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Women and the Encyclopédie

To discuss women and the Encyclopédie thoroughly is not possible in an essay such as this. We would need to consider the role of women in the publishing enterprise, from conception and preparation to publication, distribution, and subscription. At the same time, we would have to assemble, organize, analyze, and synthesize all references to women in the seventeen volumes of text and eleven volumes of plates.

My aims are far more modest, in keeping with the goals of this collection. I intend to touch briefly on some of the ways in which women were important or unimportant to the publishing enterprise, to give an introduction to the diverse views of women presented in Encyclopédie articles and plates, and to suggest some of the research still to be done.

Women have not been linked to the conception of the project or to the printing and dissemination of the volumes, though there may be unsung heroines who will still receive their due. Yet, in their own way, women lent their support. Who has not heard of the clever action of Mme de Pompadour to defend the Encyclopédie in 1759, when the Parlement and government had taken action against it. Nancy Mitford describes the scene:

Soon after the Encyclopédie had been confiscated there was a supper party at Trianon. The duc de La Vallière happened to say he wondered what gunpowder was made of. “It seems so funny that we spend our time killing partridges, and being killed ourselves on the frontier, and really we have no idea how it happens.” Madame de Pompadour, seeing her opportunity, quickly went on: “Yes, and face powder? What is that made of? Now if you had not confiscated the Encyclopédie, Sire, we could have found out in a moment.” The King sent to his library for a copy, and presently footmen staggered in under the heavy volumes; the party was kept amused for the rest of the evening looking up gunpowder, rouge and so on. After this subscribers were allowed to have their copies, though it was still not on sale in the bookshops.

Nor can one forget the influential women of the Parisian salons. There were champions, such as Mme Geoffrin, hostess, protectrice, and
"Maecenas" of the encyclopedists,3 who contributed not just moral support but two hundred thousand livres to the enterprise.4 And not to be forgotten is the "Muse of the Encyclopédie," Mlle de Lespinasse, whose salon has been called the "laboratory of the Encyclopédie."5 At the same time, there were adversaries among the salonkeepers, one of whom was, ironically, Mme Geoffrin's daughter, Mme de La Ferté-Imbault, who welcomed enemies of the Encyclopédie to her salon.6

Women were also among those who read and reacted to the Encyclopédie. Although there is no indication that any of the subscribers were women,7 some women obviously had access to the work. Mme de Pompadour, of course, read the work and found it useful. Palissot tells us of one woman whose response to a long article on "soul" was that of dissatisfaction.8 And there was the reaction of Mme de Genlis, who, having read the Encyclopédie twice, and feeling that people could never get along without this work, conceived the impractical (at her age of seventy-five) project of "redoing" the Encyclopédie in order to "purify and abridge this incoherent and dangerous compilation."9

Yet to be done is a detailed study of the reactions of women readers to the Encyclopédie. They are not to be found in the most widely read publications of the day,10 for, as Edmond and Jules de Goncourt tell us, "Books in this age were but a chance manifestation of feminine genius. . . . The woman of the eighteenth century reveals herself above all in her conversation."11 Therefore, to learn the full range of reaction of contemporary women to the Encyclopédie, one would have to examine memoirs, letters, recorded conversations, and the like. In all likelihood, feminine commentary ranges from very favorable to very critical.

As to the Encyclopédie itself, the findings on women's contributions are disappointing. There are only two recognized women contributors, and, of the two, only one is known by name. This is a Mme Delusse, identified in Jacques Proust's list of collaborators to the Encyclopédie as wife or sister of the Delusse who contributed "lutherie" to the fifth volume of plates (vol. 22).12 Mme Delusse was presumably of the same circle as her husband or brother, belonging to a class of workers who practiced an art that required as much intelligence as skill. Her contribution is probably representative of the woman artisan who was as capable as her husband or brother. The entries attributed to Mme Delusse are in volumes 22 and 24. They are straightforward explanations of plates on a subject of which she obviously had command. They do not include history or personal observations.

