

An Examination of the role of Women in the Enlightenment

Dongwoo Kim

In the traditional historiography of the Enlightenment in which historians regard it as a rather narrow, exclusively intellectual movement, the voice of women is almost, if not entirely, non-existent. However, a more inclusive interpretation of the Enlightenment, which adds cultural and social dimensions to it, allows for a place for *her-story*. In this essay, various roles that women played during the era of the Enlightenment are explored.

In the traditional historiography of the Enlightenment, in which historians regard it as a rather narrow, exclusively intellectual movement, the voice of women is almost, if not entirely, non-existent. For example, Peter Gay does not include any female *philosophe* in his anthology of the Enlightenment writings, *The Enlightenment: A Comprehensive Anthology* (1973), which is supposed “to be representative, to supply a dependable sketch map of the terrain.”¹ Given the social limitations of the women during the eighteenth century and their relative lack of opportunity for education and publication, and the focus on intellectual history within the traditional historiography of the Enlightenment, the exclusion of *her-story* becomes justifiable to some degree. However, a broader interpretation of the Enlightenment, which avoids the misappropriation of the movement under a few canonized philosophes and encourages a more social and cultural understanding that emerged circa 1970’s under Robert Darnton’s lead allows, if not makes it necessary, for historians to examine the role of women during the Enlightenment.

In this new historiography of the Enlightenment, historians have particularly been interested in the concept of public sphere, which, according to Jürgen Habermas, emerged during the eighteenth century—the century of the Enlightenment. Accordingly, historians of the Enlightenment have focused on the social interaction of literate people in public sphere during the last four decades. Also, this new historiography recognizes that while women did face difficulties, such as “poverty and illiteracy” and “the legal subordination of and practical discrimination against [them] in most public roles,”² they exercised their agencies and participated in various forms of Enlightenment discussions. The aim of this paper is not to examine the Enlightenment in context of the feminist intellectual history. Instead, I examine the role of the women during the Enlightenment within the context of the emergence of public sphere; I argue that while the emergence of the public sphere during the Enlightenment provided new opportunities and venues for women to partake in intellectual debates of the time, their contributions should not be misinterpreted and overstated as a sign of improvement in their social status and a step towards gender equality. First, I analyze the emergence of public sphere and its separation from private sphere during the Enlightenment, and the pre-existing discourse on gender roles of women. Then, I examine the role of women in public venues, particularly in printed media, social clubs, and salons, to demonstrate both their participation and limitations and difficulties that they faced due to their gender.

The emergence of the public sphere during the eighteenth century provided new venues for people, including women, to engage in intellectual debates. Habermas, according to James Van Horn

1 Peter Gay, ed., *The Enlightenment: A Comprehensive Anthology*, ed. Peter Gay (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), 11.

2 "Gender and Society," in *The Enlightenment: A Sourcebook and Reader*, ed. Paul Hyland, Olga Gomez and Francesca Greensides, 233-258 (London: Routledge, 2003), 233.

Melton, argues that “the conditions under which rational, critical, and genuinely open discussion of public issues,” that is, the establishment of the “bourgeois public sphere” took place during the eighteenth century in his work, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962).³ Daniel Roche argues that the public sphere was “situated apart from the real society, the royal government, and the practical, efficient action of the centralized monarchical administration and led by ‘men of letters’ interested in an ‘abstract and literary politics.’”⁴ Habermas claims that the “emergence of society as a realm distinct from the state”⁵ and the rise of a capitalist society that “acquired growing autonomy and self-awareness through the integrating forces of mercantile capitalism”⁶ resulted in the emergence of “a socially transcendent public that would challenge the legitimacy of a hierarchical, asymmetrical relationships on which the social and political order of the Old Regime was based.”⁷ Thus, the rise of new spaces for discussion enabled distinct forms of interaction between its participants that seemingly disregarded the existing social and cultural hierarchy. Habermas and Roche present a universalizing and egalitarian outlook of the civil society during the era of the Enlightenment.

