

# Rousseau, the Age of Enlightenment, and Their Legacies



ROBERT WOKLER

Edited by Bryan Garsten, and with an introduction by Christopher Brooke

Rousseau, the Age of  
Enlightenment, and Their Legacies

---

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Rousseau, the Age of Enlightenment, and Their Legacies

---

*Robert Wokler*

*Edited by Bryan Garsten, and with an introduction by Christopher Brooke*

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS  
PRINCETON AND OXFORD

Copyright © 2012 by Princeton University Press  
Published by Princeton University Press, 41 William Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540  
In the United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, 6 Oxford Street, Woodstock,  
Oxfordshire OX20 1TW

press.princeton.edu

All Rights Reserved

Cover art: Anicet-Charles Lemonnier (1743–1824), *The First Reading at Mme Geoffrin's  
of Voltaire's Tragedy 'L'Orphelin de la Chine'*, 1755 (oil on canvas) / Académie des  
Sciences et Belles Lettres, Rouen, France / Giraudon / The Bridgeman Art  
Library International

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Wokler, Robert, 1942–2006.

Rousseau, the Age of Enlightenment, and their legacies / Robert Wokler ; edited by  
Bryan Garsten; and with an introduction by Christopher Brooke.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and index.

ISBN 978-0-691-14788-8 (hardcover : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-691-14789-5  
(pbk. : alk. paper) 1. Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 1712–1778. 2. Enlightenment.

I. Garsten, Bryan. II. Title.

B2137.W65 2012

194—dc23 2011034661

British Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available

This book has been composed in Sabon

Printed on acid-free paper. ∞

Printed in the United States of America

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

## CONTENTS

---

<i>Foreword: Bryan Garsten</i>	vii
<i>Introduction: Christopher Brooke</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xv
<i>Abbreviations Used in Citations of Rousseau's Work</i>	xvii
1. Perfectible Apes in Decadent Cultures: Rousseau's Anthropology Revisited	1
2. Rites of Passage and the Grand Tour: Discovering, Imagining and Inventing European Civilization in the Age of Enlightenment	29
3. Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution	46
4. Vagabond Reverie	68
5. The Enlightenment Hostilities of Voltaire and Rousseau	80
6. Rousseau's Pufendorf: Natural Law and the Foundations of Commercial Society	88
7. Rousseau's Reading of the Book of Genesis and the Theology of Commercial Society	113
8. The Manuscript Authority of Political Thoughts	121
9. Preparing the Definitive Edition of the <i>Correspondance de Rousseau</i>	136
10. Rousseau's Two Concepts of Liberty	154
11. The Enlightenment and the French Revolutionary Birth Pangs of Modernity	185
12. Rousseau and Marx	214
13. Ernst Cassirer's Enlightenment: An Exchange with Bruce Mazlish	233
14. Isaiah Berlin's Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment	244
15. Projecting the Enlightenment	260
<i>Notes</i>	279
<i>Bibliography of the Published Work of Robert Wokler</i>	363
<i>Ind</i>	375

*This page intentionally left blank*

## FOREWORD

---

Robert Wokler was renowned for his brilliant oral performances at academic colloquia and for the elegant essays that often resulted when he set those performances, and the research behind them, down in prose. Too much of that prose has been difficult to find—dispersed in a whole variety of publications, many of which remain difficult to access even with modern technology. Near the end of his life, once it became clear that he would not have a chance to finish writing the books he had planned, Wokler conceived the idea of putting a number of his articles and essays together into one volume, so that they might together make their cumulative argument defending the Enlightenment and Rousseau's rightful place in it. He asked me to ensure that the project came to fruition.

In preparing these articles for re-publication, I have changed hardly anything in the prose—a few small revisions have been made, often on the basis of Wokler's own handwritten corrections to the published versions. The citations, however, have been edited a bit more assertively. Since the chapters were originally published in different venues and over a long period of time, the citation formats varied widely; in this volume they have been standardized. Since Wokler sometimes cited French editions of Rousseau's works that are now difficult to find, references to the standard Pléiade edition of Rousseau's *Oeuvres complètes* have been added. In addition, since not all readers can be presumed to have Wokler's fluency in various languages, citations of Rousseau's works in French have been supplemented with references to the corresponding pages of accessible English translations, using, whenever possible, editions that Wokler himself endorsed. And where Wokler quoted passages in the original French, German or Latin, this volume has added English translations, usually in the notes. These translations are drawn from existing English editions when possible, but if no source is given the translation is new. There were, in addition, several mistakes in the original citations that have been corrected in this re-publication. Editorial additions and translations appear in square brackets while minor corrections have simply been incorporated into the text.

The volume that you are holding represents our best effort to produce the book that Wokler envisioned. I say 'our' best effort because this project was very much a collaborative one. Ian Malcolm at Princeton University Press was quick to see the worth of the proposal and guided the project's first stages with his well-known insight and efficiency. Kimberly Williams at the Press put in many hours getting the essays into shape



for re-publication, and Dale Cotton, Hannah Paul, Al Bertrand and Lauren Lepow all provided wonderful assistance in bringing the project to completion. Tom Broughton-Willett skillfully prepared the index. Jeremy Jennings offered detailed reflections on the whole manuscript and helped to determine its final shape. Henry Hardy offered valuable advice drawn from his experience in publishing Isaiah Berlin's essays. Ryan Hanley and Jennifer Pitts, two historians of political thought whom Robert generously befriended and mentored at Yale, helped with the selection of articles and gave feedback on the Introduction. Stefan Eich, a Ph.D. student at Yale, found citations to English versions of passages that Wokler had cited, provided new translations of German quotations, and proofread the entire manuscript with great care. Christopher Brooke played a key role throughout, offering insightful advice on the structure of the volume, helping with editorial matters and translations, and, of course, writing the Introduction. Finally and crucially, Robert's sister Ann Wochiler was really nothing less than an editor herself; she put in countless hours of painstaking work on the manuscript and brought considerable insight into her brother's work to bear at every stage of the project. She also granted me access to her brother's papers, drafts and correspondence. The cooperation that propelled this volume forward is a testament to the generous scholar who inspired it and a sign of how important all of us think it is that his best thoughts reach the wide audience they deserve.

The essays in this volume are graceful, sinuous and rich, and so cannot easily be summarized. When taken all together, however, they make a coherent and forceful argument, one that Wokler may have articulated most sharply in his remarks on Alasdair MacIntyre's writings (reproduced here as chapter 15), where he wrote a sentence that might serve not only as a thesis statement for this volume, but also as a synopsis of his deepest conviction as a scholar: 'The moral chaos of the modern world', he remarked, 'stems not from the failure of the Enlightenment Project but from its neglect and abandonment'.

Bryan Garsten  
Yale University  
July 2011

## INTRODUCTION

---

CHRISTOPHER BROOKE

The French police began their round-up of stateless Jews in the summer of 1942. In Occupied France, thousands were brought to the *Vélodrome d'hiver* in Paris on 16 July pending their removal, first to the transit camp at Drancy, then to the death camps in Poland. In the Unoccupied Zone, the arrest of refugees by the Vichy authorities and their handover to the Germans began in August. In November, the demarcation line vanished when German and Italian forces invaded Vichy France as an immediate response to Allied landings in French North Africa. Isaac Wochiler was a refugee from Köln, who had left Germany in 1934, and, after working in Italy and Turkey, had come to France in 1938. Ilona Hoffer had been born in Budapest and grew up in Vienna, escaping from Austria after the Anschluss. They met in Paris—he was a dentist and she his patient—and, after being separated when Isaac joined a machine-gun unit to fight the German invasion, they were reunited in the south of France. They married in Marseilles, but fled from there in November 1942 when they learned that their names were on a list of Jews to be arrested, and their son Robert Lucien was born in Auch, not far from Toulouse, on 6 December 1942. Having been denounced by neighbours, the family fled to Grenoble, from where they crossed the Swiss frontier in a hay wagon. ‘We cannot turn our country into a sponge for Europe and take in for example 80 or 90 per cent of the Jewish refugees’, the head of the Federal Justice and Police Department had said.<sup>1</sup> But in early 1943 the Swiss were still prepared to grant sanctuary to a four-month-old stateless Jewish baby, together with his parents. Not all the family escaped the Holocaust: Robert’s maternal grandparents were among the millions murdered by the Nazis.

Robert Wokler, as he came to call himself, grew up in Paris and, later, San Francisco. He was a talented violinist and enrolled at the University of Chicago on a music scholarship. There, however, the charismatic Leo Strauss diverted him towards the study of the history of political ideas, which would engage him for the rest of his life. He graduated in 1964 and came to England to study, first, for a master’s degree with Michael Oakeshott and Maurice Cranston at the London School of Economics and, second, for a D.Phil at Nuffield College, Oxford, under the guidance of Isaiah Berlin and John Plamenatz. In 1971 he was appointed to a lectureship in the Government Department at the University of Manchester,

which was to be his base for more than a quarter of a century. There were, however, significant visits elsewhere. In the 1970s, there were two spells in Cambridge, in 1973–75 at Sidney Sussex College and in 1978–79 at Trinity, where he was close to Ralph Leigh, who was working on his epic edition of Rousseau's correspondence. In the 1990s, a more sustained period of migration began. His final years at Manchester were punctuated by visiting stints at the institutes for advanced research at Canberra, Princeton, Uppsala and Budapest; and, after taking early retirement in 1998, there were posts at Exeter, the Central European University in Budapest, the European University Institute in Florence and, finally, a senior lectureship at Yale. He died of cancer on 30 July 2006, aged sixty-three.

In an impressive doctoral dissertation, 'The Social Thought of Jean-Jacques Rousseau: An Historical Interpretation of His Early Writings', Wokler set out a framework for thinking about Rousseau that would sustain him over the course of his career. He was somewhat dismissive of the importance of the *Discourse on the Sciences and Arts*, which he judged a relatively trivial and derivative piece, and in the closing sections he argued that the crucible for the development of Rousseau's mature thought was not so much the composition of this *First Discourse* but rather the public debate that followed its sensational appearance in 1751, to which Rousseau himself made several contributions in reply to some of his critics, and through which he clarified and considerably sharpened many of his key ideas.<sup>2</sup> Those ideas found expression, above all, in four pieces written in the wake of this controversy—the *Second Discourse* ('On the Origins of Inequality among Men'), the unpublished *Essay on the Origins of Languages*, the *Letter on French Music* and the text known as the 'Geneva Manuscript', an early draft of what was eventually published as *The Social Contract*. The thesis argued that these four texts were the product of Rousseau's critical reflection on the writings of a number of his contemporaries, including the naturalist Buffon, the *Encyclopédiste* Diderot and the composer Rameau—and the violinist-turned-historian was ideally placed to make sense of the extensive writings on music, the subject on which Rousseau published more words than any other. Through his study of the surviving manuscripts and fragments in the archives in Switzerland, Wokler was able to construct a confident chronology of the development of Rousseau's ideas over this decisive period and to show just how intricately and intimately woven together were the various strands of his thinking about the origins of humankind, language, music and politics.

The doctorate provided a solid anchor for Wokler's later research career, and the themes he had explored in its pages resonated throughout his subsequent writings. He broadened out his examination of the Rousseau–Rameau debate, for example, to consider the whole of the so-called *Querelle des Bouffons*, the pamphlet war over the rival merits of French and

Italian opera that raged in Paris between 1752 and 1754.<sup>3</sup> Wokler also continued to develop his interest in the intersection between the Enlightenment's anthropology and its primatology. He was gripped by the thought that Rousseau's idea in the *Second Discourse* was not so much the received view that what appeared to be eighteenth-century orang-utans might in fact be savage humans in the state of nature, so much as that the earliest humans might themselves have been orang-utans—and he was delighted by the way in which some of the inferences that Rousseau had made about the lives of orang-utans would in the end come to be vindicated by post-war primatology. To his earlier work on the French context of Rousseau's speculations, Wokler would later add research on the analogous debates in the Scottish Enlightenment, where James Burnett, Lord Monboddo, had engaged in extensive and sometimes eccentric reflection on Rousseau's puzzles concerning orang-utans, the origins of language and the question of just what it was that made human beings distinctive from other animals.<sup>4</sup> Wokler would come to have things to say about Rousseau's other major works—*Julie*, *Emile* and, especially, *The Social Contract*—but it was the writings from the middle of the 1750s to which he would return again and again, the *Second Discourse* and the *Essay on the Origins of Languages* in particular, and it was these that formed the intellectual and spiritual core of what we might call Wokler's Rousseau.

Although they disagreed fundamentally about the nature and significance of Rousseau's theoretical achievement, Wokler was very much Isaiah Berlin's student, and he shared Berlin's instinct that the history of ideas could aspire to the highest standards of scholarship without ever losing touch with the extraordinarily rich human drama that it sought to describe. He also took after his teacher in another respect, for while both men struggled to present a systematic statement of their main ideas in book form, essays poured from their pens, with Wokler's appearing in a remarkable array of publications from *History of Political Thought* and *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* to *Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities* and the *Jewish Studies Yearbook* of the Central European University. Even the power of the Internet has not really managed to restore unity to this scattered collection, for only a small number of his major pieces are easily available through the major academic databases. The fact that so many of Wokler's published essays were the fruits of performances at various international academic gatherings, furthermore, may help to explain why some of them can be read aloud with considerable pleasure, but it also helps to illuminate yet another feature they share with Berlin's writings, which is their tendency towards the repetition of key ideas and arguments.<sup>5</sup>

Berlin's great never-to-be-completed book was his study of *The Roots of Romanticism*—and, as it happens, a manuscript from around 1950

that was posthumously published as *Political Ideas in the Romantic Age* was the subject of one of Wokler's final essays.<sup>6</sup> No single unfinished project seems to have haunted Wokler in quite the way that *The Roots of Romanticism* had haunted Berlin, but there were a number of books that he wanted to write and never managed to complete. One was *Rousseau's Enlightenment*, which was to have examined the diverse intellectual contexts of Rousseau's writings; another was on *The Enlightenment Roots of Anthropology*; a third was *The Transfiguration of the Body Politic*, in two volumes, a study of a conception of state power as the people's ghostly representative, with discussion ranging from the *golem* of Jewish folklore through Thomas Hobbes's fear of ghosts to the ritual mysteries surrounding the ballot in contemporary democratic elections.

Other projects had a more urgent political charge. Appalled by the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and by the inaction of the European powers, Wokler wanted to write the story of his mother's experiences during the Second World War as an indictment of indifference to suffering. He also planned to write on the academic careers of refugees from fascism and communism (including Berlin, as well as Ernst Cassirer and others), in a book that would have explored the parallels between this intellectual diaspora and that following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. The Enlightenment did have a unifying principle, Wokler contended, in its championing of toleration and its opposition to Louis XIV's attempt to produce a religiously cleansed Catholic France, and another unfinished book, *The Enlightenment Project and Its Critics*, was to have insisted on the importance of this point in opposition to the arguments deriving from Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer's *Dialectic of Enlightenment* that have presented the philosophy of the eighteenth century as somehow making possible the genocides and ethnic cleansings of the twentieth. In Wokler's view, the various fashionable criticisms of the Enlightenment, whether post-structuralist or 'communitarian', generally rested on an almost bottomless historical ignorance of the vitality and diversity of eighteenth-century thought; and the moment on which he focused his critical attention was 17 June 1789, the day the Third Estate in revolutionary Paris transformed itself into the National Assembly, and which he considered to be the day on which the internationalist promise of the Enlightenment was betrayed and the modern nation-state inaugurated, ushering in a world in which 'whole peoples without states—above all the Jews—would be doomed if ever such a creature should rise up against them'.<sup>7</sup>

There were various reasons why Wokler never finished the books he longed to write. One of them was that he was frequently caught up in other projects, sometimes other people's, and many of these were happily brought to publication. Of the collections he edited or co-edited, there were volumes to honour the memories of Berlin and of Ralph Leigh, on

Rousseau and freedom, on the origins of the human sciences and on the legacy of the Enlightenment, as well as the very substantial *Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, which was completed just before he died and published posthumously.<sup>8</sup> Wokler provided help to Maurice Cranston, who was working on a three-volume life of Rousseau, and it seems clear to me that the sections of that book that work best as intellectual biography are those parts that most clearly bear the imprint of that assistance.<sup>9</sup> He also worked on some of the final volumes of Leigh's edition of the Rousseau correspondence after its editor's death in 1987 and contributed to the creation of the Leigh collection in the Cambridge University Library, which was built around eight thousand volumes from Leigh's personal library and is now the major collection of eighteenth-century printed books by or about Rousseau outside Geneva. Wokler also re-edited John Plamenatz's *Man and Society* and, with John Hope Mason, published a valuable selection of Diderot's *Political Writings*.<sup>10</sup>

The two single-authored books that he did manage to publish were both on Rousseau, and they made a curious pair. One was a photographic reproduction of the text of his Oxford doctorate, which was published years later in 1987 by Garland as *Rousseau on Society, Politics, Music and Language*, and which I am sure that only a few people will ever have read. The other was his *Rousseau* for the Oxford 'Past Masters' series, first published in 1995 and later reissued in 2001 as *Rousseau: A Very Short Introduction*, a book that remains the best brief treatment of Rousseau's ideas that we possess. (This volume reproduces its sixth chapter, on 'Vagabond Reverie', which Wokler described as being 'as close to emulating Rousseau's own style as was in my power, subject also to the constraints of another language and the requirements of a work of contextual interpretation'.)<sup>11</sup>

Late in life, after he became ill, Wokler's publishing ambitions were scaled back to concentrate on the preparation of books based on his previously published writings. The selection of papers published here has its origins in a sketch for a volume that he drew up at Yale before he died. It has not been possible, however, to publish that volume just as it was first planned out. For reasons of space, and with considerable regret, we have felt obliged to leave out his long essay on Diderot's influence on Rousseau;<sup>12</sup> other papers that he suggested for inclusion overlapped with one another too much to make their publication between the same covers a sensible option; and there have been one or two other adjustments in order to include as many of his best and most characteristic essays in the selection. The papers by and large are printed as they were originally published, with only a small number of corrections based on remarks found on Wokler's own copies and in other surviving documents. One consequence of this desire to interfere as little as possible with his texts is

that a little repetition remains. There is a small overlap between the essay on ‘Rousseau’s Two Concepts of Liberty’ and on ‘Rousseau and Marx’, for example, but more commonly it is particular details from Rousseau’s own writing that Wokler relished and could not resist reproducing: around half a dozen times in the essays that follow he will remind us that in the *Essay on the Origins of Languages* it was savages that sang, ‘*aimez-moi*’ (love me!) and barbarians who muttered, ‘*aidez-moi*’ (help me!), but that we moderns can only grumble, ‘*donnez de l’argent*’ (hand over the money!).

The essays presented here cover the length of Wokler’s academic career from the 1970s (‘Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution’ and ‘Perfectible Apes in Decadent Cultures’) through to some of the last writing that he was able to complete before he died (‘Rousseau’s Reading of the Book of Genesis’ and ‘Rites of Passage and the Grand Tour’). They span the breadth of his writing from methodological reflections in ‘The Manuscript Authority of Political Thoughts’ to what might be thought to be journalism, for ‘The Enlightenment Hostilities of Voltaire and Rousseau’ was a feature written for the *Times Higher Educational Supplement* on the occasion of the bicentenary of the old antagonists’ deaths. And they include examples both of his various tributes to his mentors, such as ‘Isaiah Berlin’s Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment’, as well as of his more critical engagements with the scholars of his own time, here represented by ‘Projecting the Enlightenment’, an essay directed against Alasdair MacIntyre’s influential account of ‘the Enlightenment Project’ in his *After Virtue*. What the volume contains, therefore, can be reasonably considered a representative selection of Wokler’s published writings.

Certainly, it is a selection that shows off his characteristic virtues. In a world where so much academic writing is a thoroughly constipated affair, Wokler wrote prose that could serve as the vehicle for his formidable erudition, but which was always set out with elegance and a surprising lightness of touch. He could bring to life not only the arguments of his eighteenth-century philosophers but also those of the twentieth-century commentators with whom he engaged; and his writing was always quietly but thoroughly infused with that unusual variety of political commitment, the kind that contributes to, rather than gets in the way of, excellence in scholarship. Both Wokler’s Enlightenment and Wokler himself were cosmopolitan and humanitarian to their core; and he was, to my mind—a favourite Woklerian turn of phrase—the finest Rousseau scholar of his generation.

Christopher Brooke  
Kings College, Cambridge University  
November 2010



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

Thanks are due to the editors and publishers listed below for granting permission to reprint the essays in this volume, which were previously published as follows:

- Ch. 1: 'Perfectible Apes in Decadent Cultures: Rousseau's Anthropology Revisited', in 'Rousseau for Our Time', special issue, *Daedalus* 107.3 (Summer 1978): 107–34. © American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Ch. 2: 'Rites of Passage and the Grand Tour: Discovering, Imagining and Inventing European Civilization in the Age of Enlightenment', in Anthony Molho, Diogo Ramada Curto and Niki Koniordos (eds.), *Finding Europe: Discourses on Margins, Communities, Images, ca. 13th–ca. 18th Centuries*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2007, pp. 205–22.
- Ch. 3: 'Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution', in R. F. Brissenden and J. C. Eade (eds.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 4 (Papers presented at the Fourth David Nichol Smith Memorial Seminar, Canberra, 1976). Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979, pp. 251–83. © Australian National University.
- Ch. 4: 'Vagabond Reverie', ch. 6 of *Rousseau: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 131–50. By permission of Oxford University Press.
- Ch. 5: 'The Enlightenment Hostilities of Voltaire and Rousseau' (feature article), *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 29 September 1978, pp. 9–10.
- Ch. 6: 'Rousseau's Pufendorf: Natural Law and the Foundations of Commercial Society'. *History of Political Thought* 15.3 (Autumn 1994): 373–402. © Imprint Academic, Exeter, UK.
- Ch. 7: 'Rousseau's Reading of the Book of Genesis and the Theology of Commercial Society'. *Modern Intellectual History* 3.1 (April 2006): 85–94. By permission of Cambridge University Press.
- Ch. 8: 'The Manuscript Authority of Political Thoughts', in 'Scholastics, Enlightenment and Philosophic Radicals: Essays in Honour of J. H. Burns', special issue, *History of Political Thought* 20.1 (Spring 1999): 107–24. © Imprint Academic, Exeter, UK.
- Ch. 9: 'Preparing the Definitive Edition of the *Correspondance de Rousseau*', in *Rousseau and the Eighteenth Century: Essays in Memory of R. A. Leigh*,



- ed. Marian Hobson, J. T. A. Leigh and Robert Wokler. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1992, pp. 3–21. By permission of the Voltaire Foundation, University of Oxford.
- Ch. 10: ‘Rousseau’s Two Concepts of Liberty’, in George Feaver and Frederick Rosen (eds.), *Lives, Liberties and the Public Good*. Houndmills, Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1987, pp. 61–100, reproduced with permission of Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ch. 11: ‘The Enlightenment and the French Revolutionary Birth Pangs of Modernity’, in Johan Heilbron, Lars Magnusson and Björn Wittrock (eds.), *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity: Conceptual Change in Context, 1750–1850*, *Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook* 20, 1996. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998, pp. 35–76.
- Ch. 12: ‘Rousseau and Marx’, in David Miller and Larry Siedentop (eds.), *The Nature of Political Theory* (essays in honour of John Plamenatz). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983, pp. 219–46. By permission of Oxford University Press.
- Ch. 13: ‘Ernst Cassirer’s Enlightenment: An Exchange with Bruce Mazlish’. *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 29 (2000): 335–48. By permission of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies.
- Ch. 14: ‘Isaiah Berlin’s Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment’, in *Isaiah Berlin’s Counter-Enlightenment*, ed. Joseph Mali and Robert Wokler (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 93.5). Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2003, pp. 13–31.
- Ch. 15: ‘Projecting the Enlightenment’, in John Horton and Susan Mendus (eds.), *After MacIntyre*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994, pp. 108–26.

## ABBREVIATIONS USED IN CITATIONS OF ROUSSEAU'S WORK

---

- OC Citations to Rousseau's works in French have, whenever possible, been taken from the *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–95).

To aid readers without easy access to Rousseau's *Oeuvres complètes*, the editor of this volume has added references to English language translations in square brackets alongside the author's original citations.

The abbreviations that appear in citations refer to the following editions of Rousseau's works in English. Wherever possible, editions that the author has cited in print and therefore implicitly approved have been used.

- AE 'Articles from the *Encyclopedia*,' in *Essay on the Origin of Languages and Writings Related to Music*, trans. John T. Scott, vol. 7 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 198–221.
- C *The Confessions*, trans. J. M. Cohen (London, 1953).
- DB 'Fragments for a Dictionary of Terms of Usage in Botany', in *The Reveries of the Solitary Walker, Botanical Writings, and Letter to Franquières*, trans. Charles Butterworth, Alexandra Cook and Terence Marshall, vol. 8 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 100–29.
- DI *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality Among Men*, in *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 111–22.
- DM *Dictionary of Music*, in *Essay on the Origin of Languages and Writings Related to Music*, trans. John T. Scott, vol. 7 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 366–485.
- DSA *Discourse on the Sciences and Arts*, in *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 1–110.
- E *Emile or On Education*, trans. with notes and an introduction by Allan Bloom (London, 1991).

- EOL *Essay on the Origin of Languages*, in *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 247–99.
- ES *Emile and Sophie; or, The Solitaires*, in *Emile or On Education: Includes Emile and Sophie, or the Solitaires*, vol. 13 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 685–722.
- ETP ‘Examination of Two Principles Advanced by M. Rameau,’ in *Essay on the Origin of Languages and Writings Related to Music*, trans. John T. Scott, vol. 7 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 271–88.
- GM ‘Geneva Manuscript’, in *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 153–61.
- J *Julie, or the New Heloise*, trans. Philip Stewart and Jean Vaché, vol. 6 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010).
- JP *Judgment on the Polysynody*, in *The Plan for Perpetual Peace, On the Government of Poland, and Other Writings On History and Politics*, trans. Christopher Kelly and Judith Bush, vol. 11 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 91–99.
- LD *Politics and the Arts: Letter to M. d’Alembert on the Theatre*, trans. with notes and an introduction by Allan Bloom (Ithaca, N.Y., 1977).
- LFM *Letter on French Music*, in *Essay on the Origin of Languages and Writings Related to Music*, trans. John T. Scott, vol. 7 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 141–74.
- LG *Letter to M. Grimm on the Subject of the Remarks Added to his Letter on Omphale*, in *Essay on the Origin of Languages and Writings Related to Music*, trans. John T. Scott, vol. 7 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 121–32.
- LV *Letter to Voltaire*, in *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 232–46.
- LWM *Letters Written From the Mountain*, in *Letters to Beaumont, Letters Written From the Mountain, and Related Writings*, ed. Christopher Kelly and Eve Grace, trans. Christopher Kelly and Judith Bush, vol. 9 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed.

- Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 131–306.
- ML *Moral Letters*, in *Autobiographical, Scientific, Religious, Moral and Literary Writings*, trans. Christopher Kelly, vol. 12 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 175–203.
- LR ‘Last Reply’, in *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 63–85.
- P *Considerations on the Government of Poland*, in *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 177–260.
- PCC ‘Plan for a Constitution for Corsica’, in *The Plan for Perpetual Peace, On the Government of Poland, and Other Writings On History and Politics*, trans. Judith Bush, Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly, vol. 11 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 123–55.
- PE *Discourse on Political Economy*, in *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 3–38.
- PEM ‘Project for the Education of Monsieur de Sainte-Marie’, in *Autobiographical, Scientific, Religious, Moral and Literary Writings*, trans. Christopher Kelly, vol. 12 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 116–29.
- PN ‘Preface to Narcissus’, in *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 92–106.
- R *Reveries of the Solitary Walker*, trans. with an introduction by Peter France (London, 1979).
- RJ *Rousseau, Judge of Jean-Jacques: Dialogues*, trans. Judith Bush, Christopher Kelly and Roger Master, vol. 1 of *The Collected Writings of Rousseau*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly (Hanover, N.H., 1990–2010), pp. 1–258.
- SC *Of the Social Contract*, in *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 39–152.
- SW ‘The State of War’, in *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*, ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 162–76.

*This page intentionally left blank*

Rousseau, the Age of  
Enlightenment, and Their Legacies

---

*This page intentionally left blank*

PERFECTIBLE APES IN DECADENT CULTURES:  
ROUSSEAU'S ANTHROPOLOGY REVISITED<sup>1</sup>

I

The diffusion of Rousseau's influence over the past two centuries has been so wide and so substantial that hardly a subject or movement appears to have escaped his clutches. According to the old litany, he was responsible only for nationalism, romanticism, collectivism and the French Revolution; now a good many of his admirers, and some of his critics too, inform us that psychiatry and structuralism are also derived largely from his writings; and in the past generation we have witnessed yet another monumental proclamation on his behalf—to the effect that he founded the science of anthropology. In his 'extraordinarily modern view of the passage from nature to culture',<sup>2</sup> Rousseau posed the central problem of that discipline, writes one of its most distinguished practitioners today, Claude Lévi-Strauss. By focusing upon both his own psychic state and character, on the one hand, and the behaviour of savage peoples, on the other, he sought to define the inward and outward limits of mankind, not for the sake of ascertaining our origins but in order to establish the essence of humanity itself within these boundaries. He perceived the polarities between our animal and moral attributes, between our sentimental and rational traits and in general between our natural and cultural patterns of behaviour, along lines which have marked the development of the human sciences ever since and which, moreover, distinguish the perspective of the anthropologist, according to Lévi-Strauss, from the approaches of the moralist and the historian in their investigations of the affairs of men. Of course these general claims about the field will not command universal assent from their author's colleagues, and they may admit of several possible interpretations anyway; but at least there can be little doubt that the writings of Rousseau have exercised a profound influence upon the anthropology of Lévi-Strauss himself. For he has expounded this view of Rousseau's contribution not only in an article devoted specifically to the subject<sup>3</sup> and in the passage from *Le Totémisme aujourd'hui* which is cited here, but similarly at points throughout his major writings from *Tristes tropiques* to *L'Origine des manières de table*, where—in the last case—splendid



citations from *Emile* are employed to introduce the theme of nearly every chapter.

Thus is introduced a whole new world in which the spread of Rousseauism has still to be traced, and the task confronting historians of ideas would already be sufficiently daunting, therefore, were it not for the fact that almost precisely the opposite interpretation of the significance of Rousseau's account of man has been even more recently propounded by Robert Ardrey—that arch-enemy of cultural anthropology in general. Ardrey dedicates one of his latest works, appropriately entitled *The Social Contract*, to the memory of Rousseau and praises the real modernity and 'visionary' character of his thought because of its focus upon our roots in nature rather than our passage to culture. Rousseau 'pondered over the way of the animal as of significance to the way of man'<sup>4</sup> and hence two centuries before the coming of ethology glimpsed a truth which is today wilfully ignored by so-called social scientists—the truth that genetically established forms of behaviour are manifest in human societal systems as well as in the societies of all other organisms.<sup>5</sup> What ought to be studied, according to Ardrey, are the relations between individuals that stem from the innate and universal attributes of animal life, whereas cultural anthropologists who detect a fundamental discontinuity between mankind and other zoological species are just impervious to the revolutionary ideas of Darwinism which have reverberated throughout all the life sciences apart from their own.

Now the gulf that separates Lévi-Strauss and Ardrey is in certain respects less wide than I have so far suggested, and my remarks require at least some qualification. For one thing, Lévi-Strauss has deliberately, if only slightly, modified his views about the distinction between nature and culture which he first expounded in detail in *Les Structures élémentaires de la parenté* in 1949, and in his more recent writings he has been as much concerned to stress the inseparability of culture from the nature of humanity in one sense as to point to the hiatus between them in another. Ardrey, for his part, has clearly altered his own views on Rousseau in the course of his career, for in his ethological writings both before and after *The Social Contract* he describes Rousseau's conception of man's original goodness (or the idea of the noble savage, on his account) as actually underlying what he takes to be the centrally false perspective of cultural anthropology,<sup>6</sup> and even in *The Social Contract* itself he seems to admire Rousseau's approach to the study of human nature only grudgingly and credits him more for the questions he posed than the solutions he provided.<sup>7</sup> So far as I know, Lévi-Strauss and Ardrey have never really addressed themselves directly to each other's views, either about anthropology in general or Rousseau in particular,<sup>8</sup> and it would in any case be a

mistake to regard their respective claims as expressing a consensus of opinion that divides anthropologists and ethologists as a whole, since both figures (especially Ardrey, who has come to his subject as an amateur and popularizer relatively late in life) have their critics within their own disciplines as well as across them.

The chief principles that distinguish the work of the two men in their analyses of human nature remain, nevertheless, fundamental and decisive. If only in a general way, they even express the most striking dichotomies between the interests of cultural anthropologists and ethologists in turn: that is, myths, rituals, kinship systems, languages and social institutions of savage peoples, on the one hand, and the feeding and sexual behaviour, patterns of dominance and submission, territorial control and, arguably, aggression, perceived across a wide spectrum of animal species—often including man (the naked ape)—on the other. And while these discrepancies may, as a rule, be based more on differences of subject matter in each case than on divergences of methodology, I think it is at least clear that Lévi-Strauss and Ardrey hold essentially conflicting views of what has proved valuable in the contribution made by Rousseau to the study of human nature and behaviour.

Perhaps some historians of Rousseau's influence would regard such antithetical praise as evidence of the immensely broad sweep and complex texture of his philosophy as a whole—as if, like Zimri in Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*, he was 'A man so various that he seemed to be / Not one, but all mankind's epitome'. In my view, however, such a rich profusion of ideas would imply more inconsistency than breadth or profundity; if the interpretations of Lévi-Strauss and Ardrey were both accurate, then Rousseau's reflections, by admitting so much and rejecting too little, ought to be less worthy of serious acclaim. In fact, his conception of human nature *is* profound and subtle, I believe, not because it anticipates the views of Lévi-Strauss and Ardrey together, but largely because it excludes the bias of each; the two men, in their different ways, overlook a crucial element of his account of our nature and origins, while focusing upon—and indeed misinterpreting—only one aspect of his thought as if it were the most vital. For Rousseau perceived a historical connection between the animal and cultural features of humanity, and between our physical evolution and social development, which led him to construct a comprehensive anthropological theory remarkably original in his own day, and, in my judgement, still worthy of critical investigation now. My aim here will be to sketch what I take to be the leading features of that theory in the intellectual context which at once most clearly establishes their meaning and, I think, elucidates their significance as well.

