asking in what respect the great dead philosopher’s answer or solution accords with that of contemporary philosophers. . . . It wants to justify the historian and his friends in having the sort of philosophical concerns they have—in taking philosophy to be what they take it to be.¹⁰⁵

Historians of philosophy frequently have seen their role as that of reformers and revisionists. Influential historians, like Tiedemann and Tennemann, each rewrote the history of philosophy, raising up certain figures and quickly passing over others. And typically they constructed their histories so that they conveniently “led up to” their pet philosophical projects, be it “Lockean sensualism,” “Kantian idealism,” or some other view. Indeed, most of the great philosophers themselves included elements of *Geistesgeschichte* in their own philosophical works, as a method of tying their arguments to the philosophical past. Consider Descartes’s treatment of the Scholastics or Kant’s depiction of himself as the synthesis of what is true in Leibniz’s “noologism” (or, to transform the Greek into Latin, “rationalism”) and in Locke’s “empiricism.” Philosophers sometimes called for a new *Geistesgeschichte* to be written, as a justification for a newly emerging philosophical canon. The historian Victor Cousin, in his 1828 Paris lectures to a crowd of two thousand gentlemen, said:

Let us hope that France, . . . which has already produced Descartes, will enter in her turn upon . . . the history of philosophy. . . . Every great speculative movement contains in itself, and sooner or later produces necessarily, its history of philosophy, and even a history of philosophy which is conformed to it; for it is only under the point of view of our ideas that we represent to ourselves the ideas of others.¹⁰⁶

This passage is interesting in what it suggests about the role that gender, class, ethnicity, and nationalism may have played in the actual constructions of modern histories of philosophy. But it may also lead us to wonder why we should not just abandon sweeping narratives that lead up to a particular set of contemporary interests. Critics have argued that it is misguided to turn to

the philosophy of the past as a way of justifying one's present philosophical concerns, since past philosophers cannot do a better job than we at solving our current problems. And they argue that it is a mistake to construct history with an eye to the *present*, since this simply distorts the history of philosophy. To borrow the beautiful image from Walter Benjamin, the Angel of History is propelled backward into the future, ever keeping its gaze on the past.¹⁰⁷

If we historians of philosophy do go the way of *Geistesgeschichte*, what we need is a narrative that makes clear why some of the women discussed in this paper should figure as major or minor figures. The plot will consist, in part, in the giving of reasons for the decision to count certain questions or argumental strategies as central. The *Geistesgeschichte* that goes along with the "relative non-exclusion" of women, which currently exists, is one in which some token women are allowed to play *extremely* marginal roles. The story goes that these women *did* contribute to ongoing philosophical debates of the time but that the debates are no longer of philosophical interest, or that the women simply added flourishes to the philosophical programs of major male philosophers. But, to take one example, it now seems clear—largely because of the work of "internal history" scholars—that the role that sentiment and emotion ought to play in moral deliberations was a central philosophical issue in the eighteenth century, and that women were major contributors to these debates. Writers of a new *Geistesgeschichte* can point out that descendants of this philosophical topic are of pressing concern to many philosophers today. The model of "internal history" saves our endeavors from turning into poetry history; *Geistesgeschichte* draws the attention of philosophers to philosophy's past, so that it is not just those with purely antiquarian interests who will want to know about early modern women philosophers.

As a last example, let us take the research for the present essay. I began by using the method of "internal history" to locate those women who were contributing to the philosophical debates of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But it was the method of *Geistesgeschichte* that got me to wondering if anything like our present feminist philosophical concerns had antecedents in the philosophical writings of early modern women. These present feminist concerns helped to open up the past for me; I started to notice that early modern women frequently addressed issues dealing with the relation of gender to traditional philosophical topics. The philosophical interest I now have in the past motivated me to use "internal history" to discover the ways that the early modern "woman question" is continuous with, and the ways it sharply departs from, twentieth-century feminist concerns. But it was surely *Geistesgeschichte* that initially motivated me to make the discovery that the "woman question" constituted a major set of philosophical issues in the early modern period and that women made, perhaps, the most outstanding contributions of anyone to these debates.

It appears, then, that we are at a point, both philosophically and in terms of our knowledge of philosophy's internal history, where a rewriting of the narrative of philosophy is called for—one in which a number of the women cited here, and some of the forgotten men, will emerge as significant figures.¹⁰⁸ Contemporary feminist philosophers have already begun to turn to the women philosophers of the past in the attempt to trace a history of feminist thought. In some sense, Michèle Le Doeuff's work is precisely the attempt to provide a *Geistesgeschichte* that will make women visible once again in the history of philosophy.¹⁰⁹ A number of philosophers have also begun the detailed work of reconstructing women's contributions to the complex internal history of philosophy.¹¹⁰ By showing both how women's contributions to early modern philosophy are relevant to our present philosophical concerns and how their contributions are a vital part of the internal dialectics of philosophy, women may escape being footnotes and flourishes to the history of philosophy—makers of nothing more than silk knots and little nothings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Initial stages of research were supported by a grant from the Research Foundation of the City University of New York, an NEH Travel to Collections Grant, a Queens College Faculty in Residence Award, and a University of Pennsylvania Mellon Fellowship in the Humanities. For helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper, I thank the audiences at the University of Massachusetts—Amherst, The Graduate Center of CUNY, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Barnard College, Columbia University, Princeton University, Haverford College, Girton College, the New York City Chapter of the Society for Women in Philosophy, and the 1990 and 1991 Eastern Division Meetings of the APA, especially Madonna Adams, Lanier Anderson, Martha Bolton, Alan Gabbey, Gary Hatfield, Eva Kitray, Arcyeh Kosman, Stephen Menn, Christia Mercer, Robert Nozick, Mary Ellen Waithe, and Sue Weinberg. I am grateful to Susan Bordo, Robert Nozick, Daniel Garber, Janet Kourany, Richard Popkin, James Ross, Robert Siegh, and Margaret Wilson; the encouragement I have received from them over the years has meant more to me than I can neatly put into words. I am indebted to Sarah Hutton and Susan James for organizing the conference on "Women and the History of Philosophy" at Girton College, Cambridge. Thanks also go to the participants in my 1991 Harvard seminar, "Women Philosophers of the Early Modern Period," whose suggestions and criticisms helped to sharpen my understanding of the texts of Gournay, Schurman, Sor Juana, Cavendish, Astell, Masham, Elisabeth of Bohemia, Conway, Trotter Cockburn, Macaulay, and Scudéry. I am especially grateful to Gary Osterrag and Wolfgang Mann, my interlocutors on the historiography of philosophy. Finally, I want to thank Jonathan Rée, whose comments on an earlier draft, and whose own illuminating work, forced me to think more critically about canon formation than I had previously. This paper is dedicated to the women philosophers with whom I have had the privilege to study: Leigh Cauman, Sue Larson, Mary Mothersill, Onora O'Neill, and Margaret Wilson.

NOTES

1. Cited in Gilles Ménage, *The History of Women Philosophers*, trans. Beatrice Zeller (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984), p. 27.
2. This text and others, to which I shall frequently refer, and their abbreviations are as follows:

- BT *Beyond Their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past*, ed. Patricia Labalme (New York: New York University Press, 1980).
- FS *Female Scholars: A Tradition of Learned Women before 1800*, ed. J. R. Brink (Montreal: Eden Press, 1980).
- FW *French Women and the Age of Enlightenment*, ed. Samia Spencer (Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1984).
- H *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, Special Issue: The History of Women in Philosophy, 4, no.1 (Spring 1989).
- HD *Hypatia's Daughters: Fifteen Hundred Years of Women Philosophers*, ed. Linda Lopez McAlister (Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996).
- HWP *A History of Women Philosophers*, ed. Mary Ellen Waite, 4 vols. (Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1987-95).
- WS *Woman and Society in Eighteenth-Century France: Essays in Honor of John Stephenson Spink*, ed. Eva Jacobs, W. H. Barber, Jean H. Bloch, F. W. Leakey, and Eileen Le Breton (London: Athlone Press, 1979).
- WW *Women Writers of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Katharina Wilson and Frank Warnke (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989).

Whenever possible, the primary sources cited in this paper will be the original-language first editions. (I shall provide translations of foreign language titles in the main body of the paper.) In some cases, where a modern edition of a text is currently available, I shall also cite this. Unfortunately, few of the texts cited in this paper are currently in print. A recent anthology and a forthcoming two-volume work will begin to remedy this situation. Margaret Atherton's *Women Philosophers of the Early Modern Period* (Indianapolis: Hackett Press, 1994) contains excerpts from texts by six English women philosophers and reproduces John Blom's translation of two French letters from Elisabeth of Bohemia to Descartes. Eileen O'Neill's *Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: A Collection of Primary Sources*, 2 vols. (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming), will contain selections from some forty women philosophers, including translations from Latin, Spanish, French, German, and Italian texts.

