SOME THOUGHTS ON THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN EARLY MODERN PHILOSOPHY

Lisa Shapiro
(Simon Fraser University, Canada)

> … reading good books is like having a conversation with the most genuinely virtuous people of past ages, who were their authors – indeed, a rehearsed conversation in which they reveal to us only the best of their thoughts.
> --René Descartes, *Discourse on the Method* (AT VI 5)

> "I assure you," said Horace, "that even though everyone talks, few people know how to talk."
> --Madeleine de Scudéry, 'De parler trop ou trop peu et comment il faut parler', *Conversations*

I

At least since the mid-eighteenth century, the story of philosophy has been one in which women have gone missing.[1] To see that this is so now, one need only look at contemporary anthologies of philosophical works. While influential contemporary articles written by women are often included, from the looks of your average anthology, it would seem that there were no women doing philosophy, or at least any philosophy of significance, prior to, say, Elizabeth Anscombe, or perhaps Simone de Beauvoir and Hannah Arendt.[2] For the purposes of this paper, I take as uncontroversial the feminist point that the absence of women from the story philosophy tells of itself is problematic.[3] Indeed, it is a basic presupposition of this paper that it is a problem demanding remedy, for my concern here is just this remedy.

L. Alanen and C. Witt (eds.), Feminist Reflections on the History of Philosophy, 219-250.

But as I consider ways of situating, or perhaps better, re-situating, women thinkers in the history of philosophy, I do want these strategies to be responsive to those who might find this point controversial.

I focus my attention on a particular, and a particularly narrow, historical period—the early modern period, roughly 1600-1740 in Europe—for several reasons. For one, what is true of the history of philosophy generally is equally true of the history of philosophy of the early modern period. Moreover, the problem of how to resituate the women thinkers of this period has become of immediate importance. In recent years there have been tremendous efforts to resuscitate the works of women of the early modern period. Whereas twenty-five years ago, it might have been safely said that most philosophers working on the period were largely unaware of women's writings of the 17th and 18th centuries, now not only are there anthologies of excerpts of the works of these women, along with a growing body of literature critically appraising them,[4] there are also a growing number of re-editions of the works themselves.[5] We are thus no longer faced with a picture of early modern philosophy as a landscape largely barren of women thinkers, and the list of women whose names are recognizable is growing. But to say that many of us can now recognize these women's names amongst the men's is not to say that we know what to make of their work. Until we have a story to tell about them, a way of incorporating them into the history of modern philosophy, we run the risk of their going missing once again. That is, as Eileen O'Neill writes, "we are at a point … 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."[6] While there is no guarantee that a consideration of women thinkers of this period will be salient to a consideration of women thinkers of other periods or that the proposed remedies to the exclusion of women from the history of early modern philosophy generalize to other periods, I still hope that working through some of the issues of *this* period can be useful to addressing this problem in this history of philosophy more generally.

I begin by noting the importance of continuing with archival work, and then turn to address the central question of how to rework the narrative of philosophy so as not only to include the writings of these women but also to ensure that this inclusion endures. I first consider some relatively conservative approaches to this task. For one might think that we can simply stick to the story we already tell and weave women thinkers into it. I argue that while this strategy can be quite effective in the short term, its long term success depends on our being able to justify including the particular women figures we do rather than others who have been historically neglected. Evidence of the causal influence of these women's

works could well provide such a justification, yet it can seem that the very neglect of women's writings indicates that their work had little influence. Consideration of a particular case in which women's writings *were* clearly influential leads me to consider some less conservative approaches to resituating women within the history of early modern philosophy. First, I suggest that we might shift the questions we take as framing philosophical inquiry to align with those questions many women thinkers have taken as compelling. I also suggest that modeling philosophy, and so too the history of philosophy, as a *good* conversation can afford women thinkers' voices, as well as those of many others, occasions to be heard. We need to learn how to converse well with figures from our philosophical past, just as we aim to converse well with our contemporaries.

I present my thoughts here as just that: thoughts. There are several reasons for this. Most centrally, it seems to me that any ideas one might have for bringing women back into the history of philosophy need to be put to the test by being put into practice, to see whether they get a grip on our philosophical self-conceptions. Equally, the merits of particular proposals hang on the details of content that only further study and debate can help clarify. With this disclaimer aside, I hope that the thoughts I put forward here spur others to think about the problems presented here, help them to formulate their own thoughts about how best to re-situate women thinkers in the history of early modern philosophy, and, perhaps more importantly, move them to read the works of the women thinkers mentioned here, as well as the many others our history has neglected.

II

I am assuming here that the most effective way to ensure the continued presence of women in the history of philosophy is to have a way of weaving them into the 'narrative' of philosophy. For it seems that this is how thinkers find their way into our philosophical self-conceptions, and once a thinker finds her way in, she is likely to stay for some time. It is still worth issuing a reminder here that the first step in this process, no matter which strategy one pursues, is to continue with the work already underway, of retrieving and making readily available philosophical works by women. While, as I already noted, a growing number of works by women are being reprinted, there are some clear lacunae.[7] In many cases, what is most readily available are excerpts.[8] While this state of affairs might not be an insurmountable problem for scholars, it does pose real problems for affording non-specialists a degree of familiarity with these works. And so long as non-specialists have no ready access to these works, the chances of

these women figuring in our history of philosophy are slim, if for no other reason, the number of those familiar with the content of these women's writings will be slim. So long as only a few are aware of these works, I suspect that the works will not be folded into common philosophical discourse.

Documenting and cataloging the philosophical works of women in this way amounts to what Richard Rorty has called doxography.[9] Doxography has the advantage of instilling in us a familiarity with the ideas of philosophers of the past, and so enables these thinkers to leave an enduring mark on intellectual history. And so a new doxography, like that of early modern women philosophers, can serve to bring a variety of new figures into our philosophical view. As Rorty notes, "new doxographies usually started off as fresh, brave, revisionist attempts to dispel the dullness of the previous doxographic tradition."[10] They serve a kind of archaeological function, unearthing works, allowing them to see the light of day, and so allowing us to see our intellectual past from a new perspective. However, as Rorty also notes, if left as a simple catalog, this attempt to refresh our understanding of our past fast becomes stale itself, if not inspiring of "boredom and despair", leaving the figures whose works it aims to highlight, lifeless and "mummified."[11] Doxography on its own may be necessary, but it is insufficient. And so, while it is absolutely essential to continue the archival work and process of reissuing and translating texts, those interested in rehabilitating women thinkers need something more. And I would suggest that with respect to these women thinkers we need something more sooner rather than later. For having spent the effort to exhume them and their works from the archives, leaving them to be 'mummified' can only result in a re-interment of their works in the depths of the stacks, along with them. The problem then is not only to retrieve the works of women philosophers, but to find a way of weaving them into the narrative of philosophy.

III

Since the problem is immediate, it is tempting to solve it by sticking to the story one has been telling all along—the one that takes as its key figures a set of male philosophers—and to introduce some women characters along the way. For this strategy seems the most efficient. One can make the simple move of inserting a new text or a choice bit of text into what has come to be the canon of the early modern period at the appropriate point chronologically. And while this approach might certainly serve to bring women thinkers into view quickly, it might also serve another purpose. Part

of the problem of working women thinkers into the story of philosophy is finding threads with which to weave them in. But these threads are even harder to find the less we are familiar with the writings of these women. Fitting these women into the chronology of early modern intellectual history can help familiarize us with their works, and with this new familiarity one might well hope some thicker thread connecting these works with more canonical ones will emerge.

This very promise of finding some thicker thread, however, reveals the shortcomings of this sort of approach. As things stand, the works of women are simply added to the list of those already being read.[12] While there are clear feminist reasons to include them, no such reasons *internal* to the philosophical concerns at issue are clearly articulated. It can seem as though these women are being read simply because they are women, and not because of the content of their philosophical writings. Because the internal philosophical reasons are not clear, we are left with a number of puzzles about the women thinkers we include, and these puzzles threaten to undermine the feminist reasons—the reasons *external* to the philosophical concerns at issue—we had for including them in the first place. For insofar as internal philosophical reasons for including these women remain unclear, it can seem that there are no *good* internal philosophical reasons for reading these women.[13] So, while this strategy might weave women into the story of philosophy quickly, the narrative thread it affords is too thin. The characters of these women, or better, of their writings, are just not well-developed, and so we are left wondering what they are doing in the picture. It can seem as if they are just cluttering things up, and so obscuring the point, that is, the philosophical lessons to be learned. Insofar as they are doing that, it might seem that they should be edited out.

IV

One way to try to resolve this problem is to find good internal philosophical reasons for bringing these women into the narrative—a stronger thread, as it were. And within the story of early modern philosophy as it stands, it does not seem particularly hard to find such a thread. For the work of many of the women thinkers listed above bears on that of the currently canonical figures of the early modern period. So, as is well known, Elisabeth of Bohemia corresponded with Descartes about the relation between the two really distinct substances of mind and body.[14] Margaret Cavendish, in her *Philosophical Letters,* addresses herself to Descartes' conception of the physical world, as well as that of Hobbes and Van Helmont. Astell, in correspondence with John Norris, considers the

doctrines of occasionalism, and in Part II of her *Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* a work in which she advocates for women's education, she puts forward a Cartesian account of the workings of the human understanding and a nativist account of knowledge. In her correspondence with Leibniz, Damaris Masham takes on his theory of simple substances, and his metaphysics more generally. She also responded to Astell's correspondence with Norris. Leibniz describes his own account as agreeing with that Anne Conway puts forward in *The Principles of Ancient and Modern Philosophy.* Locke praised Catherine Trotter Cockburn's explication of his work in her *Defence of Mr Locke's Essay of Human Understanding.*

And it is not only the case that these women interacted with those we take to be key figures in early modern philosophy, it is also the case that they are engaged with precisely the questions of metaphysics and epistemology that we take to be at the heart of the philosophy of this period. One might thus think it should be easy enough to introduce women thinkers into the canon of early modern philosophy. In considering Descartes' conception of the human being and the problems it faces, one can read Elisabeth's correspondence with him on just this matter. In presenting the Cartesian account of the physical world as divested of all but efficient causes, one can look to Cavendish's criticism of Cartesian physics and her own positive vitalist account of causation. In critically evaluating Locke's empiricist account of human understanding, one can not only look at Leibniz's *New Essays* but also at Cockburn's defense of Locke. And there are many other alternatives.