## II

It is sometimes suggested that our differing assessments of the natural and cultural determinants of human behaviour have their foundation in ancient philosophy. Such distinctions as were drawn between nature and custom by Plato, for instance, or between nature and art by Aristotle, are said to underlie the fundamental assumptions that still mark off the natural from the social sciences, while claims about the animal origins of human conduct, or about the instinctual roots of social life, can also be traced to the ancient doctrine of an unbroken *scala naturae* which was supposed to join together all living creatures through a succession of anatomical approximations linked to behavioural similarities as well. It is today much less widely appreciated, however, that one of the main points at issue in the Enlightenment controversies about human nature and culture was the character of the relation between mankind and the great apes. In the 1670s Sir William Petty was still able to argue that the second place in Nature's ladder was actually filled by elephants rather than apes, since, apart from their shape, elephants displayed greater signs of humanity.<sup>9</sup> Yet by the 1680s and 1690s few commentators on the subject still doubted that apes resembled men more closely than did any other creatures, and anthropological interest over the next century came to be directed largely to the question of how we might be connected with, or distinguished from, those animals most immediately adjacent to us in the natural world. The great majority of scientific figures of the period—including Tyson, Buffon, Bonnet, Herder and Blumenbach—followed Claude Perrault<sup>10</sup> in contending that our exercise of reason and command of language proved our superiority over the apes, since despite the anatomical similarities between these animals and men they lacked the mental capacity to think or speak which was peculiar to our species. A number of scientists and philosophers, however, such as Linnaeus, La Mettrie, Monboddo and Camper, challenged this perspective of a decisive intellectual gulf between man and beast, sometimes maintaining that infant apes could in principle be trained to speak, sometimes contending, on the contrary, that they could never be so trained, but only because of anatomical or physiological factors rather than any spiritual deficiencies.

The history of these eighteenth-century controversies has been sadly ignored by most anthropologists, no doubt because they regard, or would regard, them as preceding the emergence of their subject around the distinctive questions and problems which have since established its coherence. But the Enlightenment debates about apes, men and language did not only antedate the anthropological researches of the next period; they very substantially gave rise to the subject in its present forms. For as

speculative philosophies regarding our place in Nature came in the late eighteenth century to be superseded by comparative anatomy, by first-hand observations of the behaviour of apes and by more extensive investigations into the cultures of primitive peoples, the attention of scientists came gradually to be drawn away from the apparently gross distinctions between apes and men and at the same time towards the seemingly finer variations which mark off one type of man from another. Around the turn of the nineteenth century, that is, with the exhaustion of the Enlightenment discussions of the primate limits of humanity, anthropology came instead to be focused upon the boundaries and distinctions within our species, upon the study of races, in effect, rather than the study of apes and language. And the controversies about human origins and savage societies that have raged since then in both physical and cultural anthropology, while often of immense significance in themselves, have seemed collectively to be at least internal to the discipline and, in their avowedly empirical character, distinct from the approaches to the study of man's nature that had prevailed before.

Yet for at least two reasons it seems to me regrettable that contemporary investigations of primitive cultures and hominid fossils should generally take such little stock of their own historical roots in Enlightenment philosophies of man: first, because, in attempting to establish the zoological frontiers of humanity, eighteenth-century thinkers were characteristically more concerned with defining the scope of their subject than many social anthropologists are today; and, second, because their definitions were more clearly addressed to the idea of language conceived as a cultural barrier or bridge between animals and men than is often the case now in the writings of physical anthropologists and ethologists alike. Enlightenment commentators, that is, directed their attention more to the conceptual boundaries of humanity than to the geographical outposts of civilization, and they did not take it for granted that a study of man's nature should consist basically of the examination of societies in the remote peripheries of the modern world. By addressing themselves to language as the most central manifestation of our capacity for culture, moreover, they were careful to avoid comparisons between men and apes which dealt exclusively with anatomical structures or with similarities of non-verbal behaviour. Enlightenment anthropologists, in short, perceived their subject plainly in terms of the relation between the biological and social characteristics of man, without supposing that human nature was either an assemblage of instincts or a product of culture.<sup>11</sup> It is this conjunction of approaches that forms the most striking feature of eighteenth-century speculation about mankind, as I see it—nowhere more conspicuously, or with greater profundity, than in the writings of Rousseau. What is fundamentally missing from the panegyric of Lévi-Strauss is a proper

recognition of the importance of Rousseau's account of our physical development as a species in the context of his anthropology as a whole; what is absent from the tribute paid to him by Ardrey is an understanding of why culture fills so prominent a place in his philosophy. In the next two sections I shall examine the ideas advanced by Rousseau on both of these subjects and then conclude with some remarks about his conception of the links between the physical and cultural evolution of man.

### III

The main point I wish to stress about Rousseau's view of our physical evolution is that it is based on a set of conjectures to the effect that the human race may have descended from apes. By the mid-eighteenth century it was already widely known that some species, such as the mastodon, had become extinct and that others, like the camel, had undergone a certain metamorphosis as a consequence of selective breeding and domestication by man. In fact most of the then prevailing monogenist accounts of the origins of humanity stipulated that the manifest variations between types of men were attributable to the cumulative effect of what later came to be termed the inheritance of acquired characters, transmitted over many generations. Rousseau, however, was the first and, I believe, the only, major figure of the Enlightenment who inferred from such intraspecific differences that mankind might actually have evolved from some form of animal. His contemporaries interpreted the same evidence only as proof of natural deformation, with comparisons between human development and animal domestication showing no more than that subdivisions of our race must have declined from their original condition—in essence that the non-white communities of individuals which inhabited the more torrid or desolate areas of the earth must have degenerated from an original single stock. Naturalists in the eighteenth century often contrasted the flora and fauna of the New World unfavourably with related species in the Old, and so, too, they regarded non-European men and women as generally inferior copies of an older race.<sup>12</sup> The social customs of aboriginal peoples were occasionally held up for praise by commentators who preferred their apparently natural and simple manners to the refined frippery of advanced cultures, and some observers also depicted wild natives of tropical forests as more like apes and monkeys in their appearance and behaviour than like civilized men. But no one in the Enlightenment before Rousseau suggested that such primitive and animal features of the savage state might imply that our true progenitors were really apes. For however close the resemblances might seem, and however much speculation there might be about the imperceptible nuances between

species in the natural chain, it was in the Enlightenment taken for granted that the chain as a whole was essentially fixed and static, that its main links were points of cleavage rather than conjunction and that man and ape were separated by a qualitative gulf which, as Buffon put it, even Nature could not bridge.<sup>13</sup>

Rousseau, nevertheless, was convinced that the apparent diversity between types of men throughout the world, and, even more significantly, the marked likeness between some of these types and certain species of ape, justified our forming a quite different conclusion. If we recognized that a great number of the variations between our bodily traits might be attributable to the discrepancies between the climate, forms of nourishment and general modes of life which prevailed in widely separated parts of the globe, then why should we not conceive the possibility, which such ancient authors as Herodotus and Ctesias had attested anyway, of still more striking differences in the past?<sup>14</sup> In his *Discours sur l'inégalité* of 1755 he admitted that it would be extremely difficult to trace the course of the material metamorphoses undergone by man, since the study of comparative anatomy was still so rudimentary that we could only make the most vague conjectures about this subject. Just the same, he believed that there must have been marked changes or 'successive developments' in the physical organization of the human body, all of which would have drawn us away from the 'first embryo of the species'.<sup>15</sup> Some of these transformations, he observed, would have been embodied in our faculties rather than our appearance, so that savages must originally have had powers of sight, hearing, and smell more subtle than our own senses, and even now whole peoples, such as Hottentots, were able to see as far with the naked eye as Europeans with a telescope. Other changes, however, would have been perfectly conspicuous in our external features alone. Thus while Rousseau regarded the claims about the existence of pygmies as only a 'fable' or at best an 'exaggeration', the evidence of exceptionally tall individuals in his own day suggested to him that somewhere in the world (perhaps in Patagonia) there are, or might once have been, nations of giants. We even had reason to believe, he added, that differences between particular individuals within our species were sometimes sharper than the differences between some men and some beasts, an observation which the reports of travellers tended to confirm, in so far as they described the state of most of the savages they surveyed as that of animals in general.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, because the taming of mankind has been accomplished by agents whose victims include themselves together with members of other species as well, the distinction between primitive and civilized man was, for Rousseau, possibly even greater than the difference between wild animals and beasts of burden. For by making other creatures serve us, he supposed, we had only fashioned a steeper path of decline from our

natural state; we had bred livestock to satisfy our artificial needs and had thereby made our senses still more dull and our constitutions more frail, so that in modern society we are hardly any longer even animals of a certain degenerate kind, but only pets, or prey, broken in by ourselves—weak, docile, fattened and fleeced.<sup>17</sup>

Now, Rousseau's account of the civilization of humanity as a self-imposed form of domestication points to one of the most original elements of his anthropological theory. For if *l'homme sauvage* and *l'homme civil* were distinguished not only by their social characteristics but also by their bodily traits, and if it was the case that the difference between them is even greater than the divergence between wild and tamed animals of the same species, then it followed for him that the physical properties and faculties which set mankind apart from all other creatures might in fact be less sharply defined than most commentators on this subject had supposed. We still had so much to learn about the several widely disparate kinds of men scattered all over the world, Rousseau insisted, that it was absurd for us to make categorical judgements about the inherent qualities which were necessarily typical of our race in general. At the same time, until we had more reliable evidence about the anatomy and mode of life of creatures reported by travellers to resemble man, we could only be uncertain in our assessments of which natural qualities distinguished humanity from the realm of beasts. He contended that at least some of the animals which had a constitution similar to our own were quite possibly varieties of the human species itself, and in his speculations about this subject, both in the *Discours* and in his later 'Lettre à Philopolis', he focused his attention particularly upon the creature which he described as an orang-utan.<sup>18</sup>

Drawing at length upon the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century African voyages of Andrew Battel, Olfert Dapper and Girolamo Merolla as recounted in the abbé Prévost's *Histoire générale des voyages*,<sup>19</sup> Rousseau put forward the hypothesis that the large Congolese animals described by these travellers, and taken to be of the same family as the 'Orang-Outangs of the East Indies', might really be human beings like the rest of us. A number of modern commentators had imagined that orang-utans and their pongo brethren 'occupy some intermediate place between mankind and the baboons', but Rousseau observed that in the ancient world these same creatures, then called satyrs, fauns, and the like, were held to be divine, and further research, he argued, might confirm that their true place on Nature's ladder was between that of brutes and gods—in other words that they were men. In any case Rousseau was most impressed by the extent to which his authorities were agreed about the orang-utan's 'human countenance' and its striking and 'exact' physical 'resemblance to man'. For if it was true that the animal was in so many respects just like a man, then why should we not accept at least a *prima facie* case for its humanity?<sup>20</sup>

Scientists in the Enlightenment generally agreed with Buffon's lofty proclamation that ours was the most noble species set apart from all the rest, on the grounds that there could be no hybrid progeny resulting from the sexual union of a man or woman with any beast. For Rousseau, on the other hand, this was a matter which had still to be ascertained; we could only establish by experiment, he insisted, whether matings between ourselves and orang-utans would prove fruitful.<sup>21</sup> Neither was he deterred by the monogenist contention that the progenitors of modern man must originally have been white, and in this regard he did not even have to confront the thesis—which Buffon, once again, had already rejected—that apes might represent a stage in the physical degeneration of man beyond that of the Negro.<sup>22</sup> While most eighteenth-century naturalists were adamant in holding to the view that orang-utans were beneath the level of humanity because they lacked the capacity to think and speak like men, Rousseau maintained that our savage ancestors were unlikely to have been wiser or more loquacious than orang-utans, since both reason and speech were just '*facultés virtuelles*,'<sup>23</sup> which must have undergone a long history of development in complex social settings before they could have become manifest in our behaviour. We could not point to the languages of civilized peoples as proof of the sub-humanity of orang-utans, because linguistic competence must be mastered and in itself is not a natural characteristic of our race. Hence the apparently mute condition of the orang-utan could be explained merely in terms of the creature's scant opportunity to employ and develop those vocal organs which it shared with the rest of us, and on Rousseau's account that condition lent no support at all to the thesis that Nature had formed a great and unbridgeable gulf between mankind and ape. Indeed, the fact that apes were speechless might be attributable, not so much to their want of training, as to their perfectly rational choice. For according to Negro observers it was a 'trick of monkeys', he later remarked, to pretend that they cannot speak, though they really can, 'out of fear that they might otherwise be made to work'.<sup>24</sup>

Of course since Rousseau probably never saw a true orang-utan, and since his account of the creature's behaviour was drawn from statements of observers who disagreed among themselves, his reflections about its capacities must be treated with a little scepticism and reserve. It was not until the 1770s that a sufficient number of live specimens came to be available in Europe for detailed and reliable studies to be undertaken,<sup>25</sup> and it was not until after Rousseau's death that scientists came to agree that the animal was definitely a species of ape different from the chimpanzee, with which Rousseau, Buffon and their contemporaries had confused it. But the originality, if not the significance, of Rousseau's comments about the humanity of orang-utans was widely recognized in the late



eighteenth century. Some critics treated his remarks with scorn, and in the 1760s he suffered the indignity of having a letter falsely ascribed to him signed 'ROUSSEAU, jusqu'à ce jour . . . Citoyen de Genève, mais à présent, ORANG-OUTANG';<sup>26</sup> others, like Herder, Bonnet and Blumenbach, challenged them on a variety of grounds dealing largely with mental or physiological factors underlying the linguistic incompetence of apes; and a few, most notably Monboddo, braved the ridicule and actually endorsed these ideas, though generally in support of claims about the evolution of language rather than the physical development of man. By the early nineteenth century Rousseau's speechless ape had vanished from scientific speculation about our origins, only to reappear soon afterwards as a silent hero in English satirical fiction.<sup>27</sup>

In the present context, however, two important points should be borne in mind about this account of the humanity of orang-utans. The first is that Rousseau's elaborate commentary in the *Discours sur l'inégalité* forms one of the earliest and boldest sets of conjectures regarding the physical transformation of mankind in an age when most arguments about the natural chain of being remained fundamentally wedded to a belief in the fixity of species. Arthur Lovejoy's excellent history of that idea rightly points to a variety of ways in which the chain was apparently temporalized in the eighteenth century, so that a supposition previously regarded as only portraying Nature's inventory itself underwent a metamorphosis in the Enlightenment and became for the first time a theory that gave expression to her still uncompleted programme.<sup>28</sup> Yet none of Lovejoy's illustrations actually point directly to any cases, or even principle, of evolution from one species to another; all of them, rather, are either more widely focused upon the panorama of organic development throughout the whole of Nature, as was the vision of Leibniz, for instance, or else are more narrowly concentrated upon the succession of physical transformations within distinct species, as was Robinet's conception. Rousseau was, I believe, the first Enlightenment figure to suppose that there might be a sequential relation between *particular* species, and the first, moreover, to conceive that the last link in the natural chain—that is, the relation between apes and men—might be one of genetic continuity.

Of course we must not credit Rousseau with a full-fledged theory of human evolution. For one thing, he supposed that modern man could have developed from certain animal species still present in the contemporary world, rather than from any ancestral prototypes or extinct forebears of the hominoid superfamily in general.<sup>29</sup> For another, he believed that apes and men were together zoologically distinct from all other species, and that monkeys could not possibly be counted among our progenitors, because they lacked the attribute of perfectibility, which was characteristic of the highest primates in all their forms, but of the highest

primates alone.<sup>30</sup> On Rousseau's interpretation, in short, our roots could not be traced to so distant a source in the earth's past nor to so low a place on Nature's ladder as commentators since the time of Darwin have perceived, and, paradoxically perhaps, his conception of the mutability of humanity as against the constancy of Nature incorporated a rather less dramatic view of the organic changes that effected our creation than of the geological evolution of our planet as a whole. At any rate, Rousseau's account of men as descended from apes provided a temporal perspective of the relation between the two species which was exactly opposite to the only course previously considered—that is, the idea that apes might be degenerate men—and it thus marked a significant milestone among Enlightenment accounts of our origins. In the 1790s such figures as William Smellie, one of Buffon's translators and an important biologist in his own right, no longer had much difficulty in conceiving orang-utans to be primitive members of our species, but scientific critics of the doctrine soon won the upper hand, and by the early nineteenth century the sub-humanity of the great apes had been reaffirmed.<sup>31</sup>

The second notable point in this context is that Rousseau's portrait of the orang-utan as a kind of savage in the state of nature was drawn with greater accuracy than any description of the animal's behaviour for a further two hundred years or so—a fact all the more remarkable because there is no reason to suppose that he ever actually saw one. He followed other commentators of his day in recognizing the orang-utan's natural habitat to be the tropical forest, but while most of his contemporaries were agreed about the creature's promiscuity, Rousseau alone in the eighteenth century inferred that it never formed lasting sexual attachments—or permanent pair-bonds—with other members of its species.<sup>32</sup> Some naturalists of the period imagined that orang-utans were carnivorous in their diet and aggressive in their conduct, but Rousseau had no doubt that they were frugivorous and generally peaceable animals.<sup>33</sup> Not until the publication of Wallace's *The Malay Archipelago* in 1869, moreover, was it confirmed that orang-utans are nomadic beasts without clearly delimited territorial ranges, again as Rousseau had already perceived in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*.<sup>34</sup> And not until the late 1960s was it established that Rousseau had been right all along in his guess that orang-utans even lack any distinct social system and that, apart from copulations, their lives are essentially solitary and indolent.<sup>35</sup>

I have in this section tried to sketch a few of the more striking features of Rousseau's physical anthropology ignored by Lévi-Strauss, but I think these same elements of his argument point even more sharply to some of the major shortcomings of Ardrey's ethological approach. For it seems to me quite significant that a person so passionately convinced, as he is, of mankind's basic territorial, aggressive and socially competitive nature<sup>36</sup>

should find so little confirmation of any territorial impulse, or genetically coded forms of aggression, or inequalitarian social relations, among those creatures most akin to us in the animal world, least of all among orang-utans. With perfect justification Ardrey observes that recent fossil discoveries suggest that arboreal apes and terrestrial men have been environmentally separated for some 20 million years or more and have therefore evolved along different behavioural paths as well; some of the consequences of this environmental separation, such as the fact that we have become omnivorous hunters in the course of our history, were indeed perceived by Rousseau himself.<sup>37</sup> But it remains the case that all the available scientific evidence—from palaeontology, comparative anatomy, genetics, biochemistry, immunology and the like—confirms what in a sense appears obvious anyway: that mankind is more closely related to the great apes than to any other living species. The truth of Ardrey's general claims about man's basically animal nature, therefore, can only seem rather tenuous in so far as they so commonly rely upon analogies drawn from the behaviour of slime moulds or penguins in preference to studies of the highest non-human primates. At least in his own writings the great apes in general, and orang-utans in particular, have once again become the missing link, and Ardrey appears to be most discomfited by this situation, reflecting in his latest work that it is 'all a bit too Rousseauesque'<sup>38</sup> for his stomach. His explanations for the reconstructed but now inverted barrier between brutish men and angelic apes, moreover, are implausible when taken separately and inconsistent when taken together. For they range, on the one hand, from the claim that the gorilla, chimpanzee and orang-utan are, after all, only 'evolutionary failures' approaching their natural 'extinction' (much like their human counterparts in amiable societies upon whom anthropologists have so mistakenly lavished their attention), to the postulate, on the other hand, that the gulf between man and ape is not really so wide after all, since chimpanzees in captivity display clear signs of aggression.<sup>39</sup> *Inventae sunt caveae ut homo ipse se nosceret.*

It may, in any event, seem odd that Rousseau's own picture of the orang-utan should have been produced, not through observing the animal in its natural habitat, but mainly by abstracting from civilized man those traits which he supposed unattributable to social life alone. For however speculative this method might appear, it enabled him to construct a more exact account of the creature's behaviour in the wild than any which we have had until the last decade. Even today, Edward Tyson's *Orang-Outang* of 1699 remains, I believe by common consent,<sup>40</sup> the best anatomical description ever published of any non-human primate, though that work is of course a study of a chimpanzee. In my view, the *Discours sur l'inégalité* ought to be acclaimed by ethologists as an Enlightenment contribution of similar importance, towering over the field, as it has, for

an almost equivalent period. And yet to my knowledge no one—apart from Voltaire, who characteristically thought the idea absurd<sup>41</sup>—has ever recognized that Rousseau's savage man was truly an orang-utan. A fierce and protracted dispute about the factual standing of Rousseau's portrait of the state of nature in the *Discours* could perhaps have been avoided if this simple truth had been perceived. For if it had, Rousseau would now occupy a prominent place, not only in the history of speculative anthropology, but in the history of empirical primatology as well.

#### IV

I have already observed that anthropologists of the Enlightenment regarded language as the most important manifestation of our unique capacity for culture, and in this section I should like to address myself to Rousseau's own views on that subject. The distinction between man and beast in terms of language is, of course, an ancient doctrine—in Western philosophy as old as the distinction between nature and art or nature and custom—and it has generally served much the same function as these others of underscoring the apparent fact that members of the human race alone are able to behave in morally responsible ways, either through means of verbal persuasion rather than force or intimidation, or through undertakings in speech acts which express our obligations in society.<sup>42</sup> The main contribution of eighteenth-century thinkers in this field was to draw attention once again to the great apes, since, in an age in which the physical resemblances between us and these other primates were held to be more striking than the differences, our linguistic competence often seemed to be the only sure sign of our superiority over them. 'Parle, et je te baptise',<sup>43</sup> dared the Cardinal de Polignac to the chimpanzee in the glass cage at the Jardin du roi, according to the testimony of Diderot; for if only apes could speak, where would man's special place in the universe be then? In the mid and late Enlightenment the debate about the limits of humanity was, indeed, so commonly centred around the question of language and its origins that mute individuals occasionally came to be classified as distinct species, such as Linnaeus's *Homo ferus*, for instance. On some points of principle, moreover, we have not advanced very much since that time. The most distinguished researchers in the field of primate languages today have established that apes show no capacity to relativize or nominalize the lexical markers they employ and hence are apparently unable to generate sentences in the complex forms characteristic of all natural human languages,<sup>44</sup> this despite the claims of Ardrey and like-minded figures who interpret the vocabularies learnt by Washoe, Sarah and other chimpanzees as indicative that the last bastion of man's supposed

cultural pre-eminence is now crumbling as well. Apes that ape have no doubt shown themselves to be far more mentally sophisticated than parroted parrots, but there is as yet no real evidence to suggest that Herder was mistaken when he remarked that 'Der Affe äffet immer nach, aber nachgeahmt hat er nie'.<sup>45</sup>

In certain respects, to be sure, Rousseau's reflections on the origin of languages actually anticipate the arguments of those scientists who today deny that linguistic competence is a specifically human trait, for, like La Mettrie and Monboddo among his contemporaries, he thought apes might in time develop their latent faculty of speech, just as civilized men had done already.<sup>46</sup> Most of his hypotheses about this problem, however, were focused upon what he took to be the characteristics of language rather than the capacities of apes, and his main contention, again expounded first in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, was that language is not natural to man.<sup>47</sup> In our original state, he asserted, we could not have had occasion to articulate thoughts by attaching arbitrary signs to them, because in that essentially solitary condition we would have been unable to master the rules necessary for both the conception and communication of such signs. Unlike Condillac, who stipulated that even two isolated individuals could in the beginning have devised a language by employing abstract labels or words to classify the objects of their experience, Rousseau believed that any such classification—and, for that matter, our cognitive perception of objects of experience at all—already presupposed a number of linguistic categories, so that the relation between language and thought seemed to him one of reciprocal entailment. And while Condillac had imagined that there was a clear connection between the civilized tongues of modern man and the vocalization of pleasure or fear of the earliest savages, Rousseau detected no manifest link between our complex languages and the simple cries of our progenitors. For the verbal symbols we now employ require a common frame of reference, and this, in turn, can only be manufactured in some kind of society, which, finally, requires a vocabulary of shared linguistic signs for its own invention. He thus remarked in the *Discours* that he was unable to determine whether language was fundamentally a social institution or society a linguistic artefact.<sup>48</sup>

In his anthropological theory Rousseau in fact regarded both of these claims as correct, and he pursued each to some notable, if occasionally disjointed, conclusions. On the one hand, the idea of a language system offered him a fruitful hypothetical model of the foundation of human society itself. In view of his contention against the natural law philosophers that men could not have been drawn together initially by any sociable dispositions,<sup>49</sup> he speculated that the first communities would have been formed by accident rather than design—by natural catastrophes such as floods or earthquakes which perhaps tore islands from continents

and brought individuals into permanent territorial proximity for the first time.<sup>50</sup> But once our ancestors would have come to live in such primitive settlements and to confront the same persons day after day, they must have come to take some notice of those qualities which distinguished them from one another. They must have come gradually to recognize which natives among them were the strongest or most handsome, or the best singers or dancers, or the most adroit or most eloquent, for example, and in general they must have begun to perceive, whereas previously they could only have felt the effects of, the differences in their constitutions which were due to Nature. Our savage forebears, that is, would have come to identify other members of their species with whom they were forced by chance to live in daily contact through making discriminations of just this kind, and they must eventually have come in the same way to compare themselves to others and to identify their own traits in terms of what they took to be the impressions formed about them by their neighbours. In Rousseau's judgement, society could only have arisen when men began to attach some significance to these comparisons, for by placing a value upon certain characteristics above others we transfigured our natural variations into moral distinctions.<sup>51</sup> In particular, that primeval individual who was most naturally adroit and eloquent, Rousseau suggests, was the real founder of civil society, for by enclosing a piece of land, claiming it as his own and persuading others foolish enough to believe him, he inaugurated all the misfortunes which have since bedeviled our history.<sup>52</sup> Modern man, that is, arose when *Homo habilis* or *Homo faber* became *Homo loquens* and deceived *Homo ignorans* into supposing that what he said was true.

Now the various human traits esteemed by primitive men were unlikely to have made their appearance all at the same time. Our savage progenitors ought to have been able to recognize those individuals among them who were strongest before they discovered which ones were best able to sing or dance, and they could only have come to be impressed by the most eloquent of their neighbours after they had already adopted the conventions of a language, the general origins of which Rousseau admits in the *Discours* he cannot explain. Because he also suggests in this text, moreover, that there must have been a type of private property in persons—that is, through the formation of family units incorporating sexual partners and their offspring—even before the creation of property in land,<sup>53</sup> his account of the order in which our moral characteristics must have developed seems remarkably vague, and, indeed, it is far from obvious why persons should have found some of their natural qualities to be more worthy of respect than others. Rousseau was nevertheless firmly convinced that as soon as we began to attach importance to our differences we must thereby have embarked upon the establishment of social

institutions, and it must have been the institution of property above any other which truly launched mankind, he contended, upon its path of toil, misery, slavery and conflict.<sup>54</sup>

It is my view, then, that language provides a model of the foundation of society in Rousseau's theory, not only because property relations upon which society is built are largely linguistic in origin (stemming as they do so much from eloquence and deception), but more because language offers a general paradigm of Rousseau's account of the transposition of physical dissimilarities into moral distinctions. In effect, such distinctions are, according to Rousseau, little else but the symbolic representation of natural traits endowed with meanings that issue from the ways in which individuals identify and differentiate one another. Yet this form of interpersonal classification is an exact social counterpart of the manner by which definitions are constructed in already established languages, that is, through the affixation of labels to the objects of thought, as Condillac again had supposed, and indeed Locke and others as well. Of course such a scheme, as I have already indicated, was for Rousseau quite inadequate to explain the origin of language, but it served as an excellent linguistic model in elucidating the origin of society—with this crucial difference: that whereas the lexical markers which we attach to our thoughts are arbitrary, interchangeable and hence all roughly of equivalent status, our classification of moral traits gives rise to a hierarchy of values in which some characteristics are rendered superior to others. In a sense, social inequality for Rousseau originated ultimately from the fact that the cardinal system of identification employed by our forebears must have been transliterated in language into an ordinal system for ranking moral preferences, and the baneful effects of that linguistic corruption of our species, he believed, are with us still.

If it was in this fashion that Rousseau elaborated his view of society as an essentially linguistic artefact, he developed his thesis about the social origins of language with equal conviction. In part his argument consisted simply of the proposition, once again, that until we had formed settled social relationships we could have had no occasion for communicating our ideas, and no shared frame of reference to ensure that our utterances were understood by others, so that the necessary conjunction of society with language in his theory appears almost as close as the link between language and thought. Yet he pursued this point in greater depth and more detail as well. In his *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, for example, he observed that while nations are more sharply defined by their linguistic boundaries than by political or any other frontiers, the languages which mark off peoples in that way have themselves been shaped and moulded by the patterns of community life from which they stem, so that it was impossible to understand the nature of man's verbal behaviour without



investigating the social roots of linguistic usage. The most primitive Mediterranean tongues, for instance, must have been articulated in enchanting sonorous voices, Rousseau insisted, because they would at first have expressed the passionate attraction of men and women for one another in societies in which a mild climate and fertile soil facilitated the leisurely satisfaction of their other needs. In the north, however, our earliest languages must have been gruff, shrill or monotonous, because in such inclement surroundings speakers would have been obliged to work before they had time for play and thus would have continually cried out for help rather than whisper any mellifluous love songs to their neighbours.<sup>55</sup> Of course these linguistic differences are in some respects attributable to Nature as much as to man, but Rousseau's main point here was that the distinctive patterns of social life which arose in disparate natural environments must themselves have given rise to diverse modes of linguistic expression.

In any event, when the barbarians of the North eventually conquered the Mediterranean world, he contended, their guttural and staccato speech also came to dominate the melodic inflections that had prevailed in the South before, so that our earliest modulated forms of tonal discourse must have been gradually suppressed and transformed into the humdrum reverberations of our subjugators' prose.<sup>56</sup> This loss of inflection, moreover, came for Rousseau to be a measure of the loss of spirit and passion in human affairs as a whole. For the prosaic character of the languages imposed upon us by our rulers inspired us with little else but servile manners, and in the modern age we have been transfixed into the listless auditors of those who govern by harangues from the rostrum and diatribes from the pulpit.<sup>57</sup> In fact so dispirited have we become under the yoke of kings, ministers and priests that those vocal intonations which had once expressed our pleasures have now been wholly reconstituted into nothing more than the terms that denote our trades. Whereas savages once chanted  *aimez-moi*  to one another, and barbarians muttered  *aidez-moi* , now civilized men only grumble  *donnez de l'argent* .<sup>58</sup>

Rousseau's account of the social corruption of language thus corresponds in striking ways to his theory of the linguistic corruption of society. The pernicious consequences that stem from the institution of property through a largely linguistic medium have their counterpart in the afflictions that arise from the substitution of prose for melody in speech, and our entitlements to cultivated land, on the one hand, and our rules of cultivated discourse, on the other, have together engendered much of the moral decadence of cultivated man. Upon the model of inequalitarian property relations we have constructed whole social systems in which the divisions between rich and poor, ruler and ruled, and master and slave form the central features, so that civilization has come progressively to be



defined by its political character and functions, with the principles of dominance and subservience governing almost every aspect of our lives. Philosophers of the Enlightenment often described man's civil state as that of *la société policée*,<sup>59</sup> but Rousseau developed this idea more forcefully than any other figure of his age, and throughout his writings he insisted that everything depends ultimately upon politics and that 'aucun peuple ne seroit jamais que ce que la nature de son Gouvernement le feroit être'.<sup>60</sup> Equally, he perceived that our social and political relations have an essentially symbolic character—that they derive their binding force over human affairs from the values they express and the customary significance that is attached to them in much the same way and at the same level of abstraction as the terms of our polluted and sophistical languages convey their meanings. For, according to Rousseau, our adopted meanings have in fact been a gross distortion of the truth. In civilized societies we have come to be imprisoned by our symbols, ensnared by the images of our freedom as we run headlong into our chains, altogether captivated by our accomplishments which are in fact no more than the trappings of culture. In civilized societies, in short, the very institutions we invented for our advancement have been the cause of our moral decline. We have too much admired those centuries in which arts and letters have flourished, Rousseau remarked in his *Contrat social*, without penetrating the secret object and the fatal effect of their culture. Thus, quoting Tacitus, he concluded, 'Idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset'.<sup>61</sup>

I have here addressed myself to Rousseau's conception of culture in the light of his claims about the interpenetration of society and language, not because the scientific, religious, literary or artistic features of culture figure less prominently in his thought; on the contrary, his reputation has always rightly been based above all upon his critique of culture in these more familiar senses, and his writings about the decline of music, for instance, are perhaps more extensive than those in any other field. But his accounts of the nature of both society and language provide, in my view, the clearest picture of his idea of culture in general because they define what he took to be the two most central characteristics of any cultural system: first, that it is a collective artefact or set of conventions produced by individuals only in a social context, and, second, that it is a symbolic network of ideas which convey, and often conceal, human purposes and meanings. If we are to believe the most eminent sociobiologist of our day, 'Culture . . . can be interpreted as a hierarchical system of environmental tracking devices', which 'aside from its involvement with language . . . differs from animal tradition only in degree'.<sup>62</sup> For Rousseau, however, a culture divorced from language was no culture at all, and even the perfectible apes that he imagined to be our progenitors have—on the evidence of

their linguistic achievements—shown no sign yet that they are able to manufacture the symbols around which all true cultures are formed, and, indeed, upon which all human societies, but human societies alone, he believed, have been invariably constructed.