The emergence of the public sphere, however, imposed new rules of interaction appropriate for them, which provided new opportunities for and, simultaneously, imposed restrictions upon women. Politeness surfaced as a key element of sociability during the era of the Enlightenment. Paul Langford characterizes politeness by “its enabling capacity, permitting people who lacked the traditional components of social status—inherited rank, formal education and a place in the political hierarchy—to achieve it by adopting a looser, supposedly more 'natural' code of behaviour.”⁸ Thus, this concept of politeness in public sphere permitted the transcendence of the established norms and social structures. For instance, Donna Andrew demonstrates that the new settings of the debate clubs, which were prominent public venues of intellectual exchange in eighteenth century Britain, “were conducive to a new tone of order and regularity.”⁹ To some degree, the emergence of politeness as a discourse allowed women to participate in the activities taking place in these new public venues. However, the “natural code of behaviour” imposed restrictions based on the social and cultural discourses on gender against the universalistic assumptions attributed to the Enlightenment.

In fact, historians have argued against the universalistic assumption about the Enlightenment and demonstrated that the emergence of the public sphere imposed new restrictions upon women based on the rhetoric of nature. Dena Goodman challenges “the identification of universalism with Enlightenment [...] to assert that difference was an equally important theme.”¹⁰ The source of justification for new social and cultural impositions upon women mainly came from the natural sciences. Paul Hazard, a historian of ideas, writes that the *philosophes* generally regarded nature as being “kind” and as the source of good,¹¹ thereby suggesting the emergence of a dichotomy between nature and civilization. Thomas Laqueur, writing about the construction of sexuality in eighteenth century Europe, contends that “[t]he universalistic claims made for human liberty and equality

3 James Van Horn Melton, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 4.

4 Daniel Roche, *France in the Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 420.

5 Van Horn Melton, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*, 4-5.

6 *Ibid.*, 5.

7 *Ibid.*, 7.

8 Paul Langford, "The Uses of Eighteenth-Century Politeness," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 12 (2002): 312.

9 Donna T. Andrew, "Popular Culture and Public Debate: London 1780," *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 2 (June 1996): 408.

10 Dena Goodman, "Difference: An Enlightenment Concept," in *What's Left of Enlightenment?: A Postmodern Question*, 129-140 (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2001): 129-130.

11 Paul Hazard, *European Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Meridian Books, 1963), 309-310.

during the Enlightenment did not inherently exclude the female half of humanity” and that “Nature had to be searched if men were to justify their dominance of the public sphere, whose distinction from the private would increasingly come to be figured in terms of sexual difference.”¹² Thus, the social and cultural discourse of the eighteenth century did not promote the individual universalism but rather imposed new restrictions in language of nature.

The language of the contemporary authors of the Enlightenment reflects the gendered attitude towards the expected role of women in public venues and how deeply it was embedded in the eighteenth century societies. Dena Goodman emphasizes the importance of the gender difference in public spheres by demonstrating how the *philosophes* like Voltaire, Morellet, d’Alembert, or Diderot, regarded it as “the ground upon which all of society’s structures, institutions, rules of interaction are built.”¹³ Indeed, the Enlightenment discourse on gender generally perpetuated the view “that woman civilises, that she cultivates, refines, perhaps even adulterates and corrupts”¹⁴ based on the rhetoric of nature-nurture dichotomy. Furthermore, Dena Goodman demonstrates the extent to which gender difference is embedded within the public discourse during the era of the Enlightenment by demonstrating that even Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a ferocious critic of civilization, believed the gender division to be natural. Goodman claims that “difference—gender difference—does not just wither away with society”¹⁵ and demonstrates that although he “redefined gender roles and re-opened the woman question [...] civilization (civility, civil society) is associated with women” for Rousseau.¹⁶ In terms of more conventional discourses of the era, Voltaire argued that the emergence of politeness as a discourse stemmed from the “continual commerce between the sexes” and thereby attributed the importance of women’s role as the civilizing agent of the society in his works.¹⁷ Montesquieu also highlighted the civilizing role of women by writing that “their very weakness gives them more gentleness and moderation; which can make for good government, rather than tough and ferocious virtues.”¹⁸ Olympe de Gouges, the author of the *Declaration of the Rights of Women*, admits that the difference between sexes and states that a woman is “superior in beauty and in courage of maternal suffering.”¹⁹ Thus, the gender division that attributed the role of civilizing agent was deeply embedded in the discourse of the Enlightenment.

