

---

# Forgetting the Past

*Judith M. Bennett*

---

When historians of women and gender gathered last summer at the 14th Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, we talked most often about contemporary history – that is, about matters so recent they are still part of living memory.<sup>1</sup> Nearly 700 papers were presented on a wide variety of topics and regions, but our chronological sweep was not quite so wide. At any time during the conference, roughly half the presentations focused exclusively on the twentieth and twenty-first centuries; when we took a longer view, we usually looked no farther back than 1800 (three of four papers fell into this ‘last two hundred years’ category); and we rarely cast our eyes far enough to consider peoples and cultures removed from us by 500 years or more.<sup>2</sup> A casual visitor to the conference could have reasonably concluded that, although the past is the special province of feminist history, we are at risk of forgetting most of it.

The chronological coverage of the 2008 Berkshire Conference was, in fact, relatively good, the result of concerted effort on the part of the programme committee. The effort paid off handsomely; in 2005, only 12 per cent of papers at the Berkshire Conference had treated the world before 1800, whereas 22 per cent did so in 2008. The triennial meetings of the International Federation for Research in Women’s History (IFRWH) have not been so inclusive. In 2003, 20 per cent of papers considered pre-1800 topics, but in 2007 this coverage had fallen to only 15 per cent.<sup>3</sup> As to our professional journals, we are approaching a situation in which almost nine out of ten articles address the last two hundred years. As Table 1 shows, the three main English-language journals devoted to women’s and gender history now publish little history before 1800 and even less history before 1500.

These stark figures demonstrate what many of us have observed more casually – that the field of women’s and gender history has developed a contemporary bias. Our field has tilted toward the modern, not because of a lack of research on women and gender before 1800, but instead because of our own lack of interest in that research. Feminist investigation of classical, medieval and early modern cultures has flourished for decades and continues to flourish today. But these pre-1800 studies are now largely pursued outside the mainstream of women’s and gender history. In that mainstream, as defined by our journals and conferences, ‘women’s and gender history’ has effectively become synonymous with ‘women’s and gender history since 1800’. Why do we, as feminist historians, attend so poorly to the full possibilities of the past? How might we develop better practices that take fuller account of women and gender in times before 1800?

**Table 1.4** Chronological Coverage in Journals of Women's and Gender History, 2001–07

Topics By Era	<i>Gender &amp; History</i>	<i>Journal of Women's History</i>	<i>Women's History Review</i>	Totals	Percentages
Modern (c.1800–present)	138	130	187	455	<b>86</b>
Early Modern (c.1500–1800)	23	16	16	55	<b>10</b>
Premodern (before 1500)	9	6	4	19	<b>4</b>
Total	170	152	207	529	<b>100</b>

NOTE: This count focused on research articles. Archive reports, forums, memorials and other such miscellanea were excluded, as were articles whose chronological sweep defied categorisation. If an article spanned two eras, I placed it in the earlier one.

In the hope that feminist historians will discuss these questions, debate possible answers, and reach some productive solutions, I offer here my necessarily brief thoughts.<sup>5</sup> I can speak, of course, only from my own experience and expertise. As a US citizen trained in Canada who has spent my professional career researching English medieval history while employed at US universities, my perspectives are profoundly Anglo, in American terms, or western, in world terms. I have striven to move across these boundaries as best I can but, for better or worse, these are the intellectual traditions within which I work and from which I draw most of my observations. I look forward to seeing how colleagues will complicate and enrich these observations with ideas and experiences different from my own.