Selected secondary sources, relevant to the work of individual women philosophers, will be cited as each figure is discussed. For a thumbnail sketch of women's contributions to philosophy, see Eileen O'Neill, "Women in the History of Philosophy," *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Supplement, ed. Donald Borchert (New York: Simon and Schuster/Macmillan, 1996). While the number of relevant reference works is quite large, I do want to recommend the following list of modern secondary sources, which treat early modern women scholars and the intellectual, social, and political context in which they were situated. In what follows, they will be cited by author's name.

INTELLECTUAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY

- Roland Bainton, *Women of the Reformation*, Vol. 1, *Germany and Italy* (1971); Vol. 2, *France and England* (1973); Vol. 3, *Spain and Scandinavia* (1977) (Minneapolis: Augsburg).
- Carol Blum, *Rousseau and the Republic of Virtue* (Ithaca, N.Y./London: Cornell University Press, 1986).
- Nathalie Zemon Davis and Arlette Farge, eds., *A History of Women in the West: III. Renaissance and Enlightenment Paradoxes* (Cambridge: Belknap/Harvard University Press, 1993).
- Geneviève Fraisse, *Muse de la raison: La démocratie exclusive et la différence des sexes* (Aix-en-Provence: Editions Alinéa, 1989); English translation: *Reason's Muse: Sexual Difference and the Birth of Democracy*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
- Antonia Fraser, *The Worker Vessel* (New York: Knopf, 1984).
- Wendy Gibson, *Women in Seventeenth-Century France* (London: Macmillan, 1989).
- Octave Gréard, *L'Éducation des femmes par les femmes* (Paris: Hachette, 1907).
- Joan Kelly, *Women, History, and Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1984).
- Joan Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca, N.Y./London: Cornell University Press, 1988).
- Vera Lee, *The Reign of Women in Eighteenth-Century France* (Cambridge: Schenkman, 1976).
- Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness: From the Middle Ages to Eighteen-Seventy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Carolyn C. Lougee, *Le Paradis des Femmes: Women, Salons, and Social Stratification in Seventeenth-Century France* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976).
- Myra Reynolds, *The Learned Lady in England: 1650-1760* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920).
- Gustave Reynier, *La Femme au XVII^e siècle, ses ennemies et ses défenseurs* (Paris: Editions J. Tallendier, 1929).
- Katharine M. Rogers, *Feminism in Eighteenth-Century England* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982).
- Jeannette Rosso, *Études sur la féminité aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles* (Pisa: Libreria Goldiardi, 1984).
- Hilda Smith, *Reason's Disciples* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982).
- Dale Spender, *Women of Ideas and What Men Have Done to Them: From Aphra Behn to Adrienne Rich* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982).
- Doris Stenton, *The English Woman in History* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957).

LITERARY STUDIES

- Antoine Adam, *Histoire de la littérature française au XVII^e siècle*, 5 vols. (Paris: del Duca, 1962).

- George Ballard, *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain*. . . (Oxford, 1752; new edition by Ruth Perry, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1985).
- Margaret Ezell, *Writing Women's Literary History* (Baltimore, Md./London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).
- Erica Harth, *Cartesian Women: Versions and Subversions of Rational Discourse in the Old Regime* (Ithaca, N.Y./London: Cornell University Press, 1992).
- Elaine Hobby, *Virtue of Necessity: English Women's Writing 1649-88* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992).
- Ian Maclean, *Woman Triumphant: Feminism in French Literature: 1610-1652* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).
- Sylvia Harcstark Myers, *The Bluestocking Circle: Women, Friendship, and the Life of the Mind in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
- Roger Picard, *Les Salons littéraires et la société française 1610-1789* (New York: Brenano's, 1943).

HISTORY OF SCIENCE

- Margaret Alic, *Hyppatia's Heritage: A History of Women in Science from Antiquity through the Nineteenth Century* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986).
- Robert Hugh Kargon, *Atomism in England from Harriot to Newton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).
- Evelyn Fox Keller, *Reflections on Gender and Science* (New Haven, Conn./London: Yale University Press, 1985).
- Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980).
- Gerald Dennis Meyer, *The Scientific Lady in England 1650-1760: An Account of Her Rise with Emphasis on the Major Roles of the Telescope and Microscope* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955).
- H. J. Mozans, *Women in Science* (1913; reprint, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991).
- Marilyn Bailey Ogilvie, *Women in Science: Antiquity through the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1988).
- Londa Schiebinger, *The Mind Has No Sex? Women in the Origins of Modern Science* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989).
3. Margaret L. King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1991); *Her Immaculate Hand: Selected Works By and About the Women Humanists of Quattrocento Italy*, ed. Margaret King and Albert Rabil (Binghamton, N.Y.: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1983); Paul O. Kristeller, "Learned Women of Early Modern Italy: Humanists and University Scholars," in *BTS; Women Writers of the Renaissance and Reformation*, ed. Katharina Wilson (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987). On medieval women philosophers see Peter Dronke, *Women Writers of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Elizabeth Petroff, *Medieval Women's Visionary Literature* (New York: C. Bynum, 1986); *Women Mystics in Medieval Europe*, ed. Emilie Zum Brunn and Georgette Epiney-Burgard, trans. Sheila Hughes (New York: Paragon House, 1989); *Medieval Women Writers*, ed. Katharina Wilson (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984); Joan Ferrante, "The Education of Women in the Middle Ages in Theory, Fact and Fantasy," in *BTS*.

Letizia Panizza discusses Modesta Pozzo (1555-92) in her paper "Do Women Have Rational Souls?: 16th- and 17th-Century Italian Debates from Baldassarre Castiglione to Elena Tarabotti" (paper presented at the British Society for the History of Philosophy conference on "Women and the History of Philosophy," 1992).

4. *Helene Lucretiae (Quae & Scholastica) Corneliae Piscopiae, Virginis Pietate, & Eruditione admirabilis; Ordini D. Benedicti Privatis votis adscriptae Opera quae quidem haberi poterunt*, ed. Bacchini (Parma, 1688). Secondary sources include Massimiliano Deza, *Vita di Helena Lucretia Cornara Piscopia* (Venice, 1686), Monsignor Nicola Fusco, P.A., *Elena Lucretia Cornaro Piscopia* (1646-1684) (Pittsburgh: U.S. Committee for the Elena Lucretia Cornaro Piscopia Tercentenary, 1975); Francesco Ludovico Maschietto, *Elena Lucretia Cornaro Piscopia* (1646-1684), *primadonna laureata nel mondo* (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1978); Paul O. Kristeller, "Learned Women of Early Modern Italy: Humanists and University Scholars," in *BTS*; Patricia Labalme, "Women's Roles in Early Modern Venice: An Exceptional Case," in *BTS*; Margaret King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1991); *HWP*, vol. 3.

For a detailed study of early modern women in Italy's universities and academies, see Paula Findlen, "Science as a Career in Enlightenment Italy: The Strategies of Laura Bassi," *ISIS* 84 (1993): 441-69.

5. Translation is from Findlen, "Science as a Career," p. 450; see note 4.
6. In 1980, Marguerite Yourcenar became the first woman to be elected to the Académie Française.
7. See *The International Dictionary of Women's Biography*, ed. Jennifer Uglow (New York: Continuum, 1985).
8. See Schiebinger, pp. 26, 284 n. 47.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 246. As Schiebinger points out, Sophie Germain did attempt to pursue studies at the Ecole Polytechnique in the 1790s.
10. On Erxleben and Schölzer, see *ibid.*, pp. 250-60.
11. Dorothea (Erxleben) Leporitin, *Gründliche Untersuchung der Ursachen, die das weibliche Geschlecht vom Studiren abhalten* (Berlin, 1742); Amalia Holst, *Über die Bestimmung des Weibes zur höhern Geistesbildung* (Berlin, 1802). This observation about Erxleben and Holst is in Schiebinger, p. 270.
12. Michèle Le Doeuff, "Women and Philosophy," *Radical Philosophy* 17 (Summer 1977): 2-11.
13. François-Marie Arouet de Voltaire, "Épître à Madame Du Châtelet," *Alcire*, in *Oeuvres Complètes de Voltaire*, ed. M. Léon Thiessé (Paris, 1831), vol. 3, p. 457.
14. Marie le Jars de Gournay, *L'Égalité des hommes et des femmes* (Paris, 1622); the modern edition of this work appears in Mario Schiff, *La Fille d'alliance de Montaigne, Marie de Gournay* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1910), pp. 61-86. An English translation, by Eileen O'Neill, appears in *Social and Political Philosophy in Perspective: Classical Western Texts in a Feminist and Multicultural Perspective*, ed. James Sterba (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1994). In addition to Schiff, secondary sources on Gournay include S. A. Richards, "Feminist Writers of the Seventeenth Century" (M.A. thesis, University of London, 1914); Lula McDowell Richardson, *The Forerunners of Feminism in French Literature from Christine of Pisa to Marie de Illesley, A Daughter of the Renaissance: Marie le Jars de Gournay*, Marjorie H. (The Hague: Mouton, 1963); Maja Blyvoet, "Editor of Montaigne: Marie de Gournay," in *WW*; Beatrice Zedler, "Marie le Jars de Gournay," in *HWP*, vol. 2; Eileen

O'Neill, "Marie le Jars de Gournay," *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Supplement, ed. Donald Borchert (New York: Simon and Schuster/Macmillan, 1996). For useful overviews of the texts of the *querelle des femmes* tradition, to which Gournay is responding, see Maclean and Kelly.