The emergence of the public sphere during the eighteenth century definitely provided new opportunities for women to participate in intellectual debates of the era. It would not be correct to singularly generalize women’s participation during the Enlightenment. Often times they engaged in intellectual discussions within the acceptable limits proscribed by the gender discourse, but sometimes defied them. In demonstrating women’s participation in the Enlightenment, I will focus specifically on three representative venues in the newly emerged public sphere: printed media, social clubs, and salons.

12 Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 194.

13 Goodman, “Difference,” 141.

14 Sylvana Tomaselli, “The Enlightenment Debate on Women,” *History Workshop* 20 (1985): 105.

15 Goodman, “Difference,” 140

16 *Ibid.*, 141.

17 Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), 6.

18 Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 7.

19 Olympe de Gouges, “Olympe de Gouges, The Declaration of the Rights of Woman (September 1791),” in *The French Revolution and Human Rights: A Brief Documentary History*, translated, edited, and with an introduction by Lynn Hunt (Boston/New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 1996), 125.

Printed media became a prominent sector of the public sphere during the era of the Enlightenment with the rise of the literary market and many women contributed to this form of intellectual discussion through their works. According to Darnton, “[l]iteracy probably doubled in the course of the century, and the general upward swing of the economy, combined with improvements in the educational system, very likely produced a larger, wealthier, and more leisured reading public.”²⁰ This expansion of the reading public also coincided with the shift from intensive to extensive reading, which increased the demand for more varied literary products.²¹

Women, although not in great number, participated in this form of intellectual discussion through their published works despite the gender barriers that they faced. Paul Hyland, Olga Gomez, and Francesca Greensides point to the fact that many prominent female writers, such as Marquise du Châtelet, Catharine Macaulay, Mary Wollstonecraft and Mme de Staël “wrote important scientific, historical, philosophical and literary works of the Enlightenment” and that “[i]nnumerable women were subscribers to and supporters of works such as the *Spectator* and the *Encyclopédie*.”²²

However, the female participation in the sphere of printed media was marginal. Hesse claims that “the cultural institutions of the monarchy and the aristocracy [...] were far less hospitable to female participation—at least as measured by access to print”²³ and points out that the social tension that emerged after the expansion in the number of female writers after the Revolution suggests that the social discourse of the time did not regard them favourably.²⁴ Also, Hesse points to the fact that the female writers of the Enlightenment have been stereotyped as “either an outcast or a rebel.”²⁵ Obviously, Hesse does not overstate the female contribution to the printed media, but does demonstrate that women were engaged and interested in writing, reading, and publishing to some degree. She supports Darnton’s research that “approximately 2 percent” of the published works were written by women and notes that while “the number of male writers in print nearly tripled, the number of published women increased only slightly.”²⁶ Thus, Hesse ultimately reaches the conclusion that despite “the great contributions of women to the novel in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, female participation in the public cultural life of the Old Regime was not only relatively marginal, [but] also relatively static.”²⁷ However, by demonstrating that there was a sudden expansion in the number of female writers after the French Revolution,²⁸ Hesse suggests that there were women capable of producing literary products, though restricted by the hostility of the Old Regime. Furthermore, Hesse demonstrates that, despite the social limitations placed upon them and their marginal contribution during the Old Regime, women did participate in the discussions of the public sphere through their writings to some degree.

