

# Introduction

Sandrine Bergès

Alan Coffee

DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198766841.003.0001

### Abstract and Keywords

In the Introduction to this volume, the authors attempt to reflect on the place of Wollstonecraft studies in the recovery project through the attempts to (re-) introduce texts by women in academic philosophy; to present a brief biography of Mary Wollstonecraft, and to introduce each chapter in the volume. This introduction also presents aspects of Wollstonecraft scholarship: a study of her intellectual background, from her possible acquaintance with ancient texts to her engagement with eighteenth-century political philosophy; and her social and political thought, showing that it goes beyond feminism and deals with questions of children and animal rights, property rights and slavery. The chapter concludes with a more detailed look at her specifically republican outlook on freedom.

*Keywords:* Wollstonecraft, feminism, history of feminism, history of philosophy, influences, life, recovery project, social and political philosophy, women philosophers

## Introduction

---

Anyone glancing through the course reading lists at most universities, or browsing the bookshelves in an academic bookshop, might reasonably conclude that philosophy was something that had been written historically only by men. Its standard lists of great names, beginning with Plato and Aristotle, perhaps continuing with Descartes, Hobbes, Spinoza, and Locke, moving on to Kant and Hegel, and into the last century with Russell, Wittgenstein, and others, rarely contain a single woman. Indeed, many students often struggle to name even one woman philosopher before the mid-twentieth century and Simone de Beauvoir or Hannah Arendt. Yet women have been writing philosophy throughout this history. Not only has there been a surprising number of female philosophers but they often achieved considerable influence in their lifetimes. As well as Mary Wollstonecraft, others such as Hipparchia, Hypatia, Heloise d'Argenteuil, Hildegard von Bingen, Christine de Pizan, Gabrielle Suchon, Anne Conway, Margaret Cavendish, Emilie du Châtelet, Mary Astell, Catharine Macaulay, and Sophie de Grouchy, to name only a few, all had substantial and well-deserved reputations in their own time and engaged with contemporary debates at the highest level.<sup>1</sup>

The reasons that underpin the omission of women from the history of philosophy are many and complex. The processes by which the discipline of philosophy as we now understand it and of establishing what is often taken to be its canon took place in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>2</sup> These processes were controlled by men and there is no doubt that both sexism and **(p.2)** ignorance have played a large part in obscuring women's contribution. Since philosophy is a discipline that in some sense focuses on the application of reason, then where the prevailing belief is that women were "created rather to feel than reason", as Wollstonecraft puts it, the idea of a woman philosopher just seemed wholly out of place.<sup>3</sup> Whatever the precise causes of their neglect may have been, however, the situation is now changing. Intensive work is now being done to recover and restore the historic contribution that women have made to the pursuit of philosophy.<sup>4</sup> As the influence of feminist thinking has reshaped so much of academic philosophical enquiry, refocusing its concerns beyond the confines of the post-Kantian project, so this has allowed us to reassess, as well as to rediscover, the considerable but forgotten input that women have had.

At the forefront of this revival is Mary Wollstonecraft. As the author of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, she already has a prominent place in many people's minds as an inspirational early feminist. While this has been an enormously influential book, it does not represent the whole of her thought. Wollstonecraft was a prolific writer whose interests covered subjects as diverse as education, politics, history, moral theory, philosophy, and religion. She was an activist, a novelist, and a public intellectual who was fully engaged with the issues of her time. Wollstonecraft's analysis of the nature and causes of women's subjection is understandably seen as her outstanding contribution to the history of ideas. Nevertheless, this analysis is embedded within her own wider conceptual framework, which she brought to bear on the issues she addressed. The premise of our volume is that this wider philosophy is deserving of serious study, no less than her feminist legacy.