15. This is the English translation of Anna Maria van Schurman, *Amica dissertatio inter nobilissimam virginem Annam Mariam a Schurman et Andream Rivetium de ingenii mulieris ad scientias et meliores literas capacitate* (Paris, 1638), which also appeared in her collected works, *Nobiliss. Virginitis Annae Mariae à Schurman. Opuscula, hebraea, graeca, latina, gallica, prosaica et metrica* (Leiden, 1648). Secondary sources on Schurman include Una Birch (Pope-Hennessy), *Anna Maria van Schurman: Artist, Scholar, Saint* (London: Longmans, Green, 1909); Joyce L. Irwin, "Anna Maria van Schurman: The Star of Utrecht," in FS; Joyce L. Irwin, "Learned Woman of Utrecht: Anna Maria van Schurman," in WW; Cornelia N. Moore, "Anna Maria van Schurman," *Women Writing in Dutch*, ed. Kristina Aercke (New York/London: Garland Publishing, 1994); Eileen O'Neill, "Anna Maria van Schurman," *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward Craig (London/New York: Routledge, forthcoming).

16. Juana Inés de la Cruz, *Fama, Y Obras Posthumas Del fenix De Mexico, Decima Musa, Poetisa Americana* . . . , ed. Juan Ignacio Castorena y Ursula (Madrid, 1700). English translations include *A Sor Juana Anthology*, trans. Allan S. Trueblood (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988) and *The Answer/La Respuesta Including a Selection of Poems*, critical edition and translation by Electra Arenal and Amanda Powell (New York: Feminist Press at CUNY, 1994). The standard edition of her work is *Obras completas*, 4 vols., ed. A. Méndez Plancarte [A. Salceda] (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1951-57). Secondary sources include Gerard Flynn, *Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (New York: Twayne, 1971); Octavio Paz, *Sor Juana or, The Traps of Faith* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988); *Feminist Perspectives on Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*, ed. Stephanie Merrim (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991); Mary Christine Morkovsky, CDR, "Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz," in HWP, vol. 3; Donald Beggs, "Sor Juana's Feminism," in HD.

17. Bathsua Makin, *An Essay to Revive the Antient Education of Gentlewomen, in religion, manners, arts and tongues with an Answer to the Objections against this Way of Education* (London, 1673). Secondary source material on Makin includes J. R. Brink, "Bathsua Makin: Educator and Linguist (1608?-1675?)," in FS; *First Feminists: British Women Writers 1578-1799*, ed. Moira Ferguson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985); Frances Teague, "Bathsua Makin: Woman of Learning," in WW; HWP, vol. 3; and Smith.

Lucrezia Marinelli, *La nobiltà, et l'eccellenza delle donne, co' difetti e mancamenti de gli huomini* (Venice, 1600). Among the secondary sources is Ginevra Conti Odorisio, *Donne e società nel Seicento: Lucrezia Marinelli e Arcangela Tarabotti* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1979).

18. In *Lettres, opusculs et mémoires de Madame Perier et de Jacqueline, soeurs de Pascal et de Marguerite Perier, sa nièce par M. P. Faugère* (Paris, 1845). Secondary sources include Victor Cousin, *Jacqueline Pascal: Premières études sur les femmes illustres et la société du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1844); S. W. Weitzel, *Sister and Saint: A Sketch of the Life of Jacqueline Pascal* (New York, 1880).

19. *Oeuvres de Mme de Maintenon, publiées pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits et copies authentiques* . . . , ed. Théophile Lavallée (Paris, 1854-57). Sec-

ondary sources include Paul le duc de Noailles, *Histoire de Madame de Maintenon et des principaux événements du règne de Louis XIV*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1849-58); Théophile Lavallée, *Histoire de la Maison Royale de St. Cyr* (Paris, 1853); Louis Chabaud, *Mesdames de Maintenon, de Genlis et Campan, leur rôle dans l'éducation chrétienne de la femme* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1901); and Gréard.

20. *Réflexions ou sentences et maximes morales de Monsieur de la Rochefoucauld, maximes de Madame la marquise de Sablé. Pensées diverses de M. L.D. et les maximes chrétiennes de M**** [Mme de La Sablière] (Amsterdam, 1705); *Maximes de Madame la Marquise de Sablé et Pensées diverses de M.L.D.* (Paris, 1678); *Madame La Comtesse de Maure, Sa Vie et sa Correspondance suivies des Maximes de Madame De Sablé*, ed. Edouard de Barthelemy (Paris, 1863). Secondary sources include Victor Cousin, *Madame de Sablé: Nouvelles études sur la société et les femmes illustres du dix-septième siècle* (Paris, 1854); Vicomte S. Menjoir-d'Elbenne, *Mme de la Sablière, ses pensées chrétiennes et ses lettres à l'abbé de Ranée* (Paris: Plon, 1923); N. Ivanoff, *La Marquise de Sablé et son salon* (Paris: Presses Modernes, 1927); Reynier.

Christina's two series of maxims, "Ouvrage de Loisir" and "Sentimens," together with *Réflexions diverses sur la Vie et sur les Actions du Grand Alexandre*, "Réflexions sur la Vie et les Actions du César," a sampling of her correspondence, and unfinished autobiography, *La Vie de la Reine Christine faite par Elle-même, dédiée à Dieu*, are published in *Mémoires concernant Christine, reine de Suède pour servir d'éclaircissement à l'histoire de son regne et principalement de sa vie privée, et aux événements de son tems civil et littéraire*, ed. Johan Archenholtz, 4 vols. (Leipzig/Amsterdam, 1751-60); an early English translation of some maxims is *The Works of Christina Queen of Sweden* . . . (London, 1753). A secretarial draft of the maxims, existing in manuscript at the Royal Library, Stockholm, is considered the most authoritative version; it was published in Sven Stolpe, *Drottning Kristina Maximer—Les Sentiments Heroïques, Acta Academiae Catholicae Suecanae I* (Stockholm: Bonniers, 1959). Susanna Åkerman, however, has recently discovered a completed, unaltered, late edition of the maxims (ca. 1683) in the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, that may supersede all others. Christina's notes on the maxims of La Rochefoucauld have been published in *La Rochefoucauld—Maximes des remarques de Christine de Suède sur les maximes*, ed. J. Truchet (Paris: Garnier, 1967). Secondary sources include Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato, *The History of the Sacred and Royal Majesty of Christina Alessandra queen of Swedland* . . . (London, 1658); Ernst Cassirer, *Descartes: Lehre—Persönlichkeit—Wirkung* (Stockholm: Bermann-Fischer Verlag, 1939); Sven Stolpe, *Queen Christina*, trans. R. M. Bethel (London: Burns and Oates, 1966); Susanna Åkerman, *Queen Christina of Sweden and Her Circle: The Transformation of a Seventeenth-Century Philosophical Libertine* (Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill, 1991).

21. From a letter of Leibniz to the Electress Sophie of Hanover, first published by Louis Foucher de Careil, *Lettres et opusculs inédits de Leibniz* (Paris, 1854), p. 254. Scudéry's work includes *Conversations sur divers sujets*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1680). English translation: *Conversations upon Several Subjects*, 2 vols., trans. F. Spence (London, 1683); *Conversations nouvelles sur divers sujets*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1684); *Conversations morale* (Amsterdam, 1686); *Nouvelles Conversations de morale* (The Hague, 1688); *Entretiens de morale*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1692). Secondary sources include Reynier; Émile Magne, *Le Salon de Mlle de Scudéry ou Le Royaume de Tendre*

(Monaco: Société des Conférences, 1927); Georges Mongrédien, *Madeleine de Scudéry et son salon* (Paris: Tallandier, 1946); Alain Niderst, *Madeleine de Scudéry, Paul Pellisson et leur monde* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1976); Nicole Aronson, *Mademoiselle de Scudéry* (Boston: Twayne, 1978); and Harth.

For a discussion of Scudéry's philosophical method and her feminism, see my "Women Cartesians, 'Feminine Philosophy,' and Historical Exclusion," in *Feminist Interpretations of Descartes*, ed. Susan Bordo (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, forthcoming).

22. Jeanne Dumée, *Entretien sur l'opinion de Copernic touchant la mobilité de la terre* (Paris, n.d.), ms. ca. 1680, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds français 19941. Aphra Behn, "The Translator's Preface" in Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle, *A Discovery of New Worlds*, trans. Aphra Behn (London, 1688).

23. *The Conway Letters: The Correspondence of Anne, Viscountess Conway, Henry More, and Their Friends, 1642-1684*, ed. Marjorie Hope Nicholson, rev. ed. by Sarah Hutton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 237.