Another noteworthy sector of the publishing industry in which women participated during the Enlightenment is that of the academic prize contests. In the historiography of the Enlightenment, these contests have been “relegated to a supporting role in the great dramas of the academic

20 Robert Darnton, "The High Enlightenment and the Low-Life of Literature in Pre-Revolutionary France," *Past & Present* 51 (May 1971): 94.

21 "Robert Darnton, "What is the History of Books?," *Daedalus* 111, no. 3 (1982): 79.

22 Hyland, Gomez, and Greensides, "Gender and Society," 234.

23 Carla Hesse, *The Other Enlightenment: How French Women became Modern* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 42.

24 Hesse, *The Other Enlightenment*, 43.

25 *Ibid.*, 43.

26 *Ibid.*, 37.

27 *Ibid.*, 42.

28 *Ibid.*, 37.

world.”²⁹ However, Jeremy Caradonna emphasizes the importance of these contests as they permitted “the public” to “freely participate in high intellectual discourse” in the “complete absence of requirements for entering these competitions, save basic literacy.”³⁰ According to Caradonna, “[w]omen figured prominently on the *concours* circuit” and demonstrates that they “won (or placed very highly in) a total of 49 of the over 2,000 total competitions offered by French academies (2.1%).”³¹

The discourse on gender greatly affected women’s participation in the academic prize contests. Caradonna claims that “[t]he complete anonymity of the practice shielded women from the potential gender biases of all-male academic juries” and that “[t]his policy undoubtedly inspired many women to pick up the pen and try their luck on the *concours* circuit.”³² Also, the result and category of the prize competitions in which women won suggest the influence of gender discourse in their participation. Caradonna points out that “[t]he vast majority of victorious *concurrents* found success in poetry tournaments,” and explains that “women tended to succeed in poetry contests because poetry was what they knew best, and poetry was the most socially acceptable form of female literary engagement of the Old Regime.”³³ Nonetheless, women also submitted essays in regards to issues such as morality and public policy and the academies oftentimes welcomed women’s contribution, and Caradonna also demonstrates that these institutions often posed questions specifically relevant to female authors as well.³⁴ Nonetheless, the presence of women was generally marginal in these essay competitions and participants also faced sexist bias from the male judges from time to time, as in the unpublished report from the Academy of Châlons-sur-Marne that condemned an essay submitted by a woman stating “[i]t’s a shame that this essay reveals the common ignorance of the [fair] sex in penal matters,” which Caradonna labels as “needlessly malicious and condescending.”³⁵

Women also participated in intellectual discussions of the era in newly emerged social organizations, most notably the debating and freemason clubs. These social institutions imposed different kinds of social regulations upon the participants that allowed limited transcendence of the established hierarchies. As in the sphere of printed media, these social venues permitted women to take part in the intellectual discussions of the Enlightenment, but their participation was often limited by the gender norms of the era.

The emergence of the debating societies was a phenomenon unique to Britain during the Enlightenment that provided new opportunities for women to participate in the intellectual discussions of the era. According to Donna T. Andrew, the British debating societies “mushroomed in the metropolis during the fall of 1779 and the beginning of 1780” and served as forums for discussing various political and mundane events.³⁶ Andrew claims that the characteristics and norms of interaction in these debating societies undermined the existing social hierarchy of the era. The emergence of these debating societies led to the public fascination with the “theory and practice of

29 Jeremy L. Caradonna, *The Enlightenment in Practice: Academic Prize Contests and Intellectual Culture in France, 1670-1794* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 1.

30 Caradonna, *The Enlightenment in Practice*, 2.

31 *Ibid.*, 107.

32 *Ibid.*, 109.

33 *Ibid.*, 108.

34 *Ibid.*, 110-112.

35 *Ibid.*, 115.