Wollstonecraft's influence in her own time is undeniable. She often engaged with her contemporaries—such as Edmund Burke, Thomas Paine, and Catharine Macaulay—and she participated in some of the philosophical debates that went on to shape the world—spending time, for example, in Paris during the Terror to document the effects of the revolution. Nevertheless, if it is true that women philosophers have been written out of history, it is strikingly so in her case. Moreover, her fall from grace happened almost immediately after her death when her husband, William Godwin, decided to publicize intimate details about her life **(p.3)** including the fact that she had her first child out of wedlock, that she had been in love with a married man, and that she twice attempted suicide. Wollstonecraft was immediately shunned as an immoral writer, and her *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* was not reprinted after 1796, so that by the mid-nineteenth century, George Elliot tells us that it was “rather scarce”.<sup>5</sup>

It would not be fair to say that Wollstonecraft made no impact after her death but we do have to work harder to find evidence of it.<sup>6</sup> For example, in spite of her tarnished reputation, Wollstonecraft did have an influence on nineteenth-century political philosophy. Harriet Taylor had almost certainly read her, as had John Stuart Mill, and the arguments of their *Subjection of Women* were profoundly influenced by the *Vindication*.<sup>7</sup> It is striking, however, that neither refers to her. In “The Enfranchisement of Women”, published in the *Westminster Review* in July 1851, Taylor writes “Great thinkers indeed, at different times, from Plato to Condorcet, besides some of the most eminent names of the present age, have made emphatic protests in favour of the equality of women”.<sup>8</sup> Her failure to acknowledge Wollstonecraft, whose arguments she follows very closely, is perhaps not surprising. Claiming an alliance with Plato and Condorcet (even with the latter's associations with the French Revolution) was a better tactic than referring to Wollstonecraft, the fallen woman.

Wollstonecraft remained mostly forgotten by the time of the first wave of feminism. By the latter part of the twentieth century as feminism entered its second wave, although her work was becoming more widely read, its proponents did not see her as a good role model, finding her too bourgeois, and a slave to notions of femininity. She was accused of “feminist misogyny”, of measuring women’s worth in masculine terms and finding them wanting.<sup>9</sup> Part of this **(p.4)** assessment was born, paradoxically, of her admiration for Rousseau and her insistence that girls should be educated in the way that he had determined boys should be. For Wollstonecraft, treating women as differently abled from men and failing to offer them the same means of self-improvement was the prime cause of gender inequality and its consequent social ills. But this could too easily be read as saying that women ought to be treated like men in order to be considered equally worthy members of society, hence the accusations of misogyny. This charge was perhaps tied up with a more general suspicion by feminists of this period of eighteenth-century, or Enlightenment, thinking which has been seen to assert the pre-eminence of abstract reason over emotion, where reason was understood as the preserve of men and was associated with concepts such as universalism and autonomy that privileged a male-centred view of the world and made the female perspective more difficult to articulate.<sup>10</sup> While Wollstonecraft is most definitely a product of this time, it is now widely accepted both that attitudes to reason and the emotions were far more diverse and nuanced than this simplified sketch allows, and that Wollstonecraft herself engaged confidently with its debates rather than merely being shaped by them.<sup>11</sup>

Until very recently Wollstonecraft’s work was rarely read outside of gender studies and literature courses. This began to change in the 1990s. Virginia Sapiro’s excellent study of Wollstonecraft’s political theory, *A Vindication of Political Virtue*, was particularly influential in bringing her work to the attention of a more general audience of political scientists. The last two and a half decades have witnessed an intense scholarly attention on Wollstonecraft from many disciplines. Janet Todd’s biography in 2000 and Barbara Taylor’s examination of *Wollstonecraft and the Feminist Imagination* in 2003 were only two amongst several major books that increased awareness of Wollstonecraft’s significance as a thinker and as someone who should be engaged with on her own terms.<sup>12</sup> Philosophers, however, have come late to recognize the importance of Wollstonecraft **(p.5)** within their own field. It is salutary to note, for example, that while there are a number of very good collections of essays on Wollstonecraft, as far as we are aware, ours is the first to position itself specifically as a philosophical collection directed at themes within that discipline.<sup>13</sup>