## Causes

Women's history has not always focused so relentlessly on the contemporary and modern world. In the 1970s, Joan Kelly's work – and particularly her electrifying question 'Did women have a Renaissance?' – profoundly shaped the development of women's history, modern as well as premodern.<sup>6</sup> In the 1970s, the first journals devoted to feminist scholarship better balanced modern history with early modern, premodern and transhistorical perspectives; the first four years of *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, for example, offered its feminist readers fifteen articles that treated, in whole or part, topics before 1800 and twenty-three articles on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. (*Signs* also then included a now defunct 'Archives' section, a treasure trove of primary materials that stretched as far back, in those early years, as Hippocrates). And in the 1970s, chronological coverage was also better at the earliest Berkshire Conferences, where the medievalist Jo Ann McNamara ensured that every time slot had one session devoted to medieval topics and another to ancient ones. The women's history that was launched by the second wave of feminism was by no means perfect, but one of its strengths was far-sightedness. In the decades since, we have steadily foreshortened that vision.<sup>7</sup> Let me briefly raise six factors – three general and three specific to feminist scholarship – that might have encouraged our new myopia.

First, it is probably not accidental that the culture of the United States – where feminist scholarship has particularly flourished in the past thirty years – encourages a denigration of ‘Old Europe’ and an admiration of all that is ‘new’ and ‘modern’. The presentism of US culture stems partly from the self-evident fact that US history is mostly modern history, but partly also from a nationalistic sentiment that attention to the world before 1776 harkens back to a tradition-bound, elitist and un-American past. In such a view, any history before the revolutionary inception of US democracy can easily be dismissed as irrelevant. Henry Ford put it best, in his quintessentially US statement, ‘History is more or less bunk . . . the only history that is worth a tinker’s damn is the history we make today’.<sup>8</sup> Thus, one culprit in the present-ward tilt of women’s and gender history is the present-ward tilt of the specific national culture in which our field has most taken root in the last few decades.

Second, the historical profession itself, not just in the United States but also internationally, bears part of the blame for the shallow chronological depth of women’s and gender history. For members of a profession devoted to the study of the past, historians are now remarkably uninterested in most of it. As Lynn Hunt has noted, ‘history’ in the United States and Europe little more than a century ago was mainly *ancient* history. But in the last few decades, twentieth-century history, once ‘consigned to the province of journalism’, has entered the historical mainstream and taken it by storm.<sup>9</sup> As a result, when historians worldwide gathered in 2005 for the quinquennial meeting of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries dominated (75 per cent of papers), with some attention to early modern (11 per cent) and premodern (14 per cent) topics. US-based historians do much the same at the annual meetings of the American Historical Association: in 2005, for example, modern papers accounted for 75 per cent of the AHA agenda, early modern 18.5 per cent and premodern 6.5 per cent (just 38 of 592 presentations). The relentless modernity of women’s and gender history reflects, in part, the relentless modernity of practices among historians more generally.

Third, classicists, medievalists and early modernists are themselves partly to blame for history’s waning attention to distant pasts. Classicists long ago began to pursue their work within distinctive interdisciplinary homes; medievalists have built many similar programmes in the last half-century; and early modernists are beginning now to follow suit. These interdisciplinary programmes offer many intellectual and pedagogical benefits, but they can also become enclaves that encourage scholars of early eras to remain apart from colleagues working in more modern times. The isolating effect of these time-specific interdisciplinarity encampments goes a good way towards explaining how women’s and gender history in earlier eras can be flourishing but nevertheless eclipsed within the field generally: studies of ancient and medieval women are mostly shared in conferences, journals and books whose intended audiences are classicists or medievalists, not historians. Since classicists and medievalists have not been talking much to modernists, it is perhaps not surprising that modernists have lost sight of these past worlds.