Yet while it appears that Rousseau placed greatest emphasis upon the social and linguistic foundations of culture, we ought to bear in mind the moral and historical dimensions which he attached to it as well. For the language of culture was essentially the language of values, in his judgement, and the values prevalent in every nation were always shaped by custom, tradition, and 'la force de l'habitude'.<sup>63</sup> On the one hand, this perspective of course implied that there was great cultural diversity between societies, and Rousseau often invoked the anthropological literature of his own day to stress that point, condemning the blinkered 'tourbe Philosophesque',<sup>64</sup> as he put it, which travelled nowhere but presumed that men in all places and at all times were governed by the same passions and vices as we are. On the other hand, however, Rousseau's scheme also implied that cultural patterns, notwithstanding their distinctions in different parts of the world, were in each case a conflux of symbols that formed the social manifestation of the inheritance of acquired characteristics within a community, with the history of mankind as a whole predominantly the history of the convergence of Western cultures and their rise to ascendancy over all the rest.

Some recent commentators, impressed by such rough parallels between human social development and biological evolution in Nature, have remarked that culture must serve the same function in the history of our race as natural selection for every other form of life;<sup>65</sup> or that the evolution of culture must have proceeded in the same manner as the evolution of species determined by natural selection;<sup>66</sup> or even that the transformational grammars of our languages serve as a symbolic analogue in culture for the genetic codes upon which all patterns of organic growth and change depend.<sup>67</sup> We shall no doubt witness much important research in the next few years which builds upon such resemblances, perhaps not only with regard to the structure of language, but applied to the formal principles, or what are held to be the formal principles, of other cultural systems too. In this context, however, I should like only to note that I think Rousseau would have been at least as much impressed by the differences between biological and cultural forms of adaptation as by their apparent similarities. For one thing, culture, as he understood it, was not some kind of complex adaptive mechanism at all, but rather an excessively integrated, overly specialized, maladaptive network of functions within which, in his terms, our apparent steps towards the perfection of the individual have in reality led towards the decrepitude of the species.<sup>68</sup> For another, I think he would have regarded any parallels between linguistic

and biological codes of patterned growth or behaviour as fundamentally misconceived, perhaps partly because languages 'have an infinitely greater capacity for hybridization',<sup>69</sup> though more because the meanings expressed in them are normally as false as the purposes they serve unsalutary for man. Linguistic principles and structures that comprise the symbols of our cultures are not mirrors of the world, Rousseau believed, but rather moral prisms that transfigure and obfuscate our behaviour in it; in so far as they are founded upon self-deception, their sense remains opaque and unclear to us, so that their true significance differs sharply from that signified by their constitutive terms.<sup>70</sup> 'Les Sciences, les Lettres et les Arts . . . étendent des guirlandes de fleurs sur les chaînes de fer dont ils sont chargés'.<sup>71</sup> Through culture *Homo faber* has in fact become *Homo fabulator*; *Homo fabricans* is actually *Homo fabricator*; *Homo loquens* no more than *Homo ventosus*; and our species as a whole, not *Homo sapiens* but *Homo deceptus*. We should have been wary of the impostor who founded civil society, Rousseau remarked, for 'l'état de réflexion est un état contre Nature, et . . . l'homme qui médite est un animal dépravé'.<sup>72</sup> On one point, nevertheless, the analogy between cultural development and natural selection would have held good in his philosophy, because it follows from his account of both our physical and social evolution that there is no more fixity about culture and its symbols than about the bodily traits of mankind as a whole. Fixity, for Rousseau, was an arbitrary characteristic of languages rather than a necessary feature of either cultures or species, and from the linguistic base of our specification of terms stemmed the moral emblems of our specialization of roles, and ultimately the fixation of social man in an abstract world of his own making.

In the light of this view of culture it seems to me that the work of Lévi-Strauss could have benefited greatly, and, indeed, disarmed some of its critics, if only he had followed his model more closely. For despite his frequently professed admiration for Rousseau, and despite the immense subtlety of his own anthropological vision and the eloquence with which he presents it, his writings lack the sense of cultural diversity and the rich historical perspective of Rousseau's theory. Instead of focusing upon the primate limits of humanity and offering an account of our cultural evolution, Lévi-Strauss has portrayed the mental processes of mankind generally as if they were universal constants, replacing 'the particular minds of particular savages in particular jungles with the Savage Mind immanent in us all'.<sup>73</sup> In *La Pensée sauvage* he quotes with favour Rousseau's remark that 'pour étudier l'homme il faut apprendre à porter sa vue au loin' and even claims that the task of reabsorbing 'des humanités particulières dans une humanité générale'<sup>74</sup> is only the first stage along the way towards the reintegration of culture with nature and finally life altogether with its physico-chemical foundations. But he forgets that Rousseau's only

portrait of man, painted 'exactement d'après nature et dans toute sa vérité',<sup>75</sup> was that of his own *Confessions*—the autobiography of an individual who supposed that he was made like no one else. The idea of humanity in general was for Rousseau a misconception. 'Où est l'homme qui puisse . . . se séparer de lui même?' he asked. 'Nous concevons la société générale d'après nos sociétés particulières', and 'il n'y [a] point de société naturelle et générale entre les hommes'.<sup>76</sup> Lévi-Strauss's circumnavigations of the images of man are too much encumbered by the baggage of an imaginary voyage to allow his passage through the channels of Rousseau's own anthropological expeditions. In his contention that the aim of the discipline is to locate the 'invariants' of human culture ('l'idée d'une humanité générale, à laquelle conduit la réduction ethnographique'),<sup>77</sup> he departs sharply from Rousseau's thesis that we are distinguished from all other species by the indefinite flexibility and plasticity of our nature, and he thus joins the ranks of thinkers like Grotius, Hobbes, Pufendorf and Locke, whom Rousseau challenged for having falsely supposed that men were everywhere fundamentally the same.

The ethological approach of Ardrey, on the other hand, fares much worse still against the measure of Rousseau's cultural anthropology. For Ardrey's analogies spring from animal to human behaviour in great leap-frog jumps which hurdle over cultures altogether, and his account of the instinctual roots of aggression, territoriality and the like leave us with explanations of a kind which has been aptly described as a 'bargain made with reality in which an understanding of the phenomenon is gained at the cost of everything we know about it'.<sup>78</sup> But not only has Ardrey left out the realm of culture from his descriptions of how we live; he has also quite misread the philosophy of Rousseau which he praises and condemns in turn, since he maintains that the society conceived by Rousseau was constructed by 'fallen angels', whereas his own social contract is an agreement between 'risen apes'.<sup>79</sup> In fact, however, there are no angels of any sort in Rousseau's state of nature, and Ardrey ought to have perceived that, according to Rousseau, men are actually fallen apes, literally descended from their condition by a link in the chain of being that is a downward moral slope—with the beastly manner in which we treat these creatures no doubt forming part of the proof of our descent.

If only Ardrey had worn the anthropomorphic spectacles with which he views the world of Nature while surveying Rousseau's writings, moreover, he might have taken stock of the abundant collection of zoological or quasi-zoological attributes which Rousseau attached to man. For our cultural world was indeed filled by beasts of certain types, according to Rousseau: beasts that were not so much like slime moulds or penguins as like domesticated animals and fabricated predators. Why else did he so often depict civilized men to be human cattle—'des troupeaux de bétail',

'des Bêtes esclaves' resembling 'des Animaux nés libres et abhorrant la captivité' sharing the anguish voiced in 'les tristes mugissemens du Bétail entrant dans une Boucherie'?<sup>80</sup> And why else did he regard the attested histories of vampires as but further manifestations of the sombre and nefarious tyranny of opinion exercised by priests over the minds of men?<sup>81</sup> Like Voltaire in his own day and Marx afterwards, Rousseau employed vampire metaphors to account for the benighted and parasitic relations of mutual dependence that prevailed in our societies, since while civilization had denatured the animal in one sense it had supernaturalized the beast in another.

Rousseau's anthropology, therefore, revolved not just around the divide between nature and culture in our societies but also around the double metamorphosis from animals to men to monsters of our own making which comprises the history of the self-imposed domestication of our species. Culture may have been the principal instrument of our transfiguration, and we could now only curse the few beneficiaries of the founder of civil society with Caliban's malediction addressed to Prospero in *The Tempest*: 'The red plague rid you / For learning me your language!' Yet at the same time the real miscreants of our age—tormented, cowed, vicious and terrible—are represented in Rousseau's texts as well. Ardrey should recall that it is no signatory of the social compact but rather Frankenstein's monster who perceived himself to be the fallen angel. Rousseau's thesis was that civilized men had not only fabricated brutes of this kind but, worse still, were constantly offering themselves as its prey.

## V

According to Lévi-Strauss the possibility of our passage from nature to culture—or, what is effectively the same, from sentiment to reason, and animality to humanity—is explained in Rousseau's philosophy by our possession of the psychic attribute of pity or compassion. It is because man originally felt himself to be identical with creatures which resembled him, writes Lévi-Strauss, that he came to acquire his capacity to distinguish himself among them just as he differentiated them from the members of other zoological species, 'c'est-à-dire de prendre la diversité des espèces pour support conceptuel de la différenciation sociale'.<sup>82</sup>

In my view this interpretation of Rousseau's argument is incorrect. For Rousseau believed that compassion, like the instinct of self-love, is an attribute of animals in general which in no way facilitates their creation of culture.<sup>83</sup> On the contrary, it was man's peculiar achievement in suppressing his natural sentiment of pity, and in transforming his benign self-love into a kind of vanity or selfishness at the expense of others, that lay at the

heart of his cultural development and moral decadence. In their natural state our forebears must already have been unique, Rousseau contended, not by virtue of their compassion, but because of two special attributes—natural liberty and perfectibility—which together enabled them to construct modes of life wholly uncharacteristic of the rest of the animal world. Every type of creature apart from man, he observed, is nothing more than an ingenious machine provided with instincts appropriate to its self-preservation, so that other animals, while unfettered by any social obligations, are nevertheless fully subject to the commands of Nature. Only our savage progenitors possessed the freedom to determine how best to comply with these commands—by selecting either to confront or flee from danger, for instance—so that in attributing natural liberty to man and his hominid forebears Rousseau meant that they were distinguished, not so much by any particular traits, as by the absence of internal mechanisms which controlled the behaviour of all other beasts.<sup>84</sup>

At the same time he supposed that even the most primitive men must also have been able to organize the manner of their response to natural impulses in a cumulative way, with each person having the power to make his adopted habits a permanent feature of his character and to improve and develop them as he might see fit. In Rousseau's view, in fact, this capacity for progressive self-instruction was a crucial feature of mankind, since it was precisely because we were able to make ourselves more perfect rather than merely different from other creatures that we could undergo a *history* of change. After a few months every animal aside from us is already stamped by the behavioural properties of its maturity, he observed, and after a thousand years the whole of its species is imprinted with the same instincts and patterns of life as the first generation. We alone have shown ourselves capable of improving our faculties, and we are unique among animals as well in exhibiting what is in effect the same capacity to make retrograde steps and impair our nature.<sup>85</sup> Because the offspring of the earliest men and women could swiftly imitate the qualities of their parents, moreover, it followed that we could always transmit our acquired characteristics from one generation to the next, so that the whole of our developing species must thus have been able to depart from its natural state. Our liberty and perfectibility may not have been easy to perceive in our original behaviour, but these inchoate faculties had none the less made possible the cultural evolution of the human race.

I stress these points in connection with the anthropology of Lévi-Strauss because, in my view, they are tantamount to a claim that man's passage from the realm of nature to that of culture—or, to use Rousseau's own terms, the passage from 'le physique' to 'le moral'<sup>86</sup>—must have been facilitated by the exercise of our liberty and perfectibility. He believed that our adaptive dimension was actually constituted by our capacity for

culture rather than the manifestations of culture itself, and he ascribed that capacity to the interconnection between two distinctively human traits. In his own work he in fact often placed more emphasis upon the second of those traits than on the first, since our perfectibility bore witness to our natural liberty in a historical perspective, and in civilized society it was in any case the only one which still remained intact. Thus, Rousseau contended, it was the perfectibility of apes and men together rather than the culture of civilized man alone which set us apart from all types of monkeys, so that, in effect, perfectibility has been the central catalyst of our evolutionary transformation from ape to citizen.

Now it is often argued that our capacity for culture requires a physical explanation of some sort, since even if language and society are the handiwork of mankind, our ability to construct such institutions cannot be the outcome of our endeavours—a point which I think Rousseau himself implicitly accepted, in so far as he supposed our natural liberty and perfectibility to be fundamental traits of our species, that is, neither linguistic nor social in origin. Many commentators have maintained that the human capacity for culture is essentially attributable to the much larger cranial measurements of *Homo sapiens* as compared, to earlier hominids, or to the unique neurological links between the cognitive and sound-producing centres of our brains. Some have focused instead upon the more prolonged immaturity of human infants as contrasted to all other mammals, attempting thereby to explain certain social features of our cultural life which are less obviously connected with intelligence or language; and Ardrey, for his part, asserts that the fundamental divide between man and beast is due to our muscular coordination centred in the buttocks,<sup>87</sup> in this way no doubt confirming his animal hindsight. Rousseau also speculated on these matters, commenting at some length upon the probability that our ancestors were bipedal in nature and upright in stature, which he thought enabled primeval women, for instance, to carry infants in their arms and thus nourish them more easily than the females of other species<sup>88</sup>—a thesis which Herder, in turn, later made the centrepiece of his more lofty philosophy that we are superior to orang-utans because they merely stoop while we gaze at the heavens.

In fact, however, this approach to the subject of man's capacity for culture has so far proved largely misleading, and that for at least two reasons: first, because the environmental conditions determining natural selection for the requisite traits are themselves likely to have incorporated social or cultural features of hominid life already; and, second, because we still have very little evidence of any direct physical correlations between particular cultural aptitudes and any specific organs or bodily structures which can be explained as a consequence of natural selection. Many modern geneticists contend that the shapes and sizes of our organs



are determined by their allometric growth in our phylogenic history no less than by their selected adaptation for particular functions,<sup>89</sup> and it is now widely held that the neurological complexities of the organization of the brain render it questionable that we shall ever have a plausible anatomical explanation of the emergence of language.<sup>90</sup> As for the cultural advantages of vertical posture, I think Georg Foster's excellent comment of 1785 about erect two-legged birdbrains may still be apt: 'Tragen denn nicht alle Vögel den Kopf in die Höhe; am meisten die allerdümmsten'.<sup>91</sup>

Despite his remarks about the advantages of upright stature, Rousseau's main point, moreover, was not to trace the physical or biological roots of our capacity for culture, but rather to describe the general plasticity of our mental attributes in the state of nature—to explain the open texture and unpredictability of the behaviour of perfectible creatures—for it was just the indeterminacy of the activities of our savage forebears which marked their main difference from other animals. Rousseau believed that we are not essentially adapted for culture or language or, indeed, anything else, but rather that we are beings whose genetic makeup includes no mechanisms that prescribe fixed patterns of response to natural impulses. In short, his view was that our lives are not governed by instincts. I cannot imagine what he might have thought about the claims of some contemporary ethologists to the effect that animals, strictly speaking, have no instincts either, but at least his conception of man's native faculties stands manifestly apart, as I see it, from both the constricted vision of culturalized nature set forth by Ardrey and the stereotype images of naturalized culture provided by Lévi-Strauss.

For reasons which obviously stem from this account of the indeterminacy of human nature, Rousseau supposed that the perfectibility of men in their original condition did not ensure that they would become more perfect creatures, and the real development of that attribute, he maintained, depended upon the *actual* choices which individuals must have made when they adopted their various social institutions and cultural styles of life. Our perfectibility established only that there could be cumulative change in one direction or another, and it was as much in accord with the history of our degradation as it would have been compatible with the history of our progress. Rousseau contended, in fact, that by making ourselves gradually less dependent upon Nature and more dependent on other men we had misused our liberty in the course of our development and had brought about, not our improvement, but our debasement by electing to become slaves to new compulsions that we imposed upon ourselves and bequeathed to our children. Our most remarkable faculty, that is, had played the most crucial role in the evolution of social inequality by making possible the transformation of our natural differences into moral



distinctions, so that it was ultimately our perfectibility, he remarked, which was the principal source of all our misfortunes:

Cette faculté distinctive, et presque illimitée, est la source de tous les malheurs de l'homme . . . c'est elle qui le tire, à force de tems, de cette condition originnaire, dans laquelle it couleroit des jours tranquilles, et innocens . . . c'est elle, qui faisant éclore avec les siècles ses lumières et ses erreurs, ses vices et ses vertus, le rend à la longue le tiran de lui-même, et de la Nature.<sup>92</sup>

This idea of perfectibility is, I think, particularly striking both within Enlightenment thought and in the context of subsequent social theory. On the one hand, Rousseau actually introduced the term into the vocabulary of eighteenth-century speculation about human nature,<sup>93</sup> and its importance was quickly perceived by contemporary reviewers of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, for instance by Grimm and Herder, and by Jean de Castillon in his own work of the same title which forms a reply to Rousseau's text. During the 1760s, moreover, the term came to be employed quite regularly in the field of French natural history, most conspicuously, perhaps, in Robinet's *De la nature*. The fact that it did become fashionable in late Enlightenment thought is, of course, not difficult to understand, since the idea expresses a secular and historical view of man's moral development which was shared by many of the leading *philosophes* of the period who, like Rousseau, conceived it to be a challenge to the orthodox Christian dogma of human corruption through original sin. Yet, on the other hand, the very word which most clearly defines that characteristic Enlightenment perspective has a significance for an understanding of our past, in his theory, which is quite opposed to the sense envisaged by most of his contemporary admirers and critics alike. For whereas in the doctrines of the *philosophes* our perfectibility had ensured our advance from barbarism to civilization, in his account it had engendered only our moral and political decline. Rousseau, that is, joined a highly optimistic belief about human potentialities to a deeply pessimistic vision of man's worldly accomplishments, largely redefining the notions of an essentially theological tradition of moral philosophy in terms which anticipate the more sociological modes of argument of his successors. As one distinguished interpreter of his writings has remarked, his analysis of our evolution thus took on 'l'allure d'une chute accélérée dans la corruption. . . . Rousseau transporte le mythe religieux dans l'histoire elle-même'.<sup>94</sup> Of course the ethical principles of that analysis were not widely shared by the enthusiasts of progress in his own day, for when they adopted his idea of perfectibility, they divorced it from his claims about its implications with respect to the nature of culture and civilization in general. Nevertheless, the theory of history which Rousseau built around his concept—and especially the account of property and inequality which he attached to it—

were to exercise a striking influence upon the development of nineteenth-century social thought, and they were to breathe new life, through new formulations, in the work of Marx in particular.

My aim here has been to try to show how Rousseau's theory of perfectibility forms the central element of both his physical and cultural anthropology together, but it remains for me to stress one final point. According to Lévi-Strauss, the inaugural and profound contribution which Rousseau made to anthropology rests partly on the fact that he undertook the study of human nature in a manner distinct from the approaches of the historian or the moralist. While that proposition may to some extent be true of Lévi-Strauss himself, it is, in my view, quite untrue of Rousseau: first, because his anthropology was an attempt to reconstruct the evolutionary history of mankind which our perfectibility had made possible, and, second, because it forms the most impassioned and most comprehensive moral critique of this history devised throughout the whole Enlightenment. But not only that. His anthropology actually incorporates an elaborate prescriptive moral philosophy as well, and it includes such a dimension because Rousseau supposed that even in the most decadent societies individuals still retain their capacity for self-improvement. Our natural liberty had no doubt been lost in the course of our cultural development, and once that trait was abandoned, he claimed, it could never be recovered.<sup>95</sup> If our perfectibility were similarly lost, however, then there would be no worldly possibility for civilized men to overcome their corruption, and since persons everywhere tended to display only those vicious moral qualities impressed upon them by their governments, this would suggest that it was now beyond the power of individuals or communities to realize any form of virtue. In fact the whole of Rousseau's later philosophy—his studies of the nature of religion, his political writings on Geneva, Corsica and Poland, his commentaries on the theatre and, most important of all, his *Contrat social*, *Emile* and *Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*—bears ample testimony to his belief that our natural perfectibility might still be employed to our advantage. In the corpus of his later work Rousseau indeed mapped out at least three major roads to our emancipation from the oppressive state described in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, of which the first was directed to politics, the second to education and the third to solitude, each plan offering basically disparate accounts—in public, domestic and private forms—of the autonomy, self-reliance and independence that could perhaps supply moral remedies for the misfortunes of civilized man. And while these writings suggest that our paths of redemption were likely to prove more heterogeneous than the course of our corruption, I note here only that such alternatives were conceivable in practice because however much men and women had been the victims of their own history they remained its authors as well, and

their perfectibility still enabled them to form a future morally superior to their past.

My concluding point, then, is that the moral philosophy of Rousseau constitutes an integral part of his anthropological theory. I suppose that for some readers this suggestion of adding yet a further dimension to the zoological framework with which I began might seem too much to bear. Was Rousseau's whole theory perhaps no more, in the end, than just another way of expressing that famous anti-vivisectionist cry: 'I have felt all my life an irresistible impulse to rush in wherever anyone is "oppressed" and try to "deliver" him, her, or *it*'?<sup>96</sup> Did he have it in mind to create a society for the salvation of clockwork oranges? Rousseau was not above self-parody, and the lighter touches of his imagination generally show the same deft hand as the deeper impressions that he engraved as well. In my view, however, the moral character of his anthropology has little to do with the resuscitation of the ape within us or the protection of the apes outside. Its aim, rather, is to persuade us of the need to reconstitute or else abandon the cultures within which civilized apes have enchained us. We may have learned from Marx that we have nothing to lose apart from our chains, but if we return to Rousseau we shall find explanations of more links in those chains than any other thinker ever perceived.

rites of passage and the grand tour:  
discovering, imagining and inventing  
European civilization in the age  
of enlightenment

In the Middle Ages the diverse peoples of Europe could have imagined themselves drawn together, both theologically and politically, by their shared Christian faith and the vestiges of an imperial polity marked by the absence of internal frontiers. While their multiple allegiances were often in conflict, at least the appearance of an overarching framework that united them could be articulated in the common language of their diplomats, priests and professors. But with the Reformation and its attendant wars of religion, together with the dynasties whose authority was consolidated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that European community, defined by Western Christendom, collapsed and was throughout this period progressively replaced by institutions heralding the advent of the modern nation-state and its philosophies of *ragione di stato*. The Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 which ended the Thirty Years' War consecrated the territorial sovereignty and independence of the states and empires of which fragmented Europe had come to be comprised, putting paid to papal claims of transnational supremacy. The Treaty of Utrecht of 1713 likewise brought to an end the ambitions of universal empire that might have been entertained by Louis XIV of France. Thereafter Europe seemed destined, politically, to be no more than a confederation of states, wherein peace might be negotiated only through alliances formed by its separate members, such as were envisaged in the Age of Enlightenment by the abbé de Saint-Pierre, Rousseau and Kant and which, after the Second World War, came to be enshrined in the European Community.<sup>1</sup>

In the course of the eighteenth century these political developments were nevertheless accompanied by economic and cultural changes which helped to foster an image of European integration such as had been unknown in its early modern history connected with the establishment and evolution of separate states, religions and languages. With the advent and triumph of commercial society in Western and Northern Europe, the infrastructure of traffic within the continent, including the network of roads, rivers and canals that lubricated both internal and external trade,

was improved on a scale not witnessed since the age of the Antonine emperors. Relative peace and prosperity and the absence of epidemic disease spurred substantial growth of the populations of European cities, where vastly improved rates of literacy nurtured scientific and humanistic academies and through a burgeoning book trade extended the influence as never before of Europe's international republic of letters. In the mid-eighteenth century the term *civilization* came for the first time to acquire its modern meaning as a progressive force in opposition to barbarism, which in the Age of Enlightenment was also associated with Christendom's legacy—the Crusades, the Inquisition, the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—whose fundamentalist spirit of fanaticism could now be regarded as Europe's middle-aged immaturity or retrogression from its Greek and Roman ideals.<sup>2</sup>

In opposing the Augustinian doctrine of original sin and the mysteries of revealed religions, writers and philosophers of the eighteenth century joined a conception of mankind's reason and perfectibility to a veneration of Europe's ancient cultures, whose fresh efflorescence in the Renaissance was deemed to have marked a new dawn of human history after a thousand benighted years of obscurantist priestcraft and feudal oppression. That dawn had proved short-lived, however, largely because its achievements in recovering the arts and philosophy of ancient Rome, and in paying tribute to and attempting to revitalize the political institutions and values of the Roman Republic in particular, had been obscured by forces generated quite independently of the Renaissance and in a different part of Europe but which came to be felt at the same time and were marked by an attachment to an altogether different Rome, that is, of Pauline and Augustinian Christianity. The Reformation and the Counter-Reformation together turned the culture of Europe away from classicism and instead towards the theology of an otherworldly pilgrimage unsuited, in both the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, to recover the tangible treasures of ancient Rome before they had been tarnished by Christianity.

Europe's religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries seemed to cosmopolitan tourists of the eighteenth century to be sectarian reversions to the dark ages of medievalism which the Renaissance had confronted but not overcome. Worse still for such tourists, the principal universities of Europe had, in the course of the previous two centuries, by and large abandoned many of their earlier functions as progressive seats of learning in order, rather, to consolidate the strictures of the orthodox theologies of their day. By the mid-eighteenth century their role as institutions for the ordination and instruction of clerics, especially in Italy, France and England, made them appear conservative bastions within closed ideological borders, in need of lifting in an age of grand tourism that provided an alternative map of the more expansive and engaging mind of

Europe as a whole, designed to complete the education of young gentlemen once released from the clutches of their university tutors. In many respects, the itinerary of the Grand Tour offered a programme of post-graduate studies which aimed to lift the veil of ignorance of an undergraduate curriculum that embraced classical languages but not the civilizations that had produced them. To the benighted theologies of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Paris, it provided both liberation and the promise of a countercultural experience, substituting travel, a comparative anthropology of modern Europe's inhabitants and curiosity in the relics of Europe's achievements before the advent of Christianity in its most sectarian forms, to the interpretation of Scripture and doctrines. Already in the seventeenth century the scholar James Howell had portrayed foreign travel as 'a *moving Academy*, or the true *Peripatetic Schoole*',<sup>3</sup> and by the eighteenth century tourism formed a central part of the education of inquisitive thinkers and writers, for which 'a restless curiosity' in pursuit of even 'the most doubtful promise of entertainment or instruction', was essential to a traveller, remarked Edward Gibbon, adding that 'the arts of common life are not studied in the closet'.<sup>4</sup> In cultivating their minds, freed from the trappings of both ignorance and barbarism, tourists of the Age of Enlightenment sought to retrace what they took to be European civilization's roots, sources and tributaries. In inspecting the monuments of both classical architecture and Renaissance art, they were not only modernity's amateur archaeologists determined to preserve Europe's ancient relics and treasures. They were also modernity's secular pilgrims, embarked on journeys to civilization's holy land to pay it their devotion at its most genuinely as opposed to obscurantist sacred sites.<sup>5</sup>

Tourists of one denomination or another had been in great abundance in European history before the eighteenth century, and many of the motives that had inspired travellers in medieval and early modern Europe—diplomacy, commerce, adventure and, especially outside Europe, missionary zeal and anthropological curiosity—remained widely prevalent. If the practice of inviting predominantly French philosophers to grace the court or tutor the children of enlightened monarchs in Europe's hinterland became almost commonplace in the late eighteenth century, this convergence of philosophy with kingship along lines promoted in Plato's *Republic* was not unprecedented. However much we might associate that practice with enlightened despotism—a term employed by Diderot himself in his *Mémoires pour Catherine II*<sup>6</sup>—his own presence at the court of Catherine, or Voltaire's at Frederick's, or Condillac's in Parma, had been prefigured in the seventeenth century by Descartes' and Pufendorf's invitations to Stockholm. In the Age of Enlightenment, travellers' tales, either of real or imaginary journeys, became an established literary form, not only of exoticism but above all as a means of self-inspection, whereby fictitious

foreigners drawn from beyond Europe's borders might be granted insights into the character of Europeans themselves, as in Marana's *Espion turc* or Montesquieu's *Lettres persanes*.<sup>7</sup> But perhaps the most striking differences between grand tourism in the eighteenth century and journeys undertaken by earlier travellers revolve around the conceptions of civilization which inspired eighteenth-century voyagers to retrace Europe's origins and partake of its most glorious antiquity.<sup>8</sup>

Most if not all of them came from the Protestant north and west of Europe, already identified in the eighteenth century, not least by Montesquieu himself, with the spirit of both modern liberty and enterprise. The great majority journeyed south to Catholic France and Italy, occasionally embracing Switzerland as well. In embarking on the Grand Tour they sought to complete their education by retracing the lineage of their own world, whose ancient and Renaissance ideals and standards of taste inspired what they regarded as the best of contemporary culture. 'The noblest prospect which a Scotchman ever sees', Dr Johnson famously remarked, 'is the high road that leads him to London', but he supposed London and England more generally to be just the modern executors of civilization's literary and philosophical inheritance. 'A man who has not been in Italy, is always conscious of an inferiority', Johnson added, for 'the grand object of travelling is to see the shores of the Mediterranean'.<sup>9</sup> Although other tourists, like the splenetic Tobias Smollett, might prefer to report on the nature of France's and Italy's contemporary inhabitants than to savour their monuments,<sup>10</sup> most shared Johnson's awe as first-hand witnesses of Continental Europe's achievements. For much of the mid- to late seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth century, the Grand Tour was largely conceived, by those who embarked on it, as a peripatetic *cours de civilisation européenne*. While in some instances French, the pre-eminent grand tourists were above all Englishmen, Germans and Scandinavians, and their principal urban destinations were, in the north of France, Paris, and in the south, Nice, Montpellier, Aix and Arles, followed by, in Italy, Genoa, Turin, Venice, Florence, Naples and Rome. If they travelled eastwards from England or south from Scandinavia, for the most part on separate journeys often though not always undertaken by different tourists, they were drawn as well as to the imperial capitals of Berlin and Vienna, perhaps even more to the splendours of Prague, Leipzig and Dresden, or to the smaller and architecturally more compact university towns of Göttingen or Jena. From all directions they were drawn as well to Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague in the United Provinces and to Antwerp, Brussels and Louvain in the Austrian Netherlands. In Central Europe grand tourists frequently journeyed by pleasure boats down both the Rhine and the Danube, whose attractions included not only the fashionable spas sprinkled on the shores of the

region's two most illustrious rivers but also, particularly along the Rhine, some of Europe's most visually agreeable landscapes. Tourists for whom the rugged delights of nature surpassed those of culture at its best, occasionally travelled by way of Lyon and Grenoble across the Alps into Switzerland on expeditions to the glaciers of Chamonix, but even the hardest among them, if they had the right connections, were characteristically pleased still more by the domestic charms, comforts and conversation they might be invited to enjoy at Voltaire's house at Ferney near Geneva.

En route to Paris, if they embarked from the south of England and travelled across the Channel by way of Dover and Calais, they might pause to visit the castle of the Prince de Condé at Chantilly, not so much to admire its Gothic splendour as to inspect its elegant formal gardens, festooned with fountains and waterfalls and decorated with aviaries filled with ornamental birds. At the Benedictine abbey of Saint-Denis, they could behold the crown of Charlemagne, Virgil's mirror, the shoulder bone of St. John the Baptist, a box containing some of the Blessed Virgin's hair and 'other sacred toys', including a crucifix carved by Pope Clement III from Christ's original cross and a reliquary which the friar who conducted them would have tourists 'believe was stained by the natural blood of our Saviour', remarked a sceptical John Evelyn in his diary.<sup>11</sup> At the great Palais de Versailles, they might be disappointed at the small rooms which hardly failed to conceal its overall 'pompous appearance' as reported by Horace Walpole, who initially travelled there in 1739 in the company of the poet Thomas Gray, an assessment echoed by Arthur Young not long before the outbreak of the Revolution.<sup>12</sup> If they judged some of its waterworks childish they could still admire the grandeur of Versailles' formal gardens designed by André Le Nôtre, however, and if they travelled down the Seine to Saint-Cloud or up to Fontainebleau they were almost invariably dazzled by graceful buildings and cultivated landscapes of a quality and character that Versailles lacked.

Perhaps their favourite among the royal chateaux in the vicinity of Paris, however, was that of Marly-le-roi (figure 2.1), where Louis XIV and Madame de Maintenon had built a palatial retreat called l'Ermitage and there entertained King James II of England after his enforced abdication. As reported by the Duc de Saint-Simon in his *Mémoires*, Marly's lakes had once been stocked with pedigree carp, and for much of the eighteenth century classics of the French theatre like Molière's *Le Bourgeois gentil-homme* were staged in its gardens in the presence of the king's courtiers and foreign tourists alike. Marly was destroyed in the course of the French Revolution, although some of its treasures, and particularly its sculptures, survived and are still on display in the Louvre and elsewhere in Paris.

In Paris, once ensconced at the Hôtel Anjou in the Faubourg St Germain or perhaps in a furnished room or apartment nearby such as Edward





FIGURE 2.1. Pierre-Denis Martin, painting of Marly, air view of the château and gardens, 1722. Oil on canvas. Museum (château) at Versailles (Giraudon / The Bridgeman Art Library, London)

Gibbon rented in 1763, the tourist would relish the glorious gardens of the Luxembourg, the Palais Royal and the Tuileries. He or indeed she would delight in the air among the windmills of Montmartre and, above all, bask in wonder at the spires, domes, turrets and friezes of that city's grandest monuments—Notre Dame, the Invalides, the Sorbonne and the Louvre. Already in the eighteenth century the Seine wended its sinuous path through Paris between banks which displayed its architectural glories to greater dramatic effect than the Thames flowing through London, and to visitors also acquainted with the rivers of Central Europe its bridges seemed as elegant as those that crossed Prague. It was also in Paris, above all other destinations on the Grand Tour, that European travellers endeavoured to perfect their command of the French language, which in the Age of Enlightenment serviced the interests of diplomacy and even successfully competed with Latin as the international republic

of letters' principal medium of exchange, and it was in Paris as well that they cultivated the standards of taste—in dress, dining, comportment and conversation—that had come to be deemed most appropriate to polite society. Nowhere else in Europe were civilization's refinements more conspicuously displayed in *bonnes manières*. Not every tourist, however, was captivated by the sights or fragrance of France's capital, and virtually none were impressed by the integrity of the tailors, hatters and tradesmen who fitted them with the silk, velvet and stockings required to make the right impression within fashionable society, so sharply contrasted with the ragged bustle outside. 'The charms of Paris have not the least attraction for me', remarked Walpole on a much later visit to France. 'It is the ugliest, beastly town in the universe,' he added,<sup>13</sup> forever complaining of its filthy river, devilish inhabitants, narrow streets with virtually identical houses and barbarous cold worse than London's. On no other matter apart from their shared contempt for Paris would Walpole and Rousseau ever agree, but at least Walpole was spared Rousseau's ignominious fate in being buried there.

