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Are we excluded from this civility? Are we excluded because we are women?
Amalia Holst

The Enlightenment’s philosophical reconceptualization of what it means to be human separated women and men by the physical characteristics of sex and affirmed maleness as the universal standard, thus relegating women to a category of difference. The maturation of the market economy by the end of the early modern era diminished women’s productive economic role. Governmental reformers strove to create a civil society in which manhood was a prerequisite for citizenship. Pedagogical reformers built school and university systems designed to educate “productive citizens” and made the educational institutions the exclusive domain of men.

So universally accepted were the equation of maleness with humanity and the belief in female difference that to question these tenets would have required rebutting powerful normative values. Yet there was argument. The most well known writer in Germany who dared to challenge the gendered nature of the Enlightenment, Theodor Gottlieb von Hippel (1741–96), published his radical thought anonymously in On Improving the Civil Status of Women (1792). Hippel categorically included women in the classification of human and thus projected for them the benefits of the Enlightenment, including education, participation in the professions, political voice, and legal identity. After his death, Hippel’s friends were incredulous when they heard allegations that he had been the author of such ideas.1

In recognizing the concept of female as a social construct, not a law of Nature, Hippel was nearly—but not entirely—alone. Two women
who courageously protested the Enlightenment’s disempowerment of females were Amalia Holst (1758–1829), a Hamburg writer who passionately defended women’s right to education, and Christine Dorothea Gürnth (1749–1813) of Silesia, who campaigned tirelessly for a dignified role for women in the changing rural economy. Despite their fervent advocacy of women’s inclusion in the intellectual and economic innovations of their day, both in many ways ended up affirming rather than challenging the Enlightenment’s distinctions based on sex.

In searching for reasons why such was the case, I examine Holst’s and Gürnth’s writings as texts in the Enlightenment discourse about the redefinition of gender. When viewed in their historical context, they reveal much more than is contained in their literal meanings. The two women’s publications belong to a debate—although one in which the two sides were categorically unequal—about the worth and the place of women in the emerging civil society and the market economy. Their work belongs to a body of thought that has been overlooked or trivialized in favor of male arguments about gender and status. A purpose of this chapter is to uncover and analyze some of the neglected rhetoric of the Enlightenment debate on gender.

The dominant position was so successful in this unbalanced controversy that it established itself as the accepted wisdom for the following century and a half. Stressing gradual change as “progress,” it held that the *Sattelzeit* was an age of the extension of human and individual rights and that women benefited “too.” If they emerged from the era more restricted in their options than men did, it was because they started from behind and had farther to come than men did along the path of progress.

During the past thirty years, many historians of gender have refused to accept the Enlightenment’s definition of progress. They have analyzed Enlightenment ideas and practice to demonstrate that the era of great transition constructed new ways of excluding women from mainstream social, cultural, and political life. Scholars are engaged in the task of delineating ways in which the process happened and are examining social, political, and cultural effects on the gender system. An analysis of the texts of two contemporaries who understood at the time what scholars are now rediscovering will contribute to an understanding of the ways in which the arguments put forth by Holst and Gürnth had consequences that they did not foresee.

Why did Holst and Gürnth, both passionate advocates of female inclusion, affirm values that look much like those of nineteenth-cen-
tury bourgeois gender systems? This chapter will emphasize two possible explanations. First, both naturally sought to strengthen women’s place in the realms where, according to their society’s understanding, women had made their greatest contributions—maintaining the household economy and reproducing new generations of healthy, well-trained children. Second, both used the language of the Enlightenment, a paradigm that characterized people according to physical and even sexual characteristics. The vocabulary of both Holst and Gürnth represented reproduction as the defining attribute of women, in part because of the way in which Enlightenment thinkers posited Nature as the measure of all things and categorized maleness and femaleness as “natural” differences. Thus, paradoxically, their arguments for inclusion helped strengthen the foundations of the sexual differences they sought to eliminate.