24. Margaret Cavendish, duchess of Newcastle, *Philosophical Letters: Or Modest Reflections upon Some Opinions in Natural Philosophy, Maintained by Several Famous and Learned Authors of this Age, Expressed by Way of Letters* (London, 1664), pp. 494-95, selections from which appear in Margaret Atherton's *Women Philosophers of the Early Modern Period* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994). Her other mature works of natural philosophy include *Grounds of Natural Philosophy* (London, 1668) and *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy. To which is added, The Description of a New World Called the Blazing World* (London, 1666.). A modern edition of *The Description of a New World . . .* is in Margaret Cavendish, *The Blazing World and Other Writings*, ed. Kate Lilley (New York/London: Penguin Classics, 1994). Secondary sources include Virginia Woolf, "The Duchess of Newcastle," *The Common Reader* (London: Hogarth Press, 1925); Douglas Grant, *Margaret the First: A Biography of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, 1623-1673* (London: University of Toronto Press, 1957); Lisa Sarasohn, "A Science Turned Upside Down: Feminism and the Natural Philosophy of Margaret Cavendish," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (1984): 299-307; Silvia Bowerbank, "The Spider's Delight: Margaret Cavendish and the 'Female Imagination,'" *Women in the Renaissance: Selections from English Literary Renaissance*, ed. Kirby Farrell, Elizabeth Hageman and Arthur Kinney (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1991); Londa Schiebinger, "Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle," in *HWP*, vol. 3; Kargon; Merchant; Meyer; Eileen O'Neill, "Margaret Lucas Cavendish," *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward Craig (London/New York: Routledge, forthcoming).

25. Anne Conway, *The Principles of the Most Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, ed. Peter Loftson (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982), p. 221. This edition includes the 1692 London text, as well as *Principia philosophiae antiquissimae et recentissimae de Deo, Christo et creatura, id est de spiritu et materia in genere* (Amsterdam, 1690). A new translation of the Latin text, with a useful historical introduction, is Anne Conway, *The Principles of the Most Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, trans. and ed. Allison P. Coudert and Taylor Corse (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). See also Alan Gabbey, "Anne Conway et Henry More," *Archives de Philosophie* 40 (1977): 379-404 and *The Conway Letters* (cited in note 23). Secondary sources include Joseph Politella, "Platonism, Aristotelianism, and Cabalism in the Philosophy of Leibniz" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1938); Carolyn

Merchant, "The Vitalism of Anne Conway: Its Impact on Leibniz's Conception of the Monad," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 17, no. 3 (1979): 255-69; Merchant; Jane Duran, "Anne Viscountess Conway: A Seventeenth Century Rationalist," in *H* and reprinted in *HD*; Richard Popkin, "The Spiritualistic Cosmologies of Henry More and Anne Conway," *Henry More (1614-1687): Tercentenary Studies*, ed. Sarah Hutton (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990); Lois Frankel, "Anne Finch, Viscountess Conway," in *HWP*, vol. 3; Sarah Hutton, "Anne Conway," *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward Craig (London/New York: Routledge, forthcoming); Sarah Hutton, "Anne Conway: critique de Henry More," *Archives de Philosophie*, forthcoming.

26. *Oeuvres de Descartes*, 11 vols., ed. C. Adam and P. Tannery (Paris: Vrin, 1964-74); *Reliquiae Barclaianae: Correspondence of Colonel Barclay and Robert Barclay of Urie and his son Robert, including Letters from Princess Elizabeth of the Rhine . . .* (London, 1870). Secondary sources include A. Foucher de Careil, *Descartes et la Princesse Palatine, ou de l'influence du cartésianisme sur les femmes au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1862) and his *Descartes, la princesse Elisabeth et la reine Christine . . .* (Paris: Germer-Baillière, 1879); Charles Adam, *Descartes, ses amitiés féminines* (Paris: Boivin, 1917); Elizabeth Godfrey [Jessie Bedford, pseud.], *A Sister of Prince Rupert: Elizabeth Princess Palatine and Abbess of Herford* (London: John Lane, 1909); Marguerite Néel, *Descartes et la princesse Elisabeth* (Paris: Editions Elzévir, 1946); Daniel Garber, "Understanding Interaction: What Descartes Should Have Told Elisabeth," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 21, suppl. (1983): 15-32; Janna Thompson, "Women and the High Priests of Reason," *Radical Philosophy* 34 (1983): 10-14; Beatrice Zedler, "The Three Princesses," in *H*; Harth; Eileen O'Neill, "Elisabeth of Bohemia," *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward Craig (London/New York: Routledge, forthcoming); *Feminist Interpretations of Descartes*, ed. Susan Bordo (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, forthcoming).

27. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Die Philosophischen Schriften von Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz*, 7 vols., ed. C. J. Gerhardt (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1960), vol. 3, p. 217.

28. Notice, for example, that Victor Cousin attributes the *Principles* to van Helmont in the former's *Course of the History of Philosophy* (New York: D. Appleton, 1872), p. 114. See Merchant, ch. 11. See also Stuart Brown, "Leibniz and More's Cabalistic Circle," *Henry More (1614-1687) Tercentenary Studies*, ed. Sarah Hutton (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990).

29. Mary Astell, *Letters Concerning the Love of God, Between the Author of the Proposal to the Ladies and Mr. John Norris . . .* (London, 1695); *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, Part II: Wherein a Method Is Offer'd for the Improvement of Their Minds* (London, 1697), a modern edition of which is in *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies Parts I and II*, by Mary Astell, ed. Patricia Springborg (Brookfield, Vt.: Pickering and Chatto, 1996); *The Christian Religion as Profess'd by a Daughter of the Church of England* (London, 1705). Secondary sources include Florence Smith, *Mary Astell* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1916); Joan Kinnaird, "Mary Astell and the Conservative Contribution to English Feminism," *Journal of British Studies* 19, no. 1 (Fall 1979): 53-75; Smith; Ruth Perry, *The Celebrated Mary Astell: An Early English Feminist* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Kathleen Squadrito, "Mary Astell's Critique of Locke's View of Thinking Matter," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 25, no. 3 (July 1987): 434-39, and her "Mary Astell," in

HWP, vol. 3; Margaret Atherton, "Cartesian Reason and Gendered Reason," in *A Mind of One's Own: Feminist Essays on Reason and Objectivity*, ed. Louise M. Antony and Charlotte Witt (Denver: Westview Press, 1992); Eileen O'Neill, "Mary Astell," *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward Craig (London/New York: Routledge, forthcoming), and "Women Cartesians, 'Feminine Philosophy,' and Historical Exclusion," see note 21.

30. Damaris Masham, *A Discourse Concerning the Love of God* (London, 1696) and *Occasional Thoughts in Reference to a Vertuous or Christian Life* (London, 1705); her letters to Locke are in *The Correspondence of John Locke*, ed. E. S. de Beer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); her letters to Leibniz are in *Die Philosophischen Schriften von Leibniz*, 7 vols., ed. C. J. Gerhardt (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1960), vol. 3. Secondary sources include Lois Frankel, "Damaris Cudworth Masham," in HWP, vol. 3 and reprinted in HD; Margaret Atherton, see note 29; Sarah Hutton, "Damaris Cudworth, Lady Masham: Between Platonism and Enlightenment," *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 29-54.

31. Universiteits-Bibliotheek Amsterdam Remonstrants' MSS. J. 57a, according to Ethel M. Kersey, *Women Philosophers: A Bio-Critical Source Book* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), p. 155.

32. *Bibliothèque Choisie* 7 (1705): 383-90.

33. I want to thank Sarah Hutton and Martha Bolton for identifying the Burnet in question.

34. These works, along with *A Guide to Controversies*, some letters, and a play, appeared in *The Works of Mrs. Catharine Cockburn, Theological, Moral, Dramatic, and Poetical*, ed. Thomas Birch, 2 vols. (London, 1751). An excerpt from *A Defence of Mr. Locke's Essay of Human Understanding* appears in Margaret Atherton's *Women Philosophers of the Early Modern Period* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994). Selected secondary sources include Mary Ellen Waite, "Catharine Trotter Cockburn," in HWP, vol. 3; Martha Brandt Bolton, "Some Aspects of the Philosophy of Catharine Trotter," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 31, no. 4 (October 1993): 565-88, reprinted in HD. I thank Martha Bolton and Margaret Atherton for bringing Catharine Trotter Cockburn's name to my attention.

35. Anon. [Judith Drake], *An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex . . .* (London, 1696; reprinted, New York, 1970). For a discussion of problems regarding the attribution, see *First Feminists: British Women Writers 1578-1799*, ed. Moira Ferguson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), pp. 201-2; Florence Smith, citation in note 29. See also Reynolds and Smith.

36. Lady [Mary] Chudleigh, *Essays upon Several Subjects in Prose and Verse* (London, 1710). A modern edition is available in *The Poems and Prose of Mary, Lady Chudleigh*, ed. Margaret J. M. Ezell (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). Secondary sources include Ballard and Smith.

37. *Correspondance de Leibniz avec l'électrice Sophie de Brunswick-Lünebourg*, 3 vols., ed. O. Klopp (Hanover, 1874); *Briefwechsel der Kurfürstin Sophie von Hannover* (Berlin/Leipzig: K. J. Koehler, 1927). Secondary sources include A. Foucher de Careil, *Leibniz et les deux Sophies* (Paris, 1876); Beatrice Zedler, "The Three Princesses," in H.