Just as Wollstonecraft had many interests and engaged in numerous pursuits, from writing fiction to taking part in political debate, so she can be studied from many perspectives. While philosophical examination of her work is not the only way to capture her thought, it remains very much under-researched, and we believe it will prove a very fruitful means of bringing out some of the subtleties, tensions, and innovations we find in Wollstonecraft's writing. In adopting this approach, however, we are not simply "opening up the philosophical canon" as it currently exists and inserting a woman. Rather, just as the work of feminists have altered philosophy as a discipline, thereby enabling women such as Wollstonecraft to be recognized for their philosophical contribution, so Wollstonecraft's recognition will, we hope, further broaden our understanding of the role women have played in the history of philosophy.

### The Chapters

Our aim is to bring together a collection of essays that reflects the breadth of current leading philosophical research in Wollstonecraft's work. In just one volume, of course, we cannot hope to present a comprehensive account of her overall philosophy from a single standpoint. Instead, our contributors write from a variety of perspectives that demonstrate something of the diverse interest that there is in her thought. Regrettably, there is a great deal that we have had to leave out. With any historical philosopher, those who study her face the dilemma of deciding to what extent they examine her work contextually, as it engages with her own intellectual environment, compared with treating her ideas as free-standing contributions to a larger conversation that spans the generations and **(p.6)** that may be applied to current issues. Our authors strike the balance between these two aspirations at different points.

The subjects addressed in this collection include the role played by Wollstonecraft's understanding of love and respect in her arguments on inequality (Sylvana Tomaselli), the conceptual relationship between friendship and marriage (Nancy Kendrick), the place of the emotions in the development of civic virtue (Martina Reuter), the relational nature of her conception of independence (Catriona Mackenzie), the application of her views on rights and duties to children and animals (Eileen Hunt Botting), and the influence of the abolitionist movement on her views on women as property (Laura Brace). Five of the contributors focus on one particular aspect of Wollstonecraft's political philosophy, namely her contribution to republican theory and, in particular, her use of its central ideal of freedom conceived of as the absence of domination or dependence. Philip Pettit gives a short introduction to republicanism. This is followed by Susan James's examination of a specifically republican derivation of the concepts of rights in Wollstonecraft's discourse as powers to act. Next, Lena Halldenius shows how we may derive a view of representation from her views on freedom and independence, and Alan Coffee looks at the role of public reason in bringing about and maintaining individual and collective freedom. Sandrine Bergès then tackles Wollstonecraft's attempt to resolve the tensions between her conceptions of the duties of a republican woman as mother and as citizen. The volume concludes with an afterword by Barbara Taylor that provides a perspective on the previous five papers, reminding us that despite its clear contemporary relevance, Wollstonecraft's republicanism is very much a product of her times.

We briefly introduce the volume's papers and themes below under three headings corresponding to Wollstonecraft's influences, her social and political philosophy generally, and finally her republicanism specifically.

### Influences

In-depth study of past philosophers often requires that we have some grasp of what their influences were. With male writers this task is often straightforward: we ask where they studied or who their mentors were, we look at records of their home libraries. But with writers such as Wollstonecraft who had no access to formal higher education and no family home in which she could house a large number of books, it is much harder. We must hunt for clues, such as in letters in which she comments on what she is currently reading, in the references she makes in her published works, and in the reviews she wrote for Joseph Johnson's *Analytical Review*. We may also make certain deductions about her education.

**(p.7)** We can assume, for instance that she did not read Greek as this was not generally taught to middle-class girls and since she makes no reference to learning it herself. Nevertheless, it is clear that, in one way or another, the classics did influence her.

