Una Criatura Racional: Scientific Discourse and Female Participation During the Spanish Enlightenment

By

Caitlin Beduhn

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
(Spanish)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON 2023

Date of final oral examination: 05/09/2023

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:
Alicia Cerezo Paredes, Associate Professor, Spanish
Juan F. Egea, Professor, Spanish
Mercedes Alcalá-Galán, Professor, Spanish
Ellen W. Sapega, Professor, Portuguese

Dedication

I dedicate my dissertation to my children, Peter and Graham. My work would not have flourished and bloomed without daily reminders of your limitless capacity for love and curiosity in all that sparks wonder. May you always pursue that which challenges you and brings you joy.

Acknowledgments

I am in gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Alicia Cerezo Paredes, for her intellectual guidance, gentle elucidation, and persistent respect. Through your example I grew into a becoming a better scholar and through your kindness I felt supported in the process.

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the love and unwavering support of my husband, Christopher Westby. Your belief in my professional pursuits are made evident by the foundation of love that you have built for our family. Caring for our household is work that we see as a shared responsibility, and I'm convinced you're the best partner one could have for that job. I am forever grateful that you and I get to share life's adventures together.

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Juan F. Egea, Dr. Mercedes Alcalá-Galán and Dr. Ellen W. Sapega, for their interest and encouragement, never doubting that eighteenth-century studies was indeed meaningful.

Finally, thank you to all my family, friends and coworkers who fostered my work. You listened to my doubts, calmed my fears, lightened my load, and gave me the confidence to complete this project. ¡Gracias a todos!

Table of Contents

Dedication……………………………………………………………………………………i

Acknowledgments……………………………………………………………………………...ii

Table of Contents………………………………………………………………………...…iii

Abstract………………………………………………………………………………….…..iv

Introduction: Feminist and scientific "substances of thought" during Spain's Enlightenment 1

Chapter 1: (In)Felicidad femenina: Inés Joyes y Blake's Apología de las mujeres 41

Chapter 2: Engendering Knowledge: An Analysis of Eighteenth-Century Botanical Texts in Spain 92

Chapter 3: Las virtudes que da naturaleza - El Capricho Garden as a Locus of Female Participation in Eighteenth-Century Spain 137

Epilogue: Considerations of the Other in Feijóo's "¿Si hay otros mundos?"............................ 184

Works Cited 196

Abstract

In what terms can we best describe ourselves? One exercise of the Enlightenment was to define and categorize, often through rationalizations of intellect. Women, as defined in a Spanish dictionary in 1791, were considered rational but domestic *creatures*, a term that highlights their state as persons created, molded, and formed by others. Seeds of modern discourse that questioned patriarchal societal standards were sprouting in the eighteenth century, and we see the fruits of these seedlings grow in the years to come. Scientific rhetoric affected the definition of women and the limits of their participation in Spanish society in the Enlightenment, and vice versa. The limitations may or may not be self-imposed, but their origins come from deeply seeded ecclesiastical and patriarchal impositions that granted men superiority in their perceived moral, physical and intellectual strength over women. I reconsider the commonly held Enlightened belief that "ver es creer" through perspectives of feminist theory (Scott, Laqueur) and visual culture (Mieke Bal), and illustrate how scientific discourse helped to shape the enlightened debate defending the intellectual capacity of women in Spain. In the first chapter, I examine Joyes y Blake's "Apología de las mujeres" finely-tuned lexical skills that target stereotypes that have imprisoned women in their confined domestic space. In the second chapter, descriptions of plants in eighteenth-century botanical texts show an attempt to impose order on the classification of plants through scientific language that reflected and distorted societal limits on gender. In the third chapter, El Capricho garden at La Alameda becomes a mirror of these limits, both the absorptions and reflections mixing to offer an alternative perspective of the time while also pointing to future possibilities. This shows us a glimpse into how these two topics are blended into a space that is physical, mental, and social in nature. The intersection between

scientific discourse and the debate on the limits of female participation during the Spanish Enlightenment continues to influence our perceptions of truth and history of this time.

Introduction: Feminist and scientific "substances of thought" during Spain's Enlightenment

> "Many of the analytical terms imported into Enlightenment studies—print culture, consumer revolution, public sphere, transnationalism—are only tangentially related to the history of the substance of thought. Where ideological stakes are the highest, of course, the actual content of ideas tends to matter the most."
> Ruth H. Bloch, "The Origins of Feminism and the Limits of the Enlightenment", p. 475

In what terms can we best describe ourselves? The question of gender has continued to produce an infinite number of philosophical and social chasms, and Spain's history and literature prove this conundrum to be just as divisive. In the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, an entry published in Spain in 1791 subjectively defines a woman as a "criatura racional del sexo femenino," and then objectively identifies her as "la que está casada, con relación al marido." This lexicographical find first separates women as a biologically defined creature and then, therefore, as a socially bound figure, the wife. The same dictionary defines a man physically as an "animal racional, cuya estructura es recta, con dos pies y dos brazos, mirando siempre al cielo" and then subsequently as "sociable, próbido, sagaz, memorioso, lleno de razón y de consejo." What's clear is that the scientific discourse surrounding biological sex was, and is, entrenched in cultural politics, although it is, more often than not, brushed off as common knowledge or natural law.

One exercise of the Enlightenment was to define both Man and the Other, often through rationalizations of intellect. Women were considered rational, albeit domestic "creatures," a term that highlights their state as persons *created*, molded, and formed by others. During the late

eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, while political and scientific ideas circulated in metropolises like Madrid, fueling debates on natural and religious law, women were gaining more access to the public sphere. One aspect of these debates was made up of opposing voices that argued either for or against an increase in the role of women in Spanish society, examining traditional gender roles based both on moral and (or) scientific evidence. I see this increased acceptance of female participation in Spanish society by looking at the literary and visual exchanges that deal with science and gender, and by examining the common rhetoric used in both debates.[1] By studying the works of enlightened thinkers and the way scientific discourse saturated popular thought of the time, I propose we reconsider both literary figures, such as Padre Benito Jerónimo Feijóo, Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, and Inés Joyes y Blake, and visual producers,[2] such as the Duchess of Osuna, of the Spanish Enlightenment in order to arrive at a new understanding of how scientific discourse helped to shape the enlightened debate defending the intellectual capacity of women in Spain. I achieve this, specifically, through perspectives of feminist theory and visual culture.

During the Enlightenment in Spain, the dissemination of philosophy, thought and scientific discourse became more widespread and Spanish women, who had historically been regarded as biologically and intellectually inferior to men, became more visible through increasing independence and recognition in society. This dissertation focuses on female participation in the formation of Spain as a modern nation, as seen specifically through recorded textual debates as well as visually through artistic and cultural relevant sites of interest. I have

---

[1] By participation, I mean actively engaging both in public and private discussions and assemblies on Spanish society, government, literature, and the sciences.

[2] "Visual producers" is a term I engage with in my dissertation, as it encompasses the creators of multiple forms of visual production – such as art, literature, as well as public and private spaces.

chosen this topic because as scientific rhetoric and research methods provided new ways to examine societal and cultural problems, the participation by women in Spanish society also flourished. The intersection of scientific discourse and gender politics as debated in Spanish society has not been sufficiently treated thus far, but I am confident that it promises to add to the dialogue surrounding the importance of women during the Spanish Enlightenment.

My research interests include late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century texts that focus on female participation and its reception in Spanish society. Specifically, I examine how certain scientific discourse, such as that used to classify animals and plants, may be used to help to shape the enlightened debate defending the intellectual capacity of women. I see an important connection between the flourishing of both scientific rhetoric and research methods, which provided new ways to examine societal and cultural problems, and the participation by women in Spanish society. My research on female participation during the Spanish Enlightenment also aims to add to conversations surrounding visual studies, science and technology studies, and gender studies while opening up a new discussion surrounding the role of scientific discourse and rhetoric on philosophical, cultural, and political definitions of the individual.

The central question that inspires this dissertation is: *How do terms of scientific discourse and the effects of scientific rhetoric influence women's participation and how the debate on that activity was seen in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Spain?* To approach this problem, I ask some burning questions as a sort of framework of inquiries that have guided my interest and research pursuits throughout this analysis. We can think of the questions that I use to frame this introduction as divided into two categories: 1. the role of women in eighteenth-century Spain and 2. science and scientific discourse during the Spanish Enlightenment.

The Enlightenment in Spain is generally not a time that is celebrated or given much consideration in an academic setting. This is, to put it bluntly, a mistake. Seeds of progress were sewn in the Enlightenment and by taking a more creative glance at the works produced at this time, we shine a light on more "progressive" canonical pieces from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the interest of better understanding this era, first we must define what it is, both from a general concept in Western European history, and then specifically how it falls within the timeline of literary and cultural studies in Spain.

In "The Origins of Feminism and the Limits of Enlightenment", Ruth Bloch pushes against antiquated notions of what the Enlightenment might be and redefines it:

> "Whereas it used to be that the Enlightenment referred to a semi-coherent system of ideas involving the supremacy of reason, the dictates of natural law, and the progress of history, the term now tends to stand for an eclectic mix of social practices, cultural institutions, political ideologies, and divergent philosophical positions. One cost of this broader definition is that the Enlightenment threatens to lose its distinctiveness as an analytical category. Instead of standing for an intellectually defined movement, it has come to represent a chronological unit, the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, and a cultural geography, the modern West." (473-4)

The Enlightenment cannot be defined or captured in a single definition, but for the purposes of this study, I focus on this term to describe the time period in the second half of the eighteenth century and its turn into the nineteenth century. As Bloch mentions, the supremacy of reason, the search for truth and its didactic power, and the focus on natural law to shine a light on knowledge guided this era, both in Spain as well in the rest of Western Europe. Bloch also talks about the "abstraction" of the term Enlightenment in her piece, by which she means the

processes this point in history has undergone that has stretched the term to its limits. This is important because it highlights its role as a sort of umbrella term, highlighting the transmission of ideas and the political discourse that enveloped this time. My goal here is not to further abstract what we understand the Enlightenment to be, but rather return to the "supremacy of reason" with the purpose of spotlighting a time that is often skipped over in the literary history of Spain.

I also consider a contemporary view of the Enlightenment. Authors Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor muse on the role of women in the Enlightenment and its treatment in contemporary historical and literary studies in their "General Introduction" to *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*. They quote Eric Hobsbawm's *On History* as they ponder a current view of eighteenth-century studies: "Enlightenment is contentious. Once an age of reason, tolerance and emancipation, today it is routinely characterized as repressive and incipiently totalitarian: a 'conspiracy of dead white men in periwigs to provide the intellectual foundation for Western imperialism', in Eric Hobsbawm's satiric formulation" (xvi). This oppositional take on the Enlightenment highlights the need to study it as both a time of intellectual expansion and restrictive interpretations of societal roles that created a rigid hierarchy of the sexes. This aligns with my approach to the Enlightenment because I view the eighteenth century as paradoxical: ideas surrounding sciences, government, and societal roles were changing rapidly in an effort to encompass a new perspective of the world. Despite this forward momentum, persistent, and may times inaccurate, perceptions on gender roles and supposed superiority tainted the true potential of many egalitarian notions.

In the context of this analysis, the term Enlightenment refers to a historical time period, but also the intellectual pursuit to shine a focused light on science, conceptualizations of freedom

and free will, and, interconnected with both of these studies, the role of women in the expanding, modern Spanish society. I am interested in an excavation of the Spanish Enlightenment: an excavation as a means to unearth ideas and issues that came up during this era: Enlightened authors such as Padre Feijóo, Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos and José Cadalso were criticizing censorship guidelines and societal norms to challenge and provoke the reader to envision an alternative path for Spain as the country began to contemplate its identity as a nation. They championed educational reforms, called for a larger dispersal of wealth, and forced Spain to look at itself from a different perspective by comparing it to other nations suffering through similar growing pains. To study the eighteenth century is to take a trip back in time with the primary goal of excavation: re-reading, re-digesting, and re-analyzing some of the more disseminated texts of the century in a quest for a new understanding and approach, especially as these texts relate to the study of women.

Canonical authors such as Padre Feijóo and Leandro Fernández de Moratín were actively publishing works in the eighteenth century that questioned the role of the emerging female citizen. In the first chapter, I analyze a lesser-known text, “Apología de las mujeres”, where Inés Joyes y Blake pushed against the assertion that men were biologically superior to women, arguing that they deserved a more equal place in Spanish society in the late eighteenth century. In the second chapter, I take a closer look at a few botanical texts popular during this era, authored by Antonio Palau, Casimiro Gómez Ortega, and José Quer, and propose that the “politics of participation” in these publications prove that the cultural traditions of gender roles were intrinsic to the vernacular and affected scientific rhetoric and discourse. Finally, in the third chapter, I turn to the Duchess of Osuna, a prominent figure in Spanish elite society, and her role as the patroness and main director of the construction and design of El Capricho garden at the

Alameda, a large estate 8 kilometers outside of Madrid, arguing that her endeavors deserve a closer reflection in order to analyze the aforementioned intersection between scientific discourse and female participation. I analyze El Capricho garden as if it were a text because of its function: not only was it a recreational space, but also one that housed and fostered the production of knowledge. By examining scientific discourse during the Enlightenment, I reconsider these didactic, widely circulated works and the garden space to better understand the role of scientific rhetoric used to define the woman and the limits of her participation in Spanish society. The limitations may or may not be self-imposed, but their origins come from deeply seeded ecclesiastical and patriarchal impositions that granted men superiority in their perceived moral, physical and intellectual strength over women.

The analyses I do in this work show either an escape from these limitations or highlight the clumsily tied knots that bind them together. Language both affects and reflects the societal limitations, and this can be seen in didactic, scientific texts and projects as well. In Joyes y Blake's letter, she employs her finely tuned skills aiming to target language that has been used to imprison women in their confined domestic space. In the botanical texts examined in the second chapter, in an attempt to impose order on the classification of plants, scientific language reflects societal limits on gender, but the reflection is distorted by the absurdity of the metaphors forced upon the flora. Finally, the garden examined in the third chapter becomes a mirror of these limits, both the absorptions and reflections mixing to offer an alternative perspective of the time while also pointing to future possibilities.

Because of my experience as an art history student during my undergraduate studies, and then my subsequent work as a bilingual legal advocate at a domestic abuse shelter, my methods on approaching literature and Spanish culture have been highly influenced by my other

interests. Through my studies of visual culture, I have greatly expanded my theoretical knowledge and have been especially influenced by thinkers such as Mieke Bal, who suggest that, through visual culture, we must focus on objects of a visual nature that intersect with cultural processes and practices so that we can take discourses that are presented as historical and true and then excavate and dissect them, allowing alternative narratives to emerge. Feminist theorists such as Judith Butler, Thomas Laqueur and Donna Haraway have challenged me to question notions of gender through a lens of history of science and scientific discourse with the aim of challenging master narratives that represent a clear dichotomy between man and woman. My work speaks to multiple disciplines, thus theoretical frameworks applied in fields such as the history of science, science and technology studies, architecture, landscape architecture, urban planning, women's studies, art, art history, and visual culture have enriched my theoretical and analytical approaches to research in this dissertation.

Methodology and Theoretical Framework:

Although my analyses focus heavily on literature and visual culture, my goal has always been to question the ways of knowing we take as everyday truths and in turn ask where they came from, who they support and who they subjugate. Almost all parts of our societal network are tainted by power structures that benefit the few and harm the majority. While investigating the history of women in Spain, the fields of visual culture and gender studies have proved to be monumentally important by offering an alternate perspective to the more commonly studied, male-authored canonical eighteenth-century works. By studying Spanish cultural and literary productions that challenge the historically conservative "norms," I find historical analysis of a distinct female voice to be a useful guide to my research, with help by scholars such as Bloch

and Joan Scott. Visual culture theorists such as Bal find the interplay between the object and its historical context and, more importantly, what can be learned about history from that object. In "Visual essentialism and the object of visual culture," she asserts that "visuality as an object of study requires that we focus on the relationship between the seen and the seer" (14). Literary and artistic productions can be seen as both creative outlets of their time as well as recorded historical events. Because men dominate much of the Spanish literary and artistic canon, it is pertinent to study women who were actively producing and financially supporting artistic works to better understand their role in Spanish history through the perspective of gender studies and feminist epistemology, as seen in works by Haraway and Laqueur. I see my work adding to current conversations about the role of women during the Spanish Enlightenment, specifically conversing with works by Sally-Ann Kitts and Theresa Ann Smith, while inserting the necessary ruminations of scientific discourse and rhetoric into the discussion. By looking towards the periphery of both discussions, I find points of dialogue and understand the role of the emerging female citizen in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Spain.

In this dissertation, I reconceptualize the eighteenth century in Spain, an era, especially in Peninsular literature studies, that is generally pushed aside and regarded as less important when compared to the literary legends that came from its predecessors in the Golden Age and the lettered luminaries that followed in the second half of the nineteenth century. We might ask, so what? I push against this disregard and pinpoint how the contemplation of the intersection of science and the debate on the role of women shows us the subversion of the enlightened concept that "seeing is believing", coupled with the assertion that language matters, leads us to a broader perspective on the role of women during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and shows their potential as creators and contributors within society.

It's useful now to return to the burning question that inspired this work in an effort to explore the frameworks of this introduction: *How do terms of scientific discourse and the effects of scientific rhetoric influence women's participation and how the debate on that activity was seen in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Spain?* I begin by delving deeper into the role of women in eighteenth-century Spain and ponder whether the term *female participation* is equivocal to the democratization of gender in that moment. And if so, can we speak about outspoken, prominent female figures active during the Spanish Enlightenment and not speak about social, political, and cultural differences between the sexes? Does this discussion necessarily mean that one is speaking about *feminism*? If so, what does this *feminism* look like and how does it differ from the known political movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries?

I then examine the second topic of interest in this introduction: how what is now (and then) considered scientific study affected the reason and rhetoric was shaped during this time period. I wonder what the social, economic, and cultural implications of science during the Enlightenment in Spain might be. Specifically, why is *botany* of particular interest in this dissertation and what does it have to do with gender? What were women's roles in regard to scientific investigation and study? What does this mean for women (as citizens, as political bodies, as scientists, as intellectuals, etc.)? The purpose of proposing these questions is not to suggest that this work can complete the job of answering them; rather, it is embracing my curiosity about the eighteenth century in Spain, while questioning the intersecting roles of science and the debate on women. This dissertation adds to the studies on the significance of women's contribution to literary and cultural frameworks during the Enlightenment in Spain.

Before I answer these questions, it is critical to define some key terms and concepts relevant to the study of women and women's participation in eighteenth-century Spanish society and the role of science during the eighteenth-century and how it was used to propel the engine of discovery and understanding of the natural order of world. Gaining a general understanding of how I use key terms and concepts in this dissertation provides a framework to the burning questions I listed previously, as well as provide a guide to the reader to reconsider the eighteenth century in Spain as one that deserves renewed attention.

Framework #1: The role of women in eighteenth-century Spain

Although over 200 years have passed since the publication of "Defensa de las mujeres" by Padre Feijóo, large gaps remain in literary canons and historical accounts regarding ***female participation*** in eighteenth-century Spain. Where are the women? This question becomes even more important as we think about the role of scientific discourse and rhetoric in the Enlightenment. Women, much like their *patria*, were in a paradox: they held onto traditional societal ideals about their place in the domicile as the *perfecta casada,*[3] while also trying out their new role as a participating member of society.

[3] The reference to *la perfecta casada* comes from the Fray Luis de León and his sixteenth-century text in which he describes proper behavior for young and newly married women. This text became fundamental in its misogynistic description of the female in Spain, reinforcing patriarchal ideals that saw women as inferior to men. Throughout my work, I provide a more in-depth overview of the history of the discourse on women in Spain.

Question 1: is the term female participation equivocal to the democratization of gender during this time period?

In order to answer my first question I turn to historians such as Mónica Bolufer Peruga, Kitts, and Smith who provide indispensable research and resources on the history of women in Spain, specifically in the eighteenth century. Bolufer Peruga's research has focused on Inés Joyes y Blake as well as Josefa Amar y Borbón, highlighting works by these female authors that are many times lost in discussions on eighteenth-century Spanish literature. Kitts and Smith work from a historical perspective in their study of the Spanish female citizen during the Enlightenment and both critics provide readings of Feijóo's "Defensa de las mujeres" that review the larger implications of the eighteenth-century essay. All of these scholars mentioned have gone against traditional historical methodologies and instead contribute an alternative perspective by providing examples of dynamic women as active members in Spanish society.

The terms surrounding the function and role of women in Spanish society are fundamental to define because this key terminology used throughout my analyses. Gender is a category that can be understood as both biological and social.[4] One of the terms that continually came up as problematic was the term *female participation*. This is the term that I focus on first, as it will appear throughout the text, and it may cause confusion or misunderstanding if not properly defined in the introductory portion of the thesis. In the quest to guide the definition and contextualization of women's participation in society, and in an attempt to address concerns over anachronism, I dive deeper into the analysis of texts, images, and historical circumstances that

---

[4] Scott understands gender as a category that is both biological and social. She discusses this more in her article "Gender: still a useful category for analysis" and book *Gender and the Politics of History*. Another useful edited volume on the topic is *The Question of Gender* (edited by Judith Butler, et al).

were framed by the conjunction of the religious societal structures of the past and the egalitarian reexaminations of social roles and classifications during the eighteenth-century with an eye toward imagining a new future.

I define the term *female participation* as the active engagement both in public and private discussions and assemblies on Spanish society, government, literature, and the sciences. This term can also be applied to women's work outside of the domestic realm. By domestic realm, here I mean to refer to a conservative view of women's role in society, a view that bookended the eighteenth-century debate on where women belong and what, if any, capacity they could have in a public setting. Fray Luis de León exposed his belief that women's duties and purpose lie solely within the domestic realm as a servant to her husband and family as he laid out in *La perfecta casada*. In the text, the author reminds his female reader how to behave as a married woman, giving advice to her both as a wife and mother. Published in 1583, this text was popular and distributed widely as a guide for the newlywed, clearly defining the role of women in society as being domestic and little else.

As other historians have remarked, women have been present in Spanish cultural and literary history for centuries, but many critics today shy away from speaking about their contributions as participatory in the evolution of Spanish society. By focusing on women in cultural, economic, and scientific progressions, we can understand how their participation has shifted and grown throughout. In her introduction to *El feminismo en España: Dos siglos de historia*, Pilar Folguera asserts that many historians have only focused on political movements or projects when studying feminism, but that "se han abandonado ya, por fortuna, concepciones trasnochadas que enfatizaban excesivamente a protagonistas individuales que si bien tuvieron una participación destacada en el devenir histórico no eran sino la excepción de una mayoría

silenciada por los investigadores." Folguera highlights the need to not only look to the commonly known main actors in the evolution and growth of female participation in society, but also why we must look to those that played quieter, but key, roles, even though history has forgotten them.

Other cultural historians have echoed Folguera's push to expand our understanding of women's history and feminism in Spain. In the introduction to *Recovering Spain's Feminist Tradition*, editor and author Lisa Vollendorf ponders nineteenth and twentieth-century history and posits: "Despite a growing number of feminists in all regions of Spain, Spanish women do not appear as either authors or subjects in anthologies of feminist thinking and criticism published in English" (2). She opines that Spain, and particularly Spanish women, have remained on the periphery of the debate and discussion regarding the history of feminism and female participation in the shaping of modern Western societies. She argues that this is due to the larger problem of "treating Spain as an anomaly in Western Europe" (2) because of its "different" cultural and religious makeup as well as the fact that it is geographically on the periphery of Europe.

Some historians contend that Spain was "late to the game" when it comes to historical figures that pushed boundaries and ideas surrounding women's role in society. They assert that this is because of Spain's delayed arrival to the industrial revolution, or that the restoration of the monarchy in the nineteenth century led to a more conservative approach to gender roles. Vollendorf suggests that in Spain "conditions were not right for feminist coalition building and large-scale advocacy until the 1900s" (5). But the author further problematizes only talking about women and feminism after the rise of the social and political movement in Spain in the twentieth century: "An unintended result of this decidedly modern frame of reference is the exclusion of

women who, over the centuries, have embraced feminist ideologies without participating in organizations or social movements. When such women are studied, their examples frustrate the seemingly easy delineation of the birth of feminism" (8). I agree with Vollendorf and push this idea further by contemplating the convergence of boundary pushing female figures in eighteenth-century Spain with the simultaneous surge of interest in science as a way to understand and organize social orders.

While women certainly were a small percentage of producers, Knott and Taylor surmise in *Gender, Women and Enlightenment* that "…it was as objects of intellectual discourse that women loomed largest in Enlightenment" (xviii). This stresses the centrality of the topic of women in discussions on civility and science, a key to social improvement. When pondering how women fit into enlightened ideals, Knott and Taylor think through the idea of the woman as an object, not necessarily a subject. As they state, the term "feminism" as we understand was not used until the late nineteenth-century, but "…by the late seventeenth century…pro-women sentiment was an acknowledged (it not always reputable) feature of progressive opinion" (xvii). Enlightened thoughts circulated not only in philosophical works, but also trickled down to content consumed by a wider audience, in novels, journalism, and essays. I think about this in relation to Zarco Paic and Kresimir Purgar's approximations to objects of study in *Theorizing Images*: "Objects are sites at which discursive formation intersects with material properties" (11). Women are both objects and object producers, therefore the discourse intersections were numerous.

Instead, I argue that through studies of female participation in Spanish society in the eighteenth-century, we can approach new understandings of the Spanish Enlightenment and understand the role that scientific discourse played in debate on the role of women. Women

certainly did live in a paradox at this time, at one hand yearning for a more inclusive space in public life while still maintaining their roles as wives and mothers. Thus the answer to the question I first pose is no, the term female participation does not refer to, nor does it try to equate itself with, the idea of the democracy or balance of both the masculine and feminine genders in the Spanish Enlightenment. There was most certainly not an equality of male and female presence in Spanish political or social society during this time, nor do I intend on making this lofty claim.

Question 2: Can we speak about outspoken, prominent female figures active during the Spanish Enlightenment and not speak about social, political, and cultural differences between the sexes?

Women have had varied roles throughout Spain's history. Kitts in *The Debate on the Nature, Role and Influence of Women in Eighteenth-Century Spain* writes that historically:

> "…woman was seen as the sum of a set of negatively predefined moral characteristics which were then used to justify a whole series of gender inequality: the political, the legal and economic subordination of women to men; their secondary and supportive role within the family and society as a whole; that women were inherently less intelligent than men; and that, in any case, they required very little education in order to fulfill their roles as set out by God and which amounted to the breeding and raising of children, to running the household and to providing emotional support and company for men after their day's work." (3)

In the eighteenth century, this viewpoint began to change, in that thinkers began to focus on the changing role of women in home (private) and society (public) spaces. We can see this

connectedness in the discussion on societal and contemporary issues forms the debate on women in Spanish society. Kitts describes three different types of writers that can be perceived:

1. those who wanted to see no change in women's social roles;
2. those who wanted little or no change, but regarded women as intellectual beings; and
3. those who desire and welcome change.

Kitts contribution to this history highlights the importance of periodicals as vital in bringing the debate to a wider audience.

It is also important to discuss socioeconomic class in the discussion of female participation in eighteenth-century Spain. Talking about socioeconomic class is not an excuse to ignore the work done by women not fortunate enough to be allowed into noble and intellectual spaces at this time. Rather, I suggest we frame this as a way to approach female thought and production during this time period. When talking about participatory women in Spanish society, we are speaking about a higher-class woman with access to a certain sector of nobility and intellectual commodities.[5] To tackle this topic, we must think through the public versus the private sphere, a distinction that was made even more prominent during the eighteenth-century due to the rise of the *ilustrado* and the space of the *tertulia.*[6]

---

[5] Elizabeth Smith Rousselle thinks through this, specifically regarding rhetoric used by male versus female writers: "A major difference between privileged Spanish female and male modern subjectivity is the degree to which the subject experiences disillusion with the general ethos of modernity and its profound changes. Spain's' conflicted relationship with modernity generates a disillusion among canonical male writers that tends toward pessimism and self-destruction, while privileged women writers overcome this same sense of disillusion by appealing to modes of power frequently linked to the feminine such as exalted maternity, fluidity, a postmodern-like discourse, antipositivism, transcendentalism, mysticism, marriage, and resilience" (p. 8).

[6] For a broader understanding of what public versus private space is for women, reference Joan B. Landes's *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution* and Jean B. Elshtain's *Public Man Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought*.

Eterio Pajares Infante notes that Inés Joyes y Blake, the Spanish author of "Apología de las mujeres" and translator that I analyze in my first chapter, was "una dama de clase media alta, de la naciente burguesía, la que se va a posicionar a favor de las de su sexo" (184). Biographical and critical work on Joyes y Blake and her writing is lacking, so it is unfortunate that in one of the few pieces on her life's work her interest in the debate on women's roles in Spanish society is deduced to a mere product of the class in which she was born. Certainly growing up in a bilingual household and, therefore, having access to a wide breadth of literature was afforded to Joyes because of her privileged class, but that cannot be the only reason she wrote "Apología." If that were the case, every Spanish women of middle to upper class would have penned a document in support of a greater role of female participation in Spanish society. To suggest that she positions herself on the side of women in the debate on gender roles because of her class demeans her intellectual interests and pursuits.

Elizabeth Smith Rousselle offers some important reflections in *Gender and Modernity in Spanish Literature: 1789-1920*. The author delves into the topic of modernity by looking at various philosopher's understanding of what it means to be modern and the transition to modernity that Spain experienced. She comments that Enlightenment reformers grappled with questions on education and economic reform and that competing discourses on Spanish modernization came from religion and science: "Examination of eighteenth-to early twentieth-century canonical female and male writers' reactions to these competing discourses of Spanish modernization demonstrates how the female subject is extricated from her limited role as the ángel del hogar (*angel of the house*) or the object of the usual subject-object paradigm marking the Cartesian duality of the modern male subject" (p. 8). Women were highlighted in these discourses because their role in Spanish society was central to the goal of modernity.

In Paula de Demerson's *Catálogo de las Socias de honor y mérito de la Junta de Damas Matritense (1787-1811)*, she offers a detailed look at the formation of the Junta de Damas in the late eighteenth century in Spain. In her study, she reflects that the formation of the group was both a contentious and delayed process, paralleling the more widely debated role of women during this time. De Demerson says that "…quedaron arrolladas las últimas resistencias y por primera vez en España, las mujeres, a semejanza de los varones, se lanzaron a los negocios públicos" (1), highlighting the importance of this group in regards to its impression on the perception of gender politics in the public eye. Despite these social gains, women both lived and wrote through a paradoxical understanding of what it meant to be female. The formation of the Academy of Fine Arts of San Fernando in 1752 coincided with budding female acceptance in the public sphere of Spanish society, and women were almost immediately accepted as members into the Academy. In *tertulias,* both men and women gathered to circulate manuscripts and share ideas on social, cultural, and political issues. And in 1787, Charles III made a royal decree proclaiming his support of women's admissions into the Madrid Economic Society of Spain, thus creating the Junta de Damas, or women's council, dedicated to women and their involvement in the economy. [7] Women were expected to retain their traditional role as a wife, but many also hoped to be recognized as a viable counterpart to their husbands within the public sphere of society.

[7] As de Demerson notes in her study, the women permitted to join the Junta de Damas were of the upper class of Madrid's society (2). As researchers we must tag a disclaimer on any mention of groups during this time that were pushing against conservative notions of gendered participation as they were predominantly populated and run by women of the upper class that were privileged in their education and access to public officials and intellectuals that helped them form women's groups such as the Junta de Damas.

Misogynistic beliefs were not new to eighteenth-century philosophic understandings of gender, but were rather rooted in centuries of oppression of women.[8] In the beginning of the sixteenth century, in *De institutione feminae christianae* (*Instrucción de la mujer cristiana*) from 1535, Juan Luis Vives wrote that "…todo el bien y mal que el mundo se hace se puede sin yerro decir ser por causa de las mujeres," arguing further that any education of women should be limited to domestic duties.[9] In the latter half of the same century, Fray Luis de León wrote *La perfecta casada* based on his belief that women are physically, intellectually and morally inferior to men on his reading of the Bible, and therefore argued that females are in need of very little education because it is their sole duty to create a happy and harmonious domestic environment. In *The Debate on the Nature, Role and Influence of Woman in Eighteenth-Century Spain*, Kitts articulates: "*La perfecta casada* is a text which has a noticeable influence on the views of women well beyond the eighteenth century. It was a popular book which was reedited many times and is referred to or imitated by a number of eighteenth-century authors" (2).

Despite economic and social gains in the eighteenth century (as compared to acceptance in previous centuries), Spanish women faced an unrelenting battle against authors such as Laurencio Manco de Olivares, Jaime Ardanaz y Centallas, Juan Antonio Santareli, Salvador Joseph Mañer, and others who published vitriolic writings in which they expounded on their belief that women were inherently inferior. In *Mujeres e Ilustración: La construcción de la feminidad en la España del siglo XVIII*, Bolufer Peruga claims that these writers adopted "[…]la

---

[8] Authors such as Patricia Fara and Londa Schiebinger have written comprehensive works that dissect anti-women writing since the beginning of history, interlacing their findings with the dire consequences of these beliefs.

[9] Kitts discusses Vives' influence of Erasmian humanism in sixteenth-century Spain, focusing on his interpretation of female intelligence and education.

pose en apariencia distante del filósofo que se remitía a la evidencia" (27), showing preference for a language that was "especulativo y polémico" instead of one based on logic and reason. Many of these authors reacted to Feijóo's 1726 essay on woman, "Defensa de las mujeres" ("Defense of Women"), questioning his pro-women views and advocating for value in female virtue.[10] Feijóo discusses why and how women should be included in the more modern, egalitarian, and humanist societies imagined by enlightened thinkers. Feijóo's response stands out because of his unique role as a religious clergyman that was trained in the sciences who exalted humanist and enlightened ideals, applying them to contemporary cultural and societal issues such as female education and equality.[11]

The *cuestión de la mujer* was a topic of heated debate during the eighteenth century. Authors such as Feijóo and Amar y Borbón debated to what degree women should participate in Spanish society. At the same time, the enlightened thinker was pondering the social, political, cultural, racial, and biological differences of the human race. In many of the debates on women, authors insisted that women were physically and mentally inferior to men, while others challenged these arguments with claims that women have not had the same access to education as men. Therefore, I believe it is necessary to discuss the social, cultural, and political differences between the sexes when talking about women who were actively playing a role in Spanish society.[12]

---

[10] Kitts, *The Debate on the Nature, Role and Influence of Woman in Eighteenth-Century Spain*.

[11] Kitts notes that the most apparent influence for "Defensa de las mujeres" is by a French author, François Pulain de la Barre's (*De l'égalité des deux sexes* published in 1673)

[12] It is also important to ponder what the debate on women looked like outside of Spain in other Western European nations, because Spanish intellectuals were so greatly influenced by French and English philosophers and thinkers. Women such as Olympe De Gouges (France) and Mary

Question 3: Does the cuestión de la mujer necessarily mean that one is speaking about feminism? If so, what does this feminism look like and how does it differ from the known political movement of the 20th century?

Typically, feminism is defined as a movement that fights for the political, social, and economic equality of women. Chronologically speaking, the feminist movement did not appear until the mid-to-late nineteenth century, and even later in the Spanish society. Therefore, I am not talking nor am I equating any of the participatory activities of women in the eighteenth century in Spain as part of the feminist movement. Carolyn C. Lougee wrestles with this term when she writes about seventeenth-century French women in her book, *Le Paradis des Femmes: Women, Salons and Social Stratification in Seventeenth-Century France*, "The term 'feminism' is used to denote nothing other than the positive response to the question whether women should play a public role in French society." In other words, Lougee does not shy away from the term just because it can be used to refer to the posterior political movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but rather she embraces the term as exemplary of the visible role women played in French society in the seventeenth century.

In my framing of the discussion on feminism in my work, I turn to some ideas brought forth by Lisa Vollendorf in her introduction to the collection of essays entitled, *Recovering Spain's Feminist Tradition*. This book is a compilation of a variety of different literary critics who discuss the role of women in Spain's literary and cultural history. Vollendorf also grapples with the term *feminism* when she rightly states that any mention of Spanish women is rarely found in anthologies or compilations of texts on feminism in the Western hemisphere because Spain has

---

Wollstonecraft (England) led the way for authors such as Josefa Amar y Borbón and Inés Joyes y Blake.

historically been treated as an anomaly. Vollendorf then continues to problematize only talking about women and feminism after the rise of the social and political movement in Spain in the twentieth century: "An unintended result of this decidedly modern frame of reference is the exclusion of women who, over the centuries, have embraced feminist ideologies without participating in organizations or social movements. When such women are studied, their examples frustrate the seemingly easy delineation of the birth of feminism…The application of the term feminist to oppositional thought (consciousness) and to larger commitments to social reorganization (movements) highlights the historical continuity among women from different time periods" (8). She makes an incredibly important point when she claims that by avoiding the term feminist, we may be avoiding talking about women who have participated in social organizations and movements before the twentieth century. She embraces the term as a way to describe women who have rebelliously worked to disrupt the patriarchal hierarchy present in much of Spain's history. Therefore, these oppositional female workers will not look the same as those in the twentieth century, nor will their arguments be the same, but their desire to challenge societal norms should not be ignored. The topic of modernity and its relation to gender politics is crucial to my study and my insistence that eighteenth-century female participation indeed did have a ripple effect in the development of modern-day gender relations and feminism in Spain.[13]

Laqueur's understanding of sex and gender during the eighteenth century in *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* is helpful here as well. He points to the formation of

---

[13] For further insight on the topic of Spanish modernity as it is related to gender during the Enlightenment, see Smith Rousselle's *Gender and modernity in Spanish Literature: 1789-1920* (2014). Also see Rita Felski's *The Gender of Modernity* (1995). For more on gender and the modern Spanish subject, see Jo Labanyi's *Gender and Modernization in the Spanish Realist Novel* and Alda Blanco's article "Gender and National Identity: The Novel in Nineteenth-Century Spanish Literary History".

the two-sex model, essentially that men and women are intrinsically different (as opposed to the one-sex model that was predominant before the eighteenth century that stemmed from the belief that women were essentially a weaker, less perfect version of the male body), as a product of the new push to believe in biology. Therefore, as seventeenth-century British philosopher John Locke argues, men were naturally the head of the household because they were stronger and more mentally fit than women. Laqueur states that the one-sex model that viewed men as more perfect beings than females never really dissipated, but rather the focus on biology and therefore the two-sex model "proved" this to be true. During the second half of the eighteenth century, biological differences were highlighted to the extent that women were differentiated from their male counterparts, still categorically inferior due to their inherent biological defects.[14] Laqueur suggests that many scientific investigations on the female body were completed under the notion that man is inherently superior to woman. For this reason, the results of anatomical and biological studies "proved" women's physical and mental weaknesses.

Scholars such as Joan Scott, Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter have questioned the fundamentals of historical analysis, calling for an overhaul in methodology so as to be inclusive to the female. Thomas Laqueur's *Making Sex* also demands an alternative interpretation of women and her changing role in society. In the past twenty years, there has been an increase in publication on the topic of women and women's history in Spanish literature, which is sure to enrich the field and future scholars. Nevertheless, bearing in mind the role of scientific discourse in the increased activity of women in eighteenth-century Spanish society, there still seems to be a deficiency in current research. As Patricia Fara explains in *Pandora's Breeches: Women, Science*

---

[14] Another interesting consideration here is Carole Pateman's idea of the sexual contract, which ultimately is derived from the patriarchal social order in her book, *The Sexual Contract*.

and Power in the Enlightenment, "Scientific history is not only about knowledge itself. It is also about how that knowledge was reached, taught and used. Broadening what counts as science's history entails recognizing and crediting women's involvement" (25). I answer Fara's call to include women in the discussion of the history of science and, in turn, better understand how scientific discourse and rhetoric affected opinions on women's growing participation in eighteenth-century Spain.

Framework #2: Science and scientific discourse during the Spanish Enlightenment.

Science becomes a contentious term when considering its social and intellectual implications in the study of eighteenth-century literature. This term may cause confusion or misunderstanding if not properly analyzed and situated. In the introduction to *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe,* editors William Clark, Jan Golinski, and Simon Schaffer contend that the term "sciences" may not be best understood as a uniform principle due to the geographical differences and that these differences influenced how the sciences were studied, utilized, and understood. The authors assert that due to principles of discipline, we can think of the sciences during the Enlightenment to be defined by "processes of classification and exclusion" (23). This certainly can be applied to the understanding of the sciences in Spain during the eighteenth century.

In order to understand what was happening in the late eighteenth century in Spain, it is necessary to look back at the history of the term "science" and how it evolved over time, as well as understand how scientific studies understood and presented gender differences in its discourse. The notion of science and its role in society was vastly evolving during the eighteenth century in Spain. Divisions that we now have in scientific studies did not exist in the same

organization three centuries ago, and for this reason it is important to remember that our modern approaches to studying how science affects cultural happenings and vice versa are inherently different than those discussions during the 1700s and early 1800s in Spain. As Londa Schiebinger articulates, “From the Middle Ages through the Renaissance botany was studied for one primary reason: plants were used as medicines. In the eighteenth century, however, focus shifted from the medicinal virtues of plants to find abstract and universal methods of classification. Paradoxically, this ‘scientization’ of botany coincided with an ardent ‘sexualization’ of plants” (11-12). The author assertion that we see a fundamental turn in the way botany was studied and deemed purposeful was apparent in Enlightened Europe (and I will soon return to her important observation that the “scientization” of botany was concurrent with plant’s “sexualization”).

Question 1: What is science during the Spanish Enlightenment and how does it differ from the term science today? What are the social, economic, and cultural implications of science during the Enlightenment in Spain?