This general approach seems to be the way many interested in bringing women into the canon of early modern philosophy are inclined to go.[15] So, let us consider in more detail what this strategy for including women offers us. The first thing to notice is that this strategy is somewhat conservative: it leaves the story of philosophy as it stands intact. On this line, the internal reasons which weave women into the narrative arise from these women's engagement with the issues in early modern philosophy we currently take as most relevant to our contemporary philosophical interests: the conception of the physical world, accounts of causation, the nature of thought, the representationality of ideas. However, in thinking about the relevance of its history to contemporary philosophy, we motivate these issues by taking certain canonical figures as holding representative positions. According to the way we as a discipline set things up, the works of Descartes, Locke and Leibniz, and perhaps of Malebranche, are important precisely because they allow us to frame a set of questions which are still open today. So long as we want to continue to set up the same questions, that is, to tell the same story, we do well to keep the same central characters.

In retaining this commitment, however, this strategy for weaving women into the story faces some problems. First, in the pedagogical context, there is the straightforward problem of available space and time: how practical is it to make a point of bringing women into the mix? Consider the task of constructing an early modern philosophy course that might include these women thinkers. So long as we continue to tell more or less the same story, and retain a serious level of engagement with the texts, in the course of a term, we could bring in one or two of these women at most. That, in and of itself, need not be a problem. We need to leave out many other philosophers as well in this context. How many courses in early modern philosophy include Malebranche, let alone More, Bayle, and Condillac just to name a few? While we might face the question of why we include one typically neglected figure rather than another—why include Astell, say, rather than More?—the same form of question would confront us in any non-traditional choice of whom to include: why More rather than Condillac?

It can seem that pointing to a personal interest can provide an immediate answer to these questions, and so it can seem perfectly fine to offer feminist reasons for including some women. Yet including these women because they are women has its dangers. For one, given the wholesale omission of women from the history of philosophy, in introducing one or two women into the narrative, we can give the misleading impression that the women engaged with philosophical issues were few and far between. This danger can be avoided easily enough by adverting to other female figures along the way, just as we might allude to, say, More, in passing. However, there is also another, even greater risk: that of diminishing the intellectual value of the contributions of the women we single out. For on this model, the central characters in the philosophical story are still men. Indeed, on the particular proposal currently under consideration, women thinkers are worked in just insofar as they are responsive to the works of those central characters, whether that be in correspondence with those figures, or those who followed them (such as Norris), or in works which address what we take to be canonical texts. The women are thus secondary or supporting characters. While it may just be true that women thinkers played this sort of role—indeed, it seems reasonable to think that *most* thinkers, men and women alike, even today, play this sort of role—we run the risk of presenting women thinkers as playing *only* supporting roles. While being a good worker and carrying out the program of their male mentors or correspondents is perhaps a noble role, it is nevertheless a lesser one, and we can be left with a distinct impression of women as capable but always in this lesser role.

And there is another problem as well. If these women are workers serving the ends of developing and promoting a philosophical program rather than originating it, it is not clear why we should highlight their place in philosophical history. There are plenty of thinkers, women and men alike, whose efforts contributed in small but substantive ways to the development of what we now take to be the central philosophical views. We are thus thrust back into the question of justifying inclusion of them rather than others.[16] While we can certainly justify focusing on women thinkers *now* by appealing to of the historical exclusion of *any* women from the history of philosophy, this will not do as a long term strategy. We need a stronger justification for highlighting those we do. For at a certain point we will need to explain why we continue to focus on the women to the exclusion of other comparable figures. This strategy, as it stands, does not seem to have sufficient resources to afford such an explanation. That is, it seems we have not yet articulated an adequate reason *internal* to the philosophical story for turning to these women.

V

What sorts of reasons *would* constitute adequate ones for bringing these women (or perhaps others) into the canon of early modern philosophy? It may be useful here to think about how the canonical figures in our history of philosophy have come to be so. One might begin by suggesting that at minimum the philosophers we take as canonical have *causal* influence. That is, their works have played a causal role in the development of philosophical thought. So, on the standard story, Descartes' works certainly influenced so-called Cartesians, such as Malebranche, insofar as they took themselves to be further articulating, clarifying and promoting, the philosophical vision of Descartes. More significantly, however, is the influence of Descartes on those who aimed to correct his errors. Spinoza and Leibniz both read Descartes and developed their own metaphysics and philosophical program from what they took to be misguided, if not outright ridiculous, in Descartes' program. Equally, Locke's work is seen as driving the development of an empiricist account of human understanding and cognition. For Berkeley and Hume both aimed to preserve the basic account of the epistemic primacy of perception while correcting for the errors along the way.

But have women's writings played a causal role in the progress of philosophy? On the face of it, it can seem that they have not played a substantial one. That women thinkers appear to play but supporting roles contributes to this impression. And one can easily imagine an

unsympathetic colleague maintaining that if women's writings *had* proven influential in efforts to answer the questions we take to be at the core of philosophy—questions of metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of mind, ethics—it would seem that they would not have dropped out of the canon so wholly. Perhaps a kind of sexism, or the kind of slippage between 'feminine work' and women's work that Eileen O'Neill points to,[17] could explain how the significance of writings by women came to be downplayed, but, it might be argued, if the works were truly substantially influential, it would be hard to achieve the degree of disappearance of the works that indeed was effected. I will return to reconsider whether the influence of women's writings on currently core philosophical questions was insubstantial shortly, but before doing so I want to consider one domain in which women's writings *were* clearly causally influential: that concerning the questions of women's rationality and the related matter of the education of women.

In particular, one can trace a line of influence from Lucrezia Marinella[18] possibly to Marie de Gournay and certainly to Anna Maria Van Schurman and from there to Bathsua Makin, and quite possiby to Mary Astell. What is particularly noteworthy here is that the causal influence is of the right kind. The later writers read the earlier works critically, criticizing some arguments, as well as refining and extending others.

Marinella's arguments in the first half of her *The Nobility and Excellence of Women and the Defects and Vices of Men* are all geared towards, as the title suggests, advancing claims about the excellence of women. After an argument from the nobility of the etymology of words meaning 'woman', Marinella offers a series of arguments which draw on Platonist texts. She begins by situating women within the ladder of being, not unlike that outlined in Pico della Mirandola's *Essay on the Dignity of Man.* Insofar as women are situated within this ladder, Marinella argues, they have a degree of perfection, and she goes on to draw explicitly on the Platonic theory of Ideas to specify the kind of perfection women possess: Women embody the Ideas of beauty and goodness. Marinella does not stop with this assertion of the intrinsic nobility of women, however. She rejects the 'common reasoning' that "women's souls are equal to men's," arguing rather that women's souls are nobler because of women's greater beauty, for "nobility of soul is judged from excellence of body."[19] And she continues, drawing next on Plato's doctrine of the ascent of desire in the *Symposium* and Marcilio Ficino to argue that women's beauty affords them a greater access to the nature of things and, moreover, that "the beauty of women is the way by which men who are moderate creatures are able to raise themselves to the knowledge and contemplation of divine essence."[20]

From these principles and from examples, she goes on to argue that women should be educated not only in letters but in military arts as well.

While Marinella's arguments from beauty are not taken up by those who read her, her appropriation of Platonist doctrines is. And moreover, these Platonist ideas serve the same end, that of showing that women are situated by nature to higher learning. Before considering this, however, I want to look briefly at Marie de Gournay.

On the face of it Marie Le Jars de Gournay's essay *On the Equality of Men and Women* (1622), does not draw on Marinella at all. The title seems directly counter to Marinella's rejection of 'common reasoning'. Yet the skeptical method which informs Gournay's works can be seen as in conversation with Marinella's work, for Gournay sees herself as trying to find the mean between two extremes, as the opening lines of her essay announce: "Most of those who take up the cause of women, opposing the arrogant preference for themselves that is asserted by men, given them full value for money, for they redirect the preference to them. For my part, I fly all extremes; I am content to make them equal to men…"[21] Moreover, in one of her skeptical arguments, Gournay does advert to learned Italian women who outshine their French and English counterparts. The best explanation for this disparity, she suggests, lies in the degree and quality of the education the Italian women receive, for, she intimates, French and English women would surely surpass Italian women, just as French and English men have surpassed Italian men, if they were only better educated. While Gournay need not have Marinella in mind here, she does seem to be aware of the writings of, in particular, Venetian women of the 16th century, and takes their very accomplishments to support a claim that women ought to be educated.