36 Andrew, “Popular Culture and Public Debate,” 405.

public elocution”³⁷ and became a sphere where “all external Evidence of Rank among Men is destroyed [...] Purity and Politeness of Expression [are] the only external Distinction which remains between a Gentleman and a Valet; a lady and a Mantua-maker.”³⁸ Mary Thale also adds that the “increase in women’s acting independently in the use of their leisure” contributed to the expansion in the number of female participants in debating societies.³⁹

Thus, the debating societies provided venues for women to actively participate in public discussions of the era. Andrew demonstrates that these societies not only permitted women to debate, but also provided exclusive venues for them alone, such as the society that met in Carlisle House, which provided room “in which only women were allowed to speak”; the University for Rational Amusements, “with a Female Parliament”; and La Belle Assemble, “reserved for women’s oratory.”⁴⁰ In fact, Andrew points out that there was a “wholesale presence of women in almost all the debating societies.”⁴¹ Also, the debaters discussed about gender-specific issues involving gender-specific questions involving “courtship, marriage, male and female qualities,”⁴² which provided opportunities for women to challenge—or at least question—existing social hierarchies based on gender.⁴³ Thus, the debating societies of Britain provided quite liberal opportunities for women to participate in Enlightenment discussions.

However, the society often disparaged women for partaking in public discussions, which demonstrated the conflict between the new set of norms established within the debating societies and the existing gender discourses. For instance, the Coachmakers’ Hall Society voted almost unanimously that public speaking was not a “fit accomplishment for the ladies.”⁴⁴ Also, Andrew quotes various popular songs and sources that disparaged women for participating in the debates. The verses from “Lines on Hearing the Debates of the FEMALE PARLIAMENT at the Casino May 19, 1780” condemned women for abandoning their “bashful prudence” and “[baring] the breast where modesty repos’d” by speaking publicly in the debates.⁴⁵ Thale even notes that these satires could have contributed to the decline of the debating societies after 1780.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, the participation of women in these debating societies provides an important glimpse on the female engagement in the cultural practices of the Enlightenment.

Freemason lodges provided similar venues for women to participate in Enlightenment discussions. Freemasonry originally started in Britain, but “transmitted clandestinely by the radicals and later officially by Whig politicians, provided the social milieu of the radical Enlightenment on the Continent.”⁴⁷ Margaret Jacob argues that “[t]he lodges became microscopic civil polities, new public spaces, in effect schools for constitutional government,” while emphasizing the manifestation of

37 *Ibid.*, 406.

38 Philip Withers, *Aristarchus; or, The principles of composition: containing a methodical arrangement of the improprieties frequent in writing and conversation: with select rules for attaining to purity and elegance of expression* (London: J.F. Dove, St. John’s Square, 1822), 146-147.

39 Mary Thale, “Women in London Debating Societies in 1780,” *Gender & History* 7, no. 1 (April 1995): 7.

40 Andrew, “Popular Culture and Public Debate,” 408.

41 *Ibid.*, 410.

42 *Ibid.*, 412.

43 *Ibid.*, 411-414.

44 Thale, “Women in London Debating Societies in 1780,” 14.

45 *Morning Post*, “Lines on hearing the Debates of the Female Parliament at the Casino,” May 19, 1780.

46 Thale, “Women in London Debating Societies in 1780,” 15.

47 Margaret C. Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981). 111.

egalitarianism in the lodges in form of domestic languages.⁴⁸ Thus, Jacob ultimately argues that a set of new regulations of social interaction was imposed in place of the pre-existing social hierarchies. In fact, Jacob highlights that women were often admitted “as “equals” and sisters” in some lodges.⁴⁹ However limited, women did participate in the practice of the Enlightenment by joining the freemasonic lodges. Jacob observes that “by the 1750s on the Continent gender exclusion within the fraternity had begun to break down” and that “[c]ertain lodges now began formally to admit women.”⁵⁰ However, the place of women was also limited in freemasonic lodges as well. According to Jacob, “ceremonies and discourses by women emphasized only the ethical, private virtues, never governance.”⁵¹ Thus, the gender discourse that regarded women as weaker, *fair* sex ultimately limited their positions even in an organization that promoted fraternal egalitarianism.