## Introduction

---

Although Plato's works were not translated into English until after her death, Wollstonecraft's friend and mentor Richard Price was a noted Platonist and others with whom she engaged in debate were often trained classicists. Sylvana Tomaselli makes a convincing case for reading Wollstonecraft, not as an isolated crusader for equality, but as a writer who was very much part of her contemporary philosophical debates. While focusing on her intellectual relationships with Price and Burke, she makes it apparent that Wollstonecraft was, in fact, familiar with classical debates and arguments, tracing Wollstonecraft's famous attack on servility in relationships to Plato's *Symposium*. Tomaselli also suggests that the strong religious streak in Wollstonecraft's works, and the complex relationship between human love and divine love, are also a product of the pervasive presence of Platonism in her circle. The idea that the abstract form of love is somehow more important than actual instances of love goes some way towards explaining some of her attitudes to marriage, but as Tomaselli argues, it is also significant in her rejection of social models based on servility.

If we can be confident that Wollstonecraft only knew Plato at second hand, there is at least a possibility that she had read some Aristotle. His *Politics* had been translated into French in the late Middle Ages and there was at least one English translation (attributed to the poet John Donne). There is also some evidence that she had read the *Politics*, as she criticizes Burke for misinterpreting part of it.<sup>14</sup> Nancy Kendrick's chapter offers an Aristotelian interpretation of Wollstonecraft's conception of the virtues and argues further that Wollstonecraft's discussion of marriage is best understood in terms of Aristotle's analysis of friendship. Kendrick shows that the capacity to develop Aristotelian virtue friendships has implications that go beyond marriage and into other kinds of relationships, such as the female friendships depicted in Wollstonecraft's novels, which were no doubt modelled on her own close female friendships with Jane Arden and Fanny Blood. Ultimately, Kendrick argues, virtue friendship is the clue to women's development as full moral agents, thereby showing that Wollstonecraft's emphasis on marriage is not simply a worthwhile philosophical **(p.8)** discussion in itself but an angle from which to approach more traditional questions in political philosophy.

Unlike Plato, who could only be read in Greek and perhaps Latin, and Aristotle, for whom only scarce and old translations could be found, the Stoics enjoyed a fair amount of popularity amongst the non-classically trained readers of the late eighteenth century. This was due in great part to Elizabeth Carter's bestselling translation into English of the works of first-century Stoic, Epictetus. Though we have no direct evidence that Wollstonecraft had read this translation, it is not unlikely as one of the authors she regarded as a model, Catharine Macaulay, wrote approvingly of the Stoics, especially concerning their educational models. Martina Reuter examines Wollstonecraft's position on the relationship between reason and virtue. She works through eighteenth-century discussions of Stoicism, in particular Jonathan Swift's literary depiction of Stoic philosophy in *Gulliver's Travels*, arguing that Wollstonecraft's own analysis of the relationship between reason and the emotions (or passions), in which both are necessary and sufficient for the development of virtue, shows a subtler take on Stoicism.

### Social and Political Philosophy

Until relatively recently, Wollstonecraft was most often read within a liberal framework of either one of its representatives or as rebelling against some of the strictures it imposes.<sup>15</sup> So, where an earlier generation of feminists was especially critical of liberalism for its perceived individualism, this concern was often read into Wollstonecraft's work.<sup>16</sup> At the same time, Wollstonecraft's evident emphasis on both individual liberty and strong values of egalitarian community built on mutual trust and commitment seemed difficult to reconcile. This has led commentators such as Penny Weiss to conclude that Wollstonecraft was struggling to "redefine liberalism itself".<sup>17</sup> Catriona Mackenzie's contribution **(p.9)** takes on this challenge. Drawing on the ideal of freedom as independence, she shows how Wollstonecraft prefigures current debates in the field of relational autonomy. Mackenzie maps Wollstonecraft's analysis on to her own distinction in which two aspects to freedom are required, these being what she calls self-determination (the civic opportunity to determine the direction of one's own life) and self-government (the independence of mind to exercise competent and authentic critical self-reflection). Entwined with these, Mackenzie identifies a critical third element of self-authorization, through which individuals are able to regard themselves as agents capable of self-determination and self-government. As Wollstonecraft shows, self-authorization cannot be had without the authorization of others through having sufficient social standing. To bring this about would require more than a mere set of political rights, for example. What would be needed is a comprehensive reworking of the systems of norms and practices that have entrenched their position of inequality.