Amalia Holst: The Body Is Not the Mind

Amalia Holst must have had a difficult childhood as the daughter of a well-known Cameralist, Johann Heinrich Gottlieb von Justi. She was thirteen years old when her father, then an official in the government of Frederick the Great, died in Küstrin Prison, pleading his innocence against charges of misappropriation of royal funds. She may have been largely self-educated. She lived part of her adult life in Hamburg and supported herself as an educator and school director. She and Ludolf Holst married when she was thirty-four years old, and she became the mother of one son and two daughters. Her husband, educated in theology and jurisprudence, was an educator and later a business leader active in civic affairs. During the French Revolution, when excitement arose about social and political changes in Germany, she anonymously published her first book, *Commentary on the Mistakes of Our Modern Education* (1791). Just over a decade later, when Napoleon was changing Germany’s political face, she published *On Woman’s Destiny for Higher Education* (1802), this time under her own name.

Amalia Holst warmly recommended Hippel to her readers. Like Hippel, she refused to accept the Enlightenment’s anthropological distinction between human and female. Because women were “thinking beings,” they were humans, she insisted. Because they were human, they were perfectible (17). Saying she did not want to be a “preacher of revolution,” she accepted as fact physical differences, including the idea that men were inherently stronger than women. This was her one
point of disagreement with Hippel, who “otherwise defends our rights with great acumen” (19). However, she retorted, “Is weakness of the mind a logical corollary to this? . . . Is our mind organized differently than that of men?” (19). Holst answered in the negative. She believed deeply in the Enlightenment notion of human cultural progress, and she based much of her thinking on the principle of the primacy of Nature.

When humanity lay in the cradle of childhood, the mind slumbered in the embryo, and in this state physical strength determined the worth of the human being. It required unending exertion, the experience of several centuries, before humans learned to know, to value, and to order the surrounding wonders and the operations of Nature. (20)

However, she was outraged about males’ misuse of the Enlightenment to exclude half of humankind. “J. J. Rousseau started it all off,” she charged. He was a “charlatan who always mixes up Nature [the body] and culture [intellect]” (22). He and other “egotistical male scholars” bore responsibility for turning a potentially profound movement into a mere “pseudo-Enlightenment” (19) by using the standard of masculinity rather than humanity.

Holst’s fundamental theme was the transformative power of learning. She was passionate about women’s right to become educated. If the women of ancient Greece had not been excluded from intellectual development, she argued, the classical culture would have wrought even more wonderful achievements than it did under male leadership (30). The paramount reason women should be educated was because they were the teachers of “future citizens of the world [Weltbürger].” Through women’s higher, nobler education, all of humanity would be elevated as these benefits were passed along: women’s “accomplishments in the earliest education of humans not only affect the flywheels of the machinery of state but also powerfully influence the tone of society” (39–40).

According to Holst, women must have the right as individuals to intellectual development and to study in their fields of choice.

The education of women must be completely free. Wherever our genius leads us, there we must be allowed to wander in the field of knowledge. The treasures of antiquity must stand open to us as well
as to men, so that we also can become enriched by them. Likewise, we must not be forbidden to study philosophy, this branch of knowledge that inspires men with intelligence and order when they wish to . . . benefit humanity. [Philosophy] teaches us about our true relationships to the highest being, to ourselves, and to the external world. [We must have knowledge of] everything that interests humans as humans—our place of abode, the earth with its multiple revolutions, and their great leaders. All of Nature must be our museum in which we study the omnipotent father and where we research the limits of all finite things. No less should we concern ourselves with the history of humanity. From [history] we learn what humanity has been, what it is, and what it can become. (43)

Locking the doors of education to women had produced some unfortunate traits popularly associated with femininity, such as vanity and obsession with physical beauty. If women sometimes engaged in pettiness and if boredom drove wives to seek superficial company outside their households, Holst asserted, they did so because men had withheld from them the right to develop their minds (81), not because of innate female qualities.

Women must gain their education, she demanded, from original sources rather than from “books written for ladies, which treat us like children.” Superficial knowledge imparts false pride, but fundamental knowledge makes one modest. “Our purpose is ennoblement of ourselves and participation in the great plan of the Creator of Nature” (43).

To refute any claim that women could not contribute to intellectual discourse, she offered pages of examples of accomplished female writers, ranging from Sappho of ancient Greece to Holst’s contemporary, Emilie Berlepsch. As “living proof” that women, “in spite of their neglected education,” could achieve distinction in all fields, she named female physicians, diplomats, painters, salonières, and musicians (45–52).

