

1 A Woman Philosopher in Postcolonial Brazil

Known for a long time as “the translator of Mary Wollstonecraft,” Nísia Floresta (1810–85) is a key voice in the defense of women’s rights in postcolonial Latin America. Floresta was a Brazilian philosopher who dedicated most of her works to criticizing the culture of modern Europe and the habits that were inherited by Brazilian culture, showing the inconsistencies between Enlightenment theory and colonial practice. Her major concern was women’s access to education, and she argued that as long as women were kept ignorant of their own intellectual and physical capacities they would continue to have limited capacity for action. Floresta’s philosophical reflections on equality and dignity were not only developed out of conceptual interest, but from a close observation of the social dynamics of Brazil, a society that was structured under colonial rule and remained a colony of Portugal for more than 300 years.

At the time Floresta was writing, Brazil was not yet a republic, but had recently become independent (in 1822). Slavery was still a legal institution, the Indigenous population was not integrated into society (Indigenous peoples were not regarded as citizens), and women did not have access to public jobs or higher education. Rio de Janeiro was the capital of the Brazilian Empire and its urbanization came with various social problems quickly observed by Floresta, such as the surge in poor people and marginalized social groups. Floresta – as an exception – was a highly educated woman well versed in classical philosophy and in the political debates of her time who aimed to expose the difficulties of creating an equal society after colonization.

Nísia Floresta Brasileira Augusta is the pseudonym of Dionísia Gonçalves Pinto. In her poem, *A lágrima de um caeté* (1849), on the condition of the Indigenous Caeté group during the Praieira Revolt, she used another pseudonym, “Tellesilla,” and on other occasions she signed simply as B.A. (Brasileira Augusta). A number of anonymous essays were later assumed to have been written by Floresta. Although she employed various pseudonyms, she came to be known simply as Nísia Floresta. Nísia is short for Dionísia, her first name; Floresta is the name of the ranch where she was born and raised in the town of Papari, Rio Grande do Norte. Brasileira Augusta is a combination of an homage to her second husband (Augusta being the female form of the name Augusto) and a self-styled title – “Brasileira Augusta” also means noble Brazilian woman. In choosing her pseudonym, Floresta adopted a similar strategy to the eighteenth-century anonymous British writer who gave herself the title “Sophia, a person of quality,” indicating that she was a person of high social status and moral qualities. Nísia Floresta published around ten books including educational essays, travel diaries, and autobiographical texts in Portuguese, Italian,

and French, as well as many essays in the popular presses of her day. Her daughter Lívia translated one of her Italian essays – *La donna (Woman)* – into English as an homage to her mother. Floresta did not write in English and English was not a language taught at her school.

Nísia Floresta was born in 1810 when Brazil, a colony of the Kingdom of Portugal, had just become (in 1808) the seat of the Portuguese colonial empire. Brazil was hosting the Portuguese royal family who, in an act of self-exile on account of the Napoleonic invasion of Portugal, established themselves in Rio de Janeiro. By hosting the royal family, the colony became the center of operations for the Kingdom of Portugal, gaining a special quasi-noncolonial status. When Floresta died in France, in 1885, she was a 75-year-old learned lady who was part of the intellectual circles of the French salons. She died four years before the proclamation of the Brazilian Republic and three years before the abolition of slavery. With independence, Brazil was no longer a colony and became an independent empire, the Império do Brasil. From the beginning of independence to the constitution of the republic, a period that lasted for more than half the nineteenth century, the empire of Brazil was a parliamentary constitutional monarchy under the rule of emperors Dom Pedro I (who was also prince of Portugal) and Dom Pedro II,¹ his son, who was born in Brazil. This was a period of political turmoil that led to various popular revolts, one of which – the Revolução Praieira – was the topic of Floresta’s Indigenist epic poem, *A lágrima de um caeté* (“The Tear of a Caeté,” 1849). Floresta did not live to witness the abolition of slavery in Brazil, but, through her lifetime, preliminary laws that significantly changed the institution of slavery had been promulgated.²

The life of Dionísia Gonçalves Pinto, the woman behind the Nísia Floresta pseudonym, is full of interesting anecdotes. Floresta’s father, Dionísio Pinto