In “The Images of Science in Modern Spain”, Agustí Nieto-Galan helps us to understand the pessimistic view of scientific culture in Spain: “For many Spanish historians, the Enlightenment has become one of the ‘mythical’ periods of the history of Spanish science, a golden age to hark back to when discussing weaknesses and problems of research and education in later years” (75). He argues this is because of a feeling of inferiority, Spanish historians of science have too quickly accepted the “view of Spanish science as a mere imposition of a dominant scientific culture from the North” (74). This has had disastrous implications on the study of science in

early modern Spain, although authors such as Elena Serrano are pushing to change this narrative.[15]

As we begin the discussion on science in the Spanish Enlightenment, it is important to note how the term "science" changed throughout the eighteenth century. As mentioned in the preface to *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, the eighteenth century has long been overlooked, surrounded by the bookends of the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution. Editors Clark, Golinski and Schaffer reference the "Scientific Revolution", a term coined in the 1930s, as a historical construction, meant to pinpoint "…a singular break in the secular interest that has assumed institutional centrality in the historiography of early modern science" (12). This imprecise attempt to chronicle the moment that scientific modernity began has long plagued historians.

In "Historiography and the Scientific Revolution," Roy Porter posits that in the first half of the century, the term was most closely related to philosophical notions on science, meaning that "…science was essentially thought – profound, bold, logical, abstract – and thought was ultimately philosophy" (283). In the second half of the century, it was linked to a more "modern" notion of what the sciences are due to individual scientific disciplines being reformed and refined. Clark, Golinski and Schaffer note that due to the development and advancement of the printing press led to the expansion of knowledge: "The laboratory and the workshop were opened to public gaze" (25). In *Pandora's Breeches*, Fara expands on this idea, noting that Western European science advanced because of its shared funds of knowledge, its progress dependent on the intellectual curiosity of the society in which it tries to thrive.

[15] See Elena Serrano's 2022 text *Ladies, Honor & Merit: Gender, Useful Knowledge, & Politics in Enlightened Spain.*

Michel Foucault describes scientific discourse as follows: "Discourse in general, and scientific discourse in particular, is so complex a reality that we not only can, but should, approach it at different levels and with different methods…It seems to me that the historical analysis of scientific discourse should, in the last resort, be subject, not to a theory of the knowing subject, but rather to a theory of discursive practice" (xiv). Leaning into the discursive practice of science is helpful to connect my literary analyses of texts because language matters: descriptions of women and plants as active social contributors within specific social roles mirrors the attempts to classify and organize society as a whole. Geoffrey Sutton in *Science for a Polite Society: Gender, Culture, and the Demonstration of Enlightenment* helps to connect science and literature in his analysis as well:

> "In its essentials, the new science began as a literary pursuit, allowing great latitude in discourse about nature. It offered a source of polite conversation for dabblers as well as a discipline for the serious; it was a more callow pursuit than the scholarly fields of philology and metaphysics; it appealed to feminine culture; women frequently were devotees of the study of nature and contributed significantly to the development of natural philosophy." (8)

Scientific discourse flourished in the Enlightenment because of the distribution of ideas and thoughts that came out of the Scientific Revolution. These discussions were entwined with other debates on society, gender, and politics.

So then, we ask, how did science pivot the discussions of modernity that were happening during the Enlightenment? Clark, Golinski and Schaffer make the link between Enlightenment's notoriety as the "Age of Reason" and the rigid rhetorical structures we see emerge as a result of the belief that classification and exclusion are superior in the pursuit of Truth: "The monstruous and the irrational are always threateningly present at the boundary; the smooth functioning of the

Enlightenment public domain is show to have been disturbed by the social friction between groups of different class and gender" (23). This periphery, where the defined structures of classification and exclusion bleed into the "uncategorical" is where we explore the limits of this rhetoric. As the authors above remark, society provides an ever-present friction to the Utopic vision that everything can be defined and categorized. What happens when those within the Enlightened society push against, sometimes purposefully and other times unknowingly, against the categorical structures pushed by the Age of Reason?

It is helpful to review the social, cultural, and economic implications of the diffusion of scientific discourse during the eighteenth century. Didactic reasoning provided a foundation for which to apply scientific findings to social problems. Moral problems could be solved by scientific analysis, because "seeing is believing." We can see an example of this in Laqueur's analysis of the understanding of sexual difference. Laqueur reflects in his discussion of the transition from the one to two-sex model in terms of understanding sexual difference that happened around the eighteenth century: "No longer would those who think about such matters regard woman as a lesser version of man along a vertical axis of infinite gradations, but rather as an altogether different creature along a horizontal axis whose middle ground was largely empty" (148). Thinking back to the eighteenth-century definition of "woman" in the dictionary, we can see this transition in thinking that the woman was a lesser version of man, the vitality of the one-sex model, to the desire to define man and woman as opposites, as two different creatures altogether.

Finally, I explore the economic implications of the diffusion of scientific discourse. Spain understood not only the monetary value that its colonies held, but also their intellectual capital, prompting the Iberian monarchy to guard access to Americas for scientific exploration. In the

introduction to *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World*, editors Londa Schiebinger and Claudia Swan postulate that "…early modern botany both facilitated and profited from colonialism and long-distance trade, and that the development of botany and Europe's commercial and territorial expansion are closely associated developments" (3). Daniela Bleichmar's astounding work *Visible Empire: Botanical Expeditions and Visual Culture in the Hispanic Enlightenment* focuses on the visual productions that sprouted from the botanical expeditions from Spain during this time period. She claims that one of the main goals of these expeditions was to make "imperial nature moveable, knowable, and – ideally – governable" (7). The implications of scientific discourse were felt throughout the colonies.[16]

Question 2: Why is botany of particular interest in this dissertation? And what does it have to do with gender?

While studies of the history of science in Spain provide an overview of scientific contributions, there is a lack in works that ponder the intersection of gender and science during the Enlightenment in the Iberian Peninsula. Works by Fara, Schiebinger and Bleichmar help to inform the importance of botany as an accepted field of science for study by women during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in other parts of Western Europe. They also consider the larger implications that the Linnaean classification of plants, which relied on sexual differentiation, had during this time. the history of science, including biographies about scientists, has frequently forgotten to include women.

[16] Allan J. Keuthe and Kenneth J. Andrien's book *The Spanish Atlantic World in the Eighteenth Century: War and Bourbon Reforms 1713-1796* provides more historical understanding of how the Enlightenment was affecting Spain's interaction with its colonies.

In *Pandora's Breeches*, Fara recognizes that botany was a science that was deemed socially acceptable for upper-class women interested in the sciences. Books on collecting and drawing plants and flowers flourished, although women were not allowed to make any notable scientific discoveries of the day. Women such as the British intellectual Priscilla Wakefield achieved a more accessible version of botany in her publications, distributed widely among both teenagers and women.

There was also, arguably, an economic advantage to publishing botanical texts aimed at the female audience. Fara, says:

> Many leisured ladies whiled away the hours embroidering and painting flowers, and at the end of the eighteenth century, botany boomed when authors realized that there was an untapped market for simple instruction books. Deliberately aiming at affluent women and young girls, educators recommended botanical study as a gentle and genteel way for them to improve their scientific knowledge and gain some healthy exercise out in fresh air. (194-5)

Despite this access to botanical texts, women were not encouraged to pursue lofty academic projects in the botanical garden. Men acknowledged and allowed this study because of its daintiness, its proximity to the domestic sphere, and the relative safety of botanical observation and plant tending.

In Schiebinger's book, *Nature's Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science*, the author insists that the scientific findings in the early years of modern science consistently justified the superiority of the white male while drawing upon "evidence" to keep out those that were neither white nor male. As Schiebinger sees it, studying female participation in science during the Enlightenment is not a question of aptitude but rather a "politics of participation" (3).

Natural law became political during this time as scientists tagged social conventions as scientific proof of inferiority. Schiebinger suggests that Linnaeus' choice of words as a taxonomist is proven to be highly gendered scientific vocabulary that was widely accepted and utilized throughout most of Europe.

No study of botany in Spain would be complete without a reference to Bleichmar's invaluable addition to the visual studies of the eighteenth-century Spanish empire, *Visible Empire*. The link between botanical discovery and the pursuit of riches by the Spanish Empire in Spanish America is made clear by Bleichmar's work. Her argument implores us to recognize that the study of nature was (and is) empirical, meaning that the knowledge it produces can be commodified. Images of plants and vegetation were ordered by the Spanish empire in order to visualize the economic potential, thusly creating a "visual epistemology" that carefully crafted the knowledge of natural history (8).

Question 3: Who was doing science (in Europe and, more specifically, in Spain)? What were women's roles in regard to scientific investigation and study?

When thinking through the broader participation of women in scientific investigation and study during the eighteenth-century in Europe, "[p]ublic knowledge showed itself dependent on the private exercise of reason" (25), as Clark, Golinksi and Shaeffer note. The role of salons, or *tertulias* in Spain, allowed women to participate in the diffusion of a wide range of intellectual pursuits. Paula Findlen comments: "Science played a particularly important role in the evolution of the Enlightenment tradition of female learning" (314). Women were charged with educating children, and part of that educative rearing included an understanding of nature and reason.

In the introduction to Alicia Cerezo Paredes and Ryan A. Davis' edited volume entitled, *Modernity and Epistemology in Nineteenth-Century Spain: Fringe Discourses*, the editors ponder the epistemological shift that happened between the Scientific Revolution, when scientists such as Newton were discovering new scientific ways of seeing while still believing the mysteries and superstitions of the eighteenth century, and the narrow focusing of studies that occurred in the nineteenth century: "Whatever the diversity of procedures, which continue to multiply today, the search for truth, or at least for the answers to the questions about the natural world, was to be found in the common elements of the scientific method: hypothesis, experimentation, observation, conclusions, etc. Mysteries and esoterica no longer counted as worth subjects of study in the modern world" (1). The authors see religion and science as butting heads beginning in the nineteenth century, most famously marked by Darwin's theory of evolution that contradicted the story of creation in the Bible. This edited volume focuses on the fringe discourses that took place from the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth centuries in Spain, a country that has historically held a strong belief in the Catholic Church. It is these fringe discourses "…that question the hegemonic ways science and religion understood human nature during this period" (2). In my conclusion, I bridge the fringe discourses that took place in late-eighteenth to early-nineteenth-century Spain to the more central discussions on the role of women in Spanish society by returning to canonical author Padre Benito Jerónimo Feijóo. By juxtaposing his discussion of the Other in "¿Si hay otros mundos?" and "Defensa de las mujeres" I assert that the author uses the "substance of reason" to approach these peripherical discussions with curiosity rather than fear.

Outline of chapters:

While appreciating these sources, what remains clear is the need to advocate for the study of eighteenth-century Spanish cultural and visual studies within the context of gender politics. I argue that scientific discourse furthered the call for a reconsideration of gender differences by enlightened intellectuals in eighteenth-century Spain. Debates surrounding the role of women in Spain in the eighteenth century abounded, but most often the masculine voice, which still resonates today, was the only voice to speak louder than a whisper in the study of gender during the Enlightenment. Authors such as Padre Feijóo, Jovellanos, and Moratín are canonical authors still read today in the interest of informing the active debate on the participation of women in Spain during the turn of the nineteenth century. While these male voices mainly serve to defend and advocate for a more equal inclusion of the genders in society at this time, more often than not the female intellectual voice that also participated in this debate is forgotten.[17] Female writers such as Amar y Borbón and Joyes y Blake are crucial contributors to Spanish eighteenth-century Spanish literature and a majority of these authors advocate for the expansion of women's education.

In my first chapter, I analyze a didactic text, "Apologia de las mujeres", by Joyes y Blake, to better understand the role of scientific rhetoric used to both define the woman and question the limits of her participation in Spanish society. In turn, I question how the debate on women's role in Spanish society was affected by scientific discourse produced during the

[17] It is also interesting to note that there were a number of publications under a female name, but that were, in fact, penned by a male writer. Examples include a letter to the author at the end of *Eruditos a la violeta* (José Cadalso) and periodicals published in *La pensadora gaditana* under the penname "Beatriz Cienfuegos" who was later thought to be Juan Francisco del Postigo (Dale, 2005). Although to study these curious instances of males choosing feminine pseudonyms, this will not be the focus of my research in my dissertation.

Enlightenment. I focus on the unhappy state of women, as posited by Joyes y Blake, who turns pervasive scientific arguments during this time that viewed women as inferior on their head. By referencing Laqueur's work on gender and science in *Making Sex*, I aim to understand the intrinsic connection between scientific discourse and persistent societal beliefs regarding gender and gender roles. I reason that Joyes y Blake's "Apología" was revolutionary because she actively and unapologetically pushed against the predominantly male-generated arguments that saw women as biologically inferior and therefore unable to participate in the same capacity as men in society. Joyes y Blake used her pen to craft a compelling essay directed to her female readers, convincing them that women's participation in society is not only morally but also scientifically justified by using scientific reasoning to defend women's moral and physical assets.

In the second chapter, I take a more in-depth approach to scientific knowledge disseminated in Spain during the eighteenth century to find points of dialogue with the concurrent debate on the female participation. Although Spain is rarely mentioned in anthologies devoted to scientific discoveries during the European Enlightenment, Nieto-Galan observes that broad, sweeping advances were made under the reign of Carlos III, who advocated for "the introduction of new sciences and technologies" (75). Scientific discourse, or the language used both by scientists and intellectuals interested in the sciences, became an integral part of the dissemination of knowledge during the Enlightenment. In this chapter, I study scientific discourse in a few selected botanical volumes by Linnaeus, Quer, Gómez Ortega and Palau by analyzing gendered rhetoric used to describe physical and social characteristics of plants. I begin with an analysis of a foreign author whose work was widely distributed and read in eighteenth-century Spain. Swedish botanist Carl Linnaeus was named the father of botany and his use of

gendered vernacular to describe plant behavior is a localized example of the intersection between gender politics and science studies. I then investigate a work by Casimiro Gómez Ortega and Antonio Palau y Verdera, two botanists in the eighteenth century that authored, under royal direction, some of the first Spanish scientific texts on botany. I use examples from their texts to highlight the gendered vocabulary frequently chosen to classify and describe plants and flowers. Finally, I look at José Quer who wrote about Spanish flowers and plants in *Flora Española*, and in that study employed a lexicon that reflects a preoccupation with gender differentiation. Therefore, my investigation into the history of science and botany in Spain are complicated by the necessary considerations on gender and it is with these meditations that I reexamine the "politics of participation" that applied traditional gender roles and gendered rhetoric to discussions on the role of science in Spanish society. In other words, in this chapter I show that the scientific discourse used by Linnaeus, Quer, Gómez Ortega and Palau is inflected with culturally and socially charged language of gender and, thus, becomes evidence of the intersection between science and gender in eighteenth-century Spain.

In the third chapter I turn to a test case, of sorts, of the intersection between science and gender and experiment with the idea that the garden is both a natural space and one that is managed by human artistic creation. Specifically, I wonder how the study of botany may have led scientists and other intellectuals to think about men's and women's role on Earth and, more importantly for my research, the reflection of his connection to humankind, specifically to the female. The Duchess of Osuna's garden is the main subject of my case study. She was the patroness and main director of the construction and design of El Capricho garden at the Alameda, a large estate eight kilometers outside of Madrid. Scholarly texts that reference the garden are both out of date and also do not study the space in the way that I propose to do so – as

a space in between public and private and, subsequently, representative of the female citizen during the Enlightenment in Spain. Although El Capricho garden is the last stop on my wanderings through the pathways and intersections of the debates on science and gender in the eighteenth century, I argue that it is in this botanical space that we may continue to question how these moments of intersection had and continue to have had repercussions on women's participation in Spanish society. Female participants in the Junta de Damas, like the Duchess of Osuna, actively engaged in the formation of a more enlightened society and their roles are crucial when analyzing women's intellectual contributions to scientific endeavors in eighteenth century in Spain.[18] A closer look at patronesses, such as the Duchess of Osuna, helps to shed light on what was studied, what was collected, and why. I draw mainly from the biographical piece published by the Countess of Yebes in 1955 and use this text to better understand the world in which the Duchess lived. Carmen Añón continues to be the most prolific scholar on garden history in Spain, and her text, *El Capricho de la Alameda de Osuna*, as well as Remón Menéndez's historical overview of El Capricho garden, provide the necessary historical references needed to ponder the more philosophical tendencies of the garden.

Finally, I conclude my dissertation with an epilogue that ponders female participation through the lens of Feijóo's "¿Si hay otros mundos?," in which the Spanish enlightened intellectual contemplates the existence of otherworldly beings and creates a dialogue with one of his earlier published text, "Defensa de las mujeres." These two documents have never been studied in conjunction with one another, but I assert that through Feijóo's insights in "Defensa de

[18] As scholars such as Kitts and Smith show, women had an active role in the formation of a more modernized, enlightened Spanish society as evidenced by their participation in government societies such as the Junta de Damas, which, as investigated by Paula de Demerson, propelled the creation of clinics, schools, and worker training for women during the eighteenth century.

las mujeres," we find a larger-scale implication of the effect of notions of gender roles and the Other in scientific meditations in "Si hay otros mundos." The latter was penned in reaction to Virgil's ideas relating to antipodes, in which Feijóo maintains that the thought of life on other planets is not heretical, but rather modern. I analyze this less-familiar text by coming back to Feijóo's more popular piece that assesses the advancement of women's role in Spanish society, which I introduced in the first chapter, in order to perpend the intersection between science and gender through the author's philosophical musings on the otherworldly.

I argue that looking at didactic and scientific texts and objects of interest is an important part of the excavation work of the eighteenth century. As a researcher trained in textual analysis, I can critically think through the layers of language used in these texts. Despite the chasm that exists between the academic pursuits of scientific studies and the humanities, one cannot write about science without using language; and language is inherently a cultural product that reflects sociological and cultural moments of its time. Rhi Johnson plays with this exact idea in her analysis of eighteenth-century obstetrics manuals in Spain. She states, "The didactic texts of the eighteenth century…held truths within them…[they] also formed the proving grounds for a host of philosophical ideas" (83). She admonishes the absence of study of scientific texts in literary analysis since the "…focus on usefulness is, in itself, a key element of the philosophy of Spain's enlightenment reformers. This led to the inclusion of much sociological and philosophical discourse within texts that hold utility as their main functions" (84). Although Johnson focuses on medical texts, her reasoning for using more "utilitarian texts" as a way to connect academic pursuits within the social status in which they were formed is quite useful to this study. Her ideas directly speak to my own reasoning for using botanical texts from the eighteenth century as a

way to connect the natural sciences to broader philosophical understandings of order and classification in the Enlightenment.

The fields of visual culture and gender studies have proved to be monumentally important by offering an alternate perspective to the more commonly studied, male-authored canonical eighteenth-century works. By exploring Spanish cultural and literary productions that challenge the historically conservative "norms," I find historical analysis of a distinct female voice to be a useful guide to my research. I strive to find the interplay between the object and its historical context and, more importantly, what can be learned about history from the object. Literary and artistic productions can be seen as both creative outlets of their time as well as recorded historical events. Because men dominate much of the Spanish literary and artistic canon, it is pertinent to find women who were actively producing and financially supporting artistic works to better understand their role in Spanish history. My dissertation adds to current conversations about the role of women during the Spanish Enlightenment, while inserting the necessary reflection of scientific discourse and rhetoric into the discussion. By looking towards the periphery of both discussions, I find points of dialogue and come to a better understanding of the emerging female citizen in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Spain.

In *Women Writers in the Spanish Enlightenment: The Pursuit of Happiness*, author Elizabeth Franklin Lewis investigates works by eighteenth-century female authors through the lens of happiness, a concept she says is characteristic of more modern sensibilities (2). The idea of happiness takes root in the praise for the individual, and it is there that individual happiness leads to public prosperity. [19] But could a woman in eighteenth-century Spain be happy? Inés

[19] An idea, Lewis Franklin claims, that "began with Renaissance humanism [and that] was firmly established by the end of the eighteenth century" (3).

Joyes y Blake confronts the idea of happiness at the end of her translation of Samuel Johnson's novel *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia*. Joyes y Blake gives her readers a way to pursue happiness: by subverting the language used by men to dominate women, she argues for their push to a more egalitarian future by employing direct, didactive, and at times scientific language to structure her argument. She reimagines what happiness might mean when a woman's intellect is both recognized and celebrated.

Chapter 1: (In)Felicidad femenina: Inés Joyes y Blake's *Apología de las mujeres*

"Si la perfecta felicidad se puede adquirir por medio de una perfecta bondad", dijo Nekayah, "es una cuestión que en esta vida nunca se podrá determinar; pero lo que sí se puede defender, es que no siempre consigue la virtud una visible y proporcionada felicidad."
– *El Príncipe de Abisinia. Novela traducida del inglés por Doña Inés Joyes y Blake. Va inserta a continuación una Apología de las Mujeres en carta original de la traductora a sus hijas*, 1798.

"[La instrucción] le descubre, ella le facilita todos los medios de su bienestar, ella, en fin, es el primer origen de la felicidad individual." 86
– Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos in *Memoria sobre educación pública: o sea, tratado teórico-práctico de enseñanza, con aplicación a las escuelas y colegios de niños*, 1802.

Happiness was a complicated topic in eighteenth-century Spain. On one hand, it was an individual sentiment, as states Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, a feeling unique to the person experiencing felicity. Yet happiness was also a result of a well-functioning society, a byproduct of healthy domestic and public spheres. In a study on Jovellanos' work, Marc Marti notes the challenge in analyzing the meaning of the word "happiness" in the eighteenth century because "… tendrá sentidos diferentes según se encuentre en un informe económico o una reflexión ética" (139). The challenge to find happiness is exemplified in Samuel Johnson's novel, *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia* (1759), in which a prince, his sister, and their servants leave their home in Happy Valley because the prince had grown increasingly disenchanted with the care-free life he was meant to lead. During their travels they search far and wide for

examples of true happiness in hopes of unlocking the secret to contentment, only to find that no one, no matter their origin nor socioeconomic status, was truly happy. A virtuous life, muses Nekayah, the sister of the Prince of Rasselas, does not in itself determine happiness. Virtue, despite its pure intentions, cannot be met with happiness unless society and its people are as equally dedicated to high moral standards. Due to this impossibility, a virtuous life does not, in fact, lead to a happy one. In her translation of Johnson's novel for a Spanish-speaking audience entitled, *El Príncipe de Abisina. Novela traducida del inglés por Doña Inés Joyes y Blake. Va insertá á continuación una apología de las mujeres en carta original de la traductora a sus hijas* (1798), Inés Joyes y Blake includes a letter, "Apología de las mujeres", in which she develops this theme and argues that despite women being virtuous, as exemplified in their friendships and their roles as wives and mothers, they still find themselves in an "infeliz estado" (275).[20]

In this chapter I have chosen to discuss the intersection of female participation in Spanish eighteenth-century society with scientific discourse as transmitted in this little-known text that Joyes included after her translation of *Rasselas.* In her letter, Joyes diverges from Johnson's moralistic contemplations and subsequently inserts herself into the debate on the role of women during the eighteenth century in Spain. Although she doesn't directly dialogue with Samuel Johnson, she links the main takeaway of the novel, that happiness doesn't exist despite the protagonist's relentless search for it, with the "infeliz estado" of women during the time period. Joyes y Blake refers to commonly held beliefs that women are inherently inferior, both mentally and physically, to men, and challenges them by providing anecdotes and arguments that

---

[20] Her only known original publication is the letter she appended to her translation of Johnson's novel. She was born in Madrid in 1731 to parents of Irish descent, so she most likely grew up in a bilingual household. Married to Agustín Blake, she spent time both in Málaga and Vélez-Málaga, where some of her children were born. She had six children, four boys and two girls.

contradict the persistent narrative that a woman is not, and will never be, as capable as her male counterpart. The Spanish author's original essay should be understood in conjunction with Johnson's work and should be analyzed as a call to arms that tackles the difficult questions surrounding the debate on women during the Enlightenment in Spain.

I focus on the (un)happiness of women, as noted by Joyes y Blake, seen through the lens of the scientific beliefs pervasive during this time that viewed women as inferior, and use these beliefs to guide my analysis of "Apología de las mujeres". I do this by referencing Laqueur's work on gender and science in *Making Sex* to understand the intrinsic connection between scientific discourse and persistent societal beliefs regarding gender and gender roles. Joyes y Blake shows, both in her translation and in her original letter attached, that women are capable of creation, both intellectual and maternal. I think through the act of translation, with Joyes y Blake's book as the main example, as an act of intellectual creation. Through the lens of creation, I analyze "Apología de las mujeres" and the author's contemplations on marriage, motherhood, and education, considering how she subverts the discourse of female inferiority by implicitly challenging beliefs rooted in erroneous medical knowledge. Joyes y Blake proves through her literary creation that women are indeed capable creatures, and that their intellectual and physical proficiencies prove them to be equally, if not more, competent as men.

For all those interested in the formation of Spain as a modern nation, it is critical to go back to eighteenth-century popular discourse and thought, in which enlightened scientists and intellectuals contemplated Spain's antiquated, patriarchal tendencies and pushed for a more rational, modern, and well-informed approach to society. As Nigel Glendinning notes in *A Literary History of Spain: The Eighteenth Century*, "From the few sources readily available it is clear that there was a significant rise in the percentage of scientific, medical and economic books

printed in the early nineteenth century, reflecting clearly the impact of the Enlightenment in that area" (12). Glendinning reminds us that the publication of fictional literature was a rather small percentage compared to the publication of the texts aforementioned, so to have a clearer understanding of eighteenth century one must search for the essays and periodical publications that discussed science. The release of these texts coincided with the emergence of participation of the female citizen in Spain. It is for this reason that I analyze the way in which scientific discourse during the Enlightenment in Spain shaped the debate on the role of women in society, as can be seen in Joyes y Blake's "Apología de las mujeres," in which the voice of the author, inflected at times with a scientific tone, emerges as an important mirror of reasoning during the eighteenth-century, a mirror that both reflects and obscures common beliefs regarding gender roles.

My interests in Spanish literature published in the second half of the eighteenth century that deals with female participation in society brought me to "Apología de las mujeres," as did Bolufer Peruga's work on the author.[21] I first read Joyes' letter independent of the novel she had translated alongside it and was struck by the eighteenth-century author's confident tone and steady assertion that women were not the meek creatures that society had assumed them to be. In

---

[21] Although this work has not received the attention of many critics of Iberian literature, Bolufer Peruga, an academic who has published numerous articles on Spanish women and society in the eighteenth century, wrote a monumental work dedicated to Joyes y Blake in her 2008 book *La vida y la escritura en el siglo XVIII: Inés Joyes: Apología de las mujeres* in which she presents research on the life of Joyes y Blake, the nature of translation in eighteenth-century Spain, and a detailed analysis of "Apología de las mujeres." Bolufer Peruga's study excels at providing a comprehensive guide of the life and work of Joyes y Blake, and my analysis of the text adds to the dialogue on and study of the Spanish author and translator as part of a broader analysis of female participation during the turn of the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. Specifically, I am interested in the use of scientific topics and discourse in her defense of women and how that usage elevates the concurring debate on women in eighteenth-century Spanish society.

one powerful passage (and one I will return to later), she marvels at the many examples that nature gives us of brute strength and size not necessarily equating power:

> …pues no es la abeja entre los volátiles menos apreciable que el buitre, aunque éste sea sin comparación más grande y forzudo, ni la oveja menos que el león, pues mientras éste sólo se ocupa en destruir y devorar sirve aquélla al hombre mansamente con alimento y vestido. La abeja gobierna su colmena y la llena de delicada miel y utilísima cera, mientras el buitre anda vagueando para buscar entre las crueldades su pasto. (277-8)

The author selects animals that are gendered as female, such as *la abeja* instead of *el escarabajo*, to represent their strength despite their tiny size. The female body, according to eighteenth-century anatomists and scientists, made evident what patriarchal civilizations had always held to be true: its smaller stature and features were representative of the inferior intellectual capacity of women. Joyes y Blake relies heavily, at times explicitly and others implicitly, on the scientific discourse that infiltrated society's understanding of sexual difference and gender in order to subvert the discussion on female participation and the role of women in the late eighteenth century in Spain. I show that the culturally held beliefs surrounding the sexes were so saturated in eighteenth-century modes of thinking that they infiltrated scientific modes of seeing and, therefore, believing, and it was precisely these misperceptions that Joyes identifies and challenges in "Apología de las mujeres".

Inés Joyes y Blake's "Apología de las mujeres" dreams of a world less divided by social gendered norms and more inclusive of women as fellow intellectual beings. In my analyses, I focus on how the author uses scientific discourse, be it with the intent of insertion of scientific analysis on a particular topic or through the inclusion of scientific language that is embedded in the popular vernacular, and then extrapolate how its use points at a more meaningful relationship

between scientific discourse and female participation in the eighteenth century in Spain. In this text, Joyes shows her vast knowledge of the conversation surrounding the role of women during the time, reacting and responding to debates such as original sin as related to women, the ability of women to govern, and the importance of education, all while implementing scientific rhetoric in her work to argue against the dismissal of women as inferior simply due to their smaller stature.

Joyes y Blake's letter is most certainly a response to the fiery debate that occupied a large part of the enlightened thinker's conscience – what role should women have in a society that desires to be modern? As Bolufer Peruga notes in "Las mujeres de la cultura de la ilustración," scientific rhetoric was used in conjunction with philosophical and literary discourse in debates about the role of women in enlightened Spanish society. These debates frequently used the term *naturaleza* to describe fundamental physical and moral "norms" of the genders in pursuit of justifying or condemning the inclusion of women as active citizens. Laqueur notes in *Making Sex* that, "Biology –the stable, ahistorical, sexed body –is understood to be the epistemic foundation for prescriptive claims about social order" (6). There was a dichotomy in how science perceived women: scientific investigations of female anatomy apparently explained their physical weakness, yet also proved that the female sex was not very different from their male counterparts.[22]

"Apología de las mujeres" highlights the irrational logic that women's physical traits are evidence of their intellectual inferiorities in its repeated insistences that women are capable, intelligent beings despite their smaller stature. We can see this in the author's comparisons of

---

[22] Laqueur notes that Galen's notion that the vagina was essentially an inverted penis was still an anatomical notion that held true to scientists in the eighteenth-century.

small and large animals, in which she clearly delineates gender roles through use of either the masculine or feminine direct article: "La abeja gobierna su colmena y la llena de delicada miel y utilísima cera, mientras el buitre anda vagueando para buscar entre las crueldades su pasto" (277-8). Joyes compares the female to the bee, a small, but mighty insect that not only carries a painful sting when angered but is also a productive creature, working tirelessly with other bees to produce sweet honey and useful wax. The man, on the other hand, is compared to a large worthless vulture whose only purpose is to scrounge for scraps amongst the decaying carcasses leftover from past killings. Here, Joyes subverts the idea that "seeing is believing" because size, in fact, does not determine strength nor worth. The deep-seeded notion that women are inherently weaker than men, she argues, is false, and it is worthwhile to subvert these notions with common sense examples so as to convince the eighteenth-century reader that what they have learned about gender differences might not be based on realistic findings.

Outside of Spain, authors and philosophers such as Rousseau chimed in on this debate. In *Emile*, Rousseau outlines the "proper" place for women – in the domestic realm caring for the family and educating the children. In Spain, authors such as Feijóo championed for a more egalitarian society that put value in women's bodies and minds, but his forward-thinking opinions in "Defensa de las mujeres" where challenged by more conservative minds who argued that women were indeed the inferior species. Feijóo responded to these sexist perceptions directly by repeatedly highlighting that the sources of these degrading takes are male-authored and asks what history might look like if women had written it. He questioned the popular view of women as inferior to men, instead offering to prove women's moral, physical, and intellectual equality. Despite the responsibility that women are given as primary caregivers and educators of

the young, in the late eighteenth century many men still argued that women's mental capacity was smaller than their male counterparts.

In *Making Sex*, Laqueur takes his readers through a historical retreat in time to determine how the body was gendered and sexed, what it meant to be a man and a woman biologically and therefore politically and socially. The human body, according to Laqueur, has always been a canvas for political and social brushstrokes that have shaped and contoured how we understand sex and gender today. In the first chapter to his book, Laqueur argues that between classical antiquity and the eighteenth century, the one-flesh model dominated both scientific and cultural understandings of the human body, and therefore the differences and similarities between man and woman. Laqueur notes that, "During much of the seventeenth century, to be a man or a woman was to hold a social rank, to assume a cultural role, and not to be organically one or the other of two sexes" (142). This changes in the eighteenth century.

Women were simply the less perfect version of the male body, their sex organs the inversion of what was found in the male body, their demeanor a symptom of the less perfect fluid imbalances in their female systems. The notion that "*to see is to believe*" was very much alive and well in the Renaissance – it was for this reason that anatomical dissection of the human body was such a popular way to understand the human body (70). Anatomical texts, such as Juan Valverde de Hamusco's 1556 *Historia de la composición del cuerpo humano*, showed readers images of the female sex organs that were reflections of their male counterparts, and the text that accompanied the images made no attempt to differentiate either. In his book we see anatomical figures posing as if they were showing us their body parts, proving, according to Laqueur, that "[t]he art and rhetoric of Renaissance anatomies thus proclaim the authority of seeing and the power of dissection" (77).

Laqueur forces the reader to trudge through erroneous conceptions of the human body throughout our history with the intent to question the commonly held eighteenth-century belief that “to see is to believe”: “Seeing is believing the one-sex body. Or conversely” (79). To see is to believe and to believe is to see: the female body is smaller therefore she must be intellectually inferior; she is intellectually inferior so therefore she must be physically smaller. If the converse is true, then all historical representations of women, medical or otherwise, must be scrutinized under the assumption that the author’s perspective on female capabilities were tainted by social constructs of her inferiorities. “The history of the representation”, Laqueur states, “of the anatomical differences between man and woman is thus extraordinarily independent of the actual structures of these organs or of what was known about them. Ideology, not accuracy of observation, determined how they were seen and which differences would matter” (88). Thus, anatomical texts, or any scientific literature of the time, are unreliable sources for accurate representation of the female body; nevertheless, they provide glimpses into the closely related fields of scientific discourse and gender politics during the eighteenth century in Spain.

Ines Joyes y Blake: Translation as a mode of entry

“Apología de las mujeres” is a text of interest in relation to the confluence of female participation and scientific discourse in eighteenth-century Spanish literature because the author uses her role and power as a translator to insert at the end of *Rasselas* her own political commentary regarding the participation of females in Spanish society. Helena Establier Pérez mentions in her introduction to Joyes y Blake’s translation and original work, that the logical, scientific tone and lexicon is clear in Joyes’ work:

> … Joyes se excusa por sus posibles faltas de estilo, expresa su confianza en la solidaridad de sus coetáneas para defenderla de las críticas y termina apelando a un tópico del discurso de género en materia de razón femenina: la 'sana razón natural' de las mujeres, que, a falta de una formación esmeralda y de un pensamiento lógico-científico desarrollado, servía para justificar su presencia, cada vez más frecuente, en diversos ámbitos de la vida cultural e intelectual. (58)

At times she relies on a vernacular punctuated with references to scientific language and classification so she can clearly convey her polemic ideas to the readers, proving that women are not only capable of carrying and birthing human life, but also creating and releasing intellectual work into society.

This is her only known translation, thus we might ask why she chose Johnson's novel to publish in Spanish. Although *Rasselas* is not known as a feminist novel, the allegorical tale of the fruitless search for happiness could be analyzed as a tool to understand the plight of eighteenth-century women attempting to find happiness within a patriarchal societal structure that restricts their existence. Establier Pérez notes that Johnson's novel might have been of interest for a variety of reasons, including the scarcity of translated works by women from English to Spanish at the time, the peculiarity of the choice of work to translate because "…rara vez se atrevían con obras de enjundia filosófica, rodeadas de polémica" (15) as was *Rasselas*, and because the translation opens up the discussion between the cultural and literary exchange of ideas during the Enlightenment between Spain and England. Finally, Establier Pérez postulates that "…su versión tenía unas motivaciones ideológicas concretas, y que por tanto era lógico que la *Historia de Rasselas* completara e ilustrara a la perfección la reivindicación de la razón femenina y del desarrollo vital de las mujeres que Joyes realizaba en el ensayo original que la

sigue" (15). It is this final hypothesis that hints at a deeper understanding of both the translation and Joyes' inserted essay on the role of women in eighteenth-century Spain.

One reason that Joyes y Blake might have chosen to translate Samuel Johnson's novel was that his works were bestsellers both in his native England and in other European countries. He was known to have strong relationships with women writers and intellectuals such as Mary Wollstonecraft, a well-known champion of a more egalitarian view of women in eighteenth-century England.[23] Johnson's prose was met with mixed reviews as its title might have enticed the reader into thinking it was a "light tale" (xiv, Goring), but instead finding a story that delves deep into philosophical questions related to finding true happiness. Despite the critics, the novel was a success among its British audience and beyond. [24] As Establier Pérez notes, *Rasselas* came to be consumed at a noticeably higher rate in eighteenth-century England, thanks to "…la expansión social de los nuevos valores burgueses en Inglaterra [que] exigía que la literatura se hiciera eco de la observación del hombre en su dimensión social, de la descripción realista de su vida y del conocimiento de su alma…" (31). Translations of the text appeared shortly after its publication in 1759 and continued to be published well into the nineteenth century. [25]

---

[23] Spanish authors that took part in the debate on the role of women in the second half of the eighteenth century, such as Feijóo and Amar y Borbón, influenced how Joyes structured her arguments for more inclusivity of female members of Spanish society. Joyes y Blake's access to other foreign texts published during her lifetime was ample since she had reading knowledge of both English and French, therefore she might have read eighteenth-century British texts such as Wollstonecraft's Vindication of the Rights of Women or Richardson's Pamela (Pajares Infante, 185-6).

[24] The novel has had 500 editions in English and has been translated in over 130 different languages, including the Spanish version translated by Inés Joyes y Blake (xiv, Goring).

[25] According to Establier Pérez, the novel has been translated into French (1760), Dutch (1760), German (1762), Italian (1764), Russian (1764), Spanish (1798), Danish (1809), Polish (1803), and Hindustani (1887?), Greek (1817), Armenian (1826), Bengali (1833), Hungarian (1840), and

As John Stone notes in "Translations," a chapter in the *anthology Samuel Johnson in Context*:

> "Until the 1790s Spain saw few translations of English texts, and fewer still directly from English-language sources. Translators based their work on French and, occasionally, Italian versions. To translate directly from English was the mark of either polyglot cosmopolitanism or Anglophilia; and Samuel Johnson may, quantifiably, by volume of words, be the author most extensively translated from English into Spanish in the eighteenth century." (41)

Johnson's work, including *Rasselas* as well as his journalistic pursuits such as essays from *Idler 102* and *Rambler*, spoke to the budding periodical press in eighteenth-century Spain and to the "professionalization of *literatos*" (42). Stone sees Joyes y Blake's translation as "an appeal for the better schooling of *literatas*, for her verbal portraits of the women characters, Nekayah and Pekuah, show them to be as linguistically and intellectually gifted as their male counterparts" (42). It is in Stone's investigations and perspectives that we can decipher the unique mark left on a translated text, for Joyes uses her power as translator to shape and personalize Johnson's female characters through linguistic interpretations.

Another important consideration is that women continued to have limited access to public life during the eighteenth century, so seemingly insignificant spaces of intellectual participation, such as the translation of texts, gain legitimacy in our study of gender politics during the Enlightenment in Spain. Highlighting the cosmopolitan nature of the Enlightenment, Knott and Taylor remark that translation was a key part of the travel of ideas, allowing fiction, news, and

---

Japanese (1886).

philosophies, including those that were in favor of a more inclusive society for female citizens, to travel across Europe in a way not previously possible (xviii). Many women contributed to the economic success of translations, either as consumer or as producers:

> A través de la traducción, las elites ilustradas y reformistas españolas expresaron y estrecharon sus vínculos con la cultura europea de las Luces, principalmente (pero no sólo) francesa, mostrándose así como una comunidad cultural que participaba de similares valores morales y sociales, gustos estéticos y literarios. (Bolufer Peruga, 153)

This "comunidad cultural" that was created by translated texts and their producers was a powerful force in creating an intellectual space for women in the eighteenth century in Spain. These texts were consumed by many elites in an attempt to keep up with and demonstrate their knowledge of writings from outside of Spain. Thus, intellectual groups, many of them lead by females, were able to stay connected to other European thinkers, writers, and artists by consuming their works via translation. [26]

Female translators worked on topics such as philosophy, religion, education, and literature, translating not only popular works of fiction but also socially polemic texts. [27] Their

---

[26] In Chapter 3 I discuss the significance of one of the most prominent leaders of a *tertulia* in Madrid in the late eighteenth century, María Josefa Pimentel y Téllez-Girón, who later acquired the title Countess-Duchess of Benavente, but who is most commonly referred to as the Duchess of Osuna, outlining her contributions to intellectual pursuits in Spain's capital at the time, focusing primarily on the garden at her estate at La Alameda as a locus of interest.

[27] María Jesús García Garrosa offers the following list in "Mujeres novelistas españolas en el siglo XVIII" from *Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre Novela del Siglo XVIII*: la *Historia de Gil Blas de Santillana* translated by Joaquina Basarán (1766-77), las *Obras de la marquesa de Lambert* translated by the Countess of Lalaing, Cayetana de la Cerda (1781) and *Las americanas, o pruebas de la religión por la razón natural* by the same translator (1791), *Cartas de una peruana* translated by María Romero Masegosa (1792), *Sara Th* translated by María Antonia de Río Arnedo (1795) and las *Cartas de madama de Montier a su hija* translated by the same author (1796-98), and *Las conversaciones de Emilia* translated by Ana Muñoz (1797).

work was an important piece in the collaborative effort to insert Spain into the European intellectual community. [28] The female translator demanded, to some extent, that her readers consume not only her translated text, but in some cases, such as Joyes' translation of Johnson's *Rasselas*, her own original work as well. Thus, the translated work could be used as a vehicle to disseminate original work that may have gone unpublished otherwise.

Joyes y Blake's translation of *Rasselas* and her letter "Apología de las mujeres" emerge as an intellectual creation. The translated novel allowed a wider audience to enjoy Johnson's writings while Joyes's attached original work showcased her ability to insert herself into the debate on women. It is important to note that the work of translator and author weren't seen as very different to an eighteenth-century public. Translation was viewed as another creative form of writing, a "versión libre que como traslación exacta del texto original" (Bolufer Peruga, 157). Translating a foreign text might have been an attractive intellectual activity for women because it allowed them a way to gain income, it permitted them an entrance into an intellectual space because of their interaction and intimate understanding of the work they translated, and finally because it offered them "un medio donde volcar sus propias ideas a través de la elección del texto que traducir y de las modificaciones que introducían en él" (154). A certain freedom, then, was given to the translator; a freedom to choose what text to translate, and, most liberating, a freedom to use the original text as a blanket in order to publish original material, such as "Apología."