38. Gabrielle Suchon, *Traité de la morale et de la politique, divisé en trois parties, savoir: la liberté, la science et l'autorité où l'on voit que les personnes du Sexe, pour en être privées, ne laissent pas d'avoir une capacité naturelle qui les en peut rendre*

participants. Avec un petit traité de la faiblesse, de la légèreté et de l'inconstance qu'on leur attribue mal à propos (Lyon, 1693) of which part 1 was published in *Traité de la morale et de la politique* 1663: La liberté, ed. Séverine Auffret (Paris: Des femmes, 1988); [Traité] *Du célibat volontaire, ou la vie sans engagement, par Demoiselle Suchon* (Paris, 1700). Secondary sources include S. A. Richard, *Feminist Writers of the Seventeenth Century* (London: David Nutt, 1914); Paul Hoffman, "Le Féminisme spirituel de Gabrielle Suchon," *XVII^e siècle* 121 (1978): 269-76; Michèle Le Doeuff, *Hipparchia's Choice*, trans. T. Selous (Oxford/Cambridge, Mass.: Basil Blackwell, 1991); Pierre Ronzeaud, "La Femme au pouvoir ou le monde à l'envers," *XVII^e siècle* 108 (1975): 9-34.

39. For example, S. A. Richard, in *Feminist Writers of the Seventeenth Century* (see note 38), discusses the *Traité de Morals and of Politics* and characterizes it as a "serious" feminist text in the tradition of the work of Poulain de la Barre. However, he attributes it to "Damoiselle G. S. Aristophile."

40. See Phyllis Mack, "Women as Prophets during the English Civil War, *Feminist Studies* 8, no. 1 (1982): 19-45.

41. Margaret Fell [Fox], *Women's Speaking Justified, Proved and Allowed of by the Scriptures, all such as speak by the Spirit and Power of the Lord Jesus . . .* (London, 1666); *A Brief Collection of Remarkable Passages and Occurrences relating to the Birth, Education, Life, of the Eminent and Faithful Servant of the Lord, Margaret Fell, but by her Second Marriage, Margaret Fox, together with Sundry of Her Epistles, Books and Christian Testimonies to Friends and Others* (London, 1710). Secondary sources include Isabel Ross, *Margaret Fell, Mother of Quakerism*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949); Patricia Crawford, *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720* (London/New York: Routledge, 1993); Smith; Exell.

42. *Oeuvres complètes de Mme. Guyon*, 40 vols. ed. J.-P. Dutoit (Lausanne, 1767-91). There is no standard edition. Secondary sources include T. Upham, *Life and Religious Opinions of Madame Guyon, together with some account of the personal history and religious opinions of Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambray*, 2 vols. (New York, 1847); Louis Guertier, *Madame Guyon, sa vie, sa doctrine et son influence* (Orleans, 1881; reprinted, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1971); Adam; Ernest Antoine Aimé Leon, Baron Seillière, *Mme Guyon et Fénelon: Précurseurs de Rousseau* (Paris: Alcan, 1918) (see note 75).

Anna Maria van Schuurman, *ЕУКАНПА: seu melioris partis electio . . .* [Eukleria: Or the Choice of the Better Part, As Presenting a Brief Sketch of Her Religion and Life] (Altona, 1673; Dutch translation, Amsterdam, 1684); *Korte Ondernichting . . .* [Short Instruction Concerning the State and Way of Life of Those Persons Whom God Gathers and Has United in His service through the Actions of His Faithful Servant Jean de Labadie and His Brothers and Fellow-Workers Pierre Yvon and Pierre Duignon] (Amsterdam, 1675); *ЕУКАНПА II* (Amsterdam, 1684). See Joyce Irwin, "Anna Maria van Schuurman: From Feminism to Pietism," *Church History* 46 (1977): 46-62.

43. See Mack, "Women as Prophets," where this is argued for persuasively (see note 40).

44. Victor Cousin, *Jacqueline Pascal: Premières études sur les femmes illustres et la société du XVII^e Siècle* (Paris, 1844), p. 20.

45. Their works include Hester Chapone's *Letters on the Improvement of the Mind: Addressed to a Young Lady*, 2 vols. (London, 1773) and *The Works of Mrs. Hester Chapone . . .*, 4 vols. (London, 1807); Elisabeth Montagu's dialogues in

Dialogues of the Dead, ed. George Lyttelton (London, 1760), pp. 291–320; Hannah More's *Essays on Various Subjects, Principally designed for Young Ladies* (London, 1777) and *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* . . . , 2 vols. (London, 1799; reprinted by Gina Luria, New York: Garland, 1974). The foremost intellectual of this circle was Elizabeth Carter, who had studied classics, Hebrew, Italian, French, history, math, and astronomy. She brought this scholarship to bear on her translations of the works of Epicurus (1758) and of Algorotti's *Explanation of Newton's Philosophy for the Use of the Ladies* (1739). Her "Notes on the Bible and Answers to Objections Concerning the Christian Religion" were published posthumously in *Memoirs of the Life of Mrs. Elizabeth Carter, with a New Edition of her Poems*, 2 vols., ed. Montagu Pennington (London, 1808).

46. Catharine Macaulay, *Loose Remarks on Certain Positions to be found in Mr. Hobbes' Philosophical Rudiments of Government and Society, with a Short Sketch of a Democratic form of Government in a Letter to Signior Paoli* (London, 1767) and her *Letters on Education with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects* (London, 1790; reprinted by Gina Luria, New York: Garland, 1974). In addition to her philosophical works, Macaulay also published an eight-volume history of England and a number of political pamphlets, including *Observations on a Pamphlet entitled "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents"* (London, 1770); *A Modest Plea for the Property of Copyright* (Bath, 1774); *An Address to the People of England, Scotland and Ireland on the Present Important Crisis of Affairs* (Bath, 1775); *Observations on the Reflections of the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke, on the Revolution in France* (London, 1790). Secondary sources include Bridget Hill, *The Republican Virago: The Life and Times of Catharine Macaulay* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Florence Boos, "Catharine Macaulay's Letters on Education (1790): An Early Feminist Polemic," *University of Michigan Papers in Women's Studies* 2, no. 2 (1976): 64–78; Patricia Ward Scalfas, "Catharine Macaulay: A Woman of the Enlightenment" (paper presented at the British Society for the History of Philosophy conference on "Women and the History of Philosophy," 1992); Spender; and HWP, vol. 3.

47. Mary Wollstonecraft, *Thoughts on the Education of Daughters: with Reflections on Female Conduct, in the more Important Duties of Life* (London, 1787); *A Vindication of the Rights of Men, in a Letter to the Right Honourable Edmund Burke* (London, 1790); *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, with Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects* (London, 1792); review of Catharine Macaulay's *Letters on Education, Analytical Review* (November 1790). Wollstonecraft's writings have finally been assembled in a critical edition: *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, 7 vols., ed. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler (Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1989). Secondary sources here are numerous, but see especially George Eliot, "Margaret Fuller and Mary Wollstonecraft" (1855), in *Essays of George Eliot*, ed. Thomas Pinney (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963); Regina M. James, "Mary, Mary, Quite Contrary, or Mary Astell and Mary Wollstonecraft Compared," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 5 (1975): 121–39; Carolyn Korsmeyer, "Reason and Morals in the Early Feminist Movement: Mary Wollstonecraft," *Women and Philosophy*, ed. Carol Gould and Marx Wartofsky (New York: Putnam, 1976); Jane R. Martin, *Reclaiming the Conversation: The Ideal of the Educated Woman* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985); Jean Grimshaw, "Mary Wollstonecraft and the Tensions in Feminist Philosophy," *Radical Philosophy* 52 (Summer 1989): 11–17; Kate Lindemann, "Mary Wollstonecraft," in HWP,

vol. 3; Virginia Shapiro, *A Vindication of Political Virtue: The Political Theory of Mary Wollstonecraft* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Spender.

48. Mary Hays, *Letters and Essays Moral and Miscellaneous* (London, 1793; reprinted by Gina Luria, New York: Garland, 1974); *Appeal to the Men of Great Britain in Behalf of Women* (London, 1798; reprinted by Gina Luria, New York: Garland, 1974); *Female Biography, or Memoirs of Illustrious and Celebrated Women of All Ages and Countries, Alphabetically Arranged*, 6 vols. (London, 1803); *Monthly Magazine*, July 2, 1796; March 2, 1797. Secondary sources include Joyce Marjorie Sanxter Tompkins, "Mary Hays, Philosophess," *The Police Marriage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938); Gina Luria, "Mary Hays's Letters and Manuscripts," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 3, no. 2 (Winter 1977): 524–30; Spender.