Fourth (and I move here to factors specific to feminist scholarship), feminist interest in pre-1800 eras might have peaked when those eras seemed relatively golden for women and might have since waned in step with research that chipped away at this gilt veneer. When feminists began to advocate women’s history in the 1970s, a lost golden age provided both intellectual support for a new academic field (Jakob

Bachofen and Friedrich Engels were particularly credible authorities) and inspiration for feminist political work (if women were once equal, they could be equal again). It also gave ancient, medieval and early modern women integral roles in a feminist morality play that recounted how the primordial equality of the sexes was slowly undermined by private property, capitalism and modernity. Even today, feminists can read popular books, attend public lectures, go on package tours and buy statues that evoke a glorious matriarchal (or at least, sexually egalitarian) past. Yet academic women's history has abandoned this understanding of the past, and rightly so. In the 1990s, this golden age narrative crumbled under the weight of both empirical research and postmodernist critique. As a result, feminists now have a distant past that is more historically plausible but less positive and less self-referential: a distant past that is, simply, more distant and, therefore, more easily ignored.<sup>10</sup>

Fifth, we feminist historians probably cannot help but be influenced by the simple fact that history is now often demeaned in women's studies circles. Our feminist colleagues often see history as dull and plodding; as Jennifer Manion recently commented, 'It is no secret that cutting edge feminist scholarship is more likely found in literature and American studies than history'.<sup>11</sup> They can even see history as un-feminist; as Jane Newman has reported, any feminist research that reaches back before the 1960s now risks being characterised as 'antiquarian – and potentially politically incorrect – knowledge projects'.<sup>12</sup> And worst of all, our colleagues see history as a wretched abyss from which feminists should rightly and quickly walk away; Newman also reports that feminists in the academy – teachers as well as students – are replacing old dreams of past golden ages with its self-satisfying antithesis – a fantasy of an utterly and unremittingly horrible past from which today's feminists have luckily escaped.<sup>13</sup> Some feminist scholars outside history departments continue, of course, to draw on historical insights, and, of course, the turn away from history extends more broadly to general practices in cultural studies that value meaning over causation ('how' over 'why'). Nevertheless, my point here is fairly straightforward: with women's and gender history caricatured as dull, old-fashioned and possibly even politically suspicious, one good defence is to move towards the present ourselves – to render our history seemingly less dull and more relevant by focusing on more recent times.<sup>14</sup>

My final factor – and there could be still more that others will identify – raises the possibility that our expanding appreciation of non-western histories has encouraged a waning attention to the distant past, especially Europe's distant past. In the 1970s, 'sisterhood' tripped easily off our tongues, and virtually all women's history concerned Europe or North America. I think it is possible that the historical tunnel vision of that time made it easier for us to look farther down the tunnel – only European and North American history, to be sure, but more of it. Today, studies of women in Europe and the United States still dominate women's and gender history, but our field now extends to many more world regions than it once did. Might this expansion in spatial breadth be tied to a contraction in temporal reach? For example, *Signs* publishes today different sorts of history from what it featured in the 1970s: *less* pre-1800 western history, *less* history that crosses over several eras and *more* non-western and global history.<sup>15</sup> (Only the predominance of the modern west has stayed constant and, indeed, expanded a bit.) In raising this possibility of a symbiotic link between expanding geographical vision and contracting temporal depth, I do not wish to revive the 'class versus gender' debates of earlier decades in a new 'non-west versus early west' version.

This is not an *either/or* situation; we need *both* more non-western history *and* more early history (and sometimes, of course, we get both at once). But for now, the steadfast dominance in feminist history of modern Europe and the United States over both earlier histories and non-western ones may be forcing us to trade off the latter two. Our vision of women's and gender history, which has long been overly focused on the modern west, is thankfully now growing somewhat more panoptic, but we may be contracting myopia.

## Remedies

'Is it really the case that the recent past is more important and significant for scholarly inquiry than the more distant past?' Gerda Lerner asked us this question in 2003, when she observed that the colonial era accounts for only 6 per cent of scholarship on US women's history.<sup>16</sup> Kate Haulman has suggested that most feminist historians – always and already attentive to the hermeneutic powers of the past – would respond to this question with an energetic 'Of course not!' . . . and then return to studies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>17</sup> We can do better than this and, if we do, we will produce not only better women's and gender history but also better feminist theory.