From Paris they would journey south along the Rhône, either by carriage or boat on the lengthiest and most arduous stage of their journey only pausing briefly to rest or shop in Lyon, until they reached the elegant and flourishing resort of Nice or the more vulgar attractions of the port of Marseilles. The Côte d'Azur, however, was not yet the haven for rich foreigners which it would become in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and tourists who travelled to the Mediterranean coast to escape the cold winters of England or Germany preferred the Provençal air of Aix, with its fountains around which they could stroll in greater comfort than those of Paris, and even more of Arles, whose ruins and antiquities offered them a French foretaste of Rome. The climate and waters of Montpellier, too, were deemed salubrious, and tourists who sought other distractions might be drawn there even more by the conviviality of students who flocked to the most progressive university in eighteenth-century France, where they could engage in wider pursuits less circumscribed by theologians than was so often the case in Paris. From Nice tourists would proceed to Genoa in Italy, either by boat from Marseilles hugging a shoreline often foraged by pirates, or along the still sometimes treacherous coastal road where they might instead be at the mercy of bandits.

In Genoa eighteenth-century tourists could, together with the Président Charles de Brosses or Mrs. Piozzi, the former Hester Thrale, admire that city's glorious harbour and the fine palaces surrounding it, among them the Palazzo Ducale designed in the late eighteenth century by Simone Cantone (figure 2.2). Some, however, who had learnt a refined Italian described by Howell as a *lingua Toscana in boca Romana*,<sup>14</sup> found the native Genoese less receptive to their skills than they hoped or might



FIGURE 2.2. Genoa, Palazzo Ducale, facade (Alinari / Art Resource, NY)

even, like the diminutive Mrs. Piozzi herself, be agitated by street urchins who would clasp her knees and rummage for her purse even while she was carried aloft in a chair. That mode of transport, as well as coaches and carriages, seemed in abundance in the principal Italian cities of the north, unlike the south where even the rich perambulated on foot. In Turin, in particular, a distinguished citizen's reputation might be ruined if he were seen strolling without a chair through its elegant public squares, and the etiquette which there required that even sightseers' feet be firmly planted in the air led tourists like the botanist James Edward Smith to lament the haughtiness and ceremonious dress of the inhabitants of this capital of Piedmont who would not make social visits to their superiors without wearing a sword or clutching a *chapeau de bras*.<sup>15</sup> However precious and dull its natives, Turin's wide avenues and grand buildings, many built in the early eighteenth century after the French siege of 1706, were regarded by most tourists as impressive, none more perhaps than the Palazzo Reale (figure 2.3) whose rococo interiors seemed even more extravagant than the splendours of the palace of Marly.

Turin was definitely worth a visit for the grand tourist, but a long stay there was thought ill-advised. After Genoa it was a detour and comfortable stopover on the leisurely route to Italy's jewel in the crown on the



FIGURE 2.3. Turin, Palazzo Reale, Chinese Room (The Bridgeman Art Library, London)

Adriatic coast, that is, Venice—the most admired and most often painted of all European cities in the eighteenth century, as it remains the most frequently visited in the world today. In Venice, tourists could luxuriate in appreciation of the Ponte di Rialto and the Palladian fronts to the churches of Santa Lucia, San Giorgio Maggiore and San Francesco della Vigna, all the while in awe at the sight not only of the Grand Canal and the Doge's Palace but also the glories of Veronese, Titian and Tintoretto lodged within the great monuments of a modern republic whose constitution had already survived longer than that of ancient Rome. Few paintings better display the political pageantry that this republic could still mount in the mid-eighteenth century after three hundred years of decay than the portrayal, by Canaletto, of the reception of the French Ambassador in 1742, later acquired by Catherine II of Russia and now lodged at the Hermitage in St. Petersburg (figure 2.4). Absent from this picture, because he would only be appointed a year later, is the Ambassador's secretary, one Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

In Florence, which enchanted Walpole as much as Paris had disgusted him, visitors could appreciate the treasures of the Pitti Palace and the Uffizi Gallery, including pictures or sculptures of Raphael, Rubens or Michelangelo such as are depicted by Zoffany, himself an eighteenth-century grand tourist, in his painting of the Tribuna of the Uffizi (figure 2.5). If they



FIGURE 2.4. Canaletto, *Reception of the French Ambassador in Venice*. Hermitage, St. Petersburg (The Bridgeman Art Library, London)

wished to admire the marbles of Florence they could choose between Donatello's David in the Bargello and Michelangelo's now in the Accademia, not forgetting Michelangelo's equally celebrated Pietà Palestrina nearby. If they felt disinclined to linger too long in the mausoleum of the Medici they could behold the glistening villas, vineyards and olive groves on the surrounding hills or steal a glimpse of the Duomo round a bend of the via Boccaccio as students attending the European University Institute in San Domenico di Fiesole may still do today if they stroll to the city after their classes. With the other major towns of Tuscany so much relished by visitors today—Pistoia, Sienna, even Pisa—grand tourists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were relatively unimpressed. Such towns were considered too conspicuously medieval, their narrow streets, broken pavements and grated windows cramped by a gloomy insularity that contrasted with the lush expansiveness of the hills outside. Of my own favourite small Italian city, Lucca, they might well have thought the same as Hobbes, who in the twenty-first chapter of his *Leviathan* had remarked that from 'the word LIBERTAS' inscribed on that republic's turrets no man can infer that there is more liberty there than in Constantinople.<sup>16</sup>

Naples, in the eighteenth century the largest town in Italy and by common consent the most beguiling, dazzled tourists not only on account of its vast monuments, castles, colonnades and magnificent outlook on the





FIGURE 2.5. Johann Zoffany, *The Tribuna of the Uffizi*. (The Royal Collection © 2009, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II)

sea, but perhaps above all because of the exuberance and vitality of its people, then and now forever in the streets, engaged in virtually endless dramas even more captivating than those on the stage of the San Carlo and other Neapolitan theatres. While Florentine Italians often portrayed Naples as a paradise inhabited by devils, visitors from abroad, like Goethe as he recounts in his *Italienische Reise*, were besotted and intoxicated by its charms, of an openness such as to make the capital of the world at the base of the Tiber, which he had visited earlier, seem instead like a cloister built on a poor site.<sup>17</sup> To these delights, for those who did not wish to forget the history of civilization that had drawn them there, a certain gravitas was added in the Age of Enlightenment by the excavations begun at Pompeii and Herculaneum or by Virgil's tomb.

As distinct from Naples but more like Paris, Rome was often judged a mixed blessing by tourists, struck as they were by the contrast between the magnificence of St. Peter's or the Vatican Museum on the one hand, and on the other the narrow streets of crowded houses, suffused with the smell of garlic, which gave eighteenth-century Rome the appearance of an unworthy offspring of its imperial past. To foreign observers its natives were not remotely so entrancing as the Neapolitans, and as de

Brosses records, uncharitably, a quarter of the figures one might see in its streets were statues, another quarter were priests and yet another did virtually nothing at all.<sup>18</sup> But if modern Rome lacked civilization's delights, its antiquities—even in the eighteenth century when the Coliseum had come to be filled by warrens and sheds for domestic animals and the Forum was divided into stalls for a twice-weekly market—surpassed in splendour those which survived anywhere else in the world. There could have been no more enthusiastic or better-informed guide to Rome's ancient treasures than Winckelmann, who in 1763 was appointed superintendent of Roman antiquities and for the next five years until his untimely death in Trieste guided Wilkes, Boswell and other notable visitors to Rome on their tours. Chief among the men inspired by his learning and the awe he felt himself for the civilization that had been Rome's was Gibbon, who after a sleepless night in 1764, as he reports, hastened to the ruins of the Forum and, noting every spot where Romulus had stood, Cicero had spoken or Caesar fell, embarked on his history of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.<sup>19</sup> With Winckelmann and Gibbon together in Rome, the Grand Tour—conceived as bearing witness, through its ancient monuments, to the history of Western civilization itself—achieved its eighteenth-century apotheosis.

The journey south from Protestant England and Germany to Catholic France and then Italy and thereby to Europe's pagan and pre-Christian roots was not, however, conceived as embracing European civilization in all its rich diversity; seldom did grand tourists for whom a first-hand grasp of at least the remnants of that history could be described as their chief objective stray far in their pilgrimage from the paths pursued by Evelyn, Gibbon, Johnson or Goethe. Although agents of Lord Arundel, the Duke of Buckingham and, later, William Petty scavenged Greek antiquities in the seventeenth century, and while the classicists Jacob Spon and George Wheler journeyed there to investigate ancient inscriptions, until the end of the eighteenth century travellers to Greece rarely included tourists, who would instead arrive in great numbers only after they had been stirred by the imagery of poets such as Byron in *Don Juan* and, following Byron's death, of romantic enthusiasts of Greek nationalism in the nineteenth century. Ancient Athens might have been the school of Hellas and, thus, when it was absorbed by the Roman Republic in the course of the Macedonian Wars, the fount that inspired Rome as well and, through Rome, gave birth to Western civilization's literature, philosophy and some of its civic ideals. By way of Pope's translations of both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* tourists of the Age of Enlightenment could draw inspiration from not only classical but even pre-classical Greece, and through the Society of Dilettanti which a number of aristocratic tourists had formed in London in 1734 and which would eventually inspire the

foundation of the Royal Academy, their interest in ancient art and antiquities eventually turned from Italian to Greek culture.<sup>20</sup> A two-year archaeological and architectural expedition to Greece came to be launched in 1751 by the Society, which thereby established itself as the principal sponsor of Stuart's and Revett's (ultimately) five-volume *Antiquities of Athens* of 1762–1830,<sup>21</sup> and from 1764 to 1766 the Oxford don and historian of Troy, Richard Chandler, set out to tour both Greece and Asia Minor under the aegis of the Society.<sup>22</sup>

But while perhaps moved by the same ambitions as had stirred so many travellers to Italy throughout the Age of Enlightenment, this venture in the domain of scholarship and erudition provided no spur to grand tourism in Greece. Unless they also happened to be professional archaeologists, architects or historians, eighteenth-century enthusiasts of Homer, Thucydides, Plato and democracy by and large sought only to recover that Greek legacy in their imagination and did not set out to cross the Balkans or discover, in the Levant, the remains of a world that had for centuries belonged to the Ottoman Turks. In the early nineteenth century, when the British ambassador to Constantinople took it upon himself to rescue fragments of the Parthenon frieze, he forsook the example of Winckelmann, Gibbon and other tourists of the Age of Enlightenment, looting it instead and transporting it to Scotland in the manner of Napoleon's imperialist theft from Egypt of the Rosetta Stone. That relic of an even more ancient civilization than the Parthenon frieze, in turn, was surrendered to the British for whom it became a trophy and, together with the Elgin Marbles plundered from Athens, is now lodged in the British Museum.

Nor did grand tourists of the eighteenth century cross the Pyrenees to Spain. The frontiers of European civilization which they breached had already drawn Western European travellers to Russia by the 1720s and would by the 1770s prompt them to travel to Scandinavia, still later inspiring the great project of Edward Daniel Clarke, beginning in 1799 when he was initially accompanied by Robert Malthus and others, to open the vista of civilization to Nordic and Oriental no less than to mainstream Occidental readings.<sup>23</sup> The history of late eighteenth-century anthropology (when the term first acquired its modern meaning as the science of human nature) owes perhaps as much to such literature as, in a somewhat earlier period, to Jesuit and other commentaries on the peoples of China and New World Amerindians. But comparative and synchronic studies of the diverse populations and races which comprise our species did not, and perhaps could not, take the same form as diachronic accounts of the roots of Western civilization, from which point of view it might have been thoughtlessly supposed, by northern Europe's grand tourists, that the glories of Spanish culture, at their height in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, had come to be superseded by the achievements of other European



peoples. For the same reason that eighteenth-century (and indeed later) philosophers judged that there was no Spanish Enlightenment, travellers of the period setting out on the Grand Tour displayed hardly any enthusiasm for the attractions of Spain or for Spanish thinkers or writers apart from Cervantes, even though their precursors in the seventeenth century, sometimes guided by Howell,<sup>24</sup> had been drawn there when it was still one of the jewels in the firmament of European Christendom.

They did, however, travel to Switzerland, often on the same journeys as they made to France and Italy, but not for the same reasons. Most tourists to Switzerland had scant interest in tracing civilization's trajectory, still less in uncovering its classical roots. Switzerland appealed to them instead because it was, by and large, civilization's opposite, the uncouth state of nature most accessible to Europeans, such as Rousseau—cultivated society's fiercest enemy in the Age of Enlightenment—had so romantically portrayed. It was from Chamonix in 1760 that the philosopher Horace Bénédict de Saussure resolved to scale Mont Blanc, while from the inns soon afterwards established not only at Chamonix but also Grindelwald and Lauterbrunnen leisurely tourists were enabled to study alpine plants, and more adventurous hikers, like Wordsworth, could manage to negotiate mountain passes without having to camp overnight in the snow. Since it had come to be widely supposed by persons who reflected on such matters that mankind had not sinfully stumbled in his original state but had on the contrary risen from it, scaling mountainous heights might indeed be deemed compatible with human progress, requiring as it did so many of civilization's artefacts, including barometers, quadrants, compasses, ropes and heavy shoes, none of which, however, managed to save Walpole's spaniel, which he had ill-advisedly brought to the Alps for company, when it was consumed by a wolf.

The Low Countries and the Hapsburg and Prussian territories of Central Europe attracted tourists' interest as well, offering, by contrast with the antiquities of the south and the wilderness of the Alps, glimpses of the efflorescence of European culture in its most golden age of modernity before the rise of both England and France. They were filled with awe at the sight not only of Amsterdam's magnificent Guildhall, the mansions of the Keizersgracht, the Noorderkerk and other Protestant churches and the Sephardic Synagogue, but also at the bustle of traffic along and beside its glorious canals. Here they found a city, luxuriating in its commerce, still virtually in its prime, relishing a period of ascendancy of far closer historical proximity than Rome's, seeming more even than the port of London in the eighteenth century to form the gateway to the world. In Rotterdam they were enchanted not only by buildings scarcely less opulent but by the splendid panorama of its waterfront, the Boompjes, and by the humanist spirit of the northern Renaissance which Erasmus had

bequeathed to it, destined in each case to be ground into dust by the Luftwaffe in May 1940. In The Hague they could relish the Mauritshuis and especially the Ridderzaal, one of the glories of medieval European architecture, as well as gawk at the cabinet of curiosities in the collection of the Prince of Orange. If they sought further evidence of Holland's contribution to the civilization of modern Europe, they would not fail to visit the sumptuous royal palace and baroque gardens of Het Loo, the charming harbour of Dordrecht or the university towns of Utrecht and especially Leiden, in the eighteenth century perhaps the most progressive seat of higher education anywhere in the world, to which scholars and students from all corners of Europe flocked. Nor would they forget to inspect the collections of the Holbeins, van Dyck, Rubens, Rembrandt and Vermeer which formed the supreme treasures of Dutch art. Proceeding south to the Austrian Netherlands they would be drawn to the quieter civility of Antwerp, the exquisite Grand'Place and Théâtre Royal de la Monnaie of Brussels and the Gothic Hôtel de Ville of Louvain, in the eighteenth century also a vibrant and flourishing centre of learning.

Berlin's and Vienna's architectural delights were more manifestly imperial than most of the fine buildings in the principal cities of the Low Countries, while for many tourists of the Age of Enlightenment who visited it the glistening monuments, mansions, palaces, squares and bridges of Prague made its architecture seem the most elegant and refined in the whole of Europe. Frederick the Great's Palace of Sans Souci at Potsdam near Berlin and the Schloss Schönbrunn in Vienna were deemed to rival the Palace of Versailles in scale, grandeur or pretentiousness, but tourists who wished to spend less time indoors than was required for excursions through the rooms of these vast edifices could instead enjoy strolls through Berlin's Tiergarten and along Unter den Linden or, in Vienna, in the gardens of the Belvedere Palace, in the already famous woods outside the city or, in winter, even across the Danube when it froze. For tourists who might also imagine themselves cultivated sportsmen, Vienna in particular, with its riding and fencing schools was unrivalled by any other city in Europe. From Vienna or Prague they might journey to Dresden, the Elector of Saxony's official seat elegantly tucked along the banks of the Elbe, which at the hands of the Allies was to suffer a fate similar to that of Rotterdam in the Second World War but has since been more lovingly restored. From either Dresden or Berlin they would often visit Leipzig to inspect its Romanushaus or the Alte Rathaus in the Marktplatz, and while these buildings struck them as less imposing than those of Berlin or Dresden, tourists to Leipzig generally found the city's inhabitants livelier and more companionable. Such attractions as distinct from those of urban architecture also drew them to some of Germany's smaller university towns in other regions, such as Göttingen or Jena.

If European tourists of the eighteenth century were largely determined to bear witness to their civilization's origins and inheritance, they relied heavily in their travels upon its modern technology—the vastly improved infrastructure of its roads and its networks of post horses and carriages which transported them, and the inns and taverns through which they passed, often assisted by such modern luxuries as an inflatable bath and modern necessities like latch keys that could ensure their safety and secure their purses in hostel rooms while they slept. Above all, to make their journeys both possible and tolerable, tourists of the eighteenth century required the facility of two essential aids which substantially defined their way of life—leisure and wealth—not widely available in any earlier periods of European history. Civilization had by the eighteenth century come to mean more than just the refinements of the arts, sciences and culture; it had come as well to mean commercial society, or capitalism as it would be called in the nineteenth century, denoting civilization's highest stage—the German term *bürgerliche Gesellschaft* standing at once for commercial as well as civil society. With leisure and wealth tourists could contemplate its visceral no less than spiritual delights, conceiving rites of passage across Europe's frontiers through images of freedom or sex, to be realized or fulfilled by valets, grooms, prostitutes and other professional servants provisioned at the staging posts of their journeys or at their destinations by a fresh market catering for their acquired tastes.

European civilization was not only uncovered and retraced in the Grand Tours of eighteenth-century travellers. It was in crucial respects invented by those who set out in search of it, no less than were contemporaneous or subsequent ideas of national identity inspired by notions of a community imagined through similarly creative leaps of faith and pilgrimages of another sort. To subscribe to the idea of Europe internally *sans frontières* and defined instead by its common history it was not even necessary to embark on the Grand Tour. Kant's conception of perpetual peace within a continent politically shaped by the Treaties of Westphalia and Utrecht required the crossing of borders only in his mind, since as he recounts in his *Anthropologie* he became so violently sick on a short sea journey which he took as a young man<sup>25</sup> that he never again departed from Königsberg.

Together with other cosmopolitan thinkers of his day Kant envisaged the future of Europe as populated by citizens of the world, spiritually united by ties more durable than their separate political allegiances, languages and religions. In identifying the rights of man to be exactly the same as those of the citizen, however, the French Revolutionary *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* of 1789 established both the philosophical and practical framework not for European civilization but rather the modern ethos of the nation-state, initially conceived as civilization's

instrument or vehicle, although in time, however, it would instead become its negation. For in promoting the liberation of distinct peoples by way of their acquisition of territorial sovereignty, the nation-states established in Europe in the wake of the French Revolution were in the early twentieth century to drive them towards the Treaty of Versailles, out of which was to arise the fractious disintegration of European polities along the fissures of geographical, linguistic and cultural boundaries exploded in the Second World War. A flicker of the world that had been lost with the age of the Grand Tour could be witnessed in 1989 with the fresh and overwhelmingly peaceful dissolution of some of those boundaries on account of the collapse of Europe's communist regimes, but by then and shortly afterwards, in the Balkans and for many of its own disillusioned citizens as well as other peoples throughout the world whose history was no longer cast in its shadow, the exemplary role once ascribed to Europe as the bearer of the whole of Western civilization had come to seem grievously tarnished if not fatally flawed.<sup>26</sup>

ROUSSEAU ON RAMEAU AND REVOLUTION

The controversy about the nature and extent of Rousseau's influence upon the French Revolution of 1789 began around 1790<sup>1</sup> and has not yet been settled. I suppose that like most important historical disputes it probably never will be resolved in any conclusive way, largely because a truly satisfactory treatment of the problem unavoidably presupposes our having precise answers to questions which are even more difficult to settle—questions, for instance, about the general causes of revolutions, about the characteristics of an historical influence and about the distinction between the meaning an author imparts to his theory and the significance its professed followers ascribe to it later. Much of the difficulty in this particular case, however, stems quite simply from the fact that the solution to the problem depends fundamentally upon testimony which cannot be found anywhere in Rousseau's writings. It seems to me surprising, therefore, that scholars with an interest in the subject have devoted so little attention to the only remarks Rousseau himself ever made about the influence of his own ideas upon the course of a revolution in France. For in his *Confessions* Rousseau observed that he had once actually been responsible for *preventing* the outbreak of a revolution in his adopted country—clearly not the Revolution of 1789 which came to pass anyway, but rather the French Revolution of 1753 which he claimed would have occurred but for the publication of his *Lettre sur la musique française* in November of that year.<sup>2</sup> 'C'étoit le tems de la grande querelle du Parlement et du Clergé', Rousseau reflected:

Le Parlement venoit d'être exilé; la fermentation étoit au comble; tout menaçoit d'un prochain soulèvement. La Brochure parut; à l'instant toutes les autres querelles furent oubliées; on ne songea qu'au péril de la musique française, et il n'y eut plus de soulèvement que contre moi. Il fut tel que la Nation n'en est jamais bien revenue. . . . Quand on lira que cette brochure a peut-être empêché une revolution dans l'Etat, on croira rêver. C'est pourtant une vérité bien réelle.<sup>3</sup>

Now like many passages in the *Confessions* this statement positively invites our incredulity and must at least be treated with circumspection. But while it undoubtedly exaggerates and perhaps also distorts the significance of the public reaction to Rousseau's work, it is none the less

accompanied by enough corroborating evidence to suggest, in my view, that it contains a very substantial core of truth. For one thing, the *Lettre sur la musique françoise* elicited more replies in the space of four months than any of Rousseau's other works were to do throughout the whole of his lifetime; and, in fact, the controversy about this text, though it raged principally in 1753 and 1754, continued into the 1760s, 1770s and 1780s as well.<sup>4</sup>

For another, the tone and substance of the replies make it perfectly clear that Rousseau's friends and critics alike promptly recognized the *Lettre* as a political tract whose author was the leader of a party. Jacques Cazotte, for instance, in his *Observations sur la Lettre de Rousseau*, condemned the essay as the work of a furious, furtive, fractious and ignorant conspirator,<sup>5</sup> while the most verbose of his detractors—a M. de Rochemont—insisted upon calling his reply the *Réflexions d'un patriote*.<sup>6</sup> The *Lettre sur la musique françoise* is the only one of Rousseau's writings about which nearly all the leading figures of the French Enlightenment at the time were agreed in their enthusiasm and against which most of the critics of the 'party of humanity'—the defenders of tradition, authority and religion, as well as of French music—concentrated their attack. No work of the Enlightenment before Helvétius's *De l'esprit* of 1758 so quickly aroused such passionate convictions immediately upon its publication, and no other work at all proved quite so controversial. This was an age, it must be remembered, when disputes about culture and taste divided men as much, and often in the same way, as did quarrels about justice and law, an age when Mercier could legitimately claim in his *Tableau de Paris* that the government of France cherishes opera dearly because theatrical factions always make other quarrels pale into insignificance by contrast.<sup>7</sup> And that was precisely what Rousseau in his *Confessions* maintained had been the effect of his own work.

Then again, while we may prefer to remain sceptical about Rousseau's contention that the members of the orchestra of the Paris Opéra plotted to murder him after the publication of the *Lettre*, we do know that they hanged him in effigy and generally treated him badly when he next attended a performance, and we know, too, that the free pass to the Opéra which had been awarded to him for the success of *Le Devin du village* in 1752 was promptly revoked. We even have some evidence to suggest that a *lettre de cachet* for Rousseau's arrest was contemplated, though it was never in fact issued.<sup>8</sup> There was, in short, a great public outcry against Rousseau, as d'Argenson wrote in his *Mémoires*,<sup>9</sup> for, as Palissot added, the work brought a swarm of enemies down upon its author.<sup>10</sup> The *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* of 1751 had also elicited many replies, but in that case Rousseau's text had been treated much more cordially by the great majority of its critics. The anger fomented by the *Lettre sur la musique*

*françoise* in 1753, on the other hand, was directed as much against his person as against his ideas, and it was from this moment that Rousseau first became acquainted with the public persecution which, in both real and imaginary forms, was to bedevil the whole of his career thereafter.

Now whether that outcry and the collective voice of all those enemies were sufficient to distract the citizens of Paris from the revolutionary activities in which they would otherwise have been engaged is, of course, an exceedingly difficult matter to ascertain—almost as difficult, in fact, as the task of establishing whether the French Revolution of 1789 might still have occurred without Rousseau's influence. But we have it on the independent testimony of Voltaire, Barbier, d'Argenson and others, that in November 1753 the King's attempt to dissolve the *Grand'Chambre* or Central Court of the Paris Parlement—after he had, in any case, already exiled and dispersed the bulk of the magistrates in May—was met with such resistance on the part of the other Paris tribunals that the capital was on the verge of anarchy and, as d'Argenson put it, there were fears of an uprising.<sup>11</sup> Of course Rousseau flattered himself in supposing that the appearance of the *Lettre sur la musique françoise* brought an immediate end to the crisis, since it continued in much the same fashion—and in 1754, indeed, affected many provincial parlements which had not been in conflict with the Crown during the previous year—until, that is, the return of the Paris magistrates in September. Nevertheless, there were at least some weeks of respite in December 1753, and Grimm, in his *Correspondance littéraire*, offers just a modicum of support for Rousseau's claim in his observation, made during the crisis, that the whole of the *Querelle des Bouffons* was far more captivating than the petty squabbles between the Parlement and the Court—a subject in which the public took only a fleeting interest and which failed to capture a fraction of the attention that had been devoted to the revolution in music.<sup>12</sup> 'Il est difficile de prévoir comment cette querelle finira', he added in another passage,

et le public en est bien plus intrigué que de la Chambre royale et de ses procédures. . . . Il faut attendre que les esprits soient calmés, et qu'on soit revenu de la chaleur et de l'emportement que M. Rousseau a excités par sa *Lettre*.<sup>13</sup>

Lady Sydney Morgan later put forward much the same thesis in a slightly embellished paraphrase of some remarks—from Rousseau's *Confessions* again—which appeared in her book on *France* in 1817. 'Paris [was] divided into two formidable musical factions', she wrote,

which . . . were not without their political colour. The privileged class cried out against innovation, even in crotchets and quavers; and the noble and the rich, the women and the court, clung to the monotonous discords of Lulli,

Rameau, and Mondonville, as belonging to the ancient and established order of things; while the musical connoisseurs and amateurs, the men of talent, genius, and letters, were enthusiastic for nature, taste, and Italian music.<sup>14</sup>

In the light of all these political features of Rousseau's work it is hardly surprising that historians of the *Querelle des Bouffons* have been as impassioned in their reflections about the extent and significance of Rousseau's rôle in the dispute as historians of the Revolution of 1789 have been about the scope of his influence in those events. Even leaving aside the vitriolic attacks and extravagant praise of the participants themselves—which we should of course have expected—we find that later commentators have hardly ever treated Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique françoise* without either unbridled enthusiasm, on the one hand, or unmitigated contempt, on the other.<sup>15</sup> We might have imagined that at least in relatively recent periods of political turmoil the attention of musical critics would have been turned to more lofty or topical issues than that of Rousseau's contribution to a mid-eighteenth-century debate about the relative merits of French and Italian opera. Yet on the contrary modern critics have turned to the subject again especially at times of political unrest, and they have fashioned their appraisals in still more political terms. Thus at roughly the same time during World War II that American sociologists began to uncover what they took to be the totalitarian elements of Rousseau's social theory,<sup>16</sup> Jean Gaudefroy-Demombynes, for instance, in his *Jugements allemands sur la musique française au XVIIIe siècle*, hailed the *Lettre* as having inaugurated 'un communisme idéal' and 'la libération de l'égoïsme capitaliste',<sup>17</sup> while Noël Boyer, who dedicated his study of *La Guerre des bouffons et la musique française* to Rameau and the spirit of French order, denounced the work as alien and decadent anarchic barbarism, concluding with an appeal on behalf of the restoration of French music which, he proclaimed, might well bring in its train further restorations of another sort.<sup>18</sup>

For all these reasons I think that the subject of Rousseau and Revolution might be re-examined more profitably against the background of the *Lettre sur la musique françoise* and the uprising which he claimed this work had averted, rather than in the more customary context of the *Contrat social* and the chain of political events that text may have heralded or initiated. And yet if the *Lettre* was promptly greeted as a political tract of some kind it was obviously a political tract conceived in an essentially musical frame of reference. It may have aroused political feelings and achieved a political end, but its subject is the nature of music in general and the deficiencies of French opera in particular. I should therefore like to turn my attention next to the central theses of this work and to make two main points about the substance of Rousseau's argument. The first is



that in effect, if not by design, the *Lettre* constitutes a critique of the musical philosophy of Rameau—a critique which Rameau himself attempted to refute in his own replies to Rousseau's text. The second is that it was in the course of Rousseau's formulations of his rejoinders to the counter-attacks of Rameau that he came to develop the ideas of the *Lettre* as a part of his more general social theory—and, indeed, as that part which was to prove the most politically radical in tone and the most revolutionary in its implications.