¹ During Floresta’s lifetime, Prince Dom Pedro I had disputed the Brazilian Empire with his father, King D. João VI, and was successful in declaring Brazilian independence from the Kingdom of Portugal in 1822. In 1826, D. João VI, the King of Portugal, passed away. D. Pedro I, the heir to the throne, was in Brazil acting as Emperor of the newly independent nation. However, in Portugal, D. Pedro I was declared king. Despite D. Pedro I’s role in Brazilian independence, he continued to be the successor to the Portuguese throne and became King of Portugal while also being Emperor of Brazil. Having to make a choice, he abdicated the Portuguese throne and stayed in Brazil. Various popular revolts against Pedro I’s authoritarianism were taking place. Some years later, Pedro I abdicated his Brazilian throne and went back to Portugal to regain his power, leaving his five-year-old son Pedro II to succeed him. As he was still a minor, a vacuum of power was created leading to a period of rebellion. D. Pedro II was declared able to govern when he turned fourteen and was then, as emperor, able to control the popular revolts.

² For example, the end of the Atlantic slave trade through the Eusébio de Queirós Law (1850) and other rules that paved the way for abolition such as the Free-Womb Law (1871) and the Sexagenarian Law (1884). The end of slavery came with the promulgation of the Golden Law on May 13, 1888, which abolished slavery in all forms.

Lisboa, was a Portuguese lawyer; Floresta's mother, Antônia Clara Freire, who was born in Brazil, was from a prominent family in the northeastern region. Antônia was a widow when she married Floresta's father and together they had four children. Dionísio and his household have been depicted in Henry Koster's *Travels in Brazil* (1816). Koster spent a day at the Floresta ranch and made notes about their customs in his diary:

Papari is about five leagues from Cunhau. Senhor Dionisio introduced me to his lady; he is a native of Portugal, and she a Brazilian. They possessed a small piece of land in the valley, and appeared to be comfortably situated. Papari may contain about three hundred inhabitants very much scattered. In the course of this year, I afterwards heard, that many persons flocked to it from other parts, owing to the absolute want of provisions. I went down to the edge of the lake to see the fishermen arrive, the people of the valley had all assembled to receive them; it was quite a Billingsgate in miniature – save that the Portuguese language does not admit of swearing.

We dined in Brazilian style, upon a table raised about six inches from the ground, around which we sat or rather laid down upon mats; we had no forks, and the knives, of which there were two or three, were intended merely to sever the larger pieces of meat – the fingers were to do the rest. I remained at Papari during one entire day, that my horses might have some respite, that I might purchase another from Senhor Dionisio, and on poor Julio's account, whose feet had begun to crack from the dryness of the sands. (Koster 1816, pp. 64–65)

Floresta's ranch is depicted as a large and comfortable property but the family had to move away due to popular revolts triggered by anti-Portuguese sentiment (Doria 1933, p. 16).³ In 1828, Floresta's father was assassinated by Capitão-mor Uchôa Cavalcanti who was contracted to kill him. The assassination was ordered by a family that did not accept the verdict of a judge who ruled in favor of one of Dionísio's clients (Floresta 2001, p. 51). This loss, which happened when Floresta was eighteen years old, marked her for life. It is said that her father encouraged her education and she benefited from the books in his library. We have no information on where Floresta studied and how she was educated. Duarte (2019) notes that there was a Carmelite convent in her city which was very well known among local families, suggesting that she probably attended the school (p. 24).

Most of these accounts can be found in Floresta's autobiographical works, but others come from unknown sources that are hard to track and verify with evidence. For example, Floresta was allegedly married to Manuel Alexandre Seabra de Melo when she was only thirteen. After a couple of months she

³ Two revolts that marked Floresta's family history were the Revolução Pernambucana and the Confederação do Equador.

decided to abandon her husband and go back to her parents' house. The family then moved to another state, Pernambuco, as Floresta was being charged with household abandonment. There is no document that proves this charge, as Duarte (2021, p. 25) affirms, only biographers' notes that were based on oral history. Floresta later married again – a young lawyer from the Olinda Law School, Manuel Augusto de Faria Rocha. He became the father of her children who were properly registered under Manuel Augusto's name. This suggests that the first marriage may have been annulled otherwise her children could not have been registered under the name of Floresta's second husband (Duarte 2021, p. 25). Manuel Augusto graduated in 1832 as part of the first group of students from the Olinda Law School, one of the earliest in Brazil. The family then moved to Porto Alegre and one year later Manuel Augusto, who was 25 years old, died, leaving Nísia Floresta with two young children. After this loss, Floresta moved to Rio de Janeiro with her mother, D. Antônia Clara Freire, and her children.