One fix is very simple: without abandoning our own particular historical specialities and passions, we can start talking more often across historical eras. To get this conversation going, premodernists need to speak a bit more broadly and modernists need to listen a bit more carefully. For their part, feminist classicists, medievalists and early modernists can surely reach out more often beyond our interdisciplinary enclaves, both in terms of the places in which we disseminate our work and the ways in which we pitch our findings. This outreach can break the loop (little pre-1800 coverage → fewer pre-1800 submissions → even less pre-1800 coverage) that now limits the chronological reach of feminist journals and conferences. Editors and conference organisers can help by beating the bushes for pre-1800 submissions and defining special themes in time-inclusive ways, but we feminists who work on early eras must give them the material with which to work. In so doing, we cannot expect our modern colleagues to make leaps across the centuries on their own; we must show them the way. In 2001, E. Jane Burns, who has long delighted medievalists with her wonderfully complex analyses of courtly literature, reached out to a broader audience in a *Signs* essay on 'Courtly Love: Who Needs It?' She caught the attention of *Signs* readers by linking medieval courtly love to the 1995 bestseller *The Rules: Time-Tested Secrets for Capturing the Heart of Mr Right*; she introduced her readers to the latest trends in the study of medieval romance; and she showed how feminist readings of medieval romances can help us today break apart the 'modern cage of rule-bound femininity'.<sup>18</sup> More work of this sort – more pre-1800 historians speaking to the interests of modern historians and contemporary audiences – is just what women's and gender history needs.

Historians of recent centuries can help this conversation by attending more closely to what classicists, medievalists and early modernists are saying. Modern women's history is persistently marred by an extensive series of myths about women in the world before 1500. There was no childhood or adolescence in the European middle ages, right? Wrong.<sup>19</sup> Little affection between wives and husbands? Wrong.<sup>20</sup> No effective birth control before 1500? Wrong.<sup>21</sup> No sexual identities? Wrong.<sup>22</sup> No advocates for

women? Wrong again.<sup>23</sup> In all these cases (and there are many others), the distant past is mis-imagined by modern historians as the antithesis of whatever it means to be 'modern'. Silly stereotypes like these have no place in women's and gender history. The women and men who lived long before us were not profoundly 'other' in awful or admirable ways; they were like us in some ways and different from us in others. Women's and gender history is enriched when we attend to these past lives with the same attentiveness we bring to such pressing contemporary differences as class, race, religion, sexuality and world region. Yes, one of the great pleasures of the historian's craft is to see the era we study (whatever era it may be) as *ipso facto* a time of unique and earth-shattering change. Yet this is a dangerous pleasure, one that both reifies the distant past and limits our ability to understand the more recent histories on which we focus.

Most feminist historians can, in other words, reply 'Of course not!' to Lerner and return guilt-free to research on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But all of us need to reach out beyond the particular centuries we study to understand what was new, and not new, at that time. We will produce better, richer and wiser histories of women and gender if we attend (at least a bit) to the past histories of the past times we study. We will accomplish something else, too, for histories that take the deeper past into account will help us reinvigorate the now weakened place of history within feminist scholarship more generally. Young feminists today sometimes cavalierly reject the utility of the past, proclaiming proudly that 'we don't much remember'.<sup>24</sup> It is our privileged task, as feminist historians, to respond to such foolishness by working to deepen the remarkably shallow historical foundations on which feminist theory is now being built.

Feminist theory casts a wide net, from activists whose 'theory' is also 'strategy', to postcolonial and psychoanalytic theorists, to feminist theories that are so epistemologically based that they almost become, as Mary Maynard has put it, 'theory about theory'.<sup>25</sup> But whether strategic, middle-range, or highly intellectualised, good theory grows from temporal depth. The partnership of history and theory once relied on history-as-legacy, on history as a story that linked us with past peoples and societies from which we have supposedly descended. This assumption inspired both Bachofen in *Mother-Right* (1861) and Engels in *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1884) to view their respective subjects from the distance provided by several thousand years of human history. History-as-legacy has less purchase now than it did in the nineteenth century, and it is especially hard to sustain in feminist scholarship, where attention to difference has rendered absurd the notion that the situation of women today somehow descends from a unitary past.