There are two principal themes of the *Lettre sur la musique française* which I propose to consider here: on the one hand the claim that melody in music must always take precedence over harmony, and on the other the argument that Italian opera is intrinsically superior to French. With regard to the first theme Rousseau's contention in the *Lettre* was quite simply that a clear melodic line is musically more important than the harmonic structures built around it, in so far as there is always an inescapably artificial quality produced by the intonation of more than one note, or the expression of more than one vocal line, at a time. For whatever harmony might be produced by an ensemble of voices each singing a fine tune, Rousseau remarked, the splendid effect of these songs vanishes as soon as they are heard all at once. There then follows only a succession of chords which leaves the listener cold because it is no longer animated by melody. It is impossible, in short, for the ear to lend itself to several melodies at a time, since each counteracts the impression of the other and nothing emerges from this mêlée but confusion and noise.<sup>19</sup> In contrast with Rameau's conception of a uniform harmonic structure which underlay all forms of music—a thesis about which I shall say something in a moment—Rousseau therefore put forward in the *Lettre* his own rule for the unity or singularity of melody which he thought approximated natural song most closely. For a work of music to become interesting, he observed, for it to arouse the sentiments it was intended to excite in the hearts of those who hear it, all its parts together must fortify the expression of its central theme. The harmony should only serve to make that theme more lively; the accompaniment should embellish it, but not leave it suffocated or disfigured; and the bass, by a uniform and simple though imperceptible progression, should guide both the performer and the listener to a full appreciation of the melody:

Il faut, en un mot, que le tout ensemble ne porte à la fois qu'une mélodie à l'oreille & qu'une idée à l'esprit. Cette unité de mélodie me paroît une règle indispensable & non moins importante en Musique, que l'unité d'action dans une Tragédie; car elle est fondée sur le même principe, & dirigée vers le même objet.<sup>20</sup>

In the *Lettre*, moreover, Rousseau put forward an additional claim about the connection between melodic and harmonic music which he was to elaborate in his subsequent works—a claim to the effect that in so far as the patterns of harmony differed between nations, this difference was attributable to the influence of melody, which in turn expressed the national variations between forms of language:

C'est de la mélodie seulement qu'il faut tirer le caractère particulier d'une Musique Nationale; d'autant plus que ce caractère étant principalement donné par la langue, le chant proprement dit doit ressentir sa plus grande influence.<sup>21</sup>

Some languages, Rousseau contended, were more appropriate to music than others, while certain tongues did not have any musical attributes at all. Those languages which were marked, for instance, by a lack of sonorous vowels, on the one hand, or, on the other, by an excess of consonants, or mute and nasal syllables, or imprecisely measured figures of speech, could only be joined to an insipid and monotonous form of musical expression which must be dull when sung slowly and coarse at full speed.<sup>22</sup> Since it would be impossible to construct agreeable tunes which might be sung in languages of this kind, composers in nations characterized by such defective speech would be obliged to turn their attention to harmonic arrangements instead, and even then they would often be unable to extract a melodic theme from the strident noise of their accompaniment:

L'impossibilité d'inventer des chants agréables obligerait les Compositeurs à tourner tous leurs soins du côté de l'harmonie, & faute de beautés réelles, ils y introduiroient des beautés de convention, qui n'auroient presque d'autre mérite que la difficulté vaincue; au lieu d'une bonne Musique, ils imagineroient une Musique sçavante; pour suppléer au chant, ils multiplieroient les accompagn[ne]mens. . . . Pour ôter l'insipidité, ils augmenteroient la confusion; ils croiroient faire de la Musique & ils ne feroient que du bruit. . . . Partout où ils verroient des notes ils trouveroient du chant, attendu qu'en effet leur chant ne seroit que des notes. *Voces, praetereaëque nihil.*<sup>23</sup>

Rousseau's principal thesis in the *Lettre*, in fact, was that the French language in particular suffered from just these faults and was therefore insusceptible to a properly musical exposition. The continual bark and bray which was characteristic of French songs could not be suffered by anyone who was unprepared for the ordeal, while the brusque and heavy harmonies of French accompaniment fell upon the ears of listeners as a deluge of tedious notes. The airs of French opera, moreover, were not proper airs at all, and its recitative was misconceived as well.<sup>24</sup> Thus, Rousseau concluded, 'les François n'ont point de Musique & n'en peuvent avoir; ou que si jamais ils en ont une, ce sera tant pis pour eux'.<sup>25</sup>

Against all the calamities which made French prose so intractable as music Rousseau juxtaposed the virtues of Italian. For the inflexions of the Italian language were more soft and gentle, he argued, its modulations more precise and sonorous, and the tempo of its speech more constant, than their equivalents in French—all these qualities comprising precisely what was required to make possible the expression of a language in song.<sup>26</sup>

Now the technical elaboration of this argument in the *Lettre*, and especially those features of the work that are expressly joined to the *Querelle des Bouffons* which had occasioned its composition by Rousseau, need not be discussed in detail here.<sup>27</sup> I have tried to show elsewhere<sup>28</sup> that Rousseau substantially modified his views about both the nature of harmony in general and the defects of French opera in particular in the years between 1749, when he compiled his articles on music for the *Encyclopédie*, and 1753, when he drafted the *Lettre sur la musique française*. In the 1760s, moreover, when he prepared his article 'Unité de mélodie' for the *Dictionnaire de musique*, he was later to argue that his appreciation of the predominance of melody over harmony in music had actually been inspired by the operas which he had heard in Venice<sup>29</sup> when he had been secretary to the French ambassador there in 1743–44; so that the principle could not have been established but only confirmed for him by the Paris performances of 'Les Bouffons' some ten years later. The *Lettre sur la musique française*, he added, had been designed to elaborate the foundations of that principle just as his opera, *Le Devin du village*, had constituted his attempt to realize it in practice, though in its theoretical formulation, which is my central concern here, he maintained that it had been put forward as a direct challenge to the views of Rameau:

M. Rameau, pour prouver que l'énergie de la Musique vient toute de l'Harmonie . . . n'a pas vû qu'il prouvoit tout le contraire de ce qu'il vouloit prouver; car dans tous les exemples qu'il donne, l'Accompagnement de la Basse ne sert qu'à déterminer le Chant . . . l'Harmonie n'agit . . . qu'en déterminant la Mélodie à être telle ou telle, & c'est purement comme Mélodie que l'intervalle a différentes expressions selon le lieu du Mode où il est employé.<sup>30</sup>

In any event, Rameau, who was never to know anything at all about the *Dictionnaire de musique*, and who in 1753 could not even adduce from the *Lettre* that Rousseau's concept of melody had been designed specifically to challenge him, none the less immediately perceived the sense in which the concept of melody elaborated in this work was actually opposed to his own theory. He promptly embarked upon the task of overturning the thesis about the relation between melody and harmony which Rousseau had set forth, and in April 1754, just slightly more than four months after the *Lettre* appeared, his reply was published under the

title *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique*. Here, in the text which forms his own main contribution to the *Querelle des Bouffons*,<sup>31</sup> Rameau argued that melody was in fact dependent upon rather than superior to harmony, and that the natural sentiments of musical expression were essentially derived from, and not just adorned by, a harmonic base. In a musical composition, he remarked, the harmony is played before the melody which stems from it, so that the singer may be inspired by the feeling he must display independently of the words, 'sentiment qui frappera tout homme sans prévention, qui voudra bien se livrer aux purs effets de la Nature'.<sup>32</sup> In his *Erreurs sur la musique dans l'Encyclopédie* of the following year, moreover, he turned again to Rousseau's confusion of priorities, exclaiming that 'pour un Partisan de la Mélodie c'est bien mal prendre sa bisque que de s'inscrire contre la plénitude de l'harmonie en général'.<sup>33</sup> And in both works, as I shall try to show, Rameau set out to rebut the principle of melody which he associated mainly with the *Lettre sur la musique française*, even though in the second case at least he appeared to be concentrating his attack upon some of the articles on music in the *Encyclopédie* in which Rousseau had put forward a conception of harmony that was much more favourably disposed to his own theory.

With regard to Rousseau's thesis about the distinction between national styles of opera, moreover, we must bear in mind the fact that he did not really decry the faults of French music in any general way until he had first established the deficiencies of the French language; so that his condemnation of the operatic music of France in 1753 was in fact rendered possible only by the development, from 1749 onwards, of his ideas about the central place which language occupies in musical expression.<sup>34</sup> It is true that in the *Encyclopédie* he had already remarked upon the styles of music prevailing in different nations, and especially in his article 'Accompagnement' he drew a distinction between the modes of accompaniment that best suited the Italian and French styles in particular.<sup>35</sup> But it was only in the *Lettre sur la musique française* that his observations in the *Encyclopédie* about these differences came to be transformed into an argument that the French language was less suitably adapted to articulation in music. In the concluding section of the *Lettre* Rousseau indeed commented at some length upon a passage from Lully's opera *Armide* which by repute was 'le modèle le plus parfait du vrai récitatif François',<sup>36</sup> but which, in his view, was marked only by insipid cadences that suited neither the lyrics nor the sense of the theatrical plot. And in 1753, therefore, Rousseau's attack upon French opera was illustrated principally by an extract from the dominant musical figure of the previous age and not at all by any selections from the works of Rameau.

Despite these qualifications, however, there is no doubt that Rameau was incensed by Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique française*, since the two

main contentions of that work, as he perceived them, were directed either against his own conception of harmony, on the one hand, or against the national style of opera of which he was then the leading exponent, on the other. The man who was both the foremost composer and theorist of France at the time, as well as the most dedicated and outspoken champion of these undeniable facts, must have seen himself as the intended if not explicit victim of the first charge and equally as the successor to the culprit named in the second. In any event, over the twenty months that followed the publication of the *Lettre*, Rameau produced two works, the *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique* and the *Erreurs sur la musique*, in which he attempted to refute the claims Rousseau had made, both about the relation between melody and harmony and about the distinction between French and Italian music.

The first of these claims was quite clearly treated by Rameau with greater severity than the second, probably because Rousseau's notion of the primacy of a melodic theme over its harmonic accompaniment was, in his view, nothing less than a sheer inversion of the truth. Melody was not the source but the product of harmony, he retorted,<sup>37</sup> and he charged that anyone who supposed the opposite could not pretend to have a sure grasp of the principles of music, since 'tant qu'on ne considérera que la Mélodie comme principal moteur des effets de Musique, on ne fera pas de grands progrès dans cet Art'.<sup>38</sup> The concept of 'l'unité de mélodie', which Rousseau in the *Lettre* had suggested was more central to musical expression than any harmonic rule, was thus decried by Rameau as 'une chimère . . . dont l'effet n'a que de foibles attraites en Musique sans le secours de l'harmonie'.<sup>39</sup>

Already in his earlier works, for instance in the *Traité de l'harmonie* of 1722 and the *Génération harmonique* of 1737,<sup>40</sup> Rameau had insisted that the melodic phrases of our music were derived invariably from a harmonic base;<sup>41</sup> and as he developed his theory of the 'basse fondamentale' in the years leading to the publication of the *Encyclopédie*, he in fact came to believe that other mathematical sciences were also governed by the principles of harmony he had discovered. By 1750, at the age of sixty-six, he felt sufficiently confident about the truth of his belief to proclaim, in his *Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie*, that the laws of every science were drawn, in the first instance, from the rules applying to the resonance of a 'corps sonore':

C'est dans la Musique que la nature semble nous assigner le principe Philosophique de ces premières notions purement Mathématiques sur lesquelles roulent toutes les Sciences, je veux dire, les proportions, Harmonique, Arithmétique & Géométrie, d'où suivent les progressions de même genre, & qui se manifestent au premier instant que résonne un corps sonore.<sup>42</sup>

Using arguments that owed much to Pythagorean metaphysics,<sup>43</sup> Rameau in his later years put forward the claim that musical intervals served as a model for all the relations which prevailed in the world of Nature. Music, he contended, was at once a science and an art, so that acoustics and aesthetics—that is to say, the studies of its physical and artistic material—must ultimately be reduced to the same principles. And by the time that he produced his *Observations* in 1754 Rameau was quite fixed in his view that the harmonic proportions and progressions of music which he had explained showed that this subject was the mother of all the arts and sciences. ‘Ne l’abandonnons . . . plus’, he exclaimed,

cette mere des Sciences & des Arts, examinons-la bien, & tâchons désormais de ne plus nous lais[ser] conduire que par elle. Le principe dont il s’agit, est non-seulement celui de tous les Arts de goût . . . il l’est encore de toutes les Sciences soumises au calcul: ce qu’on ne peut nier, sans nier en même tems que ces Sciences ne soient fondées sur les proportions & progressions, dont la Nature nous fait part dans le Phénomène du Corps sonore, avec des constances si marquées, qu’il est impossible de se refuser à l’évidence: & comment le nier! puisque point de proportions, point de Géométrie.<sup>44</sup>

The rules that applied to music, therefore, must be identical throughout the world, and, equally, they must be fundamental to all other subjects. For the harmonic laws of Nature were at once musical and cosmic, and to define their principles in a systematic fashion was, according to Rameau, the most important enterprise to which man could devote his talents. ‘Tel est le pouvoir prédominant de la proportion géométrique dans la Musique’, he was later to proclaim in another context, ‘tel il est, dit-on, dans l’Architecture, & tel il doit être, si je ne me trompe, dans bien d’autres Sciences’.<sup>45</sup>

The second of Rousseau’s principal claims in the *Lettre* was answered by Rameau in a much more indirect and elusive fashion, one that almost entirely overlooked the crucial points Rousseau had made about the relative musical merits of the French and Italian languages. For though as an operatic composer Rameau was often ingenious in his use of intervals and variations of tempo to express or to add emphasis to the texts of his libretti, as a theorist he never paid much attention to the tonal qualities of speech and in fact often appeared to have little patience for the suggestion that the sentiments expressed in music might be mediated in some respects by the words to which the notes were attached.<sup>46</sup> No perspective of songs conceived as poems had any real bearing upon his view of musical form and structure, so that Rousseau’s distinction between national styles of music seems to have stirred him very little, if at all. But in his own fashion Rameau did object to Rousseau’s thesis that Italian music was superior to French, and he set down his reply in two ways.

Firstly, in his *Observations*, he pointed in detail to several apparent contradictions in Rousseau's study of *Armide*,<sup>47</sup> noting, too, that a particular chordal shift to the subdominant mode about which Rousseau had complained was in fact perfectly justified in virtue of its 'basse fondamentale',<sup>48</sup> and commenting that, on the whole, Lully 'pensoit en Grand'<sup>49</sup> and did not commit the petty technical faults which had been ascribed to him. Secondly, he charged, in the *Erreurs sur la musique*, that Rousseau had been unable to appreciate French music in general, and the French style of recitative in particular, largely because of his naïve view of the place occupied by measure in musical expression. In the *Lettre* Rousseau had decried French recitative as an 'extravagante criailerie'<sup>50</sup> because the lyrics it employed were too often swollen up and drawn out so as to suit the artificial pace of the accompaniment; Italian recitative, on the other hand, he had depicted as sung in clearly measured tones which were more appropriate to the tempo of speech and which helped to place due emphasis upon the meaning of the plot.<sup>51</sup> But Rameau maintained that, in this distinction, Rousseau had allowed himself to be seduced by a crude notion of measure which took no account of the subtle progressions of harmonic accompaniment, claiming that he really ought to have commended *French* recitative instead for its greater variety of pace and tempo.<sup>52</sup> In any event it was most odd, Rameau observed, that Rousseau should have admired a certain style of accompaniment on the grounds that it does not attract the attention of the listener at all,<sup>53</sup> while the praise he had lavished upon the Italian style was inconsistent since, for no good reason, he sometimes preferred a lighter, sometimes a heavier, touch.<sup>54</sup>

Now Rameau had always reacted sharply to even the mildest criticisms of his theory, but in his later years his impatience with other thinkers assumed the form of a most fierce exasperation whenever he felt that his views had been challenged or opposed. I think it is largely because of this habit of mind that he exaggerated the extent to which the *Lettre sur la musique française* had been designed to challenge his own works. In it Rousseau had, after all, objected specifically to some features of Lully's opera *Armide* and not at all to any composition by Rameau. And even if he had mentioned Rameau as an exponent of the French style of *tragédie lyrique* that he deplored, he would in any case have had to take note of the fact that Rameau was the composer of a successful *opéra bouffon* too.<sup>55</sup> Rousseau was certainly clear in the *Lettre* that the superiority of Italian over French music was due to a difference between languages rather than the talents of composers, and in that sense at least no French musician was personally at fault for the defects of his work. With regard to Rousseau's remarks in the *Lettre* about musical theory, moreover, it must be stressed here that he refers directly to Rameau only three times in that text, twice in order to object merely to his appraisal of Lully<sup>56</sup> and



once actually to agree with his claim that certain chords evoke particular human sentiments.<sup>57</sup> Despite the widening gulf which had developed between their ideas from 1749 to 1753, Rousseau did not, in the *Lettre*, propound any general critique of Rameau's theory. Indeed, even after he replied to Rameau's attacks in 1755, he still often acclaimed the genius of the master and acknowledged the immense debt his own ideas on music owed to those that Rameau had advanced before.<sup>58</sup> Nevertheless, whether or not there is sufficient justification for the severity of the replies Rameau made to Rousseau's work in 1754 and 1755, I hope that I have shown at least some of the more important ways in which he attempted to refute the claims that form the two main themes of the *Lettre sur la musique française*. I should like now to say a few words about Rousseau's answers to these objections and to elaborate my second point about the politically radical character of his speculations in musical and linguistic theory.

There were two main lines of criticism that Rousseau pursued in his replies, of which one was built essentially around a thesis about the cultural diversity of musical conventions, while the other was constructed upon a premise about the course of their historical evolution. Each of these approaches received its fullest treatment in a separate text, though as we shall see in a moment those texts at one stage actually comprised two sections of a single essay.

Now, according to Rousseau himself, it was still in 1755, and thus only a short while after the appearance of Rameau's *Erreurs sur la musique*, that he composed the first draft of his rejoinder.<sup>59</sup> In this work, which he eventually entitled the *Examen de deux principes avancés par M. Rameau*, he recapitulated his ideas in the *Lettre* about the connection between melody and harmony, and for the first time in any of his published writings he focused his attack directly upon what he took to be the doctrine of Rameau. For in the *Examen de deux principes* Rousseau claimed that Rameau had been mistaken to suppose that the melodic line in every form of music stemmed from a harmonic root. Melody, he argued, both expressed and excited our natural passions in a tonal language and stood in much the same relation to its accompaniment as did design to colours in painting, so that the conventions of our harmony should serve only to embellish rather than determine the intonations of the human voice:

M. Rameau, pour comparer la mélodie à l'harmonie, commence par dépouiller la première de tout ce qui lui étant propre, ne peut convenir à l'autre: il ne considère pas la mélodie comme un chant, mais comme un remplissage; il dit que ce remplissage naît de l'harmonie, & il a raison . . . les accens de la voix passent jusqu'à l'ame; car ils sont l'expression naturelle des passions, & en les peignant, ils les excitent. C'est par eux que la Musique



devient oratoire, éloquente, imitative, ils en forment le langage. . . . La mélodie est dans la Musique ce qu'est le dessein dans la Peinture, l'harmonie n'y fait que l'effet des couleurs. C'est par le chant, non par les accords que les sons ont de l'expression, du feu, de la vie; c'est le chant seul qui leur donne les effets moraux qui font toute l'énergie de la Musique.<sup>60</sup>

Rousseau now contended that the philosophical presuppositions of Rameau's theory were mistaken, largely because the set of rules figuring in that theory could not, as their author imagined, have universal application. In reply to the thesis that the general laws of harmonic progression must be identical throughout the world, Rousseau maintained that the particular scheme adduced by Rameau was only limited in scope. He allowed that the principles of the 'basse fondamentale' and of the chordal structures to which the 'basse' gave rise, were—for the most part—technically correct, but that was just with regard to a number of musical forms and not all. These principles elucidate the features which mark the scales of certain modern and Western nations, but they do not explain the music of the ancient Greeks, for instance, whose scales, divided into tetrachords instead of octaves, formed harmonic patterns different from our own. The 'basse fondamentale' as it had been conceived in Rameau's system, he proclaimed, was truly fundamental only to those varieties of music that had come to be adopted by convention, and the convention could only be appreciated by persons who had been trained in the appropriate way. Thus even in our own society most men were quite unable to fathom and enjoy the harmonic configurations which the theory described; and, in any case, Rameau's ideas, as Rousseau understood them, account neither for the origin of the minor mode nor for the phenomenon of dissonance.<sup>61</sup> In the light of these facts it followed for Rousseau that the 'basse fondamentale' could not have been derived from Nature:

Si la longue routine de nos successions harmoniques guide l'homme exercé & le Compositeur de profession; quel fut le guide de ces ignorans, qui n'avoient jamais entendu d'harmonie, dans ces chants que la nature a dictés long-tems avant l'invention de l'Art? Avoient-ils donc un sentiment d'harmonie antérieur à l'expérience; & si quelqu'un leur eût fait entendre la Basse-fondamentale de l'air qu'ils avoient composé, pense-t-on qu'aucun d'eux eût reconnu-là son guide, & qu'il eût trouvé le moindre rapport entre cette Basse & cet air? . . . Les Grecs n'ont reconnu pour consonnances que celles que nous appelons consonnances parfaites; ils ont rejeté de ce nombre les tierces & les sixtes. . . . Qu'on pense maintenant quelles notions d'harmonie on peut avoir, & quels modes harmoniques on peut établir, en bannissant les tierces & les sixtes du nombre des consonances!<sup>62</sup>

On Rousseau's interpretation, then, the musical philosophy of Rameau  
 wa *cipes* he

paid some tribute to its subtleties of technical detail, but he did not agree that the laws of music which Rameau had adduced were either fixed, or constant, or everywhere the same. On the contrary those laws, in his view, were manifold, complex and, above all, different from one culture and one period to the next. Together with d'Alembert<sup>63</sup> he believed that Rameau had mistaken music for geometry and metaphysics and, as a consequence, had failed to provide an adequate account of what, in fact, were incompatible systems of music devised by men.<sup>64</sup> The rules of harmony that Rameau had defined, in short, formed a theory about chords but not about musical expression.

The second of Rousseau's replies to Rameau—and the last of his writings I wish to consider here—is the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*. There has been a long and complex historiographical dispute about the dates of composition of this work which need not trouble us now, though it should perhaps be noted that some surviving first-draft fragments of the text—including passages about the musical theory of Rameau—date from the beginning of 1754, at which time they formed a part of the original manuscript of Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité*. Rousseau must therefore have had it in mind to challenge a number of features in Rameau's system, probably as they had figured in the *Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie* of 1750, even before Rameau had come to publish his own objections to the *Lettre sur la musique française*. We know, moreover, that a second draft of what was to prove a substantial part of the *Essai* was intercalated by Rousseau in the first draft of his *Examen de deux principes*, and that is why I said a moment ago that the two works once formed sections of a single essay. But leaving aside these problems,<sup>65</sup> I should like now to turn to the final version of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, probably assembled around 1760,<sup>66</sup> and to offer an explanation of the meaning of those chapters in the work that pertain directly to his controversy with Rameau.

The account of music that Rousseau developed in the *Essai* was concerned, above all, with its properties as a language. For though it was speech which underlay the fundamental difference between human and animal behaviour, the expression of our sentiments, in his view, must have depended initially upon the intonations of our speech, so that only music could supply those phrases, tones and accents required to bestow some sense or purpose upon the vocal sounds produced by men.<sup>67</sup> According to Rousseau, therefore, the first languages must have had a rhythmic and melodic character. They must have been poetic rather than in prose, sung rather than spoken, and the significance that came to be attached to their terms must have depended upon the musical forms in which they were constructed.<sup>68</sup> Primitive expressions, that is, must have derived their meaning

Rousseau believed, moreover, that it was the passions of men rather than their practical needs—their love and their hatred, for instance, rather than their hunger and thirst—which must originally have given rise to language. For ‘l’origine des langues’, he wrote,

n’est point dûe aux premiers besoins des hommes; it seroit absurde que de la cause qui les écarte vint le moyen qui les unit. D’où peut donc venir cette origine? Des besoins moraux, des passions. Toutes les passions rapprochent les hommes que la nécessité de chercher à vivre force à se fuir. Ce n’est ni la faim ni la soif, mais l’amour la haine la pitié la colère qui leur ont arraché les premières voix.<sup>70</sup>

Thus before men came to communicate ideas, and before they began to harangue their neighbours in order to secure a personal advantage, they could only have expressed, in an impulsive manner, those sentiments and dispositions they all shared. The vocal gestures they made must have been exuberant and benign,<sup>71</sup> and since, in their earliest societies, they had not yet come to recognize their separate interests they must, in short, have been enchanting:

Dans cet âge heureux où rien ne marquoit les heures, rien n’obligeoit à les compter; le tems n’avoit d’autre mesure que l’amusement et l’ennui. . . . Là se firent les premières fêtes, les pieds bondissoient de joye, le geste empressé ne suffisoit plus, la voix l’accompagnoit d’accens passionnés, le plaisir et le desir confondus ensemble se faisoient sentir à la fois. Là fut enfin le vrai berceau des peuples, et du pur cristal des fontaines sortirent les premiers feux de l’amour.<sup>72</sup>

It was also Rousseau’s view, however, that while our first languages were formed from a variety of intonations serving as gestures, they could not all have remained musical for long. In the southern regions of the world, where the climate was mild and the land fertile, the needs of men and women were largely satisfied by Nature; and it was only in order to convey their inclinations and desires that they began to sing to one another. Those persons, on the other hand, who were later driven by fortuitous events<sup>73</sup> to live in northern areas had always to contend with Nature in order to survive and must, as a consequence, have begun to work even before they had learnt to sing. The effect upon their speech of a harsh climate and poor soil would certainly have been considerable,<sup>74</sup> for they were very soon obliged to construct a set of terms with which they could communicate their needs and had hardly any opportunity to devise some means by which they might express or articulate their pleasures.<sup>75</sup> While our original languages, then, were born of the musical ebullience of southern peoples whose speech and song expressed their own natural affections, the languages which subsequently arose in the North were produced

as a response to the constraints imposed by a Nature that was external to the character of men. In the one case, in bountiful surroundings, our needs were developed from our passions; in the other, in an inclement world, it was our needs which gave rise to our passions. Whereas in the South, therefore, one might have heard—or rather, overheard—the dulcet melodies of love, in the North one would inevitably have been confronted by men who cried out for help. And languages that in the one region were formed of gentle modulations and enlivened by sonorous tones, must, in the other region have become either monotonous, or gruff, or shrill:

Dans les climats méridionaux où la nature est prodigue les besoins naissent des passions, dans les pays froids où elle est avare les passions naissent des besoins, et les langues, tristes filles de la nécessité se sentent de leur dure origine . . . dans ces lieux où la terre ne donne rien qu'à force de travail et où la source de la vie semble être plus dans les bras que dans le coeur . . . le premier mot ne fut pas . . . *aimez-moi*, mais, *aidez-moi*. . . . Voilà selon mon opinion les causes physiques les plus générales de la différence caractéristique des primitives langues. Celles du midi durent être vives, sonores, accentuées, éloquentes, et souvent obscures à force d'énergie: celles du Nord durent être sourdes, rudes, articulées, criardes, monotones, claires à force de mots plustot que par une bonne construction.<sup>76</sup>

Now this distinction between the northern and southern cultures of the world is central to Rousseau's theory. For the historical development of both our language and our music could be attributed directly, in his view, to the manner in which the peoples of the North must have attacked and, in due course, overrun, the settlements of the South. It was, he remarked, the barbarian invasions—in particular of the Roman remnants of the ancient civilizations of the South—that destroyed those languages born of passion and desire, since with the conquest of the Mediterranean world the guttural and staccato speech of northern men must eventually have taken precedence over the rhythmic and melodic intonations which had served for the expression of human sentiments before.<sup>77</sup> Our mellifluous languages must thus have been crushed by the clamour of those who either could never sing or no longer had the facility to do so, and as a consequence our music and our speech were set apart. Men began to chatter, while their songs lost all their meaning, and, Rousseau observed, the semantic element of primitive expressions came in this way to be divorced from music:

La mélodie commençant à n'être plus si adhérente au discours prit insensiblement une existence à part, et la musique devint plus indépendante des paroles. Alors aussi cessèrent peu à peu ces prodiges qu'elle avoit produits lorsqu'elle n'étoit que l'accent et l'harmonie de la poésie, et qu'elle lui

donnoit sur les passions cet empire que la parole n'exerça plus dans la suite que sur la raison.<sup>78</sup>

According to Rousseau, in fact, it must have been just this division between our melody and diction that produced, on the one hand, harmony and, on the other, prose.

As the communities in which men lived grew larger and their cares and aspirations multiplied, individuals must have called upon each other to perform a constantly increasing number of specific tasks. Sentiments must have come to be supplanted by ideas, impulses of the heart must have been replaced by instructions of the mind, and men began to languish as they employed an idiom of discourse that was more exact but also more exacting, more clear and precise, yet at the same time more hollow and cold.<sup>79</sup> With the emergence of prose, in effect, languages became prosaic. Men who followed the same moral rules were equally required to adopt the same conventions in their grammar; and as they grew accustomed to their social obligations their manner of speaking must also have become increasingly monotonous and dull. Rousseau, indeed, believed that the contemporary languages of Central and Northern Europe were still marked very clearly by the influence of barbaric prose.<sup>80</sup> Even modern Italian, he claimed, though it remained more amenable to musical constructions than most of the European tongues, had suffered much the same fate—so that on this point in particular he now put forward a thesis strikingly different from that of the *Lettre sur la musique française*.

Les langues modernes de l'Europe sont toutes du plus au moins dans le même cas. Je n'en excepte pas même l'italienne. La langue italienne non plus que la française n'est point par elle-même une langue musicale. La différence est seulement que l'une se prête à la musique, et que l'autre ne s'y prête pas.<sup>81</sup>

The speech of men was thus transformed until its passionate inflexions had been lost, and at the same time the vocal cadences through which our earliest enthusiasms and affections had been enunciated were deprived of their significance. The sentiments that had once given rise to song were stifled, repressed and forgotten as the social relations of men changed under the bondage of barbarian rule and agricultural labour; and primitive melodies were turned into disjointed sounds which must have been as dull and drab to hear as the humdrum reverberations of our newly-acquired prose.<sup>82</sup>

It was Rousseau's view, moreover, that the invention of harmonic intervals could only have occurred when this corruption of the earliest form of music was complete. For it was only after men had ceased to give a melodic character to their natural propensities that they began to wonder whether satisfactions of a *different* kind could be obtained directly

from the senseless intonations of the human voice. We must have begun, by chance alone, to focus our attention upon the consonance which marked at least a few of the pitches we employed when emitting our cries and calls, and harmony first came to be fabricated when some individuals discovered that the simultaneous execution of several sounds produced a noise which could be more agreeable than that made by the articulation of the same tones one after the other. Our first chords, that is, must have been devised by accident:

Le chant ainsi dépouillé de toute mélodie et consistant uniquement dans la force et la durée des sons dut suggerer enfin les moyens de le rendre plus sonore encore à l'aide des consonances. Plusieurs voix traînant sans cesse à l'unisson des sons, d'une durée illimitée trouvèrent par hazard quelques accords qui renforçant le bruit le leur firent paroître agréable; et ainsi commença la pratique du discant et du contrepoint.<sup>83</sup>

Since these manufactured noises were divorced from human sentiment, however, it was clear for Rousseau that the harmonic intervals of Western music were a barbarous and gothic innovation which entirely emasculated all the melodic expressions that had served as our first language.<sup>84</sup> And just as the semantic substance of our earliest locutions was lost as poetry gave way to prose, so too our music came to be deprived of all its naturally vivid and spirited qualities when it was rendered speechless and supplanted by the lifeless modes and scales of harmony. For while our original melodies had been inspired by our own moral impetuosity, harmony, he maintained, was governed only by the physical principles of concordant vibrations.<sup>85</sup> It was impossible for men to comprehend the new and artificial patterns of their music, Rousseau asserted, unless they were first made acquainted with its rules; so that the laws of resonance which underlay the structure of gothic harmony had to be learnt before the chords derived from them could be appreciated in the proper way. Music which was divorced from the natural impulses that it had once expressed now came to occupy a place in the sphere of intellectual deliberations alone, and each person was obliged to consult a dictionary in order to be certain of the feelings that were supposed to be aroused in him by the arrangements of harmonic chords:

Les plus beaux chants à nôtre gré toucheront toujours médiocrement une oreille qui n'y sera point accoutumée; c'est une langue dont it faut avoir le Dictionnaire.<sup>86</sup>

Melody had lost its strength, Rousseau remarked, and 'le calcul des intervalles fut substitué à la finesse des inflexions'.<sup>87</sup>

With analytical dictionaries and the calculation of intervals the full corruption of both language from speech and music from song had in

fact been accomplished. For a mode of discourse and a system of intonations that had each lost their original meaning and passion had also come to be completely abstracted from the human voice which had earlier been the sole medium of expression of language and music together. In the one case our chants had been transformed, through the contrivance of speechless harmonies, into a kind of music that was predominantly instrumental rather than vocal.<sup>88</sup> In the second case our speech, reformulated through prose, had come to be delineated in script by alphabetical characters assembled from the decomposition into its elementary parts of an already spoiled language.<sup>89</sup> As the art of writing developed it substituted its own exactitude for the expressive force of speech, and it came to be communicated through the medium of the prevailing definitions of words rather than in virtue of the inspired tones adopted by writers. Now it dominates our language to such a great extent that we no longer even speak but only read aloud to one another.<sup>90</sup> Hence with the invention of writing and the fabrication of instrumental sounds we had removed the need for any human voice in the production of both language and music and had thereby made our natural means of self-expression almost utterly redundant.

It was in this fashion that Rousseau elaborated his objections to the theory of Rameau. The universal laws of harmony which Rameau had supposed to be prescribed by Nature were, in his view, established only through the degenerate conventions of a barbaric race. These rules of music were thus limited in scope, and they reflected nothing more than the insipid sensibilities of men who had constructed their chords round artificial intervals which rather resembled those manufactured hierarchies that, in society, governed the relations between one person and the next. In civilized society, that is, we had bound ourselves to permanently fixed relations with our neighbours; but we had equally become captive to the prescribed intervals of senseless tones, and the progressively more rigid application of both sets of rules could only have increased the moral degradation of mankind. It was Rousseau's view, then, that our faculties had been debased by our aesthetic and linguistic, as well as our political, conventions, so that the development of our music was to be linked directly to the history of our morals. The capacity to form artificial languages was a distinctly human trait, and the manner in which we had come to be tied to despotic terms and to dominant tones set us off from all other creatures whose mode of life was prescribed by Nature alone.<sup>91</sup>

Now this account of the corruption of music and language will of course have a familiar ring to all those readers of Rousseau who are acquainted with his description of the decay of society in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*. I have already mentioned that some first draft fragments of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* once formed a part of the *Discours*, but

even if we had no knowledge of this historical fact about the composition of the two works their remarkable similarity of both style and substance would still be perfectly clear. For what is the 'calcul des intervalles' but a musical expression of the 'relations morales' by which—according to Rousseau in the *Discours*—men have become equally enthralled in civilized society? What, in fact, are the moral relations of individuals as Rousseau conceived them but calculations of intervals of another sort? The prevailing social divisions between persons have their counterpoint in the divisions of their octaves, instrumental music is matched by instrumental politics, and the subjugation of peoples is achieved, in part, by their masters' conjugation of verbs and their manipulation of language in general.

Yet we do not even need to turn to the *Discours sur l'inégalité* to draw these conceptual parallels, since the relation between our musical and political conventions is in fact discussed by Rousseau in the text of the *Essai* itself. For in the final chapter of his work, which he entitled 'Rapport des langues aux gouvernemens', he maintained that languages which have come to be separated from music are inimical to freedom:

Il y a des langues favorables à la liberté; ce sont les langues sonores, prosodiques, harmonieuses, dont on distingue le discours de fort loin. Les nôtres sont faites pour le bourdonnement des Divans. . . . Or je dis que toute langue avec laquelle on ne peut pas se faire entendre au peuple assemblé est une langue servile; il est impossible qu'un peuple demeure libre et qu'il parle cette langue-là.<sup>92</sup>

A prosaic rhetoric thus inspired servile manners, and speech which was made hollow by its lack of tone and rhythm also made for hollow men. The languages of modern Europe have become suitable only for discourse at close quarters, in the guise of an ineffectual chatter of persons who can now only murmur feebly to one another with voices lacking inflexion, and therefore spirit and passion too. Hence, as our speech has come to be deprived of its musical traits, it has lost all its expressive force and has been transformed into the protracted but faint mutterings of individuals who have no strength of character or purpose. For such men the most appropriate utterances are also the most quiet; their form of discourse—emptied of melody—is almost devoid of sounds altogether, and their unremitting and stifling hum is hardly distinguishable from silence.