Living as a widow for most of her life, Floresta was an autonomous woman who raised her children and took care of her mother, worked as a school director and a writer, and traveled the world. A couple of years after translating *Woman Not Inferior* (from the anonymous Sophia), Floresta started her own school in Rio de Janeiro, the Colégio Augusto.⁴ Here, she implemented a progressive curriculum which included various foreign languages such as Latin, Greek, Italian, and French. She also taught her students history and geography, offering an alternative to the formal learning that reduced women's education to utilitarian domestic apprenticeship. With a curriculum that defied the accepted norms, the Colégio Augusto received criticism in the press. It was said that, by learning Latin, the girls who had been instructed in Floresta's school were acquiring useless knowledge (*O Mercantil* 1847, p. 3, n. 17). During the years when she directed this school, Floresta wrote various educational essays including *Conselhos à minha filha* ("Advices to my Daughter," 1842), a book that she would later translate to Italian (1858).

At the end of 1849, Floresta embarked on a transatlantic ship, *Ville de Paris*, with her two young children and headed for Europe. After almost two months at sea, on December 24, 1849, they arrived in France. Floresta was thirty-nine years of age. She declared, for immigration purposes, that she was going to Paris. Floresta justified the move to Europe in *Fragments d'un ouvrage inédit: Notes biographiques*: "I came to Europe thinking about finding some distraction in a life of the mind" (Floresta 2001, p. 32) And, in the literature, we find two other hypotheses justifying why she left Brazil: it was either a medical

⁴ There is evidence that Floresta ran other schools before the Colégio Augusto.

recommendation for the sake of her daughter's health or self-exile due to the repercussions of her political activities (Duarte 2019, pp. 82–83). On September 7, 1849, Livia Augusta had a serious accident, falling from a horse. The doctor of the Court, Cândido Soares, recommended that Floresta should seek a “change of air” to help Livia in her recovery (Câmara 1941, pp. 35–36). Almost a century later, an interpretation of this medical recommendation was put forward in the press, leading to an alternative explanation for her move:

Dr. Soares may have acted in this way following the suggestion of those people who were interested in keeping Floresta away from Brazil. She was a woman who voiced feminism, abolition, and the Republic in 1849, and this naturally constituted some kind of nuisance for the safeguard of order in Imperial Brazil, still impacted by so many civil wars. Nísia Floresta probably was seen as a dangerous agitator in this society with a slavery system where women also lived under a kind of an enslavement in the patriarchal regime. (*O Correio da manhã* 1954, p. 8)

Floresta's move was probably motivated by both causes, her daughter's health and the need for a change of air for the whole family, including herself and her own self-development. After traveling to France in 1849, Floresta never lived in Brazil again, visiting her home country only twice for short periods of time. In *Trois ans en Italie* (1864) Floresta writes that the death of her mother Antônia Clara Freire in 1855 was an additional reason for her decision to stay away from Brazil. In *Trois ans* she repeated the maxim that had appeared previously in *Itinéraire d'un voyage en Allemagne* (1857): “Traveling is the safest and most useful way for easing a great pain” (Lúcio 1999, p. 255).

In Europe, Floresta had her own intellectual circle and was friends with Auguste Comte, the French positivist philosopher. In Paris, Floresta attended Comte's course on the General History of Humanity at the Cardinal Palace. Due to this friendship, Floresta is considered in the literature to have been a positivist thinker. However, Comte himself declared in a letter to Audiffrent on 29 March 1857 that Floresta had “all the indications of being a good disciple” if only he could “transform a little bit her metaphysical habits” (Floresta 1888b, p. 4). He also was hopeful that Floresta and her daughter would set up a positivist salon in Paris, but they never did.

Floresta traveled across Europe and wrote travel diaries in which she described the architecture and the history of the places she visited, interspersing these with critiques of European customs. These diaries are heavily biographical and are good sources of information about her life. In one of her travel diaries, she says that an Italian bishop recommended that her work *Conselhos à minha filha* be adopted by Italian schools (Lúcio 1999, p. 730). Floresta lived in

Europe for around 28 years, and in her intellectual circle we also find Georges Louis Duvernoy, Victor Hugo, Alexandre Dumas, and others. Almost all of Floresta's letters were lost in a shipwreck, so there is little to no information on the extent of her participation in French intellectual circles other than what she describes in her autobiographical works.