For feminist theory in the twenty-first century, a different sort of history works best. Joan Scott has judged that 'simply comparing data about women did not get us very far'.<sup>26</sup> I disagree. It has taken us far, and it will take us farther still, especially if we seek to build feminist theory that, in the words of Charlotte Bunch, 'grows out of and guides activism in a continuous spiraling process'. Seeking to demystify theory and root it in feminist practice, Bunch has described theory as a four-stage process: first, description of what exists; second, analysis of why it exists; third, vision of what should exist; and fourth, strategy of how to achieve that vision.<sup>27</sup> Feminist historians, expert in archival recovery, description and analysis, have much to contribute to the development of such grounded and strategic feminist theory.

To put this another way, we feminist historians should more confidently expect that our research – especially, if it digs a bit more deeply into the past – will help to resolve some of the central questions of feminist theory: questions about the persistence of female inequality, about the varied meanings of gender, and about differences among women. In investigating such issues, it is, of course, important for feminist theorists to undertake cross-cultural comparisons as well as temporal ones; we need to look beyond privileged world regions and people, to see, for example, how women's work has been remunerated beyond the west or among the poor or among sexual minorities. But the creation of feminist theory best takes in *both* the contemporary world in all its variety and past worlds, too.

We historians know that the passage of time provides new perspectives, clearer understandings and more measured analyses – this is why we pride ourselves that history is more dispassionate than journalism. In a discipline as personally fraught and politically freighted as feminist studies, the distance of the distant past is especially useful. What we cannot yet see in the twentieth century, we can sometimes see more clearly in, say, the fifteenth century. In recent years, for example, each of the three major English-language journals in women's and gender history has devoted a special issue to women and the state, but each also confined consideration of this topic to the world since 1800.<sup>28</sup> The authors and editors in these special issues produced fine scholarship about modern women, suffrage, citizenship and state formation, but none reached quite as far as Martha Howell who, working on medieval cities, has posited that female access to citizenship might be linked to the extent to which citizenship was 'equivalent to access to rule'.<sup>29</sup> When citizenship in Howell's cities conferred little political access, women were citizens; when citizenship was equivalent to political power, women were excluded. This is a hugely important insight, one that is painful to acknowledge in our own time, but easier to see in past times. As a US citizen, I have had ample opportunity to ponder Howell's observation in the past few years: the shredding of the electoral process in Florida in December 2000; the inauguration in January 2001 of a president not elected by popular vote; and the commitment in 2003 of US soldiers to a war then opposed by the majority of US citizens. Perhaps, citizenship – such a prized achievement for US women less than ninety years ago – now has much less political meaning. This is a possibility that modern historians will have to answer, but it was raised by contemplating the distant past. For the insights that our own distance from a subject can bring, if for no other reason, the distant past has much to offer feminist theory.

\*\*\*

It takes my breath away to hear young feminists reject history and embrace the supposed value of *not* remembering. As feminist historians, we know the pleasures of remembering, and we know also the importance of such memories to the achievement of a more feminist future. Feminism needs history, deep history as well as recent history. It is our special brief, as feminist historians, to ensure that history is not only ever-present (even to those feminists who prefer to ignore it) but also rich, plausible and well-informed. In so doing, all of us can benefit from reading more deeply into the past. We should not abandon the twentieth century and embrace the Middle Ages, and indeed, if all of us did so, the historical vision of women's and gender history would be limited in newly worrisome ways. But all of us can think more wisely about women's and gender

history by reading across temporal divides. Let us search out the earlier histories of the specific subjects we study; let us also read eclectically, familiarising ourselves with the best, most illuminating, and even most provocative histories that each era has to offer. Feminist history requires more than the short view and so, too, does the achievement of a more feminist future.