Eileen Hunt Botting takes on less widely discussed aspects of Wollstonecraft's thought (children and animals) and presents them in a contemporary context, arguing that we should look at Wollstonecraft's discussion of children's and animals' rights in relationship not only to her contemporaries Immanuel Kant and Jeremy Bentham, but also to Onora O'Neill's classification of duties. Her resulting analysis of Wollstonecraft's discussion of rights and duties, and in particular the indivisibility of sets of rights, casts light on recent debates in international human rights laws. This chapter is a prime example of how discussing the themes presented in her works can have applications that reach beyond what Wollstonecraft originally intended.

If Wollstonecraft is partly ahead of her time in raising the rights issue of children and animals, references to slavery place her squarely within the republican debates of the eighteenth century. Political subjection, such as to an absolute monarch, was routinely described in the very same terms as the formal state of legal bondage, a position that had been adopted by advocates of women's rights since at least Mary Astell (1666–1731).<sup>18</sup> This rhetoric is prominent in Wollstonecraft's work and pervades her *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, and the claim that women are always slaves in virtue of their inevitable social subordination to men's arbitrary power provides one of its central organizing principles. Laura Brace explores this image, placing it in the context of the abolitionist debates of Wollstonecraft's own time concerning the legitimacy of owning **(p.10)** property in a person. While slavery was viewed as a usurping of a person's natural right to freedom, freedom in turn was understood to make moral demands which neither women nor chattel slaves were capable of fulfilling. Brace shows how Wollstonecraft dissolves the tension between these strands through a radical view of property as having the potential to corrupt the moral and rational capacities not just of the victims of domination but of the whole of bourgeois society.

### Republicanism

A significant development in the study of Wollstonecraft in recent years has been the growing appreciation of the impact her republican commitments had on her thinking. Although still often described as undergoing a revival, interest in republicanism as a field of political inquiry has become well established over the last two decades or more. Nevertheless, in the context of Wollstonecraft studies, it remains something of a newcomer. What the last five chapters in this volume show is that the philosophical implications of reading Wollstonecraft through a republican lens turn out to be far-reaching.

There is no shortage of women who can be described as republicans, especially in the eighteenth century. Women as intellectually and politically diverse as Mary Astell, Catharine Macaulay, Olympe de Gouges, and Sophie de Grouchy have, in different ways, drawn on that tradition's resources.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, the pool of sources from which today's neo-republican theorists draw has been resolutely male. From Livy to Machiavelli, and Harrington to Price, men exclusively have provided the authoritative voices that help define the core republican concepts. An obvious consequence of this has been to deprive republican theory of an alternative internal perspective to challenge and broaden its principles and focus. This not only leaves republican thinking impoverished but by excluding their voices and perspectives, exposes marginalized and minority group members to the very domination that it seeks to reduce. Especially vulnerable, of course, have **(p.11)** been women who for so long were excluded systematically from the benefits of citizenship, deprived of any effective voice, and placed in a state of dependence on men. Given this patriarchal history and its traditionally masculine imagery and language in which citizenship has been seen in terms of hardy, self-reliant individuals capable of defending their country and unencumbered by the ties or cares of domestic life, it is not surprising that many feminists have been noticeably reticent about the republican project.<sup>20</sup>

Wollstonecraft herself was forthright in her criticism of these patriarchal and masculinist characteristics. If these were essential aspects of republican theory, then indeed it would be difficult to count her amongst its number. But they are not. What is at stake when the term "republican" is applied in this volume is not a set of practices or cultural values, but rather a structure of political argument based around a distinctive notion of what it means to be free. In today's language, most republicans understand freedom as "non-domination" following Philip Pettit, although most of the contributors here refer to "independence", following Wollstonecraft's own use. Non-domination, or independence, represents a condition of full membership of a community in which one enjoys an equal protection against threats of domination understood as the arbitrary exercise of power. Domination, or dependence, is considered slavery. Since freedom is a fundamental moral and political concept, once its meaning has been established the effects will ripple through the way that a range of other concepts and values are understood such as equality, virtue, the nature of rights, meaning of citizenship, and the relationship between individual and society.