49. Lady Mary Shepherd, *An Essay upon the Relation of Cause and Effect, concerning the Doctrine of Mr. Hume, concerning the Nature of that Relation; with Observations upon the Opinions of Dr. Brown and Mr. Laurence, connected with the same subject* (London, 1824); *Essays on the Perception of an External Universe and other Subjects Connected with the Doctrine of Causation* (London, 1827), excerpts from which appear in Margaret Atherton's *Women Philosophers of the Early Modern Period* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994); *An Essay on the Academical or Scceptical Philosophy, as Applied by Mr. Hume to the Perception of External Existence; with several shorter Essays, upon subjects relating to the Doctrine of Causation* (London, 1827); "Observations of Lady Mary Shepherd on the 'First Lines of the Human Mind,'" *Parriana: or Notices of the Rev. Samuel Parr, LL.D., collected from various sources, printed and manuscript and in part written by E. H. Barker, esq.* (London, 1828–29); "Lady Mary Shepherd's Metaphysics," *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 5, no. 30 (July 1832): 697–708. Shepherd's views are discussed by John Fearn in his reply to her review in the same volume of *Parriana*. See also Samuel Allibone, *A Critical Dictionary of English Literature and Parriana*. See also Kersey, *Women Philosophers*, 1858–71; reprinted Detroit: Gale Research, 1965; Ethel 1824 publication to my attention.

50. Anne Lefevre Dacier, *Reflexions morales de l'empereur Marc Antonin . . .* (Paris, 1690–91; English translation, London, 1692); *Des Causes de la corruption du goût* (Paris, 1714). Secondary sources include Fern Farnham, *Madame Dacier: Scholar and Humanist* (Monterey: Angel, 1976); FW; Gibson; Schiebinger.

51. Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits of the Eighteenth Century: Historic and Literary*, trans. Kathleen Wormeley (New York/London: Putnam, 1905), Part II p. 57. Sainte-Beuve actually places Lambert between representative salons of the respective centuries: that of Mme de Rambouillet and that of Mme Necker, mother of Mme de Staël.

52. Anne Thérèse de Lambert, *Reflexions nouvelles sur les femmes, par une dame de la cour de France* (Paris, 1727); *Lettres sur la véritable éducation* (Amsterdam, 1729)—first published as *Avus d'une mère à son fils et à sa fille* (Paris, 1728); *Traité de l'amitié, Traité de la vieillesse, Reflexions sur les femmes, sur le goût, sur les richesses* (Amsterdam, 1732) are all contained in *Oeuvres complètes, précédées d'une notice, suivies de ses lettres à plusieurs personnages célèbres* (Paris, 1808). In addition to Sainte-Beuve (see note 51), secondary sources include M. de Lessure, *Les Femmes philosophes* (Paris, 1881); J.-P. Zimmermann, "La Morale laïque au

commencement du XVIII^e siècle: Madame de Lambert, "Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France 24 (1917): 42-64, 440-66; Ellen M. Hine, "Madame de Lambert, Her Sources and Her Circle: On the Threshold of a New Age," *Studies on Voltaire* 102 (1973): 173-91; Robert Granderoute, "De L'Éducation des filles aux Avis d'une mère à sa fille: Fénelon et Madame de Lambert," *Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France* 87 (1987): 15-30; Picard, Rosso; Gréard, FW; WS.

53. For example, *Avis d'une mère à sa fille* saw fifteen editions between 1732 and 1828. See the preface by Miliagros Palma to Anne Thérèse de Lambert, *Réflexions nouvelles sur les femmes* (Paris: Côte-femmes éditions, 1989).

54. Louise d'Épinay, *Les Conversations d'Émilie* (Leipzig, 1774/Paris, 1781); Mme Panckoucke, *Sentiments de reconnaissance d'une mère adressés à l'ombre de J.-J. Rousseau*, in Rousseau, *Oeuvres*, vol. 10 (Neuchâtel, 1779). Secondary sources include Elisabeth Badinter, *Émilie, Emilie ou l'ambition féminine au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris: Flammarion, 1983); Francis Stegmüller, *A Woman, a Man and Two Kingdoms: The Story of Madame D'Épinay and the Abbé Galiani* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991); Samia Spencer, "Women and Education," in FW; Gréard.

55. For example, see Mlle d'Espinassy, *Essai sur l'éducation des demoiselles* (Paris, 1764); Marie Leprieux De Beaumont, *Instructions pour les jeunes qui entrent dans le monde . . .*, 3 vols. (London, 1764); Charlotte Chaumet d'Ormay, *Les Malheurs de la jeune Émilie, pour servir d'instruction aux âmes vertueuses et sensibles*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1777); Marie Joséphine Monbart, *Sophie: ou de l'éducation des filles* (Berlin, 1777); Anne d'Aubourg de la Bove, comtesse de Miremont, *Traité de l'éducation des femmes, et cours complet d'instruction*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1779-89); Jeanne Louisa Campan, *De l'éducation*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1824); Elizabeth Guizot, *Essai sur l'homme, les moeurs, les caractères, le monde, les femmes, l'éducation* (Paris, 1828). Secondary sources include Paul Hoffman, *La Femme dans la pensée des Lumières* (Paris: Éditions Orphrys, 1977); Paul Rousset, *Histoire de l'éducation des femmes en France*, 2 vols. (Paris: Librairie académique Didot, 1883); Léon Abensour, *La Femme et le féminisme avant la révolution* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1923); Lougee; Samia Spencer, "Women and Education," in FW.

56. Stéphanie Felicité Du Crest de Saint-Aubin, comtesse de Genlis, *Adèle et Théodore ou lettres sur l'éducation* (Paris, 1782; English translation, London, 1783); *Discours sur la suppression des couvents de religieuses et l'éducation publique des femmes* (Paris, 1790). Secondary sources include Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Nouvelle Galerie de femmes célèbres* (Paris, 1865); Louis Chabaud, *Mesdames de Maintenon, de Genlis et Campan, leur rôle dans l'éducation chrétienne de la femme* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1901); Gabriel de Broglie, *Madame de Genlis* (Paris: Perrin, 1985); Madeleine Raaphorst, "Adele Versus Sophie: The Well Educated Woman of Mme de Genlis," *Rice University Studies* 64, no. 1 (1978): 41-50; P. D. Jimack, "The Paradox of Sophie and Julie: Contemporary Response to Rousseau's Ideal Wife and Ideal Mother," in WS.

57. Louise-Marie Dupin, "Idées sur l'éducation," published posthumously in *Le Portefeuille de Madame Dupin, dame de Chenonceaux*, ed. le comte Gaston de Ville-neuve-Guibert (Paris, 1884). According to Lee, Dupin's manuscript was sold at an auction in the 1970s and was being prepared for publication by Professor Leland Thielmann.

58. Olympe de Gouges [Marie Gouzel], *Les Droits de la femme. A la Reine* (n.p., n.d. [1791]); *Oeuvres*, ed. Benoîte Groult (Paris: Mercure de France, 1986). Second-

ary sources include Olivier Blanc, *Olympe de Gouges* (Paris: Syros, 1981); Marie Cerati, *Le Club des citoyennes républicaines révolutionnaires* (Paris, Éditions Sociales, 1966); Léopold Lacour, *Les Origines du féminisme contemporain. Trois femmes de la Révolution: Olympe de Gouges, Théroigne de Méricourt, Rose Lacombe* (Paris: Plon, 1900); Jules Michelet, *Les Femmes de la Révolution française* (Paris, 1854). Fanny Raoul, *Opinion d'une femme sur les femmes*, par F.R.*** [Fanny Raoul], ed. Princesse de Salin (Paris, 1801), reproduced with published texts by Marie-Armande-Jeanne Gacon-Dufour and Albertine Clément-Henery in *Opinions de femmes: De la veille au lendemain de la Révolution Française* (Paris: Côte-femmes éditions, 1989). Secondary sources include Fraisse.

59. Jeanne-Marie [Manon] Phlipon Roland, *Oeuvres de Jeanne-Marie Phlipon Roland, femme de l'ex-ministre de l'intérieur*, 3 vols., ed. L.-A. Champagnoux (Paris, 1800); *The Works (never before published) of Jeanne-Marie Phlipon Roland . . .* (London, 1800). Secondary sources include Gita May, "Rousseau's 'Antifeminism' Reconsidered," in FW, and her *Madame Roland and the Age of Revolution* (New York/London: Columbia University Press, 1970); Edith Bernadine, *Les Idées religieuses de Madame Roland* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1933); Théodore Gosselin Lenôtre (pseud.), "The Salon of Madame Roland," in *Paris in the French Revolution*, trans. H. N. Williams (London: Hutchinson, 1925); Una (Pope-Hennessy) Birch, *Madame Roland* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1918); Blum.