Floresta always wished to go back to Brazil, but she never lived in her homeland again.⁵ While in Europe, she sent her writings to the Brazilian press to have them published there. The newspapers would tell people about her life and her whereabouts. Later in Floresta's life, an American newspaper devoted to Portuguese-speaking immigrants in New York published an essay on her life and works. In this essay, Floresta is described as "a rare Brazilian writer" (*O Novo Mundo: Periodico Illustrato do Progresso da Edade*, 1872). Her books were acclaimed and received reviews. After she died, Floresta was cited by classical Brazilian authors such as Monteiro Lobato, Luis Camara Cascudo, and Gilberto Freyre. The second biographical essay on Floresta appeared in 1899, in a collection on illustrious Brazilian women by Ignez Sabino, *Illustrious Women from Brazil (Mulheres illustres do Brazil)*. It was in 1941 that a book-length biography appeared: Adauto da Câmara described Floresta's life and work in *História de Nísia Floresta*.⁶ The first modern edition of her works appeared only in 1989 when Peggy Sharpe wrote the introduction and notes to the republished version of *Opúsculo humanitário (Humanitarian Opuscule)* and Constância Lima Duarte wrote the introduction to *Direitos das mulheres e injustiça dos homens (Rights of Women and the Injustice of Men)*. For a long time Floresta's works were either rare or lost and only now are they being digitized in world libraries and preserved. Moreover, the city where Floresta was born, Papari, is now named after her and is called Nísia Floresta, which is also home to a museum in homage to her.

Although she did not live her whole life in Brazil, Floresta closely followed events in the country, connecting them to European and North American history. Through her writings, it is clear that she was interested in global history in order to better understand the customs of the nation and its class struggles. The key topics in her writings are women's rights and women's education, the

⁵ She paid a short visit to Brazil in 1852 but returned to France where she then lived. Floresta died and was buried in Rouen in 1885. Livia was buried next to her mother in the cemetery in Rouen. In 1954, the government of the state of Rio Grande do Norte in Brazil decided to pay homage to Floresta and demanded that her body be exhumed from the Rouen cemetery to be reburied in Brazilian soil. The Brazilian government celebrated the historical event with an official commemorative stamp and a memorial.

⁶ Henrique Castriciano (1979, p. 138) also wrote a biographical essay in 1930 (reprinted in 1979) and Oliveira Lima (1919) wrote one in 1919. Roberto Seidel (1938) published a small book (46 pages) on Nísia Floresta's life and works.

abolition of slavery, and Indigenous' rights. The historical moment in which Floresta was writing is a key period in the construction of Brazilian identity. Floresta was an intellectual of the early postcolonial period, who focused her scientific and philosophical efforts on trying to find ways out of the noxious social, economic, and cultural effects of colonization. As the country had recently become independent in the early 1800s, her works are foundational for the nascent Brazilian intellectual tradition.

2 Beyond the “Brazilian Wollstonecraft” Myth

Although there has been an effort to recover her works in the past few decades, the pseudonym Nísia Floresta is still surrounded by myths and misinformation. Floresta has been characterized as the Brazilian translator of Wollstonecraft for more than a century, and is associated with Wollstonecraft both for the wrong and the right reasons. Her first publication, *Direitos das mulheres e injustiça dos homens* (1832), which she dedicated to Brazilian women and Brazilian male academics, is described by Floresta herself – on the book cover – as a free translation of a French version of “Mistriss [*sic*] Godwin’s” work. As Mary Godwin was Mary Wollstonecraft’s married name, and since her work was known (but probably not read by many) in Brazilian political and intellectual circles, *Direitos* was accepted as Floresta’s free translation of Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), even though the first translation of Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication* to Brazilian Portuguese only appeared in the twenty-first century.⁷ Nevertheless, Floresta’s *Direitos* was the first feminist work to be published in Brazil and it contributed significantly to the spread of feminist ideas in the country and more widely in Latin America (Botting & Matthews 2014).

The recovery history of this book is a complex episode that illustrates Wollstonecraft’s reception in Brazil and recent research opens space for the study of arguments inspired by practical Cartesianism in the development of Brazilian feminism. In the 1980s, Constância Duarte, a Brazilian scholar, discovered that *Direitos* was not a direct translation of Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication* and suggested that Floresta’s free translation was actually a free appropriation of Wollstonecraft’s arguments. Duarte concluded that *Direitos* was Floresta’s original work even though it was inspired by the British feminist icon. However, because the works of other women philosophers have also been buried in silence and misinformation, it was only in 1996 that Maria Lúcia Pallares-Burke found out that the text was neither an original creation by

⁷ The translator of this first edition of Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication* to Brazilian Portuguese, published in 2016, is Ivania Pocinho Motta.

Floresta nor a translation of Wollstonecraft, but a literal translation of the first Sophia pamphlet, the *Woman Not Inferior to Man: Or, a Short and Modest Vindication of the Natural Right of the Fair-Sex* (1739).⁸ Even more recently, Botting and Matthews (2014) discovered the volume that served as a source for Floresta’s Portuguese translation: the French translation of Sophia’s *Women Not Inferior* by César Gardeton. Botting and Matthews found out that in Gardeton’s French translation, the source work was attributed to “Mistress Godwin,” Mary Wollstonecraft.

Given the information now available, one cannot say that Floresta is the translator of Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication*. It is also wrong to say that *Direitos* is Floresta’s original work or even an original free adaptation (Duarte 1995, 2021). One also cannot say that Floresta intentionally attributed the authorship of *Direitos* to Wollstonecraft as a literary prank (Pallares-Burke 1996). The fact is that Floresta translated the first pamphlet of the anonymous Sophia (Pallares-Burke 1996), a text that was considered, for a long time, to be a plagiarism of Poulain de la Barre’s *L’égalité des deux sexes* (Moore 1916) but is now interpreted as a version or an adaptation of the arguments present in the Cartesian-inspired text *L’égalité* with some original additions (O’Brien 2009, Leduc 2010, Broad 2022).

Floresta’s *Direitos* is a translation to Portuguese (1832) of the French translation (1826) by César Gardeton of the first English pamphlet of the anonymous Sophia published in 1739 (Botting & Matthews 2014). Floresta offered a literal translation of this French translation with just a few vocabulary adaptations with respect to the French source text (Soares 2017). Since the Wollstonecraft–Floresta myth is still being widely spread, it is important to highlight the fact that Floresta translated Gardeton’s version of the Sophia pamphlet with a great level of literality, so that we should assume them to be the same text in two different languages.

Soares (2017) argues that Floresta adapts the tone by simple translational operations that soften the meaning of more offensive words or expressions.

⁸ Leduc (2015) notes that

As to [Sophia]’s identity, it remains unknown. Some thought, yet without any proof, that it was a pen name used by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689–1762) . . . In 1964, Myra Reynolds had echoed another hypothesis suggesting that Lady [Sophia] Fermor (1721–1745), the daughter of Thomas, the Earl of Pomfret, and the second wife of Lord [John] Carteret, could be [Sophia] . . . Doris Mary Stenton suggests that [Sophia] was a man: “unlikely that a woman who felt deeply about the exclusion of women from all professions would have written like the so-called Sophia. . . . Another possibility is that the three writers were one and the same person since at the time it was a rhetorical game to write on both sides of a question.” But she concludes that “It remains impossible to prove either that the author of the three pamphlets was one and the same person or to reveal [Sophia]’s and her adversary’s identities.” (pp. 16–18)

There is more work to be done on this topic, but I will offer a basic comparison for illustrative purposes. The titles give us the first and more immediate evidence for the literality between Gardeton’s French and Floresta’s Portuguese translation of the Sophia pamphlet: while the French title is *Les droits des femmes, et l’injustice des hommes; par Mistriss Godwin. Traduit librement de l’Anglais* in Portuguese, it is *Direitos das mulheres e injustiça dos homens, por Mistriss Godwin, traduzido livremente do Francês*. The general structure of the texts also serves as additional evidence. Gardeton’s French translation contains an addition at the end, not translated by Floresta (“*augmenté d’un apologue: L’instruction sert aux femmes à trouver des maris*”). Floresta chose not to translate the addition authored by Gardeton (which, in English, would read “Education helps women to find husbands”). Finally, with respect to the arrangement of chapters, both the French (*Les droits*) and the Portuguese translations (*Direitos*) display a minor difference in structure – not in content – with respect to the *Woman Not Inferior* version printed in London in 1739, authored by the anonymous Sophia: while in *Woman Not Inferior* the first chapter is also the introduction, in Gardeton and Floresta the introduction comes before the first chapter. Also, in *Woman Not Inferior* the conclusion is numbered as chapter 8, while in Gardeton and Floresta the conclusion is unnumbered. Hence, in *Woman Not Inferior* there are eight chapters (including the introduction and conclusion) and in *Les droits/Direitos* there are six chapters, plus the introduction and conclusion. *Direitos* has a dedication that is not present in *Woman Not Inferior* nor in *Les droits*. This brief comparison serves the purpose of furthering the argument that *Direitos* and *Les droits* are neither translations nor versions of Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication*, but of the modern English pamphlet *Woman Not Inferior*.