But if this is the private aspect of our contemporary languages, their public manifestation, according to Rousseau, is more oppressive still. For men who govern others but have nothing to say themselves can do little else when the people are assembled except shout and preach to them; and their pronouncements, delivered as unmeasured speeches, are at once intemperate and unintelligible. The proclamations of our rulers and the supplications of our priests continually abuse our sensibilities and make



us numb; and tortuous harangues and sermons, delivered by both religious and secular charlatans, have become the sole form of popular oratory in the modern world:

Quels discours restent donc à faire au peuple assemblé? Des sermons. Et qu'importe à ceux qui les font de persuader le peuple, puisque ce n'est pas lui qui nomme aux bénéfices? . . . Nos prédicateurs se tourmentent se mettent en sueur dans les Temples, sans qu'on sache rien de ce qu'ils ont dit. Après s'être épuisés à crier pendant une heure, ils sortent de la chaire à demi-morts. Assurément ce n'étoit pas la peine de prendre tant de fatigue. . . . Qu'on suppose un homme harangant en françois le peuple de Paris dans la place de Vendosme. Qu'il crie à pleine tête, on entendra qu'il crie, on ne distinguera pas un mot. . . . Si les charlatans des places abondent moins en France qu'en Italie, ce n'est pas qu'en France ils soient moins écoutés, c'est seulement qu'on ne les entend pas si bien.<sup>93</sup>

The private and public faces of language thus provide an accurate portrait of the utterly degraded state into which our societies have fallen. Conversation has become covert, political discourse has become barren, and we have all succeeded in bringing our original manner of speaking up to date only by becoming the speechless auditors of those who rule by diatribes and recitations from the pulpit. In fact since even these perverted forms of rhetoric are no longer necessary to keep us in our allotted places, the rulers of modern states have correctly come to understand that they can maintain their authority without arranging any popular meetings or assemblies at all. They have only to direct the attention of their subjects to the many things which they might exchange with each other and away from the few thoughts that they might still wish to communicate, so that in their latest form the vocal intonations which once expressed our pleasures have been reconstituted as the terms that denote our trades. Whereas the words 'aimez-moi' must in the past have been superseded by 'aidez-moi', now all that we say to each other is 'donnez de l'argent':

Les sociétés ont pris leur dernière formes; on n'y change plus rien qu'avec du canon et des écus, et comme on n'a plus rien à dire au peuple sinon, *donnez de l'argent*, on le dit avec des placards au coin des rues ou des soldats dans les maisons; il ne faut assembler personne pour cela: au contraire, il faut tenir les sujets épars; c'est la première maxime de la politique moderne.<sup>94</sup>

This, then, is the theme of the final chapter of a work which was initially conceived by Rousseau as a challenge to the musical philosophy of Rameau. Of course like all of Rousseau's critical writings it launched upon a whole set of questions which his adversaries did not really put to him, even if for Jean-Jacques himself there was never any doubt that one campaign must lead directly to the next. Like most other great thinkers he

marched into battle backwards, and the last chapter of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*—though it was inspired by his disagreements with Rameau—came to stand among the most passionate, fiery and sweeping attacks upon the institutions of civilized society produced by the figure who was to be more highly esteemed than any other Enlightenment hero of the French Revolution of 1789. I do not wish to argue for a moment that the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* should be regarded as the manifesto of that Revolution, since even apart from the fact that it does not advocate revolution in any form, the work, which was only published after Rousseau's death,<sup>95</sup> was probably unknown to all but a handful of his revolutionary admirers and detractors alike. And yet the *Essai* is nevertheless marked by the characteristic venom and fury of the man whom Burke was later to decry as a kind of prophet—as 'the insane *Socrates* of the national assembly'.<sup>96</sup> Quite a number of distinguished historians have for some years now attempted to show that Rousseau's influence upon the Revolution was insubstantial, largely because the lofty principles of the *Contrat social* must have been too abstract to express the visceral contempt and hatred for the *ancien régime* felt by the Revolutionary leaders.<sup>97</sup> For my part, I wonder whether these historians have not looked to the wrong text, and whether they have not posed their problem in too restricted a way. When the most distinguished commentators of an earlier age condemned Rousseau for having helped to bring about the Revolution, it was precisely because they saw his theory as so abstract, as so 'inapplicable to real life and manners',<sup>98</sup> that they regarded it as dangerous. In the accounts of Burke, de Maistre and Hegel, for instance, the task of connecting Rousseau's thought with the French Revolution was not really that of tracing his influence, but rather that of assessing the practical implications of his theory, since, however they might be interpreted by their followers, his ideas themselves were revolutionary. I believe it is in this sense that Burke regarded him as a prophet, and I also believe there is still some truth in that suggestion. We must not forget Rousseau's remark that 'nous approchons de l'état de crise et du siècle des révolutions' and that it was impossible 'que les grandes monarchies de l'Europe aient encore long-tems à durer'.<sup>99</sup> Certainly this statement must be counted among his most portentous visions of our destiny, but it was not his only warning. For my principal aim here has been to show that if Rousseau was *really* a prophet, then perhaps we should look to his critique of Rameau as his Sermon on the Mount.

## Chapter 4

---

### VAGABOND REVERIE

From internal evidence in *The New Héloïse*, whose events are portrayed as having transpired over a period of more than a dozen years from around 1732, it has long been known that Rousseau invented a fictional protagonist, Saint-Preux, of exactly his own age. To this central figure of his story, as his *Confessions* make plain,<sup>1</sup> he attributes both refined sensibilities and weaknesses of character deliberately drawn from his own nature, and by depicting him as a peripatetic tutor who is deemed by Julie's father to be unworthy of her love on account of being beneath her station, he conveys the impression of a socially outcast romantic hero, doomed to unhappiness, whom readers could readily identify with the text's author. This parallel, together with a number of other superficial resemblances between characters in the novel and figures who populated his world outside it, has invited the suspicion that the most popular of all of Rousseau's works in the eighteenth century was conceived as an illusory representation of events he had actually experienced, an idealization of his autobiography couched in the epistolary form then fashionable for sentimental fiction. It would, however, be more accurate to interpret the novel's occasional *ménage à trois* of Saint-Preux, Julie and Wolmar, as well as the incidents around which their relationships turn, as expressions of profound longings which, as a matter of fact, Rousseau could barely articulate, still less satisfy, in his own life. Somewhat like his contemporary, Diderot, who often contrived to be at his most intense through a form of displacement which involved speaking his own mind as if he were reporting claims that had been made by others, Rousseau characteristically allowed his vivid imagination to give more concrete form to worlds he could inhabit, and sentiments he could control, only in fantasy.

When he began to contemplate his novel, he remarks that it was largely because his time for love had passed, and all hope for the consummation of a desire which Thérèse was unable to stir in him had withered in his middle age, that he let his imagination draw him into a 'land of chimeras', an empyrean domain inhabited by the most perfect creatures, celestial in both virtue and beauty, and of such faithful reliability as he had never known among his friends here below. It was out of his exalted attraction to such an 'enchanted world' that *The New Héloïse* was born.<sup>2</sup> The novel articulates the secrets of a rapturously ecstatic love which he was later to

hope might actually prove the key to Sophie d'Houdetot's heart; but despite the rumours about the nature of his infatuation with her—which were orchestrated by a jealous Madame d'Épinay, and which, with other factors, would soon provoke one of his life's great crises, including his break with Diderot and eventually his estrangement from most of his Parisian friends—Rousseau never conquered Sophie as, in his imagination, he licensed Saint-Preux and Julie to seduce one another. The 'erotic fervour' and 'amorous delirium', which in his *Confessions* he claims were aroused in him by Sophie, came to inspire his composition of two of the most poignant letters of his novel,<sup>3</sup> one about the hidden orchard of Wolmar and Julie at the retreat she called her *Elyseum*, the other about a day Saint-Preux spent with Julie, in Wolmar's absence, in the waters and along the banks of Lake Geneva.<sup>4</sup> By the winter of 1756, Rousseau was already gripped with love for the figure he had invented in June, doting on both her and her cousin, Claire, like a second Pygmalion, he remarks in his *Confessions*.<sup>5</sup> The explosive arrival in his life of Sophie the following year, after an inconsequentially brief meeting earlier, inspired him to invest all of Julie's charms into his new companion as well, soon making him dream only of Sophie herself, as he came to feel his own surging tremors and cascading passion for an object that was now real.

For her part, Sophie, though she was as moved by his intimate presence as he by hers, was not excited in the same way. Their sighs and tears mingled together, as each was intoxicated with love, he reports, Rousseau for her, and she for her absent lover, Saint-Lambert, whom Rousseau had met independently and with whom he was at the same time already beginning to form a friendship. His unreciprocated love for Sophie was thus always accompanied by a third presence, who at once lent poignancy to Sophie's own need for Rousseau as a confidant, at the same time making it impossible for him, loving her with such profound respect, to seek to possess her. But having had aroused in him by a kind of contagion all the longing which Sophie felt for Saint-Lambert, Rousseau could now consummate a redoubled passion only through the catharsis of its infusion into Julie, a woman he could possess just within his own mind, from which she sprang. Sophie's genuine affection for him, he thus reports, was a poisoned cup of sweetness which he swallowed in long draughts.<sup>6</sup> The four months they spent together, in an intimacy of such delicious palpitations as Rousseau states he never experienced with any other woman, were kept within the bounds of duty, whose prescription of self-denial left his own soul in the radiant circumspection of enforced innocence, as he was to inform Sophie herself in a remarkable letter he sent her in October 1757,<sup>7</sup> from which this passage of his *Confessions* would later be shaped. Yet so fired were his senses by images of an anticipated kiss that when he would walk along the slopes of Andilly to her home in Eaubonne,

three miles from his *Hermitage*, his knees would tremble, his body crumple, and, unable to distract himself and think of something else, he would ejaculate and arrive at the home of a lover he could not win, a spent force purged of the ecstatic transports of his own imagination, only to be roused again at the mere sight of her, by his 'always useless vigour'.<sup>8</sup>

If in his fiction Rousseau could assemble a world purified of such cumbersome anxieties and frustrations, in his other writings he sought equally blissful delights by cleansing moral landscapes of the fractious institutions and tortuous beliefs which he perceived as standing in the way of human self-fulfilment. The fanciful world which he constructed in his *New Héloïse*, at once brittle with dramatic tension but also luminous with unadorned grace, was matched elsewhere by his deconstruction of opaque and oppressive worlds, for which the idealizations of his fiction were a substitute. In his *Letter to d'Alembert on the Theatre*, composed at much the same time as his *New Héloïse* and embracing many overlapping themes, he contrasts the salubrious entertainments of a republic—remarkably like Geneva—where convivial celebrations are held out of doors, under the sky, with the noxious amusements of the residents of a large city—which rather resembles Paris—whose scheming and idle people, depraved by sloth, turn instead for their pleasures to hypocritical distractions performed on a stage. Let the spectators become an entertainment to themselves, he remarks, each being granted the role of an engaged actor and not just a captive witness, loving himself in the others, 'so that all will be better united'.<sup>9</sup> Shakespeare's melancholic Jaques in *As You Like It* may have regretted that 'All the world's a stage', but Jean-Jacques would have rejoiced if only it could be so.

In his *Discourse on Inequality*, he had earlier formed an image of savage man no less fancifully cleansed of the impurities and contaminations of society than was Julie of the worldly imperfections of her sex. In *Emile*, he was later to invent an equally imaginary priest, by way of abstraction from real persons, whose sublimation of an unmysterious god in Nature would be presented as a spiritual purge of truly religious belief from all the ceremonial trappings of a profane Church. While 'the real world has its limits, the world of imagination is infinite', Rousseau remarks in Book two of *Emile*, adding in Book four, in reply to those of his readers who supposed he only inhabited a world of fantasy, that he sees them 'always in the land of prejudice'.<sup>10</sup> Most of his major writings, fiction and non-fiction alike, bear witness to James Boswell's remark, in a letter of 15 October 1766 to Alexandre Deleyre, that Rousseau had ideas which were 'completely visionary, and unsuitable for a man in his position'.<sup>11</sup> That 'involuntary excitement', 'devouring ardour' or 'sublime frenzy', that 'sacred fire', 'noble delirium' or 'saintly enthusiasm', of which he speaks in just a single paragraph of the fourth of his *Moral Letters* to Sophie,<sup>12</sup>

sparks the disengagement of our faculties from their terrestrial ties. While our reason crawls, our spirit soars, he observes. No other eighteenth-century writer so inspired the Romantic movement which arose, most predominantly in Germany and England, at the dusk of the age of Enlightenment, through the intensity of his feelings, the rapture of his dreams and the spontaneity of his imagination.

Even before it had absorbed his attention in the principal works by which he is now best remembered, Rousseau's vagabond reverie drew him most fruitfully in the direction of music, a subject for which he had been born, he insists in both his *Confessions* and *Dialogues*.<sup>13</sup> In his reflections on the inappropriateness of the French language to musical articulation, and in his objections to Rameau's claims about the predominance of harmony over melody, he conceived music to have once been the ebullient form taken by men's natural language, unmannered and unsophisticated, as enchanted in its enunciation as Julie's loveliness appeared to his mind's eye. Sung with conviction in inflected phrases, and freed of orchestral ornamentation and operatic recitative, a clear vocal line of music was in some respects the most populist of all the fanciful images that Rousseau evoked of mankind's archaic means of self-expression, the lost primeval language of unsubjugated speech. Shorn of the pretence that the dominant and subdominant modes of the Western scale were inherent in every form of music, its original nature could be traced in his philosophy to its fundamentally poetic roots, and its progressive transformations from an ancient art into a modern science could be reconstructed in the manner of his treatment of the self-domestication of mankind in other ways.

But the origins of modern and Western music were not so remote as those of inequality, and Rousseau was accordingly able to assess the course of its development in far less speculative terms. Already in his contributions to the *Encyclopédie*, he had shown a genuine command of the history of music and of musical genres, and particularly of contemporary musical theory, pursuing themes in his articles 'Accompaniment', 'Dissonance' and 'Fundamental Bass' which largely elaborated Rameau's own views on harmonic modulation and on the overtone resonances of a single note, prompting Diderot and d'Alembert to object, in the *Encyclopédie*'s sixth volume, that Rameau had ungraciously maligned a man who had in fact been largely faithful to his principles. Even in the enlarged versions of those articles that he incorporated in his *Dictionary of Music* of 1767, Rousseau still acknowledges a profound debt to Rameau's *Theory of Harmony*, which had been published in 1722. But to comply with Diderot's initial deadline, he had produced his original articles in only three months and had long sought an opportunity to return to and expand them, to pursue his differences with Rameau where they arose, and to elaborate themes which he had been unable to consider earlier.

The *Dictionary of Music* was conceived as a work of reference, and it did not excite him to flights of fancy as did most of the other projects to which he turned at *L'Ermitage*, after leaving Paris. For this reason, as he remarks in his *Confessions*, he put it aside when taking the daily walks which spawned his reveries, and, exceptionally, he worked out his ideas for it indoors, seated, when it rained.<sup>14</sup> It is, nevertheless, one of his major works, comprehensive in its treatment of historical, technical and theoretical subjects, not only making the complexities of Rameau's doctrines more intelligible to lay readers, as d'Alembert had attempted to do as well, but also providing thoroughly revised and more substantial commentaries on ancient, medieval and modern practices of notation in his article on 'Notes'; a fresh essay on the history of lyrical drama (which in the *Encyclopédie* had instead been allocated to Grimm, under the heading of 'Lyrical Poem') in his article on 'Opera'; and an analysis of the musical theory of Tartini in his article on 'System'. Charles Burney, who had earlier translated the libretto of Rousseau's opera *Le Devin du village* into English, as *The Cunning-Man*, spoke in his own *General History of Music* in defence of Rousseau against the critics of both his *Letter on French Music* and his *Dictionary of Music*, while Rousseau himself, who had sketched a decidedly mixed assessment of the opera *Alceste*, by Gluck (1767), is reported to have suggested that Gluck's remarkable *Iphigenia in Aulis* (1774), with a French libretto, perhaps finally belied his contention that it was impossible to write music with French lyrics.

Even in his *Dictionary of Music*, however, he reiterated and lent additional impetus to ideas which had first fired his imagination in the late 1740s and early 1750s. In a new article on 'Plainsong', he observes that it was when Christians began to form churches and to sing psalms and hymns that the spirited music of antiquity lost all its energy. From both Scripture and classical sources, most particularly the Pythagoreans, he adds in his article on 'Music'—repeating remarks he had made in the *Encyclopédie* and recalling Plato's *Laws*—we know that both divine and human law, as well as exhortations to virtue, were once sung in verse by choirs, there being no more effective way to teach men the love of virtue. Everything that can be elicited in the imagination stems from the power of poetry from which music once sprang, he claims in his articles on both 'Imitation' and 'Opera', in each case showing his lack of appreciation and poor discernment of the emotive powers of painting, by contrast with his sensitivity to music—perhaps the most striking difference between his aesthetic judgement and that of Diderot. Unlike painting, which inspires only our sense of sight, Rousseau contends, music transports the eye inside the ear, and depicts even objects which are invisible, like night, sleep, solitude and silence, noise sometimes producing the effect of perfect tranquility and silence the effect of noise, as persons who fall asleep at a



monotonous lecture and wake up the moment it stops know only too well. Rousseau's interest in music was sustained throughout his life, not least because, having resolved around 1750 to copy music by the sheet so that he might have some regular and independent income, he drew from that occupation, almost until his end, one of the few means of support on which he could count as a writer determined to refuse all favours or pensions, thus avoiding debts that might imperil his freedom. In the greatly distracted state in which he finally fled from England in the spring of 1767, he was nevertheless prevailed upon, by Hume, to accept just such a gift from the eventually far more demented King George III, and in due course, against his principles, he received the sum of fifty pounds for nothing. His transcription of an 'air chinois' in his *Dictionary of Music*, adapted from Jean-Baptiste Du Halde's *Description de la Chine* of 1735, was to figure in both Weber's overture to *Turandot* and Hindemith's *Symphonic Metamorphosis*.

Once again in France, over the next three years, Rousseau became, both in his own mind and in fact, an itinerant hostage to fortune, travelling under a cloak of anonymity as Monsieur 'Renou', accompanied by his housekeeper, said to be his sister. The Enlightenment's most forthright lover of truth, who had for so long devoted his energies to unmasking hypocrisy, was now in disguise himself, flitting from Trye, on the border of Normandy, to Bourgoin and Monquin in Dauphiné, to Lyon and finally Paris, along the way visiting the grave of Madame de Warens in Chambéry and soon afterwards marrying Thérèse, in meanderings made all the more furtive by his principal patron of that time, the Prince de Conti—who really *was* a warder masquerading as a protector—while Rousseau was ignored by the authorities he sought to evade, because they judged him more absurd than dangerous. It was especially in this period that he turned his mind to the subject of botany, the great passion of his declining years. In Môtiers, after his flight from Montmorency, he had already become acquainted with the distinguished botanist, Jean-Antoine d'Ivernois, and had there made lengthy botanical excursions into the surrounding countryside with the Hungarian pseudo-baron Ignaz de Sauttersheim, the Pierre Loti of his age, whose life was more fictitious than all the fantasies of *The New Héloïse*. In Staffordshire, Rousseau had gathered ferns and mosses. But it was in the late 1760s, either alone or with a variety of companions, in the hinterland of Trye, Lyon, Grenoble, Bourgoin and Monquin, that he came to devote most of his time to the study of plants, arousing occasional suspicions that he was a sorcerer.

On his return to Paris in the summer of 1770, he was to resume his profession of transcribing music each morning, and in the afternoons would botanize and herborize in the course of long strolls which he took out of the city. On various dates between 1771 and 1773, he drafted eight



long letters on botanical themes to Madame Madeleine-Catherine Delesert, to whom he had warmed after an earlier meeting in Lyon, and who wished to excite her four-year-old daughter's natural curiosity by encouraging her to take an interest in plants. These letters, followed over the next four years by sixteen others on similar themes to various correspondents (all published with Rousseau's complete works in 1782), were to excite the interest of Thomas Martyn, a professor of botany at Cambridge who held his chair for sixty-three years and for at least part of that time used his own translation of them in his courses; and they were also taken up by the painter Pierre Joseph Redouté, who illustrated them for a luxurious edition of Rousseau's botanical writings published early in the nineteenth century. Around this time, Rousseau also compiled, but never completed, a dictionary of botanical terms. He continued as well to assemble the herbaria, on which he had already laboured even earlier, and of which a few survive, although the largest collection, forming eleven volumes, perished with Berlin's botanical museum in the Second World War.

Rousseau's acquired interest in botany seems a sensible choice of vocation for a man whose faculties were most alive while he was walking, his mind only working with his legs, as he remarks in his *Confessions*.<sup>15</sup> Here, at last, Nature's ageing child could commune directly with the great spectacle of Creation, before which he had always stood in awe—like a more youthful Emile, within reach of contentment, his power and will in equilibrium. Here was a subject whose lively colours and fragrances could fill his imagination, an Arcadian paradise of vegetable love, such as had equally seduced the poet Andrew Marvell a century earlier. In the Second Walk of his *Reveries*, he recalls the sweet pleasure he had felt in seeing and enumerating the plants still in flower in the meadows, between Ménilmontant and Charonne near Paris, which are now partly filled by the Père Lachaise Cemetery.<sup>16</sup> In the Seventh Walk, devoted largely to the trees and vegetation which are 'the clothing of the earth', he savours the memory of a mountain gorge, where he had found coral-wort and cyclamen, and heard the cry of the horned owl and eagle, in a corner of the earth so deeply hidden that, when he had sat down on pillows of *lycopodium*, he dreamed he had stumbled upon the wildest and most remote refuge of the universe, having uncovered, like a second, lone, Columbus, a sanctuary from which his persecutors would never seek him out.<sup>17</sup> Here, now recollected as a botanical expedition he had made near Môtiers around 1764, was Rousseau's own *Elyseum*, originally inspired in the spring of 1757 by the arrival in his life of Sophie d'Houdetot, and described, in *The New Héloïse*, in remarkably similar terms, as Julie's secret orchard, 'the wildest, the most solitary, corner of Nature'.<sup>18</sup> His love for Sophie had passed from one captivating heart of darkness to another, in retrodiction of his own life by way of imitating his own art. From sensual arousal, to fiction,

to remembrance of now transported images, Rousseau—in this as in so many other respects the Proust of the eighteenth century—could make his botany and reverie resonate in one voice.

He had not always been so well disposed to the study of plants. If only he had succumbed to the temptation to follow Claude Anet, the young herbalist Madame de Warens had employed at Chambéry, and with whom he was to share her love, he might have become a great botanist himself, he suggests. But, ignorant of its charms, he had let himself be swayed by popular prejudice that it was a science like chemistry or anatomy, connected with medicine or pharmacology and fit only for apothecaries, he claims in his *Confessions*, his *Reveries* and even the introduction to his dictionary of botanical terms.<sup>19</sup> Nothing could be further from the truth, he had later learned. And in what other science could he have passed his time? How could he have chased after animals, only in order to subdue them by force if he could catch them and then, in order to understand how they run, dissect them? If too weak, he could no doubt have impaled butterflies instead; if too slow, he could have fallen back on snails and worms; yet all those stinking corpses, dreadful skeletons and pestilential vapours had not been for him. Nor had he wished, with the aid of instruments and machines, to study the stars. But bright flowers, cool shades, streams, woods, meadows and green glades had purified his imagination, he remarks in the Seventh Walk of his *Reveries*. Plants had been placed within man's reach by Nature Herself, springing up beneath the feet of a person whose mind had already settled there.<sup>20</sup>

Of course the meticulous and disciplined study of plants must not be confused with the agreeable sensations which inspire it, Rousseau admits in his dictionary.<sup>21</sup> Botany, as he understood it, was essentially a taxonomic science which, if it did not necessarily dissect its objects of scrutiny, nevertheless sought to classify them and establish the purpose of their internal organization, he observes in his *Reveries*. In both his dictionary and his botanical letters he accordingly addresses his attention to the parts of fruits and flowers—to the pistils, calyces and panicles of plants—whose identity and function he learned from several authorities, especially the *Systema naturae*, *Philosophia botanica* and *Regnum vegetabile* of Linnaeus, the pre-eminent botanist of the eighteenth century, to whom he once corresponded, as well as an essay by one of Linnaeus's principal editors, Johann Anders Murray. Rousseau sometimes confused one plant's or organ's description with another's, and he occasionally misunderstood the principles he borrowed. Perhaps because he preferred the study of plants to that of animals, moreover, it never occurred to him that they might also be investigated in terms of their natural or artificially bred history, along such lines as were pursued by Buffon in his commentaries on the degeneration of species, which had so impressed him in his

account of mankind's development in the *Discourse on Inequality*. For botanical investigations, if not for the science of human nature, his model was Linnaeus rather than Buffon. His inspiration, nevertheless, was that of a man whose mind and sensibilities were most active when he was alone, out of doors, tramping in celebration of Nature. Botany, he remarks in his *Reveries*,<sup>22</sup> is the ideal subject of study for the idle and unoccupied solitary man.

It was not, however, the only field to which Rousseau turned in his solitude, at once enforced upon him by his estrangement from society, and at the same time relished on account of the freedom it afforded his flights of fancy. There remained one other subject of his final years, whose appeal he felt even more powerfully, because it was inescapable and because reflection upon it had always supplied him with the critical lens through which he perused everything else—that is, himself. Rousseau claims that it was around 1760 that he first contemplated an autobiography, and by 1765, with all the major works on which he had embarked almost a decade earlier at *L'Ermitage* either in print or ready for press or abandoned, he turned to his *Confessions* in earnest and assembled them principally from his voluminous correspondence, including copies or drafts of his own letters which he had kept. Knowing his ways, his eloquence and his bias, some of his former friends, who were certain they would be maligned by him, took the precaution of maligning him, either first or as well, none more than Madame d'Épinay, who, in return for her solicitude and affection after providing him with his first refuge, had been unjustly accused by him of duplicity and treachery. Her original indiscretions, revolving around Rousseau's infatuation with Sophie, had never warranted his venomous charges against her, but she was to repay his discourtesy and insults with interest. Joined by Diderot, she requested and obtained official prohibition of Rousseau's public readings from the manuscript of his *Confessions* after his return to Paris, and with the assistance of Grimm and Diderot, as her own surviving papers make plain, she reassembled and even rewrote the letters she exchanged with Rousseau at the time of their break, so as to make him appear perfidious throughout the whole period of their relationship, in the account she offers in her pseudo-memoirs, published posthumously in 1818, known as the *Story of Madame de Montbrillant*. In part endeavouring to protect themselves from his scurrilous imputations, but also out of genuine and even mounting contempt for a man whose outrageous vanity seemed to them boundless, Rousseau's enemies embarked on a variety of stratagems to discredit him, which of course always had the effect of confirming, not only his original mistrust of their character, but also his suspicions of a conspiracy to defame him. In the history of Western civilization, no major figure has ever surpassed

Rousseau in his ability to confuse mere imprudence with sinister intent, leading to dreadfully escalating consequences thereafter.

In *Rousseau, Judge of Jean-Jacques*, better known by its subtitle, *Dialogues*, drafted mainly between 1772 and 1774, he allows free rein to his by now truly formidable paranoia. He is a bear who must be kept in chains so as not to eat the peasants, Rousseau has an interlocutor called 'the Frenchman' say about himself.<sup>23</sup> Since his poisonous pen is so dreaded, how can gentlemen in such apprehension of this monstrous misanthrope conspire so assiduously to hound him?<sup>24</sup> In attempting to speak of himself from the outside, Rousseau here constructs an alien persona, who can neither recover the spontaneity of his feelings nor establish the authenticity of the motives of the man he once was, since access to his character is barred by its exclusion from himself as author, now inescapably distinguished by his otherness from the subject of his own work. The *Dialogues* were to be published in 1780 in Lichfield, Samuel Johnson's birthplace. More frenetically conceived on the wilder side of reason than any of his other works, they form a text which Rousseau tried to transmit to mankind by way of disencumbrance, seeking to leave it in the hands of Providence through placing it on the altar of Notre-Dame, only to find that the choir had been locked, his appeal to the world thereby silenced in still-birth, even escape from himself denied him. In recent years it has attracted the attention of Michel Foucault in particular, who introduced it in a modern edition. But it is infrequently read today, and still more seldom read without pain.

Rousseau's last major work, the *Reveries*, begun in 1776 and unfinished at the time of his death, is of a radically different character. Its opening passage, among the most poignant he ever penned, captures the tribulations of a life now purged of its anxieties and is presented as if it were the work's last lines, recalling all that had gone before: 'So now I am alone in the world, with no brother, neighbour, or friend, nor any company left to me but my own. The most sociable and loving of men has with unanimous accord been cast out by all the rest'.<sup>25</sup> In a series of Ten Walks, or promenades, which conclude with a regression to his beloved *maman* and the idyllic peace he savoured with her in his youth, Rousseau rehearses many themes about his estrangement from society drawn from his other writings, depicting the perambulating mind of an old man, with all his faculties now restored, forever spiralling backwards. The Seventh, Ninth and, above all, Fifth of these walks constitute the work's spiritual centre—the Seventh revealing the wilderness of his botanical *Elyseum*, the Ninth forming his lament on the inconstancy of happiness, and the Fifth recalling a watery bliss on an island sanctuary—comprising, in effect, the pastoral, heroic and choral symphonies of Rousseau's reverie.

In the Ninth Walk, he attempts to excuse the abandonment of his children and describes the juvenile impetuosity of his character, as well as the irresistible joy he feels at the mere sight of happy faces. But throughout the walk, he adopts a tone of sombre resignation at his fate, insisting that all our plans for happiness are just fantasy, there being no permanent way to secure contentment.

In the Fifth Walk, he appears to put forward similar sentiments with more intense conviction, stating that ‘everything is in constant flux on this earth’, our affections, being attached to things outside us, inevitably changing and passing away with their objects, our worldly joys but fleeting creatures of a moment.<sup>26</sup> Yet in the same walk, recollecting his flight from Môtiers in September 1765, when he had found refuge on the Island of Saint-Pierre in the middle of the Lake of Bienne, he evokes images of a sheltered haven so beautiful that he could have written about every blade of grass in the meadows and every lichen covering the rocks, where he had spent afternoons exploring the tallows, persicarias and shrubs of all kinds, or had lain outstretched in a boat, drifting wherever the waters would take him, ‘plunged in a thousand indistinct and yet delightful reveries’—a sanctum of such exquisite happiness that he would have been content to live there all his life, ‘without a moment’s desire for any other state’.<sup>27</sup> Just as his Seventh Walk displaces Julie’s *Elyseum* to a past he now suggests had been his own, so does his Fifth Walk thus transport a fictional day’s outing on the banks of Lake Geneva—which Saint-Preux had likewise described in strikingly similar detail as ‘the day when he had experienced the most vivid emotions of his entire life’<sup>28</sup>—to an island retreat of rampant beauty, cut off by Nature Herself from the manufactured turmoil of contemporary civilization. In escaping from the mundane crises of his life through reverie, Rousseau could dissolve all difference between recollection and invention. Transported by his own imagination, and carried with it into a celestial domain of pure bliss such as he describes in his third letter to Malesherbes, he could inhabit alternative worlds of perfect serenity uniquely fit for him.

In his major writings, and the various disciplines they address, he sought to give substance to such ideals by expunging all the institutions which obstructed their fulfilment, so that through a process of sublime negativity he could illuminate realms of unprosaic speech and unembellished music, of human nature without society, an education without teachers, a city without theatres, a state without rulers, a divine presence without a church. By way of such regressions, Rousseau not only posited diverse visions of men’s self-realization in a condition of unfettered freedom. He also disengaged himself more dramatically from his own age of Enlightenment, appearing less circumscribed by the presuppositions and conventions of its discourses than any other major thinker of his day.

In some of its registers, his intransigently critical voice still speaks with undiminished vigour more than two hundred years after his death. Modern and postmodern philosophers and writers alike often owe a considerable debt to his works which they are sometimes loath to acknowledge, and more often still they espouse views to which, in earlier formulations, he had already objected himself. In Rousseau's pursuit of a language of pure sincerity, in his ideal of truly communicative agents, engaged by their speech acts, taking full part in the articulation of public choice, can be found anticipations of the political philosophy of Jürgen Habermas, for instance. In his perception of the suffocating, mutilating and dehumanizing tyrannies of modern commercial society, portrayed as if it were the panopticon of a Procrustean monster assembled by a still-to-be-born Dr. Frankenstein masquerading as Bentham, he also points some of the way towards Foucault. Yet, as distinct from most postmodernist thinkers and their critics alike, Rousseau was to find refuge and achieve tranquility even while buffeted in a personal and political world of continual turbulence. From both introspection and good grace, the most formidable eighteenth-century critic of the trappings of civilization, and the most vivid illustrator of the textures of its despair and discontent, believed all his life, no less than did Anne Frank at the darkest moment of modern history, that human nature was still fundamentally good at heart.

## THE ENLIGHTENMENT HOSTILITIES OF VOLTAIRE AND ROUSSEAU

When Voltaire died at the end of May 1778, Rousseau remarked that his own death must follow soon, since their lives had been inextricably bound each with the other. Almost as if to prove his point, he in fact expired five weeks later. Neither Rousseau nor Voltaire could have foreseen, however, that it was their fate to be joined together in resurrection, apotheosis and damnation as well. Disinterred from their quiet country graves in the 1790s, the remains of these two most prominent figures of the French Enlightenment were brought to Paris and lodged opposite one another in the Pantheon, where in such partnership they came to be venerated as the heroes of a revolution of which the occasional prospect in their own lifetimes had dismayed them both. Around the turn of the nineteenth century, when revolutionary fortunes sagged, they were vilified by conservatives who, like Maistre, blamed them for their mutual responsibility in bringing down the *ancien régime*; and by the mid-nineteenth century, when the radical tide had turned again and leading socialists argued that the Revolution of 1789 had not been pursued far enough, the blinkered doctrines of Rousseau and Voltaire once more (or even of ‘Rousseau-Voltaire’ in the Gilbertonsullivan compound sometimes cemented by Marx) were held to express the nature of its limitations and the extent of its failure.

Of course these transfigured links between the two men drawn by their political admirers and critics alike form a grotesquely monochrome distortion of Rousseau’s view, since he clearly meant that Voltaire was his mortal antagonist rather than confederate in the same camp. ‘I hate you’, he exclaimed in a letter of 1760, protesting that Voltaire had betrayed the hospitality shown him in Geneva, where he had been granted asylum from his persecutors. ‘This mountebank’, ‘this impious braggart’, ‘this man of so much talent put to such vile use’, he continued elsewhere, had destroyed the morals of Genevans by introducing the love of luxury, satire and theatre in their midst, with the loss of their liberty the likely outcome and permanent monument of his stay among them. Worst of all, the scoundrel had stirred the population against him so much that he could never again make his home there, and Jean-Jacques—who had first proclaimed himself ‘citizen of Geneva’ in an earlier letter to Voltaire—supposed his worst

fears confirmed when the city's governing council condemned and ordered the burning of both *Emile* and the *Contrat social* and commanded his arrest in case he should return to his native soil.