Anna Maria van Schurman does address the work of Marinella, as well as that of Gournay, directly. In a letter of 18 March 1638 to André Rivet[22], part of the correspondence arising from her *dissertatio, On Whether a Christian Woman Should be Educated,* she adverts to both Marinella's and Gournay's works. While she deems Marinella's work to be well-argued, she takes issue with its style, noting that it seems to embody just the kind of vicious vanity, presumably in its display of its scholarliness, Schurman seeks to avoid. Conversely, for her, Gournay's work, written in the humble vein of a skeptic, is a model of style, but Schurman suggests that she might well take issue with some of the conclusions.[23]

One can see Schurman's own work as building on what she takes to be the successes of these two authors, while avoiding their pitfalls. For one, like Marinella, Schurman appeals to Platonic authority in arguing that women by their very nature have the resources to benefit from an education. However, she does not appeal to the Plato of the *Symposium.*

Rather, in holding that all humans, men and women alike, have an innate ability to grasp the truth, which, if cultivated, leads us to virtue, she seems to draw on ideas in the *Phaedo* and *Meno*.[24] In addition, Schurman pares down Marinella's style. Indeed, she distills her argument to a spartan series of fifteen syllogisms in defense of her thesis. It thus seems we need appeal to no other authority but our own reason to see the truth of her claim.

The first set of Schurman's arguments begin from a set of general premises, for which she argues, about who is suited to the arts and sciences: those who are instilled with the principles of the arts and sciences, those who desire to study them, those who stand erect, those who yearn for an enduring occupation, those with a degree of freedom in their life, those for whom virtue is fitting. They then move to defend the minor premises that women are of the appropriate nature to studying the arts and sciences. Once she establishes that women are fit to study the arts and sciences, she move on to offer a second set of arguments which aim to show that a study of the arts and sciences is particularly conducive to a Christian woman's being a good Christian. Such study perfects the human mind, leads one to revere God more greatly, fortifies one against heresies, teach prudence, leads to greatness of soul and provides intellectual joy, and so is opposed to ignorance. She then goes on to defend her thesis against a set of objections.

Schurman can also be read as picking up a thread from Gournay's essay. Gournay suggests that the equality of the sexes will be laid bare if men and women are given an equal education. Schurman flips the argument on its head, as she starts from a premise of the commonalities in the natures of men and women, and moves from there to defend the claim that women are fit to an education similar in many ways to that of men.[25] One can see the two arguments as working together to build a strong case for women's education: together they can be seen as a defense of a biconditional.

That Schurman's work influenced Bathsua Makin's *An Essay to Revive the Ancient Education of Gentlewomen*[26] is also clear. First of all, the two corresponded with one another. And not only does Makin refer to Schurman several times in the work, the basic structure of her argument is quite similar to Schurman's. After arguing that women are educable, by citing example after example of learned women,[27] she moves to follow Schurman in arguing for the suitability of education to women on the basis of a set of principles. Like Schurman, she restricts her theses about the education of women to those with sufficient means, time and talent, and from there she goes on to offer arguments from women's nature as a rational being for her suitability to pursue a higher education. Makin then moves to offering instrumentalist justification for the education of women. Education would not only profit the women themselves, Makin claims, by keeping them occupied, helping them to achieve the knowledge that is the

'First Fruits of Heaven', and providing a 'Hedge against Heresies' and so helping to ensure they are good Christians, it would also be beneficial to their families, as a well-educated wife is a better helper to her husband, and a better teacher of her children.[28]

However, it would be an oversimplification to say that Makin adopts Schurman wholesale. For one, her emphasis is different. While Schurman is concerned to educate women in order to promote their love and service to God, Makin is more concerned to ensure that women gain knowledge of, as she puts it, "things". And among these 'things' she includes "Religion, the Names and Natures of Herbs, Shrubs, Trees, Mineral-Juyces, Metals, and Precious Stones; as also the Principles of Arts and Sciences before mentioned." [29] That is, she emphasizes the *content* of an education in the arts and sciences itself; women should have knowledge for knowledge's sake as well as for the benefits of its effects. In addition, Makin supplements van Schurman's pared down arguments with lists of examples illustrating the point at issue. Here while she seems to be imitating the humanist style, akin to that of Marinella, of militating a set of authorities to one's defense, she interestingly draws not only on historical figures but also on contemporary and near contemporary women to illustrate her point; it is here that she appeals to Schurman to illustrate the contributions of women to the arts and sciences. Moreover, her arguments go beyond Schurman's. While with Schurman she argues that educating women will benefit both women and their families, she continues, arguing that "Women thus instructed will be beneficial to the Nation,"[30] pointing to the success of the Dutch and claiming that part of their flourishing as a nation derives from the care they take in educating their women. Though Makin acknowledges the influence women can have on the political sphere, she does not go so far as to claim that women are suited to public office. Still, Schurman shies away from any claim that might even appear to take women out of the home, and so Makin's move here is not insignificant.

One might also see Astell's *Serious Proposal to the Ladies* as falling within this tradition. While Astell does not appeal, to my knowledge, to any of the above authors specifically, she does seem to be addressing a question left unanswered by all their writings in defense of women's education. While it is clear that these defenses presuppose that women are rational creatures, they do not put forward any account of the nature of rationality at issue. Astell's proposal of a school for women begins with just that, and her account is interestingly a very Cartesian one insofar as she claims that each human being is imbued with a faculty of reason which, through cultivation, allows him or her to perceive clearly and distinctly what is true.

While I have here only able to sketch out a narrative of philosophical thought about women's rationality and the education of women, it should

be clear that women's writings on these topics have been causally influential. At the very least, these women read one another, and did not set about simply fleshing out the details of a predecessors view. Rather they engaged with a discussion which was very much alive for them, preserving some elements, of method as well as of content, while critiquing others, in the interest in putting forward a systematic defense of women's education.

VI

However, that we can tell a story about women's writings having causal influence does not yet solve the problem of bringing women into the history of philosophy in any enduring way. There are two issues. For one, it seems that the cases we can most clearly make in this regard involve women influencing other women, though this may simply be an artifact of women writers being much more conscious of acknowledging their fellow women writers. Second, the philosophical issues on which these women write, and so on which they exert influence, are not what *we* take to be canonical. And so, if we point to this chain of influence, we run the risk of having it seem that these women are concerned simply with 'women's issues' and not with the real meat of philosophical inquiry. I consider the second issue in the next section, but for now I turn briefly to the first.

The fact that it seems to be the case that women were more likely to influence the writings of other women is not in itself a problem. Just because women wrote about education, and women's education in particular, does not entail that that topic be reserved for women. Indeed, it would be interesting to look at other near contemporary writings on education to see how they fit with those just considered.

Yet it still seems that we are able to weave a more tightly connected story about the women's writings than we can if we include the men they may also have influenced. For these women were not only reading the works of other contemporary women writers and of their female predecessors, but also they *acknowledge* those women, and more than they do the men they might have been reading on the same topics. Their works not only are thematically unified by the philosophical questions they consider, but they are also unified in being informed by a kind of awareness of the peculiar problem of taking up the position of a woman philosopher. Though they might do so in different ways, through their writing, they all mark the fact that they are women. However, this very attention to their peculiar position also makes it all too easy to mark this line in the history of philosophy as that belonging to women philosophers. But to mark it in this way is suggests that it is something different, perhaps 'women's

philosophy' rather than philosophy proper. It is a short step from here to marginalization, and it is an even shorter step from marginalization to being forgotten once again.

There is an irony here. Though the women of the early modern period are self-conscious about their position as women, the authority of their voices is remarkable. They put forward theses to be read and evaluated by all who read them, men and women alike. That is, though they may write in defense of women's rationality and preface their arguments with some disclaimers, in the body of their works they display little hesitancy. They seem confident in their position as rational thinkers and agents. Their writings are no longer framed by the self-affirmations which characterize earlier writings by women,[31] and this suggests that they were also somewhat secure in their position in their intellectual communities.[32] Yet they do not hold a secure position within philosophy now. It seems that in order to bring them into contemporary discussions we must situate them historically within a community of women. While the hope for this strategy is that the authority gained in the community of women can then be carried out into the world at large, one populated by both men and women, the worry is that even if we manage to make these women's voices heard once again, the voices will not carry.

VII

Before resigning ourselves to a position which would partition the philosophical canon into men's and women's work, it is worth revisiting the question of women's place within the history of modern philosophy. The fact that women's writings *have* been causally influential in what would seem to be a way comparable with the way the figures in the current canon and yet are not themselves in the canon would seem to indicate that, while causal influence does help to bind our philosophical narrative, more needs to be about just what more is requisite for inclusion in the canon.

So, what more is needed for a work to become part of our canon? Richard Rorty has suggested that certain works come to be particularly influential within a particular framework, one constituted by a set of philosophical questions we take to be salient. He terms *geistesgeschichte* a history of philosophy which aims to justify our current philosophical concerns by showing just how our philosophical ancestors have led us to ask the questions. And in particular, our ancestors fit into our *geistesgeschiche,* their works come to be canonical, insofar as they are interested in our philosophical questions, or at least in questions quite similar to our own.[33]

If we look at the story we usually tell about early modern philosophy, it is easy to see that there are certain philosophical questions that serve as the central threads around which that story is woven. These came out in our earlier consideration of the conservative strategy for including women. We are interested in the epistemic question of how we might have knowledge of the world around us, and the associated issues of representation and sensation; we are interested in the changing conception of causation with the development of the new mechanist view of the physical world; and, we are interested in the debates around metaphysics which contributed to how the new mechanist science came to shape our understanding of the physical world, and our understanding of our very faculty of understanding that world. The figures we take as canonical, we also take to have made headway in formulating these questions, and we take their interest in these very questions to legitimate our own asking of them.