In response to philosophers such as Fichte and Humboldt who connected the alleged intellectual inferiority of women with a subordinate role in marriage, Holst held up an ideal of an equal and companionate marriage based on love, which was made possible by the fact that women were capable of education on an equal basis with men. Just as she refused to accept the axiom that Nature made women fundamentally different, she also rejected the notion of the sexes as polar opposites, instead envisioning females and males complementing one another through love. She lamented that she did not possess the lan-
guage to “accurately portray, with all the passion that I feel, how both sexes are so internally bound to one another, how powerfully they affect one another. They are destined to wander hand in hand harmoniously to perfection, [and] the ennoblement of the one is dependent on the ennoblement of the other.” If men understood this, she believed, they would “offer us a friendly hand” so that women could “climb the great ladder in unison with them; and we would not shy away from any challenge, and we would all despise flirtation, which until now has chained and oppressed us” (42). Education made love possible, and love raised men and women to even higher planes of being.

Moreover, if one were to bring the “ridiculous” belief that women were created to serve men before the “judicial bench of rationality,” the verdict would be “that each sex exists to promote the happiness of the other.” Holst vehemently repudiated the idea that the Genesis creation story established female subordination. She categorized the biblical account as a “childish oriental fable” and expressed doubt that Moses had written this legend, speculating that it had been authored by men of later generations who had a “crude understanding of humanity” (57–59).

Marriage, then, was the contract that led to the highest fulfillment and the greatest perfection rather than a union of unequals. Because it fulfilled its purpose only if women were educated, it was in society’s best interest to ensure them this right. Fulfillment of these conditions would transform woman into man’s “deepest and truest friend” (82). Education and love worked hand in hand to bring the world closer to perfection.

Christine Günnth: Economic Power for Women

Christine Dorothea Henschel Günnth claimed for herself the role of economist for women. Often writing under the pen name Amalie, she published between 1790 and 1811 more than twenty books that she characterized as economic manuals for women. For a short period she served as coeditor of Oekonomisches, moralisches, und gemeinnütziges Journal für Frauenzimmer (The Economic, Moral, and Communally Useful Journal for Women). The wife of a pastor, Georg Samuel Günnth, she felt called to help women find a respected place in the economy. Perhaps the economic hardships Günnth had experienced at an early age following the death of her father contributed to her sensitivity to women’s exclusion from economically valuable activities. She
explained to her readers that novelist Sophie von La Roche had inspired her to take up the pen. However, unlike La Roche, Gürnth did not write fiction. She saw herself as a successor to Christian Friedrich Germershausen, who a generation earlier had published popular manuals on the rural economy, including a widely reprinted multivolume guidebook for female managers of rural estates. Her conception of the economy was rooted in the agricultural household. She believed that women were losing touch with their unique economic heritage. Some, she said, had nothing more to instruct them than a few notes inherited from their grandmothers. They needed training and would benefit from having it from a woman’s perspective.

Like Holst, Gürnth decried the exclusion of women from education. Gürnth’s vision, however, was not a humanistic education for women, as Holst wanted, but rather professional training. Without access to knowledge and expertise, women would remain unequipped to function in the economy: “There are in our enlightened age movements to improve . . . the education and the schooling of the youth. However, these advancements are more concerned with boys than with girls,” she said in a vast understatement. Moreover, the few extant girls’ schools lacked appropriate curricula for women—that is, “economics, the most essential of all female knowledge.” Women had no opportunity to gain the scientific and technical knowledge equivalent to that which young men learned in the Cameralist lecture halls of universities and the agricultural and economic institutes that were gaining popularity.

Gürnth wanted to see the development of curricula that would prepare women to preside over agricultural households and estates.

Several prerequisite skills and auxiliary subjects are . . . useful for girls’ future careers. . . . I regard natural science, natural history, and chemistry as well as technology and merchandising as primary subjects for the female economy. Without these, it is not possible to become an enlightened household mistress. All of these are . . . tightly bound together with the household and the agricultural economy. . . . In addition, for the sake of her family’s welfare and for the benefit of the household, every household mistress should understand dietetics, nursing, and, yes, even veterinary medicine.

She insisted that mathematics and household bookkeeping become part of the female curriculum. Women should learn of the “the new discoveries, inventions, and improvements.” The female managers of estates should have instruction in moral philosophy.
Gürnth sought earnestly to respond to the structural economic changes that were undermining women’s central role in the agrarian economy. Men were becoming professionals, while women were relegated to subordinate economic roles. Through her publications, she campaigned for the inclusion of women in mainstream changes of her day.

She sought to create spheres for women in the new ideals of nation and state. In 1807, when Napoleon’s armies had overrun much of German territory, producing widespread economic crises, Gürnth published a book that instructed young “household mistresses of the middle class” on how to respond to the “austere times.” Men had been called to war, and the countryside was threatened by foreign troops. Women needed to keep things running on the home front. She developed an “economic emergency plan” for the patriotic women to follow. Their economic responsibilities consisted of two rubrics: earning (Erwerb) and wise consumption (gute Anwendung). Under the heading of earning she emphasized what she believed to be an innate female quality, industriousness, and exhorted women to apply their skills in the garden and in the house: “I urge the young household mistress to produce the fruits of her own labor by making products which she might otherwise order from milliners, tailors, seamstresses, and other professionals.” In the garden—the traditional female realm of agriculture—women must work with extra diligence and make informed choices about varieties of plants to cultivate. They must utilize home-grown products to the fullest extent. “Thus we will procure our household needs more cheaply and at the same time enhance the value of our harvested products and even earn more money.”11 Regarding consumption, the second rubric of the household emergency economic plan, Gürnth specified the guiding principle as “punctual orderliness [pünktliche Ordnung]”: “Love of order helps us fulfill an obligation to our domestic profession, the strict control over our householding.”12

Developing the realm of “female economics,” then, would enable women to participate in the transforming events of their day. Trained and educated women would gain dignity as professionals and patriots, joining civil society in their own way by preserving their threatened homes and feeding society while men were at war.

The Ideal of Inclusion and the Vocabularies of Difference

Holst and Gürnth passionately criticized the categorical exclusion of women from intellectual, economic, and civil society. Yet both also
shared the notion that women were destined for a single proper place, the home and hearth. Neither writer advocated that other women should follow their examples, earning through authorship or directing schools. The idea of women in the domestic realm was fundamental to their arguments for women’s education, training, and professionalization.

A major element in Holst’s plea for women’s intellectual development was the female role in the “sacred profession” of teaching. Women should be schooled in natural science, languages, and history. Knowledge of the laws of Nature would enable women to move toward perfection and to perform their professional duties with dignity. Educated women would raise their children in a healthy manner, would avoid quack remedies, and would distinguish between professional and fraudulent doctors. Elevation of the mind would make women immune to the temptations of luxury and would thus prevent children from inheriting such addictions. Yet this language of intellectual independence and ennoblement also imparted a message of duty—the obligation of motherhood (105). “It is indeed a sacred charge of parents to deliver intellectually and physically healthy members to the state, and even more to humanity” (106). Parents had no choice in the matter, and the responsibility fell more to mothers than to fathers.

One should look around in families and take notice: Are not knowledge, higher understanding, and morality imparted more by the mother than the father, and likewise, ignorance, base thinking, and immorality? This is very natural. The mother gives physically and morally more content to the education of the human being than the father does. (88)

The modernized conceptualization of women’s role that Holst envisioned made them participants in the Enlightenment and ennobled them through a named occupation, “the profession of mother, the first educator of youth.” Nevertheless, the reproductive role of women tied them to a single normative ideal against which men were not measured. Women were different because of their role in reproduction. Indeed, the body did determine who they were. Holst, herself a schoolmistress, identified women’s profession as that of teacher, but only of their own children.

For Gürnth, female difference rested primarily in the fact that
women were destined to be near hearth and garden, away from the market. In her 1807 tract written for “austere times,” she urged women to be good producers in their gardens, but she did not mention the field crops, the traditional male realm of agriculture, which in her day were increasingly harvested for market and for profit. She never proposed, even under the extraordinary circumstances of warfare, that women take charge of the production and sale of grain, the primary basis for the expanding rural market economy. Her main emphasis for women was consumption, not production. She presented wartime recipes and offered concrete suggestions about inexpensive cooking. She advocated the human consumption of products otherwise grown for animal feed and urged the gathering of wild fruits of forest and field. She suggested substituting maize for costly rye in the making of bread.14

Her *Economic Conversations for Ladies* (1810) suggests her vision of the female profession. In this instructional tract, Gürnth, writing in the first person under the pen name Amalie, introduced an upper-class lady, Auguste, to Sophie, “a wise and contemplative agriculturist and household mistress.” The tract unequivocally stated that Sophie’s success as an estate manager resulted from her membership in the industrious middle class. As a consequence of her social standing, Auguste had much to learn. Even though she had servants, she needed intimate knowledge of the rules of household economics so that she could supervise proficiently. Readers learned the principles of the female economy through the conversations among Amalie, Auguste, and Sophie on such topics as cooking; washing and bleaching; cultivation and spinning of flax; baking bread; churning butter and making cheese; harvesting and preparing wild greens, roots, and seeds; cultivating potatoes; fattening calves; managing the house apothecary; and raising turkeys, “the most noble fowl.” Readers learned of many ways to economize in the household, such as Sophie’s use of a mixture of peanuts and coffee beans to brew coffee. Erudite in her profession, Sophie explained that Native Americans used peanuts for multiple purposes and showed her guests how she cultivated the versatile legume in her garden. Her visitors were impressed with her knowledge of world agriculture systems, which could make households less dependent on costly imported goods. They praised her for patriotism and thrift, and she replied with appropriate modesty, “I do it because I like the taste.” This educated professional thus made her contribution to the economy through rational cultivation practices and participated in
broad social goals through saving while producing products that pro-
moted health. Yet female modesty would not allow her to take direct
credit for these virtues.15

Women had but one prescribed profession, and this caused a poten-
tial dilemma for Gürnth, who clearly earned income from her writing.
Was she violating gender norms by her authorship of books? She
addressed the problem straightforwardly in a book published in 1801.
Sophie had already challenged Amalie about the impropriety: “You
must at least admit that writing books does not belong to our female
profession.” “Of course you are right, dear friend!” rejoined Amalie.
“But if we . . . arrange our time so that our domestic responsibilities do
not suffer, I do not agree that [writing] conflicts with our profession.”
Gürnth explained that she arose earlier in the morning than all other
members of her household, thus extending her waking day. She com-
pleted her writing while others still slept. During the remainder of the
day, she could be a household mistress in good conscience. Author-
ship, moreover, was a relaxation that made her more efficient in exe-
cuting her household duties: “So if I write instead of idling my time
. . . or playing games, I am by no means culpable.” Writing, moreover,
was an act of friendship that created bonds between women. “As a
reward for this tiresome task, I often imagine myself at your side, or
with one of my other friends, and picture that we are discussing some
important matter.” Her final defense of her other career was that she
did not allow it to take her away from the womanly domain: in subject
matter, “I never dare to venture out of my sphere of . . . economics and
domestic ethics.”16

Holst and Gürnth depicted women empowered as mothers and
homemakers, yet the two authors’ words make it clear that their envi-
sioned professional women were economic subordinates to their hus-
bands. A woman’s role was largely that of consumer; her husband was
the earner or producer. Holst described the educated household mis-
tress as one who knew the prices of foodstuffs so that she could not be
cheated and would always recognize a bargain. “She knows that what
she saves is earning for her husband, for her children, and for the
poor.” Her virtues in the household are “orderliness, thrift, and pur-
poseful activity.” She must know enough about her husband’s eco-
nomic situation to adjust her side of things accordingly. She must be
extra thrifty when her husband is experiencing difficulties. In such
times, she “goes to work herself and does not fear dirtying her pretty
hands.”17
Gürnth was even clearer about the gendered roles of consumer and provider: “It is indisputable that the happiness of entire families often depends on the mistress. The husband, of course, must earn the living. But to enjoy the benefits of it, there must be good patterns of consumption.” She warned her readers not to equate the female profession solely with cooking, yet many of her economic manuals consisted largely of recipes. In their cooking, professional women should observe the domestic virtues of industriousness, thrift, and orderliness in the household. Gürnth defended her role as author by subordinating it to that of homemaker. She did not see herself as a model for other women.

**The Body as the Measure of All Things**

In their campaigns to establish women’s place in the Enlightenment, civil society, and the professions, both Holst and Gürnth ultimately confirmed the notion of women’s difference and female subordination to men. Why was this so, when both started from the premise that exclusion was fundamentally unacceptable?

First, they were emphasizing the twin honored historical roles of women—that is, reproduction and wise management of the household economy. In cultural perception, perhaps the most important of women’s labors was reproduction. As far back as memory reached, women had ensured the survival of families by bearing children, raising them to be healthy, and preparing them to take over the next generation. According to early modern norms, reproduction represented an economic duty. It was a part of women’s role in the economic institution of marriage, which began with a dowry-based contract that brought properties together to form the necessary capital to sustain a household. According to time-honored tradition, the woman’s dowry was essential and was only the beginning of her gender-specific contributions to the household economy. She helped sustain the family through dutiful performance of her ordained role in the procurement, preservation, and preparation of food and the provision of clothing. Indeed, women’s traditional economic role often involved consumption, just as Gürnth prescribed at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It is natural that Holst and Gürnth would highlight the activities that had brought honor and status to women, stressing the maternal values of nurturance and attention to education. Nevertheless, the emphasis on a maternal ideology and a mother-centered household led
to the paradox of separating women’s work from men’s in the changing context of the growing market economy. In the attempt to highlight and restore women’s contributive role, the two writers emphasized the unique, distinct, and respected role of women, thus stressing difference. Even though each in her own way argued for equality, it would never have occurred to either to argue for sameness of the sexes. The changing cultural context in which home, hearth, and nursery were declining in the value system of the male order, however, gave their emphasis on difference a meaning that Holst and Gürnth could hardly have understood.

Second, the rhetorical tools Holst and Gürnth possessed contributed to the notion of difference and exclusion. Believing in social progress, in the gradual ennoblement of humanity, and especially in education, Holst adopted the language of the Enlightenment. This vocabulary claimed universal applicability when its practitioners discussed human advancement, and Holst had merely to insist that the universality was indeed inherent: women were part of humanity. But this Enlightenment message always carried the counterbalancing notion, sometimes subliminal and sometimes explicit, that the measure of humanity was masculinity. Male philosophers justified this idea by referring to the human body and attributing female difference to Nature. When Holst tried to use the masculine language to argue women’s case, she stumbled over this problem: Nature determined that women were mothers; reproduction made them different. Even though women would, under Holst’s plan, master the world’s scientific, technical, and humanistic knowledge, they were mothers and wives, which placed them categorically lower than men in a gendered hierarchy. She corroborated this belief when she venerated the world’s great explorers and scientists for their enlightening discoveries and said women should learn of these breakthroughs to bequeath them to children.22 Men generated knowledge, while women received it and passed it on. The Enlightenment conceptualization allowed no equality or mutuality, in spite of Holst’s fervent optimism that marriages based on a love would ennable both partners and lead to egalitarian female-male partnerships.

While Holst looked to the future and positioned herself in the most contemporary discourse, Gürnth chose models from the past, emphasizing themes of the household economy. The vocabulary she used had in an earlier context represented ideals of female empowerment. Like her predecessor, Germershausen, she believed that the economy was
centered in the domestic sphere and stressed the essential role of the female partner, who could enhance her place through scientific, technical, and professional expertise. Employing this rhetoric, Gürnth could hope to restore honor to women’s economic activity. Yet her words had unintended meanings, because the household economy, whether or not it had ever existed in reality, was at best a disappearing feature of social reality in her day. She stressed the virtues of domesticity in an age in which men were devaluing the private realm precisely because it was a female sphere. Her intended message of female empowerment trivialized women’s role even in her own time.

Holst and Gürnth grasped that events of the Sattelzeit were excluding the female half of the population and denigrating their status by relegating them to the roles of wife and mother while establishing the realms of the professions and civil society for men. The authors courageously resisted these developments by attempting to elevate motherhood and wifehood to the status of a profession. On the basis of private motherhood and wifehood, Holst and Gürnth claimed a place for women in public life. Through wise and frugal consumption, women could contribute to the patriotic goal of sustaining state and society during times of warfare. As educators (in their homes), they contributed to the wider sphere by preparing their children for citizenship in the state and the world. But within the paradigm of thought that characterized people according to physical characteristics, Holst and Gürnth possessed no language with which to describe women except words that represented reproduction as woman’s defining attribute while holding up production as the key to humanity’s future. Holst explicitly rejected a connection between body and intellect when she argued that physical weakness did not mean intellectual inferiority. But reproduction ultimately became the determining factor, putting women in the home while men were moving increasingly into the public realm.
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