The last five contributors to this volume all discuss aspects of historical republicanism. Philip Pettit outlines the philosophical idea of non-domination as it is used in present-day discourse, detailing some of the issues at stake, and showing how that idea differs from the more widely understood notion of freedom as an absence of intentional interference. Pettit's contribution thus helps to show how the discussions of Wollstonecraft as a republican thinker fit within more recent debates. Susan James then takes up the question of what Wollstonecraft understands by rights within a republican context. Although best known for her book entitled *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, rights themselves appear noticeably absent from its actual concerns. James shows this **(p.12)** appearance to be misleading by reconnecting Wollstonecraft with an older strand of republican tradition that views rights as effective powers to act. While this thought is prominent in the Dutch republicanism of Spinoza, for example, it has rarely, if ever, been discussed in Wollstonecraft whose heritage is typically seen as the English natural law republicans, such as Algernon Sidney and John Locke. James acknowledges the influence of both and works through the tensions that emerge as a result.

However they are defined, rights are always exercised within the context of a system of law. Republicans consider the law to be properly formulated, and therefore legitimate, only where it is required always to operate for the common good. Implicit in this concept is an idea of representation in which each of our interests can be said to be reflected and embodied in the structures and institutions of society as a whole. Wollstonecraft nowhere sets out a systematic view of what she understands 'representation' to entail and so Lena Halldenius pieces together Wollstonecraft's various uses. This reveals a critical position that is trenchantly opposed to defining a unified representative interest of a population based on the perspectives of its elite. Taking "political society as it is", rather than in a state of idealized harmony, Wollstonecraft argues for an inclusive and egalitarian approach in which it is with the common people rather than the elite that we start. There is no assumed unity of interests but rather each group, including women and the working classes, add their perspective directly in the deliberations of government.

There remains the question of how the interests, values, and ideas of all citizens can be heard and fairly considered. Alan Coffee shows that at least part of Wollstonecraft's answer lies in the spirit in which public debate is conducted. We can only be sure of being represented adequately in a virtuous society, which at the minimum requires a collective capacity and commitment to act rationally according to the best reasons. Where individuals are not represented politically or in the laws and institutions of the society, they are dependent. According to Wollstonecraft, dependence is a corrosive state that corrupts the virtue of both dominator and dominated alike. Once it gains a foothold, this corruption has a tendency to spread, weakening everyone's freedom alike. Equal political representation for all, then, is not only a moral imperative but is also a practical one, being one of the necessary conditions of a free state.

In her contribution, Sandrine Bergès draws links between Wollstonecraft's thought and that of a French contemporary whom Wollstonecraft almost certainly did not read (although the two may have met), the republican thinker Sophie de Grouchy. Bergès argues that together, these writers help reconcile republican ideals of motherhood with political participation for women. Her **(p. 13)** contribution focuses on one aspect of female participation that historically has often been associated with women: caring for infants and children. Bergès shows that, while Wollstonecraft denies that women should be mothers in order to achieve citizenship (because citizenship is based on civic virtue and virtue is gender-neutral), she explicitly affirms that mothers who do not nurse do not deserve the title of citizen. Even on our best reading, it is not clear that these strands can be reconciled. Bergès looks for a solution in de Grouchy's writings on sympathy, and particularly in the claim that all that is needed to give infants the moral impetus they need to become virtuous citizens is physical closeness with one individual, but not necessarily a mother.