There are two things to note about this way of understanding how we come to work certain thinkers and their works into our history of philosophy. First, we have already seen that a strategy of keeping the questions the same and weaving in the responses of women has its limits. Though it works to a degree, it seems to run up against the justificatory issue of explaining why we choose to include women thinkers rather than other equally (currently) less canonical figures. We might diagnose the problem to be that the questions we take as proper to philosophy are not drawn up so that the writings of women fit in naturally. Second, as Rorty himself points out, thinking of the history of philosophy in this way leads naturally to the questions: What are the questions we deem constitutive of philosophy? And why those? That is, recognizing that the *figures* we take to be central are a function of the *questions* we take to be central can lead us to recognize the contingency not only of the canon, but of the framework in which that canon is constructed. We might well tell a story of philosophy which turns on some *other* questions, and, in focussing on *those* questions rather than the ones we are currently gripped by, we might well come to take other figures and texts as instructive and thereby justificatory of our concerns. Indeed, we might find that women thinkers are among those who address these questions in the most innovative and interesting ways. So this way of understanding how the story of philosophy is bound together might well afford us a way of introducing women thinkers into our canon in an enduring way.

The crucial question, however, is: Just what might these other questions—the ones which *do* afford a seamless inclusion of women's writings—be? Here it seems that there are several ways to go. For one, we might look at the question of what it is to be a woman. That this is already a question on the philosophical table should be clear, for it informs a fair

portion of contemporary feminist philosophy.[34] It is interesting, however, that contemporary feminist philosophers do not, for the most part, trace the history of answers to this question in any well-developed way. While there may be occasional appeals to the troubles of Aristotelian essentialism, and the somewhat egalitarian claims of Plato's *Republic,* we find few other historical markers on the way to the present. That the question of what it is to be a woman is already philosophically alive makes it a promising one to use to frame the inclusion of the texts of the women writers I have been considering. And, equally, it seems that these texts can help not only in justifying contemporary philosophical interest in this question, but also in showing just how pervasive, and indeed entrenched, the very problems feminists aim to draw attention to have been.

These are two very valuable functions that situating early modern women's writings within philosophy in this way might serve. But it is also worthwhile to note that if one were so to situate them exclusively in this way, one would be also risk separating these women and their works off from what is often called the 'core' areas of philosophy. And again there would be a real danger, if not of reinforcing the marginal status of feminist philosophy and so of the writings of these women, then of dividing the discipline of philosophy in two—into those concerned with what would most likely be called 'women's questions' and those concerned with other questions. That is, although this strategy has the advantage of serving to justify feminist philosophical interests, in doing so it is also serving to challenge the existing canon, and one can well imagine a reactive move to marginalize this challenge. It might thus be useful to think of other ways, more consonant with the existing canon and yet in concert with this one as well, in which to situate these women's writings.

As we have just seen, many women's writings on the nature of womankind also concern the question of a proper education, for they are also concerned with promoting women's education. I want to suggest that looking philosophically at the question of what constitutes a good education would be an equally constructive way of situating the women writers of the early modern period within the history of philosophy. As already noted, writings by women concerning this question were causally influential. Others read their works, and did so critically. Moreover, their views on education bear a direct relation on the questions we currently take as central, and for which we turn to the early modern period for justification. For closely tied to questions of education are questions of the natures of rationality, of knowledge, and of the mind. Indeed, it is often the case that within the writings on education we find these women's philosophy of mind. In addition, it is also the case that many currently canonical figures within the history of philosophy had something to say

about a proper education. Descartes presents his thoughts on education in First Part of the *Discourse,* and one might take the *Meditations* and *Principles* (written as a textbook) to bear on this question as well. Spinoza writes his *Treatise on the Emendation of the Intellect.* Locke's *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* is an important contribution to philosophical thought about education, and Rousseau's *Emile,* as well as the first discourse, *On the Sciences and the Arts,* also bears directly on this question. And the British Moralists and Hume have quite a bit to say about moral education.

The challenge here is to bring the question of education into the mainstream of philosophical discussion, and so to make the links between the canonical questions of epistemology and philosophy of mind and that of education through the figures we already take to be canonical.[35] Yet, it also seems to me that women thinkers have contributed both substantially and valuably to the answers to this question. And what is particularly interesting about many of their writings is how intertwined they are not only with the questions in epistemology and philosophy of mind but also with the question of what it is to be a woman. Thus, it might be possible to bring this latter question into the philosophical mix, through bringing these women's works on education to bear on current philosophical discussion. That is, we might through a consideration of these works come to integrate the question of what it is to be a woman into the more canonical former questions.

VIII

In framing the history of philosophy as concerned with a set of questions that prefigure those we ourselves are invested in, however, we usually do more than simply justify our own interest in these questions. We also implicitly take ourselves to be making *progress* on answers to these questions. One might well ask how women thinkers fit into a narrative of progress. In considering this question, I want to revisit the issue raised earlier in this paper, of whether women's writings on core philosophical questions were influential.

Recall that the first sort of strategy for weaving women into the narrative of philosophy ran the risk of portraying women thinkers in supporting roles. Let us consider, however, just what sort of supporting roles there might be. Sometimes, working out the implications of a philosophical system does serve simply to flesh out the program. But other times these implications need to be worked out precisely because the philosophical system at issue is being contested. So working out the

implications can serve the purpose of raising or defending against objections to the system itself. We might think this sort of supporting role to be more significant. It is noteworthy that several early modern women thinkers were engaged in just this sort of project. Elisabeth of Bohemia, in her correspondence with Descartes, and Margaret Cavendish, in both her *Philosophical Letters* and her *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy,* provide clear cases of this.

Elisabeth, in her challenge to the coherence of Descartes' account of mind-body interaction, also challenges a substance dualist metaphysics. In her letter of 16 May 1643, she asks: "for a more precise definition of the soul than that you give in your *Metaphysics,* that is to say, of its substance separate from its action, that is, from thought" (AT III 661) And, unsatisfied with Descartes' response, she presses this point in her next letter. She writes: "And I aver that it would be easier for me to concede matter and extension to the soul, than the capacity to move a body and to be moved by it to an immaterial thing" (Elisabeth to Descartes, 20 June 1643, AT III 685). Elisabeth is baffled about how to understand the capacity of two really distinct substances to affect one another, and she urges Descartes to explain why she should avoid the apparently more tractable monist materialist position. I have argued elsewhere that, as the correspondence continues, Elisabeth herself struggles to answer this challenge, for in her letters one can see the outline of an alternative metaphysics. In working through the difficulties of accounting for our emotional lives within a substance dualist metaphysics, Elisabeth begins to articulate a position which, like Descartes' own, takes nature as subject to mechanistic physical laws and thought as independent of those laws, but which, unlike Descartes' system, avoids positing two independent substances.

Margaret Cavendish's philosophical originality is more thoroughly realized. In her *Philosophical Letters,* a correspondence between herself and an imagined female correspondent about the views of three leading natural philosophers, Descartes, Hobbes and Van Helmont, as well as Henry More. She also touches on other figures such as Charelton and Galileo. It is clear that she aims to set up her own natural philosophy in critiquing their conceptions of substance, the nature of the physical world, motion, and causation, among other topics. And in her *Observations,* she sets out her positive account in detail, developing a vitalist account of motion and causation as a clear alternative to the mechanist accounts being developed. She carries her vitalist commitment through, proposing accounts of substance and of sense perception premised on her natural philosophy.

Elisabeth's pointed objection to Descartes does gain currency today, in part because contemporary philosophers of mind find themselves in a somewhat similar position with respect to Descartes' work. Yet her own

positive program is neglected, no doubt because it is largely undeveloped. Cavendish's philosophy, however, though it is well-developed, is hardly recognized at all. Perhaps part of the reason for this neglect is that vitalism did not win out. Our account of causation privileges efficient causation, and we are interested in the work in philosophy and in the sciences that strives to work out the details of that account.[36] Insofar as Cavendish parts ways with such views, we take her work as not contributing to our continued efforts to make progress in working out our sort of account. The irony is that in the late 17th century, vitalism *was* a viable alternative to a strict mechanist account of causation, and that fact no doubt contributed to the mechanist philosophy's being worked out as it was.

One, thus, might think that Cavendish's work gets neglected in part because we insist on seeing ourselves as charting a direct course towards the answers we seek. This move to see ourselves as following a line leaves a set of figures by the wayside, and they are eventually are pushed so far to the side that they disappear from view.

Yet still we do want to see ourselves as making some sort of progress; we do not want to be endlessly restating the obvious. I wonder then whether there is a way to think of the historiography of philosophy which involves the *geistesgeschichte* approach—the recognition that figures from our philosophical past serve to justify contemporary philosophical interests, and that those interests, and so the figures we take to be historically significant, are contingent—while avoiding a conception of ourselves as making linear progress. For if we did manage to conceive of things in this way, we might well manage to take the contributions of women thinkers, and indeed of other currently non-canonical figures, as more substantial.

We might find some guidance in the writings of early modern thinkers themselves. In the first part of the *Discourse,* Descartes describes himself as having been in conversation with all the authors whose works he read, and from there making progress of a sort. Can we model the history of philosophy as a conversation? What is it to be in conversation with the authors one reads? Of course, there are many sorts of conversations, but we are interested in the good ones, or, as Scudéry puts it, speaking well with our authors. What is a good conversation?

For one, a good conversation starts from a particular question or topic, and it is the hope of all parties to the conversation that, by drawing on the resources of one another, they will leave the conversation with a clearer sense of things than they had upon entering it. In a similar way, then, one looks to authors for some insight into questions or topics in which one is interested: one reads around to get a sense of the range of approaches to the issue. In this way, it should be clear, modeling the historiography of philosophy as a good conversation is akin to *geistesgeschichte.* While in

conversation with other authors, we see ourselves as engaged with a common set of questions, and so we are afforded a justification of our interests.

It is important to recognize, however, that one need not leave a good conversation with answers to the questions from which one began. A good conversation provides a sense of the range of possible answers and affords the resources for the grounds on which to settle on one or the other of the options.[37] And though a good conversation can unsettle one's convictions, and so leave one feeling a bit muddled, the muddle is only impetus to enter into further conversation to gain clarity. Indeed, a good conversation is not usually one in which there is unanimity of position; the best conversations seem to be those in which there is a diversity of views. For this diversity helps one to gain a critical perspective on one's position, and so to gain insight into what is at issue. Moreover, while a conversation might lead to a consensus, it is not clear that the consensus could have been reached without some strong dissenters, or advocates of alternative positions, to put pressure on a dominant account. In fact, the view for which there is consensus, might synthesize a range of positions. And while a definitive position may emerge from conversation, it is not to say that it is the last word. New takes on the matter may emerge, and the conversation might resume. In this regard, the model of conversation affords us a different way of thinking about philosophical progress. While it may still be important to arrive at answers to our questions, these answers are not all of what is important. What is equally important is the discussion through which we arrived at those answers.

This aspect of the conversational approach affords us a way of charting progress that need not be in a straight line, along a charted course leading inevitably to our conclusion. Conversations, while focused thematically, range around. The conclusion of the discussion is not inevitable. Some other position may have been settled on if the balance of discussion had tipped another way. Indeed, the introduction of new perspectives might well tip the discussion in another way. In seeing ourselves in conversation with figures from our philosophical past, we will read around, finding authors engaged with one another, and playing off one another. Looking for proponents of a range of positions, rather than looking for the line they all fall into, can allow us to get a lay of the landscape of possible answers to the questions which compel us, and so give us some perspective on the view we favor. Moreover, seeing how others have tried, and determining where they fell short, and where they seem more promising, can help us to raise and answer objections to our own view, and even to arrive at new and potentially fruitful positions and questions. These outcomes constitute making progress, but it is progress made by wending one's way forward.

In its overt acknowledgement of the variety of positions in play, there are other clear benefits, related to the concerns of this paper, of thinking of our relation to the history of philosophy as that of being in conversation with our philosophical ancestors. For one, this approach affords our including women thinkers in the history of philosophy, for their voices do figure in the discussion. And at the same time, it affords our including others who have been historically marginalized. We can show how not only Malebranche, More and Condillac engaged with the philosophical topics at issue, but also how the more fleeting voices of Digby and Charleton weighed in, not to mention Bayle, Desgabets, Régis and many others. And in this way we can avoid the justificatory issues that hounded the first sort of strategy considered for weaving women into the philosophical narrative. For on this view it is not so important to settle on the select few authors that led us forward to the definitive answers to our philosophical questions. Rather, what is important is to see how these philosophical questions were defined, and how consensus on answers to them began to emerge through consideration of a range of alternatives. While, on this view, we may still need to select whom we focus on, this focus can shift without interrupting the narrative flow.[38] And so, while it is also important to re-start discussions around questions other than those we are currently gripped by, thinking of ourselves as in a good conversation with the history of philosophy can afford us a way of including more figures in the discussions we are already in the midst of.

It is interesting to note that several of the women thinkers I have touched on here advance their views through correspondence, an interaction closely approximating conversation. I take the correspondence between Descartes and Elisabeth to be a model of what I am calling a conversation here. First, it is clear that they are both interested in a tenable philosophical position about the nature of thought in a mechanist natural world. Yet though they share this aim, they do have substantive disagreements, and Elisabeth is not one to hold her pen when she sees a flaw in Descartes' view. Nevertheless, they listen to one another's objections and reiterations of the point, and often times they rethink their view, refining and adjusting it to avoid the pitfalls. Moreover, they each bring something different to the exchange; for they draw on what they have read, as well as on their own experiences. Descartes is a better philosopher for his exchanges with Elisabeth, and equally, Elisabeth is pressed to articulate positions she might not otherwise have done because of her exchanges with Descartes.

In addition, we have also Astell's correspondence with Norris, and Masham's response to it, as well, as Masham's own correspondence with Leibniz. Indeed, we need not look to women for significant philosophical

correspondence. Much of Descartes' views are worked out in correspondence with many others as well as Elisabeth, and he publishes his *Meditations* not on their own but accompanied by a set of Objections and Replies, wherein it is clear that the later objectors read the earlier exchanges. There is a genuine conversation going on about the philosophical program in that work. The Leibniz-Clarke correspondence, as well as the Leibniz-Arnauld correspondence contains a great deal of substantive philosophical work. Equally, the exchange between Locke and Stillingfleet sheds light on Locke's program in the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. A survey of early modern views of causation would also do well here, for here not only Descartes, Locke and Leibniz, but also the likes of Boyle, Cavendish, Charleton, Digby, and Van Helmont, were reading and responding to one another, and striving to get clear on the causal working of a natural world no longer described in Aristotelian terms. One might think that if their practices are any indication, these early modern thinkers thought of philosophy as essentially involving being in conversation.

It is also interesting that several early modern women self-consciously choose conversation or correspondence as the genre in which to advance their views. Madeleine de Scudéry advances her moral philosophy through *Conversations,* and, as already noted, Margaret Cavendish imagines herself in correspondence with the likes of Descartes, Hobbes and Van Helmont. These women have been understood to be replicating the form of intellectual exchange most familiar to them in styling their writings in this way. But one might also wonder whether these women styled their writings as they did in part because they saw a value intrinsic to the conversational form which went missing from other kinds of intellectual exchange. Perhaps, in choosing the genre they did, they were advocating a form of intellectual interaction that, if practiced well, could well include many points of view, including those of women, but also others outside the mainstream, and so augment human knowledge.

IX

I have distinguished two sorts of ways of working these women into the philosophical canon in a substantive way. On the one hand I have suggested that we might weave the writings of women, such as, say, Margaret Cavendish or Elisabeth of Bohemia, into existing narratives of philosophy of the early modern period, straight narratives of progress structured around questions of metaphysics, philosophy of mind, and epistemology. I have argued that while this strategy might be effective in the short term, it is

unclear whether women's writings can secure a stable place in these well-rehearsed narratives, for eventually we will need to justify including the women we do rather than some other currently non-canonical figures. On the other hand, I have suggested that we might also weave women into the narrative of early modern philosophy by adding new threads, or questions, to the canonical set—for instance, the question of female nature, or that of education. I further proposed that we think of the history of philosophy as an ongoing conversation around these questions, rather than as charting a straight course to the answers to them. In making these suggestions, I have tried to ground the inclusion of these early modern women into the philosophical canon for reasons that could be accepted by someone without strong feminist concerns. That is, I have tried to point to the *philosophical* questions these women address, as if philosophical questions were something different from *feminist philosophical* questions.

I wonder, however, whether drawing this sort of distinction—what I earlier called internal and external philosophical reasons—is advisable. For many of the women of the early modern period, their philosophical concerns were very much tied up with what might be called their feminist concerns, that is, their concerns with securing their own positions as intellectual women and the position of women thinkers more generally.[39] Their awareness of themselves as women informs what they write about, and it no doubt informs the positions they take up. For their problem when they were writing, just as it is now, is that of being heard. For these women, it seems their reasons for holding their views were deeply intertwined with their position as women wanting to be heard. I thus wonder if part of the problem of integrating these women into the canon of the early modern period is a result of our abstracting away from their, broadly speaking, feminist concerns as we try to weave their works into the canon. This is not to say that their feminist concerns dominate the other aspects of their philosophical positions; these authors are not feminist theorists. Rather all these different philosophical concerns are intertwined together. If I am right here, then perhaps what we need to do is bring the pieces of the puzzle back together. That is, perhaps if we see these different philosophers as not simply answering one set of philosophical questions after another, but rather as addressing these questions in the context of an overarching concern of arriving at wisdom and leading of a good life, then we will find that we have a range of subtly different views brought into the mix.[40]

Doing all this is not easy. However, modeling philosophy, and our relation to the history of philosophy, as a conversation can, I think, help in realizing this goal. Thinking of each author as a figure in a conversation involves recognizing that those authors have entered the discussion from a particular position, and so bring to it their own point of view. Thus,

thinking about the claims these women thinkers argue for would involve thinking about the vantage point from which they advance those positions, in particular their position as women thinkers of a certain socio-historical period. And it would also entail recognizing that each of our interlocutors approaches the issues from a particular position as well. But recognizing that our interlocutors come from a particular postions does not demand that we focus on that position to the detriment of the content of their contributions to the discussion. We can and should attend to their philosophical claims as well.

More needs to be said about how best to integrate these elements of a philosophical discussion. I cannot undertake this here, however.[41] It is a task worth pursuing, however, if only because of this: Good conversations, in wanting to survey a range of views, encourage a discussants from a range of positions. In subscribing to this ethic of inclusiveness then, thinking of philosophy as a conversation can not only help to bring women into the philosophical fray, but also to effect our hearing the voices of the many others who we have heretofore neglected.[42]

NOTES

[1] There are quite a few 17th century catalogs of philosophers which make a point of including women, including that by Gilles Menage, *The History of Women Philosophers,* trans. Beatrice Zedler, (Lanham, MD: University Presses of America, 1984), which aims to record women thinkers of antiquity; and that by Thomas Stanley, *The history of philosophy,* (London: Humphrey Mosely and Thomas Dring, 1655-1662). Others include Jean de La Forge's *Circle of Women Scholars* and Marguerite Buffet's *New Observations on the French Language... with the Elogies of Illustrious Women Scholars Ancient as well as Modern.* Also, Renaissance and early modern Italian texts, especially those written by women, offer us catalogs of women who engaged in philosophy as part of their empirical arguments in defense of women's intellectual capacities. See, for instance, Christine de Pisan's *The Book of the City of Ladies,* trans. Rosalind Brown-Grant, (New York: Penguin, 1990), Henricus Cornelius Agrippa *Declamation on the Nobility and Preeminence of the Female Sex,* trans. Albert Rabil, Jr., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), and Lucrezia Marinella, *The Nobility and Excellence of Women and the Defects and Vices of Men,* trans. Anne Dunhill, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). There are scattered efforts to include women in philosophical history in the 18th and 19th centuries, including those by Hedengrahn at the beginning of the 18th and Tennemann and the beginning of the 19th. Hegel and Charles Renouvier mention women but do not give a developed account of their thought. Victor Cousin in his *Course of Philosophy* includes several women. And M. Lescure writes *The Women Philosophers* in the late 19th century. Foucher de Careil is responsible for bringing Elisabeth's correspondence with Descartes to light, as well as the relations between Descartes and Christina and Leibniz and Elisabeth's sister and niece Sophie and Sophie Charlotte. Charles Adam's *Descartes: ses amitiés feminines* (Paris: Boivin, 1937) is very limited in scope, and it is not clear that he counts these 'amitiées' as philosophers. In the 20th century, Mary Ellen Waithe's four volume work *A History of Women Philosophers,*

(Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1987-1991) goes a long way to rectifying the current situation. See Jonathan Rée "Philosophy and the History of Philosophy," in *Philosophy and Its Past,* ed. J. Rée, M. Ayers and A. Westoby, (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1978) and Eileen O'Neill, "Disappearing Ink: Early Modern Women Philosophers and Their Place in History" in *Philosophy in a Feminist Voice,* ed. Janet Kourany, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), for interesting discussions of the changing styles of the historiography of philosophy. This account only touches the surface and owes much to the more complete bibliography offered by O'Neill.

[2] Sometimes, the earlier figures of Mary Wollstonecraft *(A Vindication of the Rights of Women)* and Harriet Taylor Mill *(Enfranchisement of Women* and *Correspondence with John Stuart Mill)* work their way in, but still they appear as oddities in the crowd of men. Mary Warnock, in her *Women Philosophers,* (New York: Everyman, 1996), identifies all of 19 women philosophers, only four of which, Anne Conway, Catherine Cockburn, Mary Wollstonecraft and Harriet Martineau write prior to the 20th century.

[3] Here are two very general reasons holding this view. First, though now it might well appear to many students of philosophy, as well as many philosophers, that within the history of European thought only a somewhat homogeneous bunch of men has engaged in philosophical inquiry, this is far from being the case. Insofar as we take a goal of our history of philosophy to represent its past adequately, the absence of women from this history is a problem. Having this goal need not entail that we expect ever to recover the past perfectly, but it does seem to entail that our histories not be so off the mark that they present a distorted picture of who was capable of being a philosopher. Second, the very existence of these women and their work demonstrates that there were a range of people, of somewhat different stations, with somewhat different perspectives, with an interest in philosophy. And showing that this was so in the past can help to encourage students from a variety of backgrounds and interests to feel welcome to engage in and pursue the study of philosophy. So, if one has a more immediate end of increasing the diversity of those engaged in philosophy now, as, I would think, most of us do, one might think that there is something to be gained by helping the women philosophers of the past regain their place in the history of philosophy.

[4] See Margaret Atherton, *Women Philosophers of the Early Modern Period,* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994) and Eileen O'Neill, *Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: A Collection of Primary Sources,* 2 vol., (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming). See O'Neill, "Disappearing Ink" for an invaluable bibliography of primary and secondary sources. See also *Hypatia's Daughters: Fifteen Hundred Years of Women Philosophers,* ed. Linda Lopez McAlister, (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996), for critical articles on a range of figures.

[5] Undoubtedly, the following list is incomplete. Mary Astell, *Political Writings,* ed. Patricia Springborg, (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), and *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* ed. Patricia Springborg, (London/Brookfield,VT: Pickering and Chatto, 1997). Margaret Cavendish, *Observations on the Experimental Philosophy,* ed. Eileen O'Neill, (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); *Description of a new world, called the Blazing World, and other writings,* ed. Kate Lilley, (New York: NYU Press, 1992); *Paper Bodies, A Margaret Cavendish Reader,* ed. Sylvia Bowerblank and Sara Mendelson, (Peterborough, Ont./Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press, 2000). Mary Chudleigh, *Poems and Prose of Mary Chudleigh,* ed. Margaret J.M. Ezell, (New York: Oxford, 1993). Anne Conway, *The Principles of the Most Ancient and Modem Philosophy,* ed. Allison Coudert and Taylor Corse, (Cambridge/New York; Cambridge University Press, 1996). Moderata Fonte, *The Worth of Women,* ed and trans. Virginia Cox, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997). Marie le Jars de Gournay, *Preface to the Essays of*

Michel de Montaigne / by his adoptive daughter, Marie Le Jars de Gournay, transl. Richard Hillman & Colette Quesnel, (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998), and *Apology for the Woman Writing and other works,* ed and transl by Hillman and Quesnel, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); the latter includes the essay 'On the Equality of Men and Women'. Catherine Macaulay, *On Burke's Refelctions on the French Revolution,* (Poole/Washington, DC: Woodstock Books, 1997); *Letters on Education with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects,* ed. Gina Luria, (New York: Garland, 1974). Mary Shepherd. *Philosophical Works of Lady Mary Shepherd,* ed. Jennifer McRobert, (Bristol, England/Sterling, VA: Thoemmes, 2000). Anna Maria van Schurman, *Whether a Christian Woman Should Be Educated,* ed and trans. Joyce Irwin, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998). Catherine Trotter Cockburn's works are forthcoming from Broadview Press. I have already mentioned the work by Marinella and more are forthcoming in the University of Chicago Press series *The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe,* including a new translation of the Elisabeth-Descartes correspondence, Madeleine de Scudéry's *Orations and Rhetorical Dialogues,* selected writings of Emilie du Chatelet, selected writings of Jaqueline Pascal, letters of the Duchesse de Montpensier, and selections from the writings of Gabrielle Suchon. There are recent editions of works by Marie de Gournay, Emilie du Chatelet, Olympe de Gouges and Gabrielle Suchon in French. See fn.7 below.

[6] O'Neill, "Disappearing Ink," p.43.

[7] Here is one I find particularly compelling: While there is a new edition of Suchon's *Traité de la morale et la politique* in French, there has yet to be a translation into English. Gabrielle Suchon, *Traité de la morale et de la politique: la liberté* (Paris: Des Femmes, 1984) and *La contrainte: Traité de la morale et de la politique, premiere partie, deuxieme section* (Paris: Indigo & Coté femmes, 1999). Also reissued is *Du célibat volontaire, ou, La vie sans engagement.* Paris: Indigo & Coté femmes, 1994. I am not sure what the forthcoming translation of Suchon will include. Se fn. 5 above. Other works have been re-issued in French but there is as yet no English translation: Emilie du Chatelet's translation of Isaac Newton's *Principia* into French, *Principes mathematiques de la philosophie naturelle, traduction de la Marquise du Chatelet,* (Paris: Blanchard, 1966) and her *Lettres d'Amour au Marquis de Saint Lambert,* ed. Anne Soprani, (Paris: Paris-Mediterranée, 1997); Olympes de Gouges, *Oeuvres Completes,* (Montauban: Cocagne, 1993) and *Ecrits politiques,* (Paris: Côté-femmes, 1993).
Again, see O'Neill, "Disappearing Ink." Most of the primary sources she mentions are long out of print. There are few if any contemporary re-issuings of German and Spanish women writers, perhaps because there were few. Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz is an exception here.

[8] Atherton, *Women Philosophers,* provides a handy anthology of selections from the works of Princess Elisabeth, Margaret Cavendish, Anne Conway, Damaris Masham, Mary Astell, Catherine Trotter Cockburn, and Lady Mary Shepherd. While the works of Cavendish and Shepherd are available (though Shepherd is quite pricey), and Cockburn's works and Elisabeth's correspondence will soon be available, I am not aware of when the writings of Masham will be. Whole works are sometimes available on microfilm or through new electronic databases of image files.

[9] Richard Rorty, "The Historiography of Philosophy: Four Genres" in *Philosophy in History,* ed. R. Rorty, JB Schneewind, and Q. Skinner, (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

[10] Rorty, "Four Genres," 62-63.

[11] Rorty, "Four Genres," 62

[12] This approach is akin to what Mary Ellen Waithe has called "adding women and stirring" in her "On Not Teaching the History of Philosophy," *Hypatia,* 4, 1, (Spring 1989), 133.

[13] By drawing a distinction between internal and external reasons here, I do not intend to apply that feminist reasons for including women are not philosophical. The reasons are not internal and external to philosophy as such. Rather, the reasons may be internal or external to the treatment of a particular philosophical issue – say, an account of causation, the representationality of ideas or the nature of woman. At the end of this paper, I reconsider this distinction.

[14] Their correspondence continues through Descartes' life, and they turn to discuss details of Descartes' physics, questions of ethics, politcal philosophy, and the passions, among other matters.

[15] Indeed, Atherton's anthology of excerpts of writings of seventeenth century women philosophers seems geared to facilitating this sort of approach.

[16] To make the return to this justificatory issue more compelling I need only broaden the list of questions: Why should we read Elisabeth's letters to Descartes rather than the exchanges between Descartes and Arnauld, or Descartes and Mersenne, or Descartes and Gassendi? Why should we read Catherine Trotter's and Damaris Masham's defense of Locke rather than, say, the Stillingfleet-Locke exchange or perhaps Condillac's version of empiricist psychology? Why not include Bayle, someone who wrote on those who preceded him and who was read by those who followed him?

[17] See O'Neill, "Disappearing Ink," p. 34-39.

[18] The discussions of women's rationality and the education of women in the early modern period follow on from the *querelle des femmes,* or 'debate on women', which began in the 14th century with vernacular declamations against women, reified most famously in Jean de Meung's portion of the *Roman de la Rose,* and the response to such defamation by Christine de Pisan in her *Book of the City of Ladies* and other works in which she attests to women's intellectual abilities as well as their moral virtue. These two figures in this literary exchange come to represent each of the two camps in what comes to be a fervent debate about the relative worth of men and women. For an overview of the *querelle des femmes* see Joan Kelly, "Early Feminist Theory and the *Querelle des Femmes:* 1400-1789" in *Women, History, Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), pp 65-109.

This debate was no doubt tied to the shifting ground in Renaissance philosophy, as defenders of the intellectual superiority of men draw on Aristotle and Aristotelian philosophy in support of their views, while the defenders of women began to draw on Plato and neo-platonism in support of their positions. Nevertheless, these texts, both denigrating and laudatory of women, were largely polemics against the opposing position accompanied by simple assertions of the positive claims being made. The rhetorical ground seems to shift a bit, however, with the Lucrezia Marinella's work of 1600, though it is still essentially reactive -- she is responding to Guiseppe Passi's *The Defects of Women* and matches his presentation point by point.

[19] Marinella, *Nobility,* p.57.

[20] Marinella, *Nobility,* p.62.

[21] Gournay, 'On the Equality of Men and Women', in *Apology for the Woman Writing,* p.75.

[22] André Rivet was a professor of theology at Leiden with whom Schurman corresponded and who encouraged her in her work. While supportive of Schurman, he saw her as an exception to the female norm.

[23] Schurman, *Christian Woman,* p.55.

[24] Both Marinella and Schurman draws on the notion of intellectual virtue presented in Book X of Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics* to defend their claims that the education of women can only contribute to their virtue.

[25] Schurman does not go so far as to claim that men and women have the same natures, nor does she claim that men and women should receive the same education.
[26] Bathsua Makin, *An Essay to Revive the Antient Education of Gentlewomen,* (Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, Publication No. 202, 1980).
[27] It is possible that here she is influenced by empirical the arguments of humanist writings and perhaps Marinella.
[28] Makin, 25ff.
[29] Makin, 34. While she does not do so explicitly, she seems here to be drawing on humanist scientific writings which seem focused on natural history in a similar way. Interestingly, the second half of Moderata Fonte's *The Worth of Women* assumes this same natural historical approach to the education of women.
[30] Makin, 28.
[31] If one looks back to women's writings within the thick of the *querelle des femmes* one sees a marked difference. In works like Christine de Pisan's *The Book of the City of Ladies,* and even as late as Moderata Fonte's *The Worth of Women,* there is a self-conscious recognition that effective writing, or rather effective thinking, requires a community of interlocutors with whom one can play out one's ideas, and who, even in providing a critical perspective, acknowledge one as a reasonable being. Pisan's book begins with its heroine alone in her study, demoralized by what she finds written about women. With these books as her only authority, she suffers a loss of confidence, which would seem to prevent her doing any work of her own. But very quickly Pisan provides her heroine with the antidote to her insecurity. The heroine, Christine herself, is visited by the three ladies of Reason, Justice and Virtue, who in turn set out for her an array of women who have succeeded in their various intellectual and artistic endeavors. The idea is one which is not novel to contemporary feminist thinkers. In order for Christine to be able to succeed in her own endeavors, she must have confidence in herself, and this confidence is to be gained by through the recognition of a community. The community Pisan imagines is one of women: there are not only the three visionaries, and the historical figures they remark upon, but there is also the city of ladies that Christine builds within the book, and the one that presumably de Pisan is building through her book. Her method suggests, at the very least, that for women to overcome the pernicious ways in which they are represented, there needs to be positive examples of the successes and achievements of women; there needs to be the positive experience of women governing themselves, and doing so well; and there needs to be the individual's experience of her own authority. And moreover, it would seem she is arguing, these needs can best be met through a community composed only of women. Once the work of this community is begun, however, these women can then venture out into the world at large.
Fonte's work suggests something similar. She presents us with seven women, all of different age, rank, and marital status, who enter into a two day conversation with one another, first about who is more worthy and virtuous men or women, and second about various topics in what can only be described as natural history. While the work is couched as a debate about the relative merits of the sexes, the discussion ends up being rather lopsided, and threatens to degenerate into an harangue against men. It nevertheless does exhibit women's capacity for argument: those charged to defend men present reasons in their defense, but these are rebutted by the women charged with defending women. Moreover, reading the work as simply polemical cannot explain the scientific enterprise of the second day. It seems rather that the rather frank and open discussion of the first day, in which the women validate their own worth, while denigrating the way men have represented the female sex, sets up, and perhaps enables, the scientific discussion. Again, the women form a community amongst themselves, recognize each other as intelligent, reasoning beings through engaging in a

heated debate, and then through this recognition undertake the serious intellectual investigations proper to science. Again, in order to realize their native intelligence, that intelligence must be acknowledged, and those most suitable to acknowledging it are not the men who have given them short shrift, but their fellow women. It is only once they have practiced reasoning with one another, in debate, and practiced the art of scientific investigation by observing the natural world around them, that they, at the end of the second day, can venture back out into the larger world and engage in intellectual commerce with men as well.

[32] This is not to say that they did not come under attack. Gournay and Makin were certainly mocked.

[33] Rorty, "Four Genres," 57.

[34] Contemporary feminist writers on essentialism include Simone de Beauvoir, Judith Butler, Luce Irigaray, Iris Marion Young, Sally Haslanger, Elizabeth Spelman and Charlotte Witt, along with many others.

[35] A recent collection of essays edited by Amelie Rorty, *Philosophers on Education,* (New York/London: Routledge, 1998) takes a step in this direction. Yet though the collection offers a perspective on philosophers' views of education extending from Socrates to the present, there are no essays on Marinella, Gournay, van Schurman or Makin, let alone Mary Astell's *Serious Proposal for the Ladies* or Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women,* or indeed, on the views of any other women philosophers.

[36] And so for this reason, perhaps, we take greater interest in misguided mechanists like Hobbes.

[37] As Descartes puts it: "conversing with those of past centuries is like travelling. It is good to know something of the customs of various peoples, so that we may judge our own more soundly..." (AT VI 6, CSM I 113-14).

[38] To switch to an acting metaphor, we will be thinking of the history of philosophy as an ensemble piece rather than as a star vehicle.

[39] It is not clear that these women recognize all women as of the same class. Their writings and arguments are directed at a privileged class of women whose responsibilities permit them the resources for an education.

[40] A recent article by Michèle LeDoeuff ("Feminism Is Back in France – Or Is It?" ed. Penelope Deutscher, *Hypatia,* 15,4 (2000), 243-255) seems to effect this integration successfully, while at the same time bringing a woman in the history of philosophy to bear on contemporary philosophical discussion. LeDoeuff begins by citing a discussion between Benoîte Groult and Josyane Savigneau, the editor in chief of *Le Monde des Livres,* in which the "two women who are more or less sympathetic to feminism agree that women don't think philosophically *yet,* and have not done so in the recent or distant past, except for [Hannah] Arendt and possibly [Simone] Weil" (Le Doeuff 2000, 247). She then uses this claim to make a point about the tension between 'state-handled' feminism and the active citizen, who thinks for herself and makes choices for herself. It is this active citizen who, LeDoeuff claims, lies at the core any feminist initiative, indeed at the core of any activist cause.

LeDoeuff makes her point through the work of Gabrielle Suchon. For not only does Suchon provide evidence of a woman 'thinking philosophically' in the 'distant past', she also makes a point which is very much the forerunner of that Le Doeuff herself wants to make. Suchon argues in her *Traité de la morale et de la politique,* that political freedom and reason go hand in hand. For having reason entails that one is able to inquire, to reflect on one's experiences, to change one's mind, and potentially that of another reasonable being. Reasoning thus depends on a certain 'inner freedom', and this freedom, if properly developed, can lead to a political community in which an 'exterior' freedom, that is a freedom to develop one's mind, reason or inner freedom, is the guiding ideal. Good

government, then, is one which promotes in its citizens not only a capacity for reflection but a vigilance to inquire and reflect on how one is living.

Le Doeuff's point is one very much invested in the present. She is concerned to diagnose the state of feminism in France at the turn of the new century. But in making this point she turns back to the past, not to more familiar Enlightenment figures, such as Rousseau, who also ties good citizenship to a good education and a good education to that promoting a capacity to think for oneself, but to a woman thinker. And this woman thinker, Suchon, has made the very point credited to someone like Rousseau, a good fifty years before Rousseau. Indeed, Le Doeuff speculates, Rousseau read and then 'hijacked' Suchon. Intertwined are a political point, a philosophical point, a point about intellectual history, and a feminist point about the place of women in philosophy and in the history of philosophy. And Suchon's philosophical position is equally presented as intertwined with the set of concerns in which it was developed. And in reaching back to the past in this way, I want to suggest, LeDoeuff invests Suchon with canonical status.

[41] See Michèle Le Doeuff, *Hipparchia's Choice: an essay concerning women, philosophy, etc.* Trans. Trista Selous. (Oxford/Cambridge,MA: Blackwell, 1991) for a very rich discussion of these sorts of issues.

[42]I began to articulate these thoughts in conversations with Kate Abramson, Donald Ainslie, Margaret Atherton, Daniel Garber, Michael Jacovides, Michael Rosenthal and Todd Ryan. I thank them for lending their ears. Jutta Sperling introduced me to the thought of Italian early modern women, as well as the historian's perspective on these discussions. Working with her was an invaluable experience. I also thank the editors of this volume, Lilli Alanen and Charlotte Witt, for the opportunity to put those thoughts in writing. And I especially thank Eileen O'Neill not only for all her work on 17th century women philosophers and her support, but also for the many very stimulating discussions on this topic.

REFERENCES

Adam, Charles. *Descartes: ses amitiés feminines.* Paris: Boivin, 1937.

Agrippa, Henricus Cornelius. *Declamation on the Nobility and Preeminence of the Female Sex,* translated by Albert Rabil Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Astell, Mary. *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies,* edited by Patricia Springborg. London/Brookfield,VT: Pickering and Chatto, 1997.

Astell, Mary. *Political Writings,* edited by Patricia Springborg.Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Atherton, Margaret. *Women Philosophers of the Early Modern Period.* Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994.

Buffet, Marguerite. *Nouvelles observations sur la langue françoise…Avec les éloges de illustres savantes tant anciennes que modernes.* Paris, 1668.

Cavendish, Margaret. *Observations on the Experimental Philosophy,* edited by Eileen O'Neill. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Cavendish, Margaret. *Description of a new world, called the Blazing World, and other writings,* edited by Kate Lilley. New York: NYU Press, 1992.

Cavendish, Margaret. *Paper Bodies, A Margaret Cavendish Reader,* edited by Sylvia Bowerblank and Sara Mendelson. Peterborough, Ont./Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press, 2000.

Chatelet, Emilie. *Lettres d'Amour au Marquis de Saint Lambert,* edited by Anne Soprani. Paris: Paris-Mediterranée, 1997.

Chudleigh, Mary. *Poems and Prose of Mary Chudleigh,* edited by Margaret J.M. Ezell. New York: Oxford, 1993.

Conway, Anne. *The Principles of the Most Ancient and Modern Philosophy,* edited by Allison Coudert and Taylor Corse. Cambridge/New York; Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Cousin, Victor. *Cours de Philosophie.* Paris, 1828.

Cruz, Sor Juana Ines de la. *Poems, Protest, and a Dream: Selected Writings,* translated by Margaret Sayers Peden. New York: Penguin, 1997.

Descartes, René. *Oeuvres,* edited by Charles Adam and Paul Tannery. Paris: Vrin, 1996. (Cited internally as AT, followed by volume and page number.)

Descartes, René. *Philosophical Writings,* 3 volumes, edited and translated by John Cottingham, Dugald Murdoch, and Robert Stoothof, and (vol. III) Anthony Kenny. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge, 1984-1991. (Cited internally as CSM, followed by volume and page number.)

Fonte, Moderata. *The Worth of Women,* edited and translated by Virginia Cox. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Forge, Jean de la. *Le Cercle de Femmes Savantes....* Paris: 1687.

Foucher de Careil, A. *Descartes et las Princess Palatine, ou de l'influence du carteésianisme sur les femmes au XVIIe siecle.* Paris, 1862.

Foucher de Careil, A. *Descartes, la princesse Elisabeth et la reine Christine…* Paris: Felix Alcan, 1909.

Foucher de Careil, A. *Leibniz et les deux Sophies.* Paris, 1876.

Gouges, Olympe de. *Oeuvres Completes.* Montauban: Cocagne, 1993.

Gouges, Olympe de. *Ecrits politiques.* Paris: Côté-femmes, 1993.

Gournay, Marie le Jars de. *Preface to the Essays of Michel de Montaigne / by his adoptive daughter, Marie Le Jars de Gournay,* translated and annotated by Richard Hillman & Colette Quesnel. Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998.

Gournay, Marie le Jars de. *Egalité des hommes et des femmes; Grief des dames ; suivis du Proumenoir de Monsieur de Montaigne,* edited by Constant Venesoen. Geneva: Librarie Droz, 1993.

Gournay, Marie le Jars de. *On the Equality of Men and Women,* translated by Eileen O'Neill. Manuscript.

Hedengrahn, Peter. *Excercitum academicum mulieres philosophantes adumbrans....* Uppsala, 1700.

Hegel, GWF. *History of Philosophy,* translated by Haldane. London, 1892.

Kelly, Joan. "Early Feminist Theory and the *Querelle des Femmes:* 1400-1789." In *Women, History, Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988, pp. 65-109.

Le Doeuff, Michèle. "Feminism Is Back in France—Or Is It?," edited by Penelope Deutscher, *Hypatia,* 15,4 (2000): 243-255.

Le Doeuff, Michèle. *Hipparchia's Choice: an essay concerning women, philosophy, etc,* translated by Trista Selous. Oxford/Cambridge,MA: Blackwell, 1991.

Lescure, Mathurin de. *Les Femmes Philosophes.* Paris, 1881.

Macaulay, Catherine. *On Burke's Refelctions on the French Revolution.* Poole/Washington, DC: Woodstock Books, 1997.

Macaulay, Catherine. *Letters on Education with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects,* edited by Gina Luria. New York: Garland, 1974.

Makin, Bathsua. *An Essay to Revive the Antient Education of Gentlewomen.* Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, Publication No. 202, 1980.

Marinella,Lucrezia. *The Nobility and Excellence of Women and the Defects and Vices of Men,* translated by Anne Dunhill. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

McAlister, Linda Lopez. *Hypatia's Daughters: Fifteen Hundred Years of Women Philosophers.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Menage, Gilles. *The History of Women Philosophers,* translated by Beatrice Zedler. Lanham, MD: University Presses of America, 1984.

Newton, Isaac. *Principes mathematiques de la philosophie naturelle, traduction de la Marquise du Chatelet.* Paris: Blanchard, 1966.

O'Neill, Eileen. "Disappearing Ink: Early Modern Women Philosophers and Their Place in History." In *Philosophy in a Feminist Voice,* edited by Janet Kourany. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

O'Neill, Eileen. (ed.) *Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: A Collection of Primary Sources,* 2 vol.. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming.

Pisan, Christine de. *The Book of the City of Ladies,* translated by Rosalind Brown-Grant. New York: Penguin, 1990.

Rée, Jonathan. "Philosophy and the History of Philosophy." In *Philosophy and Its Past,* edited by J. Rée, M. Ayers and A. Westoby. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1978.

Renouvier, Charles. *Manuel de Philosophie Moderne*. Paris, 1842.

Rorty, Amelie, ed. *Philosophers on Education.* New York/London: Routledge, 1998.

Rorty, Richard. "The Historiography of Philosophy: Four Genres." In *Philosophy in History,* edited by R. Rorty, JB Schneewind, and Q. Skinner. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Schurman, Anna Maria van. *Whether a Christian Woman Should Be Educated,* edited and translated by Joyce Irwin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Scudéry, Madeleine de. *Choix de Conversations de Mlle de Scudéry,* edited by Phillip J. Wolfe. Ravenna : Longo, 1977.

Shapiro, Lisa. "Princess Elisabeth and Descartes: The Union of Soul and Body and the Practice of Philosophy." *British Journal of the History of Philosophy,* 7,3 (1999).

Shepherd, Mary. *Philosophical Works of Lady Mary Shepherd,* edited by Jennifer McRobert. Bristol, England/Sterling, VA: Thoemmes, 2000.

Stanley, Thomas. *The history of philosophy.* London: Humphrey Mosely and Thomas Dring, 1655-1662.

Suchon, Gabrielle. *Du célibat volontaire, ou, La vie sans engagement.* Paris: Indigo & Coté femmes, 1994.

Suchon, Gabrielle. *La contrainte: Traité de la morale et de la politique, premiere partie, deuxieme section.* Paris: Indigo & Coté femmes, 1999.

Suchon, Gabrielle. *Traité de la morale et de la politique: la liberté.* Paris: Des Femmes, 1984.

Taylor, Harriet. *Complete Works of Harriet Taylor Mill,* edited by Jo Ellen Jacobs. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

Tennemann, Wilhelm Gottlieb. *Geschichte der Philosophie,* 11 vols. Leipzig, 1798-1819.

Waithe, Mary Ellen. "On Not Teaching the History of Philosophy," *Hypatia,* 4, 1, (Spring 1989): 133.

Waithe, Mary Ellen. (ed.). *A History of Women Philosophers.* 4 Volumes. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1987-1991.

Warnock, Mary. *Women Philosophers.* New York: Everyman, 1996.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Men, with A Vindication of the Rights of Woman,* edited by Sylvia Tomaselli. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge, 1995.