Women also participated in Enlightenment discussions through the salons, which contributed greatly to the making of the *philosophes* during the era of the Enlightenment. Robert Darnton demonstrates in his article, “In Search of the Enlightenment: Recent Attempts to Create a Social History of Ideas,” that salons played an important role in making of a *philosophe* through the example of Jean-Baptiste-Antoine Suard.⁵² Roger Chartier writes that “[p]articipation in the society of the salons was [...] a necessity for anyone who wanted to get ahead” as it was “there that protection, pensions, employment, and subsidies could be obtained.”⁵³ Furthermore, salons provided an opportunity for commoners to interact with nobility as the rules of “conversation” replaced the pre-established social norms.⁵⁴ The historiography of the Enlightenment has always acknowledged the presence of women, though in a rather misogynistic perspective influenced by the discourse of Jean-Jacques Rousseau—“as the unqualified judges of male cultural performance and production.”⁵⁵ However, Dena Goodman and Antoine Lilti, though reaching completely different conclusions, claim that women played much more important roles in the institutions that made the *philosophes*.

Dena Goodman argues that women played the role of governors and exercised their agencies for their educational leisure in running the salons, arguing against “[t]he conventional image of the salon as a frivolous place in which earnest philosophes were distracted from their work by foolish but seductive women.”⁵⁶ Instead, Goodman attempts to demonstrate that the *salonnières* were “a small number of elite women who knew and admired one another, lived lives of regularity rather than dissipation, and were committed both to their own education and to the philosophes’ project of Enlightenment.”⁵⁷ In order to support her arguments, Goodman uses prominent *salonnières* like Claudine-Alexandrine Guérin de Tencin, Anne-Thérèse de Marguenat de Courcelles, the marquise de Lambert, Marie-Thérèse Geoffrin, Julie de Lespinasse, Marie Du Deffand, and Suzanne Necker as examples.⁵⁸ Also, Goodman adds that the *salonnières* acted as agents who enforced the rules of conversation and behaviour to “limit conflict and misunderstanding between people of different social ranks and orders.”⁵⁹ The role assigned to the *salonnières* corresponds to the gender discourse of

48 Margaret C. Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 20-21.

49 Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment*, 21.

50 *Ibid.*, 121.

51 *Ibid.*, 21.

52 Darnton, "The High Enlightenment and the Low-Life of Literature in Pre-Revolutionary France," 82-86.

53 Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), 156.

54 Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 97.

55 *Ibid.*, 53.

56 *Ibid.*, 84.

57 *Ibid.*, 74.

58 *Ibid.*, 74-75.

59 *Ibid.*, 97.

the era that regarded a woman as a civilizing agent. Therefore, Goodman ultimately makes the argument that “[t]he function of *salonnières* was to maintain order in the Republic of Letters by enforcing the rules of polite conversation”⁶⁰ and demonstrates that women exercised strong agency by making use of the gender discourse imposed upon them.

Antoine Lilti argues against Goodman’s case on salons and role of *salonnières*, but nonetheless demonstrates that women played a role in intellectual activities as well. Lilti basically refutes Goodman’s claim on the grounds that she “constructs her arguments on a restricted number of salons (Geoffrin, Lespinasse, Necker).”⁶¹ Lilti emphasizes that “the intimate politeness of high society circles erased neither the tensions nor the differentials of power, wealth, and consideration” and that “the salons were places of social distinction where symbolic violence was particularly acute.”⁶² He contends that “women of the salons played a role not unlike the one traditionally played by women in court society: offering protection, acting on behalf of such or such a person, mobilizing ministers or courtisans.”⁶³ Also, Lilti adds that “women of the salons ensured the “decency of their household” (*honneurs de leur maison*), enlivened conversation, and served as guarantors of politeness,” and emphasizes “[t]he social role of women as civilizers,” which also highlights the gender discourse of the time.⁶⁴