The other contributor, an anonymous female, is acknowledged in the introduction to volume 6 (p. vi): "A woman whom we do not have the honor of knowing has sent us the articles FALBALA, FONTANCE, and others." John Lough suggests that this anonymous woman was probably Suzanne Marie de Vivens, marquise de Jaucourt, the cheva-

The articles "Falbala" and "Fontange" are of limited interest. "Falbala" (6:387, col. 2) consists of thirty-seven lines of text about bands of material that were applied to women's dresses and skirts. There are a definition, an anecdote about the etymology of the word, its history in fashion, and commentary on the importance of fashion to women who "more easily renounce the pleasure of loving than the desire to please." The article is light, witty, and superficial, apparently by a worldly woman writing on a topic of interest to her equals, one on which women were considered to be authorities.

As concerns the article "Fontange" (6:105, col. 2-6:106, col. 1), Lough seems to suggest that the female contributor submitted only a few fragments of the article. Yet the whole article gives the impression of having been written by one person, a point of view not expressed in "Falbala." Again, the author, or authors, gives the historical sense of the word before describing its contemporary meaning of tied ribbons that complement a hairdo.

A cross-reference in the article "Fontange" to "Palatine," another term of fashion, is not helpful in identifying the woman contributor or locating "other articles" because the tone and content of "Palatine" do not resemble those in the aforementioned two articles. To date, there has been no determination of the "other articles" this unnamed woman contributor may have sent to the editors or whether the other articles were even printed.

When these few women and brief articles are measured against the hundred-plus contributors and thousands of pages making up the Encyclopédie, we are forced to conclude that women's contributions were neither very numerous nor of much impact. Nor are statistics likely to change significantly. About sixty percent of the articles have been attributed, with the authors of the remainder not likely to be identified.

Of perhaps more significance to us is the absence of any expression of awareness that the situation should have differed in any way. Contributors were drawn primarily from a cross section of the professional and upper-class men of France during the 1750s and early 1760s. Even foreign men seem to have written more articles than French women; Lough lists a number of Swiss, a Berliner, a Lithuanian, and a Portuguese. Might the paucity of women authors be explained by the fact that few women were held in high esteem for their writings or recognized as authorities in fields other than fashion and society? If so, the predominance of male contributors is a reflection of society rather than a conscious exclusion of women by the editors.

Until fairly recently, it was common to draw conclusions on how women fare in the Encyclopédie from one or two of the major entries entitled "Femme," in particular "Femme" (Morale) by Desmahis and "Femme," (Droit, and by Jaucourt. But there are four principal entries
for "Femme" in the *Encyclopédie*, as well as twenty-seven entries whose titles begin with the word "femme." All of these cover a little more than thirteen folio pages. To use only one or two of the articles might be misleading.

Jaucourt’s article, about two columns in length, is a clear statement of the equality of the sexes in marriage and a recognition that custom and temporal laws have often obscured this equality. "Marriage is by its nature a contract and the reciprocal rights, beyond those dictated by natural law, to be determined by the man and woman agreeing to the contract," says Jaucourt (6:471, col. 2). His even longer article, "Femme en couche," (*Med.*), over five columns in length, is equally sympathetic, giving testimony to Jaucourt’s understanding and appreciation of women’s "precious token of their love" during childbirth (6:479, col. 1-6:481, col. 2). It is easy to understand why, on the strength of such articles, Vera Lee, le comte de Luppé, and others consider Jaucourt a strong voice for women.17

Desmahis’s article, about 6½ columns in length and the longest of the four entries entitled "Femme," for the most part contradicts the idea of equality advanced by Jaucourt. The bulk of the article is an exaggerated painting of one type of contemporary woman about whom the author has little good to say. To Desmahis, women are weak, timid, shrewd, false, less capable of attention than men, vicious, vindictive, equivocal, cruel, curious, less capable of friendship with their own sex, living a continual lie called coquetry, vain, superficial, deceitful, inconstant, etc. With such obvious disdain for the fair sex and such one-sided reporting on the part of Desmahis, it is no wonder that this article infuriated broad thinkers of the period like Voltaire, and even his archenemy, Fréron.18

The kindest thing Desmahis can say about woman is that society contributes to her problems. He shakes his head in disbelief over the relative lack of education for women and its results: "We must be surprised that such untutored souls can produce so many virtues, that there are not more vices germinating in them." The problems of education are numerous: it is in the hands of women who have renounced the world, it does not prepare woman for what she meets when she enters society, and its focus is on beauty and the artificial means of augmenting it rather than on character and thinking ability (6:472, col. 2).