---

[28] As Bolufer Peruga points out, "Así, a través de sus versiones, las traductoras contribuyeron a conectar la cultura española con las distintas corrientes de pensamiento y sensibilidades literarias de las letras europeas" (155, *Vida y escritura*).

Thus, reading translations was a way in which many were able to participate in conversations happening in France and England about modern society and the role of its members, while also formulating their own ideas of how these theories might apply to a Spanish context. Spain's Enlightenment, although certainly influenced by the writers and thinkers that were part of *le Siècle des Lumières* in France and the Age of Reason in England, was not simply a plagiarized copy of its neighbors' work. Translation, then, emerged as a form of communication, a way to dialogue between countries as a mode of nation-building. In John Stone's article, "Translated sociabilities of print in eighteenth-century Spain," he advocates not for a "notion of influence" but rather a notion of cultural transfer of ideas (264). This cultural transfer of ideas, the market of sharing and translating literary works, political musings, and scientific knowledge, is key in understanding why Joyes might have chosen to translate Johnson during the second half of the eighteenth century in Spain. Johnson's allegorical journey through a fictional land with the intention of pondering the notion of happiness was deemed not only an intelligent piece to translate by Joyes, but also an appropriate work to append her own take on (un)happiness as a woman in that time period.

"Apología de las mujeres:" A reconsideration of woman's role as wife, educator, and mother

As a translator, Joyes was able to inflect her style and voice throughout the translation of the text, but in her appendage, she introduces her own politically charged ideas. To label "Apología de las mujeres" as an epilogue is faulty because neither does it provide a conclusion of Johnson's text, nor does it bring any further closure to the English author's work. Despite it being addressed to "Hijas mías," the text fails to read as a letter either. Although Joyes utilizes

the first person in the text, the content does not focus on her life nor her personal experiences; rather, it sheds light on the polemic topic of female participation in eighteenth-century Spanish society. The translator and author herself notes in the title to the Spanish translation of Johnson's text that her text "[v]a inserta," highlighting the separation of her text from that of the original author's novel. Her "Apología" is an insert, an addition, something that bookends the translation but that doesn't necessarily conclude it.[29]

I argue that "Apología de las mujeres" is not simply an addition unrelated to her translation of Johnson's text, but rather an essay on the primary reason for feminine unhappiness: inequality between the sexes during the eighteenth century in Spain. John Stone's take on the Spanish translation of Johnson, in contradiction, argues that Joyes y Blake was supplementing the original text. At the end of *Rasselas*, the reader hopes for a concluding take on the lives of the protagonists who had traveled far from their home in search of happiness. But instead, Samuel Johnson gives us a last chapter entitled "The conclusion, in which nothing is concluded" in which each character's destiny is outlined. Stone argues that Joyes y Blake's original work functions as an interpreted conclusion of Johnson's text: "The intended counterpoint between polemic and fiction makes Nekayah's choice in life – to found a college for learned women – all the more memorable when Joyes y Blake argues that women be allowed to undertake traditionally male studies" (42). Stone's musings on the two pieces of writing creates a loose connection, but a closer look at Joyes y Blake's essay reveals that it deals with much more than the need of the expansion of education for women in eighteenth-century Spain. The letter, which

[29] "Apología," as defined by the *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, is a "[d]iscurso de palabra o por escrito, en defensa o alabanza de alguien o algo" (http://dle.rae.es/?id=3EdAe0R). In English we can understand this term to relate to the Anglo-Saxon "apology" with its secondary meaning, as something that is written or said in order to defend something that has come under criticism.

does not mention the translated text to which it is attached, functions as a call to arms to Spanish women at the turn of the nineteenth century to value their strengths and intellectual power, aiming to gain more freedom in the public sector.

The letter reads more like a conversation rather than an argumentative expository clearly delineating the defense of women during the Spanish Enlightenment. I argue that it is within this conversational tone that Joyes y Blake stamps her mark of originality on the ongoing debate. Commenting on her style, Bolufer Peruga states that the letter is "marcado por un fluir de las ideas más que por un armazón lógico férreo" (192), arguing that the author's writing lacks clarity of expression and cohesive argumentation largely in part due to her lack of formal education that was awarded mainly to men; a lack of which she, and other female writers, were keenly aware, and that they "defendieron explícitamente en sus textos" (192). The invocation of "hijas mías" and specifically directing part of her work to her "lectoras" creates a feeling of intimacy and friendship, priming her readers to listen and engage with her ideas. In the following paragraph she begs her "lectoras" to forgive her for the text's imperfections, a common rhetorical tool in letters, and for her "lectores" to abstain from making "críticas mordaces o impertinentes" (273). [30] By separating the genders of her readership through the pluralization of the noun *lector*, Joyes y Blake is aware that the readers of her translation will react differently to her arguments.

We can think of the invocation of "hijas mías" as a show of camaraderie with the female readers of her translation with the purpose of inviting them to challenge the conservative notion

---

[30] *Captatio benevolentiae*, or winning of goodwill, is a common tool for authors to utilize in the "*advertencia*" to their work, an introductory message that divulges some of the author's intentions and intended public for their work. This rhetorical tool can be found in documents dating back to the medieval era. Bolufer Peruga postulates that Joyes y Blake's directs this rhetorical tool specifically only to her female readers because she is looking for "complicidad" (190).

that women are a second-class, lesser, weaker citizen. Bolufer Peruga argues that although the main consumers of this translation were most likely female, "…Inés Joyes aspira a exponer sus argumentos en la palestra común y mixta de la opinión pública" (191). Indeed, a letter hidden at the end of a translated novel that is addressed to "hijas mías" might have proven to be a tempting read for female and male readers alike. For a male reader, this reference to a directed female audience might be intriguing as a way to "listen in" on a conversation between a group of women. It could also be a way to trying to reach a masculine audience through "falsa modestia" by being "simply" a conversation between women, for women, therefore less threatening to the general public and its debate on gender roles. No matter the intention of the header, Joyes sparks interest in her readers by inviting them into an intimate conversation in which she deviates quickly from her job as translator to her job as a writer who confidently places herself in the polemic dispute on the role of women in eighteenth-century Spain.

Joyes enters into the debate on women swiftly in the *advertencia*, beginning her letter with a gentle warning to her readers that the author is conscientious of the debate surrounding the place of women in society. She cites her daughters as the driving force behind her penmanship of the letter, but clearly states that her intention is for it to be seen by the "público": "…mis hijas…habían sido mis principales argumentos, y les escribí la carta que ahora doy al público" (273). Distinguishing her male and female readership, she asks that women forgive the imperfections of her work and that men refrain from "biting critiques," confident that her *protectoras* will come to her rescue with "la sana razón y la sencilla explicación de las mujeres" (273). Her unwavering confidence in female intellect continues as a primary reason to promote equality among the sexes throughout the letter.

She immediately offers a less-than-subtle critique of Feijóo's well-known piece on the debate on women, stating, "Pero, de la defensa de las mujeres pasé a notar algunos defectos y a dar tal o cual consejo sobre la crianza de los hijos; en una palabra, salí casi sin conocerlo de los límites del tema primitivo, como sucede ordinariamente en las conversaciones familiares" (273). In this essay, Feijóo remarked on the unfair expectations women receive regarding their intellect. He gives the example of a woman who sits at home all day, chained to her domestic life because that is the only one in which she is allowed to participate. One day she overhears her husband speaking with a friend on an important manner and she interjects, offering her opinion. The men laugh at her uninformed response, using it as proof that women are not as intelligent as men. But, Feijóo points out, the woman was never given a chance to educate herself on the topics that the men debated, thus calling her intellectually inferior was erroneous. Women, Feijóo argued, need to be offered educational and cultural opportunities like the ones men are to create a more egalitarian society.

The author acknowledges the common debate of the day surrounding the role of women in society, thus inserting herself into the conversation: "Sabido es que la disputa sobre preferencia o preeminencia de los sexos es uno de los asuntos de conversación más comunes en la sociedad" (273). Joyes immediately places herself into a space of knowledge, legitimizing her participation in the discussion. In Sandra Harding's contribution to *Feminist Epistemologies*, "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is 'Strong Objectivity'?", she firmly attests that "[k]nowledge claims are always socially situated" (54) and here Joyes firmly situates herself in

the debate on the role of women in eighteenth-century Spanish society with this letter that details the precise reasons why women's intellect should not be underestimated. [31]

With this in mind, I argue that Joyes's confirmation of knowledge of the dispute on gendered roles in eighteenth-century Spain positions her socially and politically as a player in this debate. Authority to speak on such topics was not granted to any and all individuals at the time. The male voice was still that of authority, so women who were active in the public sphere, either by written word or by other forms of participation, were compelled to dialogue with their presence, either explicitly or implicitly. Joyes asserts her authority in "Apología de las mujeres" by speaking truth to what she knows: the experience of being a woman, wife and mother in a society that devalues women. Her experience, of course, is not unique, so she acts as a voice of the many women who have suffered due to the false belief that women are not as capable as men.

Instead of beginning with a complaint about the current state of gender inequality, she directs her frustrations towards the useless pigeonholing of women throughout history, firmly affirming her expertise on the subject matter: "Somos queridas, aborrecidas, alabadas, vituperadas, celebradas, respetadas, despreciadas, y censuradas" (275). She complains that if a woman is too serious she is considered a "hipócrita melindrosa", if she is too happy then she is a "coqueta", and if she is too wise then she is a "bachillera" (275). She expresses frustrations at

---

[31] A longer excerpt from the text helps to contextualize Harding's claims: "In societies where scientific rationality and objectivity are claimed to be highly valued by dominant groups, marginalized peoples and those who listen attentively to them will point out that from the perspective of marginal lives, the dominant accounts are less than maximally objective. Knowledge claims are always socially situated, and the failure by dominant groups critically and systematically to interrogate their advantaged social situation and the effect of such advantages on their beliefs leaves their social situation a scientifically and epistemologically disadvantaged one for generating knowledge. Moreover, these accounts end up legitimating exploitative "practical politics" even when those who produce them have good intentions."

men for perpetuating the injustices that exist, but also points the finger at women "…por no saber usar de las ventajas que nos concedió la naturaleza…" (275). It is for this reason, she concludes, that they find themselves in this "infeliz estado" (275) – and it is the lack of happiness that is underscored in her critique on the treatment of women in eighteenth-century Spanish society. She repeats this phrase later in the letter (278), linking the theme of (un)happiness with the translation of Johnson's novel.

Joyes continues Johnson's meditation on the pursuit of happiness, specifically situating the concept in her reality as a woman in eighteenth-century Spain. She laments that the qualities commonly attributed to women, such as extreme modesty and a preference for physical beauty rather than intellectual growth (qualities that are taught to them and that are valued by all), are, indeed, harmful: "Por tanto, las impresiones que, he dicho, se les dan generalmente a las mujeres desde el principio, son contrarias a su propia felicidad, a la de su familia y al bienestar de la sociedad humana" (282). With this forceful proclamation, the author succinctly summarizes the "infeliz estado" not only of women, but of all of humanity. Her insistence that the happiness of the individual is representative of that of society as a whole reflects her position as an enlightened thinker of her time.

In *Women Writers in the Spanish Enlightenment: The Pursuit of Happiness*, Franklin Lewis investigates works by eighteenth-century female authors through the lens of happiness, a concept she says is characteristic of more modern sensibilities (2). The idea of happiness takes root in the praise for the individual, and it is there that individual happiness leads to public prosperity. [32] Although the end of Johnson's novel dismisses the dreams of Pekuah, the maiden

---

[32] An idea, Franklin Lewis claims, that "began with Renaissance humanism [and that] was firmly established by the end of the eighteenth century" (3).

of Princess Nekayah, as stagnant, stating that she "would gladly be fixed in some invariable state" (112), I see her adventures in the second volume of the work as most fruitful in her pursuit of happiness. Pekuah is captured by a troop of Arabs while she awaited the Princess, who was satisfying her curiosity of the pyramids. The princess, distraught in her guilt of leaving Pekuah behind, falls into a deep depression and is only eventually persuaded by Imlac that her grief wouldn't remedy the situation, and falls back into her daily routines, reserving a section of each afternoon to think about the lost maiden. Pekuah, on the other hand, describes her seven months under imprisonment as a revelatory experience. She approached her captors with curiosity and, upon realizing that her and her servants' safety was guaranteed, took advantage of the kindness and knowledge of her detainers, who built her an observatory tower so that they could share their scientific insight on the stars and celestial bodies that occupied the sky. Pekuah retains this knowledge and uses it to approach an astronomer who has never conversed with the opposite sex, happy to find a companion with whom to share her astronomical passion. At the end of the novel, her fond memories of her time as prisoner are seen as evidence of her desire to be admired, but I see her adventures as evidence of a pure happiness that allowed her to find joy in learning during extenuating circumstances and to continue this passion after her kidnappers return her back to her friends from Abyssinia.

At the end of Johnson's novel, in the inconclusive termination of the work entitled "The conclusion, in which nothing is concluded," the author briefly describes what each character will do with their lives after completing a trip around the world in search of happiness. A section of interest describes the princess' desires to continue her quest for knowledge and wisdom:

> The princess thought, that of all sublunary things, knowledge was the best: she desired first to learn all science, and then purposed to found a college of learned women, in

> which she would preside, that, by conversing with the old, and educating the young, she might divide her time between the acquisition and communication of wisdom, and raise up for the next age models of prudence, and patterns of piety. (112)

I cannot help but think of the Duchess of Osuna, to whom Joyes' translation and text are dedicated, in this description of the princess, a woman born to a life of wealth and opportunity, but who continuously strived to better the lives of women in Spanish society by promoting education through the Escuelas Patrióticas. [33]

The description of the princess' future goals falls so closely to the letter penned by Joyes that it not so subtly hints at her desire to bring this novel to the Spanish public during a time in which a heated debate regarding the role of women raged. The princess' desires, then, do not veer far from the desire of Joyes, when in her "Apología de las mujeres" she continuously argues for a better educational system for children, one that does not rely on only the teachings of the parents, but rather public education that provides children with skilled and learned teachers. She laments the focus that not only society, but also educators and parents, put on young women, lauding their looks and social graces rather than their intellect: "Veamos el modo con que generalmente se crían las mujeres. Apenas empiezan a pronunciar y andar cuando ya se les habla de hermosura, de garbo, y aun a muchas, por chiste, de cortejo, cuya doctrina suelen algunas entender antes que la cristiana" (280). Parents are able, according to Joyes y Blake, to educate their children on the moral differences between right and wrong, but "…se suele equivocar la

[33] In Chapter 3 I discuss the case study of El Capricho garden as directed by the Duchess of Osuna and provide biographical information on her contributions to Spanish society in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

idea de educación, tomando muchas veces lo accesorio por lo esencial" (291). [34] Joyes' work, then, functions as a sort of social translation for the ideas displayed in *Rasselas*, in its call for a better education system that employs trained teachers to educate children on the topics that parents cannot or do not have the experience to teach.

Joyes y Blake goes on to outline precisely why women are in this state and pleads that they take the steps necessary to value their own voice of reason: "Sí, nosotras tenemos la culpa" (278), she asserts. With all the domestic work that women perform at home, why, she wonders, must they be judged by men and also judge other women based solely on their physical appearance? She laments that "…por más que digan los hombres que las mujeres sólo se adornan por parecerles a ellos bien, es muy cierto que cualquiera pone más cuidado en prenderse cuando ha de presentarse en un concurso de señoras que cuando ha de ir adonde no haya más que hombre…" (279). The dangers of vanity, she continues, are not only a problem perpetuated by women, but rather a sin shared by both genders. Physical appearance, argues Joyes y Blake, is the only quality on which a woman is judged, with no thought given to her intellectually capacity. Throughout the letter, she uses topics such as religion, physical size versus mental capacity, the moral superiority of women, and nature versus nurture to add depth to her argument that women, indeed, deserve to be recognized as rational counterparts to their brethren.

She begins the text with a clear message: "Mas, ¿qué digo?; me quejo de la injusticia de los hombres con nuestro sexo, porque la verdad me sobran razones; pero también es cierto que nosotras, por no saber usar de las ventajas que nos concedió la naturaleza, nos hemos construido

---

[34] Joyes y Blake states: "Pero estudiar el genio de los niños, acostumbrarlos temprano a reprimirlo, darles ideas de rectitud, de veracidad, de compasión, de caridad, de beneficencia, en una palabra, de amor a lo bueno y horror a lo malo, esto, vuelvo a decir, lo harán los padres sin mucho trabajo como estén de acuerdo" (291).

en este infeliz estado" (275). In Bolufer Peruga's annotations, she reminds the reader that it was not uncommon in women's writing of the time for authors, such as Madame de Lambert, Mary Wollstonecraft, and Josefa Amar y Borbón, to place at least partial blame on their own gender for the discrimination that they have received (275). In the eighteenth-century debate on the role of women in society, both men and women chimed in with their fervent opinions, but both sides of the argument engaged in a sometimes explicit and other times subtle form of hyper-criticism of the female sex – either by lambasting her physical weaknesses, her intellectual incapacities, or her social indecencies. Here Joyes places partial blame on women for finding themselves in such an "infeliz estado" by "no saber usar de las ventajas que nos concedió la naturaleza." I do not believe this is due to the author's belief that women are inherently less intelligent, but rather that they lack the education to harvest the intellect they need to persevere. She pointedly says that they do not know how to *use* the skills that nature has given them, not that they are deficient in capability.

The author anticipates responses critical and attacking in nature to her "Apología," but decidedly intimidates any of her disparagers by stating, "…pero confío no me faltarán en todo caso protectoras que se animen a emprender mi defensa, y si conspiran muchas a sacudir el yugo de la preocupación que injustamente favorece a los hombres, bien presto se verá cuán poco puede el pedantismo de los que se llaman sabios contra la sana razón natural y la sencilla explicación de las mujeres" (273). In contradiction to her claim that her argument might be less than perfect, Joyes y Blake warns specifically her male readers to conceal their pedantic urge to correct her assertions based solely on the fact that she is female, instead reminding them that her defense of women is of sound and clear logic.

Joyes y Blake does not shy away from the two-sex model that Laqueur proposes in his work, rather she leans into it and highlights the biological differences between men and women. But, she argues, these differences do not inherently make women less capable or less superior to their male counterparts. Joyes argues that women, in some regards are more capable than men to have full autonomy over their lives both public and private because of their biological differences. Men and women did not argue that they were the same and, therefore, they should be treated equally; instead, they used supposed biological differences to justify that each sex has strengths *and* weaknesses that should be celebrated and valued in a modern society. Laqueur states that "[t]he ostensibly neutral language of liberalism also left women themselves without a voice of their own and initiated a feminist discourse of difference in search of one" (197). Considering the one-sex model, women were simply lesser versions of the perfect male body; therefore they had no need to find a voice because men's expression was far superior than one they could ever produce. The two-sex model opened up the space for women to search for a voice, despite the "biological" justifications of their inferiority. In fact, it was the biological differences between the male and female bodies that placed urgency on the need for a female voice and perspective on the debate on women – women are different than men, therefore their opinion on the matter was not only a distinct but necessary consideration.

In terms of classification, and subsequent degradation, of women, Joyes points to the accepted hierarchy of gender that rewards the man with the responsibility to support and protect his wife and family. Joyes states: "Asignó Dios a cada sexo sus destinos, y conforme a ellos les dotó de aquellas propiedades que les convenían: al hombre le dio la fuerza, a la mujer la perspicacia y, como de genio más blando y flexible, dispuso fuese su voto el segundo en las consultas" (276-7). As Bolufer Peruga notes, Joyes follows Amar y Borbón's lead in this

argumentation, establishing the hierarchies between sexes as comparable to those found in government and military (276). Joyes goes on to explain how these hierarchies do not necessarily equate to intellectual superiorities:

> "Que el mayor talento esté anexo a la mayor robustez, es idea de que se reirá toda persona juiciosa, aunque no faltan necios que para sostener su pretendida superioridad lo defienden. Pero compárese un gañán forzudo e ignorante con un hombre de buena educación y estudioso, aunque de complexión delicada, y se verá que si se ponen a luchar vence el gañán, pero si a discurrir el estudioso." (277)

As the author does later in the text with use of animal comparisons, she argues that one's physical size or strength does not equate to their intellectual superiority. This type of muscular hierarchy and classification might benefit a bulky fighter in a competition of strength but would easily favor the person "de complexión delicada" but "de buena educación" in a contest of cerebral feats. This is the same logic Joyes uses to claim that women, although typically more delicate in stature, should not be assumed to be lacking in mental capacity.

Joyes y Blake offers a product of intellectual creation in this letter, a creation that subverts the pervasive rhetoric that female inferiority is a natural outcome of her physical shortcomings. Weaving together discussions on marriage, motherhood, and education, she provides examples that contradict the common narrative that men are superior to women and therefore should be in positions of power while their feminine companions be relegated to the domestic sphere. Women, Joyes y Blake proves, are not only able to physically create (human life, milk, a safe and clean domestic space), but they are also able to intellectually create, as proven by the translation and letter penned by the author; thus, their creation should be celebrated and rewarded by a more equal position in society.

Marriage:

Women have historically had very few options when it comes to love. Joyes states that for men "…hay diversos destinos, mas que para las mujeres no hay sino dos, pues han de ser o monjas o casadas" (289). Marriage was deemed the best (and for many, forced) option because families would receive dowries in exchange for their daughter. The commodification of women was a social practice propagated systematically, from the church to the state, and women were given little to no say in the decisions regarding their future. Therefore, love was not a deciding factor in the arrangement of a marriage – if the family of the woman deemed the suitor acceptable, then they were matched. If a woman did not marry, the next logical placement would be in a monastery where she would lead a celibate life married to God. To be single and female was to be dangerous, a threat to the family structure that was the foundation for the religious and political structures that formed early modern societies. Joyes ponders the relationships women have, either matrimonial or platonic, in "Apología," arguing for a reconsideration of women's perceived inferiorities.

One of the topics that Joyes y Blake turns to in an effort to attack misconceptions surrounding female power and intellect is religion and religious iconography. She begins by mentioning Adam and Eve at the start of the letter. Similarly to Feijóo in "Defensa de las mujeres," the author clarifies that both Eve and Adam sinned, brushing off the question of who sinned more as irrelevant and insisting that both carried that sin with them and were damned to eternal punishment. She sides with the ideas of Feijóo without specifically mentioning the well-known author in her interpretation that the inequality of the sexes didn't exist in Paradise, but

rather was a consequence of their fall from grace.[35] Both she and the Benedictine friar interpret the bible verse that dictates that a woman must submit to her husband as a necessary part of the order and organization needed in a family (Bolufer Peruga, 276). She values hierarchies seen in society as a necessary part of social organization but distinguishes that "…de esto no se arguye desigualdad, así como no arguyen desigualdad personal ni esencial las varias autoridades que conocemos en el mundo" (276). She believes that God gave both men and women qualities that would help them succeed: namely masculine physical power and female keen intellect.

This mode of classifying and stereotyping strengths and weaknesses according to gender is precisely what Joyes argues against in other portions of her text, yet here she uses it organize her thoughts and strengthen her call for a re-consideration of women's skills. Does she argue that all men excel at physical strength and all women at rational intellect? No, not exactly, because in her text she explains that there exist men that fail to be the strong and women that fail to be rational. The strength given to men does not, according to Joyes y Blake, mean that they are the only ones fit to govern, and she mentions the fact that governments have successfully been run by women as an example. It is brain and not brawn, after all, that creates a capable leader, especially considering the Enlightenment's context for more value in rationality.

---

[35] As seen in "Defensa de las mujeres" in *Teatro crítico universal*, tomo primero, discurso XVI: "Sin embargo, la práctica común de las Naciones es más conforme a la razón, como correspondiente al divino Decreto, notificado a nuestra primera madre en el Paraíso, donde a ella, y a todas sus hijas en su nombre se les intimó la sujeción a los hombres. Sólo se debe corregir la impaciencia con que muchas veces llevan los Pueblos el gobierno mujeril, cuando según las leyes se les debe obedecer; y aquella propasada estimación de nuestro sexo, que tal vez ha preferido para el régimen un niño incapaz a una mujer hecha; en que excedieron tan ridículamente los antiguos Persas, que en ocasión de quedar la viuda de uno de sus Reyes en cinta, siendo avisados de sus Magos que la concepción era varonil, le coronaron a la Reina el vientre, y proclamaron por Rey suyo el feto, dándole el nombre de Sapor antes de haber nacido."

Friendship, much like marriage, is a social relationship in which both parties must mutually support and benefit one another in order to be successful. In her discussion of friendship, Joyes y Blake opines that women are taught to be virtuous, thus giving them the primary attribute for a true friendship. She also mentions that women tend to have "…[un] genio más blando, flexible y benévolo [que] las inclina naturalmente a la amistad" (285). As Bolufer Peruga mentions, we see Joyes toeing the line here between the idea that women have a natural moral compass that guides them while also indicating that their education leads them to be morally superior beings, thus more adept for friendships (285). Women that "se crían con sólidos pensamientos" (285) are most successful with friendships because they "aman sinceramente a su sexo, celebran a todas aquellas a que poseen cualidades dignas de aprecio: saben lo que pueden contribuir a la reforma de las costumbres, desean que todas conozcan su valor y que no limiten su ambición a tan bajo punto como el de ser cortejadas de los hombres…" (285). The women that Joyes describes are full of self-respect, and thusly appreciate other females for their positive attributes and contributions to society. She continues that men "…los cuales, generalmente persuadidos de que a eso aspiramos, van perdiendo insensiblemente el respeto que nos tenían en aquellos tiempos en que nos miraban como más altivas" (285). Again, Joyes sees men as the reason that some female friendships deteriorate.

She continues, blaming men, rather than women, for the downfall of many female friendships:

> "¡Cuántas niñas contraen entre sí en sus primeros años un cariño que les causa infinitas satisfacciones! Pero esto dura hasta que entran en la palestra del mundo, donde nunca faltan hombres frívolos que se divierten en desunir aquellos cándidos corazones, trayendo y llevando chismes, y ensalzando a la que tienen delante a costa de la que está ausente. Y

> como nada hiere más a un corazón sincero que la falsedad, la persuaden a que la que tenía por amiga la vende, y esto basta para que se desprenda de todas, o si conserva algunas que llama así es sólo por razón de estado, a fin de que no falten concurrencias donde divertirse y lucir." (285)

Here, Joyes turns on its head the notion that women are frivolous, petty gossips that take pleasure in undermining their female counterparts. The author, instead, sees men as the perpetrators of the destruction of female friendships once young women enter into the "palestra del mundo." This idea is a powerful one because it suggests that men might view female friendships as threatening, and therefore it is in their best interest to "desunir aquellos cándidos corazones." Men, according to Joyes, are merely looking to have spread gossip and frivolously play, not heading the harm they cause to the female friendships they destroy. Furthermore, *cortejos* are especially a danger to single women because "…es el hombre de tal condición que donde encuentra facilidad se fastidia" (287). Joyes warns women that those who keep *cortejos* as company "…tarde o nunca se casan, o casan mal" (287). Again, she blames these male companions for the negative impact they have on the social lives of the women they court, causing them to either forgo marriage altogether or to marry the wrong person for the wrong reasons, setting them up for a lifetime of unhappiness.

Female friendship is no cure for unhappiness either, laments the author, because women are taught to see their sisters as competitors rather than companions: "…las jóvenes se vengan de lo que por envidia las murmuran, haciendo burla de sus canas, y sus contemporáneas están hechas a mirarlas como competidoras, y la amistad no es fruto que brota, florece y madura en breves días" (283). This excerpt is reminiscent of Goya's print "Hasta la muerte" (no. 55) in Los Caprichos. In this print, an old woman adorns herself with a fashionable dress and adjusts her

hairpiece as she gazes at herself in the mirror. Her skin sags and her deformed jaw suggests she has lost her teeth. A young woman covers her mouth, presumably laughing at the older woman try to beautify her decaying body, while two younger men also linger in the background, one looking on with a clear smirk and the other rolling his eyes, exaggerating his reaction of disgust of the woman. In "Apología", the author recognizes the unhappy state of aging women, for they are condemned for doing they only thing they have been taught to do: wear attractive clothing, cover their faces in makeup, and put value in their physical appearance. But what if a woman were to place value in her intellect and moral compass, rather than place all her worth in physical appearance which inevitability deteriorates and losses value? And what if as women age, they gain happiness through a "sincera amistad" (284).

But to not marry at all, to veer off the acceptable path of marriage or a religiously devout life, was a choice not many women could or did make. To lead a life independent of the acceptable structure of marriage or the convent was to be on the periphery of eighteenth-century society. Joyes, in line with other contemporary female authors such as Amar y Borbón or Wollstonecraft, criticizes the lack of options for women, and specifically attacks the insults that bombarded single women: "¿Por qué ha de mirar como desairada la que llegó al tiempo de ser lo que vulgarmente llaman <<tía>>?" (287).[36] The term *tía*, although a colloquially acceptable term to refer to a woman nowadays, was sometimes used as derogatory name given to women who were not married or used for female friends of the family who were treated parental figures for the children (instead of its common meaning of "aunt," sister of either the mother or father of children). Men, Joyes quips, were allowed to be bachelors for decades, spouting excuses such as

[36] Bolufer Peruga notes on p. 288 that Joyes' critique of society's approach to single women follows the lead of other female authors at the time that criticize the lack of options given to women.

not wanting to "perder su libertad" (288) or fearing that they might find "una mujer impertinente, celosa, tonta, etc." (288). Women were not afforded such excuses, for liberty was never theirs to be had – the confinement of marriage or a life devoted to God was the only acceptable option for the eighteenth-century female citizen.

Despite all the faults that men may have, women were expected to be perfect for the sake of their marriage potential: "…válgate Dios por mujeres y qué perfecciones se exige de ellas, y un hombre aunque sea viejo, feo y mentecato le parece que tiene derecho para pretender, si tiene caudal, aun la mujer más perfecta" (288). Bolufer Peruga notes that unequal marriages, such as the relationships described by Joyes here, were not uncommon at the time, citing examples such as Moratín's "El sí de las niñas" or Goya's "La boda" (288). Joyes notes that women will criticize other women who might take their time finding a mate, a decision that shouldn't be taken lightly because "…donde hay discernimiento cuesta mucho el vencerse a tomar por compañero y cabeza de su casa a quien no se puede mirar, no digo con amor, que es pasión poco durable, pero ni aun con aquel aprecio que se convierte en amistad firme" (288). The author returns to the topic of friendship, a theme acutely present in the accompanying novel *Rasselas*, because it is not just passionate love that guarantees a life of happiness, but rather a dedication to the relationship between the two people who spend the rest of their lives together, that matters. Despite this important decision, only men are allowed to court the opposite sex, choosing who to direct their interest to and who to ignore, while women are only allowed to either accept or deny the invitations presented to them. Women must, urges Joyes, deploy prudence and consult not only God but also "…a nuestros padres o los que hagan sus voces, a nuestro director y a nuestro propio genio y propiedades" (289) before making a life-altering decision about their future. Again, Joyes subverts widely held beliefs that women are incapable of rationality, turns this

thought on its head, and argues that women make these important life decisions and take their destiny into their own hands because *they* are the most capable to do so, not their male counterparts.

Joyes pushes against this notion and asks, "…¿no será mucho mejor quedar solteras, que exponerse a entregar su libertad a quien les repugne? ¿No sería esto engañar al pretendiente y exponer a grandes riesgos su dicha en esta vida y en la otra? ¿Hay tormenta mayor que el vivir siempre con quien se aborrece?" (288-9). Here, the author puts value on the liberty and happiness of a woman because marriage to a "mal marido" (289) is worse than a man that marries a "mujer pésima" (289) because women are bound to the house, caged into a ruinous domestic life. A man, though, has the ability to live his life as he chooses, independent of his partner: "Entra y sale, hace viajes, se hace sordo a sus voces (si es de las que la levantan) y tiene mil modos, si quiere, de sujetarla. Pero la infeliz mujer, ¿qué recurso tiene? Cuanto más prudente es, más sufre y padece. Se vio obsequiada, acariciada, seguida por un hombre rendido mientras la pretendía, y luego que se ató el fatal nudo, se encuentra con un tirano que hasta sus pensamientos quiere gobernar" (289). The terms *tirano* and *gobernar* here insist that marriage be seen as a tiny version of a tyrannically governed society, in which the husband wields enormous power over his female subject. The author succinctly describes the fate many women are destined to reach: an abusive marriage with no recourse to leave. Because of women's lack of independence and freedom, they are vulnerable to a life of unhappiness both in public and private, effectively tying "el fatal nudo" without any chance to save themselves. Joyes sees this unhappiness not as a symptom of the "weak" female psyche, but rather a consequence of a society that puts little value into their right to happiness. Although it might be argued that society has an interest in keeping

women happy (and ignorant) as subservient wives and mothers, Joyes pushes against this belief and argues that happiness can instead be found in greater freedoms and education.

Arranged marriages, as mentioned previously, were common practice during the eighteenth century, and Joyes selects them as another factor that can negatively affect the education that a child receives at home. Children, she reminds readers, can detect disagreements between their parents, causing them to "…[perderles] fácilmente el respecto, y perdido éste, no les hace tanta impresión la enseñanza ni los documentos que les oyen" (291). Parents who are unhappy may not, Joyes opines, show the greatest care in choosing teachers or caregivers for their children either. Further aligning with her enlightened contemporaries, Joyes summarizes that a nurturing domestic environment gifts children with the best possibility for a suitable upbringing and education.

Motherhood:

Despite the prevailing scientific literature of the time that assured its learners that women's bodies were imperfect versions of the male body, women's ability to make and nurture life was an undeniable force of creation. The female body has historically been deemed inferior, powerless, weak, and unclean. Thus, women's ability to bear children was a reason to dominate them, to control their bodies and the space those bodies occupied, in order to perpetuate the false narrative that men are inherently superior to women. Joyes pushes against this narrative in her complex discussion of breastfeeding. Such a digression seems scatterbrained at first, but as Bolufer Peruga suggests, "El hecho de que le dedique un largo inciso en su ensayo y la dureza de su crítica sugieren que se trataba de un tema que le preocupaba y le indignaba especialmente, quizá por alguna experiencia personal, bien suya o de sus hijas o amigas" (293). An act tied

directly to the female gender and her occupation of domestic versus public space, then, seems more legitimate, because in her opinionated detour on lactation, Joyes y Blake offers the reader more to ponder on the strengths and weaknesses of the female body.

As Bolufer Peruga notes in "Actitudes y discursos sobre la maternidad en la España del siglo XVIII: La cuestión de la lactancia," Rousseau's musings on breastfeeding in *Émile* urged women to "return to nature." This might certainly be the case, but I would add that Joyes may have devoted ample writing space to the topic of breastfeeding because it perfectly summarizes her reason for penning "Apología de las mujeres": that the systematic control of the female body, demeaning it, using it and then disposing of it when it doesn't do what it is meant to do, is the one of the primary causes of unhappiness in women in the eighteenth century in Spain. Joyes states: "Las infelices sienten todavía más la dureza y falta de compasión de sus maridos que el mismo mal que padecen, y cuanto más entendidas y de más finos sentimientos, más se afligen. Éste es ciertamente un punto que se debería dejar a la prudencia y conciencia de la misma que lo ha de sufrir" (294). Unhappiness is left to fester and grow when women's bodies aren't cared for and nurtured, and it is for this reason that women should be left to make decisions about their own bodies. In this portion of text, although admittedly digressive by the author herself, we might re-frame her musings to find a more overarching argument on female corporeal autonomy; namely that women's bodies have historically been (mis)managed by their male counterparts and that medical research into the specific workings and ailments unique to the female body have been woefully under-researched. The women's body, by going through the physical processes of maternity and breastfeeding, becomes a prison of sorts, confining her even more to closed spaces, closed in both the literal sense of the borders of the domestic, as well as the physical

sense in that she might endure pain or infection that restrict her from participating as she normally would in her daily routine.

The author sees breastfeeding as a tool used to guilt and control mothers: “Algunos que escriben de crianza empiezan poniendo todo su conato en persuadir a las madres a que alimenten a sus hijos con su propia leche” (293). Joyes doesn’t deny that breastfeeding is a satisfactory way to feed one’s child, but she reiterates that it should be the choice of the mother whether or not she wants to do it, or if it is a good choice for her health: “…muchas hay cuya constitución delicada no les permite tolerar los trabajos de tal empeño” (293), adding that “…yo he conocido algunas a quienes costó la vida” (293). Echoing her previous comments on the female physique, smaller than that of her male counterpart, but not necessarily weaker, the author asserts that for some women, breastfeeding can cause great harm, even death. Joyes laments that many women suffer from “…postemas de pecho, inapetencias y otros males, sin querer que se remedien” (293). The lack of regard for the mother’s body causes her physical harm, all in the name of bringing up the child in the best way possible.

Joyes y Blake criticizes the pressure put on women to breastfeed, particularly from the husbands who may have only read or heard an argument in favor of breastfeeding being the most “natural” choice. She puts blame on many husbands who have read “tales tratados” (293) that claim that breastfeeding a child is the best way to ensure a natural and nurturing upbringing.[37] The milk that comes directly from the biological mother was, argued some, the only suitable nutrition for a child. Joyes challenges this logic when she questions whether the milk of a weak and sick mother is better than that of a nursemaid. She recounts from personal experience the

[37] *Emile* was a popular book that circulated during this time that spread the notion that breastfeeding was the only fit way to feed an infant. It should not be ignored that the male author, Rousseau, was dictating specifically how a woman should use her body.

pain, suffering, and even death that this sort of pressure has caused, due to untreated infections and other health issues. Here Joyes y Blake sees the pressure to breastfeed as an unfair expectation of the female body, and that ultimately the decision to breastfeed or not should be that of the women, not her husband.

In the same section, Joyes y Blake also chastises men who in one breath tell their wives that they must breastfeed so as to raise a healthy child and then who go out and commit adultery, bringing home with them a wealth of venereal diseases that jeopardize the health of not only their wives but their future children. She astutely observes that it is rarely women who have the opportunity to write about the physical caring of young children, citing this as the reason that so many manuals on how to raise children admonish mothers who don't breastfeed their own children. The author sees this as a double moral standard because men who cheat and then pass on sexually transmitted diseases to their wives are not lectured on the health and safety of their actions in regards to their family: "…ninguno he visto que toque la inhumanidad de los hombres que, habiendo vivido una vida desenfrenadamente viciosa, pasan sin escrúpulo a contraer matrimonio con una sencilla paloma, cuyo semblante a muy pocas semanas manifiesta la impiedad del que la ha contaminado y de resultas a todos sus descendientes" (294). The actions of unfaithful men lack humanity, Joyes insists, because they unscrupulously infect not only the purity of the woman that they married (referenced here as "una paloma", a dove), but also that of their descendants.[38] The author not only highlights the moral impurities of these actions, but also the health risks associated with such behavior. Joyes doesn't mention a specific venereal disease when she cites that the contamination would affect "de resultas a todos sus descendientes", but

[38] Bolufer Peruga notes that this was a "tema delicado" at the time of publishing this letter because men were not historically held responsible for their indiscretions.

diseases such as gonorrhea, syphilis and chlamydia are all known to put a newborn baby at serious risk for complications such as blindness, infections, or malformations of the body. As Bolufer Peruga notes, men expect women to perform perfectly in the domestic realm as wife and mother, leaving no opportunity for extramarital affairs, while society "…disculpaba en mayor medida las aventuras amorosas de los hombres, especialmente (pero no sólo) solteros" (294).

Joyes y Blake concludes her digression on breastfeeding by tying this corporeal topic directly to her main thesis on the unjust treatment of women by men in Spanish society and women's need to take control over their own bodies and minds with the intention to exit the "infeliz estado" (275) in which they find themselves. Joyes displays a rare exasperation during this discussion, adding, "No quiero extenderme más: harto he dicho y ojalá me entendieran y me creyeran" (294). It is unclear here if she is addressing her female readers, or if she is instead fed up with the lack of attention her concerns have had with both the men who continue to have extramarital affairs and infect their families or the male authors who write about the importance of female physical excellence when rearing children but fail to place any responsibility on the fathers who very well might be negatively impacting the health of their offspring. She continues, remarking that the immoral and potentially risky behavior of men should be more judged than that of a woman who decides to contract a wet nurse to feed her child. Furthermore, a woman's lack of ability to breastfeed her child does not consequentially make her an unfit mother: "…y afirmo que hay muchas que no pueden criar y son excelentes madres de familias" (294-5). She laments the lack of time and space she has to dedicate to the task of responding to "los modernos escritores de crianza física" (295). "Más bien," she adds, "suplicaría a algún facultativo imparcial que escribiese sobre las varias enfermedades que padecen las que crían y sobre los medios de precaverlas y curarlas" (295). This astonishing end to her discussion on breastfeeding highlights

Joyes as a crusader for more impartial and thorough research into women's health issues. As many researchers such as Laqueur have noted, women's bodies and health problems related to their specific biological functions were rarely researched, leading to deaths of many women during or after childbirth. The issue of inadequate research on women's health concerns continues to be an issue even today.[39]

Education:

Women, either in the domestic space as mothers or caregivers, or in a public space as educators, provide the foundation of education for all children, male and female alike. These are impressionable years, and the author concludes that "…es fácil concluir que el tiempo de la infancia es el que se ha de aprovechar para poner en aquellos tiernos corazones los cimientos de todas las virtudes, y que mediante este cuidado, que debiera ser nuestro, se podía seguir mucha reforma en las costumbres" (292). Here, Joyes concludes that women hold great power in their roles as caregivers and educators, for it is they who have the unique ability to create and mold the characteristics and virtues of young children.