60. [Gabrielle-Émilie Le Tonnelier De Breteuil, marquise du Châtelet-Lomont], *Institutions de physique* (Paris, 1740); *Réponse de Madame** [du Châtelet] à la lettre que M. de Marfan . . . lui a écrite le 18 février sur la question des forces vives* (Brussels, 1741); *Dissertation sur la nature et la propagation du feu* (limited edition by Académie des Sciences, 1739/Paris, 1744); *Principes mathématiques de la philosophie naturelle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1756; first complete edition 1759; reprinted Paris: A. Blanchard, 1966); *Réflexions sur le Bonheur in Opuscules philosophiques et littéraires, la plupart posthumes ou inédits* (Paris, 1796); essays in Ira O. Wade, *Studies on Voltaire with Some Unpublished Papers of Mme du Châtelet* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1947). Secondary sources include Ira O. Wade, *Voltaire and Mme du Châtelet: An Essay on the Intellectual Activity at Cirey* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1941); William H. Barber, "Madame du Châtelet and Leibnizianism: The genesis of the *Institutions de Physique*," *The Age of Enlightenment*, ed. W. H. Barber et al. (Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, 1967); Carolyn Iltis [Merchant], "Madame du Châtelet's Metaphysics and Mechanics," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 8, no. 1 (1977): 29-48; Linda Gardner Janik, "Searching for the Metaphysics of Science: The Structure and Composition of Mme du Châtelet's *Institutions de physique*, 1737-40," *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 201 (1982): 85-113; Elisabeth Badinter, *Émilie, Emilie ou l'ambition féminine au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris: Flammarion, 1983); Alic; Merchant (1980); Ogilvie; Mozans; Schiebinger; Harth; FW.

61. Marie Thiroux D'Arconville, *Mélanges de littérature, de morale et de physique*, 7 vols., ed. Rossel (Amsterdam, 1775). In addition, she published translations of English scientific works and of Lord Halifax; her *Vie du Cardinal d'Ossat* was reviewed by Diderot. Her circle included Voltaire and Lavoisier. Secondary sources include Schiebinger and Alic.

62. *Théorie des Sentimens Moraux . . . par Adam Smith; Traduit de l'Anglais . . . par S. Grouchy Ve. Condorcet. Elle y a joint huit Lettres sur le Sympathie* (Paris, 1798). Secondary sources include Jules Michelet, *Les Femmes de la Révolution*

française (Paris, 1854); Antoine Guillois, *La Marquise de Condorcet* (Paris, 1897); Thierry Boissel, *Sophie de Condorcet* (Paris: Presses de la Renaissance, 1988); Barbara Brookes, "The Feminism of Condorcet and Sophie de Grouchy," *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 189 (1980): 297-361.

63. Sophie Germaine, *Considérations générales sur l'état des sciences et des lettres aux différentes époques de leur culture*, ed. Armand-Jacques Lherbette (Paris, 1833); *Oeuvres philosophiques de Sophie Germain, suivies de pensées et de lettres inédites et précédées d'une notice sur sa vie et ses oeuvres par Hippolyte Sturpy* (Paris, 1879). Secondary sources include Lynn M. Osen, *Women in Mathematics* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974); Mozański; Ogilvie; Schiebinger.

64. Anne Louise Germaine Necker, baronne de Staël-Holstein, *Lettres sur le caractère et les écrits de Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (1788); *De l'influence des passions sur le bonheur des individus et des nations* (1796); *De littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales* (1800). All appear in *Oeuvres Complètes de Madame la Baronne de Staël-Holstein*, ed. Auguste de Staël (1820; reprinted, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1967). Secondary sources include Amelia Gere Mason, *The Women of the French Salons* (New York, 1891); Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Nouvelle galerie de femmes célèbres* (Paris, 1865); Fraisse, FW.

65. [Henriette], *Philosophie der Weiber* (Leipzig, 1802); Amalia Holst, *Über die Bestimmung des Weibes zur höhern Geistesbildung* (Berlin, 1802). Secondary sources include Schiebinger; I am indebted to this source for these references.

66. Isabelle de Charrière, *Eloge de Jean-Jacques Rousseau, qui a concouru pour le prix de l'Académie française* (Paris, 1797); *Oeuvres complètes*, 10 vols., ed. Jean-Daniel Canaux et al. (Amsterdam: van Oorschot, 1979-84). I am indebted to Gina Fisch-Freedman for bringing Charrière to my attention. The citation of the text on Rousseau appears in Blum. Secondary sources include Philippe Godet, *Madame de Charrière et ses amis* (Geneva: Julien, 1906); Rolf Winkler, *Madame de Charrière: Essai d'un itinéraire spirituel* (Lausanne: Éditions l'Âge d'homme, 1971).

67. Marie Huber, *Le Monde fou préféré au monde sage* (Amsterdam, 1731); *Le Système des anciens et des modernes, . . . sur le état des âmes séparées des corps* . . . (London, 1731) both in English translation as *The World Unmask'd, or the Philosopher the greatest Cheat in Twenty Four Dialogues* . . . To which is added, *The State of Souls Separated from their Bodies* . . . In Answer to a Treatise entitled, *An Enquiry into Origenism* (London, 1736); *Lettres sur la religion essentielle à l'homme, distinguée de ce qui n'en est que l'accessoire* (Amsterdam, 1738; English translation 1738). Secondary sources include Gustave A. Metzger, *Marie Huber. Sa vie, ses oeuvres, sa théologie* (Geneva, 1887); E. R. Briggs, "Marie Huber and the Campaign against Eternal Hell Torments," in WS.

68. Laura Maria Caterina Bassi [Veratti], *Philosophica Studia* . . . [forty-nine theses disputed for the doctorate] (Bologna, 1732); *De aqua corpore naturali elemento aliorum corporum parte universi* [theses for a disputation] (Bologna, 1732); the following appear in *De Bononiensi Scientiarum et Artium Instituto atque Academia Commentarii. De aëris compressione* (1745); *De problemate quodam hydrometrico* (1757); *De problemate quodam mechanico* (1757); *De innimto fluidis aëre* (1792). Secondary sources include Marita Cavazza, "L'aurora luce settemplare: Algarotti, Laura Bassi e Newton," in her *Settecento inquieto: Alle origini dell'Istituto delle Scienze di Bologna* (Bologna: Mulino, 1990); Alberto Elena, "In lode della filosofessa di Bologna? An Introduction to Laura Bassi," *Isis* 82 (1991): 510-18; Paula Findlen, "Science as a Career" (see note 4); Schiebinger; Alic; Mozański; Ogilvie.

69. Maria Gaetana Agnesi, *Propositiones Philosophicae* (Milan, 1738). Agnesi's important contribution in calculus was translated into English as *Analytical Institutions*, trans. John Colson (London, 1801). Secondary sources include Lynn M. Osen, *Women in Mathematics* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974); Giovanna Tilche, *Maria Gaetana Agnesi: La scienziata santa del '700* (Milan: Rizzoli, 1984); Carla Vettori Sandoz, "L'opera scientifica ed umanitaria di Maria Gaetana Agnesi," in *Alma mater studiorum: La presenza femminile dal XVIII al XX secolo* (Bologna: CLUEB, 1988), pp. 105-18; Schiebinger; Alic; Mozański; Ogilvie.

70. *I principi della filosofia di Renato Descartes tradotti . . . da Giuseppa-Eleonora Barbapiccola* . . . (Turin, 1722). Secondary sources include Mozański; Ogilvie.

71. Gilles Ménage, *Historia mulierum philosopharum* . . . (Lyon, 1690; English translation, 1702); a recent English translation is cited in note 1.

72. Thomas Stanley, *A History of Philosophy* . . . , 3 vols. (London, 1687).

73. Jean de La Forge, *Le Cercle des femmes sçavantes* . . . (Paris, 1663). Marguerite Buffet, *Nouvelles observations sur la langue française* . . . Avec les éloges de illustres sçavantes tant anciennes que modernes (Paris, 1668).

74. Wilhelm Gottlieb Tennemann, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, 11 vols. (Leipzig, 1798-1819); Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie* (Berlin, 1833-36), English translation: *History of Philosophy*, trans. Haldane (London, 1892); Charles Renouvier, *Mmanuel de Philosophie Moderne* (Paris, 1842).

Sophie Charlotte, who became the first queen of Prussia, was the daughter of the Electress Sophie of Hanover and niece of Elisabeth of Bohemia. She corresponded with Leibniz and John Toland, among others. Secondary sources include Louis Foucher de Careil, *Leibniz et les deux Sophies* (Paris, 1876); Merchant; Beatrice H. Zedler, "The Three Princesses," in H.

75. Victor Cousin, *Cours de Philosophie* (Paris, 1828), English translation: *Course of the History of Modern Philosophy*, New York, 1872).

Jeanne-Marie Bouvier de La Motte Guyon attempted to convince her readers of the doctrines of Catholic quietism, including the importance of achieving indifference and passivity of the soul, in works such as *Moyen court et très-facile pour l'oraison* . . . (Grenoble, 1685) and *Les Torrents spirituels* (Amsterdam, 1704). She was imprisoned several times for her allegedly heretical published views, which included, among other things, disparaging ceremonial devotion and claiming that in the soul's union with God the soul is beyond good and evil (see note 42).

Antoinette Bourignon's complete works appear in *Toutes les oeuvres de Mlle Antoinette Bourignon*, 19 vols. (Amsterdam, 1686). English translations of her writings include *The Light of the World* (London, 1696) and *The Academy of Learned Divines* (London, 1708). Secondary sources include A. R. Macewen, *Antoinette Bourignon, Quietist* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910); M. Van der Does, *Antoinette Bourignon, 1616-1689: La vie et l'oeuvre d'une mystique chrétienne* (Amsterdam: Holland University Press, 1974).