Barthéz in "Femme" (*Anthropologie*) broaches the subject that woman is to a certain extent *un homme manqué* (an imperfect man). Yet, elsewhere, he recognizes woman’s equality and creativity and also discusses education. He mentions Marie de Schurman, a feminist advocating universal education for Christian women. Although he questions her assertion that the study of letters enlightens and gives a
 wisdom not to be bought by the dangerous help of experience, he 
affirms that “it appears certain that this study causes distractions that 
weaken tendencies toward vice” (6:469, col. 2).

After an historical and geographical survey, including past accusa-
tions that women are at the origin of superstition and sorcery, he 
comes out with an explanation that places him among women’s allies: 
perhaps such accusations were made because “people recognized that 
women had more resources of the mind than they were willing to 
grant them” (6:470, col. 1).

Boucher d’Argis’s article “Femme” (Jurisp.) is a compendium of 
pronouncements on the legal état présent of women in France, often with 
a notation of how laws differ in other times or countries. He reports 
that women, because of the fragility of their sex and their natural 
delicacy, are excluded from some offices and incapable of certain 
appointments: ecclesiastical, monarchical, military, and others (6:475, 
cols. 1-2). He describes contemporary practice that women cannot be 
witnesses in wills or before notary publics but can give depositions, 
though it is commonly said, and to a certain extent he seems to agree 
with the practice, that it takes two women to make one witness (6:476, 
col. 1).

Yet he does recognize that women have distinguished themselves 
by receiving the doctor’s degree in foreign academies: Hélène-Lucrèce 
Piscopia Cornara in philosophy at Padua in 1678; la demoiselle Patin, 
the same in 1732; Laure Bassi in medicine at Bologna; the Signora 
Maria-Gaetana Agnesi, in mathematics at Bologna in 1750. And 
although he goes no farther, he may be planting the idea that women’s 
access to education should be more commonplace in his own country 
as well as elsewhere.

While there is no way to mention here all the aspects of women 
found in the entries on “Femme,” perhaps enough has been included to 
illustrate that approach and content differ greatly from article to 
article. Anyone who reads a few pages of the work cannot help but 
realize that content is not predictable, that uniformity was not an aim 
of the work, and that to fully understand any question one cannot go 
to any one article and expect to see the full picture.

Unfortunately, this was not understood by one recent writer who 
judged that “the presence of four articles on women in the Encyclopédie 
clearly indicates the ambivalence of Enlightenment ideas on the 
subject of equality of men and women.”19 The ambivalence that exists 
has nothing to do with the number of entries. To so explain the 
number is to fail to acknowledge how the Encyclopédie was composed. It 
was not at all unusual for the editors to have a number of authors 
contribute an entry dealing primarily with one aspect of a broader 
topic.
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Nor should the sometimes opposing views of contributors surprise us; each contributor was given license to choose what he would say. As far as we know, there was no editorial policy set for the subject of women, for example. Rather, it was up to each contributor to approach a topic as his background or interest dictated. This naturally encouraged a divergence of views.

As to the subject of equality, it could be risky to say that the encyclopedists were ambivalent on this matter on the basis of only four entries among the thousands. It would be almost as dangerous to judge the encyclopedists as ambivalent because the figure represented in the frontispiece of the volumes alternates between Apollo and Minerva. However, the more entries we read, the more frequently we find contradictory opinions. Therefore, we can say that there is ambivalence when we consider the contributors as a whole. More research is needed to determine the extent to which individual authors expressed this ambivalence.

At least one scholar, P. Charbonnel, has suggested that the apparent contradictions, the ambivalence on the matter of equality for women, were deliberate. While Charbonnel realizes that one can examine the overall picture of women in the Encyclopédie and conclude that the encyclopedists confirmed the servitude and humiliation of women rather than contesting them, she questions this interpretation by asking whether the seeming conformity might only be dust cast into the eyes of credulous readers and inattentive censors. The disconnected remarks, far from being innocent, could correspond to the ambition spread throughout the Encyclopédie of inciting readers to consider the Holy Scriptures and certain customs as sacred no longer. She feels that Barthez, Desmahis, and Jaucourt all wished to see prejudices changed. And she suggests we can read into Barthez an intention to cast doubt on the idea of male supremacy when he points out that autopsies reveal indifferentiation of sexes in the fetus at four months, raising questions about the androgynous nature of humans and suggesting that rather than woman being "an imperfect being" or "an imperfect man" man might be "an imperfect woman."

But does Charbonnel's thesis that "Femme" is representative of the avant-garde nature of the work that attempts to bring change by hiding revolutionary statements among traditional and openly misogynist assertions hold up other than in the four articles on "Femme"? Isolated but similar remarks throughout the Encyclopédie lend support to Charbonnel's interpretation. In an article that would certainly not be the first place we would look for ideas on women, in one of the entries on "Man"—"Homme" (Morale)—the author Le Roi blames jealous men for depriving women of the chance to develop fully. From
childhood, women are prepared for what Le Roi calls "slavery"; they are focused on bagatelles, falsities, a limited circle of objects, rather than on noble and generous qualities and virtues. The very fact that they have learned their lessons well dooms them to be victims of frivolity, a state Le Roi, for one, finds abhorrent (8:278, cols. 1-2). Though this is more awareness of a problem than a plea for change, it is the type of passage that might lead to generalizations about the encyclopedists' recognition that change was necessary, which is after all the first step in effecting change.

On the other hand, other isolated remarks occur in equally unlikely places and seemingly contradict each other. In "Imagination des femmes enceintes sur le foetus, pouvoir de l'" (8:563, col. 1), the contributor gives many examples of the power of a pregnant woman on her fetus but then tells us that these cases ought more reasonably to be attributed to the imagination of the person who believes he sees this influence than to the mother who really has no such power. However, in "Enfans (maladies des)" (5:659, col. 2), the contributor flatly states that hereditary vices come especially from the mother. What are we to make of such contradictory remarks?

The only way to be sure that we can clearly see all the threads woven into the tapestry representing women in the Encyclopédie is to read the entire seventeen volumes of text and eleven volumes of plates. For the volumes of text, this has been done by Terry S. Dock, who identifies the articles that treat women and organizes the materials into three sections: woman as a physical being, woman as a psychological being, and woman as a social being. In the first case, woman is seen as un homme manqué, weak and delicate, but sympathetically viewed during puerperium, admired for risking her life to insure the continuation of the species, and recognized for her female pulchritude. But Dock admits that despite some advanced notions from the encyclopedists, "they do nothing . . . to modify radically the traditional concept of the weak, delicate woman." As for woman as psychological being, she is seen as having a lively imagination, strong passions, timidity, and modesty. Yet, at the same time, the question is posed as to whether woman's weakness and inferiority might be socially induced. Dock points out that within the "curious mixture of traditional and enlightened thought . . . any major discussion of women is left to the minor contributors" and that, unfortunately, there is no program designed for educating women.

As regards the social role of woman, i.e., daughter, wife, and mother, the most noble and important function for the encyclopedists, in Dock's view, is that of mother. Laws reinforce and sanction the notion of woman's inferiority and exclude her from the power
professions, no matter that she is as capable as man, for example, in ruling the family. But she does have a role to play in raising children, in supporting mankind, hardly an avant-garde notion!

In addition to analyzing references to women in the *Encyclopédie*, Dock draws attention to notable absences, not just of women contributors but also of specific topics. For one thing, as she points out, the encyclopedists “omit any reference to the salons in which women exercised such power and influence.” This “conspiracy of silence” may have been a deliberate attempt to reduce the threat to “the stability of the bourgeois social structure.”24 But, again, we have no proof of an editorial policy.

Her conclusion, based upon many references to women throughout the *Encyclopédie,* is in some ways similar to Charbonnel’s, which grew out of a study of the four main entries “Femme.” But for Dock, the encyclopedists did not necessarily have the master plan to improve the lot of women, such as implied by Charbonnel; rather, with some of them debunking traditional notions of women and extending dignity to women, they may unwittingly have brought about subsequent changes in women’s condition, changes which none of them could have imagined.

And how did the encyclopedists extend dignity to women, whether deliberately or not? Certainly by favorable remarks scattered throughout the seventeen volumes of text. But likewise by according working women the same recognition as working men, by faithfully recording their labors and instruments of labor, as they sought to portray all facets of human existence, not only in the text but also in the eleven volumes of plates.

To date, there has been little attention paid to women as they are pictured in the plates. Yet we know from Diderot that “the volumes of text and the volumes of plates shed light on each other, correct each other, and complete each other reciprocally.”25

While one ideal of the emerging Enlightenment, under the impetus of Rousseau’s glorification of the nurturing female, was the woman who stayed home to care for husband and children, this was not the reality for contemporaries of the *Encyclopédie.* Lower- and middle-class women were needed in the work force. They took their places alongside men in shops, factories, and fields. Rarely leading or controlling but rather filling support roles, they were often given less physically demanding tasks, sometimes allowed to use their creativity, and sometimes replaced men. Women had their own exclusively female corporations. They also belonged to mixed corporations, where they were ordinarily hired into lower positions with lower pay.26

The volumes of plates better than the volumes of text usually describe women. Although the first seventeen volumes of text usually describe
occupations in general terms without referring to women at all, the volumes of plates recognize their importance in the work force and present them pictorially. In a way not possible to exploit in the realm of painting, where subjects had to be noble, heroic, pastoral, etc., where a Chardin was criticized for painting scenes of everyday life, the engravers of the Encyclopédie could portray life as it was.

When analyzing women as represented in the plates of the Encyclopédie, we realize immediately that we are not dealing with representation in great numbers. Many subject entries have no scenes or figures containing people at all. In the section “Architecture,” for example, the plates are of parts of buildings only. The subdivisions of “Histoire naturelle” have pages and pages of fish, insects, amphibians, etc., but no people.

It was, however, usual to include a vignette representing the studio or workshop for each industry or commercial occupation pictured. Even though women are definitely in the minority in the plates, some of them give us a most vivid idea of women at work. To understand the predominance of males, consider that in “Manufacture des glaces” (vol. 21), twenty-four plates show no women but 171 males working. A representative list of occupations where no women are pictured includes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>occupation</th>
<th>occupation</th>
<th>occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>basketmakers</td>
<td>grain threshers</td>
<td>shoemakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacksmiths</td>
<td>locksmiths</td>
<td>silk worm cultivators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canon makers</td>
<td>masons</td>
<td>tailors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cider pressers</td>
<td>military</td>
<td>tanners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clockmakers</td>
<td>miners</td>
<td>tile layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foundry workers</td>
<td>roofers</td>
<td>tool makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glassblowers</td>
<td>sculptors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, women predominate and outnumber men in plates and figures of occupations traditionally considered “women’s work”:  

making butter in a churn (18, “Œconomie Rustique, Laiterie,” fig. 1)  
working on bonnets (18, “Aiguillier-Bonnetier,” pl. 3, figs. 2, 4, 5, and 6)  
embroidering (19, “Brodeur,” pl. 1, fig. 2)  
cutting material to form a cloche (20, “Découpeur et Gaufreur,” pl. 1, fig. 1)  
making lace (20, “Dentelle,” pl. 1, figs. 1 and 2)  
making false pearls (21, “Emailleur à la Lampe, Perles Fausses,” pl. 2, fig. 3 and pl. 3, figs. 1-6)  
spinning and unwinding thread and wool (21, “Fil, Rouët, Dévidoirs,”
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pls. 1-2) or spinning and weaving (26, “Tapis de Turquie, Division des Fils et autres Opérations,” pl. 5, figs. 4 and 5)
making artificial flowers (21, “Fleuriste artificiel,” pl. 1)
washing, smoking, and salting sardines and herring (25, “Pesches de Mer,” pl. 12, figs. 1 and 2 and pl. 13, fig. 1)
sewing, arranging, adjusting feathers on hats and dresses for noble men and women and on adornments for horses’ heads (25, “Plumassier Panachier,” pl. 1 and pl. 2)

Even within industries usually associated with men, women can be seen at their “womanly” work or at the lightest tasks:

tending the fire and separating hemp fibers from bark while men are occupied with more physically demanding tasks (28, “Œconomie Rustique, Culture et Travail du Chanvre,” pl. 1, 1re et 2me Division)
sewing gut while men do nonsewing tasks (19, “Boyaudier,” fig. 3)
carrying sheets of cards to the cutter while men cut, paste, etc. (19, “Cartier,” pl. 1, fig. 5)
finishing the print characters the man had cast, by breaking letters apart and polishing them (19, “Fonderie en Caractères,” pl. 1, figs. 1 and 2)
preparing the material for the men who are making it into the finished product (20, “Cirier, en Cire à Cacheter,” pl. 1, figs. 1 and 2)
cutting material that a male worker is using to line a case (21, “Gainier,” pl. 1, fig. 3)
cutting rags from which to make paper and hanging paper on drying lines (22, “Papeterie, Délissage,” pl. 1, Bis, figs. 1 and 2; “Papeterie, Etendage,” pl. 12, figs. 2 and 3: “Papeterie, La Salle,” pl. 13, figs. 1-4)
whitening sheets of tin (23, “Métallurgie, Fer Blanc,” pl. 2)
brailing (25, “Perruquier, Barbier,” pl. 1, fig. c)
stitching a book, while men hammer, cut, or press bindings (25, “Relieur,” pl. 1, fig. b)
sewing on drapes (26, “Tapisssier, Intérieur d’une Boutique et différens Ouvrages,” pl. 1, fig. 1)
spinning, while men are at other tasks (26, “Tapisserie de Haute Lisse des Gobelins, Plan et Perspective de l’Atelier, des Métiers, et différentes Opérations,” pl. 1, fig. o)
dragging glass across the workshop, while men are shown blowing glass and working with machines (27, “Verrerie en bois,” second series, pl. 18, fig. 2).