In highlighting Wollstonecraft's republican background, it is not the intention of any of the contributors to label Wollstonecraft, or to attempt to place artificial limits on her philosophy. In her chapter, for example, Susan James shows Wollstonecraft to be drawing on both classical republican ideas and a natural law tradition characteristic of liberal thought in developing her own arguments about rights. While Barbara Taylor is appreciative of the benefits of reading Wollstonecraft in republican terms, she offers a reminder against the temptation to freeze any writer into any particular canon. Representing Wollstonecraft as a "modern philosopher" with diverse and shifting interests inspired by numerous sources, Taylor highlights two other influences that should not be neglected: her womanhood and her strong religious commitment. Religion and republicanism are not easily separated in the eighteenth century, of course. Many of Wollstonecraft's own dissenting sect, such as Richard Price, can rightly be regarded as Protestants and republicans in equal measure even if philosophers today have often tended to downplay the theological dimension. This much said, it is the unique appreciation of the female experience that Wollstonecraft brought to the male-dominated debates she entered for which she is most celebrated. In aligning her with the masculinist tradition of republicanism, great care must be taken not to overshadow her feminist concerns, or the feminist tradition that was to follow. As Taylor reminds us, "feminism is not like other sorts of politics; it's the personal made political, it's politics with a sexual difference", something she asks us to keep in mind "when we read Mary Wollstonecraft, and hear the echoes of her ideas in twenty-first century Britain".

### Notes:

(<sup>1</sup>) For an account of women's extensive contribution to philosophy from antiquity to the twentieth century see Mary Ellen Waithe's (1987–94), *A History of Women Philosophers*, 4 vols (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers).

(<sup>2</sup>) See Jonathan Ree (2002), "Women Philosophers and the Canon", *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 10 (4): 641–52.

(<sup>3</sup>) Mary Wollstonecraft (1992), *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (London: Penguin Books), p. 155.

(<sup>4</sup>) Lisa Shapiro, "The Place of Women in Early Modern Philosophy", in *Feminist Reflections on the History of Philosophy*, eds Lilli Alanen and Charlotte Witt (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2004); Jacqueline Broad and Karen Green (2009), *A History of Women's Political Thought in Europe, 1400–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). See also Green and Hagenruber's introduction to a special issue of *The Monist* on women's historical contribution to philosophy ("Introduction", *The Monist* 2015, 98: 1–6) as well as the papers they discuss.

(<sup>5</sup>) George Eliot's review essay "Margaret Fuller and Mary Wollstonecraft" was first published in *The Leader* in 1855.

(<sup>6</sup>) And we should be aware also of extending this conclusion beyond Europe. Eileen Hunt Botting and Christine Carey argue that Wollstonecraft's *Rights of Woman* was a significant influence in the thought of American women's rights advocates in the nineteenth century. See their 2004 article "Wollstonecraft's Philosophical Impact on Nineteenth-Century American Women's Rights Advocates", *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (4): 707-22.

(<sup>7</sup>) There is evidence that Mill knew Wollstonecraft's works, as he and Auguste Comte discuss these (in passing) in correspondence: see Oscar Haac (1995), *The Correspondence of John Stuart Mill and Auguste Comte* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction), p. 188. Helen Taylor reports having read the *Vindication* as a teenager, and that the book was a gift from her mother, which suggests that Harriet Taylor had some idea at least of its contents.

(<sup>8</sup>) Andrew Pyle (1995), *The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill* (London: Continuum), p. 16.

(<sup>9</sup>) Susan Gubar (1994), "Feminist Misogyny: Mary Wollstonecraft and the Paradox of 'It Takes One to Know One'", *Feminist Studies* 20 (3): 453-73, p. 454. Thomas H. Ford (2009), "Mary Wollstonecraft and the Motherhood of Feminism", *Women's Studies Quarterly* 37 (3 & 4): 189-205.

(<sup>10</sup>) See, for example, Genevieve Lloyd (1984), *The Man of Reason: 'Male' and 'Female' in the Western World* (London: Routledge); Joan Landes (1988), *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press); Carole Pateman (1989), *The Disorder of Women* (Cambridge: Polity Press); Moira Gatens (1991), *Feminism and Philosophy: Perspectives on Difference and Equality* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

(<sup>11</sup>) These re-evaluations were made possible in no small measure thanks to the pioneering work done by the earlier feminists such as those mentioned.