In order to be capable educators, Joyes argues, women must first recognize their own worth and need for a proper education. Self-love was a popular concept in eighteenth-century French philosophy, or as Rousseau referred to it, *amour de soi* or *amour propre*. The former was a term that was seen as a concept of holding oneself in high enough regards to act appropriately and with virtue (a trait most commonly seen as feminine), versus the latter which refers to the reproachable trait of being too vain. Joyes Blake reminds the reader that Feijóo believed that

[39] See Maya Dusenbery, *Doing Harm: The Truth About How Bad Medicine and Lazy Science Leave Women Dismissed, Misdiagnosed, and Sick* (2018)

both women and men could benefit from *el amor propio*: “Vamos claros: el amor propio nace con nosotras como con los hombres, y por más que nos digan que la virtud se debe seguir porque es apreciable y que todo bien se debe obrar sin pensar en aplauso ni vituperio, el deseo de aquél y la repugnancia a éste permanecen siempre en el corazón humano” (282). Here, the author reaches into moral philosophy to debate whether a trait such as modesty cultivated through self-love is really a gendered quality, or whether this is an attribute that is desirable in both sexes.

Joyes returns to comment on self-love when she refers to the topic of *marcialidad*, which Bolufer Peruga defines as a “…término propio del siglo XVIII, designa el comportamiento y el lenguaje excesivamente desenvueltos, en especial en las mujeres, que se consideraban característicos de las nuevas costumbres del siglo” (285). Bolufer Peruga goes on to remark that this topic of an excess of self-confidence was a popular one during the eighteenth century, and that many *moralistas* would criticize “la excesiva <<libertad>> de las costumbres en su tiempo>> by promoting moral austerity and traditional values. Joyes falls in line with the critique of *marcialidad*, but she veers away from moralizing tendencies and rejects the notion that women should be more modest, especially the idea that keeping them out of society and in the home (“vivir encarceladas” 286) would keep them safer, when she declares: “No, hijas mías son más nobles mis ideas: nuestro pundonor, nuestro juicio han de ser las únicas cadenas que nos sujeten” (286). Joyes subverts the language of incarceration and instead suggests that women’s self-love and their capacity to distinguish right from wrong be the only chains that they wear. Self-love, then, leads to a certain independence of judgment, a trust in the judgment of women by women themselves, that doesn’t stem from the guidance of male authority. To do this, a woman must educate herself, honing her innate capabilities for knowledge so as to achieve the gift of *buen juicio*.

The limited choices that women are offered, namely that between marriage and the convent, need to be made with prudence, remarks Joyes: "Yo estoy firmemente persuadida de que una de las principales causas de la perversidad de costumbres, consecuencia pésima de la mala educación que se da generalmente a los niños, es la ligereza con que suelen contraer muchos este tremendo lazo" (290). Joyes puts value into those relationships that are not based on a forced marriage because "[s]i no llegan a fastidiarse uno de otro será mucho, pero aun cuando no llegue este caso, no pueden tener aquella serenidad de ánimo que exige el cuidado de formar el corazón de sus hijos, cuidado que principalmente pertenece a los padres y que ha de empezar casi desde la cuna" (290).

Much like Amar y Borbón, Joyes believes that on top of the formal education training a child receives in school, the education that a child receives at home is of great importance in her formation as a well-rounded person. But she argues that an education should not focus on frivolous lessons such as "…hacer la cortesía a la francesa, bailar con primor, presentarse entre gentes con despejo, hablar varias lenguas, conversar a la moda, etc.…." (291) because these teach nothing about the "…sólidas virtudes para hacerle ciudadano útil y capaz…" (291) that one would need to grow into a person that morally aligns with an ideal enlightened Spanish citizen (Bolufer Peruga, 291).

The topic of raising and educating children is common within the realm of the debate on women. Amar y Borbón delves deeply into this topic in *Discurso sobre la educación física y moral de las mujeres*, in which she sees women as the most important providers of this indispensable service. The author mentions that women must be educated in matters outside of beauty and appearance because beauty does not last, reminding readers that "(e)s necesario un gran fondo de filosofía para tolerar este destronamiento [de la belleza]" (18). According to the

author, a woman should be educated so that she can be a rational conversation-mate for her husband. Her text undoubtedly advocates for more education of women, but at the same time reduces the woman's domain to the private, domestic sphere and man's authority to the public, mercantile sphere. For Amar y Borbón, these gendered spaces are clearly divided and her desire for more educated women is not to blur these dividing lines, but rather to create a more balanced society in which both sexes can be educated in topics that will help them succeed in their pre-established roles. Her work treats women much like the 1791 dictionary entry that cites women as a "criatura racional" and "la que está casada." What is clear is that the woman, in accordance with popular belief systems of the time, was primarily a reproductive being.[40] Inés Joyes y Blake's *Apología de las mujeres* is a much more radical, risk-taking piece than Amar y Borbón's *Discurso sobre la educación física y moral de las mujeres* because the Spanish translator dreams of a world less divided by social gendered norms and more inclusive of women as fellow intellectual beings.

Unfortunately, Joyes sees the education that women received in late eighteenth-century Spain as lacking because of its focus on the physical attributes of women rather than their intellectual potentials. Teaching women that only their physical beauty is worthy of praise is directly correlated to the societal perception that women are vain, thus creating a vicious cycle that is impossible for women to overcome. Joyes y Blake highlights this hypocrisy in her perspective on the traits that are perceived as beautiful as qualities that are fleeting: "Y al fin, el reinado de la hermosura de todas suertes es brevísimo: se va insensiblemente marchitando esa

---

[40] Popular belief systems of the time, of course, were based off of the conversely related notion that female physical inferiority was linked to female intellectual inferiority. Their bodies, meant to shelter natal life, were merely vessels with a sole purpose of human creation. If the female body could not create life, it was yet another proof of the imperfect female body.

flor, y entonces, ¡qué de afanes para conservarla!, ¡qué medios para disimular los estragos del tiempo!" (283). Bolufer Peruga correctly recognizes that Joyes y Blake's contemporaries also wrote on the cruelty of passing time, but their writings focused on the need for women to seek out friendship, virtue, or education rather than love. Joyes y Blake, on the other hand, is more concerned that the inevitable passing of time slowly degrades the only trait on which women are trained to base their happiness: beauty. She uses the comparison of a young attractive female to that of a flower: delicate and lovely, until the inescapable grips of time transform her into a decaying form barely reminiscent of her original beauty. Thus pursuing happiness purely through praise of one's outward looks is a pointless exercise: "Mas, a pesar de sus esfuerzos, llegan los días en que, por más que les pese, el mundo las desengaña. Ya no ven en los semblantes aquel agrado que causa la vista de una hermosura, ya no oyen celebrar como gracias aquellas fruslerías que, realzadas por su belleza, parecían donaires y agudezas: en fin, ya se fue el esmalte y no queda más que el valor del metal" (283). Women who are only valued for their looks end up "entre vapores y murmuraciones" (283), which Bolufer Peruga states is a reference to "…los diversos desarreglos nerviosos, atribuidos comúnmente a la vida ociosa y sedentaria y los excesos de la imaginación, y que se consideraban más frecuentes entre personas acomodadas, en particular mujeres" (283). Much like the diagnosis of hysteria given to many women in the late nineteenth-century as a catch-all disease thought to be provoked by the physical limitations of the female body, here too women are driven mad due to the society's unrealistic expectations of their worth to only be found in their youthful beauty. Happiness, Joyes y Blake continues, is only available to women as they age if they are able to successfully become virtuous beings, an outcome she sees as unlikely since "…la que en tiempo no se acostumbró a hacer reflexiones

útiles, es difícil que en estas circunstancias las haga capaces de darle serenidad y paz de ánimo" (283).

Joyes y Blake also sees the domestic work of caring for children as of utmost importance, but she is critical of the treatment of young girls, denouncing the gendered language used to describe them as harmful to their development: "Apenas empiezan a pronunciar y andar cuando ya se les habla de hermosura, de garbo, y aun a muchas, por chiste, de cortejo…" (280). She continues to decry the parents that refuse to teach their little girls how to read because it would only "sería facilitarles correspondencias amatorias" (280). Girls are being taught that their only worth lies in their beauty and capacity to be admired by men. Their education pales in comparison to that of boys, as many are only taught a select few novels as well as the lives of saints. Joyes y Blake, opposing Amar y Borbón who writes that the education of the woman is only in order to make her a better wife and mother, argues for a broader selection of readings (Bolufer Peruga 281).

Joyes also echoes Feijóo's arguments, as Bolufer Peruga notes, when she clamors for a more equal space for women in eighteenth-century Spanish society:

> Pues qué, ¿todos los hombres a quienes diariamente oímos discurrir sobre asuntos políticos, historia, artes, etc., han estado en colegios o seguido estudios? No por cierto: muchos ni palabra de latín saben, y muchos adquirieron la tal cual instrucción que tienen en edad casi adulta, porque sus padres no supieron o no tuvieron proporción de dársela cuando se criaron. Pero llegó el caso de acercase a gentes cultas, les vino el deseo de poder tener parte en las conversaciones, lograron buenos libros, se aplicaron a leer, y con esto y el trato de buenas compañías se disiparon las nieblas de la ignorancia que ofuscaban su entendimiento, y hablan en las concurrencias sin recelo de que se traten de

> bachillerías sus discursos, teniendo siempre el cuidado de no dar voto en lo que no entienden (295).

This lengthy quote is significant in its totality because the author precisely perceives the gender imbalance that perpetuates the false stereotype that men are inherently smarter than women. Joyes argues that formal education has little to do with the difference in intellect, but rather the social situations in which men are allowed to participate and women are shunned. Men are given the opportunity to speak to "gentes cultas" and to read "buenos libros," and it is due to this good company that they are able to speak intelligently about a great number of topics. Women, on the other hand, are rarely gifted the same opportunity to ignite their intellectual curiosity, so their minds are confined to the domestic realm.

Conclusion: "*… viviréis felices cuanto cabe en el mundo…"*

Joyes, like Feijóo, blames society for the way that it has acted as a collective entity, educating women to only fret about their looks and ability to take care of a household. Women, therefore, have been conditioned to be victims to the passing of time, for once their youthful beauty fades and the wrinkles appear, they not only have no worth but are unable to make "reflexiones útiles" (283) due to their lack of proper education. Below is the passage I referenced at the beginning of the chapter, curious in its use of zoological vocabulary to highlight the size and force of animals as a metaphor for how women and man are (unfairly) compared:

> Digan los hombres lo que quieran, las almas son iguales, y si por mayor delicadeza de los órganos son las mujeres más aptas para un género de aplicación, y los hombres por su mayor robustez para otro, nada prueba esto contra nosotras, pues no es la abeja entre los volátiles menos apreciable que el buitre, aunque éste sea sin comparación más grande y

> forzudo, ni la oveja menos que el león, pues mientras éste sólo se ocupa en destruir y devorar sirve aquélla al hombre mansamente con alimento y vestido. La abeja gobierna su colmena y la llena de delicada miel y utilísima cera, mientras el buitre anda vagueando para buscar entre las crueldades su pasto. (277-8)

Women, much like the bee, not only reign over their domestic space, but also are active producers, whereas the larger vulture is nothing but a meaninglessly wandering animal. [41] Karen O'Brien notes in her introduction to "Sexual Distinctions and Prescriptions" that British female writer Mary Wollstonecraft was "suspicious of [the] idea of convergence, seeing it as a form of managed and veiled inequality," arguing that she would rather see the distinctions of the sexes "'confounded' in society as far as biologically possible" (3). Here Joyes y Blake stresses that "las almas son iguales" despite the size and force of varying living beings.

The debate surrounding women's participation in society continually returns to preoccupations that women are inherently physically inferior to men. Joyes turns that idea on its head in the cited text, giving examples in the animal kingdom of creatures whose physical proportions have no correlation to their strength and productivity. To conclude her letter, Joyes makes a forceful charge to all women to recognize themselves as important actors in the debate surrounding the role of women in society: "Oíd, mujeres, les diría, no os apoquéis: vuestras almas son iguales a las del sexo que os quiere tiranizar; usad de las luces que el Creador os dio […]" (297). In this commanding quote, the voice of the female translator thus appears not as a mere conveyer of ideas but rather a mandating call to arms, ordering that women take a stand to command respect for the society that has cast them off as inferior and unworthy. Additionally,

---

[41] I return to musings on melittology in my studies on El Capricho garden in Chapter 3 because the bee seems to be a reoccurring didactic theme in enlightened thought in Spain during the late eighteenth century.

Joyes emerges not only as a voice of authority in the debate on women, but also as a creator of a space that invites more women to stand firm and ignite the fire that is already within so as to harness the intellect they have. Women, as Joyes highlights, are powerful creators, not only in the physical sense as mothers and sources of nutrition for their children, but also in the intellectual sense as educators, translators, writers, and thinkers.

Joyes concludes her letter with a clear, charged message regarding the social structure that keeps men at the top and women subordinated: "Los hombres, en general, las quieren ignorantes, porque sólo así mantienen la superioridad que se figuran tener" (296). Joyes' comments on religion, physical and moral capacity, and education all in relation to the imbalanced treatment of women in Spanish enlightened society. It is through the lens of unhappiness that she focuses her attention, arguing that women's lack of joy is directly linked to her subordinate position at home and in the public sphere, the lack of educational opportunities that are offered to her, and the constant critique and control over her body. Ignorant women, opines Joyes, are easier to manipulate, therefore men prefer to maintain the unbalanced treatment of the sexes to perpetuate their dominance. As Bolufer Peruga notes, Amar y Borbón, Joyes' contemporary, did not agree that men desired to keep women ignorant to control them; instead she argued that this couldn't be true because there have historically been men who have written about the wit and rigor of some women. Amar y Borbón's argument lacks the depth and consideration that Joyes gives to the topic. "Apología de las mujeres" is a nuanced, insightful look at eighteenth-century Spain and the author doesn't shy away from critiquing the unbalanced society that has systematically pushed women down.

The concluding paragraph of the letter urges her female readers to recognize their equality in an effort to manifest a more balanced society in which both men and women would flourish and be respected:

> Respetaos a vosotras mismas y os respetarán; amaos unas a otras; conoced que vuestro verdadero mérito no consiste sólo en una cara bonita, ni en gracias exteriores siempre poco durables, y que los hombres, luego que ven que os desvanecéis con sus alabanzas, os tienen ya por suyas. Manifestadles que sois amantes de vuestro sexo, que podéis pasar las horas unas con otras en varias ocupaciones y conversaciones sin echarlos menos, y entonces huirán de vosotras los pisaverdes y los hombres frívolos… (297).

Joyes returns to the topic of self-love and self-respect, recognizing that to receive love and respect you must manifest it yourself first. That manifestation of self-love can be done, she assures the readers, through the practice of knowing your own self-worth, brushing aside all of the societal pressures that tell women that their self-worth is only skin deep. She urges women to believe in themselves as proper conversation mates and companions and to purposefully surround themselves with others who believe in their potential. The letter ends reminding the reader that happiness will come when women are allowed to fit in the word: "…viviréis felices cuanto cabe en el mundo, y moriréis con la gloria de dejar una posteridad virtuosa" (298). Upon first glance this declaration might seem optimistic about the future of women in Spanish society; but read as an accompaniment to Joyes' translation of *Rasselas*, a novel that concludes that true happiness is nowhere to be found, the author might be suggesting that a woman's happiness is still a dream yet to be materialized.

With a closer reading of "Apología de las mujeres," keeping in mind other works defending women's physical and intellectual capacity, it is clear that Spain's Enlightenment

offered not only new conceptualizations of who were socially acceptable members of society but also innovated classifications and definitions of the individual. Joyes' work is a pillar to this concept, an extraordinary example of the intellectual output of an enlightened thinker who was not only cognizant of popular discourse of the day, but also capable of weaving in scientific rhetoric to provide fascinating glimpses into the debates happening during the eighteenth century in Spain.

In Rousseau's *Emile*, he identifies traits that he believes to be natural, or innate, to each gender, but then argues that society amplifies and exaggerates those traits so that they become moral differences. For instance, female modesty is an instinctual trait that females have so that they don't get pregnant too often, but this same trait has been modified and magnified by human society so that it presents itself as a moral difference rather than a natural one. Joyes y Blake speaks to many of these differences between the sexes (women are more nurturing, smaller, etc.) but rather than concluding that they are moral differences between men and women, she urges her readers to reevaluate the traits assumed to make men more dominate over women. Does size determine strength? No. Do a woman's reproductive organs make her lesser than a man? No. Therefore traits, according to Joyes y Blake, are not determinate depending on sex. Differences can be celebrated without being reductive.

Although Amar y Borbón's work is frequently cited by eighteenth and nineteenth-century scholars as representative of pro-women's voice that lauded education for all, I would argue that Inés Joyes y Blake provides a more progressive perspective. Joyes constructs a well-articulated argument, weaving in historical, cultural, and scientific constructs of women into her text that calls for a fairer society in which both genders are given both intellectual and social powers. She used her power as a translator to pen a compelling essay to convey her ideas to her readers,

formulating convincing arguments for the expansion of women's participation in society by using scientific reasoning to defend both their moral and physical likeness to men.

Joyes y Blake's "Apología" was revolutionary, then, because she actively countered the predominantly male-generated discourse that argued that women were biologically unfit to occupy the new spaces created during the Enlightenment. Her writing pointedly dissected the debate on women that was widely circulated during the second half of the eighteenth century in Spain, and that was deeply rooted in the misogynistic belief system that men are superior to women. The roots of misogyny run so deep that scientific texts claimed to "prove" these beliefs as fact because, as Laqueur states, "believing is seeing." Joyes allows the reader to re-imagine female happiness as a state in which women's intellect is celebrated and fed, rather than ignored and starved. Some women during this time, such as the Duchess of Osuna, were actively infiltrating male-dominated spheres, either through determined calls for inclusion or the creation of new spaces that were meant for both men and women, therefore making a reality the dream that Joyes y Blake imagined in "Apología" that women are not to be locked out of the public sphere because of ill-conceived biological inferiorities.

Chapter 2: Engendering Knowledge: An Analysis of Eighteenth-Century Botanical Texts in Spain

> "Perhaps knowledge succeeds in engendering knowledge, ideas in transforming themselves and actively modifying one another…"
> Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, p. xxiii

The Enlightenment is known as a time of reason and controversy. In Spain, the influx of philosophy and thought was undoubtedly affected by the fascination with scientific investigation as a way to prove hypotheses through the belief that "*ver es creer*." Interest in science became more widespread through its dissemination in newspapers and *tertulias*. Scientific rhetoric and research methods provided new ways to examine societal and cultural problems such as hygiene, education, and medicine. While the previous chapter investigated how scientific discourse permeated the debate on women, in this chapter I turn this question on its head and ask how notions of gender affected scientific discourse during the Enlightenment. Thinking back to the debates on the limits of science in Inquisitional Spain that I discussed in the introduction, in this chapter I center those discussions around the study of botany in eighteenth-century Spain, specifically referencing research on the historical and social implications of botanical investigations and texts in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Spain.[42] From this understanding of the dissemination of botanical information during this time, I analyze the scientific vernacular that was used in texts that were deeply rooted in social and gendered cultural norms. I argue that Spain's Enlightenment innovated classifications and definitions of

[42] Scientific expeditions to the New World abounded in the eighteenth century, so any discussion of advancements in botanical studies in the Peninsula are also, at some level linked to our propelled by plants studied in viceroyalties such as Peru and New Spain (Mexico).

the individual infiltrated language used to write about botanical objects of interest. Both humans and plants were discussed as active, gendered participants in their respective worlds, each species contributing to the creation of a more egalitarian social organization.

How did gender biases affect scientific discourse during the Spanish Enlightenment? In *Nature's Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science*, Londa Schiebinger argues that studying participation in the sciences during the Enlightenment is not a question of aptitude but rather a "politics of participation" (3). In this chapter I analyze eighteenth-century botanical texts at a microscopic level to consider how gender biases affected scientific investigations during the Enlightenment and their repercussions, and thus propose that the "politics of participation" show that the cultural biases surrounding gender roles affected scientific rhetoric in Spain. Natural law became political during this time as scientists tagged social conventions as scientific proof of inferiority, as seen in examples of gendered vocabulary in Linnaean texts.[43] His use of gendered, scientific vocabulary became widely accepted and utilized throughout most of Europe. I explore the importance of the study and practice of botany in the eighteenth century in the Iberian Peninsula, by looking to discussions on botany and botanical texts by Enlightened thinkers such as Padre Benito Feijóo and Gaspar de Jovellanos, as well as the Spanish botanists José Quer, Antonio Palau, and Casimiro Gómez Ortega in their quest to classify and describe plants. I pay close attention here to the language used to describe different plant parts and their relationship

---

[43] Carl Linnaeus, also known as Carolus Linnaeus or Carl von Linné was born in 1707 in Sweden. He showed great interest in both the study of plants and the study of the human body, which led him to study under a doctor at a young age. This introduction to the study of physiology and the study of plants led him to travel, eventually becoming a physician himself. He was named professor at the University of Upsala because of his pioneering work on natural history, the study of plants from lesser-known locales, and his development of a practical system of classifying plants. It is for this last accomplishment that he is best known.

with other plants to dissect the heavily gendered language used by botanists. One must distinguish the difference between botany, the scientific study of plants, and agronomy, the study of soil and crop management. It is the former that, according to Javier Puerto Sarmiento, "…sería digno de estar presente en gabinetes y academias" (19). In other words, it is the study of plants themselves that was deemed dignified enough to be classified worthy of study, and we can see that in the creation of the Royal Botanical Garden in the eighteenth century.

I analyze works by Quer who contributed to the popular field of botany during the Spanish Enlightenment, and Palau, who is credited with the translation of Linnaeus's texts into Spanish. Not only a translator, Palau also penned original work on Spanish botany, along with Gómez Ortega. Keeping in mind that botany was deemed one of the only "suitable" areas of scientific studies for women – I conclude this chapter discussing the link between the botanical space, or the garden, as both a locale of scientific investigation and social gathering, and women, who, during this century, were gaining more access to public spaces. Scientific discourse was, and is, entrenched in cultural politics. Therefore, I argue that eighteenth-century classifications of the individual as an active, gendered participant in Spanish society became a part of the Humanist vernacular that permeated scientific texts.

Before diving into analysis of botanical texts, we must answer the question: what is the link between women and botany in eighteenth-century Spain? The study of botany quickly became popular in the second half of the eighteenth century, thanks particularly to the work of Linnaeus and his development of the sexual classification system to identify and describe plants. The scientific interest in plant studies intersected the interest in the natural world and its relationship with the physical human body. Plants were studied for agricultural, pharmaceutical, and decorative purposes. Unlike the typical denial of admission to and permission to engage with

academic studies, women *were* allowed to study botany and avidly did so in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Western Europe.

The intersection between botanical studies and language used to describe male and female anatomy and relationships is not challenging to find in eighteenth-century texts. As Sam George mentions in his introduction to *Botany, Sexuality and Women's Writing 1760-1830*, "…the feminization of botany first occurred in texts written by men. These botanical texts were often reinterpreted in significant ways by women, but there had already been a distinctive female orientation of the texts by the male writers themselves" (5). What sort of "distinctive female orientation" did the texts take? That is certainly subject to the reader. But we might link Schiebinger's assertion that the language used in botanical texts is not free from gendered connotations and stereotypes that permeated the lexicon of the time.

How might this understanding of the intersection of body politics and anatomical studies affect our reading of botanical texts? I engage with this question more deeply in this chapter. As George clearly states: "Linnaeus famously made use of human-plant analogies; his nomenclature was inspired by traditional wedding imagery and marriage metaphors permeate his botanical taxonomy in *Systema Naturae* (1735) in which he explained the concept of *nuptiae plantarum* (or 'The Marriage of Plants')" (1). As I later show, Linnaeus and his writings had deep and lasting impacts on botanical texts and the study of plants in Spain. So to understand these texts, we must also understand cultural and societal debates on the role of women that were concurrent to the expansion and interest in botany in the eighteenth century.

Theoretical considerations:

In order to bridge the historical significance of the study of botany in the eighteenth century to the broader interpretive significance of this science in conjunction with other societal debates at the time, it is necessary to lean on theoretical approaches to help form connections. I examine the twentieth-century French philosopher Michel Foucault's musings on classification systems as well as an eighteenth-century Swiss thinker, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and his writings on botany and philosophy.

That one idea might modify another is not a novel approach to the understanding of epistemology: we assume that ideas are born from another, more developed episteme. But our approach to the birth of knowledge is that ideas must follow a linear pattern; that the discovery of a new plant is only possible because of previous knowledge of botany and agronomy. What if, in addition to these plant studies, other approaches helped the production of this new set of ideas? Foucault wrestles with the approaches to classification of knowledge in *The Order of Things*, and his approach, along with Rousseau's eighteenth-century approach to the study of botany and its link to philosophical understandings of the natural world, help me link the work I have discussed on the participation of women in eighteenth-century Spain and the scientific discourse that was concurrently erupting as thinkers were attempting to quantify and qualify biological discoveries.

In the introduction to his foundational work, *The Order of Things*, Foucault reminds the reader that our ways of understanding science, mathematics and technology as methodical studies that excavate pure truth, can also be applied to our study of human life and interests; in other words, it also follows a "certain code of language" (ix). Foucault argues that through comparative work, such as looking at the knowledge of human beings while looking at the

philosophical discourse available to those thinkers at that time, he was able to produce results richer than studies that are restrained to a singular topic. This approach, then, links to my assertion that the politics of gender in eighteenth century Spain can be better understood by looking at the currents of knowledge that flowed through society at that time, namely the powerful current of scientific knowledge.

It is important to note that Foucault shies away from speaking about the epistemology of the sciences as specific to a certain century. My work does deal with the eighteenth century as a point of departure, but as will be discussed in the epilogue, the discussions and paths created during this time had lasting effects on the participation of women in Spanish society. Foucault saw the changes in scientific discourse around the turn from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century as transformations propelled by the scientists who interacted with these sites of knowledge.

Then, to center these thoughts in the eighteenth century, I examine Rousseau's interest and writings on botany, specifically in his *Letters on the Elements of Botany* (1771-1774), a series of letters he penned to Mdme. Madeleine-Catherine Delessert. It is in these letters that Rousseau expounds on his interest in botanical studies, and also his "disillusionment with the sexual system" (Cook, 189) of classification that was made popular by Linnaeus. These letters were never published by Rousseau himself, but rather posthumously. Because of that, there are many theories as to whether the Swiss philosopher ever wanted to make public his theories or if these were rather letters detailing his personal interest in botany to a family, the Boy de la Tour, that he was close with. It is true that Mdme. Delessert initiated the written correspondence with Rousseau on the topic of botany, and thus this archive is of interest to this study as it speaks to

the popularity of botany in eighteenth-century Europe as well as the connection between the study of plants and the sexual system that was used to classify them.

It is necessary to highlight that the study of botany was intrinsically linked with other sciences in the eighteenth century. The division of studies in science that are common practice today were not so easily delineated in the 1700s in Europe. This is most notable, when considering the study of botany, in the interest and study of chemistry. Chemistry was primarily a medicinal study during this time, and primarily was researched and practiced with plant-based remedies. Furthermore, it was not uncommon for women to participate in the study and creation of botanical remedies. This is exemplified in Rousseau's connection with Mme. de Warens, also known as Maman, a woman Alexandra Cook describes as "…a highly intelligent, non-conforming aristocrat…" (28) who participated in the study of the medicinal benefits of plants and sold plant-based remedies. Cook notes: "Maman's pharmacological enterprise was not only chemical, but also botanical, because herbal remedies used plant materials…" (31). Therefore, these two scientific pursuits were closely related during the eighteenth century.

Enlightened thinkers ponder plants: approximations by Feijóo and Jovellanos

I find it useful to begin my analysis of eighteenth-century botanical texts by turning to two canonical authors of the period. Benito Jerónimo Feijóo y Montenegro, most commonly referred to as Benito Feijóo, is a Spanish philosopher and monk that is known for early eighteenth-century musings on science and empirical reasoning as it applied to different aspects of society, religion, and individual ethos. One of his most well-known texts is *Teatro crítico universal* (1726–1739), and it is in this work that he provides us a glimpse of how the concept of agriculture and plant life was regarded at the time. Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos was another

philosopher whose neoclassical ideas and writings helped to define the political and economic landscape of the late eighteenth-century in Spain. One of his most influential works, *Informe sobre la Ley Agraria* (1795), detailed his understanding of agrarian law and sought to rethink land distribution in Spain. Although ultimately his suggestions were not heeded, his writings on the topic were influential across Europe and Latin America. Both authors engaged with the woman question in other publications, but here I turn to their botanical reflections as a way to orient us to the importance of the study of plants and plant life during the eighteenth century in Spain.

Padre Benito Jerónimo Feijóo

The Spanish monk helps us to seed our understanding of botany and the art of cultivation in the first half of the eighteenth-century in Spain. Feijóo highlighted in "Honra y Provecho de la Agricultura" in *Teatro Crítico Universal (tomo VIII, discurso XII)* that the act of cultivating the land is as ancient as man himself:

> Luego que Dios creó a Adán, le colocó en el Paraíso, para que le cultivase, y guardase: *Ut operaretur, & custodiret illum*. Cultivar la tierra fue la primera ocupación, y el primer oficio del hombre. A esta incontestable antigüedad añaden un gran lustre dos gloriosas circunstancias. La primera, que la Agricultura fue la única entre las Artes, que tuvo su origen en el estado de la inocencia; todas las demás nacieron estando ya la tierra envilecida con la culpa. La segunda, que de todas las demás Artes fueron Autores los hombres; de la agricultura lo fue Dios. Consta del Sagrado Texto: pues Adán, no por designio propio se dedicó a cultivar la tierra, sino por destino, y orden del Altísimo: *Tulit*

ergo Dominus Deus hominem, & posuit eum in Paradiso voluptatis, ut operaretur, & custodiret illum. (section 2.5-6)

This lengthy quote is worth dissecting under the umbrella of the importance of botany and botanical studies during the eighteenth century in Spain. Throughout this section, the author argues for more advancement in the technology needed to cultivate the lands as well as how to better the lives of the farmers and workers who cultivate it. Feijóo directly links the cultivation of land to the work of God: man's interaction with dirt, plants and trees brings him closer to God because, as Feijóo states, it is the most pure of crafts.

Feijóo and Rousseau share the belief that the authorship of plants is displaced from man. In the introduction to *Letters on the Elements of Botany*, Rousseau begins saying, "The principal misfortune of Botany is, that from its very birth it has been looked upon merely as a part of medicine" (2). Rousseau's text is composed of an introduction and thirty-two letters in which he details both his interest in botany and various species of plants that he has studied. Rousseau is aware of the purposeful ignorance of the study of plants by the scientific community because it was seen as a pharmaceutical pursuit. During the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, plants were viewed to be useful objects of study only if they were researched as crops or as medicine. The study of plants and their species, detailing their physical descriptions and life cycles, was only beginning to take hold in Western Europe during the second half of the eighteenth century. Rousseau goes on to lament how plants were picked apart and desiccated with the desire to transform them into an herbal healing balm, or merely grown in order to harvest food. The Swiss philosopher saw plants as an elevated part of the life cycle, worthy of studying in their entirety.

The "truth status" (17), as Alexandra Cook suggests, that Rousseau lends to plants is similar to Feijóo's exaltation of agricultural and botanical practices. In *Jean-Jacques Rousseau and botany: the salutary science*, Cook examines the eighteenth-century Swiss philosopher's writings on and study of botany. She references a number of his writings and letters to show that Rousseau wrote frequently on the topic of the study of plants, but his interest was saturated less in the science behind the plants and more seeded in their proximity to Nature, and therefore the *Auteur*. It is for this reason that Rousseau saw such benefit in being in nature and observing plants: he perceived them as having, as Cook states, "truth status" – they are the bounty of what the *Auteur* created, not a product of manufactured intervention. Humans can interact with the herbal bounties in a garden or field, but the true creation was product of a higher power.

According to Feijóo, working the land is not a job that one chooses, but rather one that is chosen by God. Keeping in mind that another important chapter of *Teatro crítico universal* is dedicated to the advancement of women in Spanish society, it is interesting that Feijóo chooses to recall the Garden of Eden as the first, and arguably most important, garden. Although he only mentions Adam as the worker of the land, Eve also had a hand in the cultivation of garden and is most famously known for picking the one fruit forbidden to cultivate by the Creator. As Puerto Sarmiento notes in regards to Feijóo's text, "La Botánica no ocupa un lugar relevante en su obra, pero sí la ciencia útil y como tal la Agricultura" (18).

Rousseau showed a disdain for the academic study of botany; he preferred that the observation of plants in their natural habitat. It is for this reason that he rejected gardens for a more rustic interaction with botanical matter: "Gardens, which had traditionally offered a space for contemplation and spiritual renewal, are for Rousseau human creations fraught with human

concerns, and therefore play no role in his salutary botany" (19). In its essence, botany should be domination-free, unattached to a laboratory or scientific pursuit.

Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos

The study of plants and agriculture was valued by other *ilustrados* such as Jovellanos in his *Informe sobre la Ley Agraria*, in which he extoled the importance of agriculture after offering a brief history of its value to the Spanish empire:

> La Sociedad no ha podido confrontar los hechos que la confirman sin hacer al mismo tiempo muchas importantes observaciones que le servirán de guía en el presente informe. Todas ellas concluyen que el cultivo se ha acomodado siempre a la situación política que tuvo la nación coetáneamente, y que tal ha sido su influencia en él que ni la templanza y benignidad del clima, ni la excelencia y fertilidad del suelo, ni su aptitud para las más vanas y ricas producciones, ni su ventajosa posición para el comercia marítimo, ni en fin, tantos dones como con larga mano ha derramado sobre ella la naturaleza han sido poderosos a vencer los estorbos que esta situación oponía a sus progresos. (5)

Here Jovellanos links Spain's excellence and prosperity as a nation to the agricultural abundance it's been able to cultivate. This thought process evolved over time, especially after Jovellanos publication of *Informe sobre la Ley Agraria* (1795). In this treatise he elevates the role of the farmer, the harvester, "…hombres prácticos y pacientes que sepan estercolar, arar, sembrar, coger, limpiar las mieses, conservar y beneficiar los frutos, cosas que distan demasiado del espíritu de las escuelas y que no pueden ser enseñadas con el aparato científico" (82). Here Jovellanos distances himself from the rigidity of the academy, instead praising these workers for

skills that were not learned in *escuelas* because they are inherent, unable to be taught with the *aparato científico*.

The Royal Botanical Garden also gradually changed their perspective on its own role, preferring a focus on agricultural practice towards the end of the eighteenth century (Puerto Sarmiento, 19). As Puerto Sarmiento notes, this dichotomy between the study of botany and agriculture was a debate that lasted well into the next century, because it highlighted the plight about the intellectualization of the study of plants. Botanists became concerned with the utility of their studies and the connection between agriculture and natural theories and theologies that guide other fields of study (20). Despite the crisis that occurred in the Iberian Peninsula as the nation progressed from the eighteenth century to the nineteenth, botany continued to be considered an important research endeavor.

Plants were deemed to be providers of not only natural beauty, but also to be full of useful compounds for medicinal purposes: “A partir de 1783 la Botánica y los botánicos se convierten en los mejores aliados del proyecto modernizador de la sanidad en el campo de la Farmacia” (21). This, along with pressures from other foreign powers interested in military and intellectual expansion, prompted Spain to continue their overseas expeditions, focused on the search for botanical discoveries to rival scientists such as Lord Byron and Cook (England) and Bouganville (France). (22)

Botany as a colonizing power

During the reign of the Bourbon Dynasty in Spain, the centralized powers in the peninsula sought consolidated control and economic expansion in their colonies in the

Americas.[44] As Patricia Aceves Pastrana explains, these measures were done in conjunction with the formation of the Royal Botanical Garden in Madrid, as a centralizing locale to filter, catalogue, and produce botanical knowledge (287). Other researchers, such as Puig-Samper, have noted the influence the Royal Garden's creation had in solidifying central power over scientific expeditions and research through the Spanish monarchy: "Nacía pues el nuevo jardín ligado a una institución de corte ilustrado empanada en la modernización del país y en la reforma de las enseñanzas sanitarias, así como a hombres pertenecientes a la farmacia, la medicina y la cirugía militar, siguiendo el modelo general de renovación científica que se daba en esos momentos en España" (351). It is clear, then, that the mission of botanical research was to empower the Spanish Crown as well as its viceroyalties.

There are undoubtedly damaging effects of botanical expeditions and the botanical language used in the literature to describe plants that were rooted in the Linnaean classification system. In the introduction to *Colonial Botany*, Schiebinger and Swan remind the reader that the interests in botanical expeditions were primarily economic rather than intellectual: "Europeans' efforts to develop scientific taxonomies to capture the order of nature coincided, at times paradoxically, with large-scale alteration of nature by European global botanical, economic and military operations" (8). Therefore we cannot examine eighteenth-century Spanish pursuits in the botanical realm without acknowledging its unfettered ties to the colonial expansion project.

In *La ilusión quebrada: Botánica, sanidad y política científica en la España Ilustrada*, Puerto Sarmiento argues that the Spanish monarch's interest in botany was directly linked to

[44] For more information on the expansion of different scientific expeditions and pursuits during the Enlightenment in Spain, see edited collections such as *Mundialización de la ciencia y cultura nacional* (Eds. A. Lafuente, A. Elena, y M. L. Ortega) and *Ciencia, técnica y estado en la España ilustrada* (Eds. Joaquín Fernández Pérez y Ignacio González Tascón).

their desire to retain control over their colonies and remain a major power in the eighteenth-century political landscape in Europe. In the first half of the eighteenth-century, the monarchy contracted the help of chemists and naturalists to gather information from the colonies and later formed institutions such as the Cabinet of Natural History and the Royal Botanical Garden, in order to "…desempeñar un relevante protagonismo en la renovación farmacéutica y el control de las expendiciones científicas ultramarinas" (13).

The empirical project of expansion of botanical knowledge was inherently connected to the viceroyalties in the New World. These were very expensive undertakings and were meant to excavate both knowledge and potential natural resources for the Spanish Empire to monetize. Two voyagers and researchers worth noting here are Hipólito Ruiz and Joseph Pavón. They completed botanical expeditions to Chile and Peru between 1777-1788. It is pertinent to also turn to Daniela Bleichmar's monumental work, *Visible Empire: Botanical Expeditions and Visual Culture in the Hispanic Enlightenment.* Bleichmar notes that "…these naturalists delivered to Madrid a significant herbarium (collection of dried plants) and approximately 2,300 paintings of South American specimens" and that after returning to Spain they devoted nearly a decade and half to documenting their botanical discoveries in *Flora Peruviana* (*Visible Empire*, 6). Other important expeditions included those led by José Celestino Mutis to the New Kingdom of Granada (1783-1816) and Martín Sessé and José Mariano Mociño to New Spain (1787-1803). [45]

Bleichmar has a unique analytical voice that is lacking in other studies of the history of Spanish botany; specifically, she revolves her research around visual studies of the botanical

[45] It bears mentioning that Mutis communicated with Carl Linnaeus during his expeditions to New Granada. In these correspondences he shared "letters, specimens and images" (Bleichmar, *Visible Empire*, 21). This speaks to the international cooperation that was seen in many of these botanical expeditions.

prints and drawings that came out of the boom research of plants in both Spain and the New World. It is through visual culture and scientific studies that she tells the story of the Spanish Empire during the eighteenth-century. She finds value in the drawings and paintings of plants: "Each image embodies not only a plant but also multiple observations, decisions, negotiations, and types of expertise" (6). It is what propelled the image to have been created that navigates her research. Visibility, Bleichmar argues, is the focus and main purpose of these botanical studies and expeditions. By making their discoveries visible, both in artistic form but also in the creation of botanical gardens, Spanish botanists were able to "…make imperial nature movable, knowable and – ideally – governable" (7). Imperial nature was the main commodity that the Spanish empire sought to reap in these expeditions. During the reigns of Charles III and Charles IV, the purpose of these voyages was to "uncover and exploit the natural riches of the Spanish empire" (18), and botany played a key role in this exploitation. As Bleichmar notes, "Thus, the expedition operated in three interrelated domains: taxonomic botany, economic botany, and collecting" (19). These trips also required cooperation from a variety of European powers: Spaniards worked alongside the French, Italians, as well as indigenous, Creole, and mestizo naturalists from the viceroyalties that the scientists visited (20).

As Bleichmar notes in *Visible Empire*, the power of taxonomic botany was not lost on the Spanish empirical powers that funded the expeditions to their viceroyalties in the New World. The Linnaean classification system was implemented in the collection of specimens and data of various expeditions (19). Miguel Angel Puig-Samper dates the arrival of the Linnaean classification system to Spain as 1751, with his academic disciple Pehr Löfling, who traveled to the peninsula to study the plants and animals of the region (349). What solidified the use of the Swedish botanist's classification system was the development of the Royal Botanical Garden in

Madrid in 1755. Specifically, it was through the written works of the first professor of the Royal Garden, Quer, and later his predecessor, Miguel Barnades, that the Linnaean system took hold as commonplace when naming, classifying and organizing plant species.

Despite the adaption of the Linnaean classification system within the botanical societies of Spain, decades prior to the establishment of the Royal Botanical Garden in Madrid, Linnaeus clearly states his opinion on the state of botanical studies in Spain. He did not mince his words in *Bibliotheca Botanica*, published in 1736, about the "barbarity" of botany in Spain. The following is José Quer's translation into Spanish of Linnaeus' original text that was written in Latin:

> "¡La flora Española ninguna planta ha dado a conocer; siendo así que en lugares fertilísimos de España hay algunas plantas que no se han descubierto. Es sensible dolor que en los lugares mas cultivados de Europa en nuestro tiempo se experimente tanta barbaridad en la Botánica! Estas poquísimas plantas, que nos constan ser de España y Portugal, debemos su noticia al curioso Tournefort, clase III y a otros." (363)

In this statement we see vestiges of the Black Legend that had plagued Spain: it is painted as a country ever behind in terms of its intellectual pursuits, never living up to his northern French neighbor. Of course, Linnaeus' opinion on Spanish botanists was tainted and did not take into account the remarkable work of scientific work and study on plants by renowned thinkers such as Andrés Laguna and Dioscórides in the sixteenth century. Spain was seen as backwards and behind, and disciples of Linnaeus such as Pehr Löfling traveled to Spain with these stereotypes in mind.

In Chandra Mukerji's article "Dominion, Demonstration, and Domination: Religious Doctrine, Territorial Politics, and French Plant Collection," she suggests, referencing the French enlightenment project to expand botanical knowledge, that "Colonial botany became embroiled

in state politics as finding exotic species, learning their uses, collecting their various names, sending them to France, displaying them in botanical gardens, and comparing them systematically constituted practices of territorial governance as well as of natural history" (19). Although this assertion references France's eighteenth-century history, parallels can certainly be drawn to Spain's quest to collect and catalogue new plant species as a political endeavor as much as an intellectual one. Collecting this information gave a boost to the knowledge capital of each and every colonizing nation at the time, and with that capital came power.

The emphasis on order, and thusly that order being a biological and therefore truthful determinant, is an example of how this language might have been used to uphold Western European, patriarchal belief systems. Staffan Müller-Wille asserts: "Science, with its dialectical ability both to upset and to objectify social relations, constitutes one of the motors of colonialism write large, rather than merely serving as one of its instruments" (48). The visibility of the plant, the capability to observe it, reinforces the idea that to see is to believe. But when the taxonomic system used to educate those that study botany is soaked in language riddled with gender stereotypes, we also might assert that believing is seeing.

Botany was a key factor in the advancement of pharmaceutical, medicinal and surgical studies and was worthy of economic support. A. González Bueno firmly states: "La Botánica es, en definitiva, una herramienta de la política borbónica" (383). He goes on to assert that enlightened thinkers in Spain took interest in botanical texts primarily due to their political nature, rather than an interest in natural sciences. This is a bold idea and one that I delve into deeper as I analyze a private garden space created by the Duchess of Osuna in Chapter 3. What is clear here is that botanical ideas disseminated throughout the academic systems, primarily

though the production of botanical texts written in Spanish. Next, I focus on some of the key players in the publication of botanical texts: Quer, Palau and Gómez Ortega.

¡Tanta barbaridad en la botánica!: Eighteenth-century botanical texts published by José Quer, Antonio Palau y Verdera, and Casimiro Ortega

It is true that Spain certainly was not at the forefront of the Scientific Revolution and important works from outside the Peninsula, such as Linnaeus' *Systema Naturae* and *The Temple of Flora*, were read by intellectuals and affected common discourse of the day. The Spanish Empire quickly adapted Linnaean classification of plants, which included marriage and gender role metaphors to explain plant behavior, and the interest in botany was made clear by numerous references to the Swedish botanist in Spanish newspapers during the eighteenth-century.[46]

These eighteenth-century texts by Spanish scientists help to further analyze gendered rhetoric in botanical investigations and show that gender politics did, in fact, permeate scholarly, scientific texts in the Spanish Enlightenment. José Quer, Casimiro Gómez Ortega and Antonio Palau, considered some of the first educated botanists in Spain, were acutely aware of works by Linnaeus and used the Swedish scientist's work to create a dialogue between Iberian botanical investigations and those of the rest of Western Europe (Puerto Sarmiento 22).[47]

---

[46] *Linneo en España: Homenaje à Linneo en su segundo Centenario, 1707-1907*. In fact, the King of Spain (Phillip V) offered Linnaeus a spot at the Universidad de Madrid as well as the task of overseeing the botanical garden. Linnaeus turned down the stipend and job offer.

[47] La *ilusión quebrada: Botánica, sanidad y política científica en la España Ilustrada*. España: Serbal, 1988.

A study of botany in eighteenth-century Spain cannot be done without mentioning the influence and power that Carl Linnaeus, a Swedish botanist, had on the field at large. His effect on the study of plants and the formation of the Royal Botanical Garden in Spain is undisputed, as well as his influence on prominent botanists of the time, such as Palau and Quer. Linnaeus (1707-1778) was trained as a physician before he chose to focus on botany, thus I draw connections between his knowledge and interest in human anatomy and his popular classification forms that made connections between plant structures and gendered human body parts. Finally, I introduce his influence on Spanish eighteenth-century botanists before turning to those Iberian scientists and a closer analysis of their texts.

Another Spanish botanist worth noting is Antonio José Cavanilles. He studied the works of Linnaeus as well as other French botanists and was eventually named the Director of the Royal Botanical Garden of Madrid in 1801 (Pelayo, 60). It was his work on the Linnean class Monadelphia that brought him eventual fame and controversy. He had used his knowledge and study of the Linnaean classification system to create "several new genera and species of Monadelphian[48] plants" (53). This caused controversy with other European botanists because many of them were opposed to Linnaean classification efforts. One of his opponents, Friedrich Kasimir Medikus, was "opposed to 'sexualists' like Linnaeus" (54). This controversy surrounding Cavanilles is linked directly to his study of Linnaeus and shows the polemic qualities of the study of botany at the time. The sexualization of plants was deemed not only incorrect but immoral. Cavanilles held Spanish botanist Antonio Palau in great esteem: he lauded his translation work in *Filosofía botánica*: "He also recognized the importance of spreading

---

[48] Monadelphian plants, as related to Linnaeus's sixteenth class of plants that have hermaphrodite flowers, have stamens joined to their filaments, forming one set or tube.

Linnaeus' system, as Palau had done with that translation, because he thought that to be the best system for learning botany" (55).

As Pelayo and Garilleti mention in their article on the influence of Spanish botanist A. J. Cavanilles, foreign influences on the formation of the Royal Botanical Garden and other eighteenth-century interests in the study of plants came also from France. Botanists such as Jean-Baptiste Lamark and Joseph Pitton de Tournefort had an undeniable effect on botanists in Spain. This should not come as a surprise as during this time, France was asserting itself as a dominant cultural compass in Western Europe, both in creations of intellectual spaces as well as publications of intellectual advancement, certainly including the natural sciences. As Clorinda Donato asserts: "From the seventeenth century on, the denigration of Spain and its colonies by the French press had continually escalated for reasons of economic competition that were easily recast as moral victories on the side of reason in French narratives of the Spanish Empire" (7). Cavanilles, although certainly influenced by the French botanists (as is evidenced in his work with the Jardin du Roi in Paris, was critical of their outdated methods and nomenclature. In fact, Cavanilles criticized Gómez Ortega because he still used Tournefort's studies to guide his own research. He saw Linnaeus' work as the way of progress (56).

José Quer

Quer authored a popular text on botany published in 1762 in Madrid, *Flora Española o Historia de las plantas que se crían en España*. The Spanish botanist, along with José Hortega, helped to create the Royal Botanical Garden in the mid-eighteenth century, as well as encourage scientific expeditions in New Spain in order to gain more knowledge on plant species that might be used as pharmaceutical substances (Puerto Sarmiento, 13).

Quer was a follower of Joseph Pitton de Tournefort, a French botanist, and in *Flora Española* he responded to the popularity of Linnaeus's plant taxonomy in Spain by advocating for an alternative system to the one popularized by the Swede. It is useful to study the scientific discourse used in Quer's text to see how it compares to other Spanish botanical works of the time, such as *Curso elemental de botánica* by Gómez Ortega and Palau, that were heavily influenced by Linnaean classification. Quer was a trained surgeon, offering a unique approach to botanical studies because of his intimate understanding of human anatomy (Pascual, 13). How did his previous training affect his study of plants, and how might that training affect the way he speaks about plants in his writings? Quer offers an understanding of botany, its pharmaceutical purposes, and its relation to the human condition.

Quer made waves in the eighteenth-century intellectual scene when he published *Flora Española* because he refuted Linnaeus' taxonomical system – a system at its core binary in nature. The Spanish botanist, in part, wanted to vindicate Spain's intellectual territory, arguing in the *Apología de la Ciencia Española* that while Spaniards have been treated as "*bárbaros*" in regards to their "latent" scientific discoveries, that they have in fact superseded many other European countries in their botanical research and collections: "…en este Reino se crían las más de ellas con la mayor abundancia. De los Aromáticos, y Plantas Americanas, respóndame el señor Linneo, ¿a quién se debe la lora de tan felices descubrimientos, sino es a los famosos españoles?" (40). He goes on to question Linnaeus' accusations that Spain's botanical endeavors don't compare with other European nations by citing important scientific academies founded in Spain, such as the first Academy of Medicine founded by Ibn Zuhr (Latinized name Avenzoar), an Arab physician, surgeon, and poet, in Toledo, the works of Dioscórides, a great botanist of the Golden Age, and the work of the great erudite Antonio de Nebrija (41).

Before the Linnaean classification of plants became both widely known and widely used, scientists would use Latin to name living things. The problem was that there was no unifying system to name plants, and as the exchange of knowledge became more widespread throughout the eighteenth-century, it was possible to find that a single plant had been identified and named differently by a variety of scientists. Linnaeus used descriptions of plants, or their physical characteristics, to group them together. This divided plants into larger groups, genera, and into smaller divisions, or species. It is within these divisions into genera and species that Linnaeus developed his unique naming system: "First come the name of the genus into which it is put, then a specific name or 'epithet' which distinguishes it from the other species within the genus" (Hadfield, 46). This naming system has evolved to be more specific, but to this day the basic structure of the Linnaean plant naming and classification system is still used.

As Schiebinger writes in her first chapter of *Nature's Body*, "The Private Lives of Plants," Linnaeus's choice of words as a taxonomist is proven to be highly gendered, scientific vocabulary that was widely accepted and utilized throughout most of Europe. In his most widely circulated work *Systema naturae* (1735), the system on which he bases his new classification system is the difference between male and female flower parts:

> "Linnaeus divided the vegetable world (as he called it) into *classes* based on the number, relative proportions, and position of the male parts or stamens. These classes were then subdivided into some sixty-five *orders* based on the number, relative proportions, and positions of the female parts or pistils. These were further divided into *genera* (based on the calyx, flower, and other parts of the fruit), *species* (based on the leaves or some other characteristic of the plant), and *varieties*." (14-17)

Some have argued that Linnaeus focused on these differences because the reproductive cycle in plants was so important to understanding their differences. But his classification system is based off of the visualization of plant parts, essentially comparing them to male and female anatomy, rather than their actual sexual function. Plants aren't inherently male or female – those are labels with which the Swedish botanist tagged them. Again, it is important to understand that culturally formed biases and thought patterns on gender actively influenced scientific literature during this time.

Quer admonishes the unjust treatment of Spain in its relation to the sciences when he proclaims: "¡Qué mal concuerda la inmortal memoria de estos sabios Naturalistas, con el injusto dicterio de la *barbarie*, con que se queja de nuestra Nación! ¿No han sido estos Varones los Argonautas primeros de aquellos siglos, que en el Océano vasto de la Historia Natural, por la parte de las Indias Oriental, y Occidental, descubrieron incognitos rumbos a todas las Naciones?" (42). He mentions the complaints and calls of "barbarity" when speaking about the scientific endeavors of Spain, but he reminds his readers that Spaniards made some of the most prolific trips across oceans in the past centuries.

It is apparent both in Quer's piece and in other writings on scientific expeditions and discoveries of the eighteenth century in Spain, that the nation and its intellectual leaders were dealing with an identity crisis: despite other nations' accusations of mediocrity or barbarity, Quer and other Spanish scientists saw a legacy of intellectual scientific investigative work. The Spanish botanist goes on to specifically call out Linnaeus for his name-calling: "Con pruebas tan evidentes, que contra el producente plenamente prueban, y con testimonios tan incontrastables, parece, que queda nuestra *Flora* defendida del baldón de la *Barbaries Hispánica*, con que el erudito Linneo, tan sin razón, ni verdad ha querido vulnerar el blasón de su decoro, en deshonor

de los grandes ingenios, con que siempre este Reino ha florecido en la Botánica" (43). He goes on to admit that Spain had been lagging between the reigns of Phillip II and Phillip V, but that the country's interest in scientific pursuits had not diminished. Spain, he pointedly states, has proven their intellectual worth and any statements otherwise are "sin razón, ni verdad."

In the "Dedicatoria" of *Flora Española*, Quer compares his botanical text to a "ramillete de flores", offering the "frutos y frutas en estos dos tomos de mi Flora Española" as a sort of offering to the reader. The delightful comparison of the text as akin to the flowerings of a plant encourages the reader to approach Quer's work with wonder. Although the author is aware of the popularized Linnean taxonomical system, he offers a simpler version in his tome:

> No quiero manchar las heroicas acciones de V.M. con mis rústicas expresiones; que aunque no sean improporcionadas para una Flora, que será más fructuosa, si la leen los rústicos labradores, no pueden ponderar objetos tan sublimes. Dejo que cada flor de este ramillete celebre a su modo, y con florida, aunque muda elocuencia, las prendas de V.M. palando el aprecio, que hará vuestra real dignación de la agricultura, y botánica, mientras yo a mi modo, y con mis leales vivas ansias importunaré a Dios en mis suplicas nos conserve la preciosa vida de V.M. para que haga ver el mundo lo mucho que Dios ha criado en España. (26-27)

He extols a simpler naming system in which he "…[o]bservaba, además de la ocular inspección, preguntar, siempre que podía, a los habitantes del País el nombre de las plantas" (43). But it is important to note that the author was not simply seeking a simpler taxonomical classification system. By providing an alternative to a foreign way of thinking about plants, it can be inferred that Quer was attempting to nationalize the science of botany. That is to say, by making a system for the classification of plants that is unique to the Iberian Peninsula, and eventually its

territories, we might suggest Quer was attempting to perfect a system by way of language. He lists what he sees as necessary steps in the categorization of plants: "…separar lo que ha de estar dividido, y unir lo que no debe estar separado: quitar lo superfluo, poner lo que falta, corregir lo defectuoso; y finalmente, descubrir la virtud de las Plantas" (52-53). Quer's experience as a doctor is clear here in his desire to surgically recreate the language with which Iberian plants are described in order to correct its defects.

In his preface, Foucault upends the power to which we bestow classification, turning to a Borges text, "El idioma analítico de John Wilkins," that challenges our ways of classifying and understanding the world. Foucault argues:

> Order is, at one and the same time, that which is given in things as their inner law, the hidden network that determines the way they confront one another, and also that which as no existence except in the grid created by a glance, an examination, a language; and it is only in the blank spaces this grid that order manifests itself in depth as though already there, waiting in silence for the moment of its expression. (xx)

He acknowledges that the codes of culture and the scientific and philosophical theories line culture with suggestions of order, but that between these two lines there exists much which cannot be ordered and therefore results in "the pure experience of order and of its modes of being" (xxi). This interpretation of classification and its theoretical limits is important not only in the readings of botanical texts by Linnaeus and Quer, but also in the understanding of all limits and orders that a culture imposes on its members. We can see in the writings of Joyes y Blake and later in the creations by the Duchess of Osuna that those who push against the boundaries and order that dictate what a person can or cannot do are pioneers in the reclassification and evolution of a society.

Despite his frequent admonishments of the Linnean classification system, Quer frequently comes back to compare his work to that of the Swedish botanist. I share here an excerpt that we will see again in my discussion on Gómez Ortega y Palau. In this text, Quer shares Linnaeus' discussion of hermaphroditic plants: "Dice Linneo, que cuando las Plantas florecen, celebran sus bodas. Asía de las Plantas, cuyas flores son fecundizadas por un solo estambre, o macho, o marido (como él mismo llama) forma la primera clase de Plantas en su sistema, a las cuales llama Monadrias con flor Hermaphrodita" (377). The short aside in parentheses that reads "como él mismo llama" cannot be overlooked. Throughout the book, Quer criticizes the Linnean way of classification and nomenclature. I cannot help but think that the Spanish botanist found Linnaeus' use of marriage metaphors to be lacking.

Quer goes on to question Linnaeus' understanding of the plant, by specifically calling into question his way of seeing:

> Los estambres, o filamentos, son en algunas Plantas tan pequeños, que muchas veces se desaparecen a la vista natural, y a la lente. Así, es preciso un microscopio de los más arreglados, para hacer una exacta inquisición de sus partes…Aunque aseguró Linneo el haber visto con su vista natural casi todas las cosas, o partes, que el escribe de las flores; no obstante en las de esta *Alfine* en algunos flósculos de los más enteros, ni aun con el microscopio, la perspicacidad de los mayores Lynces pudo descubrir sus estambres." (378).

In the chapter "Classifying," Foucault turns to the burgeoning curiosity in the physical sciences that is associated with the eighteenth century. With advancements in technological tools such as the microscope, thinkers started to investigate and organize the laws, animals and plants that

surround human beings. Quer tries to elevate his understanding of botany by way of the microscope, a tool that gives meaning to only those that have the tool to see.

Foucault acknowledges that before the eighteenth century, when interests in classification were peaking, writings on the natural world focused on the object of interest, its history and supposed virtues, the legends told about it, what it provided in terms of food and medicine. In short, the history of a plant or animal was a multidisciplinary approach, "the whole semantic network that connected it to the world" (129). Foucault ascertains that this is not due to the naivety of early scholars, but alternately spoke to the fact that signs were a part of the thing being defined. Later, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, signs became modes of representation, rather than intrinsically linked to the thing itself. The philosopher argues that knowledge was not gained, per say, during the Enlightenment, but rather thinkers reimagined ways of displaying knowledge; they preferred informative tables over theatrical productions, and this transformation carried over into other parts of society.

The ever-important phrase "seeing is believing" again becomes important in our understanding of eighteenth-century ways of knowing, and we see that here in Quer's text. Tools such as the microscope propelled thinkers to value and prioritize what was noticeable by the eye to be the driving force behind biological classifications. The microscope provided the false security that now, as opposed to before, humans conquered the capability to see what was before invisible: the cell.

Antonio Palau y Verdera

In *Explicación de la filosofía, y fundamentos botánicos de Linneo, con la que se aclaran y entienden fácilmente las instituciones botánicas de Tournefort* (1778), Antonio Palau y

Verdera delves into the theoretical posturing behind Linnaeus' work, attempting to "españolizar los términos botánicos…" (Colmeiro, 31) some, but not many, of the scientific terms that the Swedish botanist coined. As Colmeiro notes, Palau instead chooses to "vulgarizar" many of the scientific terms, thusly making them more digestible to the Spanish reader. In Chapter VII of *Filosofía*, Palau dedicates space to the different synonyms that plants might be named, recognizing the work of botanists long before him: "…que la obra perfecta de los sinónimos es muy necesaria; porque entendido el nombre que ha puesto un Autor a una planta, facilmente se hallarian los demas que la hayan dado los otros Autores" (209). He recommends using terminology contemporary to the taxonomy popular in eighteenth-century botanical studies, but also sees reason in listing other names by which the plant is known.

Rousseau argues that one of the gravest obstacles that has botany has faced is its nomenclature. In his introduction, he complains that the lack of an organized classification procedure to systematically name and catalogue known plant species resulted in a chaotic mess in which researchers would create their own naming systems. He commends Linnaeus as a contemporary leader in the formation of a naming and classification system of plants that allows for greater learning and appreciation of plant studies. Despite the Swedish scientist's work, Rousseau opines that there is room for improvement, for he finds the long Latin names to be tedious and impractical in common usage. His dedication to the betterment of the botanical naming system lies within his desire to make it a more accessible study: "…I would ask every reader of common sense, how it is possible attach one's self to the study of plants, and at the same time to reject that of the nomenclature? It is just as if a man would make himself skillful in a language, with a determination not to learn the words of it" (17).

In the prologue to his treatise on botany, Palau asserts that "…la Botánica, que en otro tiempo solo era una confusa y arbitraria Nomenclatura de las plantas, fue elevada a la dignidad de Ciencia demonstrable" (14). Here Palau highlights the importance of the study of botany in the eighteenth century as a science that was previously not viewed as elevated as other sciences, primarily because of the "confusing and arbitrary nomenclature of the plants;" but that it had transformed to a more dignified status because it was demonstrable. In other words, botany embodied the enlightened notion that "seeing is believing." This visibility and availability to touch and observe the plant, coupled with the advancement and simplified and unified naming system developed by Linnaeus, propelled botany to a top tier scientific study. In fact, Palau goes on to specifically laud "este famoso Sueco" (14) for his research and publications that "enseñan el verdadero, y científico método de conocer las plantas" (15); he recognizes the works of Linnaeus' predecessors and his disciples as being important, but not as influential in the progress of the study of plants. Palau's intention for writing this text was to merge Linnaeus' monumental work on botany with that of a well-regarded French botanist, Joseph Pitton de Tournefort, who published works at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century that led the way to genus and species distinctions among plants.

We might also look to Rousseau's interest in botany as a way to understand how to link the study of plants to more overarching philosophical contemplations that were swirling in the minds of enlightened thinkers. In Gerard J Van den Broek's article, "I think I'll be a plant myself: The semiotics of Rousseau's botanical practice," the author links the eighteenth-century Swiss philosopher's interest in semiotics and signs and links his interest in botanical studies to his desire "to avoid written and spoken signs as much as possible" (81). Van den Broek states that a discussion of signs was not uncommon in eighteenth-century Europe, and that the same

distinction of signs given in classical times were used: *signum natural* (natural sign) and *signum ad placitum* (conventional sign) (81). Van den Broek suggests that Rousseau took such a deep interest in botany because "interpretation was scarcely necessary for 'reading' these natural, memorative signs" (92) of plants. Whether observed live in their natural habitats or dried and persevered in books or laboratories, plants didn't need the conventional signs of language in order to be understood.

Van den Broek goes on to suggest that plants acted as a sort of "private symbol" that fell out of the realm of needing to be interpreted. Thusly, while in his herbarium or outside observing plants, Rousseau was able to engage in the type of communication he most preferred: nonverbal communication (92). "His botany," writes Van den Broek, "and his herbariums in particular, formed the key to an open space, without obstacles. Here he found his badly needed immediate communication: a dialogue with himself" (93). This notion that plants themselves provided a new way for their human researchers to think and communicate is intriguing. We might think of the study of plants as a re-interpretation of conventional signs, or verbal communication, and in this re-interpretation, a simplification of communication. Obviously, in the written studies and verbal communications about plants that were produced in the eighteenth century, conventional language had to be used to convey meaning and educate. So we cannot study plants and the emerging field of botany without understanding the language that was used their description.

In Chapter XII of his *Filosofía*, Palau delves into the sexuality of plants. The title of the chapter is "Del sexo de las plantas en que funda Linneo su Sistema sexual" – he references the influence that the Swedish botanist had in this convention to organize and understand plant differences. He begins, "Pretende Linneo que al principio de las cosas, fueron criados dos sexos de toda especie de vivientes" (267). Palau immediately notices that Linnaeus applies the

biological sexual differences seen in humans and other mammals to botanical varieties. Palau continues that one cannot know why God created living things as he did, but that it is clear that to multiply a creature, be it animal or botanical, must reproduce. He begins by describing the plant parts used to identify them as either male or female:

> "En el córculo de la semilla reside una porcio de la medulla de la planta, la qual fecundada por la substancia del leno, que se halla en las antheras u organos masculinos, arroxa otra planta de todo semejante a aquella que la produxo: de lo qual se colige, que despues de su creacion se ha continuado por medio de la generacion. Visten los cotyledons el córculo para conservarle mucho tiempo, y subministrarle alimento muy analogo a la leche, quando empiece a germinar." (267)

In this description, we see a reliance on human sexual anatomy and understanding of reproduction used to describe the different parts of plants. This connection is made, one can assume, to best describe these processes to the reader. But also one might ask why other analogies aren't used?

He continues describing the life cycle of the plant as similar to that of a human: "Es en ellas bien reparable la edad de infancia, puericia, adolescencia, virilidad, y vejéz" (268). Again, the comparison of a plant's life to that of human seems laughable, but in humanizing plants, Palau allows the reader to identify with them and recognize their fragile, mortal nature, similar to that of a human. He reminds the reader, "Mueren las plantas, y por esto es preciso concesar que viven" (269). This observation is curious in that it is so blatantly obvious to the modern reader. But in humanizing plants both in their life and in their death, the author elevates their importance. Might it be that if we observe these plants with care that we might also observe a reflection of ourselves in nature?

At times, the description of the reproductive cycle in plants reads as if it were a moral cautionary tale: "Son animales hybridos o bastardos, los que tienen origen de diversas especias, y nunca se asemejan perfectamente a aquellas que los engendraron; no pudiendo tampoco continuar su generacion" (270). At other times, I can only imagine that certain eighteenth-century readers might blush at the seemingly pornographic description of male and female plant parts: "Que sean las Antheras los genitales masculinos de las plantas, y su Pollen la verdadera geniture o esperma, lo enseñan su esencia, precedencia, situacion, tiempo, celdillas, castracion o privacion, y estructura del pollen. Lo demuestra la situacion, por quanto las antheras se recogen debaxo del labio superior de la flor, a donde se inclina el stigma o genital femenino" (272). Reading descriptions like this, it becomes clear why some thought it necessary to censor botanical texts and make them more "digestible" for female readers.

In *Nature's Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science*, Schiebinger discusses the link between Linnaeus's classification system based on the sexuality of plants to gendered stereotypes prevalent in eighteenth-century Europe. "...[T]he revolutions in science and sexuality," argues the author, "cannot be understood in isolation, for they share an intimate history" (12). She sees this proven in the "…implicit use of gender to structure botanical taxonomy and the explicit use of human sexual metaphors to introduce notions of plant reproduction in botanical literature" (13). We might not be surprised by the borrowing of gender and human sexuality to identify and classify plants – biological sex was, and is still, used to identify and classify humans, therefore the borrowing from this lexicon to create literature and educate on this burgeoning scientific field would make it more adaptable and easily understood.

Palau's use of Linnaeus's sexual classification system in his text shows the far reach the Swedish botanist had in the world of eighteenth-century botany. By penning this text in Spanish

and sharing these descriptions with Spanish readers, Palau invites a new audience to learn about plants, identify their uses and parts, and understand their life cycles. He ends *Filosofía* saying, "…es el primer fin a que encamina sus tareas el Botanico; porque sino se tiene de antemano una idea clara, y distinta de las especies, no es facil hacer uso saludable, y provechoso de ellas" (280). By using human anatomical terms in the description of plant parts, Linnaeus and his followers such as Palau allowed humans to relate to plants and, possibly, search for answers to questions that couldn't be answered by studying the human body. Plants were readily available for human observation – by classifying and ordering them, the botanist might attempt to derive meaning of their life cycle in hopes to find meaning in ours.

In *Parte práctica de botánica del caballero Cárlos Linneo* (1784),[49] a text that translates many of Linnaeus' taxonomic and botanical findings into Spanish by Antonio Palau, the reader is almost immediately confronted with the gendered language of Linnaean classification. In the part entitled, "Principios del sistema sexual del Linneo," plants are organized by their sexual organs: "Entre las plantas donde estos órganos son visibles, las unas contienen dentro de una misma flor los dos sexôs: esto es, *estambres* y *pistilos*, y se llaman hermafroditas: otras no tienen mas que un sexô, y se denominan *masculinas* quando no poseen mas que estambres; y *femeninas* quando no tienen mas que pistilos" (xxxiv).[50] What is especially interesting here is the consideration of a hermaphrodite plant, as the condition of hermaphroditism was concurrently

---

[49] *Parte práctica de Botánica del caballero Cárlos Linneo que comprehende las clases, órdenes, géneros, especies y variedades de las plantas, con sus Caracteres genéricos y específicos, Sinónimos mas selectos, Nombres triviales, Lugares donde nacen, y Propiedades*. Traducida del latín en castellano e ilustrada por Don Antonio Palau y Verdera. Madrid: La Imprenta Real, 1784.

[50] The italicized text is transcribed as view in the original.

perplexing enlightened scientists.[51] This gendered classification of plants culminates in the "Llave del sistema sexual ó nupcias de las plantas," in which, as indicated by the title of the section, plants are categorized by their destined nuptial bliss as per their natural compatibilities.

As I noted before, Linnaeus did not speak highly of the state of Spanish botany in the first half of the eighteenth century. Palau, a loyal follower of Linnaeus, defended his nation by stating, "Que no se hallase en tiempo de Linneo escrita ninguna Flora Española; y que él no conociese las plantas naturales de estos Reynos, parece son razones muy insuficientes para tratar a los Espanoles de ignorantes en la Botánica; porque pueden ser muchas las causas legitimas que impidan escribir de esta Ciencia, sin que al mismo tiempo dexe de haber muchos sugetos bien instruidos en ella" (*Filosofía*, 18-19). Palau goes on to say that Linnaeus must have simply not been aware of Spanish botanists at the time, such as Barcelona native Don Jaime Salvador, who had made advances in the study of plants and who referenced botanists such as Joseph Pitton de Tournefort, in his works.

Casimiro Gómez Ortega and Antonio Palau y Verdera

I finally turn to a text, *Curso elemental de botánica* (1785), written by Casimiro Gómez Ortega and Antonio Palau y Verdera. Gómez Ortega was a highly revered physician and botanist as well as the First Professor of the Royal Botanical Garden, his tenure lasting from 1771-1801 (Puerto Sarmiento, 7).[52] He was interested in the utilitarian nature of plants, or how their leaves, flowers and fruits could be used for medicinal, or consumption purposes. Palau was a Catalan

---

[51] See Laqueur, *Making Sex* for more on the one-sex model used in anatomical studies in the Enlightenment.
[52] For an in depth look at Ortega-Casimiro's contributions to the Royal Botanical Garden in Madrid, see Puerto Sarmiento's *La ilusión quebrada*.

botanist who moved to Madrid in 1773 in order to work at the Garden. With Palau came the adaptation of Linnaean classification of plants, as Palau was an avid follower of the Swedish botanist's work. Although some critics are skeptical of Palau's contribution to *Curso elemental de botánica*, Miguel Angel Puig-Samper argues in his study of the botanist, "Antonio Palau Verdera y la enseñanza en el Real Jardín Botánico," that the Catalonian certainly worked on the scientific text. Puig-Samper goes on to state that Palau's 1778 publication of the *Explicación de la Filosofía y Fundamentos botánicos de Linneo, con la que se aclaran y entienden fácilmente las Instituciones Botánicas de Tournefort* in Madrid was viewed as monumental by contemporary Spanish botanists (723).

In a description of class XXIII of plants known as *Poligamia*, the authors state that it is in this class in which "las plantas…se observan muchas *bodas*…en que hay en una misma especie flores hermafroditas y masculinas, ó hermafroditas y femeninas" (XVI). This description might look familiar, as it is quite similar to José Quer's discussion of the same plant. In this description, the reader is not distracted by the annotations of the author. This excerpt closely mirrors Linnaeus' language, which is unsurprising when considering the authors' loyalties. For this reason, I find it valuable to dissect the language. The name of the class most certainly was influenced by the perceived polygamous behavior of its plants that celebrate many "weddings." The term wedding here is a socially charged, erroneous term as it specifically refers to the reproduction cycle of the plants. Gómez Ortega and Palau continue the discussion on different classes of plants and their reproduction cycles with a description of the *Cryptogamia* class, in which they "celebran ocultas sus *bodas*, es á saber, cuyas flores son imperceptibles ó casi imperceptibles á la vista por muy pequeñas" (XVI). In eighteenth-century Spain, it would be preposterous to reproduce outside of the confines of marriage, thus it is only appropriate to

discuss plant reproduction as masked by the term "wedding," be it a public or private affair. Despite this text being scientific in nature, the authors choose to borrow social terminology so as to prescribe a certain morality to these plants. It is in this choice of language that I suggest we consider the moral implications of this vocabulary. By charging a scientific text with social notions of gender normality, the authors show that scientific discourse was indeed influenced by rhetoric common in debates on gender and gender-specific roles in eighteenth-century Spain.

In *Nature's Body*, Schiebinger notes that Linnaeus chose to place class above order, essentially prioritizing male parts in the classification of plants: "There is no empirical justification for this outcome; Linnaeus simply brought traditional notions of gender hierarchy whole cloth into science" (17). Linnaeus, much like other learned men that came before him, allowed social relations between the genders to influence how he penned scientific literature on plants – this completely upends the assertion that seeing in believing; it is proof that cultural and social belief systems are so entrenched in our psyche, and therefore our vocabulary, that they cannot be untied from intellectual productions thought to be "free" from bias. Ortega Gómez and Palau's use of these terminologies translates the sexualized description of plants into a botanical text read by many, be them erudite men or women curious about plant life.

According to Gunnar Broberg, some of Linnaeus' contemporaries considered his science to be "indecent", not because of its false reliance on human social relations to describe plant reproductive cycles, but rather because it was based on the sexuality of the plants (61). Interestingly, Broberg argues that Linnaeus' work is better classified as Renaissance or Baroque rather than pertaining to the philosophy of the Enlightenment: "His duty was to decode the order and taxonomy given by God…Building his system he wanted nothing less than an encyclopedic covering of the whole but also the unchangeable nature. He believed in harmonic and balanced

creation" (66). But if we take these scientists' contributions to botany into consideration with the concurrent undertakings of other eighteenth-century thinkers and philosophers, their projects are nothing but purely a product of the Enlightenment. If seeing is believing, then we must use our observations to classify and name, to organize and to understand, the world in which we live.

Foucault focuses on Linnaeus as an important figure in his study of the transformation of ideas as relating to the human sciences in the eighteenth century. He describes Linnaeus as a scientist that asserted that "all of nature can be accommodated within a taxonomy" (126). It is the Swedish thinker's commitment to classification that intrigued Foucault because of his dedication to the art of labeling and categorizing plants. Foucault notes why Linnaeus' classification system became so popular, because at its root it was meant to homogenize the identification of plants and botanical specimens:

> These four variables, which can be applied in the same way to the five parts of the plant – roots, stem, leaves, flowers, fruits – specify the extension available to representation well enough for us to articulate it into a description acceptable to everyone: confronted with the same individual entity, everyone will be able to give the same description; and, inversely, give such a description everyone will be able to recognize the individual entities that correspond to it. In this fundamental articulation of the visible, the first confrontation of language and things can now be established in a manner that excludes all uncertainty. (134)

Again, the commitment to the eye, reinforcing the notion that "seeing is believing" is what drives Linnaeus' goal to classify plants in a way that a specimen can be identified no matter who studies it. He makes the plant a static object that does not change depending on who sees it or who interacts with it.

What ultimately is most intriguing about Linnaeus' work and its link to Spanish botany is the dedication to describing the structure of the plant, and in that description the use analogies so that the reader can clearly visualize the specimen: "In this way it becomes possible to describe certain fairly complex forms on the basis of their very visible resemblance to the human body, which serves as a sort of reservoir for models of visibility, and acts as a spontaneous link between what one can see and what one can do" (135). As we saw in the descriptions by Palau and Quer, the language used by scientists, language that is deemed pure because it is supposedly derived from observation, is in fact tainted with the same stereotypes and assumptions of male versus female bodies and their abilities. Thusly, gendered human bodies are limited by scientific discourse, such as that seen in botanical texts, because their limits and roles are supported by other biological species. The constricted roles that dictate that females are weak compared to their male counterparts cannot be denied, then, if it is seen across the biological kingdom of species.

Conclusion: botany as a step closer to the unknown

As Schiebinger notes in *The Mind Has No Sex?: Women in the Origins of Modern Science*, "The nature of science is no more fixed than the social relations of men or women: science too is shaped by social forces. One of those forces has been the persistent effort to distance science from women and the feminine" (9). Women have been systematically kept out of the academic institutions and universities that men were allowed to populate. For this reason we do not have a long list of female scientists that participated in documented progresses in the natural sciences in the eighteenth-century. It is also important to note that women historically did participate in certain domestic pursuits, in their roles as healers and domestic workers. Therefore,

it might not be such a surprise that botany was deemed an acceptable form of study by young women in the eighteenth century.

Schiebinger reminds us that science has indubitably been shaped by social and political trends and thus we must continue to question who is doing science and remember that "science is not a neutral culture" (212). As Patricia Fara explains in *Pandora's Breeches: Women, Science and Power in the Enlightenment*, the history of science, including biographies about scientists, has frequently forgotten to include women. Fara notes that botany was a science that was deemed socially acceptable for upper-class women interested in the sciences. Books on collecting and drawing plants and flowers flourished, although women were not allowed to make any notable scientific discoveries of the day. Historians and literary scholars have linked the growth of botanical studies in the eighteenth century with the concurrent debate on the role of women in society. Thinkers such as Fara and Schiebinger have shown us that by reading these botanical texts, we are also gazing into the social implications of the language and metaphors used to talk about plants, and interestingly, talk about human relations. The most obvious discussion is of that of class and order. But, specifically, how this was done with plants, by sexuality, is significant.

Because of the sexualized language used to discuss plant taxonomy, many of the botanical books that were marketed to women were sanitized, according to Fara. A clear example from England is Patricia Wakefield's *Introduction to Botany* (1796), which toned down the focus on the sex and sexual reproductive parts to educate young women on plants without exposing them to lewd descriptions of plant anatomy and reproduction that would taint its female reader's mind. It is undeniable that women were both consumers and creators of botanical literature in Western Europe. But what does this consumption and production mean? In Spain, although we

do not have access to a botanical text written by women, we do have an example of a botanical space curated by a women – and I explore that space in my next chapter. It is for this reason that I analyze the botanical literature that was circulating in Spain at the time, all of it male authored, in an attempt to gain insight on how the information was presented to readers in the eighteenth century.

Although both Fara and Schiebinger's texts provide a critical base for the discussion on women and science during the Enlightenment, they do not speak specifically to the intersection of science and the debate on women in the Iberian Peninsula. *Feminist Epistemologies*, edited and introduced by Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, provides a helpful place to stop and consider the interconnectedness of the debates surrounding science and gender. Contributors to the text all suggest that there have always existed alternative ways of knowing. This, for many feminists, may not come as a shock, but to apply these critiques of philosophy to the dusty, forgotten collections of eighteenth-century literary production, especially in Spain, is to turn these didactic, straightforward texts on their heads. In Sandra Harding's contribution to *Feminist Epistemologies*, "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is "Strong Objectivity"?, she firmly attests that "[k]nowledge claims are always socially situated[53]" (54) and it is with this notion of situated knowledge that I would like to concentrate on scientific texts in my second

---

[53] A longer excerpt from the text helps to contextualize Harding's claims: "In societies where scientific rationality and objectivity are claimed to be highly valued by dominant groups, marginalized peoples and those who listen attentively to them will point out that from the perspective of marginal lives, the dominant accounts are less than maximally objective. Knowledge claims are always socially situated, and the failure by dominant groups critically and systematically to interrogate their advantaged social situation and the effect of such advantages on their beliefs leaves their social situation a scientifically and epistemologically disadvantaged one for generating knowledge. Moreover, these accounts end up legitimating exploitative "practical politics" even when those who produce them have good intentions."

chapter to order to investigate the reverse of my ponderings on science's role in the debate on gender that I propose in my first chapter.

Might it be that women have always been studying and working with plants (in the agricultural setting to feed, but also in the medicinal setting to tend to the ill because they were allowed to be healers) and so this inclination to "allow" women to study plants was not very revolutionary or forward-thinking in terms of the expansion of female participation in Spanish society? Maybe. But Geoffrey Sutton also suggests that the shift in the understanding of science that we see in the eighteenth century (what he deems "new science") can be understood to have a domino effect in the expanding audience for scientific studies and discourse:

> In its essentials, the new science began as a literary pursuit, allowing great latitude in discourse about nature. It offered a source of polite conversation for dabblers as well as a discipline for the serious; it was a more callow pursuit than the scholarly fields of philology and metaphysics; it appealed to feminine culture; women frequently were devotees of the study of nature and contributed significantly to the development of natural philosophy. (8)

Science was becoming more accessible, and in that accessibility came the allowance of women to become amateur botanists simply by moving through the spaces that were already deemed socially acceptable for them to be, including the garden. Sutton has an important reminder to readers in his conclusion: "If we see science as more feminine only insofar as we see it as a more accessible, more entertaining, more charming, and less technical science, then we see the feminine side of science as the least like what science is supposed to be—and the most like what stereotypical characterizations claim women are supposed to be" (342). My goal is not to argue that the study of botany was somehow feminist: it was not and to see women's participation in

the study of plants as proof of some sort of revolutionary progress is a superficial reading of what was happening during the eighteenth-century. Instead, I argue that scientific discourse used in botanical texts was influenced by body politics. Women's participation in the study of botany allowed them an avenue to dabble in the sciences (although only on an amateur level), yet it also allowed them access to scientific texts and its vernacular.

As Tina Gianquitto remarks in *Good Observers of Nature*, "Nature, according to the terms of natural theology and the codes of sentimental flower books, was a web of moral associations that connected the individual to the divine" (2). Nature has always been a source of philosophical and intellectual advancement throughout human history, so the connection between peaked interest in botanical studies and the debate on the role of women during the Enlightenment might not come to many as a surprise. Gianquitto argues that women were, and are, "good observers of nature." Although she details the scientific writings of four women in nineteenth-century America, she concludes that these women were products of the "enormous public debate concerning ideal feminine behavior" that was born in the century prior: "Good observing," she remarks, "as expressed in popular advice and educational literature, was thus tied to mental improvement, moral action, and domestic duty. The idea observer had trained both the eye and the mind to read the scientific and moral geography of nature.

In Rousseau's first letter in *Letters on the Elements of Botany*, he addresses his female cousin and answers her inquiry about teaching her daughter the study of botany. Alexandria Cook says that these letters "are usually said to have been directed to an exclusively female audience" (190), so I believe that it is worth a brief analysis as a bridge to my study of botanical literature in Spain during the eighteenth century and the space of the garden during this same time period. The Swiss philosopher wholeheartedly agrees that it is a worthy project. He states

that he is "…convinced, that at all times of life, the study of nature abates the taste for frivolous amusements, prevents the tumults of the passions, and provides the mind with a nourishment which is salutary, by filling it with an object most worthier of its contemplations" (19). Rousseau sees the advantages in studying plants primarily for its dilution of other "frivolities" that could clog the mind of a young woman.

I find it interesting that he sees botanical studies as a way to "prevent the tumults of the passions" because of the sexual classification system that Linnaeus, and also Rousseau, use to teach plant anatomy, structure, and life cycle. In the following six pages of the letter, Rousseau suggests that his cousin begin by teaching her daughter about the lily – a commonly found flower, one that is large enough to be observed without any need for special equipment, and simple enough to identify plant parts. In conclusion, he suggests: "You will not begin by telling your daughter all this at once; and you will be even more cautious, when in the sequel you shall be initiated in the mysteries of vegetation; but you will unveil to her by degrees no more than is suitable to her age and sex, by directing her how to find out things of herself, rather than by teaching her" (26). Rousseau sees the limitations of teaching botany to a female – and one might wonder how to limit the teaching based on sex. But it is also notable that he encourages the young girl to self-teach – and in fact, this is one of the most advantageous aspects of the study of botany, according to the Swiss philosopher. Plants can and should be study by the naked eye in their natural habitat. One does not need to have studied centuries' worth of writings and musings on plants in order to gain important information about their structure and anatomy.

In the next chapter, I connect to this idea of geography both scientific and moral in nature, specifically in the locale of the garden. The garden represents an ideal intermediary space. Physically, it is connected to the domestic landscape of the home but extends its reach

beyond the confining walls of the domicile. This physical in-between realm was a spot that did not push the limits of areas deemed socially acceptable for women to occupy, but it did allow for the flourishing of interest in the natural world. What might the garden show us about female participation, both scientific and political, during the Enlightenment in Spain? I suggest that the Duchess of Osuna's garden at Alameda (cleverly referred to as "El Capricho") and her oversight of the scientific and social happenings in this botanical space might offer a different perspective on the role of women in eighteenth-century Spain.

The garden, then, provides a useful link to connect these ideas on the debate surrounding women in the eighteenth century in Spain with the growing interest in botany. The garden is both a natural space and one that is managed by human artistic creation. To conclude this chapter, and to provide a bridge to my final chapter on El Capricho garden, Feijóo's 1734 writing entitled "El no sé qué" provides an apt perception on the connection between the human and the natural world. He begins the essay:

> En muchas producciones, no sólo de la naturaleza, mas aun del arte, encuentran los hombres, fuera de aquellas perfecciones sujetas a su comprehensión, otro género de primor misterioso, que cuanto lisonjea el gusto, atormenta el entendimiento: que palpa el sentido, y no puede descifrar la razón; y así, al querer explicarle, no encontrando voces, ni conceptos, que satisfagan la idea, se dejan caer desalentados en el rudo informe, de que tal cosa tiene un *no sé qué*, que agrada, que enamora, que hechiza, y no hay que pedirles revelación más clara de este natural misterio.

Feijóo suggests here that the edge of human understanding and reason, where one questions what is right and what is wrong, provides the enchantment and yearning that provokes us to seek out the "no sé qué". He continues, bringing the reader to an enchanted botanical space:

> Llegan a un sitio delicioso, cuya amenidad costeó la naturaleza por sí sola. Nada encuentran de exquisito en sus plantas, ni en su colocación, figura, o magnitud, aquella estudiada proporción, que emplea el arte en los plantíos hechos para la diversión de los Príncipes, o los Pueblos. No falta en él la cristalina hermosura del agua corriente, complemento precioso de todo sitio agradable; pero que bien lejos de observar en su curso las mensuradas direcciones, despeños y resaltes, con que se hacen jugar las ondas en los Reales jardines, errante camina por donde la casual abertura del terreno da paso al arroyo. Con todo, el sitio le hechiza; no acierta a salir de él, y sus ojos se hallan más prendados de aquel natural desaliño, que de todos los artificiosos primores, que hacen ostentosa, y grata vecindad a las Quintas de los magnates. Pues, ¿qué tiene este sitio, que no haya en aquéllos? Tiene un *no sé qué,* que aquéllos no tienen. Y no hay que apurar, que no pasarán de aquí.

Here, one of the pioneers of the Spanish Enlightenment, urges his readers to turn to nature with the aim to get closer to the unknown, the questions that keep us learning and creating. Plants provide us the framework for a more perfect artistic creation. The garden offers space to linger, to straggle, to dream. Victoria Soto Caba asserts that here, Feijóo wants artistic creation to follow the lead of the enchanted garden space: "Como los nuevos jardines, el artificio en la obra literaria debía ser natural y espontáneo…" (413). Might the garden be the space that a woman such as the Duchess of Osuna could dream about the future of female participation in Spanish society?

Chapter 3: *Las virtudes que da naturaleza* - El Capricho Garden as a Locus of Female Participation in Eighteenth-Century Spain

"Esté en obligación Naturaleza,
pues con tu ciencia ayudas a su intento,
haciendo que de flores la belleza
tenga de hoy más por ella nuevo aumento."
-Anónimo, 1592

In *Agricultura de jardines* (Gregorio de los Ríos, 1592), one of the first published books in Europe on botanical spaces, an anonymous writer[54] pens the prologue of the text with a short ode to the garden, lauding the natural realm of the garden as a place in which the beauty of flowers can be enjoyed thanks to the knowledge and dedication to the craft of gardening. In this ode, written nearly three hundred years before the construction of the garden of El Capricho, the object of interest in this chapter, the author's remarks reflect the growing interest in the study of botanical spaces in Spain. In this sixteenth century publication, Gregorio de los Ríos, recognizes the garden as a separate space in nature, one tended to by the gardener, a lover of plants and flowers and one who is knowledgeable in the art of gardening, so that it may grow and flourish in a controlled environment. Therefore the art of gardening and the science of gardening become a singular act – to create a beautiful botanical space, one needs to understand how to care for the

[54] In the prologue to *Agricultura de jardines*, Agustín G. de Amezúa says that Gregorio de los Ríos asked a few of his friends to write "unas composiciones laudatorias" (LIV) to accompany his text on gardens. Amezúa says that the texts fail to inspire. I disagree with Amezúa and find the literary treasures at the beginning of the text a beautiful artistic ode to the scientific passion that accompanied de los Ríos' text.

plant.[55] Ríos compares the care of the garden to the act of raising a child: "Y así, conviene que le tenga propio y muy cuidadoso; porque así como los niños, en dexándolos de limpiar, críen sarna y queresas, de la misma manera los jardines, si no los limpian cada día, críen hierbas malas que ahogan a las buenas" (23). Flowers and plants, much like children, must be pruned and controlled so that the "hierbas malas" are weeded out. Gardening, then, becomes not only an exercise in botany, but rather might be considered a moral exercise in which the good plants are separated from the bad, so that they are allowed the space to flourish and grow as the gardener intended. Thus, the social implications of the garden might lead to a better understanding of the society in which it was constructed. We can speak of the El Capricho garden, located in the outskirts of Madrid, as multi-meaning as well, as a physical space, a mental space, and a social space, created and managed by Doña María Josefa Alonso-Pimentel y Téllez-Girón, Duchess of Osuna in 1784.

For centuries the garden has been where humans forcefully manipulate plant species with the intention to create an aesthetically pleasing space with two purposes: to offer picturesque enjoyment to guests and to present a didactic experience in which the visitor can learn about botanical varieties and observe their growth in nature. In this chapter, I provide a brief overview of the influential botanically designed spaces in Spain before and during the eighteenth century, but it is pertinent to note that this chapter is not devoted to a spatial historiography of gardens. Rather, I propose using the garden, specifically El Capricho garden at La Alameda, as a space representative of the intersection of scientific discourse and exploration and of gender politics,

[55] The term "ciencia" in the ode should be understood to mean knowledge, or a broad understanding, in this case of the plant. The more modern use of the term science to refer to the intellectual, and many times institutional, practice of studying a natural structure or being through the formation of a hypothesis, careful observation and experimentation cannot be applied here.

specifically that of female participation, during the Spanish Enlightenment. The Duchess of Osuna created El Capricho with a unique syntax, carefully curating the man-made natural space with certain arrangement of botanical and structural whims and surprises. Through an investigation applying the semiotics of the garden, it might be seen as an object that can be read like a text in order to see it; or, as France Bequette states in his April 1997 contribution to *The Unesco Courier* entitled "Gardens: A Cultural Flowering", as "a mirror of the society which creates it" (44).

In my previous chapter I thought through the idea of the politics of participation and the non-neutral culture of participation in science, specifically botany. In this chapter I turn to a specific botanical space at El Capricho, commissioned and designed by the Duchess of Osuna. She began the plans for design of this garden in the mid 1780s and her oversight of the construction and additions of the space continued until the French occupation of Spain in 1808. The Duchess was known to be fond of this place, constantly thinking about what elements she could add to create the garden of her dreams.

Botany, for many reasons, embodies the gendered take on science during the Enlightenment and was, in fact, one of the only scientific topics considered acceptable for study by educated women. Furthermore, the study of plants, with its divisions in class, orders, genera, species, and varieties, is completely embedded in the social and gender roles of the time, as I have discussed in the second chapter of this dissertation. To exemplify this association, the Duchess of Osuna emerges as a person of interest because of her notable participation in eighteenth-century Madrid society as a patron of the arts, as a cultured voice that hosted and

engaged in *tertulias*, and as a curious mind that never ceased to be a friend of intellectual pursuits.[56]

Authors such as David E. Cooper, Robert Pogue Harrison, and Adrian Von Buttlar have proposed that the garden be studied as a space with philosophical significance. Cooper ponders the garden in *A Philosophy of Gardens* with questions familiar to any contemplation of life and art, but directing those common philosophical puzzles to the garden: What is the garden? What makes a garden great? Is the garden an object? Why garden? (1-3). The last question gets at the "fundamental question" (3) of the philosophy of gardens: the meaning that the garden has for humans. Cooper argues that the garden is exemplary of a certain co-dependence between human and nature, that "…the distinctiveness, the irreducibility, of appreciation of exemplary gardens and their 'atmosphere' is due, on some occasions at least, to a sensibility towards these gardens as epiphanies of co-dependence – something that 'wild' nature and other art-forms are not" (156). The distinctiveness of the garden is precisely why I believe it deserves to be studied as an object of interest in regards to eighteenth-century Spain, women and visual culture. The dichotomies the garden presents, ranging from the power of human creativity versus the volatility of nature to the expansion of domestic (feminine) space outside into public (masculine) space, are ripe and ready for intellectual harvest.

I am interested in looking at the space of the garden, but with an understanding of the term "space" as multi-meaning, as mentions Henri Lefebvre in *The Production of Space*. I

---

[56] María Carmen Iglesias states in "La nueva sociabilidad: mujeres nobles y salones literarios y políticos" that: "María Josefa Alfonsa Pimentel y Téllez-Girón es, a mi parecer, la gran figura femenina del siglo. Todo lo reúne: nobleza, gracia física, cultura, inteligencia, conocimiento perfecto de varias lenguas, encanto y fidelidad a sus amigos, una curiosidad y una sabiduría que le acompañan hasta la víspera de su muerte, a los 83 años, en 1834, cuando recibe el telescopio que había pedido a sus fieles amigos-editores y proveedores de París. Nada le fue ajeno en su larga vida: política, ciencia, arte, literatura" (198).

believe that we can speak of the garden at La Alameda as a physical space, a mental space, and a social space. It gets its physicality in that it is an identifiable, enclosed area that follows the restrictions of the term "garden" closely. To better understand the garden as a physical space, I again turn to the 1791 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*. There, the garden is first defined as "[un] huerto de recreación, compuesto de diversas flores y yerbas olorosas, ordenado regularmente en varios quadros, y en ellos lazos y labores formadas de las mismas yerbas." With this definition we can understand the garden as a physical, ordered space, divided neatly into sections or "quadros" and dominated by the presence of plants species. The dictionary continues with another definition of the garden: "El parage donde hay abundancia de sugetos hermosos, especialmente mugeres, ó de otras cosas de especial bondad, ó agradables y deleytosas á los sentidos." With this definition, we edge more towards the understanding of the garden as a social space, here occupied by beautiful subjects, most of them feminine in nature. What lies between these two definitions is the mental space that Lefebvre describes in his work: "In an inevitably circular manner, this mental space then becomes the locus of a 'theoretical practice' which is separated from social practice, and which sets itself up as the axis, pivot or central reference point of Knowledge" (6). Mental space, then, is a sort of precursor to Knowledge. Might we understand the garden as a precursor to knowledge as well? Specifically with El Capricho in mind, can the garden and its space and allowance for silent contemplation as well as access to the beauty and complexity of nature be considered a locus that feeds the mental space? As Lefebvre notes, there is normally a great divide between the mental space (or that which is philosophical, epistemological, or representational) and the physical and social space. But the bridge between these two spheres can, I believe, be exemplified in El Capricho.

In his study of El Capricho, Remón Menéndez thinks of this garden as "a Garden of Ideas, and its purpose, by arousing ideas and appealing to the intellect, was to be an instrument of social and moral reform within Spanish culture" (224). The author's assertion is simple yet important – the garden in eighteenth-century Spain was not only a place for folly, but also a place to appeal to the intellect. This dual nature of the garden, both for enjoyment and for intellectual contemplation, is precisely why I would like to use it as an exemplary object in my study of the relation between scientific investigation and rhetoric and female participation during the Spanish Enlightenment. By female participation I mean an active role offered to women and taken by them during this time, allowing them to play a bigger role in public, social activities.

Before looking to El Capricho as a test case for the garden as a representative space of female participation in during the Spanish Enlightenment, a brief overview of gardens in Spain before the eighteenth century provides a backdrop for this discussion. I then offer a textual tour of El Capricho garden to orient the reader and to highlight sites of interest in the garden. The overview of El Capricho garden provokes a variety of questions, mainly: *1. Why did the Duchess commission such an extravagant garden? 2. Who was the intended audience?,* and, from what we know about the Duchess and her friendship with other enlightened intellectuals, *3. What can this garden tell us about the Enlightenment, women, and modernization of Spain during the eighteenth century?* In an attempt to unravel these questions, I turn first to the life and work of the mastermind behind El Capricho, the Duchess of Osuna. Then I contemplate the second question through the lens of the Osuna's relationship with other *ilustrados* and creators of art at the time, especially Francisco de Goya. I finish my analysis of the garden by suggesting that seeing and experiencing the botanical space at El Capricho might not just lead to believing, but also to the spark of pursuit of other cultural and intellectual interests. I conclude the chapter by

connecting the theoretical approach of the semiotics of the space of the garden to the persistent question of female participation in eighteenth-century Spain as a way to interpret the garden's broader influence in the discussion surrounding the Enlightenment and the modernization of Spanish society.

A brief history of gardens in Spain

In *Agricultura de jardines*, the first book published on this material in Europe[57], the sixteenth century author, Gregorio de los Ríos, dedicates the work to Phillip II for his love of flowers. Ríos was a clergyman who became enchanted with gardens and plants at a young age and became an expert in their cultivation. He was named chaplain of the church and caretaker of the gardens at the royal hunting estate, Casa del Campo, in 1589. *Agricultura de jardines* was a unique text, something the author himself knew to be true, when he wrote in the prologue to his work:

> "Y teniéndose consideración a que los que han escrito de agricultura, y naturaleza y propiedad de los árboles y hierbas, jamás han tocado este particular de la población de los jardines, ni de la conservación de las plantas y verduras que en ellos se ponen, podré decir con razón ser yo el primero que escribe esta materia…" (21).

In this quote it is clear that he distinguishes the garden from other forms of agriculture. In the twentieth-century prologue to Ríos's work, Agustín G. de Amezúa notes other texts contemporary to *Agricultura de jardines* dealt with agriculture and plants, including Alonso de Herrera's *Agricultura general*, but does not venture why Ríos's text is entitled *Agricultura de*

[57] Amezúa notes that the book "tiene el singular valor, tan honroso para España, de haber sido la primera obra impresa en el mundo en este material, adelantándose a Francia y a los demás países en cerca de medio siglo" (XLII).

jardines (LVI). It may be simply in line with other texts of similar content such as Herrera's book, the term *agricultura* highlighting the genre in which a text on gardens might fall.

In the introduction to the 1951 edition of the book, Amezúa notes that King Phillip II desired an expansion of royal plots of land to include La Casa de Campo, El Palacio de El Pardo, El Bosque de Segovia, and La Fresneda at El Escorial to enjoy outdoor activities such as hunting and horseback riding. The author notes that before the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Spain, flowers were rarely mentioned in literature nor seen in art because the dry land was not suitable for botanical outcrops. Rather, the garden was a space of imagination and fantasy during this time period, a place imagined in medieval tales of war and conquest. It wasn't until the seventeenth century that one can see a real interest in flowers and ornamental gardening with Phillip II's love for Flemish and French gardening: "…surge el rey antófilo, por no decir el rey antomaníaco, el amante de las flores, el que halla singular deleite en percibir su colorido y aspirar su fragancia…" (XX). In fact, Phillip II set up a laboratory at El Escorial to study flowers and their fragrances in order to make perfumes. *Agricultura de jardines* marks the beginning of Spanish nobility's interest in the art of gardening and can be read not only as a scientific or informational text that guides its readers to better care for their garden, but also a text saturated with social and cultural norms of human society, as we have seen in later-published botanical texts in Chapter 2.

In C.M. Villiers-Stuart' 1929 study, *Spanish Gardens: Their History, Types and Features*, on Spanish gardens, the author notes that racial, and I would add cultural, contacts throughout Spanish history have made their mark on Spanish architecture and landscape design. For instance, the patio, or interior courtyard, and the courtyard garden, characteristic in many Spanish homes, are both traits inherited from the influence of Roman architecture (2). In the

south of Spain, Arabic gardening styles can still be seen in southern cities such as Cordoba and Granada. During the eighth through the fourteenth centuries, written Arabic texts treated topics such as horticulture, garden building, the treatment of the land and the science of botany and its connection to pharmacology, but, as Villiers-Stuart acknowledges, Christian leaders destroyed many Arabic texts after the Reconquest.[58]

As Xavier de Winthuysen states in his 1930 study on Spanish gardens, "España es el único país del mundo que encierra la historia completa del arte de los jardines desde la Edad Media hasta la actualidad, con ejemplos de diversos estilos y modalidades hispano-morisco, mudéjar, renacimiento, barroco, escurialense, clásico-francés, neo-clásico, isabelino, y actual resurgimiento sevillano" (13), lauding Spain's preservation of botanical spaces and the variety of styles to be found on the Peninsula. In his study of the gardens of the Castile region of Spain, Winthuysen correlates the study and upkeep of gardens with other cultural outlets such as poetry, painting and theater and he lists the many authors and painters that have looked to the garden for inspiration (15). But the author notes the lack of attention and study the history of gardens in Spain has attracted: "Ocuparía mucho espacio citar los volúmenes antiguos y modernos sobre los jardines franceses e italianos. En España carecemos de estas publicaciones y escuelas, y como consecuencia, nuestras obras de jardinería desaparecen o decaen al quedar en manos de empíricos o de horticultores ajenos a toda cultura estética" (17). This lack of attention is important to highlight because, as Winthuysen notes, there hasn't been nearly enough attention given to the scientific, aesthetic and, I would add, cultural space of the Spanish garden. Since the

[58] "But the Christians in the Peninsula after the fourteenth century seemed to have had a profound contempt for everything that did not emanate from Rome; at all events, they never grasped the importance of the land, or understood the necessity of keeping up the wonderful Arab system of irrigation they had inherited" (Villiers-Stuart, 6).

1930 publication of this work, more texts have been written and the study of design and of architecture of gardens are again gaining the attention they deserve, but the consideration of the garden as a cultural space is still lacking.

As mentioned in chapter two, in the eighteenth century, the garden became popular not just among the Spanish elite as a private space managed and operated by the nobility, but also among government and academic officials as a space to showcase the botanical wealth cultivated in the Americas as well as a learning space to teach and be trained in the different species and classifications of plants. This is exemplified in gardens such as the Jardín Real Botánico in Madrid. As Carmen Añón Feliú notes in the introduction to *Jardines clásicos madrileños*, it is not necessary to discuss public versus private gardens separately because "…[lo] que se hacía en la ciudad, en sus paseos y plazas, respondía a las mismas tendencias de la moda de cada momento, sobre todo a partir del siglo XVIII…" (14). I believe that the Duchess of Osuna, a public female figure, and her garden El Capricho, built at her private estate, can be seen as a test case to discuss the intersection between science and female participation in eighteenth-century Spain by contextualizing the garden within the era and society in which it was built.

Madrid's climate proves more difficult to the art of gardening as compared to Spain's southern cities. The harsh winters and scalding summers provide a more challenging terrain on which to cultivate either a plot of land for agriculture or a stylistic garden in a courtyard. Before the eighteenth century, the nearest royal garden was located at the Casa de Campo beyond the Río Manzanares, which housed a country house and gardens for an escape from the cruel summer sun. Other gardens near and around Madrid include the gardens at El Escorial, built under the rule of Phillip II in the sixteenth century, El Pardo and La Zarzuela, both constructed

by Phillip the IV in the seventeenth century, and the gardens at Aranjuez,[59] primarily associated with both Philip IV and Charles IV (eighteenth century), although "…each Spanish ruler has done something to embellish the palace…" (Villiers-Stuart, 109). Lastly, the gardens at the Palacio Real de La Granja de San Ildefonso located outside of Segovia are worth mentioning for their French influence and the taste of the Bourbon monarchy in Spain. Villiers-Stuart notes that, at the close of the seventeenth century, French fashion came to trump Italian style throughout most of Europe (112) and notes the negative commentary given to these gardens by French garden historicist M. Georges Gromort in *Jardins d'Espagne* (1926), and offers another perspective: the gardens at La Granja were not designed to be a dedicated replication of French gardening aesthetics, but rather incorporate Spain's northern neighbor's botanical design into non-Western European influences popular in so many other gardens in Spain. This is apparent in "…the ornamental waterfalls, the irrigation channels for the trees, and the way in which the water from the main canal was conducted through the palace…" (114). This mixture in styles is characteristic of other gardens in and around Madrid, especially at El Capricho.

Overview of El Capricho Garden

I first offer my tour and overview of the garden with the purpose to gain a more complete perspective of the space and then I narrow my analysis to certain structures of interest. It is important to note that there is not one "correct" way to view the garden. Once the visitor passes through the gate into the garden, she may go left or right, and with this directional choice may have a very different experience at the garden than the next visitor. We begin in the *plaza de*

---

[59] The gardens at Aranjuez are the backdrop to Goya's tapestries, now only preserved as cartoons, or preliminary artwork on which the tapestries were based, painted on canvas.

toros, a small bullring which was used to entertain visitors to the garden. Before entering the garden, a large, ornate iron gate greets the wanderer with the name of the garden, El Capricho, right above the doors to enter. Turning right, you walk by a group of cypress trees and then the *invernadero* or greenhouse. Walking past the greenhouse, below you see the large labyrinth – the maze was purposefully built below the walkways eye level so that visitors could stand by and watch or give orders to others that attempted to walk through the labyrinth. Sandwiched in between the Italian and English gardens is the French garden. Beginning in the Plaza de los Emperadores, statues decorate the landscape as well as trimmed shrubbery and trees that create straight lines that lead the eye to the *palacete* or mansion at the other end of the plaza, a characteristic reminiscent of the gardens at Versailles.

A statue of Bacchus on top of a hill straddles the border between the French and English gardens. Starkly contrasting with the clear lines and angles of the French garden, the English garden embraces nature and its chaos with windy paths lines with overgrown bushes and trees. One can easily feel lost in this section of the garden, but that feeling of isolation is part of the experience in the interest of communing with nature. Isolation quickly melts away as visitors come across various structures amidst the overgrowth, such as the apiary, a hermitage, and the Casa Vieja, an English-style country house complete with vegetable garden. Another feature of the English garden at El Capricho is the manmade river that gently runs through. Visitors were invited to take a boat down the river, ending at the Casino where the Osuna family hosted dinners and dances. Although a thorough study all of the buildings, statues and features of the garden would be illuminating, I plan to focus on some of the most didactic buildings and structures in the Duchess' original garden, such as the Apiary, the Casa de la Vieja, the use of water as exemplified in the importance of *la ría* and the lake, and the *invernadero*.

The Apiary can be found in the English part of the garden, seen only by walking through paths lined with thick brush. According to Mónica Luengo, the structure might have been designed by Mateo Medina. Two wings flank the center of the building, where the bees were housed. The bottom portions of the walls of the two arms of the building have openings so that the bees could leave the hive to pollinate and then return. Guests could access the center of the building, where they would find a statue of Venus. The original statue of Venus[60] was originally located in the *templete*, or pavilion, at the top of the hill, which now houses a statue of Bacchus. The Apiary in itself was not a unique structure in eighteenth-century gardens[61], but what does make this specific beehive stand out is that it was designed to allow visitors to contemplate the constant humming, buzzing labor of the curious yellow and black insect. Juan Remón Menéndez, Añón and Mónica Luengo all agree that the purpose of the Apiary was didactic, a structure meant to show visitors the labor of the bee.

As Michael C. Reed states in *The Landscape of Britain from the Beginnings to 1914*, the different parts that make up a landscape (structures, statues, farms, churches, cottages, etc.) cannot be seen as separate entities but rather as “a dense historical matrix.” The matrix, or interconnectedness, of the parts that make up the whole of a geographic area such as the garden must be considered when analyzing the social significance of a certain space. Karen Sayer expands on Reeds idea in “The labourer’s welcome: Border crossings in the English country garden” and remarks that “[…] the cottage garden, just like the gardens of the elite and the middle class, belonged (and belongs) to a wider landscape, a palimpsest of power relations, the

[60] The original statue was created by Juan Adán but was damaged when the cupola fell in on the statue. A replica quickly replaced the original.

[61] Luengo notes that many could be found in England (86). The apiary at El Capricho was, in fact, in the English part of the garden.

spatial morality of which constituted a set of historically significant identities" (36). Thus, we must look to the structures and edifices that constitute El Capricho to understand the identity of the space, while simultaneously considering the historical specificity in which it was constructed. Sayer continues, suggesting that the garden must not be considered a simple staging ground, but rather a part of "real" space through which ideas are enacted and created. This idea is central to the work at hand: the garden El Capricho must not be considered simply a decorative object that mirrored eighteenth-century elite Spanish society, but rather a playing ground of sorts in which intellectuals, artists and members of the upper class were given the physical and intellectual space to investigate and imagine.

The Apiary is important to my study because it stands as an example of the politics of participation and the depth of this practice that indeed happened at the garden. For other researchers such as Añón and Remón Menéndez, this structure may be the most representative of the entire meaning of the garden. A structure dedicated entirely to the contemplation of the production of bees, I believe, can suggest a broader theme, and might be the perfect representative of the exact political and socially soaked beliefs that were used to construct notions of natural law in the eighteenth century. The hive itself, a small structure that housed in it a colony of creatures that worked together in order to attain more efficient production, could be contemplated by visitors while strolling through the garden. It should not be overlooked that the head of the hive was the queen, the largest and most powerful participant in the colony.

Other structures and features of the garden, such as the Casa de la Vieja and the lake and its tributary, also highlight the fantastical, playful nature of El Capricho. The Casa de la Vieja is a house on the garden on the Alameda estate that was designed by Ángel María Tadey. His design of the house showcased an interpretation of the natural world in an interior setting. A

room of particular interest is the *gabinete del musgo*, a room and its furnishings covered in moss. This room is important because of the way it plays with space – in this interior room, the architect has created an exterior, natural, untamed space by allowing moss to climb and grow over the man-made walls and furnishings. The Duchess also used the Casa de la Vieja to house scientific and artistic collections, such as an automaton. The lake and *la ría*, and more generally the use of water as a part of the landscape design of El Capricho, provide many secret spots and alcoves for visitors to explore. As Menéndez notes, there was no point in the garden in which one could see the entire expanse of *la ría*, suggesting that its purpose might be "more important to excite the mind than to enjoy expansive vistas" (233).

It is important to note that the garden in its current state is not identical to the garden construction overseen by the Duchess. It has gone through a variety of transformations between her death in 1834 and today. These remodelings are not the focus of my research, but rather the original garden plan and construction as directed by the Osunas in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. After the Duchess' death, the garden changed hands and her grandson, Don Pedro, continued construction and renovations at the Alameda. His editions included the labyrinth and the Exedra and bust of his grandmother in the French gardens in front of the palace. After Don Pedro died, the garden and land were left to his brother, Don Mariano, who reportedly dwindled away all that was left of the Osuna fortune[62]. The Bauer family took care of the estate after Don Mariano's death and during that time, in 1934, the Patronage of Historic

[62] Luengo reports (85) that it was Don Mariano that threw lavish dinners and parties at El Capricho and, after one such event, he ordered the gold-plated dinnerware to be thrown into the river after it was used. I anecdotally heard this same story, but Duchess and the Duke themselves were charged with the disposing of fine china into the river and lake. Because of these major discrepancies, I am hesitant to find the tale truthful, but it is fair to assume that this story demonstrates the extreme wealth that the Osuna family once had.

Gardens declared it a site of art historical importance. The Bauer's held on to the estate until 1937, and during the Spanish Civil War, El Capricho and its structures were used as headquarters for the Republican General Miaja. Luengo notes that there are few reports that document what happened to the garden during the war, but it is clear that it deteriorated due to lack of upkeep and construction of at least three underground passageways (85). After the war, the Bauer family liquidated the estate and was set to sell it to a company hoping to turn the land in to a luxury campground. In 1974, the garden was sold to the City of Madrid and thence began the construction and restoration of the garden, in hopes to return it to its original state.

Visitors of El Capricho encountered, and still encounter today, a varied landscape, a mixture of Italian, English and French gardening styles, with almost hidden features such as the lake, *la ría,*[63] and the Casa de la Vieja. The Duchess hired some of the most highly revered gardeners and architects of her time to work on the design of her natural sanctuary, such as Pablo Boutelou, Jean Baptiste Mulot and Pierre Prévost, who used a mixture of foreign gardening styles and sculpture to create the space that the Duchess envisioned. Mónica Luengo suggests that El Capricho as well as other Spanish gardens of the time[64] are examples of "paisajismo a la española," or as she explains it, "el tímido resultado de intentar adaptar los principios del jardín inglés al clima, la topografía y la peculiar idiosincrasia española…a través de un filtro francés, en el que también se confunden con reminiscencias de un jardín rococó y con nuevos aires prerrománticos" (73). This definition, multifaceted in its desire to neatly classify El Capricho

[63] *La ría* can be translated as estuary and is an important feature of the garden, commonly referred to with its Spanish name, which is why I use it here.

[64] She mentions The Garden of the Prince of Aranjuez in her study of El Capricho as similarly identifiable as "paisajismo a la española" (73).

garden as a singular style, instead hints at the inherent complexity in the style of the garden constructed by the Duchess of Osuna.

In "What does your garden show? Explorations of the Semiotics of the Garden," Susan Jagger explores the different philosophical approaches to gardens throughout the centuries. The baroque period in gardening was marked by a characteristic wide, central axis that pointed to either a building or landmark of importance and was realized by "extensive transformations" (639) of the natural landscape. One of the main purposes of the baroque garden was to advertise wealth and grandeur. Jagger also notes that the baroque garden displayed "the militant humanism of the late seventeenth century" (640). What makes El Capricho a departure from the typical baroque garden is that it doesn't follow the specific plan of the garden described by Jagger. Instead, El Capricho takes the visitor on a tour of multiple gardening styles that blend inspiration and design from French, English and Italian styles of gardening to ultimately create a unique botanical space unlike any other in Spain during the eighteenth century. The Italian garden at the site, ornate with geometric figures, is one of the oldest and is where one can find the labyrinth, as well as small waterways and large trees that pay homage to the Spanish tradition of gardening. The French garden displays strict lines and perfectly manicured shrubbery outside of the garden outside of the *palacete*, or mansion, in El Capricho, and are in stark contrast to the windy trails and overgrown brush of the English style gardens that house the hermitage and apiary. The English gardens are the largest in size, and focus on nature as designer instead of man, allowing visitors to "discover" the winding *ría* or waterway that flows through the estate or stumble across the skeleton of buildings of yore crumbling to the ground, in fact fake ruins constructed in line with typical English country garden of the time.

As Adrian Von Buttlar explains in the introduction to *Jardines del Clasicismo y el Romanticismo: El jardín paisajista*, Baroque style gardens, the most extravagant example being the gardens at Versailles, can be interpreted as contrary to the unruliness of Nature due to the rigid control necessary to create the mathematical and symmetrical regularity characteristic of the Baroque garden. Man's domain over the botanical space shows hierarchical order representative of the world, where man reigns over all other beings and life. This deeply contrasts with the *jardín paisajista* or landscape garden typical of English style gardens, in which the visitor is prompted to forget that the paths and curves of the garden are man-made, and instead enjoy the natural beauty evoked in the garden. Although the visitor might come across an artifice, Von Buttlar suggests that "…sería al mismo tiempo reproducción concentrada y realzada de la creación visible y expresión de una idea nueva liberal del Paraíso" (9). The largest part of El Capricho is the English style garden, and thus Von Buttlar's interpretation that the landscape style evokes "una idea nueva liberal del Paraíso" is suggestive in a broader sense in my approximations to the Duchess of Osuna's creation of a botanical space that converses with gender-political happenings of the time. Might El Capricho, and specifically the English-style gardens on the property, allow visitors, both male and female, to lose themselves either by wandering through curved paths and waterways or by stumbling across a artifice that has been enveloped by the trees and plants surrounding it? And in this act of loss of self, what might be the new liberal Paradise be that the Duchess was trying to evoke? Although this speculation is impossible to answer with any degree of certainty, it is not far-fetched to believe that a woman as connected to the intellectual and political happenings in Madrid in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries might understand the effect of the gardening styles at her estate and their effect on the visitor.

Mónica Luengo argues in "El Capricho de la Alameda de Osuna" that the garden should be considered a garden of sentiments rather than a garden of ideas, playing with Remón's assertion that the garden is a central locale of enlightened inspiration. Luengo pushes on the reluctance some garden historians have with categorizing El Capricho as a romantic garden and asserts that "…en el jardín se pueden rastrear no solo la aparición de nuevos conceptos estéticos, sino también el auge de los métodos experimentales y la ciencia, especialmente la botánica y las nuevas técnicas ingenieriles. Es el momento en que brota y crece una nueva idea de jardín, porque brota y crece una nueva consideración del entorno que el hombre habita y de su forma de dominarlo" (72). The author succinctly identifies the importance of the time in which the garden was constructed, an in-between moment (namely in between the Enlightenment and Romanticism).

La Duquesa de Osuna

María Josefa Pimentel y Téllez-Girón, who later acquired the title Countess-Duchess of Benavente, but who is most commonly referred to as the Duchess of Osuna, created this botanical, whimsical space through knowledge of botany and her link to prominent intellectual circles, thus she is crucial to my study of women's participation in Spain during the Enlightenment. The Duchess is a remarkable woman, an intellectual[65] in close contact with Goya and other *ilustrados*, who commissioned works by the artist. We know that she eventually

---

[65] I believe that it is appropriate to label the Duchess as an intellectual of her time. As Gonzalo Martínez del Valle says in his article, "Goya y los IX Duques de Osuna. Pinturas para el palacio de La Alameda," "Fue una de las pocas mujeres que destacó dentro de la clase aristocrática de su tiempo, no sólo por su riqueza sino sobre todo por su inteligencia" (31). To distance oneself from labeling women such as the Duchess as "intellectuals" is to perpetuate the trend in literary and history studies to shy away from highlighting women's contributions to the societies in which they lived.

decided to move the location of her popular *tertulia*, frequented by canonical authors such as Tomás de Iriarte, Leandro Fernández de Moratín and Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, originally housed in Puerta de la Vega in central Madrid to the outskirts of the city at the Alameda. The garden she commissioned not only provided a point of refuge from the oppressive metropolis but was also designed as a place of enjoyment and fantastical contemplation. But more than a mere decorative construction, the garden represented an authentic creation by a woman celebrating the popular French architecture of the time while also drawing inspiration from English botanical gardens.

The main residence of the Duke and Duchess of Osuna was in Madrid at la Puerta de la Vega, and the edifice was known as La Puerta Otomana. As Regueras Grande notes, it was "[c]ostumbre muy extendida entre la monarquía y la nobleza de la segunda mitad del siglo XVIII, la compra o construcción de casitas o palacetes, quintas o casas de campo, en las cercanías de Madrid, granjeaba a príncipes y aristócratas alivio y solaz del trajín de la corte, sobre todo en el verano" (69). In 1783 the Duke and Duchess purchased a house on a farm, part of the estate on which they would eventually build El Capricho, and they continued buying up land around the farm until it extended roughly 600 acres, nearly 50 of which would be dedicated to the construction of the garden (Luengo, 77).

Sue Bennet remarks in her chapter "Allusion and Illusion: The Eighteenth Century" in *Five Centuries of Women & Gardens* that "…garden design permitted the proprietor to display his, and very occasionally her, learning and taste" (47). By examining the garden at El Capricho, and its design, we learn more about the learning and taste of its creator, the Duchess of Osuna. The Duchess was undoubtedly the main actor in the construction of El Capricho garden. Many

scholars, including Mónica Luengo[66], Añón, and Pedro Navascués, all concur that she was the main contributor to its construction, as can be evidenced by the receipts for architecture, landscaping, and art for El Capricho.[67] She hired some of the most prominent gardeners of her time to design and construct El Capricho. The first gardener she hired was Pablo Boutelou, but within three short years she contracted another gardener, Mulot, to continue work on the botanical space[68]. The only section that Boutelou completed that can be viewed by visitors today[69] is the "jardín de las Ranas," named for the fountains adorned with frogs in the section next to the mansion.

In an 1867 collection of poems entitled "Una gira en la Alameda de Osuna" about the Alameda and El Capricho garden, an anonymous author writes:

"Bien en ellos se refleja

el genio altivo, soberbio

de aquella de Benavente,

---

[66] As Mónica Luengo notes in "El Capricho de la Alameda de Osuna": "Pero a pesar de su experiencia y de su posición, la duquesa no deja de tomar parte active y opine, revisa los solados, repasa la decoración mural y controla la actividad de los artistas y artesanos de primera fila que participan en la construcción de la Alameda" (78).

[67] Añón and Luengo have completed an exhaustive study of the beginnings of the garden and details that the Duchess' name indeed appeared on a variety of documents and receipts pertaining to the garden. More can be found on this in the chapter "Los comienzos" of *El Capricho de la Alameda de Osuna* (61-64).

[68] Boutelou was likely replaced by Mulot because Queen María Luisa also had hired Boutelou to work on the gardens at Aranjuez and, reportedly, the Duchess didn't want to share her time with "su odiada reina" (80, Luengo). Luengo goes on to suggest that the duchess organically hired Boutelou because he was the only expert in *paisajista* garden design in Spain during the late eighteenth century.

[69] This section of the garden is currently off limits to visitors, which is unfortunate as it includes some of the oldest structures in the garden, including *el fuente de las ranas*.

señora de tanto peso,

que aunque Condesa de título

fue reina de sentimientos,

haciendo una posesión

sólo para su recreo,

que pudiera competir

con lo que hubiera más bello

de este género de quintas

en todito el universo." (33)

The narrator of this poem, a fictitious character named Paco, describes his visit to El Capricho and describes the various structures and landscape that he encounters. The portion above comes from the seventh poem written about the palace at El Capricho, and Paco takes this opportunity to talk about the Osunas, and specifically the Duchess. She is described as having a "genio altivo, soberbio" which speaks to her character and then goes on endow her with the title of "reina de sentimientos," siting the beauty and magnitude of her garden, El Capricho, as "lo que hubiera más bello / de este género de quintas[70] / en todito el universo." The praise of the Duchess by Paco is not unique, as she was considered to be one of the most influential women of her time.[71]

---

[70] Here I understand the term "quintas" to refer to the Alameda estate, according to the definition in the *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, "6. m. Parte de dehesa o tierra, aunque no sea la quinta" (http://dle.rae.es/?id=UvNPWWd)

[71] In *El Capricho de la Alameda de Osuna*, Añón states that the Duchess was "una de las más grandes señoras y la mayor heredera de su tiempo en toda España" (16).

The Duchess was born into riches, inheriting much of her fortune after her brother's death in 1763. She was educated at the finest schools and later wed the Duke of Osuna. She gave birth to nine children, six of whom survived, and was a devoted mother, "criándolos personalmente, llevándolos en sus viajes y ocupándose de su educación con todo interés" (Añón, 25). She began participating in *tertulias* in 1748 and "poco a poco se transformó en una junta académica" (25-26) with topics ranging from mathematics, physics and geography to history, music, and literature.

The Duchess's devotion to the expansion of knowledge in Spain can also be seen through her participation in the Junta de Damas, a branch of the Economic Society of Madrid, and more specifically, her creation and expansion of a program devoted to educating young woman in schools called *escuelas patriotas*, or patriot schools. In 1787 she was named president of the Sociedad Económica Matritense de Amigos del País. Author and historian Carmen Martín Gaite says that the acceptance of women into these sorts of societies did not represent any sort of celebration of their intelligence. Rather, she opines that their participation in such societies in the public sphere was done "siempre en función del varón, es decir, en nombre de incrementar la afición al matrimonio por parte de los hombres, cuya resistencia a contraerlo resultaba <<en perjuicio del Estado>>" (221). In other words, admitting women was not done in order to offer them an educational or worldly opportunity, but rather was a way to continue to spread the enlightened ideals of a society in which everyone knew their roles, specifically here that of woman/man and wife/husband. While Martín Gaite's work on eighteenth-century Spain and female participation in that society is indispensable, I propose a reconsideration of this understanding of Spanish society during the Enlightenment. A woman such as the Duchess of Osuna, whose wealth and titles matched that of her husband, had nothing to gain by sitting idly

in meetings of societies and *tertulias* in which she participated, exemplified by her work with the *escuelas patrióticas*. Añón states that these schools were:

> "…repartidas por toda la ciudad, se dedicaban a proporcionar una instrucción básica y un oficio con que ganarse la vida a las jóvenes de modesta condición que hasta entonces no habían tenido más horizonte que el convento. Se ocupaban también de difundir normas de higiene y prevención de enfermedades, y fueron pioneras en organizar campañas para la difusión de la vacuna de la viruela." (27)

I argue that the Duchess would not have gone to such lengths to offer education to poverty-stricken women and girls as well as take interest in the medical health and hygiene of the region if she was only part of these groups to appease an enlightened desire to fit into the marital role of an elite wife.

The Condesa de Yebes, who authored the most comprehensive biography on the Duchess of Osuna, stresses the connections the Duchess had with other foreign nobility, such as Lady Holland from England who wrote in a letter about the vast libraries of the Duchess, impressed by her collections of books that spanned the classics, history, travel literature and science. Her collection of books, which included quite an extensive list of banned titles, was also housed at the Alameda. The Duchess also displayed her love for inventions by displaying an automaton at the Casa de la Vieja in El Capricho. The inclusion of this robotic machine at her garden highlights the enthusiasm the Duchess shared with much of Spanish nobility at the time for scientific discoveries. However, I argue that this must not be brushed aside as an admiration for simply objects in fashion. The garden is a space typically dedicated to natural curiosities and growths and is not necessarily a site in which a visitor would expect to encounter a self-operating machine, something that surely drew reactions of awe, its creation precariously teetering between

an understanding of the rational constructs of science and the fear of the magical unknown. To house the automaton at El Capricho points to an alternative use of the garden: not only might it be a locale to entertain visitors with Nature's delights, but also it might be a place to contemplate Man's creative wonders. For this reason I insist that we must think through these interests, such as the automaton,[72] to discuss how scientific ideas and discourse infiltrated everyday life during the Spanish Enlightenment, affecting all discourses, including that of the role of women.

We might ponder the Duchess' interest in creating and maintaining the botanical and intellectual space at El Capricho by returning to Ríos' 1582 text *Agricultura de jardines*. In this text the author addresses his audience of other caretakers of royal and noble gardens and begins the work with a list of warnings: first, to cultivate a garden, one must have an fondness of these botanical spaces and desire to continue to learn rather than just tend to the garden once in a while; second, one must desire to be a gardener with all of the dirty work, so to say, that it entails, rather than just a designer of outdoor spaces; finally, the garden must be a closed space "guardado de pajes y de mujeres" (28). This final piece of advice is particularly interesting, seeing that as gardens continued to evolve in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they became a popular place for women to wander and were mainly tended to by servants and peasants employed by the nobility. El Capricho brings these suggestions alive in its offerings of a place to wander and contemplate for all its visitors.

The Duchess was also acutely aware of state-of-the-art botanical inventions, as evidenced in her commission of the first *invernadero*, or greenhouse, in Madrid for the purpose of studying

---

[72] For an in-depth consideration of the philosophical implications of the automaton during the Enlightenment, please see Simon Schaffer's chapter "Enlightened Automata" in *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*.

plants and trees throughout the year as well as grow seedlings to sell to other estates in the area. The greenhouse was part of the original construction plan of the garden, overseen by the garden designer Boutelou.[73] Mónica Luengo notes that the greenhouse "…nos indica el interés que sentía su propietaria por contar con la infraestructura adecuada para adaptar y aclimatar algunas de las plantas que se estaban introduciendo en Europa, bien desde América, bien desde Asia, y que se iban incorporando a la jardinería y la horticultura habitual de nuestros jardines" (83), stressing the importance of this structure not only in garden, but also in the botanical history of Spain. The greenhouse at El Capricho, first of its kind in the area, was home to plant species from all over the world[74], highlighting the Duchess' interest in the pursuit of botanical knowledge and currency. Seeds that were grown in the *invernadero* became a source of income to the Duke and Duchess and they produced many of the trees and plants found in other gardens of their time. Today the garden houses nearly 6,000 species of tree and plant life, some of which can be dated back to the conception of the garden in the late eighteenth century.

The Duchess also chose to house her extensive library at La Alameda, which she dreamed one day of being accessible to the public[75]. Her collection included classics by authors

---

[73] Luengo notes that the greenhouse wasn't constructed until 1805, or more than fifteen years after Boutelou stopped working for the Duchess (82).

[74] The author lists some of the plants that were brought into the greenhouse included trees such as conifers, birch, gingko, liriodendron, and the magnolia and plants such as the mock orange, the privet, viburnum tinus, lilac, hydrangeas, honeysuckle, and clematis, among many others (83).

[75] Sadly, this dream was not realized during her lifetime due her commitment to a wide variety of books and documents, including ones censured by the Inquisition. Añón states: "El permiso especial que tenían para tener toda clase de libros, aun los prohibidos, les impidió durante un tiempo tener permiso para abrirla al público, lo que consiguieron al fin, siendo una de las primeras bibliotecas públicas españolas" (25).

from Horace to Cervantes, as well as an ample selection of the latest publications from all of Europe. In total, 60,000 volumes of texts, genres including literary classics, science and history. The list "Project de bibliothèque dressé d'après les notes remises par S.E. Madame la Duchesse d'Osuna"[76] complies the titles found at the library. Philosophers such as Montesquieu, Fontenelle, Raynal, Charron, Paschal and Confucius are present as well as Locke, Mably, Mercier and Montaigne. There are a variety of texts dedicated to education, politics, legislation, and jurisdiction. For the sake of this study, I found the list of books on agriculture to be most intriguing – titles include (among many others): "Art d'orner et dumbellier les jardines," "Dictionnaire des jardiniers," "Manuel du jardinière, and "Traite complete sur les abeilles." This last title is on special interest as it relates to the study of bees, surely read with an aim to best care for the insects at the apiary at El Capricho. By examining sites such as the library, the apiary, and the greenhouse, it is clear that the garden was not only a botanical space but also a site of knowledge.

Goya and the Osuna family

The Osuna family supported a variety of artists and creatives over their lifetime. Fernando Regueras Grande's study of the Dukes of Osuna, *Pimental: Fragmentos de una iconografía*, delves into the philanthropic endeavors of the elite couple. The author describes the taste of the Duchess to be of "los de temas <<supersticiosos>> y <<terribles>> que reflejaban una lúcida fascinación por lo irracional, por el lado tenebroso del espíritu humano" (84). This preference for the macabre and otherworldly can be seen in the whimsical, and sometimes

---

[76] Unfortunately there is no exact date of publication, but the Biblioteca Nacional de España cites that it was published in the nineteenth century.

terrifying statues and structures sprinkled throughout El Capricho. The Osunas were well-known patrons of Francisco Goya y Lucientes, but also of other artists, such as famed *miniaturistas,*[77] painters such as J. Gálvez, A. Carnicero, and A. Esteve, and sculptors such as Isidoro, Cayetano, Canalís, Adán, Guerra, Ramón y Barba, y Tomás (86-7).

From 1785 to 1816, the Duke and Duchess commissioned portraits of their family and paintings of a variety of themes, including the supernatural (89). According to Martínez del Valle in "Goya y los IX Duques de Osuna. Pinturas para el Palacio de La Alameda," "Los duques fueron unos de los grandes protectores y valedores del pintor aragonés durante sus primeros años en la corte" (31). In his work "María Josefa de la Soledad, Duchess of Osuna, Countess of Benavente," created in 1785, Goya painted an early portrait of the Duchess of Osuna. She wears a stylish dress of the time and showcases a French hairstyle reminiscent of the styles created by

[77] Boltri, Bouton, Ducker and Eusebi were *miniaturistas*, or artists of miniature portraits popular in the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries. Gabriele Finaldi, assistant director of the Prado Museum of Art from 2002-2015, said in an interview with *El País*: "Es una técnica pictórica […que…] no tiene que ver con el tamaño de la obra. Son trabajos hechos sobre vitela o tabletas de marfil con pigmentos disueltos en agua. Inglaterra fue el primer país en introducir esta técnica mientras que en España no se practica hasta la llegada de los Borbones. La miniatura representa la faceta más íntima de la pintura. En general se utilizaban como obsequios dentro del ámbito privado. Por ejemplo, para concertar matrimonios. Pero también para darse a conocer ante los embajadores extranjeros, para poner cara a quienes suscribían un tratado o un acuerdo o como reconocimiento de una acción militar." In other words, miniature portraits can be understood as a sort of business card or social media page of their time – a small portrait that could easily be transported and used as a form of introduction, in a manner of speaking. Regueras Grande also notes that the Osunas took interest in the latest technological advances in art making: "En la misma línea del gusto por el pequeño retrato, los Osuna fueron unos de los primeros aristócratas que mandaron realizarse fisionotrazos, muchos de los cuales publicó en su día Ezquerra del Bayo. El fisionotrazo o fisionotipo fue una invención del siglo XVIII que como el plantografo servía para hacer la réplica de un diseño, a distinto tamaño, o para copiar el perfil de una cabeza con todo lujo de detalles" (85). This appreciation for the latest trends in art and science is evidenced throughout El Capricho. Mentioned later in this chapter, the Osunas were preoccupied with keeping up with the newest trends in scientific and technological innovations, such as the *invernadero* or greenhouse and the apiary at the garden.

Queen Marie Antoinette. Her body turned slightly away from the painter, the Duchess's head faces the painter, arms stretched out at her side, one hand holding a fan and the other either resting on the handle of a parasol or holding a telescope.[78] The hands, and specifically what she grasps, holds the clue as to what sort of person Goya saw in the Duchess. Regueras Grande aptly notes that the painter is able to capture the duality in the Duchess' personality, unknown to be either a request from the client or birthed from the keen perception of the painter of his subject and portrays her as "…fervorosa no sólo de las modas francesas y de ese nuevo papel desempeñado por las mujeres en la sociedad, sino apasionada también por el progreso ilustrado que tales objetos científicos representaban en su época" (92).

Once the construction began at the Alameda estate, the Duchess ordered 7 paintings from Goya to be (appropriately) countryside-themed to be used to adorn the interiors of buildings at El Capricho[79]: "El columpio," "La cucaña," "La caída[80]," "Asalto a una diligencia," "Procesión de aldea," "Apartado de toros," and "La conducción de una piedra." These paintings mix typical imagery of the countryside with objects and themes contemporary to the Duchess's experience. In "La cucaña," the setting of the painting obviously takes place at El Capricho, as you can see

---

[78] What the Duchess holds in her left hand is disputed by historians and art historians. The author here argues that she holds a telescope, because it seems to be "uno de esos instrumentos científicos, catalejo o pequeño telescopio…por los que los Osuna estaban tan interesados y que hacían traer de toda Europa" (91-2). I accept Regueras Grande's speculation that the object is a telescope because of the Osuna's interest in the pursuit of knowledge and keen interest in collecting the latest and greatest scientific inventions and instruments, as evidenced by their housing an automaton at El Capricho.

[79] Regueras Grande notes that there is a receipt from 1787 signed by the Duchess approving this order (93).

[80] According to Glendinning, the Duchess of Osuna appears in this painting.

some of the work houses and the palace in the Alameda estate.[81] Another series of paintings that the Duchess commissioned from Goya nearly ten years later ,between 1797 and 1798, were 6 small witchcraft-themed works: "Vuelo de brujas," "El aquelarre, "El conjuro," "La cocina de brujas," "El burlador de Sevilla," and "El hechizado a la fuerza." Regueras Grande notes that this series is a "…parodia de las convenciones que asociaban los temas campestres y mitológicos con las casas de campo" (93). Contrasting this macabre series with the more lighthearted countryside paintings, the thematic is more superstitious, more grotesque, and, in that portrayal, edges toward a representation of the Sublime.

Two art historians, Frank Irving Heckes ("Goya y sus seis 'Asuntos de brujas'") and Mercedes Águeda Villar ("Goya y las brujas") have written about these works (specifically, *El dómine Lucas, El aquelarre, Berganza y Cañizares, El conjuro, El hechizado por fuerza* and *El convidado de piedra*) in great detail. Both Irving Heckes and Águeda Villar mention the connection between the topic of witches and witchcraft and the long tradition of treating these themes in Spanish literature, such as in *La Celestina* and Cervantes' *Las novelas ejemplares*. Goya most certainly does seem to be influenced by the common folklore and literary treatment surrounding witchcraft in Spanish society during the late eighteenth century.[82] Both critics also

---

[81] According to the Fundación Goya en Aragón (http://www.fundaciongoyaenaragon.es/goya/obra/catalogo/?ficha=510), "El fondo de la escena lo componen la casa de labranza a la derecha y el propio palacete neoclásico de los Osuna, a la izquierda, rodeado por la frondosa arboleda."

[82] A popular theatrical genre in the eighteenth century was the *comedia de magia*, or as Susan Paun de García describes in "A Censor on State: Cañizares and Magic Plays," as a representation of types of magic and/or fear of the demons and superstitions. It is surprising, then, that this genre was so popular due to the ever-vigilant Inquisitional eye, most specifically the Santo Oficio which condemned works that dealt with magic or any behavior that put into doubt "las buenas costumbres de la Iglesia cristiana" (56). That being said, there was a steep decline in witch trials during the eighteenth century and Paun de García sees a secularization present in

touch on the artist's theatrical presentation of the topic, with central, demonized figures lit as if by a stagehand in the theater. Most importantly, both historians mention that Goya seems to be presenting an underlying message in all of these works an interpretation of the fantasy that the human mind is capable of creating if subject to superstitions and fear of the unknown. In all of these six depictions of witchcraft that can be linked back to literary roots[83], Goya is visually bringing to light the morbid fantasy created by the author. Irving Heckes suggests that "Esta ambigüedad creada a propósito por Goya le permite mostrar como la imaginación abandonada por la razón puede conferir a seres y creencias fantásticas la ilusión de realidad" (203). I find this conclusion to be fascinating and promising as a connection to the socially critical messages that the artist most certainly portrayed in a variety of his works. Martínez del Valle hesitates to label the Duchess's purchase as a result of critique of popular superstitious beliefs of the time or an attraction to "los temas demoníacos" (31). I, too, am wary to classify these works as a product of either satiric critique of popular beliefs or attraction to dark magic. Rather I think that the Duchess's request of these works is representative of something in between – possibly a fascination with the border that magic straddles between the rational and irrational.

In arguably his most famous print, "El sueño de la razón produce monstruos," Goya portrays *el hombre ilustrado* trapped in a nightmare produced not only by the sleepy state he is in but also by the dream produced from his desires for a more enlightened, modern Spain. In this case, the illumination of rationality and knowledge shed light on the monsters lurking in the corner, suggesting that the rationality gained from an enlightened society might produce

---

eighteenth-century comedies in which magic can at times be seen "as the result of study and application of 'conocimientos extraordinarios'" (57).

[83] According to Martínez del Valle, at least two of the works are based on plays be Antonio de Zamora (*El convidado de Piedra* and *El hechizado por fuerza*).

grotesque irrationalities that its proponents might not have forecasted. Spain's ruling class, including intellectuals like Jovellanos and the elite such as the Osunas, were grappling with the limits of science as a way to cure society's ailments, and it is within these limits that rationality fights with irrationality's monsters. Goya's exaggerated, macabre visual descriptions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were extremely popular and much sought-after during this time period.

Although both Irving Heckes and Águeda Villar mention the Duchess of Osuna as a figure of importance in Goya's life, both as a frequent buyer of his works and as a friend who introduced him to other enlightened members of Spanish society through her popular *tertulia*, I am still curious as to why the Duchess might commission so many works dealing with such dark subject matter. Heckes starts to hint at a possible answer to my question in his investigations of the works – he cites the Duchess' mother, Faustina, as a woman quite interested in the supernatural and who also mingled with other occultists of her time, such as William Beckford.[84] Although this fact is sure to fascinate readers, I am not sure it is strong enough to link the Duchess as another follower of the occult. The Osuna's extensive library included many banned books, works from around Europe that have been found in other noble libraries of the time, so to single out a few particular texts that have to do with witchcraft as evidence that the Duchess herself was interested in the supernatural is a stretch that I am not willing to make. Rather, I think the topic of witchcraft, and witches in particular, as representative of the superstitious, naïve fears that enveloped much of Spain during the turn of the century is a theme that might prove to be quite fruitful as I continue my investigations.

[84] William Beckford (1760-1844) was a British novelist best known for his occult Gothic work *Vathek*.

Finally, the Osunas were patrons of the famous print series, *Los Caprichos*, by Goya.[85] In comparison to *Los Caprichos*, *Los Disparates* offers a more expressionist view of the female character. His portrayal of women in *Los Disparates* questions societal barriers, contrasting both traditional and enlightened viewpoints on the role of women in society. This contrast is intriguing and has prompted my examination of why female identity and participation in society was more widely accepted in eighteenth-century Spain. Because of this, it is prudent to examine both the content and style of *Los Disparates* to better understand the artist's social commentary. *El disparate* is something done or said contrary to reason. A selection of prints from *Los Disparates*, such as "El caballo raptor," "Disparate puntual," and "Disparate matrimonial," questions the societal barriers for women during the Spanish Enlightenment, contrasting both traditional and enlightened viewpoints of the time, and instead offers a contrary perspective, a view of a world that has been flipped on its head, where humans are deformed into monstrous forms and women are figures that play a central role.

As stated previously, it is erroneous to give Goya credit for influencing the name of the garden as his prints were published after construction began on the garden, but I think it would be a missed opportunity to not ponder the mutual influence these two eighteenth-century intellectuals might have had on each other in relation to the garden El Capricho. It is during the early construction of El Capricho that the Duke and Duchess begin commissioning works by Goya and their friendship flourishes. Might, then, the title of Goya's enigmatic prints that share a

---

[85] One of the prints of the series, number 55 "Hasta la muerte," is said to depict the Duchess as an old woman who is grooming herself in front of a mirror while two younger males and a young female look on. As Regueras Grande notes, "En dicho grabado una vieja horrible y cotorrona se emperifolla en su boudoir queriéndose probar una <<caramba>>… Dos jóvenes petimetres asisten al lever de tan acecinada señora, uno de ellos, quizá su cortejo, entorna los ojos extasiado mientras el otro no puede contener la risa que trata de disimular con la mano." (98-100).

name with the Duchess's garden be influenced by the botanical space created by one of his most important beneficiaries? The concept of *un capricho*, a whim, caprice or action taken without reason, applies to the botanical paradise created by the Duchess, presenting a sort of fantasy to visitors in which the restraints of metropolitan life need not necessarily apply; and it is within this whimsical environment that inspiration blossoms.

Ver es creer… ¿o cuestionar?

The garden might be seen as an example of "*ver es creer*," or the notion that one needs to be able to see to believe. The importance of scientific investigation, analysis, and observation allowed intellectuals to empirically understand the world around them. The world of botany lends itself well to observation because plants are easily manipulated and reproduced through human intervention. The garden in particular is a space that is exclusively pruned and managed by human influence – only certain plants are allowed to grow, and unwanted species are removed. In this space of the garden, the gardener has the ability to grow his plants under certain conditions and observe their growth as closely as he likes. He is also able to watch the plant interact with the environment around it, spreading out to reach for more sun or shade, housing small insects that benefit from its growth symbiotically, and flourishing with proper care and water. Or the gardener might learn that a plant is not able to grow in a certain environment when he observes it wither and die due to not having access to the ambient needs it requires to thrive.

Adrian Von Buttlar, in his introduction to *Jardines del Clasicismo y el Romanticismo: El jardín paisajista*, says:

> "Un jardín es siempre una imagen ideal del mundo y, al mismo tiempo, una reconstrucción del primer jardín: el paraíso terrenal. Pero la imagen del paraíso cambió

> con el transcurso de la historia, incorporó en sí experiencias diversas y sucesivas definiciones de la naturaleza humana en sus aspectos internos y externos y fue adquiriendo a cada momento una validez nueva en cuanto modelo de un orden global de la creación" (9).

The space of the garden, then, is reminiscent to Eden, the first garden, and thus is a version or reconstruction of it: an ideal space and an Earthly paradise. But, according to Von Buttlar, that idea of paradise changes depending on the moment in history when it was created. What might the Duchess' version of paradise suggest if it too incorporates unique experiences and ever-evolving definitions of human nature? What internal and external aspects of the garden might suggest her worldly views and interpretations of natural order? El Capricho garden is a significant site both for question-inducing complexity and for its interest in intellectual and scientific advancements.

The same scientific process used to properly tend a garden might be applied to the observation and study of women during the Enlightenment. In the chapter entitled "Sex Socialized" in *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*, Thomas W. Laqueur says, in regards to sex[86] during the enlightenment:

> "The creation of a bourgeois public sphere, in other words, raised with a vengeance the question of which sex(es) ought legitimately to occupy it. And everywhere biology entered the discourse. Obviously those who opposed increased civil and private power for women – the vast majority of articulate men – generated evidence for women's physical and mental unsuitability for such advances; their bodies unfit them for chimerical spaces that the revolution had inadvertently opened" (194).

---

[86] Here I refer to the biological notion of sex as a determinant of gender classification.

Women and men were deemed to have physical differences stark enough to legitimize variances in the way they act in public, are educated and what roles they should have in society. Women, delicate and fragile creatures, benefited from the pruning and tending by a gardener, or male authority, in order to blossom into the best versions of themselves.

When did the garden become a feminine space? Sue Bennett in *Women & Gardens* postulates that belief in Christianity, and specifically the belief in the notion of Creation, Fall and Redemption, have deeply implicated both gender's relationships to the environment: "This tended to stress the dominant role of men and to place a value on docility and passivity in women" (11-12). According to dominant Christian beliefs that infiltrated morality-driven societal and domestic gender roles, men tend to impose their power on others while women are more inclined to care for and mother other living beings. In her article "El jardín paisajista y la mujer en España: La Alameda de Osuna, El Casino de la Reina y Vista Alegre," Eva Rodríguez Romero concurs that the garden is a feminine space, stating "[t]ras esta idea recurrente de Paraíso como un jardín se esconde entonces el concepto de la mujer, pero la mujer como símbolo, como origen de vida" (347). In fact, as Dawn MacLeod observes in the preface to *Down-to-Earth Women: Those Who Care for the Soul,* "[t]here is nothing artificial in distinguishing between the sexes in connection with gardening" (ix) because it is clear that the two genders took divergent approaches to tending the ground. According to this author, women have long had a place in the garden, passing down notes and knowledge to future generations either through verbal communication or personal notebooks which has "undoubtedly prevented posterity from recognizing women's gardening achievements" (106). Thinking back to the 1791 definition of the garden in the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, it is defined as a space populated with beautiful things, specifically women. The way that we think about the garden is,

and has been, gendered, therefore contemplating this space as a potential site of female participation during the Spanish Enlightenment becomes clear.

Hegel's thoughts on the garden align with my understanding and analysis of El Capricho. Hegel says, "[…] the purpose of the garden is to provide, for diversion and the pleasure of strolling, a place which is no longer nature as such, but nature transformed by humans to meet his need for an environment created by himself (*Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, 699). The transformation of nature, argues Hegel, meets a human need to create an environment that meets her needs. El Capricho, a space curated by the Duchess of Osuna, thus deserves an investigation into the pursuits of its creator because her interests may lead us to a different analysis of this botanical space. Returning to the quote by Bequette that states that the garden "is a mirror of the society which creates it" (44), this idea of a mirror, of a reflective landscape, of the society that created it is suggestive in that it highlights the link between garden, creator and social environment, a link that I argue is an important one in the consideration of female participation in Spanish eighteenth-century society.

The metaphorical possibilities comparing the garden to the budding female participation in Spain during the time are seemingly endless, and I argue that this lush equivalence shouldn't be ignored. As Cooper addresses in *Philosophy of Gardens,* the meaning of gardens reminds us that this botanical space, in its essence, is a reconciliation of opposites, between nature and culture or change and continuity. I propose that women during this time were also obligated to reconcile opposing forces between a desire for more independence and a society that limited their participation based upon presupposed natural weaknesses. Much like the garden, women were a force of nature meant to be tamed. Constant pruning and attention were required to produce an object of material beauty in both the garden and in the education of the enlightened

woman. Women's access to the study of botany cannot be ignored either – while botanical language, as discussed in my second chapter, seemed to highlight gender roles (which may be a reason it was an "allowable" science to study), this access to scientific knowledge certainly expanded their knowledge and allowed them to think beyond the narrow perimeters given to them by a male-dominated society. Botany utilized a gendered rhetoric used in other registers to not only describe but also prescribe a moral society in which the woman is dependent on and inferior to her male counterpart. Therefore, the study of botany may not have been considered so "dangerous" because it reinforced the same stereotypes that enclosed women during this time period. Despite this, some women, including the Duchess of Osuna, were able to subvert botanical discourse through their participation in scientific intellectual endeavors, thusly appropriating the rhetoric for their own interests.

In her study on gardens and space, Jagger notes that the notion of garden denotes a certain "exclusivity of space" because we can consider the garden as a site of knowledge of which only certain visitors have access. The idea of the garden as a site of knowledge is useful in my study of El Capricho specifically in that it correlates with the notion that the Duchess was an active female participant in the production of knowledge in her eighteenth-century environment. Jagger, commenting on who might have had access to sites of knowledge at a garden, says: "The sacred groves were home to schools of philosophy and only those deemed worthy of admission (i.e. those capable of understanding philosophy) were given the opportunity to learn within its walls" (641). As far as this idea applying to the garden, it would be useful to have an exhaustive list of visitors to the garden, but unfortunately we do not have access to such a document. We do know that the Osunas invited guests such as Lady Holland from England (who wrote about her

experiences in Spain and, specifically, at El Capricho)[87] and writers, artists and other intellectuals to the *tertulia* that the Duchess eventually housed at the mansion in El Capricho[88]. It would be misleading to suggest that El Capricho is an object of interest in the study of female participation during the Enlightenment in Spain without clarifying that the frequenters of the garden were most certainly of the highest echelon of society. The socio-economic status of the visitors, though, does not concern my study of the garden itself nor the Duchess' creative labor in it. What does concern my study is that El Capricho became a space in which it was deemed socially acceptable for a woman to be in charge of the aesthetic and technical aspects of the garden, to display her wealth of knowledge, and to invite both sexes to participate in the intellectual capriciousness that can be found throughout the garden.

The charming, regal garden was sure to impress both eighteenth and nineteenth century and contemporary visitors alike, but it is not the aesthetic pleasures derived from the garden that I would like to stress. Rather, it is the locus of the garden itself and its space that serves both for enjoyment and for intellectual stimulation that deserves attention. Might we think of this botanical space, the garden, as representative of women during the Enlightenment in Spain: a space that straddles the borders of domestic and public, a natural entity that might be wild if not for the limits it is given; that requires a certain instinct and intellect to trim and prune in order to best cultivate its beauty and value?

---

[87] The Countess of Yebes delves into Lady Holland's letters and account of the garden in her book on the life of the Duchess, *La condesa-duquesa de Benavente: Una vida en unas cartas*

[88] The invitee list of the Duchess' *tertulia* included people such as Francisco de Goya, el Marqués de Manca, Tomás de Iriarte, Ramón de la Cruz, Leandro Fernández de Moratín, el Marqués de Bondad Real and el abate Pedro Gil.

The garden was a locale in which it was deemed socially acceptable for women to wander, either accompanied by a *cortejo*, or male escort, or not, and to experience nature in a controlled environment while also allowing them space to deviate from the suggested path and discover whatever natural curiosity might be found around the next corner. This dual purpose of the garden is precisely it as an exemplary object in my study of the relation between scientific investigation and rhetoric and female participation during the Spanish Enlightenment.

In *Five Centuries of Women & Gardens*, Sue Bennett historicizes the garden through five centuries, but in her reflection on the design of eighteenth-century gardens she is hesitant to declare the entire garden a feminine space, whether a male or a female designed it:

> "Traditionally the female space was the flower garden. Increasingly, flower and kitchen gardens, along with the domestic parts of the house, were banished from the front of the building. To be a gentleman was to possess an estate, to look out on far-distant prospects, both sure and certain signs of economic and social success. To be a gentlewoman was to cut the roses in the flower garden, safely tucked away behind the house, and to be part of, rather than possessor of, the landscape" (56).

With the gender delineations Bennet mentions, El Capricho clearly blurs the boundaries between traditional male and female roles regarding the garden. The garden, rather than being "safely tucked away behind the house," was the central attraction that greeted visitors to the Alameda estate. Furthermore, the Duchess did not simply "cut the roses in the flower garden"; she was a prominent part of the construction and design of the space, and she utilized it for her social gatherings and *tertulias*.

Conclusion: The garden as a sign

In Ferdinand de Saussure's *Course on General Language*, he proposes that language be understood in terms of signs, or more specifically, how the differences between signs give us their meaning. I interpret this as an important answer to the question "Why study the garden?" To use the garden as a case study, specifically an object of interest, and more specifically a sign to be analyzed, it is also necessary to distinguish the garden from other spaces. The Duchess chose to construct a complex garden replete with edifices, statues, and botanical wonders with which a visitor could interact. Instead of speculating why the Duchess dedicated her efforts toward the construction and maintenance of this garden space, keeping in mind Mieke Bal's understanding of the object of visual studies and the interplay between the object and its historical context and, more importantly, what can be learned about history from that object, I analyze and interpret the object of the garden being ever vigilant that my interpretation stems from my personal viewing practices.

In *Production of Space*, Lefebvre wonders whether "…the producers of space have always acted in accordance with a representation, while the 'users' passively experienced whatever was imposed upon them inasmuch as it was more or less thoroughly inserted into, or justified by, their representational space" (43-4). Thinking about the Duchess as a producer of space, we might look at the El Capricho as a representational space, a park in which visitors where subjected to the producer's intended experience. What was the intended experience of the garden? By examining El Capricho not only as a recreational space, but also a space that housed sites of knowledge that might include the *tertulia* that was hosted there, the library in the *palacete*, the *invernadero* where gardeners and botanists studied plants or the apiary where visitors could contemplate the work of the bee, we might analyze the garden as representational

of the intersection of science and female participation in Spanish society during the Enlightenment.

Pentti Määttänen in "Semiotics of space: Pierce and Lefebvre" ponders both the linguistic and non-linguistic meaning of space. As the critic notes, Lefebvre understands meaning as a "semiotic triangle" (456) in which the linguistic component is only part of an object's overall meaning, which should also be understood by the habits associated with it as well as the social and political practices wrapped up in its usage. Both Lefebvre and Pierce understand space to be part of the layers of meaning, and the body as an essential presence in an object's meaning. Määttänen asserts, "[s]patial practice is, then, essentially embodied practice" (457) because the body moves, forms habits, and asserts itself both socially and politically. In the second volume of *Essential Pierce*, the theorist lays out his basic understanding of the sign: "I define a sign as anything which is so determined by something else, called its Object, and so determines an effect upon a person, which effect I call its interpretant, that the latter is thereby mediately determined by the former" (478). Essentially, there are three main components to the concept of a sign, the sign itself, which also can be understood as the signifier, the Object, and the interpretant.

Määttänen's states, "[t]he object of perception is interpreted by activities that are somehow related to it […and…] buildings, squares, places, and so on are ultimately interpreted by different kinds of habits and practices that are somehow related to those places…" (455). The garden as the object of study must be understood and interpreted as a layered space whose meaning can be found partly in the activities carried out there. Sites of knowledge at the garden shift the meaning of El Capricho from that of simply a green space created as an accompaniment to an estate to an interactive site because of its physicality and because of its commitment to expanding both mental and social space for its visitors.

We might consider the garden, then, as a connotative sign,[89] metonymic both in its association with botany and the intellectual pursuits of a female during the eighteenth century in Spain. Important too is the scientific language used in the garden, specifically that of botany. *La botánica*, as defined in the 1791 *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, is "[e]l arte que enseña el conocimiento y calidades de las yerbas y plantas." This art, or study, of the knowledge and qualities of herbs and plants was routinely practiced at El Capricho, both in its design as a unique botanical space, as well as in specified botanical laboratories such as in the *invernadero*, or greenhouse, where new varieties of plant species were cared for and nurtured. *El jardinero*, or gardener, was subject to caring for this space, and as defined in the same dictionary, "tiene cuidado de cultivar y aderezar el jardín." According to this definition, the Duchess, with her interest in botanical research as well as garden designer, might also be considered a gardener at El Capricho.

In a chapter dedicated to semiology in her book, *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials*, Gillian Rose states, "In semiology there is no stable point that can provide an entrance into the meaning-making process; all meanings are relational not only within the image but also in relation to other images and to broader dominant codes, referent systems and mythologies." For my work, this notion of semiology is key in that it reminds the interpreter to not limit the focus on only one point in the garden: El Capricho should not be interpreted in a linear manner. What I mean here is that the garden does not lend itself to a singular interpretation – when one visits the garden, one can turn left or right, look up or down, stop and contemplate or wander aimlessly. Thus El Capricho is an encoded space that welcomes

---

[89] As defined in *Visual Methodologies*: "Connotative signs carry a range of higher-level meanings" (82) and can be divided into two categories, metonymic and synechdochal.

multiple interpretations and meanings. I use this garden, then, as a case study in my pursuit to analyze gender politics and scientific discourse in eighteenth century Spain.

As Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson postulate in their co-authored text, "Semiotics and Art History: A Discussion of Context and Senders," signs might be framed by discourse, institutions, systems, and even mechanisms of communication and meaning. One must look to the context of the object in order to examine "the social factors that frame the signs" (244). The authors describe semiotics as a "supradisciplinary theory" (246), one that lends itself to an analysis of a variety of disciplines, specifically to the relationship between text and image, without weighing on one discipline more heavily than the other. If we consider the garden as the sign or work of art here, then the context in which it thrives is ever changing – and it has been since the moment of its conception. A garden is a living, breathing space that molds nature into premeditated forms, but the context of the garden – the people that visit it, the city that houses it, and the workers that till its land – grow, die, and are replaced again and again, so the context is in an ever state of cycle and rebirth. It is for this reason that it remains ever pertinent to examine the space of El Capricho and learn what it might tell us about the eighteenth century in which it was born while keeping the knowledge that our twenty-first century context informs its analysis.

I conclude the chapter by returning to the apiary. As Ventura Aguado mentions in his "Alabanza de la Alameda"[90]:

> Segunda marabilla se presenta
>
> en la hermosa abegera, en que se encuentra
>
> la habilidad y el arte decontadas

---

[90] Unfortunately we do not have an exact date of publication – the Biblioteca Nacional de España estimates the date of publication anywhere between 1801 and 1900.

con natural instinto concretadas,

pues si artifice docto la fabríca,

a tan curioso fin, su fin dedica,

como es hacer presente con certeza

las virtudes que da naturaleza.

In his poetic tour of the garden, Aguado stops to admire the *abegera*, or apiary, "en que se encuentra / la habilidad y el arte decontadas." This building, unique both in its architecture and purpose, "hacer presente con certeza / las virtudes que da naturaleza." It is in the building that the veil of nature is lifted, where visitors might pause for a few moments and gaze in awe at its virtues. The bee, a small creature that seemingly labors endlessly, is commonly brushed off as a nuisance but here she is admired. The worker bee, any female bee that does not have the reproductive capabilities of the queen bee, labors away gathering pollen and producing wax. It seems fitting, then, that the Duchess constructed this unique building to exalt the bee, a *criatura* who tirelessly works to build and provide for its community.

In *Gardens: An Essay on the Human Condition*, Robert Pogue Harrison prefaces his study of the garden by contemplating Voltaire's ending to *Candide* in which he implores that we must cultivate our own garden. Pogue Harrison contextualizes the quote by stating that "[…] the garden in question must be viewed against the background of the wars, pestilence, and natural disasters evoked by the novel" (iii), emphasizing the act of cultivation and elevating the garden as a refuge from the human condition. In the same paragraph he then continues: "[a] garden severed from history would be superfluous" (iii). The insistence on historicizing the garden is vital to my study of El Capricho and its meaning within the context of eighteenth-century Spain and gender politics.

It seems fitting, then, to recall Inés Joyes y Blake's words in *Apología de las mujeres*, where she, too, exalts the bee:

> Digan los hombres lo que quieran, las almas son iguales, y si por mayor delicadeza de los órganos son las mujeres más aptas para un género de aplicación, y los hombres por su mayor robustez para otro, nada prueba esto contra nosotras, pues no es la abeja entre los volátiles menos apreciable que el buitre, aunque éste sea sin comparación más grande y forzudo, ni la oveja menos que el león, pues mientras éste sólo se ocupa en destruir y devorar sirve aquélla al hombre mansamente con alimento y vestido. La abeja gobierna su colmena y la llena de delicada miel y utilísima cera, mientras el buitre anda vagueando para buscar entre las crueldades su pasto. (277-8)

Joyes compares the female to the bee, a small, but mighty insect that not only carries a painful sting when angered but is also a productive creature, working tirelessly with other bees in order to produce sweet honey and useful wax. The man, on the other hand, is compared to a large worthless vulture whose only purpose is to scrounge for scraps amongst the decaying carcasses leftover from past killings. Here, Joyes subverts the idea that "seeing is believing" because size, in fact, does not determine strength nor worth. The deep-seeded notion that women are inherently weaker than men, she argues, is false, and it is worthwhile to subvert these notions with common sense examples so as to convince the eighteenth-century reader that what they have learned about gender differences might not be based on realistic findings. Women not only reign over their domestic space, but also are active producers.

I cannot help but see a comparison between the delicate but mighty bee and the Duchess of Osuna. Small and fragile creatures upon first glance, both the Duchess and the bee deserve more attention for their labors. The bee "gobierna su colmena y la llena de delicada miel y

utilísima cera" much like the Duchess reined over El Capricho, creating a space that both delighted and inspired its visitors. Returning to Bal and Norman's reasoning that we must examine "the social factors that frame the signs" (244), framing El Capricho garden with eighteenth-century gender politics allows an interpretation of this botanical space that lends itself to a broader understanding of Spanish society. It allows us to look beyond texts and instead analyze objects and environments created during a time in which the assumption that women were inherently inferior to men was being questioned. And finally, it allows a reevaluation of the pivotal role of figures such as the Duchess of Osuna during the Spanish Enlightenment.

Epilogue: Considerations of the Other in Feijóo's "¿Si hay otros mundos?"

> "Es, pues, forzoso, que los habitadores de los cuerpos Planetarios tengan unos cuerpos de diversísima temperie, y organización que los nuestros; a cuya diversidad específica de organización, y temperie corresponden también, según buena Filosofía, almas informantes de diversa especie. Diversa organización específica pide diversa forma informante; por cuya razón [322] la organización específica de un bruto, no sólo no es capaz de ser informada del alma racional, mas ni aun del alma sensitiva de otro bruto de distinta especie."
> Padre Benito Jerónimo Feijóo in "¿Si hay otros mundos?", Carta XXVI in *Cartas eruditas y curiosas* (1773)

Modern Peninsular Literary and Cultural Studies has primarily situated itself in the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first centuries. A few eighteenth-century authors might be mentioned at the beginning of a survey class, or briefly quoted in studies on cultural and theoretical works from later time periods. While there exists a small group of scholars that dedicate energy to eighteenth-century studies, texts from this time might be described by others as sterile or patronizing at best, or null in cultural or literary value at worst. In fact, I was told, after sharing my interest in eighteenth-century texts with a fellow scholar, that I better "get used to the idea of flipping burgers" because no one would ever take interest in these texts. Despite the naysayers, my interest in eighteenth-century Spanish works has not only survived but thrived. Eighteenth-century studies, much like Spain itself during the time period, remain on the margin of the tantalizing tag "modern." While some describe the paralysis of cultural production in eighteenth-century Spain, I question this perspective and push back by elevating producers that

dared to break the mold when discussing themes such as science and the role of women in society.

In this epilogue, I conclude my dissertation by leaving the garden with the intention of returning to a voice that resonated in eighteenth-century *tertulias* and intellectual conversations – Padre Feijóo. Feijóo remains to be an enigmatic eighteenth-century figure because of his unapologetic views that include pro-women and pro-science arguments. His insistence on grappling with larger, philosophical questions that nagged Humanists around Europe separates him from other Spanish enlightened intellectuals of his time. He was a religious man that was deeply familiar with the philosophical ramifications of the Bible, and he used his knowledge of religion to compliment his interest in the sciences. As a religious man, he took time to consider the moral implications of his arguments. As a man of the sciences, he presented his findings in a well-organized fashion that made clear his didactic reasoning.

Feijóo is one of the most famous thinkers to come out of Enlightened Spain, and his prolific writings questioned supposed truths pushed by the Church and accepted as such by society at large. Many critics of his work, including Menéndez Pelayo and Vicente de Lafuente have said that the Spanish monk produced interesting ideas, but he didn't write well, which is why his works aren't widely read as a part of the Modern Peninsular canon. But Gregorio Marañón in *Las ideas biológicas de Padre Feijóo* (1941), argues for a different reading of Feijóo, one in which he is seen as the modern author for his use of scientific language (85). I agree with Marañón's assertion, paying attention to both the language and methodical language used in his arguments, it becomes clear that his writing is powerful not only for its eloquence but also for his insistence to uncover the truth. Feijóo's most well-known work that does just this is "Defensa de las mujeres" (1726), in which he challenges commonly held beliefs about women,

who are normally viewed as the Other in a world dominated by men. He highlights the supposed masculine superiority touted by religious and scientific texts alike and in turn presents an argument to unravel these stereotypes.

We travel far outside of Spain and into the cosmos with Feijóo in his text "¿Si hay otros mundos?" (1773), which challenges religious leaders to confront the fear of the Other with curiosity rather than fear, welcoming astronomical research that hints at the expansive and unknown population of the Universe. In my reading of "¿Si hay otros mundos?", I compare this text with "Defensa de las mujeres," a publication that I analyze in the first chapter. In both of the works by Feijóo, the author challenges eighteenth-century Spaniards to accept the Other, be her a woman or an alien. The Enlightenment in Spain welcomed these discourses and allowed not only intellectuals but also society as a whole to imagine Spain's "modern" future.

Now, one might ask how we might compare the two works mentioned here: one that focuses on the possibility of alien life and the other that defends women as capable members of society. I assert that Feijóo confronts the idea of the Other in both essays, applying enlightened approaches to reason and truth to both arguments in order to reach the goal of rationality. Instead of facing differences with fear and anger, the author excels at understanding differences and applying logical reason with the purpose of finding order and congruity.

In the letter "¿Si hay otros mundos?," Feijóo highlights the fact that Virgil never used the word "Antipodes," or inhabitants of another continent, but rather that he mentions inhabitants of another world, with another sun and moon, distinct from the planet we inhabit. To speak of the "other," or the otherworldly, would not only be acceptable according to Feijóo, but in fact it would be a modern, enlightened thought. He supports Virgil by applying the science and rhetoric of Reason to understand how life on another planet could be possible: "No es creíble que Dios

haya querido dar habitadores a este pequeño Palacio, dejando aquellos para que sólo sirvan de objeto a nuestra vista." He continues by saying that if, in fact, there are Others, then at least some have to be as intelligent as we are and, furthermore, that their diversity may be explained by the environment and differing atmospheres they inhabit. In Feijóo's reaction, I see curiosity more than fear – he provides a rational explanation of life on another planet, using modern scientific discoveries and notions of his time to offer a well-organized reasoning of the possibility that we are not the only inhabitants in the universe.

Feijóo was a religious man who wrote with the purpose to be understood – clarity was of the most utmost importance to his prose. All of Feijóo's writings are didactic in nature – they are meant to educate the reader, so understandably he employs repetition and everyday language in order to be understood. In addition to his religious profession, he was also an intellectual who knew of many of the scientific discoveries and treatises about science. It is obvious that he has been influenced by scientific rhetoric in his dissection of problems, always with the aim of presenting the clearest resolution. I invite thinking through both Feijóo's thoughts regarding the possibility of life on other planets and how it might relate to a more localized discourse with which he also participated – the participation of women in society. His intellectual curiosity regarding the Other mirrors many Humanist's curiosity regarding the otherness of science and scientific investigation during the eighteenth century, a curiosity that both propelled intellectualism forward and that was seen as an insurmountable obstacle by conservative thinkers that viewed many scientific findings as heretic.

In Feijóo's reaction, I see curiosity rather than fear in his attempt to confront the possibility of other worlds. It is through his rational explanation that fuses modern scientific reasoning of his time into the argument that the author is able to offer a response that is open to

alternative ways of seeing. In *Cartas eruditas y curiosas*, scientific language is used to establish a thesis that is more closely related to an intellectual hypothesis you would find in a scientific paper. Feijóo uses the same literary technique to explain other phenomena and polemic issues in the time period, such as the supposed superiority of men over women. In "Defensa de las mujeres," he proves that this "truth" is all but a social construct loosely supported by erroneous conjectures. He avoids flowery language and instead presents a solid, logical argument that agitates the leading ecclesiastical current of thought during his time.

"Defensa de las mujeres," from another collection of his work entitled *Teatro crítico universal* (1726), is a pertinent text to any study on women during the eighteenth-century in Spain. In this work, Feijóo polemicizes the popular opinion of the time that women were inferior by intentionally disputing this supposed mental, physical, and moral inferiority to men. The author does this by dissecting what is truth and what is opinion, showing that the former is a force that guides reason, which he states at the beginning of the text:

> "En grave empeño me pongo. No es ya sólo un vulgo ignorante con quien entro en la contienda: defender a todas las mujeres, viene a ser lo mismo que ofender a casi todos los hombres: pues raro hay que no se interese en la precedencia de su sexo con desestimación del otro. A tanto se ha extendido la opinión común en vilipendio de las mujeres, que apenas admite en ellas cosa buena. En lo moral las llena de defectos, y en lo físico de imperfecciones. Pero donde más fuerza hace, es en la limitación de sus entendimientos. Por esta razón, después de defenderlas con alguna brevedad sobre otros capítulos, discurriré más largamente sobre su aptitud para todo género de ciencias, y conocimientos sublimes."

Feijóo presents the reader with a problem while also offering a proposed solution, approaching the issue as if it were a scientific conundrum meant to be decoded. He attacks anti-women

perceptions and instead supports a society that values education for all its members no matter their gender. It is naïve to state that this view is "feminist" in the sense of the word that we use today, because his text, much like other texts of time, also comes with its problems and contradictions in terms of its attempted defense of women.[91] Still, we see Feijóo's wish to criticize his predecessors that had reproached women as the inferior gender without offering much of any substantial evidence to this divisive declaration.

It was Feijóo's intention to question the popular opinion that women were inferior and instead propose a more egalitarian approach to the moral and intellectual capacity of both sexes. The author mentions a variety of voices of reason in his essay, many times criticizing their weak arguments in regards to feminine inferiority. He recognizes that the intellectual world has been dominated by the male voice, and if the roles were reversed, women would certainly have cast men aside too: "Al caso: hombres fueron los que escribieron esos libros, en que se condena por muy inferior el entendimiento de las mujeres. Si mujeres los hubieran escrito, nosotros quedaríamos debajo." This voice of reason captured the attention of enlightened thinkers that were in pursuit of a more egalitarian world view.

It's important to also note that Feijóo dedicates a large part of his defense of women to the importance of virtue. The topic of feminine modesty is not anything new in the eighteenth century, and Feijóo purposefully offers readers a different perspective of women. Olivia Blanco Corrujo, in her book *La polémica feminista en la España ilustrada: La Defensa de las Mujeres*

[91] Olivia Blanco Corrujo repeatedly mentions the "misoginia latente" in Feijóo's writings, specifically in "Defensa de las mujeres," but she posits that the contradictions and issues with his works are intrinsically tied to anti-women theory that is riddled throughout the debate on women in Spain during the time. In the first chapter of her book, Blanco Corrujo succinctly summarizes this topic as well as literature and theory related to the treatment of women during the eighteenth century in Spain.

de Feijoo y sus detractores, explains her understanding of Feijóo's proposal: "Su fin es demostrar la igualdad de los sexos en cuanto a la virtud, y sólo muy limitadamente se toca el aspecto de los entendimientos. Centrar la polémica en este aspecto será el mérito del padre Feijóo" (19). Authors such as Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, Fray Luis de León, Juan Luis Vives and many others had published reactions or opinion pieces on the topic of feminine virtue. It was a shared conviction that the woman was temptation incarnated, and that she was intrinsically inferior to her male counterpart, thus Feijóo's perspective vastly differed from this dangerous stereotype.

The idea of the Other is repeated in both "Defensa de las mujeres" and "¿Si hay otros mundos?" By approaching the unknown with intellectual curiosity instead of fear, Feijóo granted himself and his readers access to these polemic topics through reasonable problem-solving techniques. His contemplations on the possibility of extraterrestrial life and his suggestions that the alien Other might be intelligent are linked, I argue, to his provocative ideas in "Defensa de las mujeres" about broadening access for women to public and private spaces. Women, despite not being alien beings on Earth, were treated as Other as far as their limited participation in society. In "¿Si hay otros mundos?", Feijóo works through the issue of the possibility of extraterrestrial life by applying the religious theories of Saint Paul to justify his hypothesis, saying that in the Acts of the Apostles, Saint Paul discussed the possibility of:

> "…otras especias intelectuales, y juntamente corpóreas, incógnitas a la verdad, pero con suma verosimilitud consideradas posibles; porque aunque nosotros no conozcamos otras criaturas compuestas de cuerpo, y espíritu, que las de la especie humana: ni se puede sin temeridad pensar, que en los senos de la posibilidad no las haya, o lo que es lo mismo, que Dios no pueda producirlas. Si no viésemos en el mundo más que una especie de brutos,

> creerían muchos que ni entre los posibles había otra. Yo no veo más repugnancia en que haya muchas especias de animales intelectuales, que en que haya muchas de animales brutos."

For Feijóo, it's important to recognize the possibility of the Other so as to understand their differences.

I find the thoughtful contemplation of the Other important to emphasize. Instead of assuming that no other being could possibly exist, or that if we do that we would automatically be superior to them, is poignant. Feijóo uses this same application of reason in "Defensa de las mujeres," explaining that:

> "Las verdades tienen su valor intrínseco; y el caudal, o riqueza del entendimiento, no consta de otras monedas. Unas son más preciosas que otras, pero ninguna inútil. Ni la verdad, que hemos probado, puede por sí inducir vanidad, y presunción en las mujeres. Si ellas son verdaderamente en las perfecciones de la alma iguales con nosotros, no habrá vicio alguno en que lo conozcan, y entiendan así."

If we consider the woman as the Other in a society dominated by men, or the possibility of life on other planets, it becomes clear that Feijóo completely revolutionized the assumption of superiority, be it masculine or human. He turns this concept on his head with simple and direct language, because his intention to educate his reader was always forefront in his purpose.

Returning to Marañón, he says that Feijóo's language is "…un lenguaje esencialmente científico, en el cual, la única elegancia permitida es la claridad" and continues, stating that "(e)nseñar…es sólo claridad e insistencia" (87-8). Feijóo confronts the fear of the Other, a fear propagated by the Church but also by society, with an eye to rationally explain the diversity of our world and the possibility to find other distinctive forms of life on other planets. With this

modern take, the author chooses reason over fear, giving life to new perspectives with a didactive language that was accessible to his eighteenth-century Spanish audience.

In the following century, Spain continues marching towards modernization, experiencing an explosion of technology, and with it a vastly different perspective of the world. The goal of uncovering the truth to use it to educate is obvious in both of Feijóo's texts mentioned here. And with the considerations mentioned in this dissertation, it becomes clear that we must value eighteenth-century studies, especially those texts and objects of interest that recognize the role of the sciences, in order to better understand Spain's steps towards modernization in the nineteenth century and beyond. I argue that the seeds of modern discourse that questioned patriarchal societal stands were sprouting in the eighteenth century, and we see the fruits of these seedlings grow in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Progressive thoughts indeed existed in eighteenth-century Spain, as we can see in authors such as Inés Joyes y Blake, Feijóo and Jovellanos, as well as scientists such as José Quer, Antonio Palau, and Casimiro Gómez Ortega. They, alongside other producers such as intellectuals like the Duchess of Osuna, offered a perspective that lauded the freedom to stretch beyond the constraints of a conservative approach.

In my first chapter, I engaged with ideas surrounding gender roles in eighteenth-century Spain and the rhetoric that enveloped debates surrounding male and female participation in Spanish society, specifically examining the intersection between scientific rhetoric and language used to discuss the body, place, and role of the female both at home and in public. As I asserted, body politics are deeply linked to societal and scientific ways of understanding and assigning roles to the gendered body. Theorists such as Laqueur have connected the way bodies are gendered to how bodies are studied anatomically. This turns the notion that "seeing is believing" on its head because what was believed to be scientific "truth" was what scientists and doctors

saw to be true in bodies. This sort of thinking allows for gendered roles to be perpetuated and justified by those who study the body because they see what they are looking for.

In my second chapter, I expanded on the topic of seeing is believing by examining agricultural and botanical texts during the eighteenth-century. If what one believes does in fact influence what one sees, we can find evidence of that in the writings of botanists at the time that superimposed gendered roles onto plant life, forcing the hierarchies of the patriarchal society that men and women inhabited on the unknowing flora that surrounded them. When what we believe is what we see, then what we see is what we believe, creating an endless loop that supports the powers that be. Despite the pursuit to uncover "el no sé qué" of different plants while providing order with taxonomical terms and categories, scientific discourse that was riddled with biases and falsehoods continued to leach into the soil and poison budding vegetation with predispositions and prejudices.

And then in my final chapter, I think through this in relation to the garden and the study of botany, because the botanical space hovers between public and private. It was an acceptable site for women to occupy, evident by the popularity of the practice of botany among women during the eighteenth century. El Capricho, then, is an object of interest in the study of women's participation during the Spanish Enlightenment because it was a space that was managed by a woman, directed by a prominent figure in Spanish society, and designed by an intellectual female curious about the newest scientific inventions to create a whimsical, stimulating environment.

I return to Määttänen's insistence that "[t]he object of perception is interpreted by activities that are somehow related to it," and that "buildings, squares, places, and so on are ultimately interpreted by different kinds of habits and practices that are somehow related to those places, perhaps carried on in these places" (455). In other words, there exists layers of meanings,

according to Määttänen, and our understanding of the world is based on these multiple approximations of meaning. I find this conceptualization of meaning directly linked to the activities or actions that are correlated with the object itself very insightful. The garden at El Capricho, botanical texts authored in eighteenth-century Spain, translated novels accompanied by a letter that is a call to arms: these things are not simply defined by their physicality nor the botanical items or words that make up their composition. Their meaning comes also from the activities or actions that took place there or that the texts inspired: the working of the land, the design of space, the *tertulia*, the study of plants, the conversations with friends and family. This analysis of the semiotics of space opens up many doors leading to a broader interpretation of not only the garden but also the texts I analyze in this dissertation.

What is clear is that discussions and paths paved in the eighteenth century in Spain had lasting effects on the participation of women in later centuries. In future considerations of my research, I might bridge the gap between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Spain by looking to how the theories and work of Darwin, arguably the most influential scientific thinker in the later part of the nineteenth century, were received in Spain. Specifically, I wonder how his thoughts on evolution – individual variation, heritability and proliferation of the species, and natural selection – worked for and against the debate on women going during this time. While the debate on women during the end of the nineteenth century certainly had evolved over 100 years, women were still seen as the "ángel del hogar," their domain overwhelmingly domestic in character. Realism as a literary movement took hold of Spain's readers during this time as well, and many famous authors such as Benito Pérez Galdós and Clarín used female protagonists to ponder the society in which they lived, using the novel as a sort of fictional microscope to study, probe and dissect the nation's problems as it progressed into the twentieth century. Nineteenth-

century Spanish authors such as Emilia Pardo Bazán or Vicente Blasco Ibáñez might also play a role in my investigations on Darwinism in Spain. [92]

Works such as "¿Si hay otros mundos?" thus prove to have greater implications on the intersection between science and gender because the author and producer of thought is influenced by both debates on both the limits of science and the limits of female participation in this work. Therefore, we broaden our understanding of eighteenth-century Spain and ask how our perceptions of truth, science and history have been affected by the cultural debates that populated the Spanish Enlightenment. This question is precisely what drives me to continue to search for the alternative producers, subjects, doers, and knowers that worked against the grain of the widely accepted epistemological model that guided many Western nations into modernity.

[92] While Emilia Pardo Bazán publicly criticized the use of Darwin's theories as a means to justify women's rights to equality and education (Rowold, Katharina. *The Educated Woman. Minds, Bodies, and Women's Higher Education in Britain, Germany and Spain, 1865-1914*), she was against not Darwin, but rather the simplification of his ideas in order to boost the fight for gender equality. Specifically, Pardo Bazán rejected that the primary role of females was reproduction – thus her role in any future investigations might still be valid in that she was keen enough to look past the "buzzwords" that so many common readers of Darwin took away in an attempt to continue the evolution in the fight for a more equal role of women in Spanish society.

Works Cited

Aceves Pastrana, Patricia. “Las políticas botánicas metropolitanas en los virreinatos de la Nueva España y del Perú.” *Mundialización de la ciencia y cultura nacional*, edited by A. Lafuente, A. Elena and M. L. Ortega., Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1993.

Aguado, Ventura. *Ritma En Alabanza De La Alameda: Octavas*, 1801.

Águeda Villar, Mercedes. “Goya y las brujas.” *Goya: imaginación romántica y disparates en la Fundación Lázaro Galdiano*, 2005, pp. 15.

Agulló, y C. M, and Carmen Añón. *Jardines Clásicos Madrileños*. Museo Municipal, Ayuntamiento de Madrid, Delegación de Cultura, 1981.

Amar y Borbón, Josefa. *Discurso sobre la educación física y moral de las mujeres*. Imprenta de Benito Cano, 1790.

Alborg, Juan Luis. *Historia de la literatura española*, vol. 3. Gredos, 1970.

Añón, Carmen y Mónica Luengo. *El Capricho de la Alameda de Osuna*. Ayuntamiento de Madrid, 2003.

Arias Divito, Juan Carlos. *Las expediciones científicas españolas durante el siglo XVIII: Expedición botánica de Nueva España*. Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1968.

Bal, Mieke. “Visual Essentialism and the Object of Visual Culture.” *Journal of Visual Culture*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2003, pp. 5-32.

Bal, Mieke and Norman Bryson. “Semiotics and Art History: A Discussion of Context and Senders.” *The Art of Art History: a Critical Anthology*, edited by Donald Preziosi, Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 242-57.

Bennett, Sue. *Five Centuries of Women & Gardens*. National Portrait Gallery, 2000.

Bequette, Frances. "Gardens: A Cultural Flowering." *The Unesco Courier*, April 1997, pp. 44-6.

Blanco Corrujo, Olivia. *La polémica feminista en la España ilustrada: La Defensa de las Mujeres de Feijóo y sus detractores*. Biblioteca Añil Feminista, 2010.

Bleichmar, Daniela. *Visible Empire: Botanical Expeditions and Visual Culture in the Hispanic Enlightenment*. The University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Bloch, Ruth H. "The Origins of Feminism and the Limits of Enlightenment." *Modern Intellectual History*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2006, pp. 473–494., doi:10.1017/S1479244306000886.

Bolufer Peruga, Mónica. *La vida y la escritura en el siglo XVIII: Inés Joyes: Apología de las mujeres*. Universitat de València, 2008.

---. "Las mujeres en la cultura de la Ilustración." *Ilustración, ciencia y técnica en el siglo XVIII español*. Edited by Enrique Martínez Ruiz and Magdalena de Pazzis Pi Corrales, Universitat de Valencia, 2008, pp. 209-232.

---. *Mujeres e Ilustración: La construcción de la feminidad en la España del siglo XVIII*. Institución Alfons el Magnànim, 1998.

---. "'Neither Male Nor Female': Rational Equality in the Early Spanish Enlightenment." *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*. Edited by Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, pp. 389-409.

---. "Women of Letters in Eighteenth-Century Spain: Between Tradition and Modernity." *Eve's Enlightenment: Women's Experience in Spain and Spanish America, 1726-1839*. Edited by Catherine M. Jaffe and Elizabeth Franklin Lewis, Louisiana State University Press, 2009, pp. 17-32.

"botánica." *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, 1791. http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUILoginNtlle. Accessed 20 Jan. 2017.

Boutelou, Pablo. "Carta de Pablo Boutelou al Duque del Infantado, comunicándole haber realizado ya la desforestación de árboles y el envío de semillas." Aranjuez, 25 de enero de 1800.

Breve historia feminista de la literatura española (en lengua castellana). IV La literatura escrita por mujer de la Edad Media al siglo XVIII. Coordinated by Iris M. Zavala, Anthropos, 1997.

Broberg, Gunnar. "Linnaeus and the Linnean Project." *Spain and Sweden: Encounters throughout History. Carl Linnaeus and Enlightened Science in Spain*, edited by Enrique Martínez Ruíz and Magadalena de Pazzis Pi Corrales, Translated by David Langlois, Fundación Verndt Wistedt, 1998.

Bueno, González A. "Penetración y difusión de las teorías botánicas en la España Ilustrada." *Ciencia, técnica y Estado en la España Ilustrada*. Edited by Joaquín Fernández Pérez and Ignacio González Tascón, Gráficas Olimar, 1990, pp. 381-395.

Butler, Judith and Elizabeth Weed. "Introduction." *The Question of Gender: Joan W. Scott's Critical Feminism*, edited by Judith Butler and Elizabeth Weed, Indiana University Press, 2011, pp. 1-10.

Caba, Victoria Soto. "El jardín romántico en la España ilustrada: Una visión en la literatura." *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, vol. 7, no. 6. 1993, pp. 407-432.

Cadalso, José. *Los eruditos a la violeta*. Edited by Nigel Glendinning, Biblioteca Anaya, 1967.

Capel Martínez, Rosa María. "Mujer, sociedad y literatura en el Setecientos español." *Cuadernos de Historia Moderna*, no. 16. Servicio de Publicaciones UCM, 1995, pp. 103-119.

Carl Linnaeus and Enlightened Science in Spain. Project managed by Enrique Martínez Ruiz and Magdalena de Pazzis Pi Corrales, Fundación Berndt Wistedt, 1998.

Casid, Jill H. "The Hybrid Production of Empire." *Sowing Empire: Landscape and Colonization*, University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Catálogo online de obra. Fundación Goya en Aragón, 2010. http://www.fundaciongoyaenaragon.es/goya/obra/catalogo/?ficha=510. Accessed 15 Jan. 2017.

Davis, Ryan A. and Alicia Cerezo Paredes. "Introduction." *Modernity and Epistemology in Nineteenth-Century Spain: Fringe Discourses*, edited by Ryan A. Davis and Alicia Cerezo Paredes, Lexington Books, 2016.

Cheek, Pamela. *Sexual Antipodes: Enlightenment Globalization and the Placing of Sex*. Stanford University Press, 2003.

Clark, William and Jan Golinski, and Simon Schaffer. "Introduction." *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, edited by William Clark, Jan Golinski, and Simon Schaffer, The University of Chicago Press, 1999, pp. 3-31.

Colmeiro, Don Miguel. *La botánica y los botánicos de la Península Hispano-Lusitana*. Imprenta y Estereotipia de M. Rivadeneyra, 1858.

Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World. Edited by Londa Schiebinger and Claudia Swan, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Cook, Alexandra. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Botany: The Salutary Science*. Voltaire Foundation in association with Liverpool University Press, 2012.

Cooper, David E. *A Philosophy of Gardens*. Oxford University Press, 2006.

Dale, Scott. "La construcción narrativa e ideológica en *La Pensadora Gaditana*." *Dieciocho*, vol. 28, no. 1. Spring, 2005.

de Demerson, Paula. *Catálogo de las Socias de honor y mérito de la Junta de Damas Matritense (1787-1811)*. Raycar, 1971.

de Winthuysen, Xavier. *Jardines clásicos de España*. Ediciones Doce Calles, 1990.

Donato, Clorinda. "Introduction. 'Espagne' or "España'? Answering Enlightenment in the Encyclopedia metódica, the Spanish translation of the Encyclopédie méthodique." *Enlightenment Spain and the Encyclopédie méthodique,* edited by Clorinda Donato and Ricardo López, Voltaire Foundation, 2015.

Dusenbery, Maya. *Doing Harm: The Truth About How Bad Medicine and Lazy Science Leave Women Dismissed, Misdiagnosed, and Sick*. Harper One, 2018.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought*. Princeton University Press, 1981.

Enciso Recio, Luis Miguel. "El papel de la ciencia en la Ilustración española." *La ciencia en la España ilustrada.* Edited by Francisco González de Posada, Instituto de España, 2007, pp. 9-77.

Establier Pérez, Helena. "Estudio preliminar." *Historia de Rasselas, príncipe de Abisinia / Samuel Johnson; traducción de Inés Joyes y Blake; epílogo Apología de las mujeres: carta original de Inés Joyes a sus hijas*, edited by Helena Establier Pérez, Ediciones de Salamanca, 2009.

Fara, Patricia. *Pandora's Breeches: Women, Science and Power in the Enlightenment*. Pimlico, 2004.

Feijóo, Benito Jerónimo. "Defensa de las mujeres." *Teatro crítico universal*, vol. 1. *Proyecto filosofía en español,* 1998. http://www.filosofia.org/bjf/bjft116.htm.

---. "El no sé qué". *Teatro crítico universal*. 1734. http://www.filosofia.org/bjf/bjft812.htm

---. “Honra y Provecho de la Agricultura”. *Teatro crítico universal*, tomo VIII, discurso XII. 1734. https://www.filosofia.org/bjf/bjft812.htm

---. “¿Si hay otros mundos?” *Cartas eruditas, y curiosas*, vol.2, Imprenta Real de la Gazeta, 1773, pp. 315-23.

Feminist Epistemologies. Edited by Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, Routledge, 1993.

Findlen, Paula. “A Forgotten Newtonian: Women and Science in the Italian Provinces.” *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, edited by William Clark, Jan Golinski and Simon Schaffer, The University of Chicago Press, 1999, pp. 313-349.

Folguera, Pilar. *El feminismo de España: Dos siglos de historia*. Editorial Pablo Iglesias, 2007.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. Pantheon Books, 1970.

García, Ángeles. “El Prado desvela su colección de miniaturas.” *El País*. cultura.elpais.com/cultura/2011/10/10/actualidad/1318197609_850215.html. Accessed 10 Oct. 2011.

George, Sam. *Botany, sexuality & women’s writing 1760-1830: From modest shoot to forward plant*. Manchester University Press, 2007.

Glendinning, Nigel. *A Literary History of Spain. The Eighteenth Century*. Barnes & Noble, 1972.

Gómez Ortega, Casimiro and Antonio Palau y Verdera. *Curso elemental de botánica, teórico y práctico, dispuesto para la enseñanza del Real Jardín botánico de Madrid de Orden del Rey Nuestro Señor*. En la Imprenta Real, 1785. Digital Copy: http://bibdigital.rjb.csic.es/spa/Libro.php?Libro=1893&Hojas=

González Bueno, A. "Penetración y difusión de las teorías botánicas en la España Ilustrada." *Ciencia, técnica y estado en la España Ilustrada*, edited by Joaquín Fernández Pérez and Ignacio González Tascón, Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, 1988, pp. 381-395

Goring, Paul. "Introduction." *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia by Samuel Johnson*. Penguin Classics, 2007.

Gromort, Georges. *Jardins d'Espagne; 124 Planches En 2 Volumes Donnant plus De 160 Vues Des Jardins Anciens Et Modernes De l'Andalousie Et Des Deux Castilles, Accompagnées De 20 Plans, d'Une Préface Et d'Un Texte Explicatif*. A. Vincent & cie, 1926.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Time Travels: Feminism, Nature, Power*. Duke University Press, 2005.

Hadfield, Miles. *Pioneers in Gardening*. Great Britain: Bloomsbury, 1995.

Haraway, Donna. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*. Routledge, 1991.

Harding, Sandra. "Feminism, Science, and the Anti-Enlightenment Critiques." *Feminism/Postmodernism*, edited by Linda Nicholson, Methuen/Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1988, pp. 83-106.

---. "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: 'What Is Strong Objectivity?'" *Feminist Epistemologies*, edited by Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, Routledge, 1993.

Haidt, Rebecca. *Embodying Enlightenment: Knowing the Body in Eighteenth-Century Spanish Literature and Culture*. St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Harrison, Robert Pogue. *Gardens An Essay On the Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Heckes, Frank I. "Goya Y Sus Seis "asuntos De Brujas"." *Goya / Fundación Lázaro Galdiano*, 2003, pp. 197-214.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Clarendon Press, 1975.

Helman, Edith. *Jovellanos y Goya*. Taurus Ediciones, 1970.

"Hombre." Diccionario de la lengua castellana. 1791, Madrid: Real Academia Española. https://apps.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUILoginNtlle. Accessed 14 Sept. 2014.

Hobsbawn, Eric. *On History*. Abacus Books, 1998.

Hughes, Robert. *Goya*. Alfred A. Knopf, 2006.

Iglesias, María Carmen. "La nueva sociabilidad: mujeres nobles y salones literarios y políticos." *Nobleza y sociedad en la España moderna II*, edited by María Carmen Iglesias, Ediciones nobel, 1997, pp. 175-230.

Jagger, Susan. "What Does Your Garden Show? Explorations of the Semiotics of the Garden." *International handbook of semiotics*, 2015, pp. 629-45.

"jardín." *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, 1791. http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUILoginNtlle. Accessed 15 Sept. 2016.

Jay, Martin. "The Dialectic of EnLIGHTenment." *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought*, University of California Press, 1994, pp. 83-147.

Johnson, Rhi. "Birthing an Epistemological Shift: The Discursive Function of Eighteenth-Century Obstetrics Manuals." *Dieciocho,* vol. 39, no. 1, Spring 2016.

Johnson, Samuel. *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia,* edited by Paul Goring, Penguin Classics, 2007.

Jovellanos, Gaspar Melchor de. *Informe sobre la Ley Agraria*, 1795. http://www.espacioebook.com/ilustracion/jovellanos/Jovellanos_InformesobrelaLeyAgraria.pdf

---. *Memoria sobre educación pública: o sea, tratado teórico-práctico de enseñanza, con aplicación a las escuelas y colegios de niños*, edited by Antoni J Colom y Bernat Sureda,

Biblioteca Nueva: Madrid, 2012. Accessed through *Digitalia* http://www.digitaliapublishing.com.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/visor/14687

Joyes y Blake, Inés. *El Príncipe de Abisinia. Novela traducida del inglés por Doña Inés Joyes y Blake. Va inserta a continuación una Apología de las mujeres original de la traductora a sus hijas*. Imprenta de Sancha, 1798.

Kitts, Sally-Ann. *The Debate on the Nature, Role and Influence of Woman in Eighteenth-Century Spain*. The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.

Knott, Sarah and Barbara Taylor. "General Introduction." *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*. Edited by Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, pp. xv-xxi.

Keuthe, Allan J. and Kenneth J. Andrien. *The Spanish Atlantic World in the Eighteenth Century: War and the Bourbon Reforms, 1713-1796.* Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Labrador Herráiz, Carmen and Juan Carlos de Pablos Ramírez. *La educación en los papeles periódicos de la Ilustración española*. Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, 1989.

Landes, Joan B. *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*. Cornell University Press, 1996.

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

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Blackwell, 1991.

León, Luis de. *La Perfecta Casada*. Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2003. Digital edition based on the 11th edition, Espasa Calpe, 1980. http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra-visor-din/la-perfecta-casada--1/html/

Lewis, Elizabeth Franklin. *Women Writers in the Spanish Enlightenment: The Pursuit of Happiness.* Ashgate Pub Ltd, 2004.

Linné, Carl von and Antonio Paláu y Verdera. *Parte práctica de botánica del caballero Cárlos Linneo, que comprehende las clases, órdenes, géneros, especies y variedades de las plantas, con sus caracteres genéricos y especificos, sinónimos mas selectos, nombres triviales, lugares donde nacen, y propriedades*. Imprenta Real, 1784-1788. http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/31993#page/3/mode/1up

Linneo en España: Homenaje á Linneo en su Segundo centenario 1707-1907. Mariano Escar, Tipógrafo, 1907.

Llanos, Bernardita M. "Integración de la mujer al proyecto de la Ilustración en España." *Ideologies & Literature*, vol. 4, no. 1, University of Minnesota, 1989, pp. 199-223.

López-Cordón Cortezo, María Victoria. *Condición femenina y razón ilustrada: Josefa Amar y Borbón*. Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2005.

Lougee, Carolyn C. *Le Paradis des Femmes: Women, Salons, and Social Stratification in Seventeenth-Century France*. Princeton Press, 1977.

Luengo, Mónica. "El Capricho de la Alameda de Osuna." *Jardín y romanticismo*, 2004, pp. 71-89.

Määttänen, Pentti. "Semiotics of space: Peirce and Lefebvre." *Semiotica*, vol. 166, de Gruyter Mouton, 2007.

MacLeod, Dawn. *Down-to-Earth Women: Those who Care for the Soul*. William Blackwood, 1982.

Marañón, Gregorio. *Las ideas biológicas del P. Feijóo*. Espasa-Calpe, S.A., 1941.

Martín Gaite, Carmen. *Usos amorosos del dieciocho en España*. Siglo XXI de España Editores, S.A., 1972.

Martínez del Valle, Gonzalo. "Goya y los IX Duques de Osuna. Pinturas para el Palacio de La Alameda." *Cuadernos de los Amigos de los Museos de Osuna*, vol. 12, 2010, pp. 31-32.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas. "Ghostwriting: Working Out Visual Culture." *Journal of Visual Culture*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2002, pp. 239–54.

Mitchell, W. J. T. "Showing Seeing: A Critique of Visual Culture." *Journal of Visual Culture*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2002, pp. 165–81.

"Muger." Diccionario de la lengua castellana. 1791, Madrid: Real Academia Española. https://apps.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUILoginNtlle. Accessed 14 Sept. 2014.

Mukerji, Chandra. "Dominion, Demonstration, and Domination: Religious Doctrine, Territorial Politics, and French Plant Collection." *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World*, edited by Londa Schiebinger and Claudia Swan, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Müller-Wille, Staffan. "Walnuts at Hudson Bay, Coral Reefs in Gotland: The Colonialism of Linnaean Botany." *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World*, edited by Londa Schiebinger and Claudia Swan, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Mundialización de la ciencia y cultura nacional. Edited by A. Lafuente, A. Elena and M. L. Ortega, Doce Calles, 1993.

Navascués Palacio, Pedro. *Antecedentes De La Alameda De Osuna*. Artes Gráficas Danubio, 1977.

Nieto-Galán, Agustí. “The Images of Science in Modern Spain.” *The Sciences in the European Periphery During the Enlightenment*, edited by Kostas Gavroglu, University of Athens, 1999, pp. 73-94.

O’Brien, Karen. “Sexual Distinctions and Prescriptions: Introduction.” *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*, edited by Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, Palgrave and Macmillan, 2005.

Paas-Zeidler, Sigrun. *Goya: Caprichos, Desastres, Tauromaquia, Disparates. Reproducción completa de las cuatro series*. Verlag Gerd Hatje, 1978.

Pajares Infante, Eterio. “Inés Joyes y Blake, Feminista ilustrada del XVIII.” *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo*, vol. 76, 2000, pp. 181-92.

Palau y Vereda, Antonio. *Explicación de la filosofía, y fundamentos botánicos de Linneo, con la que se aclaran y entienden fácilmente las instituciones botánicas de Tournefort*. Don Antonio de Sancha, 1778. https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=wo1QAzpe5JoC&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP5

Pascual, Ricardo. *El Botánico José Quer (1695-1764), primer apologista de la ciencia española*. Catedra e Instituto de Historia de la Medicina, 1970.

Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford University Press, 1988.

Paun de García, Susan. “A Censor on Stage: Cañizares and Magic Plays.” *Dieciocho*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2006, pp. 55-68.

Pelayo, Francisco and Ricardo Garilleti. “Spanish Botany during the Age of Enlightenment: A. J. Cavanilles.” *Huntia: A Journal of Botanical History*, vol. 9, no. 1, Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation at Carnegie Mellon University, 1993.

Peñuelas, Marcelino C. "El siglo XVIII y la crisis de la conciencia española." *Cuadernos americanos*, vol. CIX, no. 2, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1960, pp. 149-179.

Peset, José Luis. "Cultura, saber y práctica en la ciencia ilustrada." *La luz de la razón: literatura y cultura del siglo XVIII : a la memoria de Ernest Lluch*, edited by Aurora Gloria Egido Martínez, José Enrique Laplana Gil, 2010, pp. 13-36.

Pierce, C.S. *The Essential Peirce*, vol. 2. Indiana University Press, 1998.

Porter, Roy. "Historiography and the Scientific Revolution." *Science in Europe, 1500-1800: A Secondary Sources Reader.* Edited by Malcolm Oster, Palgrave, 2002, pp. 281-286.

Project de bibliothéque dressé d'après les notes remises par S.E. Madame la Duchesse d'Osuna. 19th century: 1-50. Microform, MICRO 18896.

Puerto Sarmiento, Francisco Javier. *La ilusión quebrada: Botánica, sanidad y política científica en la España Ilustrada*. Serbal/CSIC, 1988.

Puig-Samper, Miguel Ángel. "Antonio Palau Verdera y la enseñanza en el Real Jardín Botánico." *El siglo que llaman ilustrado : Homenaje a Francisco Aguilar Piñal*. Coordinated by José Checa Beltrán and Joaquín Álvarez Barrientos, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1996, pp. 723-728.

---. "Difusión e institucionalización del sistema linneano en España y América." *Mundialización de la ciencia y cultura nacional,* edited by A. Lafuente, A. Elena and M. L. Ortega, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1993.

Quer y Martínez, José. *Flora española, ó Historia de las plantas, que se crian en España.* Edited by Joachin Ibarra, D. Ángel Corradi,1762. Digital copy. http://bibdigital.rjb.csic.es/spa/Libro.php?Libro=197

"quintas." *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, 23rd edition, 2014. http://dle.rae.es/?id=UvNPWWd. Accessed 27 December 2016.

Razón, tradición y modernidad: Re-visión de la Ilustración Hispánica. Directed by Francisco La Rubia Prado and Jesús Torrecilla, Tecnos, 1996.

Real Sociedad Económica Matritense de Amigos del País, Instrucción para las escuelas patrióticas. Edited by D. Antonio de Sancha, Impresor de la Real Sociedad, 1776.

Reed, Michael C. *The Landscape of Britain from the Beginnings to 1914*. Routledge, 1997.

Regueras Grande, Fernando. *Pimental: Fragmentos de una iconografía*. Centro de Estudios Benaventanos, 1998.

Remón Menéndez, Juan F. "The Alameda of the Duchess of Osuna: a garden of ideas." *Journal of garden history* vol. 13, 1993, pp. 224-240.

Ríos, Gregorio de los. *Agricultura De Jardines*. Sociedad de bibliófilos españoles, 1951.

Rodríguez Romero, Eva. "El jardín paisajista y la mujer en España: la Alameda de Osuna, el Casino de la Reina y Vista Alegre." *La mujer en el arte español: VIII Jornadas de Arte / Departamento de Historia del Arte Diego Velázquez, Centro de Estudios Históricos*., ACTAS, 1996, pp. 26-69.

Rose, Gillian. *Visual Methodologies: an Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials*. SAGE Publications, 2012.

Rousseau Jean-Jacques. *Emile: Or on Education*. Basic Books, 1979.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Letters on the Elements of Botany: Addressed to a Lady*. E-book edition, B. and J. White, 1794. https://www.google.com/books/edition/Letters_on_the_Elements_of_Botany/RPBcAAAAcAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1

Rowold, Katharina. *The Educated Woman: Minds, Bodies, and Women's Higher Education in Britain, Germany, and Spain, 1865-1914*. Routledge, 2009.

Sánchez, Alfonso E. Pérez and Eleanor A. Sayre. *Goya and the Spirit of Enlightenment*. Bulfinch Press, 1989.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course In General Linguistics*. Columbia University Press, 2011.

Sayer, Karen. "The labourer's welcome: Border crossings in the English country garden." *Gender and Landscape: Renegotiating morality and space*, edited by Lorraine Dowler, Josephine Carubia and Bonj Szczygiel, Routledge, 2005, pp. 34-54.

Schaffer, Simon. "Enlightened Automata." *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, edited by William Clark, Jan Golinski, and Simon Schaffer, The University of Chicago Press, 1999, pp. 126-165.

Schiebinger, Londa. *Has Feminism Changed Science?* Harvard University Press, 1999.

---. *Nature's Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science*. Beacon Press, 1993.

---. *The Mind Has No Sex? Women in the Origins of Modern Science*. Harvard University Press, 1989.

Schiebinger, Londa and Claudia Swan. "Introduction." *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World*, edited by Londa Schiebinger and Claudia Swan, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Schott, Robin May. "The Gender of Enlightenment." *Feminist Interpretations of Immanuel Kant*, edited by Robin May Schott, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997, pp. 319-337.

Schulz, Andrew. “Goya's portraits of the Duchess of Osuna: fashioning identity in enlightenment Spain”. *Women, Art and the Politics of Identity in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, edited by Melissa Hyde and Jennifer Milam, Ashgate, 2003.

Science in Europe, 1500-1800: A Secondary Sources Reader. Edited by Malcolm Oster, Palgrave, 2002.

Science in the Spanish and Portuguese Empires, 1500-1800. Edited by Daniela Bleichmar, Paula De Vos, Kristin Huffine, and Kevin Sheehan, Stanford University Press, 2009.

Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History*. Columbia University Press, 1999.

Serrano, Elena. *Ladies, Honor & Merit: Gender, Useful Knowledge, & Politics in Enlightened Spain.* University of Pittsburgh Press, 2022.

Smith, Theresa Ann. *The Emerging Female Citizen: Gender and Enlightenment in Spain*. University of California Press, 2006.

Smith Rousselle, Elizabeth. *Gender and modernity in Spanish literature: 1789-1920*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Soto Caba, Victoria. “El jardín romántico en la España ilustrada: Una visión en la literatura.” *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma. Serie VII, Historia del Arte*, vol. 6, 1993, pp. 407-432.

Stone, John. “Translated Sociabilities of Print in Eighteenth-Century Spain.” *Cultural transfer through translation: the circulation of Enlightened thought in Europe by means of translation*, edited by Stefanie Stockhorst, Rodopi, 2010, pp. 263-278.

---, “Translations.” *Samuel Johnson in Context*, edited by Jack Lynch, Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 38-44.

Sullivan, Constance A. “Constructing Her Own Tradition: Ideological Selectivity in Josefa Amar y Borbón’s Representation of Female Models.” *Recovering Spain’s Feminist Tradition*,

edited by Lisa Vollendorf, The Modern Language Association of America, 2001, pp. 142-159.

Sutton, Geoffrey V. *Science for a Polite Society: Gender, Culture and the Demonstration of Enlightenment*. Westview Press, 1995.

Terral, Mary. “Metaphysics, Mathematics, and the Gendering of Science in Eighteenth-Century France.” *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, edited by William Clark, Jan Golinski and Simon Schaffer, The University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Tomlinson, Janis. *Goya: Images of Women*. Yale University Press, 2002.

Trueba Mira, Virginia. *El claroscuro de las luces: Escritoras de la Ilustración española*. Montesinos, 2005.

*“*Una gira en la Alameda de Osuna.*” Relación histórica en once cuadros al pastel*, no. 29, Imprenta de T. Fortanet, 19 of May 1867.

Urzainqui, Inmaculada. “Hacia una tipología de la traducción en el siglo XVIII: los horizontes del traductor.” *Traducción y adaptación cultural. España-Francia,* edited by María Luisa Donaire and Francisco Lafarga, Universidad de Oviedo, 1991, pp. 623-638.

Valverde de Hamusco, Juan. *Historia de la composicion del cuerpo humano*. Antonio de Salamanca y Antonio Lafrerij, 1556. https://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/historia-de-la-composicion-del-cuerpo-humano-0/

Van den Broek, Gerard J. “I think I’ll be a plant myself: the semiotics of Rousseau’s botanical practice.” *Semiotica*, vol. 72, no. 1-2, De Gruyter Mouton, 1969.

Villiers-Stuart, Constance Mary. *Spanish Gardens: Their History, Types and Features*. B.T. Batsford, Ltd., 1929.

Vives, Juan Luis. *De institutione feminae christianae (Instrucción de la mujer cristiana)*. Juan Varela de Salamanca, 1535. https://bivaldi.gva.es/es/consulta/registro.do?id=12480

Vollendorf, Lisa. "Introduction." *Recovering Spain's Feminist Tradition*, edited by Lisa Vollendorf, The Modern Language Association of America, 2001, pp. 1-27.

Von Buttlar, Adrian. *Jardines Del Clascismo y el Romanticismo: El jardín paisajista*. Translated by José Luis Gil Aristu, Editorial Nerea, S.A., 1993.

Yebes, Condesa de. *La condesa-duquesa de Benavente: Una vida en unas cartas*. Espasa-Calpe, S.A., 1955.