## Notes

This brief commentary borrows freely from chapter three of my *History Matters: Patriarchy and the Challenge of Feminism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press and Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006). Readers will find more extended discussion there, but I have updated here my figures for journals and conferences in women's and gender history. I thank the Huntington Library in San Marino, California for a fellowship during which I wrote this essay.

1. I use 'we' advisedly, aware that it sails over two patches of rough water: first, that all readers of *Gender & History* are not self-identified as feminist historians and second, that many diverse circumstances separate me from other feminist historians. By eliding here differences among feminist historians, women's historians and gender historians, I hope to make common cause with all readers; by using the first-person plural, I mean to evoke our shared interest in the past, not to claim any shared subjectivity.
2. The figures for the 2008 Berkshire Conference on the History of Women are as follows: 78 per cent of papers dealt with post-1800 topics (535 of 689; of these, 338 dealt with topics since 1900, usually 'living memory' topics from the 1930s to the present); 17 per cent treated the early modern era from 1500 to 1800 (117 papers); and 5 per cent discussed premodern eras before 1500 (37 papers). I am grateful to Susan Amussen for providing me with an uncorrected proof of the programme; my numbers might differ slightly from the final version. I excluded from my calculations non-research papers, roundtables for which no paper titles were provided and papers whose chronological focus could not be determined from their titles. If a paper spanned two or more eras, I placed it in the earliest possible.
3. At the 2007 meeting of the IFRWH, 85 per cent of speakers addressed the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; 7 per cent treated the early modern era; and 8 per cent considered topics before 1500. These figures are drawn from the programme published in the *IFRWH Newsletter* 42 (2007), accessed online at <<http://www.ifrwh.com/>> on 6 December 2007. I excluded from my calculation papers whose chronological focus could not be determined; if a paper spanned two or more eras, I placed it in the earliest possible. At the 2004 conference of the IFRWH, chronological coverage was slightly better: 80 per cent modern; 11 per cent early modern; 9 per cent premodern.
4. I have here updated figures tabulated for 2001–04 in Bennett, *History Matters*, p. 32, but the update (adding data for 2005–07) scarcely changes the overall trend. For 2001–04, 87 per cent of articles were modern; 11 per cent early modern; and 2 per cent premodern.
5. Each of these matters is discussed more fully in chapter three of *History Matters*; in chapters four to six, I offer extended examples of how a consideration of the distant past can improve both the writing of modern history and the development of feminist theory.
6. Kelly's essay on the Renaissance is now most readily available in her posthumous *Women, History and Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 19–50.
7. For a brief summary of the deficiencies of women's history in the 1970s, see Bennett, *History Matters*, p. 65.
8. Interview in *Chicago Tribune*, 25 May 1916.
9. Lynn Hunt, 'Against Presentism', *Perspectives* (newsletter of the American Historical Association), May 2002. Accessed online on 12 December 2007 at: <<http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2002/0205/0205pre1.cfm>>.
10. For critiques of this golden age narrative, see especially: Cynthia Eller, *The Myth of Patriarchal Prehistory: Why an Invented Past Won't Give Women a Future* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000); Lauren E. Talalay, 'A Feminist Boomerang: The Great Goddess of Greek Prehistory', *Gender & History* 6 (1994), pp. 165–83; Judith M. Bennett, 'Medieval Women, Modern Women: Across the Great Divide', in David Aers (ed.), *Culture and History 1350–1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities, and Writing* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), pp. 147–75, and revised in Ann-Louise Shapiro (ed.), *Feminists Revision History* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1994), pp. 47–72.
11. Jennifer Manion, 'Calling all Liberals: Connecting Feminist Theory, Activism, and History', in Jim Downs and Jennifer Manion (eds), *Taking Back the Academy! History of Activism, History as Activism* (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 145–59, here p. 155.