(<sup>12</sup>) Also of note is Wendy Gunther-Canada (2001), *Rebel Writer: Mary Wollstonecraft and Enlightenment Politics* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press). More recent treatments include Susan Laird (2014), *Mary Wollstonecraft, Philosophical Mother of Co-Education* (London: Bloomsbury); and Lena Halldenius (2015), *Mary Wollstonecraft and Feminist Republicanism* (London: Pickering and Chatto). There has also been a wealth of journal articles written in the last ten years. Many are listed in the Bibliography, this volume.

(<sup>13</sup>) We do not mean to make too much of this claim. The superb *Feminist Interpretations of Mary Wollstonecraft* in the *Rereading the Canon* series (1996), ed. Mary Falco (University Park, PA: University of Penn State Press), for example, orientates itself in the preface as a political science collection written by people in that field, while the *Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft* (2002), ed. Claudia Johnson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) is in the *Companions to Literature* series. The division between disciplines such as philosophy, political science, and literature is by no means rigid, of course. We are not making any specific claims about the content of these volumes so much as their positioning with relation to others working within those areas. Most of the contributors to this volume would identify as philosophers or are located in philosophy departments.

(<sup>14</sup>) See Tomaselli's edition of *A Vindication of the Rights of Men*, p. 19, and Nathalie F. Taylor (2007), *The Rights of Woman as Chimera: The Political Philosophy of Mary Wollstonecraft* (New York and London: Routledge), p. 8.

(<sup>15</sup>) Penny Weiss (2009), *Canon Fodder: Historical Women Political Thinkers* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press), pp. 84–90.

(<sup>16</sup>) For critical feminist accounts of liberalism that include Wollstonecraft amongst its targets, see Alison Jaggar (1983), *Feminist Policies and Human Nature* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield); and Ruth Abbey (2009), "Back to the future: Marriage as Friendship in the Thought of Mary Wollstonecraft", *Hypatia* 14 (3): 78–95; see also Abbey (2011), *The Return of Feminist Liberalism* (London: Routledge). The relationship between the different varieties of feminism and liberalism is, of course, a complex one. In recent years there has been a fruitful dialogue between these approaches: for a helpful collection, see Amy Baehr (2004), *Varieties of Feminist Liberalism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield).

(<sup>17</sup>) Penny Weiss, *Canon Fodder*, p. 90.

(<sup>18</sup>) Astell famously asked why "if all men are born free, how is it that all women are born slaves?" (quoted in Patricia Springborg (ed.) (1996), "Reflections upon Marriage", in *Astell: Political Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 18).

(<sup>19</sup>) As a committed royalist and High Church Tory, Astell would, of course, be horrified to be classed alongside republicans. She does, however, make extensive appeal to the principle of freedom as independence from arbitrary power, or domination, and in that sense she can be said to draw on a republican resource: see Patricia Springborg (2005), *Mary Astell: Theorist of Freedom from Domination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). On the other writers listed, see Karen Green (2012) "Liberty and Virtue in Catherine Macaulay's Enlightenment Philosophy", *Intellectual History Review* 22 (3): 411-26; Sandrine Bergès (2015), "Sophie de Grouchy on the Cost of Domination in the *Letters on Sympathy* and *Two Anonymous Articles in Le Républicain*", *The Monist* 98: 102-12; Karen Green discusses Olympe de Gouges in Green (2015), "Anticipating and experiencing the Revolution in France", in *Political Ideas of Enlightenment Women* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), ch. 9, esp. pp. 374-84.

(<sup>20</sup>) See, for example, Anne Phillips (2000), "Feminism and Republicanism: Is this a Plausible Alliance?" *Journal of Political Philosophy* 8 (2): 279-93 and Carole Pateman (2007), "Why Republicanism?" *Basic Income Studies* 2 (2): 1-6. In recent years, there has been the beginning of a rapprochement between feminism and republicanism. In addition to several of the contributors to this volume, see Cécile Laborde (2008), *Critical Republicanism: The Hijab Controversy and Political Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Access brought to you by: