

UNITED WISDOM

Women in the history of philosophy: how the canon is selected

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-32-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Women in the history of philosophy: how the canon is selected

Epigraph

> *“I do not wish them to have power over men; but over themselves.”*

Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), Chapter IV. The quotation follows the English original; RU uses our own translation. Verified text.

What this article is about

The history of philosophy usually begins with a sequence of familiar names. That sequence seems to be the history of thought itself: some authors pose questions, others answer, and others make the next turn. Women rarely appear, and their rarity is easily taken as evidence that they scarcely participated. Yet a syllabus primarily shows how that syllabus is arranged.

This article examines how a thinker gains a place in the canon through access to education, textual survival, recognition of a genre, publication, and repeated teaching. It does not propose declaring every forgotten author great or replacing evaluation of an argument with evaluation of sex. The task is more precise: distinguish an absence of thought from an absence of conditions under which thought becomes visible. Several verifiable examples show how recovering women’s texts changes both the number of names and our understanding of philosophical questions themselves. The practical consequence concerns any reading: whom do we accept as an interlocutor beforehand, and on what grounds do we exclude others before encountering their arguments?

I. The canon is a map that begins to govern the terrain

A canon is necessary because nobody can read everything. It offers a coherent route through a large corpus, permits comparison of questions, and provides a shared reference point. The problem begins when the route is treated as a complete inventory of roads that existed. What did not enter a textbook gradually becomes something that seemingly never existed.

Imagine a hypothetical course designer with twelve classes. They choose texts available in translation, supported by commentary, and familiar to colleagues. These are reasonable practical criteria. But each already depends on previous selection. An author long taught gains a new edition more easily; the edition helps include them again. Another thinker must establish significance without that infrastructure.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A cycle of accumulated recognition emerges. It need not be deliberately organized or require a teacher's ill intent. Its strength lies in local convenient choices reproducing global inequality of visibility. Readers see the result of many decisions but rarely the decisions themselves. After several generations of repetition, the sequence of names appears natural.

Feminist history of philosophy investigates this selection, recovers lost figures, and reconsiders acceptable genres of philosophical writing. Charlotte Witt and Lisa Shapiro's academic overview separately considers recovering authors and historiographical questions. This is a research program, rather than an assertion that every canonical text is useless. "Feminist History of Philosophy," Sections 2 and 2.4.

A modest but significant reading rule follows. Familiarity with an author is good grounds to begin, but weak grounds to end a search. If the philosophical problem concerns freedom, the body, or education, ask whose texts may have disappeared when the problem itself was defined. The map remains useful while it reveals its boundaries and allows new routes.

II. Unequal entry does not make thought empty

The conditions of producing thought cannot be inferred from its surviving result. Someone with a library, time, and recognized interlocutors can more easily develop an objection into a book. Someone excluded may have only a letter, conversation, or manuscript. This does not automatically strengthen their argument; it changes the likelihood that a subsequent reader will encounter it.

Anne Conway, who lived in the seventeenth century, received philosophical education through correspondence with Henry More. As a woman, she could not attend the university her brother attended. Her treatise appeared posthumously and anonymously in Latin in 1690. A particular chain of restrictions and transmission can be checked here without reducing it to a general story of silent women. Sarah Hutton, "Lady Anne Conway," Sections 1–2.

The example matters for its inconvenience to a simple scheme as well. Conway belonged to a privileged milieu and had access to a substantial private library. Gender restriction coexisted with advantages of position. Her history does not represent every woman of the period. It shows how conditions can simultaneously support thought and close its official path.

In a hypothetical contemporary situation, a similar distinction arises between participating in discussion and authorship of an accepted document. Someone may ask significant questions for years, but if minutes record only official presentations, the next generation sees a different conversation. This is an authorial analogy about documentation, rather than an assertion of historical identity.

Recovering participation therefore requires precise evidence: dated letters, editions, manuscripts, and interlocutors' replies. Wanting a worthy predecessor is insufficient. Honesty works both ways: no record cannot prove no thought, but a gap cannot be filled with a beautiful biography. Researchers must preserve the difference between a known restriction, an established text, and a conjecture about what may have gone unpreserved.

III. A text's form decides who is heard

A definition of philosophy is also a rule of admission. If only a large systematic treatise counts as philosophical, a letter becomes supplementary material. If a carefully developed objection in correspondence is admitted, the membership changes. Yet expanding the genre must not remove examination of content.

In *Philosophical Letters* (1664), Margaret Cavendish discusses motion, matter, and perception. In her letter on transferring motion, she asks successive questions: what moves from a hand to an instrument, is motion corporeal, and what happens to it after stopping? These arguments belong to her natural-philosophical system. They may be mistaken by contemporary physics' standards while remaining philosophical arguments requiring an answer. Cavendish, *Philosophical Letters*, Part I, Letter XXIII.

Reading this text only as an expression of the author's character misses its work. Accepting every image as a scientific discovery would be another mistake. The letter should be assessed through its question, assumptions, transitions, and objections. Genre then becomes a way of reasoning, rather than an excuse for a weak argument.

The same discipline is needed with religious writing. A theological framework does not prevent a text from containing a metaphysical argument. It establishes its grounds. Readers may reject those grounds, but must identify them before judging the conclusion. Otherwise "it is merely religion" performs the same excluding work as "it is merely a letter."

The boundary lies between an utterance that discloses its grounds and a formula demanding recognition without examination, rather than between prestigious and unprestigious forms. Philosophical reading seeks the first activity in different containers. Correspondence sometimes offers a more precise objection than a book; a long book sometimes offers only impressive repetition. Genre alone decides neither beforehand.

IV. Wollstonecraft challenges the shaping of reason

Returning a woman to the history of philosophy does not necessarily mean adding a subject about women. Mary Wollstonecraft asks how society forms the capacities it then uses to explain unequal treatment. In her argument, education and assessment become parts of one chain.

In *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, she challenges education that trains attractiveness and obedience rather than judgment. Her disagreement with Rousseau primarily concerns the grounds of Sophie's education. If reasonable action requires practice, one cannot systematically restrict practice and then treat the result as natural incapacity. Wollstonecraft, Chapters II and IV.

The argument's inner logic exceeds school curricula. Imagine a hypothetical adult permitted only to execute decisions. Later, initiative is demanded and its absence declared a personal characteristic. Accurate assessment requires distinguishing current skill from the history of opportunities provided. This excuses no error automatically; it is a condition of precise explanation.

Wollstonecraft retains her century's religious and moral grounds. She is not a ready-made spokesperson for every contemporary demand for equality. Her conceptions of virtue, family, and bodily differences require historical reading of their own. A strong argument about education can be used without turning the entire treatise into today's program.

Philosophical significance appears through an inconvenient question about universality. If reason is declared a universal human capacity, on what grounds are some people systematically denied conditions for developing it? A universal concept is tested through consistency of application as well as definition. Including Wollstonecraft therefore changes the substance of "reason and freedom," rather than merely correcting the number of women's surnames at a chapter's end.

V. Differences among women are no obstacle

Excluded thinkers cannot be recovered by replacing them with one position of "women's philosophy." Cavendish, Conway, and Wollstonecraft address different questions and grounds. They share no ready-made theory, but a particular relation to conditions of recognition. Even that relation varies case by case.

Cavendish develops her natural philosophy, where self-moving matter is important. Conway connects the created world's arrangement with divine attributes and rejects inert matter. Wollstonecraft examines education, reason, and moral independence. Reducing these works to an intuition of care or bodily experience would create another stereotype in place of exclusion. Cavendish, Part I; Hutton, Sections 2–3; Wollstonecraft, Chapters II–IV.

Disagreement signals actual philosophical participation. People enter history when they do more than confirm a reader's convenient expectation. They may defend a metaphysics the reader rejects, dispute a favored author, and make mistakes. Giving them a place means allowing examination in all this complexity.

It therefore helps to notice asymmetry of evaluation. A familiar man’s error often becomes a productive historical stage; an unfamiliar woman’s error becomes grounds to stop reading. In a particular case, that asymmetry still needs evidence, but the question is legitimate. We compare both authors’ conclusions and the rules by which a reader decides whether a mistaken argument deserves attention.

Class, education, language, and religious affiliation differ too. Adding several European aristocratic women does not create a worldwide history of women’s thought. This text deliberately confines itself to a few European cases. Its boundary makes the conclusion more precise: the familiar canon can expand through verifiable materials, but one successful recovery does not establish that every other line has been studied.

VI. Including a name and including a question are different actions

Formal inclusion can preserve an earlier course’s structure. A teacher adds one lecture on women while the other classes continue telling history without them. The list is more diverse; relations between questions scarcely change. This can be a useful beginning, but its result is bounded.

More substantive inclusion begins with a shared question. If a course discusses motion’s nature, particular arguments by different authors are placed together. If it examines freedom and education, Wollstonecraft enters the main conversation. If it investigates matter and spirit, Conway’s position becomes a possible answer, rather than a biographical note to a more famous interlocutor.

Someone must not be included only through her relation to a canonical man. That connection helps orientation but can return the center to others. An author “objects to Descartes,” “influences Leibniz,” or “corresponds with More,” but what does she assert herself? Name her own problem and argument first, then her relations with others.

A hypothetical reader can test one paragraph. Remove famous male names. Does an intelligible philosophical task of the woman remain? If only a biography of acquaintances remains, the description is insufficient. If a thesis, grounds, and difficulty remain, there is real participation. This checks exposition, rather than historically proving independence from influences.

A similar difference exists in family or workplace memory. Someone may be described as helping an important participant, or through a decision they proposed. The second changes the authorship of knowledge. History of philosophy requires particular caution with attribution,

but the principle is clear: a place in discussion is measured by whether the author’s question can change the explanation’s shared structure, rather than the number of mentions.

VII. Textual survival is no fair verdict

An archive retains traces that outlived their environment. It does not distribute them by merit. A manuscript may disappear accidentally; a text with many copies has more chances of survival. Contemporary visibility also depends on the book’s material history.

This does not mean every missing text was outstanding. Absence remains absence. But “if the work had mattered, we would know about it” requires an excessive assumption: transmission always preserves significance. Recognizing preservation and quality as different variables is enough to reject this convenient conclusion.

Research connects recovery and evaluation. First establish ownership, date, and what was transmitted. Then establish the argument’s meaning and compare alternatives. Beginning with a desire to prove greatness risks turning inquiry into a defense speech. Requiring already established fame makes recovery of new participants impossible.

A good edition facilitates examination but does not finish it. An editor’s introduction, translation, and treatise have different authors and statuses. They are especially easy to confuse electronically when everything occupies one page. A read annotation does not become a read book, and a historian’s view is not the thinker’s direct statement.

A small register helps readers: primary text, available passage, scholarly account, and one’s own conclusion. It need not be cumbersome. It prevents attributing an attractive idea to an author when a contemporary retelling created it. Recovering a voice requires respect for its actual words, including their inconvenience, unfamiliarity, or failure to supply expected inspiration.

VIII. Quality survives reconsideration of the old list

Criticism of the canon often prompts fear that representation will replace arguments. This is a real danger of badly performed selection. It does not establish that the earlier list is free of social criteria. The requirement is to make criteria explicit and apply them consistently.

Philosophical work can be assessed through its question, clarity of distinctions, strength of grounds, ability to withstand objection, and influence on subsequent inquiry. These features do not always coincide. An unfamiliar text may ask something important without visible influence; an influential system may retain a serious error. One indicator must not silently represent all others.

A course's task also differs from final evaluation of an author. A short course selects a text that helps with a particular problem. This does not make the other thinkers worse. Naming the time restriction makes selection more honest. Concealing it makes practical necessity look like a metaphysical verdict on the worth of someone else's thought.

A hypothetical anthology editor can record criteria first, then apply them to familiar and unfamiliar authors. If historical fame suffices for the first while the second must combine originality, contemporary relevance, and perfection, selection is asymmetric. Correction means a common procedure, rather than a compulsory positive decision in every case.

Consistency permits contextual differences. A small surviving corpus limits conclusions about a system; historical barriers explain participation's form. Explaining the form does not exempt the argument from scrutiny. Unjust conditions can be recognized, a weak argument called weak, and a strong question preserved together. This is more respectful than unconditional admiration that removes the thinker's right to be a serious, disputable interlocutor.

IX. Reading changes the distribution of authority

Every new reader helps continue the canon by recommending a book, choosing a quotation, and retelling history. Each action is small, but repetition creates future familiarity. Reader responsibility therefore exceeds passively correcting someone else's list.

Begin with one actual text, rather than a collection of famous women or a ranking of inspiration. Start with a question that interests you and a particular argument by a woman thinker. Read the available passage, name a premise, and record an objection. Such contact makes the author a participant in your thinking, even if disagreement follows.

Do not turn an author into a symbol without complexity. If Wollstonecraft is needed only as a predecessor, her reasoning may disappear behind a ceremonial portrait. If Cavendish is needed only as an unusual woman, her motion questions become exotic detail. Symbolic recognition matters but does not replace philosophical reading.

The reverse risk is requiring the first woman's text read to represent all women. A familiar man is generally not expected to do this. A thinker may be local, religious, disputable, or limited by her age. This is no failure of recovery. It is what actual history of philosophy looks like: incompatible attempts to understand the world, retaining their limits.

The sense of tradition changes. It becomes a network of transmitted and interrupted conversations, rather than a ladder of sole winners. Differences of scale remain: some works transformed entire fields. But scale now needs investigation, rather than inference from an absent name in a familiar sequence. Readers gain a harder, freer task: judge thought after encountering it, rather than by a place assigned beforehand.

X. Translation opens access to thought and changes it

Language access enters selection before readers compare arguments. If one author is available in several good translations and another only in an awkward fragment, impressions of clarity already form unequally. A difference in access quality is easily mistaken for philosophical quality.

This does not accuse translators: transmission always requires decisions. A historical term may have several contemporary equivalents; a familiar word may add an association. In a short text, one decision changes the whole argument's understanding. An important formulation deserves examination against an available original or commentary, especially when it seems unusually convenient for today's dispute.

In a hypothetical example, a reader encounters "reason" and hears logical reasoning. The source also discusses moral independence and education. Retaining only the first meaning impoverishes the argument. Adding modern psychological theory without grounds changes it. A good account restores connections between the term and the author's task, rather than merely replacing an old word with a prettier one.

Someone without the original language can name the translation, retain a locator, and compare available explanations. This cannot be presented as independent work with a manuscript. An acknowledged boundary does not humiliate the reader. It clarifies where their judgment depends on the thinker and where on a mediator.

Recovering women's history therefore includes invisible publishing work: preparing texts, establishing variants, translating, indexing, and commenting. This creates conditions for dispute. "Read more women" is insufficient if access remains harder. Working with the canon sometimes means making one significant text actually readable and verifiable for the next person, rather than selecting another name.

XI. Authorship can be relational but requires precision

Philosophy arises in conversations, but thought's collective character does not permit arbitrary redistribution of authorship. Presence nearby does not establish ownership of an argument. Absence of a name on the cover does not establish no participation. Both extremes obstruct actual history.

Ask about the contribution's character. Did someone propose a problem, write a passage, repair a proof, provide a translation, or maintain working conditions? These activities all matter but differ. Naming them precisely is more respectful than calling everything "help" or declaring coauthorship without evidence. Historical inquiry establishes contribution through documents; contemporary teams can agree beforehand how to record it.

In hypothetical editorial work, one participant writes and another notices a hidden premise that changes the central conclusion. Thanking the second only for “proofreading” removes a significant intellectual action. Calling them the author of the entire conception distorts in reverse. A good revision history describes which question was asked and what changed because of it.

This returns us to the canon. History need not consist only of heroic individuals. A network of relationships does not dissolve thinkers; it reveals them more precisely: who developed the question, objected, supplied access, and transmitted the text. In this record, care and organization do not automatically become metaphysics, while a metaphysical objection does not disappear under care’s general heading.

Fair recognition concerns verifiable differences of contribution. It neither awards identical titles to everyone nor leaves all credit to whoever could sign the result. This guides archivists and living readers alike: seek a person’s concrete action, then choose an accurate word for their place in the conversation.

What this means in practice

Take a philosophical subject you know: freedom, education, matter, or justice. Examine your usual authors. Immediate numerical equality is unnecessary. Name the list’s grounds first: which texts you read, which you know only through accounts, and which are available in your language.

Choose a woman thinker with a verifiable text on that subject. Read enough for one complete argument. Record question, answer, grounds, and strongest objection. If only an overview or annotation is available, mark that boundary. It supports further reading and prevents confident attribution.

Compare the argument with a familiar author using identical criteria. Do not demand greater perfection because the new text’s place is not established. Do not lower requirements out of sympathy either. Distinguish error, historical restriction, and a genuinely new question. Sometimes changing the problem’s formulation is the valuable result.

If you arrange a course, library, or family reading collection, include the author’s question in the main route. Explain why the text belongs here. A separate collection can introduce it, but lasting recognition arises when the work participates in shared subjects and becomes open to dispute.

Finally, examine the retelling. Whose thought is named their own, and whose appears only as help to someone famous? Who may err productively? These questions do not automatically

establish injustice in every case. They make selection visible. The canon remains a map, but readers begin to understand its making and can add a road they have actually traveled.

Key quotation

> *“Without knowledge there can be no morality!”*

Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Chapter IV. The quotation follows the English original; RU uses our own translation. It concludes her objection to restricting education. Knowledge concerns independent judgment’s development, rather than mechanical accumulation of information. Text.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity and boundary
Wollstonecraft: educating reason ↔ criticism of the syllabus canon	Both ask about conditions of intellectual participation. Contemporary historiography is not an eighteenth-century program.
Cavendish: motion questions ↔ familiar early modern causation debates	A woman’s text participates in a shared question. Her natural philosophy is not declared contemporary physics.
Conway: religious metaphysics ↔ Cavendish: natural philosophy	Both develop accounts of nature; material and theological grounds differ substantially.
Letter ↔ treatise	Both can contain successive justification. Genre itself guarantees no philosophical quality.
Historical recovery ↔ contemporary reader selection	Visibility depends on transmission in both. A personal collection cannot replace archival proof of authorship.

Primary sources and research

1. Mary Wollstonecraft. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792). Passages of Chapters II and IV were read: educational grounds, independence, and both quotations.

2. Margaret Cavendish. *Philosophical Letters* (1664). The preface and passages of Part I on motion and perception were read; the letter’s philosophical character.

3. Sarah Hutton. “Lady Anne Conway,” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Sections 1–3 and 6 were read: education, publication, and a brief account of the system. Conway’s entire treatise was not read.

4. Charlotte Witt, Lisa Shapiro. “Feminist History of Philosophy”. Sections 2, 2.1, and 2.4 were read: recovering authors, genres, and historiographical questions.

Tags

history of philosophy, women, canon, selection, Mary Wollstonecraft, Margaret Cavendish, Anne Conway, reason, education, independence, authorship, archive, letter, treatise, genre, historiography, religious metaphysics, natural philosophy, motion, matter, freedom, recognition, curriculum, translation, preservation, access, argument, equality, critical reading, philosophical dialogue

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.