Voltaire, for his part, filled the margins of his copies of the political writing of Rousseau with such fine expletives as 'ridiculous', 'depraved', 'pitiful', 'abominable' and 'false'. Infuriated by the suggestion that in Geneva he had sought and been offered asylum, and dismayed by Rousseau's disclosure that he was the author of an anti-Christian tract which, as usual, he had taken the precaution to publish anonymously, he retorted that Rousseau was a 'bastard of Diogenes's dog' whose veins were filled with vitriol and arsenic, a 'monster' whom he would have to see beaten senseless, were it not for the fact that the lunatic was on his way to Bedlam already. In his *Sentiment des citoyens*, moreover, he accused Jean-Jacques of, among other things, attempting to overthrow the government of the city *he* had betrayed; of having contracted a venereal disease as a consequence of his debaucheries (Rousseau suffered from a congenital urinary complaint); of having abandoned his children to a foundlings home (the first public disclosure of his most terrible secret); and of having brought about the death of the mother of his mistress (still very much alive when Voltaire made the allegation). So scurrilous was this attack that eighteenth-century publishers chose not to incorporate the *Sentiment* in their collections of Voltaire's writings, and even in our own time the distinguished editor of his correspondence and devoted disciple of his ideas, Theodore Besterman, has stood alone against nearly all other authorities in doubting that such a libel of Rousseau could really have been drafted by Voltaire himself. Yet, just as Besterman was inviting his readers to admire Voltaire's remarkable forbearance in the face of preposterous and malevolent charges, Ralph Leigh, the world's most eminent scholar of Jean-Jacques's writings, was meticulously documenting the lies and calumnies about him, circulated by Voltaire, in his own superb edition of Rousseau's correspondence. Still, there is nothing so useful as a revolution to bury or blur personal and doctrinal differences, and a dismal blend of the philosophy of 'Rousseau-Voltaire' has come to encapsulate the popular image of the Enlightenment from 1789 to this day.

No doubt there has been at least some justification for amalgamating the two thinkers in the service of a common cause. Their early exchanges were entirely cordial, and even in the letter of 1760, which marks the break between them, Rousseau reiterated the admiration he had originally professed for Voltaire's works. Voltaire, in turn, often regarded Rousseau less as an adversary to be opposed than as a madman to be pitied (as on the occasion he reported to Hume that Jean-Jacques suspected him of having persuaded the authorities in Berne to decline his request to lock him up for ever), and when, on the other hand, he described him as a



'Judas' and 'false brother', this was because Rousseau had apparently abandoned and deserted the camp of the *philosophes* to which he had been previously allied. If the two men could not be friends, nor hold to the same principles of Enlightenment, they were at least both critics of the Enlightenment's enemies, and from different perspectives they attacked similar targets—obscurantism and superstition in theology, metaphysics and dogmatism in philosophy, and despotic systems of tyranny and privilege in politics and economics. In company with many leading thinkers of their day, Voltaire and Rousseau fulminated against a Christian gospel that was enshrouded in mysteries and revelations of which only prophets and priests were held to be the true curators. Both condemned fanaticism and intolerance fired by religious credulity and fanned by self-appointed ministers of God, in their place endorsing the benign, simple and rational principles of a natural theology, the one especially in his *Dictionnaire philosophique*, the other most notably in *Emile*. Voltaire occasionally expressed his approval of certain aspects of Rousseau's writings on religion, and, with some justice, d'Alembert once reminded him that Rousseau had hurled his own bolts against *l'infâme*, much as he had done.

Both figures were also generally critical of the great speculative systems of European philosophy that prevailed in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Voltaire challenging mainly the metaphysics of Descartes and the theodicy of Leibniz, Rousseau objecting more to the natural law philosophies of Grotius, Hobbes, Pufendorf and even Locke. They opposed these doctrines partly because of their inadequate treatment of our moral sentiments such as the desire for happiness or the pursuit of virtue, partly, too, because Voltaire and Rousseau were commonly distrustful of what they regarded as transcendental dogmas about the nature of the cosmos or of mankind which they uncharitably and unsoundly characterized in terms of the *esprit de système* of an earlier philosophical epoch. There is thus a good deal of historical irony in the fact that one of the most widespread misconceptions of the Enlightenment as a whole—which we owe to the ill-informed eloquence of Burke and Tocqueville among others—is that it was an 'Age of Reason' dominated by conceptual abstractions divorced from the real world of human affairs. As a rule, the *philosophes* decried speculation of this kind. When Voltaire spoke of the English as 'a nation of philosophers', he hailed their wit and their devotion to liberty rather than their impractical pursuit of abstract reason, while Rousseau maintained that he was not a philosopher at all but rather a lover of truth. Nowhere, indeed, was their contempt for metaphysical doctrines more evident than in their political ideas.

Throughout his life, Voltaire advocated policies and commended forms of government that promoted a spirit of toleration, the abolition of privilege, the rule of law and efficient but humane public administration.

Yet he never propounded a theory of politics in which these principles were mapped out, and he hardly ever spoke of the nature of authority, or the duties of subjects, in general. While he venerated the reign of Louis XIV and the absolutist monarchy of France as against the aspirations of the church and nobility, he also praised the more liberal and more limited monarchy of England, admirably tempered, as it was, he maintained, by the Houses of Lords and Commons. From his endorsement of the autocratic regimes of Prussia and Russia, moreover, some of his interpreters have wrongly inferred that he was a consistent advocate of enlightened despotism, thus neglecting, among other things, the radical republican constitution he commended to the Genevans, after first aligning himself with their nation's ruling patrician party. This flexibility of approach, this commitment to reform in terms of what was suitable, expedient or opportune, might strike some as no political philosophy at all; at any rate it lacks precisely the speculative, abstract, esoteric frame of reference which critics of the Age of Reason have so often ascribed to the Enlightenment as a whole.

The pragmatic character of Rousseau's politics is more striking still, though less frequently recognized. Like Voltaire, he thought distinct forms of government appropriate to different states, on this point supplementing Voltaire's views regarding the stability of political traditions with claims about the needs arising from variations of climate, terrain and population which he drew largely from Montesquieu. Rousseau even enjoyed something of a political career, not only as secretary to the French ambassador in Venice (a matter of record Voltaire refused to believe, claiming he had only been the ambassador's discredited valet), but also as invited legislator of the constitutions of Corsica and Poland during the brief periods of their autonomy. Both Voltaire and Rousseau counted princes and ministers among their correspondents, yet while Voltaire's proposals for reform could exercise only indirect influence upon policy through his role as preceptor to rulers, the circulation of Rousseau's doctrines had a more immediate effect on public affairs—once helping to distract popular feeling in Paris away from the King's expulsion of the *parlement* long enough to avert a major upheaval, on another occasion nearly provoking a civil war in Geneva. In his own lifetime aspiring rebels throughout Europe were intoxicated with his political ideas, and even if Robespierre's claim to have visited him just before his death was probably a fabrication, we know that other radicals sought and received his advice. If he had not been so suspicious of the real motives of insurrectionists, or so pessimistic about the outcomes of revolutions, he might, like Bakunin a century later, have entrusted his disciples with the task of circulating incendiary material throughout those states of the modern world he believed to be corrupt. He certainly imagined that Voltaire had

assembled agents to discredit him, and Voltaire, for his part, thought Rousseau capable of inflicting a comparable amount of damage quite on his own.

Such similarities, however, can hardly be taken to constitute the stuff of which the supposed alliance between these two heroes of the Enlightenment was forged, and, in any case, they are heavily outweighed by doctrinal differences. Even at those points Voltaire and Rousseau seem most akin to one another, the resemblance is often superficial. Thus, for instance, whereas Voltaire's campaigns against religious intolerance on behalf of Calas, Sirven and La Barre expressed his profound conviction that political fanaticism was just the outward form of religious credulity, Rousseau was more concerned to challenge ritual, miracles and the appurtenances of a Church that interposed its priesthood between God and man, all the while earnestly maintaining the orthodox (Calvinist or Catholic) Christianity of his beliefs. He also stressed the importance of a zealous civil religion for consolidating the patriotic allegiance of citizens in a properly constituted state, a doctrine criticized as dangerous by Voltaire, for whom there could be no article of compulsory faith that does not eventually give rise to bigotry and conflict.

Of course Voltaire was convinced that 'If God did not exist it would be necessary to invent him'. But the God required by society he sometimes described had little in common with the Creator so fervently trusted by Rousseau. Voltaire's *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne* proclaimed that it was illusory to suppose God had manufactured the best possible world for us, to which Rousseau replied in his 'Lettre sur la Providence' that he believed God was perfect and that the misfortunes to which we may be subjected by Nature are less cruel than the evils inflicted upon us by man. Voltaire, in turn, rebutted Rousseau on the subject of providence in his most celebrated work, *Candide*.

If the two men differed about the nature of God and the function of religion, their respective philosophies of history, which perhaps gave rise to these differences, were even more fundamentally opposed. For Voltaire, modern Christianity was, by and large, the vestige of a barbarous Judaic superstition, from whose thralldom rational and progressive men of science and culture were coming to release us. For Rousseau, on the other hand, culture was in general the stultifying product of luxury that only embellished the social and political evils we had brought upon ourselves in the course of our evolution. 'The arts, literature, and the sciences weave garlands of flowers round the chains under which men are crushed', he lamented in his *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, and this was a thesis he reaffirmed in all his major writings.

Voltaire, moreover, despite his misgivings about grand philosophical systems, had a special fascination for doctrines conceived by Englishmen,

particularly the physics of Newton and the epistemology of Locke. Having come to England in 1726 just after his second release from imprisonment in the Bastille, he found there a fresh new world and breathed in its clear ideas. On his return to France his eloquence and enthusiasm quickly succeeded in making those ideas fashionable, and over the next fifty years he established himself as the foremost Anglomaniac of the whole Enlightenment. Rousseau, for his part, had not much to say about Newton and was more hostile than receptive to the philosophical teachings of Locke. England may at first have welcomed him as a fugitive from persecution, but, suffering from paranoia, he soon saw himself ensnared even in this refuge from which he eventually felt obliged to flee, and, not surprisingly perhaps, the English political theorist with whom he felt the closest affinity was 'the unfortunate Sidney'.

The differences between Voltaire and Rousseau over England are, in fact, even sharper with regard to their assessments of its social institutions. For Voltaire, the most remarkable feature of those institutions was their spirit of free and open assembly, lavishly praised by him in his *Lettres philosophiques*, particularly in its manifestations on the floor of the London Stock Exchange. For Rousseau, however, the most salient characteristic of English political and economic life was its representative system of government, under which voters, free only at elections, were deprived of their real sovereignty. Unable to take part in legislation, the people of England, he argued, had no substantive civil or moral liberties, of which the proper safeguard, in any case, was not the prosperity engendered by a stock exchange, but the general economic equality of all subjects, both urban and rural. Such notions were quite alien to Voltaire's social thought. Liberty (about which he generally had less to say than is often supposed) he identified with toleration rather than sovereignty, and he showed nothing but contempt for Rousseau's insane notion, as he put it, 'that all men are equal and that a state can exist without subordination'.

This whole collection of issues, moreover, permeates their extraordinary battles over the fate of Geneva. On the one hand, Rousseau saw Voltaire's promotion of the theatre there as fostering the cultural trappings of moral decadence and political subjugation, and he was not yet so estranged from the country of his birth, he wrote in his *Lettres de la montagne*, that he could view the oppression of its citizens with tranquility. He dedicated his *Discours sur l'inégalité* to the Genevan Republic; he conceived both his *Lettre sur les spectacles* and the *Contrat social*, each emblazoned by the signature 'citizen of Geneva' on its title page, with the constitution of that state of mind; and he was never more impassioned than in his commitment to the restoration of its democratic principles, so much eroded in practice under the rule of Voltaire's governing patrician friends. On the other hand, Voltaire deplored the ascetic, mystical, zealous

and intolerant brand of patriotism which he saw Jean-Jacques as upholding, and he thought justice well served when the Calvinist pastorate, which he loathed for much the same reasons, joined the patriciate of Geneva in condemning Rousseau's ideas. Yet Voltaire's interest in the politics of his adopted city was earnest as well, and, after discrediting Rousseau's 'unsocial contract' he in fact took up the republican cause with gusto (he was then already in his seventies), actively negotiating alliances between factions and employing or, rather, manipulating, his good offices everywhere on behalf of reforms which finally proved so radical that they dismayed patricians and democrats alike. There are many paradoxical features about Voltaire's and Rousseau's Genevan campaigns, among them such facts as that the sovereign assembly, whose powers Rousseau sought to restore, had always been the preserve of only a small fraction of its population; and that when he became the patron saint of the republican cause in the early 1760s he declined to join it, instead abdicating his citizenship and later graciously encouraging his followers to seek the advice of Voltaire, whom they might otherwise have shunned. Nevertheless, the ideological and temperamental distinctions between the two men stand out most conspicuously in their views on the politics and culture of Geneva.

Even on those subjects about which they did not directly conflict, the paths of Voltaire and Rousseau tended more to diverge than to complement one another. When they turned their attention to history, Voltaire, one of the major historians of the century, wrote principally about the grandeur of the reigns of some modern European monarchs, Rousseau about the republics of antiquity and the decline of the human race ever since. They each made important contributions to Enlightenment science, but whereas Voltaire dealt largely with optics and physics, Rousseau was more generally concerned with anthropology and botany. Their works filled an even more prominent place on the eighteenth-century stage, for which, however, Voltaire wrote plays and Rousseau especially ballet and opera.

Music, the subject of Rousseau's most extensive output, was an interest they shared, and yet on the only occasion they had a hand in the same composition (*Les Fêtes de Ramire*, originally orchestrated by Rameau but still their sole achievement truly warranting the 'Rousseau-Voltaire' epithet), it was Voltaire who wrote the libretto, Rousseau who revised mainly the score. In their own epoch they were both esteemed particularly for their literary genius, but Voltaire as France's leading poet as well as foremost playwright, Rousseau as its greatest novelist and autobiographer. Jean-Jacques, moreover, only occasionally emulated Voltaire's alexandrine verse, and Voltaire, who thought Rousseau's continual outpourings about himself in grossly bad taste, found what he regarded as the confessional moral homilies of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* insufferably dull.

If in his own mind he drew his greatest inspiration from Corneille, for Rousseau he was cast more in the disingenuous mould of Molière; he, in turn, imagined Rousseau to be lurking in the demented shadows of Pascal, for him the most perverse writer of all.

At least some of these variations of literary form are actually important markers of the substantive philosophical and political distinctions between the two men, distinctions which are themselves all the more noteworthy because they had no real personal contact with one another (having met only once, before Rousseau was known to the public), so that the enmity displayed in their writings differed in that respect from the antagonisms which separated Jean-Jacques from most of his former friends among the other *philosophes*. In his commitment to the cause of reform, Voltaire felt free to employ every artistic stratagem, every sarcastic distortion of the aims of his reactionary foe, every ingratiating tribute to a potentially influential ally, which he supposed might take seed or bear fruit. Yet if his own crusade on behalf of enlightenment had so often to be fuelled by useful lies, Rousseau, in his view—introspective, self-righteous, unworldly and vain—was concerned with little else but the torch he might set to himself and the truth that would lead to his martyrdom. For Rousseau, on the other hand, the deliverance of man from corrupt society required an uncompromising integrity of purpose that could only be sustained if all the Voltairean masks of pretence, subterfuge and deception were first removed from one's character. His vision of the transformation of human nature was at once more sublime and more intimate than Voltaire's insight into what was possible with good will and a little cunning, and in an utterly oppressive world it seemed that there could be no room, even in the fraternity of the *philosophes*, for the solitary prophet of the brotherhood of man.

Besterman has observed that Voltaire, while pursuing his goals, came to know practically everyone who was anybody in the Enlightenment. Rousseau, however, came to stand for everyone who was nobody. A moral critique of institutions under which individuals were estranged from themselves and enchained to each other was articulated with more passion and fire in his writings than in the work of anyone else in pre-revolutionary France, and Voltaire's remark that he did 'not think the tocsin of Rousseau will create a dangerous situation' for the authorities was eventually proved a mistake. Either because they are unimpressed by the success of Voltaire's reforms, or undiscouraged by the failure of modern revolutions to advance beyond them, there are many, even today, who share Rousseau's plaintive grievances about the world men have created and his fervent hope that they might still set themselves free.

## Chapter 6

---

# ROUSSEAU'S PUFENDORF: NATURAL LAW AND THE FOUNDATIONS OF COMMERCIAL SOCIETY

### INTRODUCTION

Rousseau subscribed more earnestly than perhaps any other major thinker of modern history to the proposition that human nature is shaped by politics. No figure of the Enlightenment took greater pride in his political identity than did the 'Citizen of Geneva' who heralded most of his principal works with this author's flourish on their title page; no one before or since was so convinced, as he put it, that 'everything depends upon politics' and that the character of a people is always what its government makes of it.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, both in his personal life and in almost all his writings, Rousseau showed a passionate attachment to freedom and the autonomy of the individual, as remarkable as any plea on behalf of the idea of liberty that can be found in Western philosophy or literature. His uncompromising determination to refuse the pensions pressed upon him; his contempt for urban artifice and the trappings of commercial society as against his love of the open sky outside the closed city; his ecstatic communion with Nature in preference to the disingenuous company of sophisticated persons, all drove him into such fierce craving for independence that he was left, as he put it, 'incapable of the thralldom necessary for anyone who wishes to live among men'.<sup>2</sup>

In proclaiming that virtue springs from political life, while yet determined to be a free spirit apart from civil society, Rousseau has often perplexed his critics and admirers alike. At least since the French Revolution, many of his interpreters have observed that the commitment of radical republicans to reforming human nature through the reconstruction of the political order showed how Rousseau's theoretical principles could in practice lend themselves to terror. Others have remarked instead upon the extent to which he perceived the dangers of political despotism, and on how his devotion to the freedom of every individual prompted his sceptical disdain of revolutionary movements which aspired to promote the liberty of humanity through violence. The connection between liberty and sovereignty which informs his conception of the state has long excited more partisan commentary than any of the themes in his philosophy of history for which he was better known in his own lifetime, and it is



above all this feature of his political theory whose significance has come to be judged in the light of its putative influence on events which occurred in the French Revolution. I have tried to sketch certain aspects of Rousseau's revolutionary significance on several occasions before,<sup>3</sup> and I do not here mean to pursue that subject further. My aim, rather, will be to consider the political dimension of liberty, as he conceived it, in the light of a particular debate which to my mind has formed the most important contribution to the study of Rousseau's political thought in the twentieth century, around a theme which had received perhaps insufficient, and certainly less problematic, attention before. This debate has to do with the place of natural law in his philosophy, and with the extent to which, in his idea of the foundations of the state, he upheld or rejected principles of jurisprudence espoused by earlier thinkers.<sup>4</sup> I will consider such principles in three rather different forms, which I here term *superior*, *anterior* and *generative* natural law, and in my final and longest section I will comment on Rousseau's idea of representation in the light of arguments drawn from a number of jurisprudential thinkers before him. In the course of my discussion, moreover, I mean to offer a new interpretation of his assessment of one figure in particular—that is, Pufendorf—whom I believe Rousseau came to confront in his writings as much as, if not more than, any other political thinker.

### I: SUPERIOR NATURAL LAW

By *superior* natural law, I mean an immutable principle of justice or right reason independent of the positive laws of actual states, to which political enactments should always correspond, and which they must never transgress. When we speak of the protection of human rights or the prosecution of crimes against humanity, when our governments are taken before international tribunals for their failure to protect the rights of women, children or the unemployed, we generally have in mind standards of justice that stem from natural law conceived in this way, which is indeed derived from its classical formulations in Stoic and Scholastic philosophy.<sup>5</sup> So defined, natural law establishes moral rules which transcend and delimit what is politically permissible, and superintends and sets restraints upon the policies of every government, however difficult the enforcement of such rules may be. In Rousseau studies, although there have been several important contributions to the subject in learned journals, the controversy about the place of natural law in his philosophy, conceived in this sense, has been pursued mainly by two scholars—C. E. Vaughan in his introduction to *The Political Writings of Rousseau*, published in 1915, and Robert Derathé in *Rousseau et la science politique de son temps*,



which dates from 1950. Each of these texts offers a remarkable treatment of its subject, exercising a preponderant influence over other commentators for many years—in the first case, mainly in the interval between the two world wars; in the second, over the whole of the subsequent period.<sup>6</sup>

Vaughan, who had been a professor of English literature in the University of Leeds and was a meticulous scholar, produced collations and transcriptions of the texts from their original manuscripts which set a standard perhaps unmatched even in the recent more or less definitive Pléiade edition of Rousseau's *Oeuvres complètes*. His lengthy introduction set a standard of another sort which, I suspect, may be equally unparalleled. If we bear in mind that he was the nephew of T. H. Green and drew much inspiration from the political idealism of his uncle, we should quickly grasp one of the main themes of his reading of Rousseau, to whom he ascribed a collectivist view of liberty which situated men's fundamental rights and duties within, rather than outside, the state. In so far as Rousseau believed that our nature was shaped by politics, he was persuaded that there could be no moral dimension to human conduct independent of state control, and thus rejected any idea of a superior natural law which might hold political authority in check. Personal liberty was properly defined by state membership, and the state, in turn, was perceived as the pre-eminent collective agency through which autonomous citizens ruled themselves. According to Vaughan, the major significance of this doctrine was that it provided a response to Locke's 'charter of individualism', by which he meant the notion that the state is 'wholly external' to the moral life of man. Thus whereas the social contract of Locke, claimed Vaughan, had been 'expressly designed to preserve and confirm the rights of the individual, that of Rousseau ends, and is intended to end, in their destruction . . . for the sake of a greater and higher benefit'.<sup>7</sup>

Unfortunately, however, Rousseau had not been fully consistent in subscribing to this collectivist ideal, since in both the *Discours sur l'inégalité* and subsequently in the first few pages of the *Contrat social* he had introduced individualist notions of human nature and liberty which proved to be disturbing elements in his theory and were incompatible with his main argument. Worse still, having already refuted the idea of natural law in his early draft of the *Contrat social*, that is, the so-called *Manuscrit de Genève*, and having therein shown, in a lengthy chapter, that the social contract could have no overriding moral sanction, Rousseau had himself demonstrated how his own conception of the state's foundation out of the mutual transfer of rights must be at fault; yet rather than abandon that theory he elected instead to erase his own refutation of natural law from the published text, deleting the offending chapter. Vaughan's sympathetic attempt to render Rousseau truly coherent thus led him to propose a revision of Rousseau's argument, by way of wholly

different excisions from the published works. Taken together, they form an extraordinary deconstructivist reading of a major author, perhaps unrivalled in its absurdity: 'Strike out the state of nature and the contract from the opening pages of the treatise', Vaughan counsels cheerfully:

Replace them by the idea of a gradual growth from barbarism to what may fairly be called the 'civil state'. Admit that the discipline which slowly brought men to that state was, in its earlier stages, largely a discipline of force. . . . Make these changes in Rousseau's argument, and its inconsistencies, its other inherent blemishes, will have largely disappeared. He would no longer have been hampered by the necessity of basing a collectivist structure upon a foundation of individualism. . . . But to have recast his argument in this fashion would have been to accept the idea of progress.

And alas—one can hear Vaughan's weary sigh of regret—'The idea of progress was wholly alien to his way of thought'.<sup>8</sup>

New and much needed light was shed upon this amicable darkness by Derathé's *Rousseau et la science politique de son temps*. Whereas Vaughan had laboured under the impression that the collectivist doctrine of Rousseau was founded upon his rejection of natural law, Derathé insisted that, on the contrary, the whole of Rousseau's political theory was designed to conform to such a principle. His works, it was now claimed, incorporate a multitude of allusions to jurisprudential writers, from whose treatises of natural law were drawn the main themes of his philosophy. For Rousseau, as for Locke or Pufendorf, Derathé contended, civil law may prescribe nothing which is contrary to the law of nature, a truth giving rise to consequences as crucial for an understanding of Rousseau's politics as were the implications of the opposite perspective adopted by Vaughan. For if the obligations of persons to respect the terms of the social contract are founded upon a principle of natural law, then no provisions of the contract can require that men entirely renounce the rights which they enjoy under that law. It is therefore clear that 'the total alienation of each associate together with all his rights to the whole community', as prescribed in Book I, chapter six of the *Contrat social*, does not in Rousseau's doctrine lead to the suppression of our natural rights [OC vol. 3, p. 360; SC 50]. Vaughan and his followers are found to have been mistaken in their belief that for Rousseau the liberty of individuals in the state of nature was absolutely lost when men collectively joined together to form the sovereign. The allegation that he endorsed a collectivist idea of the state in reply to Locke's 'charter of individualism' is deemed incorrect, since based on a false assumption. Rousseau's theory of politics turns out to be in fact the work of a disciple of Locke, and the conception of natural law which he drew from Locke and others must be understood as a constant feature of his thought.<sup>9</sup>

Derathé comes to these conclusions partly by placing emphasis upon a scattered selection of passages from Rousseau, including his correspondence, which had apparently escaped Vaughan's attention, and partly by juxtaposing certain themes from his work with those of jurisprudential writers before him. But despite the profound scholarship that underlies his study, I believe that Derathé's account is in its fashion as fundamentally misconceived as that of Vaughan. For if Vaughan attributed to Rousseau the rudiments of a theory he could not have anticipated, still less adopted, Derathé ascribes to him a political philosophy which in large measure it was his intention to refute.

No principles of natural law could possibly apply to individuals in the state of nature, Rousseau insists in his *Discours sur l'inégalité*, since the savage inhabitants of that state, having no perceptible duties or moral relations with one another, would have been incapable of following its dictates.<sup>10</sup> In the *Manuscrit de Genève* he maintains that the law of nature could only become intelligible after the prior development of men's passions had rendered all its precepts powerless, from which, he concludes, 'it is manifest that this so-called social trait dictated by nature is a veritable chimera'.<sup>11</sup> It was only in society, when relations between individuals were made permanent and binding, that they could recognize and perform their obligations under law, for in their state of natural independence, as Derathé himself admits, Rousseau's savage men cannot grasp the meaning, nor feel the binding force, of law.<sup>12</sup> The notion of a 'droit naturel' in the passages cited by Derathé is not that of a moral rule but of an impulse of nature, engraved in our hearts, as Rousseau puts it, rather than our reason.

None of Derathé's references to Rousseau's putative sources establish any intellectual debt of a kind that Rousseau would, or should, have been willing to repay, for he was overwhelmingly critical of these sources and claimed, in *Emile*, that a proper definition of the meaning of law had still to be drawn.<sup>13</sup> A principle designed by its main authors to bridge the gulf between nature and politics was ill-suited to his philosophy, which set political artifice apart from man's inchoate nature, and according to which our passage into civil society had not fulfilled our original potentialities but had instead denatured and transformed us. To the question set by the Academy of Dijon for which he produced his *Discours sur l'inégalité*—that is, 'What is the origin of inequality among men, and is it authorized by natural law?'—he clearly replies in the negative: 'Moral inequality [is] authorized solely by positive law'.<sup>14</sup> In the *Contrat social* he introduces no principle of natural law which might constrain the sovereign's powers; the idea is not even mentioned there. Men's natural rights are indeed renounced completely according to the terms of Rousseau's fundamental compact; in contrast most particularly with Locke, the sovereign power

which they establish is described as legitimate only if it has absolute authority over them.

## II: ROUSSEAU'S REFERENCES AND ALLUSIONS TO PUFENDORF

It may at first appear that Pufendorf is unlikely to have exercised a major influence on Rousseau, if only because he is so seldom mentioned in Rousseau's writings, by contrast with figures such as Plato, Montaigne, Montesquieu and Buffon, to whom a profound intellectual debt is acknowledged, or those, like Hobbes, Locke, Rameau and Voltaire, whose doctrines are, for the most part, vigorously opposed. Rousseau no doubt had Pufendorf in mind—together with Grotius, Locke, Burlamaqui and Hobbes—when he remarked in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, his fragmentary essay on 'L'Etat de guerre' and elsewhere, that the 'jurisconsultes' had wrongly transposed mankind's acquired social traits to the original state of nature, and had proposed political doctrines to remedy the inconveniences of such a state, whereas it was the very prescriptions that those doctrines set forth which were responsible for human misery and conflict. When Rousseau addressed the ideas of earlier jurisprudential thinkers he characteristically charged them with having proffered solutions to problems of which those solutions were in fact the cause.<sup>15</sup> But in his reflections on such thinkers, taken collectively, he does not cite Pufendorf in particular. We know from his *Confessions* that when he acquired the only systematic education that he was ever to receive, at the bosom of Madame de Warens in Annecy around 1730, he read Pufendorf, presumably the *De jure naturae et gentium*, or conceivably its crib, the *De officio hominis et civis*, both available in a French translation by Jean Barbeyrac, although he points to no text in particular. The two memoirs dating from the early 1740s which he prepared for the education of the son of Jean Bonnot de Mably also refer generally to Pufendorf, in addition to Grotius, as essential reading in natural law,<sup>16</sup> but in each case he just notes Pufendorf's name, without any comment or even mention of a specific work. Elsewhere, his infrequent references to Pufendorf are uniquely to the *De jure naturae et gentium* in the Barbeyrac edition entitled *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, first published in 1706; and they most characteristically cite Pufendorf by way of Barbeyrac's own commentary and annotations, particularly where Barbeyrac objects to Pufendorf's principles.

On the evidence which has survived, Rousseau appears to accept Barbeyrac's authority as a reliable critic of Pufendorf, and as an interpreter of other doctrines to which he refers in his notes. These notes may have served as Rousseau's source for his remarks in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*

on a passage about princely obedience to law from an obscure anonymous work devoted to Spanish monarchism, the *Traité des droits de la reine* of 1667,<sup>17</sup> and they were probably the only source for his references or allusions in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, the article 'Economie politique', the *Manuscrit de Genève* and the *Contrat social*, to the political philosophy of Filmer.<sup>18</sup> Occasional remarks in Barbeyrac's notes, perhaps reinforced by his lengthy introductory essay devoted to a historical and critical account of the science of morality, are likely to have been Rousseau's main inspiration, furthermore, for the distinction he draws in the preface to the *Discours sur l'inégalité* between modern natural law, in its application to intelligent moral beings only, and ancient natural law, which had defined the relations of all living creatures.<sup>19</sup> Compared with his intellectual debt to Pufendorf's editor, Rousseau's interest in the ideas of Pufendorf himself seems slight, there being only five specific references to them in the whole corpus of his writings, all of them figuring in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, the 'Economie politique' or the *Lettres de la montagne*. Neither Pufendorf's name nor any of his works is mentioned in the *Contrat social*, or, indeed, anywhere in Rousseau's voluminous correspondence.<sup>20</sup>

In the *Discours sur l'inégalité* there are three passages<sup>21</sup> that address Pufendorf's ideas directly, in the first of which Rousseau notes that Pufendorf, in company with Cumberland and an unnamed 'illustrious philosopher' (Montesquieu), differed from Hobbes in his conception of human nature, because he supposed men naturally timid rather than aggressive. This is a point also pursued in a later passage<sup>22</sup> in which Rousseau remarks that to be robust excludes dependence, which arises only from frailty, here implying the main difference between Hobbes's and Pufendorf's doctrines without, however, mentioning either Pufendorf or his work. In the second and third passage he takes up Barbeyrac's criticism of Pufendorf, following Locke, to the effect that men have no right to forsake their liberty, however much they may choose to alienate their property. Liberty, claims Rousseau, being a gift of nature and not a product of human industry, may never be renounced or transferred. In the 'Economie politique'<sup>23</sup> he cites Pufendorf again, this time by way of support for the contention that the right to transfer property may only be enjoyed by the living, since the dead can have no estates. In the eighth of his *Lettres de la montagne*,<sup>24</sup> he notes with approval the unchallenging idea that 'according to Pufendorf, right is a moral quality which prescribes something that is due to us'.<sup>25</sup>

I should add that apart from these direct references to Pufendorf, there are a number of obvious, and perhaps many more not so obvious, allusions to Pufendorf's ideas or Barbeyrac's interpretations of them in Rousseau's writings. When remarking adversely upon the ferocity of natural man as conceived by Hobbes, he appears in the *Discours sur l'inégalité* to

follow an observation drawn from Barbeyrac, and in the same text he also seems to allude to a passage by Pufendorf himself on the lack of periodicity of human sexual relations.<sup>26</sup> Rousseau's reflections on the absence from man's most primitive condition of any language apart from inarticulate cries, and on savages quenching their thirst at the first stream, or finding refuge in caves and forests, resemble Pufendorf's exposition in his own portrayal of the state of nature (*De jure naturae et gentium* II.ii.2); his insistence on investigating savage man as he emerged from the hands of nature, and before his acquisition of artificial powers, corresponds to Barbeyrac's gloss to the *De jure naturae et gentium* (II.i.5), that 'by original condition [is meant] that in which man finds himself in leaving the hands of his Creator . . . prior to having made any use of his faculties'; and it may even be that Rousseau's reiterated claims on the general unreality or inexistence of the state of nature were inspired by similar observations of both Pufendorf and Barbeyrac.<sup>27</sup> There are a number of other allusions to Pufendorf's text which merit at least passing notice as well, perhaps most importantly a passage in Book I, chapter two of the *Manuscrit de Genève*<sup>28</sup> in which Rousseau's reference to the expression 'bienveillance universelle' suggests that he might have had Pufendorf's text (II.iii.18) in mind, since these words appear as Barbeyrac's translation of Pufendorf's 'communis amor' but are missing from the article 'Droit naturel', by Diderot, to which this chapter of the *Manuscrit de Genève* is nominally addressed. In my next section I will consider the sense in which that work may have been intended by Rousseau to challenge Pufendorf's doctrine of sociability in an indirect fashion by way of a response, only in the first instance, to Diderot.

