

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

The Enlightenment *in a Hurry*

When reason took on tradition

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 6

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 22

What People Get Wrong 33

Use It 38

Terms 43

Go Deeper 48

Notes and Sources 50

Bibliography 57

The Whole Thing in One Page

The Enlightenment is often staged as a duel. On one side stand priests, kings and inherited custom. On the other, a small company of philosophers carries a new weapon called Reason. The scene is memorable and wrong. Eighteenth-century Europe contained several enlightenments, many of them religious, and reason had histories far older than the century that claimed its light.

The change lay in who increasingly had to explain themselves. Revelation, rank, ancient authority and custom did not disappear, but more claims faced demands for evidence, comparison, public purpose and revision. Tradition lost some of its presumption. Reason became less a possession than a procedure through which one person could require another to answer.

The procedure depended on routes. Books, journals, letters, academies, coffeehouses, reading societies, lodges and salons made criticism travel. Printers, translators, artisans and postal workers did the material labour. Censors, patrons, wealth, literacy and social status decided which speakers reached a public. Knowledge also moved along imperial routes. In 1721, arguments in Britain and Boston over smallpox variolation drew on Ottoman practice carried by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and West African knowledge reported by Onesimus, a man enslaved in Boston. Evidence crossed boundaries that credit and freedom did not.

Natural philosophy supplied prestige. Newton joined terrestrial and celestial motion through mathematics and observation, although he remained immersed in theology and alchemy. Experiments, instruments, classification and historical criticism made claims more testable without eliminating trust or bias. The *Encyclopédie* placed crafts beside learned disciplines across seventeen text volumes and eleven volumes of plates, while depending on artisans whose knowledge editors could display without granting them equal authority.

Religion remained central. Locke, Bayle, Mendelssohn and many clerical scholars argued over conscience, toleration, scripture and civic

membership. Deists sought rational faith; materialists pushed beyond it. The result was not faith replaced by reason, but revelation, church jurisdiction, moral conduct and civil equality pulled apart and disputed.

Politics and society became more available for redesign. Montesquieu compared constitutions. Beccaria made punishment answer to public necessity. Hume and Smith examined sentiment, convention, commerce and unintended order. Rulers adopted the language of utility while keeping dynastic power. Better government and self-government proved to be different achievements.

The century's most reusable claims concerned humanity, liberty and rights, and its deepest failures concerned who counted. Women, religious minorities, colonised people and enslaved people were often excluded from the public said to be guided by reason. Wollstonecraft challenged an education built to produce female dependence. Equiano made an enslaved man's experience judge Atlantic commerce. Revolutionaries in Saint-Domingue forced universal language through a struggle its European authors neither designed nor controlled.

Revolution then made Enlightenment confidence answerable. Burke argued that abstract reconstruction could destroy knowledge stored in institutions. Herder showed that languages and cultures could not be ranked by one universal scale. They did not end reason. They enlarged the dispute over what reason must understand before it acts.

The Enlightenment took on tradition by moving the burden of proof. Its own traditions of exclusion were then exposed to the same demand.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

In 1721, smallpox made two kinds of testimony collide with established medical authority. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu promoted variolation after observing the practice in the Ottoman Empire. In Boston, the minister Cotton Mather argued for a related method after Onesimus, an enslaved West African man, had explained it to him. Variolation deliberately exposed a healthy person to smallpox material. It was dangerous, but less deadly than ordinary infection. The controversy forced physicians, clergy and officials to ask whose experience counted, how risk should be compared and what evidence could justify changing inherited practice.

The episode is a better doorway into the Enlightenment than a row of marble busts. Knowledge did not move from an enlightened centre to a passive world. It travelled through women, enslaved people, merchants, diplomats, practitioners and communities whose authority European institutions often denied. A claim became usable only when witnesses, records, tests and institutions made it credible. Reason was never detached from the social question of who could be believed.

That question still governs public life. Governments publish evidence for policy. Courts require punishment to have a lawful purpose. Scientists expose findings to criticism. Religious communities defend interpretation through scholarship. Companies commission reviews. Campaigners compare a stated principle with the people excluded by its application. None of these practices began cleanly in the eighteenth century, and none guarantees justice. The Enlightenment matters because it widened a shared demand: authority should be able to answer an objection in terms extending beyond its own status.

This inheritance is easy to romanticise. Statistics may hide the category chosen before counting began. Expertise may close a debate that also requires moral judgement. A ruler may improve administration while preserving the right to rule without consent. A public may praise universal humanity while financing plantation slavery. The Enlightenment is useful as

neither sacred origin nor charge sheet. It is a history of attempts to make inherited worlds intelligible and alterable, together with evidence of how institutions and interests narrowed those attempts.

It also changes how ideas should be understood. A famous book rarely walks straight into law. It travels through reviews, extracts, translations, teachers, officials, preachers, clubs and conflicts already under way. Its language is selected for new purposes. Its enemies may spread it while trying to suppress it. Its readers may draw consequences the author rejected. This protects against two lazy stories: that ideas cause events by intellectual magic, and that material interests make ideas irrelevant. People act within conditions they did not choose, but they still need words that name an injustice, gather allies and describe another arrangement.

Paris supplied many famous names, not the whole subject. Dutch printers, British political conflict, Scottish universities, German debates, Italian legal reform, Jewish intellectual life, Atlantic commerce and colonial resistance changed the field. So did religious thinkers who revised faith without abandoning it. The result was not a European gift passed intact to everyone else. Knowledge and wealth crossed imperial routes; classifications of peoples could support domination; colonised and enslaved writers also entered, altered and judged the language of enlightenment.

This book follows the connected arguments from the late seventeenth century to the revolutionary 1790s. It explains why criticism needs infrastructure, how natural philosophy changed standards of explanation, why religion remained productive and contested, how institutions became objects of design, how sentiment and commerce entered social analysis, and why universal principles are tested by those refused their benefits.

The reward is a demanding inheritance. You will see why evidence needs credible channels, why reform and freedom differ, why dissent can belong inside a movement, and why a principle proves its reach only when people denied standing can use it. The century will look less like reason defeating tradition and more like a struggle over who must give reasons, before which audience and with what consequences.

The Core Ideas

Reason Became a Procedure, Not a Verdict

The Enlightenment did not discover reason. Greek philosophy, Roman law, Islamic scholarship, Jewish commentary, Christian theology and medieval universities had developed demanding traditions of argument.

Seventeenth-century Europe also inherited Renaissance philology, Reformation controversy, natural law and practical knowledge accumulated in courts, farms, workshops and households. What became unusually forceful was a demand that more kinds of authority submit to procedures other people could inspect: evidence, consistency, comparison, public argument and revision.

This did not produce one political or religious answer. Locke used natural rights and consent while defending property, colonial projects and limits on toleration. Bayle made certainty a poor warrant for persecution, yet scepticism could not design a constitution. Newton connected motion on Earth and in the heavens, but no political order followed from the equations. Kant later urged people to use their own understanding while allowing that officials might still have to obey within their civil roles. Shared tests opened disputes whose participants settled little in common.

A claim became less secure merely because an ancient author, church, ruler or custom stood behind it. That did not mean ancestry ceased to matter. It meant defenders increasingly had to say why inherited authority should govern the present case. Comparison made familiar arrangements look contingent. Publicity allowed an argument to travel beyond a private command. The possibility of correction separated confidence from immunity. These practices reinforced one another without forming a fixed method or a neutral court above society.

Probability became central because most public questions offered neither proof nor ignorance. Historical testimony, reports of miracles, commercial intelligence, medical cases and travellers' accounts required judgements about witnesses, interests, consistency and independent confirmation. This

was a gain in discipline and a fresh site of prejudice. The same reader who demanded corroboration from a rival confession might accept a European traveller's description of an entire people after one encounter. Standards of credibility could expose a weak claim or encode the social rank of the witness.

The shift also remained institutional. Courts censored. Universities guarded confessions. Household authority stayed hierarchical. Most people lacked the education, money, leisure and protection needed to enter print. An argument could circulate among officials without changing what a tenant could demand from a landlord or a wife from a husband. Yet the language of justification widened. A ruler presented reform through utility and public happiness. A theologian answered historical criticism. A punishment required a civic purpose. A monopoly defended its benefit rather than its age alone.

Reason in this sense was not a substance held by one party. It was a relationship of answerability. Who may question? What counts as a reply? Can contrary evidence alter the decision? Does the rule bind the people who made it? Those questions explain the period's achievements and its evasions. Philosophers could demand proof from priests while repeating claims about women or colonised peoples they had never tested. They could attack hereditary office while treating property qualifications as natural. The procedure mattered because it later supplied grounds on which those exemptions could be challenged.

A verdict can be memorised and guarded. A procedure can be taken up by an opponent. The burden of proof therefore moved before political power did, and that made enlightenment difficult to contain.

Criticism Needed Places to Travel

An idea becomes public through material work. Paper must be bought, type set, permission obtained or evaded, copies transported, reviews written and readers gathered. The Enlightenment's intellectual mobility depended on printers, booksellers, translators, postal routes, journals, libraries, academies and rooms in which strangers could meet. The Republic of Letters was an aspiration to learned exchange across borders and confessions, but it also involved postage bills, patronage, reputation and gatekeepers.

Print enlarged the number of available arguments without creating unrestricted speech. In France, legal publication depended on privilege and censorship. Authors used foreign presses, false imprints, manuscript circulation, coded language and anonymous publication. Dutch and Swiss centres supplied books to markets that prohibited them. Officials could confiscate a work yet permit another edition through tacit tolerance. Censorship raised costs and risks, but it also made prohibited titles desirable. The public that emerged was therefore shaped by negotiation between state control and commercial demand, not by a clean passage from silence to freedom.

Different settings produced different kinds of exchange. A learned academy rewarded specialised papers and official recognition. A coffeehouse sold access with a drink and encouraged news, trade and dispute, though its clientele varied by city and class. A salon brought writers, nobles, officials and visitors into a host's home, where conversation depended on manners and invitation. Masonic lodges offered ritualised sociability and networks across status lines, while remaining selective associations. Reading societies and lending libraries expanded access later in the century. None was a miniature democracy. Each organised attention, trust and exclusion in its own way.

Women were central to parts of this infrastructure and still faced structural limits. Parisian salonnières could choose guests, connect patrons and writers, guide conversation and sustain reputations. Women wrote novels,

letters, translations, histories and philosophical works. Yet universities, academies and public offices mostly excluded them, and polite sociability could turn intellectual authority into an extension of hosting. The salon should neither be dismissed as decoration nor romanticised as equality. It shows how agency can operate inside a rule system that it does not control.

The network changed arguments themselves. A private observation had to be made legible to distant readers. A book written for one controversy acquired a new meaning in translation. Reviews compressed complex works into portable claims. Encyclopaedic articles linked subjects that universities kept separate. Correspondents corrected facts, supplied specimens and spread news of experiments. Reputation travelled ahead of full understanding. Voltaire's account of England, for example, offered French readers a sharpened comparison rather than a neutral photograph of British life.

Translation was interpretation, not transport. Terms for liberty, constitution, nature and citizenship carried different legal and religious histories. An editor could omit danger, add a preface or recast a foreign example for local conflict. The Enlightenment spread by being changed, which is why resemblance across countries should not be mistaken for one programme copied from a centre.

This infrastructure created a new pressure on authority because criticism could accumulate. One pamphlet might be suppressed. A pattern repeated across journals, letters and foreign editions was harder to treat as a local quarrel. Still, visibility did not equal representation. Literate urban elites appear heavily in the surviving record because they produced and preserved it. Artisans, servants, rural readers and colonial intermediaries often enter indirectly. The public sphere was an achievement built from unequal admission.

The lesson is mechanical. Criticism requires channels, protection and memory. Without them, courage remains private and objections disappear with the person who raised them.

Nature Became a Model of Intelligibility

Newton's *Principia* of 1687 gave the age its most commanding example of explanation. The same mathematical relations could connect falling bodies, tides and planetary motion. Newton was no secular mascot: he wrote extensively on theology and alchemy and understood natural order within a providential universe. His achievement showed something narrower and more disruptive. Phenomena separated by scale and place could be related through principles exposed to calculation and observation rather than assigned to unrelated hidden qualities.

Natural philosophy changed expectations through a family of practices rather than one scientific method. Instruments extended the senses. Experiments isolated effects. Classification made specimens comparable. Mathematical models disclosed relations that ordinary description missed. Historical and philological enquiry tested texts by transmission and context. Ancient authority remained useful, but it could no longer end an enquiry when a repeatable observation or a better-supported reading contradicted it.

No instrument removed the need for trust. A telescope, air pump or thermometer had to be made, calibrated and described. Someone had to report conditions, preserve specimens and persuade distant readers that an awkward result was not fraud or error. Knowledge therefore depended on skilled labour and credible witnesses. Academies, correspondence and print stabilised procedures through which private experience could become a public claim. They also decided whose testimony counted.

The smallpox controversy made that social machinery visible. Variolation, deliberate exposure to smallpox material, had long been practised in parts of Asia and Africa. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu promoted it in Britain after observing Ottoman practice. In Boston, Cotton Mather argued for it after learning of the technique from Onesimus, a West African man he enslaved. The method carried serious danger, but it could be compared with the still greater risk of natural infection. The argument involved observation, records, testimony, religious judgement and unequal credibility. European institutions did not invent the knowledge. They subjected imported practice

to their own forms of proof and often reassigned authority in the process.

Enlightenment writers borrowed the prestige of successful natural enquiry. Montesquieu compared laws across climates, economies and political forms. Hume examined regularities in understanding and convention. Smith analysed sympathy, exchange and divided labour. Administrators counted populations, production and trade. Diderot's *Encyclopédie* joined abstract learning to plates of tools and manufacture. Nature's intelligibility encouraged the hope that institutions could also be investigated and improved.

The borrowing was productive and dangerous. Human beings interpret rules, remember injuries and react to descriptions of themselves. A political institution cannot be tested under controlled conditions like a pendulum. A pattern observed in commercial Britain need not describe a Polish village or a plantation in Saint-Domingue. Eighteenth-century writers often converted local cases into universal stages of development. Classification could disclose difference, then turn unequal encounters into ranked human types.

The familiar opposition between empiricism and rationalism also hides working practice. Locke and Hume stressed experience; Descartes and Leibniz are associated with reason's internal resources; Newton combined mathematics, observation and bounded inference. Thinkers read across those later labels. The live problem was how sensation, calculation, testimony, comparison and probability should support a claim.

Nature supplied an image of intelligibility, not a political instruction manual. Its successes made ignorance appear reducible and institutions alterable. They also tempted reformers to confuse explanation with a licence to control. A state that counts subjects may prevent disease or organise relief. It may also see people only through categories built for taxation, conscription or hierarchy.

The strongest habit was to ask how a claim could be known. The recurrent error was to assume that successful knowledge carried its own moral warrant.

Faith Faced Rival Tests

Religion was not a wall that reason knocked down. It was one of the main places where Enlightenment methods were developed, resisted and absorbed. Europe entered the period after generations of confessional conflict, state churches and arguments over scripture, conscience and authority. The problem was practical as well as philosophical: how could people who believed salvation depended on religious truth live under one government without recurrent coercion?

Toleration offered several answers. Some defended it because forced belief was impossible. Others argued that civil peace required separating the magistrate's task from the care of souls. Locke's famous defence remained bounded. His exclusions reflected fears about political allegiance and the reliability of oaths, not a modern rule of equal religious liberty. Bayle pressed further by showing how easily persecutors mistake confidence for knowledge and by defending the possibility of a morally ordered society without shared orthodoxy. Neither argument removed the need to decide where religious practice met civil law.

Scholarship altered the ground of debate. Philologists compared manuscripts, languages and historical settings. Biblical critics treated sacred texts as documents with transmission histories. Accounts of distant religions weakened the assumption that one European confession represented the natural starting point of humanity. Disputes over miracles brought testimony and probability into theology. Natural religion and deism sought truths about God available through reason rather than a single revelation. Materialists and atheists went further, but open unbelief remained risky and less typical than later secular origin stories imply.

Much enlightenment took religious form. Protestant theologians revised doctrine through historical study and moral philosophy. Catholic reformers criticised superstition, clerical privilege or poor education while remaining within the Church. Jewish thinkers such as Moses Mendelssohn argued for intellectual openness and civil toleration without treating emancipation as the abandonment of Judaism. Clergy participated in academies, natural

philosophy, educational reform and print culture. The conflict was often between rival accounts of true religion, institutional power and the limits of interpretation, not between faith and thought.

Even the language of conscience contained a political choice. A state might permit private worship yet bar a minority from office, guilds, landholding or public ceremony. Such a settlement reduced violence while preserving civic inequality. The distinction between inward belief, communal practice and equal membership became one of the sharpest tests of whether toleration was a right or an administrative concession.

Tradition itself was not inert. A practice could contain accumulated judgement that no theorist had reconstructed. Religious institutions supplied schools, charity, community and languages of moral obligation. Rousseau attacked materialist self-confidence and made conscience central to his account of moral life. Religious opponents of slavery drew on scriptural equality, while defenders of slavery did the same with other passages. The question was which authority interpreted tradition and whether its reasons could answer experience and criticism.

The political setting changed every argument. A tolerant established church was different from legal equality among confessions. A ruler could reduce persecution while keeping the power to define approved religion. Jewish admission to civic life raised questions about corporate privilege, individual rights and the state's demand for uniformity. Anti-clerical attacks on wealth and jurisdiction could advance liberty, or allow a state to bring religious life under tighter administrative control.

Faith faced new tests from history, comparison, conscience and public utility. It also helped form those tests. The Enlightenment's religious history is therefore one of differentiation. Revelation, church authority, personal belief, moral conduct and civil membership were pulled apart and recombined. That made more forms of coexistence thinkable, while leaving the boundary between toleration and equality unsettled.

Power Became Available for Redesign

Political authority had long been argued over, but Enlightenment writers treated a widening range of institutions as arrangements whose purposes and mechanisms could be reconstructed. Government was no longer explained only through dynasty, providence or inherited law. It could be analysed through consent, natural rights, security, commerce, climate, institutional balance and public happiness. Once power was described as a human design, it became possible to ask which design worked, for whom and under what conditions.

Natural law supplied a language above local command. Locke's political writings grounded legitimate government in the protection of life, liberty and property and allowed resistance when rulers broke their trust. The argument was radical in its challenge to unlimited rule and limited in its historical applications. Consent often became tacit; property structured political standing; colonial dispossession sat uneasily beside natural rights. The importance lies less in a finished democratic programme than in the claim that rulers were agents for purposes that could be judged.

Montesquieu changed the method through comparison. In *The Spirit of the Laws*, political forms were connected to laws, customs, commerce, geography and social orders. His account of England helped popularise the division and balancing of powers, although later constitutional designers made the doctrine more rigid than his own analysis. The mechanism mattered: liberty depended on institutions checking institutions, not on the private virtue of a ruler. A well-intentioned person with unchecked power remained a structural risk.

This was not politics by blueprint alone. Montesquieu's attention to history and manners warned that an institution moved from one country might perform differently in another. The caution competed with the century's appetite for general reform. Together they produced a lasting tension: government could be redesigned through principles, yet every design entered inherited habits, offices and conflicts that altered its operation.

Beccaria applied the same pressure to criminal justice. Punishment should answer a public purpose, use clear law and avoid needless cruelty. Torture was both inhumane and unreliable because pain measured endurance rather than truth. Secret accusation and arbitrary discretion corrupted legal security. His arguments spread because they joined moral revulsion to administrative reasoning. A punishment that failed to deter or protect could no longer defend itself as vengeance sanctified by age.

Reform entered courts. Frederick II of Prussia, Catherine II of Russia, Joseph II in the Habsburg lands and other rulers borrowed languages of reason, utility, toleration, codification and education. The category later called enlightened absolutism remains disputed because it can flatter sovereigns with the intentions of their advisers and exaggerate coherence across different states. Some reforms reduced suffering or widened opportunity. They also improved taxation, conscription, surveillance and central control. The same administrative knowledge could make rule more humane and more penetrating.

This creates a distinction that the century never resolved. Better government is not the same as self-government. A sovereign may abolish torture without accepting that subjects can remove him. A bureaucracy may standardise law while silencing local institutions. A decree of toleration may remain a revocable favour rather than a right. Enlightenment political thought supplied arguments for constitutional restraint, republican citizenship and popular sovereignty, but it also supplied rulers with a programme of expert improvement from above.

Power became redesignable before it became broadly shareable. That sequence explains why reform and revolution could grow from related vocabularies while producing different settlements. It also explains why modernisation should never be mistaken for emancipation.

Society Acquired Its Own Mechanisms

A government can issue an order, but much social order is not issued. Languages develop without a ministry. Prices coordinate distant choices without one person knowing the whole chain. Customs persist because expectations reinforce one another. Eighteenth-century thinkers became increasingly interested in such patterns, and Scotland supplied a concentrated body of work on how human institutions emerge from action, habit, conflict and exchange.

Hume treated many rules of justice as conventions that become stable because people recognise a common interest in following them. This did not mean a formal contract had once been signed. It meant that repeated interaction could produce an institution no single mind designed. His scepticism also turned attention from abstract rational command towards passions, habits and probability. People are moved through sentiment as well as calculation, and political order must work with the beings who exist rather than the perfectly rational agents a scheme imagines.

Adam Smith joined moral psychology to political economy. In *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, people judge conduct by imagining how it appears from another standpoint, though sympathy is partial and social approval can be corrupted. In *The Wealth of Nations*, the division of labour raises productivity, exchange links strangers and competitive pressures can coordinate activity. Yet Smith also described monopoly, employer power, colonial privilege, the mental costs of repetitive labour and the need for public institutions. The market was a mechanism with conditions and failures, not a moral personality that guaranteed good outcomes.

Commerce provoked a larger argument about civilisation. Some writers believed exchange softened manners by making people depend on peaceful cooperation. Others feared luxury, inequality, debt and military weakness. Ferguson described civil society as the product of human action without being the execution of a single plan, while warning that commercial specialisation could narrow citizenship. Rousseau made the sharpest internal objection: refinement might polish conduct while deepening

dependence and comparison. Progress in arts and sciences did not prove moral improvement.

Historical schemes tried to explain movement from hunting through pastoral and agricultural life to commerce. These stadial accounts made social difference intelligible through material conditions rather than biblical chronology alone. They also ranked peoples against a European commercial endpoint and often converted conquest into evidence of advancement. Natural histories of humanity, travel accounts and colonial administration contributed to increasingly rigid classifications of race. The effort to explain society could expose prejudice, or organise it more efficiently.

The household exposed another blind spot. Accounts of civil society often treated the independent property-owning man as their ordinary actor while placing women's labour and dependence outside political economy. Domestic service, reproduction and care sustained commercial life without receiving equal conceptual weight. A theory can discover unintended social mechanisms and still mistake the legal privileges of its representative observer for human nature.

Political economy also enlarged the state's field of vision. Population, grain, trade, labour and revenue became linked objects of policy. Such knowledge could reveal that famine, poverty or unemployment had institutional causes. It could also reduce lives to aggregates and treat imperial extraction as national prosperity. Britain and France debated commerce while Atlantic slavery generated wealth, commodities and coercive markets that polite theories could ignore or compartmentalise.

The key insight is that society has mechanisms distinct from both individual intention and sovereign command. That insight restrains utopian design because reforms meet habits, incentives and unintended effects. It can also excuse injustice by calling an institution spontaneous or natural. The Enlightenment made social order explainable. The moral question of which orders deserved preservation remained open.

Universal Claims Created Their Own Critics

A principle becomes universal in more than grammar. It becomes universal when people outside its first circle can use it to challenge the circle itself. Enlightenment writers spoke with growing confidence about humanity, natural liberty, conscience, civilisation and the rights of man. Their societies continued to organise political membership through sex, property, confession, status and race. The distance between language and admission was not a side issue. It generated some of the period's strongest criticism.

Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* attacked a familiar defence of hierarchy: women appeared dependent, ornamental and intellectually weak, so their subordination seemed natural. She reversed the inference. An education designed to secure dependence would predictably produce the traits used to justify it. If reason grounded moral agency, women could not be denied serious education without weakening the universal claim. Her argument did not settle every question of class, sexuality or domestic labour, but it made manufactured incapacity visible as a political mechanism.

Olaudah Equiano's 1789 narrative moved through another blocked category. He presented himself to British readers as a formerly enslaved African, sailor, convert and commercial participant in an Atlantic world that treated Africans as exchangeable property. The book joined remembered experience to languages those readers claimed to honour: providence, commerce, feeling, law and liberty. Its authority did not depend on one philosopher granting him admission. A person whom the slave system had classified as an object entered print as an interpreter of the system itself.

Anti-slavery politics drew on Quaker organisation, Black testimony, evangelical religion, legal cases, consumer action and parliamentary campaigning. Anti-imperial arguments also existed within eighteenth-century thought. Diderot and contributors associated with Raynal's *History of the Two Indies* attacked conquest and colonial violence, though the multi-authored work carried tensions of its own. Other philosophes repeated civilisational hierarchies or accepted empire. There was no automatic route

from enlightenment to opposition against domination.

The Atlantic revolutions intensified the return of principle. American revolutionaries used natural rights against imperial rule while preserving slavery. French declarations announced equal rights amid disputes over women, property, colonies and political membership. Enslaved insurgents in Saint-Domingue began a revolution in 1791 that would destroy slavery in the colony and create independent Haiti in 1804, through war and political struggles no European text had scripted. Universal language became one resource inside a conflict driven by enslaved people's action, imperial rivalry and colonial crisis.

This pattern prevents two opposite errors. The first is to credit famous European philosophers for every later emancipation, as though excluded people merely applied a gift. The second is to treat universal principles as empty because their authors were inconsistent. A compromised principle can still disclose a contradiction, especially when institutions have made it publicly available. Its force depends on organisation, evidence, risk and a forum capable of hearing the claim.

Declarations do not enforce themselves. They can legitimise a claim, expose inconsistency and help strangers recognise a common grievance, but institutions decide admission and organised people create consequences. The return of universal language is therefore political work, not the automatic unfolding of an idea.

Core Idea 1 began with answerability. The final test is reciprocal. May those classified as dependants, subjects, outsiders or property ask the questions? May they reject the categories used to exclude them? May their evidence change the rule? The Enlightenment did not pass that test. It helped make the failure arguable in terms that travelled, and its critics widened the meaning of enlightenment by refusing to let its authors grade their own examination.

How It Actually Works

After confessional certainty

The story begins before the eighteenth century had a name for itself. European states had spent generations binding political loyalty to religious settlement. The Peace of Westphalia in 1648 ended major wars within the Holy Roman Empire but did not create modern toleration or remove confessional government. In England, civil war, restoration and revolution kept sovereignty, church and conscience entangled. In France, Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes in 1685, driving many Protestants into exile. The Dutch Republic, with its commercial presses and divided religious life, offered greater room for publication without becoming a state of unrestricted liberty.

Exile and controversy made comparison unavoidable. Refugees carried skills, grievances and books across borders. Pierre Bayle, a French Protestant who lived in Rotterdam, turned learned doubt into an argument against persecution. His *Historical and Critical Dictionary* amassed contradictions, testimonies and errors with notes that often overwhelmed the entries they served. The form mattered. It taught readers to distrust confident stories by placing sources beside one another and exposing what could not be established.

John Locke wrote amid the same European crisis. His *Letter Concerning Toleration*, first published in Latin in 1689, distinguished civil interests from the care of souls and denied that force could produce belief. His political writings defended government as a trust grounded in the protection of rights. They were arguments from a particular Protestant and English setting, with exclusions and silences that later readers would contest. Their mobility came from offering a language through which authority could be judged rather than merely inherited.

A new prestige of explanation

In 1687 Newton published the *Principia*. The work was difficult, technical and rooted in decades of mathematical and observational labour. Its cultural effect exceeded its direct readership. A universe governed by regular relations could be investigated without treating every motion as a separate mystery. Newton remained deeply religious and pursued alchemy and biblical chronology, facts that resist the modern habit of making him a secular mascot. What contemporaries admired was the power of an explanation that joined terrestrial and celestial phenomena.

The Royal Society and other academies had already encouraged reports, instruments, collections and experiments. Newton's success gave that culture a commanding symbol. Writers began to promise Newtons of the mind, morality or government. The promise was more persuasive than the results. Human affairs did not yield laws with the precision of mechanics, but the attempt changed the questions. Instead of asking only which authority had spoken, a reader could ask what observations supported the claim, how effects were connected and whether another account explained more.

The prestige of natural philosophy also altered education and patronage. Courts sponsored academies, observatories, surveys and useful arts. Physicians and naturalists circulated specimens through imperial and commercial networks. Knowledge gathered in Europe was inseparable from travellers, translators, Indigenous informants, enslaved labour and colonial extraction, although published works often displaced those contributors. The enlarged archive widened enquiry while preserving an unequal map of credit.

The Republic of Letters becomes a market

By 1700, learned correspondence joined a rapidly expanding trade in print. Journals reviewed books and experiments. Dictionaries compressed knowledge for consultation. Newspapers and periodicals formed habits of regular reading. Postal systems made letters more dependable, while booksellers treated controversy as stock. The Republic of Letters described a community in which learning might cross political and confessional borders. Its citizens still required literacy, contacts, time and money, and its republic had no equal franchise.

Censorship shaped the market rather than controlling it completely. A French author might publish in Amsterdam or Geneva, use a false place of publication, circulate a manuscript or negotiate a tacit permission. Officials sometimes tolerated works that were formally prohibited, especially when suppression seemed likely to attract attention or injure trade. Books crossed frontiers hidden among legal goods. Readers encountered arguments through summaries, attacks and gossip before finding the original. An idea's route affected its meaning.

Coffeehouses, clubs, libraries and learned societies created audiences beyond courts and universities. They made news and criticism social practices. Yet public discussion remained stratified. Servants maintained the rooms but rarely appear as equal speakers in accounts of them. Colonial commodities sweetened the conversation. A London coffeehouse connected maritime trade, finance, insurance and political news. The institution associated with open discussion therefore rested on global systems that many discussants examined only selectively.

France looks across the Channel

Voltaire's *Letters Concerning the English Nation*, published in English in 1733 and in a French version the next year, turned travel and comparison into provocation. He praised Quaker simplicity, religious plurality, commerce, Newton and aspects of English political life. The England on the page was selective. Its job was to show French readers that institutions presented as necessary could be otherwise. Praise abroad became criticism at home.

The strategy was powerful because it avoided building a complete ideal state. A concrete alternative unsettled claims of inevitability. Religious diversity did not appear to have destroyed London. Merchants could possess civic dignity. Newton's prestige could be set against Cartesian orthodoxy. Voltaire's England had conflict, corruption and exclusion, but comparison gave him leverage against French clerical and intellectual authority.

Voltaire also revealed a recurrent political ambiguity. He attacked persecution and judicial cruelty, yet often trusted an educated monarch more than an ignorant public. His correspondence with Frederick II of Prussia joined admiration, patronage and quarrel. Criticism of inherited authority did not automatically produce democratic faith. For many philosophes, the practical carrier of reform might be a sovereign who listened to writers.

Comparison becomes political analysis

Montesquieu made comparison more systematic. His *Persian Letters* of 1721 used fictional foreign visitors to make French customs look strange. The device showed that familiarity disguises contingency. In *The Spirit of the Laws* in 1748, he examined how laws related to political form, social order, commerce, climate, history and manners. He did not reduce every institution to one cause. He asked how parts fitted and what consequences followed.

His account of England gave later readers a language of separated and

balanced powers. The mechanism mattered more than a perfect institutional copy. Liberty required arrangements in which power checked power. Montesquieu's environmental claims could become crude, and his typologies compressed diverse societies. Yet he helped turn constitutional thought from a catalogue of offices into an analysis of relations.

Comparison also widened Europe's view of itself while exposing its limits. Travel literature and accounts of China, Persia, the Ottoman world and the Americas supplied alternatives to Christian chronology and European custom. Some writers used them to criticise Europe. Others arranged peoples on developmental ladders that placed commercial Europe at the summit. The outsider could be an intellectual mirror or an object of classification. Often the same work did both.

The encyclopaedia as a machine

In 1751 the first volume of the *Encyclopédie* appeared under the direction of Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert. The project grew from a proposed translation of an English reference work into an undertaking with seventeen volumes of text and eleven volumes of plates, issued across the following two decades. Thousands of articles drew on more than a hundred identified contributors, with precise totals depending on attribution and counting. No reader was expected to absorb the whole. The work was designed for movement among entries.

Its cross-references carried argument. A conventional article could direct the reader towards a more corrosive one. Theology occupied a place inside a map of knowledge rather than standing above every field. The plates gave tools, workshops and sequences of manufacture an authority usually denied to manual labour. Diderot and his collaborators relied on artisans while sometimes presenting practical knowledge as if editors had rescued it from mute hands. Recognition and appropriation arrived together.

The project survived bans, withdrawals of privilege, quarrels, surveillance and the loss of d'Alembert's active leadership. Diderot continued editing while publisher André Le Breton secretly altered passages he considered

dangerous, a discovery that enraged Diderot. The history prevents the book from becoming a monument to frictionless reason. Knowledge was produced through contracts, compromises, money, censorship, betrayal and stubborn labour.

Arguments split and move underground

The *Encyclopédie* gave the French Enlightenment a visible centre, but the century's thought did not stay within it. Some writers sought moderate reform, natural religion and civil toleration. Others developed materialist accounts of mind, attacked revelation or questioned monarchy. Anonymous manuscripts and clandestine books allowed stronger arguments to circulate among restricted readerships. Baron d'Holbach's *System of Nature* appeared in 1770 under the name of a dead academician, a useful precaution for a work that denied providence and treated nature as material necessity.

Jonathan Israel has argued that a radical current derived from Spinoza supplied the most coherent roots of democratic equality, secularism and freedom of thought. The interpretation restores ideas often softened in moderate accounts, but historians dispute whether it makes one philosophical line carry too much explanatory weight. Networks, religious reform, political languages and local institutions produced different enlightenments. The disagreement itself is instructive. A label that includes Voltaire, Hume, Mendelssohn, Rousseau and d'Holbach cannot be made coherent by subtracting their conflicts.

Sociability organises the French public

Parisian salons connected writers to nobles, diplomats, officials and wealthy visitors. Hosts such as Marie-Thérèse Geoffrin and Suzanne Necker organised regular gatherings, managed introductions and helped reputations travel. Conversation could soften disagreement and make learned exchange attractive to people outside formal academies. It also depended on invitation, manners and household resources. The salon was neither an open parliament nor an irrelevant drawing room.

Women used this setting to exercise intellectual and social power while facing barriers to official authority. Some wrote and published; others shaped networks, patronage and discussion. The same culture could praise women's civilising influence while discouraging claims to equal education or citizenship. Politeness expanded participation in one register and assigned women a limiting role in another.

Beyond elite rooms, pamphlets, songs, cheap print, lending libraries and reading societies widened political and literary discussion. It is hard to map reception precisely. Sales records, police reports and marginal notes preserve fragments, not a full census of opinion. What changed was the density of routes through which public reputations formed. A minister, cleric or court could face criticism that was dispersed, commercial and difficult to answer by one act of suppression.

Scotland turns manners into history

Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen joined universities, clubs, publishing and professional life in a distinctive intellectual setting. The union with England, expanding commerce and the memory of religious and political conflict encouraged questions about how societies change. Francis Hutcheson taught moral philosophy through an account of moral sense. Hume examined understanding, passion, convention and historical evidence. Smith studied sympathy, exchange, labour and institutions. Adam Ferguson explored civil society and the risks of commercial specialisation.

Their work made social development a subject with mechanisms. People formed rules without designing a complete system. Dependence could move from feudal status towards commercial exchange without disappearing. Manners, law, labour and government interacted. The approach could puncture legends of ancient virtue and explain unintended order. It could also turn a Scottish and European path into a ladder on which other peoples were assigned earlier stages.

Smith's famous pin factory made the productivity of divided labour visible, but the larger analysis was not a hymn to business. He criticised monopoly,

colonial companies and the capacity of merchants to shape policy for their own interest. He worried that repetitive labour could damage judgement and defended public education. The Enlightenment's political economy was an argument over the conditions and consequences of commerce, not the discovery of one market creed.

Rousseau refuses the easy story of progress

In 1750 Rousseau won a prize by arguing that the progress of arts and sciences had not purified morals. The challenge came from inside the culture of public criticism. He wrote for competitions, publishers and readers created by the world he attacked. Later works examined inequality, dependence, education, political legitimacy and conscience. Civilisation, in his account, could make people exquisitely attentive to opinion while estranging them from freedom.

Rousseau's presence prevents enlightenment from meaning confidence in smooth progress. He shared its suspicion of inherited claims and its ambition to reconstruct society, but turned those tools against luxury, cosmopolitan polish and intellectual vanity. His political thought could inspire democratic readings, civic severity and later coercive appropriations. No one route from Rousseau to revolution can carry that range.

Reform enters the state

Beccaria's *On Crimes and Punishments* appeared in 1764 and rapidly crossed languages. Its compact argument attacked torture, secret proceedings, arbitrary penalties and punishments lacking public necessity. Reformers could present mercy as rational government. Legal change followed unevenly across European states, often through officials who wanted clearer administration as well as reduced cruelty.

Rulers used the language of enlightenment selectively. Frederick II cultivated philosophers and legal reform while preserving monarchy, social hierarchy and military discipline. Catherine II corresponded with leading writers and issued an ambitious legislative Instruction, then governed an empire dependent on noble service and serfdom. Joseph II pursued

toleration, administrative centralisation and church reform with an intensity that provoked resistance. Their policies differed too much to form one programme.

Reform from above could matter to people who received religious toleration or relief from a penalty. It could also strengthen the state that granted it. Codification displaced local privilege while extending central reach. Schools widened instruction while standardising subjects. The sovereign claimed to act for public happiness without admitting the public as sovereign. Enlightened rule made power explain itself in a new vocabulary, but the explanation remained issued from the throne.

Berlin asks what enlightenment is

In 1783 a Berlin clergyman asked what enlightenment meant in the pages of the *Berlinische Monatsschrift*. Moses Mendelssohn and Immanuel Kant answered in 1784. Their essays show that contemporaries did not regard the process as complete or self-evident. Mendelssohn distinguished the cultivation of human beings as persons from their formation as citizens. Kant defined enlightenment through escape from self-incurred immaturity and made the public use of reason central.

Kant's argument carried a tension. A scholar should be free to address the reading public, while a person in an official role might still be required to obey. He praised an age of enlightenment rather than an enlightened age. Criticism and civil discipline were expected to coexist until publicity altered institutions. The formulation captures the century's sequence: the burden of proof moved more quickly than political power.

Universal language meets revolution

The American declarations and constitutions of the 1770s and 1780s drew on natural rights, republican history, Protestant arguments, colonial experience and resistance to imperial taxation. They created institutions of self-government for a political people whose boundaries excluded enslaved people, Indigenous nations and most women. Enlightenment language did not resolve those exclusions. It made some of them harder to defend without qualification.

The French Revolution began in 1789 from fiscal breakdown, political conflict, harvest distress, institutional deadlock and organised demands. Enlightenment writings supplied concepts, examples and reputations, but no philosophical text scheduled the fall of the Bastille. Once authority fractured, declarations of rights, sovereignty and citizenship helped actors define what was at stake. They also sharpened disputes over property, religion, empire, sex and violence. The Terror later allowed critics to treat enlightenment itself as a path to abstraction and coercion, although the causal chain was never so direct.

Mary Wollstonecraft answered the revolution's language with a demand that reason and education include women. Olaudah Equiano and other Black writers made Atlantic freedom answer enslaved experience. In Saint-Domingue, enslaved people began an uprising in 1791 amid conflicts among white colonists, free people of colour, imperial officials and foreign powers. The revolution that created Haiti made abolition and independence through action from below. European universalism was one language in the conflict, not its author.

Criticism also turned against the century's confidence in abstraction. In *Reflections on the Revolution in France* in 1790, Edmund Burke argued that political liberty depended on evolved relations, habits and institutions that reconstruction from first principles could destroy. Johann Gottfried Herder, writing from within the German Enlightenment, treated languages and cultures as historical formations that could not be measured by one uniform timetable. Neither man merely refused reason. Each used history and

comparison to attack a thinner account of what reason could safely ignore. The later label *Counter-Enlightenment* helps only when it does not turn distinct criticisms into one organised camp outside the age.

By the end of the 1790s, enlightenment had ceased to look like an orderly reform programme. Revolution, war, abolition, reaction, religious revival and new forms of nationalism rearranged its arguments. Its vocabulary survived because no faction owned it. Reason could criticise revolution as well as monarchy. Rights could be narrowed or widened. Progress could be promised, measured or doubted. Tradition had been made more answerable, and the same treatment now awaited enlightenment.

How we know

The archive is abundant and badly unequal. Printed books, correspondence, censorship files, academy records, subscription lists, library catalogues, police reports and marginal notes reveal networks and disputes, but they favour literate people whose papers were collected. Salon conversation, oral exchange, colonial mediation and ordinary reading survive unevenly. Publication figures do not tell us what readers understood, and a famous text's earlier date does not prove that it caused a later event.

The label *Enlightenment* also changes the evidence selected. Contemporaries used terms such as *lumières* and *Aufklärung*, yet later historians drew different boundaries around the movement. Some emphasise a radical philosophical current, some national settings, some sociability and print, and others religion, empire, gender or political economy. This account treats the burden of proof as an organising synthesis, not a phrase shared by all participants. Secure chronology is separated from claims about influence. Where totals for the *Encyclopédie* vary with attribution, the text uses bounded descriptions rather than false precision. Where archives privilege Europe, the limit is stated rather than converted into a claim about the world.

What People Get Wrong

The Enlightenment attracts myths because it is often used as a badge in present disputes. Each myth takes one real feature and promotes it into the whole.

The correction is rarely a flat opposite. A movement can be connected without being unified, religiously disruptive without being secular, reforming without being democratic and universal in language without being equal in practice. The useful question is which mechanism the myth hides.

"The Enlightenment was one movement with one programme"

There were collaborations, shared references and recognisable centres, but no membership card or agreed platform. Voltaire's reforming anticlericalism, Hume's scepticism, Mendelssohn's Jewish Enlightenment, Rousseau's criticism of civilisation, d'Holbach's materialism and Kant's public reason cannot be reduced to one doctrine without removing what made their disputes consequential. National labels also conceal divisions within France, Scotland, German-speaking lands, Italy and the Atlantic world.

The myth survives because surveys need a subject and later defenders or critics prefer a coherent ancestor. The better model is a connected field organised by recurring problems: how claims are known, how criticism travels, what toleration requires, how power can be judged, whether commerce improves society and whom universal language includes. The connections are real. Agreement is not. This matters because a movement can share procedures and enemies while dividing over faith, democracy, empire and progress.

A useful history therefore asks which enlightenment, in which city, language, institution and decade. The label earns its place when it reveals exchange across those settings. It fails when it turns differences into imperfect copies of a Parisian original.

"Reason replaced religion"

Some philosophes attacked churches, revelation and belief. Materialist and atheist works circulated, sometimes clandestinely. Yet many participants were clergy or committed believers, and religious scholarship supplied methods central to enlightenment. Protestants, Catholics and Jews used philology, history, natural philosophy and moral argument to reform their traditions. Deism was a religious position, not the absence of religion. Even Newton joined natural philosophy to intense theological study.

The replacement story reads nineteenth- and twentieth-century secularisation backwards into the eighteenth century. It also mistakes anti-clericalism for unbelief and legal toleration for indifference. The stronger correction is that revelation, ecclesiastical authority, conscience, moral conduct and civil membership were separated and recombined. Faith faced more rival tests and more internal criticism. In some places churches lost jurisdiction; in others states tightened control over them. The change was differentiation, not evacuation.

This correction also changes the politics. Removing clerical privilege may protect conscience, or transfer control of schools and worship to officials. A decline in church jurisdiction does not by itself reveal whether individuals became freer.

"It was a French club of famous men"

Paris supplied the philosophes, salons and *Encyclopédie*, so its prominence is deserved. It was not the whole map. Dutch presses carried controversial works. British politics and natural philosophy supplied comparisons. Scottish universities produced major work on moral sentiment, history and political economy. German debates joined Protestant, Jewish and philosophical enlightenments. Italian reformers transformed criminal-law argument. Smallpox variolation entered British and colonial controversy through Ottoman practice and West African testimony, a reminder that knowledge did not begin at Europe's intellectual centres.

The phrase "famous men" hides a second distortion. Women wrote,

translated, corresponded, hosted and managed networks while formal institutions often excluded them. Artisans supplied knowledge recorded in encyclopaedic plates. Colonial and Indigenous intermediaries informed natural history and travel accounts without receiving equal credit. Enslaved and formerly enslaved writers altered arguments about humanity and commerce. Enlarging the cast does not create an inclusive Enlightenment. It shows that its intellectual production already depended on people whom its public image pushed to the edge.

Geographical widening must also avoid a new fiction. Atlantic and imperial connections did not make every participant part of one equal conversation. Information could travel towards European classifiers while authority and credit travelled in the opposite direction.

"The philosophes invented modern freedom for everyone"

Enlightenment writers gave force to toleration, rights, legal equality, constitutional restraint and attacks on cruelty. Their arguments became resources for later emancipation. That does not mean they invented freedom from nothing or applied it consistently. Republican, natural-law, religious and customary traditions had older histories. Many philosophes accepted property qualifications, domestic hierarchy, colonial rule or civilisational ranking. Locke's defence of rights coexisted with colonial interests. Voltaire could oppose persecution while distrusting popular rule.

The heroic version makes excluded people into recipients of European ideas. Wollstonecraft, Equiano, free people of colour, enslaved insurgents and anti-imperial critics did more than request admission to a complete system. They exposed how its categories had been built and altered the meaning of its principles. The correction matters because universality is not secured by an author's intention. It is tested when people denied standing can invoke the rule, supply evidence and force a revision.

Nor should every later right be traced to one intellectual source. Customary claims, religious equality, republican practice, resistance, family memory

and material conflict met Enlightenment language. Political freedom was assembled from arguments with different ancestries.

"Enlightened rulers became liberal democrats"

Frederick II, Catherine II and Joseph II sponsored reforms associated with toleration, education, codification or reduced legal cruelty. Some measures produced material improvement. None converted monarchy into rule by equal citizens. The rulers remained dynastic sovereigns, defended hierarchy and used reform to increase state capacity. Catherine's ambitious language coexisted with serfdom and noble power. Joseph's centralising programme could remove old restrictions while overriding local institutions.

The label "enlightened absolutism" can therefore mislead in two directions. Treating it as hypocrisy erases changes that mattered to subjects. Treating it as liberalism confuses humane administration with transferred sovereignty. Ask two questions separately: did policy become better, and did those affected gain enforceable control over the decision-maker? A subject may receive toleration as a revocable decree rather than possess religious liberty as a right. Reform can deserve credit without answering the constitutional question.

Administrative success could even deepen dependence by making the sovereign more capable of taxing, conscripting and supervising. The balance must be judged policy by policy, not inferred from a ruler's correspondence with philosophers.

"The Enlightenment caused the French Revolution"

The revolutionaries read Enlightenment works, borrowed concepts and argued in a political culture the philosophes had helped shape. That is influence. It is not a sufficient cause. The monarchy faced debt after war, a defective fiscal structure, conflict among institutions, harvest distress, contested privilege and a crisis of representation. Events radicalised participants through choices and confrontations no book had arranged. Different actors used Montesquieu, Rousseau, natural rights, classical republicanism and religious language for rival ends.

The causal myth became persuasive for opposite reasons. Revolutionaries wanted illustrious ancestors; conservatives blamed abstract philosophy for disorder and Terror. The better method traces links: publication, carrier, audience, political opening and decision. Ideas identify problems, legitimise action and shape possible settlements. They need institutions, resources and conflict to become events. The same caution applies to the American and Haitian revolutions. Shared vocabulary did not produce one route or one result.

Influence may also run backwards in memory. Once a revolution succeeds or horrifies, readers select earlier writers as prophets. That retrospective canon can tell us how later actors understood themselves without proving what made the original crisis erupt.

"We must either defend the Enlightenment or reject it"

Present arguments often offer a moral referendum. One side identifies enlightenment with science, liberalism and universal rights. The other identifies it with empire, racial classification and domination through abstract reason. Both gather real evidence and lose historical discrimination when they make the package indivisible. The eighteenth century contained universal claims and exclusions, anti-imperial criticism and imperial knowledge, toleration and state control, scepticism and confident social ranking.

A more demanding inheritance keeps the procedures open. Claims should face evidence and criticism, including claims made in the name of reason. Universal principles should be tested by people excluded from their first application. Expertise should explain its categories and limits. Traditions should be questioned without assuming that age proves error. The Enlightenment is neither a finished constitution nor an inherited guilt. It is a contested history of answerability whose best tests must also be applied to itself.

This position is harder than choosing a camp because it withholds inherited innocence from defenders and inherited guilt from critics. It requires judgement about particular claims, institutions and consequences, which is the historical discipline both slogans avoid.

Use It

The Enlightenment is useful less as a list of approved beliefs than as a set of questions for examining authority. These lenses apply to a government report, scientific controversy, corporate policy, religious rule, historical custom or movement claiming to speak for humanity. They do not deliver a verdict. They show where the real disagreement and the hidden admission rules are likely to be.

Use them in order when a dispute feels falsely simple. First locate the

accepted authority. Then inspect the method, channels, membership and transfer of power. Last, trace how an idea entered action. The sequence separates a disagreement over facts from a disagreement over values or institutional control.

Ask who carries the burden of proof

Begin by identifying which side is treated as normal. A tradition may require challengers to prove overwhelming harm before change is considered. A reformer may assume that novelty deserves adoption unless opponents disprove it. Neither allocation is neutral. Ask why the burden falls where it does, what evidence could satisfy it and whether those bearing the cost can alter the standard. Long survival can be evidence of adaptation, but it can also record durable power. Newness can answer a changed problem, but it can also evade accumulated knowledge. Enlightenment criticism is strongest when every claim must state the purpose it serves and remain open to counterevidence, including the claim that change itself is progress.

A practical test is to reverse the default for one page. Require the established practice to justify its continuation, then require the proposed replacement to justify its risks. The arguments that survive both tests deserve more confidence than either side's initial presumption.

Separate a procedure from its result

Calling a decision evidence-based says something about method, not enough about outcome. Evidence may be incomplete, selected from a narrow population or interpreted through disputed values. A transparent process can still encode a bad category. A majority decision can still violate a right. Conversely, an inherited practice may survive a demanding test. Ask what was measured, who framed the alternatives, which uncertainty remains and where moral judgement entered. The eighteenth century's greatest scientific successes encouraged people to search for general laws in human affairs, sometimes beyond what the evidence could carry. The lesson is neither distrust of method nor worship of it. Inspect the chain from observation to category, category to inference and inference to action.

When two sides cite evidence, compare the question each dataset can answer. A reliable estimate of an average may say little about distribution, causation or acceptable harm. Methodological agreement can therefore coexist with a substantive political dispute that statistics cannot decide.

Trace the route from criticism to action

An invitation to disagree means little if critics lack information, access, time, protection or a route to an audience. Map the channel before praising its openness. Who controls publication, funds the research, appoints reviewers, sets the meeting rules and preserves the result? Which objections remain private? Which can change an institutional memory or decision? Enlightenment publics were made by printers, postal systems, salons, journals, academies and censors. Their form decided which arguments travelled and which risks critics had to bear.

Then follow the argument into action. A proposition may become a review, pamphlet slogan, legal clause, administrative instruction, campaign demand or justification written after the event. At each conversion its meaning can narrow, expand or reverse. Trace five links: formulation, carrier, audience, institutional opening and decision. A missing link does not prove that no influence existed, but it identifies where confidence should fall. This prevents a book's earlier date from becoming proof that it caused a revolution. It also prevents the opposite error of treating ideas as decoration. Arguments matter when people can use them to coordinate, legitimise, criticise or redesign action within a conflict already capable of moving power.

Test the channel with one concrete case. Find the last objection that altered the institution's choice, identify the critic's status and note the protection they possessed. A process that gathers comments but cannot revise an outcome may be useful consultation. It is not yet a structure of answerability.

Test universal language against admission rules

Words such as humanity, merit, reason, safety and the public can be general in aspiration while hiding a narrow reference case. Ask who supplied the model of the normal person. Who was absent from the evidence, excluded from authorship or treated as an object of study? Then perform the return test: can a person affected by the rule invoke its principle against the institution applying it? Wollstonecraft's educational argument had force because a claimed natural deficiency could be traced to training for dependence. Equiano's testimony had force because a person reduced to property entered print as an interpreter of commerce, religion and freedom. Universal language becomes credible through contestability, not breadth of wording alone.

Then inspect the fallback category. When the universal rule becomes costly, does the institution suddenly distinguish citizens from dependants, experts from laypeople, regular from exceptional cases, or deserving from undeserving claimants? Exceptions often reveal the person for whom the principle was designed.

Distinguish reform from transferred power

A ruler, executive or expert body can improve conditions without becoming accountable to those affected. Record both changes. Did punishment become milder? Did the procedure become clearer? Did subjects gain a right, or did they receive a benefit that the same authority can withdraw? Did consultation change the decision-maker's obligations, or merely provide information? Eighteenth-century monarchs could promote toleration, codification and education while preserving dynastic rule. The distinction does not dismiss useful reform. It prevents humane administration from being confused with shared authorship. A good institutional analysis therefore tracks capacity, discretion, review and removal: who can act, what constrains them, who can challenge them and who can replace them.

Write the result in two sentences. The first should name the material improvement. The second should state whether discretion, review or

replacement changed. This format preserves credit for reform without allowing benevolent conduct to answer a constitutional question.

Keep the dissenter inside the model

A movement is often described through its dominant self-image and its opponents placed outside. Rousseau complicates that habit. He used critical enquiry against confidence in arts, luxury and polished society. Religious enlighteners revised faith through scholarship rather than choosing between orthodoxy and unbelief. Anti-imperial writers challenged conquest from within eighteenth-century debates. Treat such dissent as evidence about the range of the field, not noise around a pure centre. The same approach improves analysis now. A critic may share a method while rejecting an outcome, or defend an institution while contesting its justification. Before labelling someone anti-science, anti-modern or anti-tradition, identify the exact claim and standard they dispute.

Reconstruct the dissenter's strongest model before evaluating it. Ask which shared value they believe the dominant account sacrifices and which counterexample their criticism explains. A movement that cannot state its internal objection fairly has probably converted a contested method into an identity.

The limits

These lenses inherit their own Enlightenment bias. They favour explicit reasons, visible evidence and public contest, while much human knowledge is tacit, local or sustained through practice. A community may understand a risk that it cannot translate into an institution's approved vocabulary. Love, loyalty, ritual and identity cannot be exhausted by utility or proof. Constant challenge can erode the trust needed for any enquiry to proceed. Publicity can punish experimentation, reward certainty and expose vulnerable people. Reason-giving is therefore one political and intellectual good among others. It needs privacy, historical memory, plural forms of knowledge and institutions able to distinguish criticism from harassment or domination.

The one thing to keep

Keep the return of the question. When an authority asks others for evidence, ask what evidence supports the authority's categories. When a universal principle is announced, ask whether excluded people can use it against its authors. When reform is praised, ask who gained a right and who merely gained a better administrator. When reason is invoked, ask whether the reasoning remains answerable to objection. The Enlightenment did not complete this discipline. It made the demand visible on a larger scale, then repeatedly failed it. Its best inheritance is the refusal to exempt inherited power, modern expertise or enlightenment itself from reasons that other people are allowed to challenge.

Terms

These terms recur across Enlightenment history. Several had contested eighteenth-century meanings, so each definition is a guide to the argument rather than a timeless formula.

Enlightenment

A later umbrella term for connected eighteenth-century projects of criticism, knowledge, reform and public reasoning. It matters because the singular label can conceal disagreement, geography and exclusion.

Lumières

The French plural for lights, used for knowledge and intellectual illumination. The plural suits a French field containing philosophes, salons, encyclopaedists, religious reformers and rival political positions.

Aufklärung

The German term for enlightenment or clarification. Debates around it linked education, religion, public reasoning and civic order, with Mendelssohn and Kant offering influential but distinct accounts.

Republic of Letters

An imagined transnational community of learned correspondence and print. It crossed some political and confessional borders, while access still depended on literacy, reputation, money, patronage and postal connections.

Public sphere

The spaces and practices through which private people discuss matters of common concern. The concept draws attention to publicity, but historical publics were selective, commercial and subject to censorship.

Reason

The capacity and practice of drawing inferences, testing consistency and giving grounds for belief or action. Enlightenment appeals to reason differed in method, starting assumptions and political result.

Critique

Disciplined examination of a claim's grounds, limits and consequences. Critique can challenge tradition, but it also turns against modern expertise and the categories through which critics organise evidence.

Empiricism

An emphasis on experience, observation and the origins of ideas in sensation. The label helps with Locke and Hume, though real enquiries also relied on reasoning, testimony, instruments and inherited concepts.

Rationalism

A family of approaches granting a strong role to reason and necessary principles in knowledge. Its contrast with empiricism is useful only if it does not become two sealed intellectual camps.

Natural law

A moral or legal order claimed to be discoverable by reason and applicable beyond local command. It supplied standards for judging rulers, war, property and obligation, with disputed conclusions.

Natural rights

Rights held by persons through their human status rather than a ruler's gift. Eighteenth-century uses strengthened arguments about liberty and consent while leaving sex, race, property and citizenship contested.

Toleration

Permission or protection for beliefs and practices disapproved by an authority. Toleration can reduce persecution without creating equal citizenship, since the tolerating power may retain discretion over the tolerated.

Deism

Belief in a creator known through reason and nature rather than a single revealed church. Deists differed widely, and the term should not be treated as a polite synonym for atheism.

Scepticism

Systematic doubt about what can be known or justified. Bayle and Hume used sceptical methods differently, but both weakened the assumption that confidence, tradition or testimony automatically establishes truth.

Materialism

The view that reality, including mind and life, can be explained through matter and its organisation. In the eighteenth century it often carried religious and political danger, especially in clandestine works.

Philosophe

A French public writer committed to critical discussion of knowledge, religion, law or society. The term names a social role and network more accurately than a single philosophical doctrine.

Encyclopédie

The French reference project directed by Diderot and d'Alembert. Its articles, cross-references and plates reorganised knowledge, exposed readers to controversy and displayed the practical intelligence of skilled work.

Salon

A recurring gathering in a private home, often organised by a woman host, connecting writers, nobles, officials and visitors. Salons enabled exchange through invitation and manners rather than open admission.

Coffeehouse

A commercial meeting place associated with news, reading, trade and discussion. Coffeehouses widened some urban publics, although clientele, cost, gender conventions and political supervision limited who participated.

Academy

A recognised body supporting scholarship, arts or science through membership, prizes and publication. Academies gave knowledge institutional authority while concentrating judgement in selected experts and patrons.

Variolation

Deliberate exposure to smallpox material to produce a usually milder infection and later protection. The practice predated European adoption and became a test case for comparing risk, testimony and knowledge carried across cultural boundaries.

Censorship

Official control over publication, performance or circulation.

Eighteenth-century censorship included prohibition, licensing, privilege and negotiated tolerance, producing evasion and compromise rather than a simple division between speech and silence.

Clandestine literature

Manuscripts or printed works circulated secretly because their religious or political claims were dangerous. Hidden circulation allowed radical arguments to travel, though usually through small and socially connected readerships.

Civil society

The field of social association and order not reducible to household or sovereign command. Enlightenment thinkers used related ideas to explain commerce, manners, conventions and institutions produced through interaction.

Social contract

A model grounding political authority in agreement among persons rather than divine or hereditary title. It could justify limited government, popular sovereignty or strict civic obligation, depending on the theorist.

Separation of powers

The distribution of legislative, executive and judicial functions so that power checks power. Montesquieu's relational analysis influenced later constitutions, which often made the divisions more formal than his account.

Enlightened absolutism

A disputed label for monarchical reform justified through reason, utility and public welfare. It helps compare policies, but can hide differences among states and confuse improved administration with shared sovereignty.

Political economy

The study of production, exchange, revenue, labour and public policy as connected processes. It made commerce and population governable objects while raising arguments about monopoly, poverty, empire and state power.

Sentimentalism

An emphasis on moral feeling, sympathy and the social formation of judgement. It complicates the image of Enlightenment people as calculating minds and links ethics to imagination, habit and approval.

Counter-Enlightenment

A later term for criticisms of rationalism, universalism or progress associated with religion, history, culture and authority. It is useful cautiously, since dissent also arose from inside Enlightenment methods and networks.

Go Deeper

These four works are deliberately argumentative rather than four versions of the same survey. Begin with Outram, then use the primary debate to loosen any fixed definition. Israel and Muthu offer rival tests of scope: one asks how much a radical philosophical current explains, while the other asks whether eighteenth-century universalism contained serious resources against empire. Read them as models to compare, not authorities to combine into a painless consensus.

Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment*, fourth edition, 2019

Start here for a concise, balanced survey organised around problems rather than a parade of great men. Outram connects science, religion, gender, government, slavery, colonialism and public culture while keeping national differences visible. The book is accessible after this one and useful for testing any claim that the Enlightenment had a single centre or political destination. Its thematic chapters mean that readers seeking a continuous chronology will need to build one across the discussion, but the structure suits a subject whose arguments moved through several settings at once.

James Schmidt, editor, *What Is Enlightenment?*, 1996

Use this collection to hear the question being asked rather than accept a later definition. It places Kant's famous 1784 answer beside essays by Mendelssohn and other contributors to the German debate, then follows the concept into later criticism. The primary texts show why enlightenment could mean education, public reasoning, civic formation and release from intellectual dependence without becoming one programme. Some philosophical passages require slow reading. That difficulty is productive because it reveals how much modern shorthand removes from Kant's brief formula.

Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment*, 2001

Read Israel for a large, forceful interpretation centred on a radical current associated with Spinoza, philosophical monism, freedom of thought, equality and democratic possibilities. Its scale makes hidden networks and dangerous ideas hard to dismiss as marginal decoration. It is also a thesis to argue with. Critics question whether one intellectual line explains too much and whether national, religious and institutional differences receive enough weight. The book is long, detailed and best approached after an overview, but it demonstrates what a serious organising model can reveal and distort.

Sankar Muthu, *Enlightenment against Empire*, 2003

Choose Muthu to test the claim that Enlightenment universalism led naturally to imperial confidence. Through Diderot, Kant and other writers, he reconstructs a significant anti-imperial strand that rejected conquest and questioned civilisational ranking. The argument does not turn the century into an age of decolonisation. It shows that empire was contested within its thought and that later summaries often flatten this dispute. The book is conceptually demanding, especially where it reconstructs moral psychology and cultural plurality, but it offers the strongest next step for understanding universal language without either innocence or cynicism.

Notes and Sources

Scope, model and terminology

The label. Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment*, fourth edition, supplies the main thematic overview and supports treating the subject as plural, connected and internally disputed. John Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment*, is important for comparison between national settings, especially Scotland and Naples. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entry on the Enlightenment was used as a current reference check for major philosophical relationships, not as a substitute for the specialist histories listed below.

The burden of proof. The claim that the Enlightenment redistributed the burden of proof is this manuscript's organising synthesis. It is not presented as a phrase shared by the period's writers or as a sufficient explanation of every local enlightenment. Its evidential basis lies in recurring demands for public reasons, comparison, historical criticism, observable support and institutional justification across the primary works and modern scholarship cited here.

Dates. The narrative begins in the late seventeenth century because Locke, Bayle, Newton, the Dutch publishing world and the confessional crises of

the 1680s are necessary to explain the eighteenth-century field. It closes with the revolutionary 1790s, while Haiti's independence in 1804 appears only as the outcome of a revolution that began in 1791.

The Whole Thing in One Page and Why You Should Care

The Encyclopédie. The publication sequence and architecture are checked against the ARTFL Encyclopédie Project and Robert Darnton's *The Business of Enlightenment*. The original undertaking comprised seventeen text volumes and eleven plate volumes published from 1751 to 1772. Contributor and article totals vary according to attribution, unsigned material and what counts as an article, so the body uses bounded descriptions rather than one exact total.

Craft knowledge. Diderot's attention to tools and skilled processes is visible in the plates and articles themselves. The text also preserves the asymmetry between recording artisanal knowledge and granting artisans equal authorship or status. The claim is therefore about the publication's organisation, not proof that social hierarchy within knowledge had ended.

Variolation and travelling knowledge. The World Health Organization's history of smallpox vaccination and Robin A. Weiss and José Esparza's Royal Society commentary support the distinction between variolation and later vaccination. Variolation was practised in parts of Asia and Africa before eighteenth-century European adoption. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu promoted Ottoman practice in Britain, while Cotton Mather publicised West African knowledge described to him by Onesimus in Boston. The manuscript does not claim that these were identical local techniques or that testimony alone settled safety. The example is used to show cross-cultural transmission, contested credibility and comparison of risks.

Modern inheritance. References to evidence, review, rights and public justification describe family resemblances, not an assertion that every modern practice descends directly from one eighteenth-century source. The book avoids a straight-line origin claim.

Sources for the seven ideas

Reason as procedure. John Locke's *Letter Concerning Toleration*, Pierre Bayle's selected *Historical and Critical Dictionary*, Newton's *Principia* and the German answers collected by James Schmidt provide the main primary anchors. John Marshall gives the confessional and political setting for Locke and early toleration. The manuscript distinguishes inspectable procedures from agreement on results because these authors reached incompatible conclusions.

Probability and testimony. Bayle's source criticism and Hume's treatment of evidence and miracles support the discussion of testimony, probability and fallibility. No claim is made that eighteenth-century public reasoning used one formal probability theory.

The infrastructure of criticism. Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, James Van Horn Melton, *The Rise of the Public*, Antoine Lilti, *The World of the Salons*, and Darnton support the accounts of correspondence, sociability, print commerce and censorship. Goodman emphasises women's role in organising the French Republic of Letters; Lilti warns against turning salons into early democratic institutions. The manuscript retains both the agency and the admission limits.

Coffeehouses and publics. Coffeehouses differed across cities and decades. The London example is kept local and is not made a model for Europe. The association with trade, news, finance and colonial commodities is used to show institutional entanglement rather than to claim that every discussion depended on the same commercial chain.

Natural philosophy. Newton's achievement and terminology are grounded in the Cohen and Whitman translation of the *Principia*. Rob Iliffe's *Priest of Nature* and the Newton Project's editions of scientific, alchemical and religious papers support the warning against a secular mascot version of Newton. The manuscript does not infer a single scientific method from Newtonian mechanics or claim that political and moral enquiries achieved comparable precision.

Imperial knowledge and classification. Londa Schiebinger's *Plants and Empire* supports the role of colonial routes, local knowledge and unequal credit in European natural history. Silvia Sebastiani's *The Scottish Enlightenment* supports the account of race, gender and the limits of progress within social classification. Evidence from one collecting network is not generalised to every science.

Religious Enlightenment. David Sorkin's *The Religious Enlightenment* establishes substantial Protestant, Jewish and Catholic enlightenments. Jonathan Sheehan's *The Enlightenment Bible* supports the importance of translation, historical scholarship and changing scriptural authority. Marshall supplies the early modern context of toleration. Open atheism and materialism are treated as important currents without being made representative of the whole field.

Mendelssohn. The 1784 essay and its relation to Kant are read in Schmidt's collection. The manuscript does not collapse Jewish Enlightenment into assimilation or assume that civil admission required the abandonment of Jewish religious identity.

Political design. Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* supports the account of comparison, institutional relations and the later development of separation-of-powers doctrine. The text avoids treating his account of England as a precise description of the eighteenth-century British constitution. Beccaria's *On Crimes and Punishments* supports the claims about torture, clear law, proportionality and public purpose.

Enlightened monarchy. H. M. Scott's edited *Enlightened Absolutism* supports the comparison of monarchical reform and the disputed character of the label. The examples of Frederick II, Catherine II and Joseph II are deliberately bounded. No common programme, uniform success or direct route to liberal democracy is claimed.

Scottish moral and social thought. Hume's *Enquiry*, Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* and *Wealth of Nations*, Robertson's comparative history and Emma Rothschild's *Economic Sentiments* support the account of

convention, sympathy, commerce and political economy. Smith's criticism of monopoly, colonial companies and damaged labour prevents the pin factory from becoming a slogan for unrestricted business.

Stadial theory and household limits. Sebastiani supports the warning that histories of social development could rank peoples, sexes and forms of life against a European commercial standard. The household paragraph is an interpretive synthesis about what many accounts placed outside their representative political actor, not a claim that every Scottish thinker held one doctrine of women or domestic labour.

Wollstonecraft. The 1792 *Vindication* in Miriam Brody's edition supports the argument that education for dependence was used to explain the traits then cited in defence of dependence. The manuscript does not attribute to Wollstonecraft a complete later programme of sex equality.

Equiano. Vincent Carretta's revised Penguin edition supplies the primary text and scholarly apparatus. The place of Equiano's birth has been disputed through archival and autobiographical evidence. The narrative does not rely on resolving that question: it describes how Equiano presented himself to his readers and rests the argument on his secure public roles as author, sailor, convert, free man and abolitionist.

Anti-imperial thought. Sankar Muthu's *Enlightenment against Empire* supports the existence and importance of anti-imperial arguments within the field. The book does not treat those arguments as the dominant European position or as the source of later decolonisation.

Haiti. Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World*, supplies the main narrative authority for Saint-Domingue and the Haitian Revolution. The manuscript assigns agency to enslaved insurgents and other actors in the colony, not to European declarations or philosophers. Enlightenment language is retained as one resource inside a conflict with military, imperial, social and economic causes.

Sources for the chronological narrative

Confessional chronology. The Peace of Westphalia is described as ending major imperial wars without creating modern toleration. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes is dated to 1685. Bayle's Rotterdam career and Locke's 1689 publication are checked against their editions and Marshall. These events establish conditions; they are not declared a single starting gun.

Newton and academies. The *Principia* date is 1687. Its cultural authority is distinguished from direct mathematical readership. Courts, academies and collecting networks are treated as different institutions rather than one coordinated programme.

Voltaire. Nicholas Cronk's edition of *Letters Concerning the English Nation* supports the first English publication in 1733, the French publication in 1734 and the comparative use of English religion, commerce, politics and Newtonian science. The book's England is described as a strategic selection, not dismissed as fabrication.

Montesquieu. *Persian Letters* is dated to 1721 and *The Spirit of the Laws* to 1748. Later constitutional influence is separated from Montesquieu's own, less rigid account of powers and intermediate bodies.

Diderot and Le Breton. Darnton and the ARTFL project support the publication sequence, censorship and commercial machinery of the *Encyclopédie*. Diderot's discovery that publisher André Le Breton had altered passages is retained as a documented conflict. It is not reconstructed as a dramatic scene and no dialogue is invented.

Clandestine radicalism. Israel supplies the account of Spinozist influence, d'Holbach's *System of Nature* and the radical thesis. The book records scholarly objections to making this one current the master cause of democratic modernity. The false authorial attribution of *System of Nature* to Jean-Baptiste de Mirabaud is treated as a publication precaution, not proof of a uniform underground readership.

Salons. Goodman and Lilti support the examples of Marie-Thérèse Geoffrin and Suzanne Necker, the organisational role of hostesses and the limits of invitation-based sociability. No private conversation or undocumented motive is reproduced.

Scotland and Rousseau. Robertson and Rothschild support the Scottish sequence. Rousseau's 1750 prize discourse is used as an internal criticism of confidence in progress; the manuscript avoids a direct causal line from Rousseau to revolutionary violence.

Beccaria and rulers. Beccaria's work is dated to 1764. Scott supports the reform settings. The text separates policy effects from rulers' self-presentation and does not use correspondence with philosophes as proof of liberal intention.

The Berlin debate. Schmidt's collection supports the 1783 question in the *Berlinische Monatsschrift* and the 1784 answers by Mendelssohn and Kant. Kant's distinction between public reasoning and obedience in office is paraphrased rather than quoted at length.

Burke, Herder and criticism of abstraction. Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* supports the argument that liberty and authority depend on inherited relations and historically developed practices that abstract reconstruction may damage. Michael N. Forster's edition of Herder and current specialist reference scholarship support the account of language, culture and historical formation. The manuscript does not collapse Burke and Herder into one reactionary programme or use *Counter-Enlightenment* as their own shared label. Each remains part of a wider eighteenth-century dispute over what reason must understand before redesigning institutions.

Revolutionary causation. Jack Censer's review of intellectual explanations, together with Outram and Dubois, supports the separation of ideas from sufficient causes. Fiscal crisis, war, harvest conditions, institutional conflict and political organisation remain visible. Later revolutionary use of a text is not treated as proof that the text produced the

original crisis.

How we know. The discussion of archival inequality follows the source base used throughout: print, letters, police and censorship records, catalogues, subscriptions and surviving annotations. Claims about reception are narrowed because sales, confiscations and ownership do not establish agreement or comprehension.

Sources for misconceptions, practical lenses and terms

The seven misconception corrections synthesise the evidence above and add no independent anecdote or numerical claim. The practical lenses transfer mechanisms rather than proposing that eighteenth-century cases prove a universal rule for current institutions. The Terms entries are functional definitions for this manuscript. *Variolation* is kept distinct from vaccination. Where a term such as public sphere, sentimentalism or Counter-Enlightenment belongs to later historiography, the definition says so or avoids presenting it as a shared eighteenth-century category.

Further-reading verification

Edition and publication details for Outram, Schmidt, Israel and Muthu were rechecked against publisher or scholarly catalogue records on 2 September 2026. The recommendations are selected for distinct purposes: overview, primary debate, major organising interpretation and anti-imperial counterweight.

Bibliography

Primary sources and original evidence

Bayle, Pierre. *Historical and Critical Dictionary: Selections*. Translated and edited by Richard H. Popkin. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991.

Beccaria, Cesare. *On Crimes and Punishments and Other Writings*. Edited by Richard Bellamy. Translated by Richard Davies with Virginia Cox and

Richard Bellamy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Edited with an introduction by L. G. Mitchell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Diderot, Denis, and Jean le Rond d'Alembert, editors. *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*. 28 volumes. Paris and Neuchâtel, 1751 to 1772. Consulted through the ARTFL Encyclopédie Project.

Equiano, Olaudah. *The Interesting Narrative and Other Writings*. Revised edition. Edited by Vincent Carretta. London and New York: Penguin, 2003.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. *J. G. Herder: Philosophical Writings*. Edited and translated by Michael N. Forster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Tom L. Beauchamp. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Locke, John. *A Letter Concerning Toleration and Other Writings*. Edited by Mark Goldie. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2010.

Montesquieu. *The Spirit of the Laws*. Edited and translated by Anne M. Cohler, Basia Carolyn Miller and Harold Samuel Stone. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Newton, Isaac. *The Principia: Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*. Translated by I. Bernard Cohen and Anne Whitman, assisted by Julia Budenz. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*. Edited and translated by Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*. Edited and translated by Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Schmidt, James, editor. *What Is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Edited by R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1981.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Edited by D. D. Raphael and A. L. Macfie. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1982.

Voltaire. *Letters Concerning the English Nation*. Edited by Nicholas Cronk. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Edited by Miriam Brody. London: Penguin, 1992.

Modern scholarship

Censer, Jack R. "Intellectual History and the Causes of the French Revolution." *Journal of Social History* 52, no. 3 (2019): 545-554.

Darnton, Robert. *The Business of Enlightenment: A Publishing History of the Encyclopédie, 1775-1800*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1979.

Dubois, Laurent. *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004.

Goodman, Dena. *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2007.

Iliffe, Rob. *Priest of Nature: The Religious Worlds of Isaac Newton*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Israel, Jonathan I. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of*

Modernity 1650-1750. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Lilti, Antoine. *The World of the Salons: Sociability and Worldliness in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Marshall, John. *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Melton, James Van Horn. *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Muthu, Sankar. *Enlightenment against Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Outram, Dorinda. *The Enlightenment*. Fourth edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Robertson, John. *The Case for the Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples 1680-1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Rothschild, Emma. *Economic Sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet, and the Enlightenment*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Schiebinger, Londa. *Plants and Empire: Colonial Bioprospecting in the Atlantic World*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Scott, H. M., editor. *Enlightened Absolutism: Reform and Reformers in Later Eighteenth-Century Europe*. London: Macmillan, 1990.

Sebastiani, Silvia. *The Scottish Enlightenment: Race, Gender, and the Limits of Progress*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Sheehan, Jonathan. *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Sorkin, David. *The Religious Enlightenment: Protestants, Jews, and Catholics from London to Vienna*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Weiss, Robin A., and José Esparza. "The Prevention and Eradication of Smallpox: A Commentary on Sloane (1755) 'An Account of Inoculation'." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370, no. 1666 (2015): 20140378.

Digital reference

ARTFL Encyclopédie Project. University of Chicago and Centre national de la recherche scientifique. Edition and project information checked 2 September 2026.

Newton Project. University of Oxford. Edition and project information on Newton's scientific, mathematical, alchemical and religious writings checked 2 September 2026.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Entries on the Enlightenment, Edmund Burke, Johann Gottfried Herder and relevant thinkers. Revision and bibliographic information checked 2 September 2026.

World Health Organization. "History of Smallpox Vaccination." Historical and technical information checked 2 September 2026.