It is not known why Gardeton, when translating the Sophia pamphlet from English to French, changed its title from *Woman Not Inferior* to *Les droites des femmes* and attributed its authorship to Wollstonecraft.⁹ It is possible that Gardeton was either assuming freedom as a translator or that his source text was anonymous and he decided to attribute authorship on the basis of its content. Or it could be that the source text available to Gardeton was itself

⁹ In one of the French translations of the Sophia pamphlets, *La femme n’est pas inférieure à l’homme: Traduit de l’anglois* (1750), credited to Madeleine de Puisieux, there is a handwritten note attributing authorship of the work to “Mistriss Godwin” (Wollstonecraft). In this volume, owned by the National Library of France (BNF), there is no mention of authorship of the content, of the translator, or of the publishing house. There is, however, information about the printing location, London, and there are handwritten notes attributing the authorship to “Mme. Godwin” and the translation to “the Puisieux” (either Philippe Florence or his wife Madeleine d’Arsant). Although there are other versions of this pamphlet with different titles (such as, for example, *Beauty’s Triumph, Les triomphe des dammes*), the first vindictory pamphlet of the anonymous Sophia is known by the title *Woman Not Inferior to Man*.

misattributed to Wollstonecraft – so that the misattribution of authorship was done by a third party. It is possible that there might be a lost version of the Sophia pamphlet with the title *Rights of Women and the Injustice of Men* that has been wrongfully attributed to Wollstonecraft by some editor and Gardeton translated the work literally, passing the mistaken attribution forward in his translation. What “free translation” means in each of these texts is a methodological problem still to be solved, since a freely translated text can mean either a literal translation with minor adaptations of vocabulary (as in Floresta’s case) or an adaptation of the original text that entails some degree of change in the theoretical content (the anonymous Sophia’s text in comparison to Poulain’s, for instance). On the front page of Gardeton’s volume, we read that he translated into French the eighth edition of the English text (“traduit librement de l’anglais, sur la huitième édition”). Hence, there is still a lot of archival work to be done to find out which eighth edition he possessed and at which point Wollstonecraft’s name started to be associated with and attributed to the first Sophia pamphlet.¹⁰

Botting and Cronin (2014) describe Gardeton’s translation as “the first ‘fake’ edition of Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication*” that is “actually a pirated copy of a French edition of Sophia’s 1739 *Woman not inferior to man*” (p. 316). But given that Gardeton translated it from the eighth edition, there is no evidence as yet that this French translator willingly created a fake copy of Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication*. A similarity between the titles of the translated books could also be a possible cause for the mistaken attribution of authorship. As we have seen, the word “vindication” appears on the subtitle of the first of the Sophia pamphlets, which reads, *a Short and Modest Vindication of the Natural Right of the Fair-Sex*. Also, the titles of Wollstonecraft’s and Sophia’s works, when translated into French, were changed, and in the course of various editions the titles of these works ended up bearing some resemblance. Finally, these texts were sometimes translated and published with no mention of authorship or of the name of their translators, creating greater confusion. Botting and Cronin (2014) also state that the “educator Nísia Floresta unwittingly translates Gardeton’s ‘fake’ edition of the *Rights of Woman*” which becomes “one of the founding documents of Brazilian feminism” (p. 316). They are correct in saying that Floresta did not know that she was not translating Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication*. On this brief reception history, they consider the founding document of Brazilian feminism to be the introduction Floresta wrote in *Direitos*.

¹⁰ See Botting 2012, Johnson 2020, and Bour 2022 on the reception history of Wollstonecraft in Europe and the translation history of the *Vindication*.