The emergence of a public sphere and new institutions of sociability provided novel opportunities for women to participate in Enlightenment discussions. The increased participation of women in intellectual discussions may lead into an overstatement about the improvement of their social and cultural status. However, the examination of their activities demonstrates that while the emergence of public sphere did impose new set of social and cultural regulations that often replaced pre-existing ones, women were still limited by gender discourses deeply embedded in their societies. Even if they exercised their agencies, they did so within the confines of the acceptable social behaviors imposed on them or faced ridicule from the society.

Bibliography

- Andrew, Donna T. "Popular Culture and Public Debate: London 1780." *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 2 (June 1996): 405-423.
- Caradonna, Jeremy L. *The Enlightenment in Practice: Academic Prize Contests and Intellectual Culture in France, 1670-1794*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Chartier, Roger. *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Darnton, Robert. "The High Enlightenment and the Low-Life of Literature in Pre-Revolutionary France." *Past & Present* 51 (May 1971): 81-115.
- Darnton, Robert. "What is the History of Books?" *Daedalus* 111, no. 3 (1982): 65-83.
- de Gouges, Olympe. "Olympe de Gouges, The Declaration of the Rights of Woman (September 1791)." *The French Revolution and Human Rights: A Brief Documentary History*. Translated, edited, and with an introduction by Lynn Hunt, 124-129. Boston/New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1996.

60 *Ibid.*, 91.

61 Antoine Lilti, "Sociability and Mondanité: Men of Letters in the Parisian Salons of the Eighteenth-Century," in *History 421: The Cultural and Intellectual History of the Enlightenment*, trans. Jeremy L. Caradonna, 1-25 (Edmonton: University of Alberta Students' Union, 2009), 2.

62 Lilti, "Sociability and Mondanité," 4-5.

63 *Ibid.*, 7.

64 *Ibid.*, 17.

- Gay, Peter, ed. *The Enlightenment: A Comprehensive Anthology*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973. "Gender and Society." In *The Enlightenment: A Sourcebook and Reader*, edited by Paul Hyland, Olga Gomez and Francesca Greensides, 233-258. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Goodman, Dena. "Difference: An Enlightenment Concept." In *What's Left of Enlightenment?: A Postmodern Question*, 129-140. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- . *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Hazard, Paul. *European Thought in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Meridian Books, 1963.
- Hesse, Carla. *The Other Enlightenment: How French Women became Modern*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Jacob, Margaret C. *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- . *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.
- Langford, Paul. "The Uses of Eighteenth-Century Politeness ." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 12 (2002): 311-331.
- Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Lilti, Antoine. "Sociability and Mondanité: Men of Letters in the Parisian Salons of the Eighteenth-Century." In *History 421: The Cultural and Intellectual History of the Enlightenment*, translated by Jeremy L. Caradonna, 1-25. Edmonton: University of Alberta Students' Union, 2009.
- Morning Post*. "Lines on hearing the Debates of the Female Parliament at the Casino." May 19, 1780.
- Roche, Daniel. *France in the Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Thale, Mary. "Women in London Debating Societies in 1780." *Gender & History* 7, no. 1 (April 1995): 5-24.
- Tomaselli, Sylvana. "The Enlightenment Debate on Women." *History Workshop* 20 (1985): 101-124.
- Van Horn Melton, James. *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Withers, Philip. *Aristarchus; or, The principles of composition: containing a methodical arrangement of the improprieties frequent in writing and conversation: with select rules for attaining to purity and elegance of expression*. London: J.F. Dove, St. John's Square, 1822.