12. Jane O. Newman, 'The Present and Our Past: Simone de Beauvoir, Descartes, and Presentism in the Historiography of Feminism', in Robyn Wiegman (ed.), *Women's Studies on Its Own* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), pp. 141–73, here p. 144. Newman's article focuses on the teaching of women's studies in the United States.
13. Newman, 'The Present and Our Past'.
14. Kate Haulman has commented on the seemingly greater political importance of more modern projects; see her 'Room in Back: Before and Beyond the Nation in Women's and Gender History', *Journal of Women's History* 15 (2003), pp. 167–71, here p. 168.
15. The comparative numbers for history articles, review essays and reports in *Signs* are as follows: (a) for 1975–78: modern west, 18; early modern west, 4; premodern west, 4; transhistorical west 5; non-western, 7 (two transhistorical, 5 modern); global, 0; (b) for 2001–04: modern west, 5; early modern west, 1; premodern west, 0; transhistorical west, 0; non-western, 2; global, 1.
16. Gerda Lerner in a forum on 'Considering the State of U.S. Women's History', *Journal of Women's History* 15 (2003), pp 145–63, here p. 147. See also her 'U.S. Women's History, Past, Present, and Future', *Journal of Women's History* 16 (2004), pp. 10–27.
17. Haulman, 'Room in Back', p. 168.
18. E. Jane Burns, 'Courtly Love: Who Needs It? Recent Feminist Work in the Medieval French Tradition', *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 27 (2001), pp. 23–57, here p. 50.
19. The major source for this myth is Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, tr. Robert Baldick (published in French in 1960 and New York: Vintage Books, 1962). Among the many rebuttals of this thesis, see Barbara A. Hanawalt, *Growing Up in Medieval London: The Experience of Childhood in History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); James A. Schultz, *The Knowledge of Childhood in the German Middle Ages, 1100–1350* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).
20. See Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500–1800* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977) for the myth; for a summary of its many rebuttals, see Peter Fleming, *Family and Household in Medieval England* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 53–9.
21. John M. Riddle, *Contraception and Abortion from the Ancient World to the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992); Peter Biller, 'Birth Control in the West in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries', *Past & Present* 94 (1982), pp. 3–26.
22. Ruth Mazo Karras, 'Prostitution and the Question of Sexual Identity in Medieval Europe', *Journal of Women's History* 11 (1999), pp. 159–77, and responses pp. 178–98. See also Ruth Mazo Karras on chastity as a sexual identity in her *Sexuality in Medieval Europe: Doing Unto Others* (New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 28–58.
23. Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness: From the Middle Ages to Eighteen-Seventy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Beatrice Gottlieb, 'The Problem of Feminism in the Fifteenth Century', in Julius Kirshner and Suzanne F. Wemple (eds), *Women of the Medieval World* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), pp. 337–64.
24. As cited in Anne Clark Bartlett, 'Defining the Terms: Postfeminism as an Ideology of Cool', *Medieval Feminist Forum* 34 (2002), pp. 25–9, here p. 28.
25. Mary Maynard, 'Beyond the "Big Three": The Development of Feminist Theory in the 1990s', *Women's History Review* 4 (1995), pp. 259–81, here p. 273.
26. Joan Scott, 'Feminism's History', *Journal of Women's History* 16 (2004), pp. 10–29, here p. 24.
27. Charlotte Bunch, 'Not By Degrees: Feminist Theory and Education', in Charlotte Bunch and Sandra Pollack (eds), *Learning Our Way: Essays in Feminist Education* (Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1983), pp. 248–60, esp. pp. 251–3.
28. *Gender & History* 13:3 (2001); *Journal of Women's History* 13:4 (2002); *Women's History Review* 11:4 (2002) and 12:1 (2003).
29. Martha C. Howell, 'Citizenship and Gender: Women's Political Status in Northern Medieval Cities', in Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (eds), *Women and Power in the Middle Ages* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988), pp. 37–60, here p. 47.