At times women did not do the actual work of a trade or industry but contributed to the business in other ways. As wives or daughters, they ran the shop for husband or father; as widows, they inherited businesses that they then managed. Plates show:
a merchantwoman sorting corks (19, “Bouchonnier,” fig. 3)
the mistress arranging products (20, “Coutelier,” pl. 1, fig. 6)
a woman making a sale (21, “Ferblantier,” pl. 1)
two women behind the counter, selling furs (21, "Fourreur, Outils," pl. 5)
the mistress at the counter weighing and selling jewelry (25, "Orfèvre Bijoutier," pl. 1, fig. f)
a woman selling pastries to a male and a female client (25, "Pâtissier, Tour à Pate, . . . ," pl. 1ere).

We also find women working at less traditional tasks:

removing sheets of gold from the pounding board (19, "Bateur d’Or," pl. 1, fig. 3)
engraving silver (18, "Argenteur," pl. 1, fig. 1)
composing with letters cast in the shop (19, "Fonderie en Caractères," pl. 3, fig. 1)
turning a drum (20, "Blanchissage des Cires," pl. 2, fig. 1)
making pin heads of round points (20, "Cloutier d’Epingles," pl. 1, fig. 3)

inlaying gold or silver strands to give artistic designs that are successful or not according to the "genius of the artist." Such a reference to women’s creativity is rare in the volumes of plates. (26, "Piqueur et Incrusteur de Tabatière, Ouvrages et Outils," pl. 1, figs. a and e)
breaking old pottery to recover the glass in them (27, "Verrerie en bois, l’Opération de briser les vieux pots . . . ," pl. 8, fig. 3)
dragging glass across the workshop floor (27, "Verrerie en bois, Vue Intérieure du Four. . . .," pl. 18, fig. 2).

From the foregoing description of women in the volumes of plates, we can see that women had an important role in the rural and urban labor force. The plates give recognition to the working people making up this force, women included. Without the plates, an important facet of the lives of eighteenth-century women would have remained largely unrepresented to readers of the Encyclopédie.

To consider women and the Encyclopédie is to examine women in eighteenth-century France—as they are important to the endeavor of the Encyclopédie, as they are viewed by the encyclopedists, as they are represented in their everyday pursuits: a vast and fascinating topic. While the encyclopedists in their treatment of women are often guilty of common forms of bias—invisibility, stereotyping, imbalance and selectivity, unreality, fragmentation—the Encyclopédie nonetheless presents the other side of the coin as well. The good and the bad, the profound and the superficial, the complimentary and uncomplimentary coexist. Underlying everything, there is always the possibility for progress, hope for a better future. And if we agree with interpretations such as Charbonnel’s and Dock’s, the Encyclopédie is one of the works that prepared the climate of change and the actions that have more recently moved women closer to the goal of equality in France and elsewhere.
NOTES


For this essay, I consulted the Oregon State University edition of the Encyclopédie, which has the following publishers and dates: vols. 1-3, 9 (Genève: Chez Cramer l’ainé, et Cie., 1772); vols. 4-7 (Paris: Chez Briasson et al., 1754-1757); vols. 8, 10-17 (Neufchastel: S. Faulche et compagnie, 1765); vols. 18-28 (Paris: Chez Briasson et al., 1762-1772).

All further references to this work appear in the text; references to the first seventeen volumes of text include volume, page, and column notation; references to the eleven volumes of plates are to volume, plate title and number, and figure notation where pertinent.
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