I wish to thank Richard Popkin for invaluable information about women preachers, prophets, and mystics in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, especially about figures like Guyon and Bourignon. I am particularly indebted to him for bringing Margaret Fell Fox to my attention.

76. Catherine Trotter Cockburn, *Works*, vol. 2, part 1, p. 202 (see note 34).

77. M. [Mathurin] de Lescure, *Les Femmes philosophes* (Paris, 1881).

78. A. Foucher de Careil, *Descartes et la Princesse Palatine, ou de l'influence du cartésianisme sur les femmes au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1862); *Descartes, la princesse Elisabeth et la reine Christine . . .* (Paris: Felix Alcan, 1909); *Leibniz et les deux Sophies* (Paris, 1876).
79. Victor Cousin, *Madame de Sévigné: Études sur les femmes illustres et la société du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1854); *La Société Française au XVII^e Siècle d'après Le Grand Cyrus de Mlle de Scudéry*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1858).
80. Cousin, *Course of the History of Modern Philosophy*, vol. 1, p. 316 (see note 28).
81. Wilhelm Gottlieb Tennemann, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie für den akademischen Unterricht* (1812), which was an abridgement of his *Geschichte der Philosophie* (see note 74), appeared in English as *Manual of the History of Philosophy*, trans. Rev. Arthur Johnson (Oxford, 1832).
82. Benjamin Farrington, "Temporis Partus Masculus: An Untranslated Writing of Francis Bacon," *Centaurus* 1 (1951): 193-205; I am indebted to Schebinger for this reference.
83. Eileen O'Neill, "Women Cartesians, 'Feminine Philosophy,' and Historical Exclusion" (see note 21).
84. Schebinger, pp. 153-54.
85. Translation in *ibid.*, p. 156.
86. Louis Sébastien Mercier, *Tableau de Paris* (Amsterdam, 1782-88), pp. 295-96; translation in Lee, pp. 76-77.
87. Translation in Schebinger, p. 110.
88. Karl Joël, *Die Frauen in der Philosophie* (Hamburg, 1896), pp. 44, 48; translation in Schebinger, p. 152.
89. Immanuel Kant, *Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen* (Königsberg, 1764); translation in Schebinger, p. 146.
90. Makin, *An Essay to Revive the Ancient Education of Gentlewomen . . .*, p. 3 (see note 17).
91. Samuel Johnson quoted in Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1957), p. 56.
92. Pierre Joseph Proudhon, quoted in Jenny d'Hericourt, *A Woman's Philosophy of Woman; or Woman Affranchised* (New York: Carleton, 1864), p. 73.
93. I am indebted to Burton Dreben for suggesting that I examine more closely the relation of the French Revolution to the disappearance of women from the philosophical sphere—that is, for suggesting that factors "external to philosophy proper" might turn out to be quite illuminating here. It is not at all clear that Dreben would accept my interpretation of the import of these political factors.
94. Anne Louise Germaine Necker, baronne de Staël-Holstein, *De l'Allemagne* (1810) in *Oeuvres complètes . . .* (1820-21, 1861 edition reprinted Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1967); translation in Fraisse, p. 118.
95. Stendahl [Henri Beyle], *De l'amour* (Paris, 1822), cited in Fraisse, p. 69.
96. *Ibid.*
97. Sylvain Maréchal, *Projet d'une loi portant défense d'apprendre à lire aux femmes* (Paris: Massé, 1801); translation in Fraisse, p. 11.
98. Proudhon, as cited in d'Hericourt, *A Woman's Philosophy of Woman*, pp. 73-74 (see note 92). Cf. this report regarding Marie-Charlotte Corday in an official newsheet, as quoted in Linda Kelly, *Women of the French Revolution* (London:

- Hannah Hamilton, 1987), p. 102: "She was a virago more brawny than fresh, graceless and dirty in her person as are almost all female philosophers. . . ."
99. Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Carlat, marquis de Condorcet, *Lettres d'un bourgeois de Neuchâten à un citoyen de Virginie sur l'inutilité de partager le pouvoir législatif en plusieurs corps* (1788); cited in Fraisse, p. 52.
100. Marquis de Condorcet, "Sur l'admission des femmes au droit de cité," *Journal de la Société de 1789* 5 (3 July 1790), reprinted in *Paroles d'hommes* (1790-1793), ed. Élisabeth Badinter (Paris: P.O.L., 1989).
101. The following papers on the historiography of philosophy are of particular interest: Jonathan Rée, "Philosophy and the History of Philosophy," in *Philosophy and Its Past*, ed. Jonathan Rée, Michael Ayers, and Adam Westoby (Brighton: Harvester, 1978); Richard Rorty, "The Historiography of Philosophy: Four Genres," in *Philosophy in History*, ed. Richard Rorty, J. B. Schneewind, and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Michael Frede, "The History of Philosophy as a Discipline," *Journal of Philosophy* 85, no. 11 (November 1988): 666-72; Margaret D. Wilson, "History of Philosophy in Philosophy Today; and the Case of the Sensible Qualities," *Philosophical Review* 101 (January 1992): 191-243.
102. Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), p. 256.
103. *Ibid.*, p. 257.
104. For a clear exposition and defense of this form of historiography, see Wolfgang Iann, "The Origins of the Modern Historiography of Ancient Philosophy," *History and Theory* 35, no. 2 (1996): 165-95. It is not clear Iann would agree with my characterization of this form of historiography or with the use to which I would put it.
105. Rorty, "Historiography of Philosophy," p. 57 (see note 101).
106. Cousin, *Course of the History of Philosophy*, pp. 63-64, 230 (see note 28).
107. Benjamin, *Illuminations*, pp. 257-58 (see note 102).
108. Another way in which a narrative of the history of philosophy could be rewritten would be from a vantage point external to philosophical dialectic. One such narrative would be a postmodern intertextual one, in which women philosophers, together with forgotten female writers of fiction, autobiography, poetry, and so forth, would be portrayed as heroines and interwoven into the plot. Here the justification for the presence of women philosophers in an emerging new canon of Western thought would not make reference to any moves interpreted to be internal to philosophy. On this view there would be no such moves, since "moves purely internal to a discipline" would simply be taken to be illusions—as in Marxist historical materialism. But where historical materialism rejects any philosophical justification of the plot and ranking of figures in favor of a political/economic/social explanation, postmodernism gives up the privileging of any type of explanation: our canons are simply expressions of the sheer "pleasure of texts" and our delight in thinking through their interrelations. But philosophy, as we have known it in the West, takes justification as a constitutive ideal. It is what we have been aiming at, even if philosophy is a series of (occasionally somewhat brilliant) failures—even if we have never fully been able to justify a philosophical position. I do not have space here to argue for my view that postmodern intertextualism and Marxist historical materialism cannot provide satisfactory histories of philosophy, since they fail to value sufficiently this constitutive ideal of philosophy.

109. A bibliography, together with a useful discussion, of Michèle Le Doeuff's work to date can be found in Kerry Sanders, "Michèle Le Doeuff: Reconsidering Rationality," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 71, no. 4 (1993): 425-35.

110. See, for example, the papers that have been delivered at the APA meetings of the recently formed Society for the Study of Women Philosophers, and the articles in *HWP* and *HD*.

PHILOSOPHY OF PERSONS

"Human Nature" and Its Role in Feminist Theory

LOUISE M. ANTONY

A whistling woman and a crowing hen
Will never come to a good end.

—*Midwestern proverb*

PHILOSOPHICAL APPEALS TO "HUMAN NATURE"

Essentially positive conceptions of human nature have figured prominently in the normative theories of Western philosophers: Aristotle, Rousseau, Kant, and many others based their general ethical and political systems on substantive assumptions about the capacities and dispositions of human beings. Many of these views have been interpreted as affirming the inherent moral value and essential equality of all human beings, and a few have provided inspiration for emancipatory movements, including feminism.

Nonetheless, for anyone who would find in these theories a message of universal equality, there is one immediate difficulty: none of the major philosophers intended their claims about the natural entitlements of "man" to be applied to women.¹ Contrary to what's maintained by many contemporary exegeses, it's unlikely that the philosophers' use of masculine terms in the framing of their theories was a "mere linguistic convenience."² For if one looks at the (very few) places at which the major philosophers explicitly discuss women, one finds that women are expressly denied both the moral potentialities and the moral perquisites that are supposed to accrue to "man" in virtue of "his" nature.³ If "man" is generic, and women are "men," then how could this be?

It's possible that the philosophers in question believed that men and women did not share a nature at all, in which case all their talk of "man" would be simply and literally talk of *men*. But this seems unlikely. Philosophers have not really wanted to claim that men and women are members of distinct *kinds*. Aristotle, Rousseau, and Kant, for example, who all made the possession of reason criterial of humanity, agreed that women could not plausibly be claimed to be utterly devoid of rationality.⁴ Alternatively, then, the view must have been that men and women shared some sort of "human" nature, even while women differed from men in morally relevant respects.