Yet all of these citations and allusions, and perhaps a few others still more oblique which I shall not pursue here, might be deemed of merely minor significance for a contextual understanding of Rousseau's ideas, if only because his express references to other political writers are so much more substantial, or because his images of a pristine state of nature draw upon wider sources, and his perception of Pufendorf among modern philosophers of natural law locates him in unspecified company from which Rousseau characteristically neglects to set him apart. Until a few years ago, I believed that the direct influence of Pufendorf upon the intellectual formation of Rousseau's ideas was slight, but I now hold that view to be false. Although his citations from Pufendorf are scanty, the themes they pursue form prominent features of both his philosophy of human nature and his theory of the foundations of the state, and I have come to see some of his principal arguments as quite centrally designed to challenge Pufendorf's natural jurisprudence, to the extent that it gave warrant to what Rousseau judged was the miserable history of human society and the despotic establishment of state power. In the rest of my essay I mean

to elaborate these propositions and to show how Rousseau sought to confront an author he so seldom mentions.

From the direct references to Pufendorf in his works, perhaps two points are most striking. The first of these is Rousseau's perception of Pufendorf, joined by Cumberland and Montesquieu, as supposing, quite contrary to Hobbes, that man in his natural condition is weak, timid and helpless.<sup>29</sup> 'We are continually told that nothing could be so miserable as man in this state', Rousseau remarks in the *Discours*,<sup>30</sup> alluding at once to Hobbes and Pufendorf, but quite the opposite is true. Savage man, according to Rousseau, was strong, vigorous and largely self-reliant, even if less fleet of foot and powerful than certain animals. Pufendorf had been entirely mistaken to suppose that men and women without laws were feeble and thus in need of mutual assistance;<sup>31</sup> they had not been drawn, on account of any infirmities of their solitary condition, to seek each other's company and thus, through society, to satisfy their needs. Second, Rousseau refers sharply in several passages of both the *Discours sur l'inégalité* and the *Contrat social* to Pufendorf's (as well as Grotius's and Hobbes's) misconceived idea of voluntary servitude. The political bond of association through which citizens form the state is not a pact of submission, for in surrendering their liberty to a king subjects renounce their humanity and make themselves slaves. Such is the unfortunate history of mankind, whose members have been deprived of their freedom by their own acts of will, in headlong pursuit of their chains. I will develop these themes in my next three sections, as follows: first, in my remarks on anterior natural law, I will assess the critique Rousseau puts forward of Pufendorf's idea of *socialitas*, or sociability; second, in my comments on generative natural law I will discuss Rousseau's rejection of the claim that men's feeble constitutions and infinite needs impel them to cooperate, to seek each other's company and form the bonds of commercial society; and third, in addressing Rousseau's views on representation, I will consider his denunciation of all political authority established from a people's self-imposed subjection to its ruler.

### III: ANTERIOR NATURAL LAW

Rousseau's central complaint against jurisprudential authors is that in their accounts of the state of nature they do not strip away those human qualities and institutions which could only have arisen in society. Though they seek to establish the philosophical foundations of our civil state, they characteristically assume what they need to prove and do not go far enough back in their accounts of mankind's origins. Rousseau believed this to be true of Pufendorf's conception of natural sociability, as it was



of Locke's idea of a natural right of property and Hobbes's notion of a natural state of war, as well as of these and other thinkers' suppositions about our faculty of reason, our conventions of language and our sense of duty and obligation. None of his precursors had perceived that primitive men are more like animals than like civilized persons. 'They spoke of the savage and depicted civil man', he contends in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*.<sup>32</sup> In Book I, chapter two of the *Esprit des lois*, Montesquieu had made much the same charge against Hobbes in particular.

Rousseau's idea of natural right in the *Discours sur l'inégalité* is established from a combination of *amour de soi* and *pitié* alone, rather than from any notion of natural sociability.<sup>33</sup> He there rejects the idea of *sociabilitas*, or the sociability of man in the state of nature, conceived as a desire, or as a need, or as a tendency, for social life, on the grounds that it is not their sociability but their liberty and perfectibility, above all the misapplication and abuse of these natural faculties, which draw men into the cooperative ventures that mark their passage from the state of nature into society.

The critique of sociability in Rousseau's *Manuscrit de Genève* is still more striking. His argument in the (ultimately deleted) Book I, chapter two of this work is essentially that the notion of a moral natural law is a chimera because it depends upon the self-contradictory idea of a natural society of mankind. If his final title for the chapter—'Of the general society of the human race'—puts the question, his original title—'That there is no natural society among men'—settles it most plainly. The whole of Book I, chapter two of the *Manuscrit de Genève* in fact comprises a critique of Diderot's article 'Droit naturel' for the *Encyclopédie*.<sup>34</sup> That article, in turn, was essentially a refutation of Hobbes's conception of the state of nature (ascribed, as Diderot put it, to a 'violent interlocutor'), by way of a defence of natural sociability. It introduced Diderot's own conception of the *volonté générale* which, according to its author, is in every individual an act of pure understanding, operating in the silence of the passions with respect to what each person may demand of another like himself, and what that other has a right to demand of him.<sup>35</sup> Rousseau, in his one and only political contribution to the *Encyclopédie*, the article 'Economie politique', had developed his idea of the *volonté générale* for the first time by way of an elaboration of Diderot's idea in the 'Droit naturel'.<sup>36</sup> But it must be emphasized that Diderot's article was largely inspired by his reading of Pufendorf, as indeed were many of his other contributions on political and economic subjects to the early tomes of the *Encyclopédie*, such as 'Agriculture', 'Autorité politique', 'Cité' and 'Citoyen'. In 'Citoyen' Diderot drew attention to two passages from *Les devoirs de l'homme et du citoyen*, that is, Barbeyrac's translation of Pufendorf's *De officio hominis et civis*, while in his *Encyclopédie* article 'Hobbisme', drawn almost



entirely from Jacob Brucker's own Pufendorffian reading of Hobbes in his *Historia critica philosophiae*, he added a few concluding paragraphs of his own, contrasting Hobbes and Rousseau, in which he argued that Rousseau's philosophy was the opposite of that of Hobbes. The one imagines human nature good, claimed Diderot, the other evil; the one believes the state of nature is a state of peace, the other supposes it to be a state of war.<sup>37</sup>

His article 'Droit naturel' was thus designed to criticize both authors: Hobbes because he conceived an idea of right which no person was under any obligation to respect and which, therefore, as Diderot incorrectly inferred, prompted vice and immorality in nature; and Rousseau, because he imagined that the formation of society and the establishment of laws depraved mankind. 'Both men were extreme', he observed in 'Hobbisme'.<sup>38</sup> Between them there is another idea which was closer to the truth—the idea that while mankind may be subject to perpetual turmoil, its goodness and evil are the same, each circumscribed by limits which cannot be breached. All artificial advantages have harmful effects, Diderot concluded; all natural evils are matched by consequences which are good. Diderot's view, in the 'Droit naturel' and 'Hobbisme' taken together, was that virtue and vice are at once natural and social; it was equally false to suppose, with Hobbes, that man is naturally vicious and, with Rousseau, that he always becomes so in society. In his essay 'Droit naturel', following Pufendorf, he thus put forward a view of natural right, allied to his conception of a general society of mankind, which was designed to refute Hobbes while at the same time excluding Rousseau's contrary conception of human nature and society.

The deleted chapter of the *Manuscrit de Genève* forms Rousseau's direct response to Diderot, itself by way of a double refutation of the Hobbesian position and that of Pufendorf which Diderot had adopted as an alternative. The violent interlocutor, that is, Hobbes, had been correct, claims Rousseau, in supposing that outside civil society there can be no conception of, or agreements about, a common good. Hobbes had rightly identified *droit naturel* not with moral duty but with perfect licence, excluding men's realization of any shared objectives. A true *volonté générale*, he contends, could only be established when political authority is already recognized by a community; only in a properly constituted state can the conception of a moral right for all men have any application. Yet if Diderot had misconceived the meaning of *droit naturel*, Hobbes had equally failed to grasp the manner in which natural rights could be exercised or enjoyed. For Hobbes had imagined that liberty itself engendered conflict and that the pursuit of natural rights produced a state of war. But according to Rousseau it is a mistake to suppose that the hostilities of corrupt society were a universal feature of mankind. Hobbes had attributed

human conflict and misery to vices which are in reality the effect of war, since in the state of nature, the passions of men could lead only to their disregard of, or pity for, one another.

Rousseau's contention is therefore that neither duty nor conflict can be found in nature, since both arise in society alone.<sup>39</sup> Diderot's *droit naturel* was a chimerical concept because it ascribed a moral rule to a state from which all authority is absent, while Hobbes's theory is founded upon the no less erroneous supposition that the exercise of natural rights gives rise to war. Each author derived his account of the *droit naturel* from his understanding of the social rather than the natural attributes of men. We only conceive the general society of mankind from the point of view of a particular society, Rousseau asserts: 'Those professed cosmopolitans who justify their love for their country by way of their love for humanity boast of loving the world so as to have the right to love no one at all'.<sup>40</sup> Moral rights could only be established in specific communities formed by the agreement of their members, he concludes; they were never to be found in any natural society of mankind. To the extent that a conception of such a society, in which natural law could be seen to operate, was drawn by Diderot from Pufendorf, Rousseau's argument forms a critique of Pufendorf by way of Diderot, as well as a response to Hobbes.

#### IV: GENERATIVE NATURAL LAW

My remarks in this section are much indebted to recent scholarship on Pufendorf's jurisprudence, especially the work of Fiammetta Palladini and Istvan Hont. In her study of Pufendorf's seventeenth-century commentators (*Discussioni seicentesche su Samuel Pufendorf*), and even more in her *Samuel Pufendorf discepolo di Hobbes*,<sup>41</sup> Palladini has sought to correct a number of misinterpretations of Pufendorf's meaning. His fundamental concept of *socialitas*, she contends, was not designed to portray our original tendency towards society, still less our naturally benevolent disposition, but only a moral imperative necessary for human survival. Unlike Grotius, who had conceived the state of nature as marked by an *appetitus societatis*, Pufendorf followed Hobbes in supposing that man was motivated merely by self-love and the desire to ensure his preservation. In his central chapter devoted to the fundamental law of nature he described the human race as malicious, petulant and easily irritated—a form of animal exposed to want and unable to exist without the assistance of his fellow creatures.<sup>42</sup> For an animal of this kind to preserve itself, it was necessary that it should be sociable, God having assigned to man a nature such that he is unable to survive except by leading a social life.<sup>43</sup> Society is thus seen to have been generated out of the needs, irascibility

and weakness of the individual, rather than any communal attraction. This Hobbesian, indeed originally Epicurean, notion of mankind led Pufendorf at first to suffer much the same criticism of his apparent moral indifference—that is, to be accused of heterodoxy or even atheism—as had been charged against Hobbes, and in her writings Palladini attempts to show how, in order to meet such challenges, Pufendorf at first defended Hobbes and subsequently came to redefine his own idea of sociability so as to endow it with less objectionable attributes in the manner of the Stoics and Grotius.<sup>44</sup>

Hont, in a number of essays in print or progress, pursues a similar reading of Pufendorf in order to show how he attempted to reconstruct the natural history of society out of this conception of self-interested need. Pufendorf, he remarks, began his account of society's origins from the premise that God gave the world to men in common, a donation yielding an indefinite right of all persons to appropriate the fruits of the earth. This right of everyone to everything excludes all private dominion over the land, since in the state of nature men can have no obligations; they therefore have common rights but lack reciprocal duties to respect them and live in a condition which Hont, following Pufendorf, describes as one of 'negative community'.<sup>45</sup> Against such a background of primeval communality defined by the absence of specific rights, Pufendorf is shown to have projected the establishment of a positive right of private property, by stages, through a conception of need that serves as a principle of individuation and distribution. Because human needs, unlike those of animals, are neither uniform nor finite—because, as Pufendorf observed, men have an endless desire after things superfluous<sup>46</sup>—the history of mankind's development from negative community to private property must have been a history of the transformation of abundance into scarcity as our forebears, in ever-growing numbers, sought to fulfil their insatiable needs through continual appropriation of the land. With this condition becoming progressively more unstable, private property rights would have been introduced as a remedy against the increasing threat of internecine war, in an attempt to regulate and ensure the political tranquility of mankind.

According to Hont, Pufendorf perceived that 'the peace of society would be better preserved if communally organized artificial beneficence gave way to the mutual sociability of selfish agents'. Such a society depended on the extension of the market, and the introduction of both money and foreign trade thus followed logically and inevitably from the stage of simple barter which prevailed earlier. This is what Hont terms Pufendorf's theory of 'commercial sociability'. The formation of the modern state in its various historical categories was conceived according to such a scheme, Hont claims, as 'part and parcel of [Pufendorf's] solution to the problems of disintegrating negative community, completing the

transition into a system of individual property rights'.<sup>47</sup> From the need to regulate men's endless desires there arose both rights of private property and the social organization of economic life. In the eighteenth century this theory of society's development was pursued further by Turgot, Smith and many other political economists, in terms of the stages of mankind's passage from barbarism to civilization through advancing forms of economic sustenance, while in the nineteenth century it came to be developed, above all by Marx, around a notion of progressive historical epochs, distinguished from one another in terms of their prevailing modes of economic production.

In the absence of any detailed treatments in his own writings, it may seem difficult to establish whether Rousseau interpreted Pufendorf's philosophy of history in anything like the manner set forth by Palladini and Hont. No doubt the *Discours sur l'inégalité* appears to recapitulate many of the themes of the *De jure naturae et gentium* highlighted by Hont in particular, since Rousseau's description there of mankind's passage from the state of nature to the civil state also incorporates the idea of a *res nullum* gifted by God to men in common, and hence the lack of private dominion in the state of nature, followed by population growth, increasing scarcity, an incipient state of war, the establishment of private property and the institution of different forms of government appropriate to distinct distributions of property and power in diverse circumstances. We ought not to put too much stress on such parallels, however, since Rousseau could have drawn these ideas from many other sources which he cited more frequently, in some instances from roughly contemporary thinkers who were themselves perhaps influenced by their reading of Pufendorf, and in others from writers who clearly were not. Rousseau's own conception of a propertyless, unregulated and uncultivated state of nature could, apart from Scriptural sources and commentaries, have been inspired by Lucretius, Horace or Diodorus Siculus (not to mention Locke); and allowing that these authors all happen to be cited by Pufendorf in his text, Rousseau could still have turned for guidance instead to the *Essais* of Montaigne,<sup>48</sup> for instance, to which he owed, and acknowledged, a greater debt than to the *De jure naturae et gentium*. Even with the helpful guidance of Palladini and Hont, I believe that Rousseau's connection with what I have here termed the generative theory of natural law, expounded by Pufendorf, may be better established in a different way.

The Hobbesian reading of the concept of sociability, as presented by Palladini, seems to have been clearly evident to Rousseau himself, whose allusions in his second *Discours* to the notion that natural man is miserable, timid and helpless, as I have tried to show here, all appear to pertain to specific passages from the *De jure naturae et gentium*. Rousseau of course contends that this doctrine is false, for the same reason that Hobbes

was mistaken to suppose man naturally aggressive—that is, because both timidity and belligerence are social traits. In rejecting the doctrine of man's original feebleness, and hence the supposition that we need society to survive, Rousseau in fact puts an objection which correlates with his rebuttal of Hobbes, in so far as he judged Pufendorf to be mistaken about man's need for society, and found Hobbes in error about the consequences of solitude. Both authors, he believed, had wrongly supposed that man's natural condition required social remedy. To that extent he understood the idea of *socialitas* in precisely the manner now rendered plain by Palladini; his critique of this notion indeed forms one of the principal themes of his *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in its endeavour to show how 'little Nature contrived to bring men together through mutual needs', and how 'little it gave rise to their sociability'.<sup>49</sup>

With the assistance of Hont, moreover, I believe we may now form a better idea of Pufendorf's conception of the generation of society out of the continual pursuit of superfluous needs, whose organization and distribution come progressively to require the introduction of money and the development of a commercial market. However much his view of sociability may reflect a Hobbesian notion of self-love, Pufendorf seems rather more illuminating than Hobbes with respect to the origins of society, since like La Rochefoucauld, Pascal and Bayle among his near contemporaries, or Mandeville among his successors, he explains how selfish men may both require assistance from and then come to depend upon one another, whereas Hobbes rather suggests that we are able to keep company only through sufferance and continual self-restraint. Rousseau's portrait of attractively robust savage self-reliance may have been designed to contradict each of these authors, but his account of the miserable dependence on others of *l'homme sociable*, always obliged to live outside himself,<sup>50</sup> confronts Pufendorf and Mandeville rather more directly than Hobbes. The pursuit of superfluous needs which would have progressively bound men to one another does indeed seem a feature of the history of society, he claims, but our original nature gave rise only to a capacity, and not a tendency, for such endeavour.

To my mind, however, the principal rejoinder of Rousseau to Pufendorf's theory of 'commercial sociability' may have been less his *Discours sur l'inégalité* than the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, even though Pufendorf's name is nowhere mentioned there. In this work—which forms the most notable contribution of Rousseau himself to the stadial theory of our economic development and modes of sustenance—he attempts to show that primeval society was bred from our natural passions and not our factitious needs.<sup>51</sup> Our first languages, our most primitive common vocabulary of signs, he insists, must have articulated our love, pity or anger rather than expressed our needs, with our initial passionate encounters

having been progressively transformed into fixed settlements merely by chance, as volcanic eruptions and other natural catastrophes would have dispersed savages from one region and driven them into closer proximity elsewhere.<sup>52</sup> We are not naturally united but divided by needs and by the self-interested means we pursue to satisfy them. Languages in their earliest seductive form, 'daughters of pleasure and not need', Rousseau observes, came to be effaced with the ebullient sentiments from which they had sprung, only when 'new needs that were introduced among men forced each person to think of no one but himself and to draw his heart back within him'.<sup>53</sup> How could it possibly be such fractious needs which originally brought men together? 'It would be absurd' to suppose 'that the very cause which drives men apart should also be the means that unites them', he concludes, here contradicting not only Hobbes and Pufendorf but also Mandeville.<sup>54</sup> Pufendorf's concept of *socialitas*, enjoining selfish and feeble men to form a collective crutch for one another so that they might reinforce their misery, only marked the corruption of human society, and not its joyous origins, as Rousseau portrays them in the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*. Thereafter could be witnessed the progressive decadence of the savage, barbarian and civil man, respectively, in advancing through the hunting, pastoral and agrarian stages of his development, which Pufendorf and others took as evidence of humanity's ingenuity in passing out of its wretched and unstable original condition. No less than Pufendorf or Mandeville, Rousseau, in his ninth chapter of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, sketches an economic theory of our species' history which plots the metamorphoses of civilization that herald the advent of commercial society.<sup>55</sup>

Of course the driving force of man's commercial sociability was all too evident in the contemporary world, according to Rousseau. It was just because of the interconnections between commerce and civilization—the tyranny of finance, the corruption of cities, the depravity of riches and poverty alike—that he could find Pufendorf's philosophy at once manifestly powerful and morally perverse, in so far as the acquisition of wealth was a measure of the decline of morality, he suggests in his *Constitution pour la Corse*.<sup>56</sup> Where commerce reigns, as he notes in the *Contrat social*,<sup>57</sup> freedom is always traded, degrading buyer and seller alike. It was not only Hobbes who, in anticipation of Pufendorf, recognized that in modern society 'all things obey money';<sup>58</sup> Rousseau too remarks, in Book IV of *Emile*,<sup>59</sup> that money has become 'the real bond of society'. Sole measure of value, but valueless in itself, it forms the secret currency of thieves and traitors when they put the public good and liberty up for auction. Having originally chanted  *aimez-moi*  to one another in our savage state, and then finding ourselves forced through need, in barbarous conditions, to cry out  *aidez-moi*  in order to survive, now in societies

which have assumed their 'final form' around the contemporary institutions of commerce, all that we can say is *donnez de l'argent*.<sup>60</sup> If, following Hont, it is right to read Pufendorf's *De jure naturae et gentium* as an account of the divinely sanctioned political economy of progress, then Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité* and *Essai sur l'origine des langues* together should be read as a rebuttal which offers a secular account of man's fall.

## V: THE IDEA OF REPRESENTATION

In this concluding section I turn to Book III, chapter fifteen of the *Contrat social*, entitled 'Of deputies or representatives', which, to my mind, occupies a central place in that work and forms probably the most important point of departure for locating it in the context of Rousseau's other writings. He there puts forward two theses about the corruption of modern society. The first is that *finance* is a slavish term, unknown to the citizens of free states in the ancient world. Through the hustle of commerce and the arts, he writes, through the greedy self-interest of profit, personal services are replaced by money payments. 'Make gifts of money, and you will not be long without chains', he concludes. In a country that is truly free, citizens do everything with their own arms, and nothing by means of money. In a free state everyone flies to the assemblies, drawn by an attachment to the common good which is far more absorbing than the pursuit of private interest. In the modern world, by contrast, domestic cares absorb all our attention. 'I hold enforced labour to be less opposed to liberty than taxes', he claims, for once taxed, we entrust affairs of state to the masters of our public revenue. What does it matter to me, we say, as we turn in upon ourselves, leaving the regulation of the political domain to our appointed governors?<sup>61</sup>

This is a familiar and recurrent theme in Rousseau's writings, and it can be found, as well, in *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, the *Lettre à d'Alembert* on the theatre, and the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*. In both his *Constitution pour la Corse* and *Gouvernement de Pologne*, moreover, he uses words almost identical with those employed in this chapter of the *Contrat social*. The system of finance, he repeats, is a modern invention. In the ancient world, public revenue was comprised not of money but of produce and commodities (*denrées*). Even the citizens of the richest republic of antiquity, that is Rome, were not taxed. The grandeur of that state was achieved with little revenue. The less that money is necessary, the more does virtue become possible as a spur for action in its stead.<sup>62</sup> Of course these tributes to antiquity are somewhat disingenuous, since, as Rousseau observes elsewhere, the liberty of citizens in the ancient world depended, in large measure, on their possession of slaves, so that the virtuous freedom



enjoyed by some was obtained only by others being deprived of it.<sup>63</sup> But I draw attention to this passage of the *Contrat social* just to recapitulate, in a slightly different idiom, the points I have already made with reference to the factitious and superfluous needs of men and women, according to Rousseau, as they passed from their natural condition of self-sufficiency into the commercial entrapments of civil society, where they are drawn outside themselves to find new identities only in the eyes of others, pursuing insatiable wants which are continually frustrated in their relations of mutual dependence.

Rousseau's remarks about the modernity of finance in the *Contrat social* thus rather resemble the points I have already ascribed to his critique of the generative conception of natural law, which I have here associated mainly with Pufendorf. His characteristically extravagant claims about the modernity of finance in the *Contrat social* cannot be said to follow strictly from the main themes of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, because that work deals with mankind's progression from a solitary state of nature into civil society, and not its passage from ancient civic virtue into modern private vice. But the themes are, to my mind, entirely compatible. Their connection with the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* is even stronger.

In Book III, chapter fifteen of the *Contrat social* there is, however, a second and related claim about the corruption of civilization, to which I will devote my concluding remarks. This is what Rousseau states:

The idea of representation is modern; it comes to us from feudal government, from that iniquitous and absurd system which degrades humanity and dishonours the nature of man. In ancient republics and even in monarchies, the people never had representatives; the word itself was unknown.<sup>64</sup>

Modern peoples, believing themselves to be free, have representatives, whereas ancient peoples had none. The moment a people allows itself to be represented, he concludes, it is no longer free; it no longer exists.

Perhaps the most illuminating way of pursuing this critique of *representation*, whose modernity Rousseau holds to be no less striking than that of *finance*, is by connecting it with the passage in Book I, chapter four of the *Contrat social*, in which he claims that 'To renounce one's liberty is to renounce one's human quality as a person, to surrender the rights of humanity and even its duties'.<sup>65</sup> Why does Rousseau hold the very idea of representation to be incompatible with freedom? It is clear from the *Contrat social* and other related passages in the *Discours sur l'inégalité* and elsewhere that the principal focus of Rousseau's criticism there is once again the philosophy of natural law and, in this context, especially that of Grotius who, in his *De jure belli ac pacis*, had claimed that a people may dispose of its freedom (in Rousseau's transcription, 'may alienate its liberty') and freely render itself subject to a king.<sup>66</sup> In transferring its liberty



to one who represents its will, a people may submit itself to a condition of voluntary servitude, passing over its freedom to a person who acts on its behalf, Grotius had claimed. Such a renunciation, says Rousseau, is incompatible with the nature of man, destroying all the morality of his actions and his freedom of will. For Rousseau, there could be no right of slavery stemming from a subject's willing submission to his king, since the words *right* and *slave* exclude one another and are mutually inconsistent.<sup>67</sup> Liberty, he insists, can never be represented. In contemplating a people's surrender of its freedom to a king, Grotius neglects the far more important question, according to Rousseau,<sup>68</sup> of how it comes to constitute a people, since it is the formation of a people and not its subjection to a king which marks the establishment of a civil society.

I remark upon Rousseau's reading of Grotius here, because it is specifically the doctrine of Grotius which Rousseau addresses in chapters four and five of the *Contrat social*. But in both the *Discours sur l'inégalité* and elsewhere in the *Contrat social* Rousseau makes it abundantly plain that he has in mind a general theory of the formation of the state which is not only that of Grotius, but also of Hobbes and Pufendorf as well, according to which every legitimate political association is established by the willing subjection of a people to its ruler. This idea, essentially that of voluntary servitude, is rejected by Rousseau time and again in his political writings. In the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in particular, he pursues the same point not only against Grotius, as in the *Contrat social*, but specifically against Pufendorf, who had claimed that just as a person may contract to transfer his property to another, so may one agree to relinquish his freedom in the same way.<sup>69</sup> That contention, says Rousseau, in the only passage of the *Discours* which won the approval of Voltaire, is 'un fort mauvais raisonnement' (that is, 'a thoroughly rotten argument'), for slavery is always contrary to human nature.<sup>70</sup> Rousseau notes (in a passage of the 1782 edition of the *Discours* based on his original manuscript) that it had already been shown, by Locke, that one could not dispose of one's liberty by submitting it to the control of an arbitrary power in the same way that one might sell one's estate; although the concepts of liberty and property are closely linked by Locke in his political theory, they do not have the same meaning, since liberty is not a transferrable good, and no man has a right to make himself a slave.<sup>71</sup> As Locke himself puts this point in his fourth chapter of the *Second Treatise of Government*: 'A man, not having the power of his own life, cannot by compact or consent enslave himself to anyone, nor put himself under the absolute arbitrary power of another to take away his life when he pleases'.

Rousseau's immediate source for this claim is the commentary, provided by Barbeyrac, who cites Locke at length and with approval, in his notes to Book VII, chapter eight of his own translation of Pufendorf's

*De jure naturae et gentium*.<sup>72</sup> In discussing the author's assertion that a people might subject itself to slavery Barbeyrac had observed, following Locke, 'that no man may so part with his liberty as to give himself up wholly to an arbitrary power, for this would be to dispose of his own life, of which he is not master'. Much less can a whole people have such a right, he concludes, when every single person who forms a part of that people lacks it himself. On this point Rousseau subscribes entirely to Locke's and Barbeyrac's criticisms of the legitimacy of any voluntary subjection of a people, and in the *Discours sur l'inégalité* he takes issue, above all, not so much with Grotius or Hobbes, as with Pufendorf. More than once in the *Contrat social*, moreover, he alludes disdainfully to any notion of a people's deliberate submission to their ruler following the establishment of the state.<sup>73</sup> There is, he observes, only one contract in the state, which excludes all others.<sup>74</sup> There can be no pact of submission following a pact of association, for the institution of government is not a contract,<sup>75</sup> and the indivisible sovereignty of a people may never be delegated to or represented by a king. In the *Contrat social* Rousseau remarks that Grotius, in dedicating *De jure belli ac pacis* to King Louis XIII, had spared no pain in robbing the people of all their rights, and even the otherwise admirable Barbeyrac, who had dedicated his translation of Grotius (*Le droit de la guerre et de la paix*, dating from 1724) to King George I, had scarcely hesitated to tie himself up in his own sophistry.<sup>76</sup> Truth does not point the way to riches, Rousseau concludes, and the people never make anyone an ambassador, nor a professor, nor hand out any pensions.

If we now return to my point of departure in Book III, chapter fifteen, we find in these remarks of Rousseau an elaboration of his earlier claims that liberty may never be renounced, that sovereignty may never be represented and that, in confusing a particular form of government with the general notion of sovereignty, Grotius, Hobbes and Pufendorf had all laid the modern foundations of political slavery. In each of their philosophies, the absolute power of monarchy was masqueraded behind the shroud of consent. Immediately before his critique of representation in Book III, chapter fifteen of the *Contrat social*, moreover, Rousseau puts the same point as I have just made about absolute monarchy with respect to the supposed sovereignty of Parliament. As we shall recollect, he writes, in one of the most memorable passages of the work, that 'the people of England regards itself as free, but it is grossly mistaken; it is free only during the election of members of Parliament. As soon as they are elected, slavery overtakes it, and it is nothing. The use it makes of the short moments of liberty it enjoys shows indeed that it deserves to lose them'.

The philosophical legerdemain, as Rousseau conceived it, by which one person's will may articulate the liberty of many others is, I suppose, best known to contemporary students of political thought from chapter sixteen

of Hobbes's *Leviathan*, entitled 'Of persons, authors and things personated'. According to Hobbes, the authority of the sovereign, who is an artificial person, is granted to him by commission or licence from his subjects. They are the authors of his actions, and he is no more than the actor personating them. He is his own subjects' lieutenant, vicar, attorney, deputy or representative. In authorizing him to act on their behalf they entrust him with their liberty and are bound by his word and his will because they are subject to the consequences of their own agreement. The sovereign representative of his people has an absolute and unlimited right to all things, because, as Hobbes writes in chapter twenty-one of *Leviathan*, 'Every subject is author of every act the sovereign does'. If I may employ Rousseau's terminology here once again, this is 'un fort mauvais raisonnement', not least because Hobbes's idea of sovereign power as at once unconditionally binding and wilfully delegated neglects his earlier distinction between obligation and liberty (in chapter fourteen of the *Leviathan*) by making the act of submission of authors to their representative one which embraces both concepts together, when in fact the liberty of subjects passes from them to their representative in their establishment of the state. For Rousseau, no expression of liberty could embrace its renunciation.

I say that the argument is best known to contemporary students of political thought through this chapter of *Leviathan*, but it was perhaps most familiar to Rousseau from his reading of sections twelve and thirteen of Book I, chapter one of the *De jure naturae et gentium* of Pufendorf, entitled, in English, 'Of the Origin and Variety of Moral Entities'. According to Pufendorf, compound moral persons which are invested with the power of natural persons, or individuals, sustain their character and may thus be termed their *representatives*.<sup>77</sup> Political societies, such as *republics* (the example is missing from Kennet's translation), comprise moral persons of just this kind, he remarks, constituted when separate persons so unite that by reason of their union whatever they want is considered as one will. This takes place when several individuals subordinate their will to the will of one person or to that of a council, Pufendorf claims, such that they acknowledge that whatever that person or council has decreed or done is the action of them all. No less than Hobbes, Pufendorf thus contends that by submitting themselves to the absolute authority of their king, subjects are the authors of his power and he, through his office, is the agent and personator of their will.

Of course the theory of representation encapsulated in a people's submission to the authority of their ruler does not originate with Hobbes and Pufendorf, however modern Rousseau supposes it to be. It can be found in the political thought of Marsilius, for instance, in his conjunction of the notion of popular rule with the idea of delegated conciliar

power, through which the authority of the whole body of citizens is expressed, 'auctoritatem universitatis civium representantes'.<sup>78</sup> There are no doubt numerous other precedents for this claim before the seventeenth century, of which Rousseau may have been as ignorant as I am. But the main point I wish to stress about his critique of the idea of representation is his insistence that through this institution—through the representation of sovereignty—the people who are said to be agents of their state's legislative power invariably find themselves confronted by an authority which does not express their will but instead deprives them of their freedom. In taking on the public persona of popular sovereignty, modern governments impersonate the only legitimate authority in each state, which is the whole body of citizens taken collectively. In coming to stand in for the people, governments deprive citizens of the right to govern themselves. The public personification of the people by the modern state, Rousseau believed, was a mask, a counterfeit, a disguise. In subscribing to what we might term the metonymic theory of the state, modern man, no less than his savage forebears who had suffered a like delusion in their creation of civil society, has run headlong into his chains, believing himself to be free. Legislators acting on behalf of the people do not articulate the will of citizens but only the interests they ascribe to them, that is to say, what citizens ought to will, now that they have forfeited their freedom to determine that choice for themselves.

As Rousseau understood the matter, modern states, in their replacement of equality with thralldom, had no citizens at all, but only subjects. If the development of commerce in his philosophy of history may be described as a fundamental misrepresentation of need, so may the development of a public power in the modern world which substitutes government for sovereignty be described as a misrepresentation of freedom. In both cases individuals come to live outside themselves, establishing a false identity in their dependence on others. Having delegated his public persona to his representative, the allegedly free subject of a modern state finds himself depoliticized, his moral liberty eviscerated, so to speak, as he is now forced to seek a new identity only in his domestic life, retaining such meagre liberties that are left to him only as a private person, in the pursuit of ambitions which drive him to exploit his neighbours rather than seek fraternity and common cause with them. Whereas in the republics of antiquity our interests were openly shared and inscribed in our hearts, now they are in conflict, Rousseau laments in Book III, chapter fifteen of the *Contrat social* (his epiphany of equality), secreted away in the linings of our purses. As we have come to serve the state with our purses rather than our persons, our collective voice has been stilled, our public identity lost, our liberty freely forsaken. Such are the consequences that stem from the modern idea of voluntary subjection, which Rousseau

ascribes to the theory of natural law, and to the jurisprudential doctrines of Grotius, Hobbes and, above all, Pufendorf.

If I have to come to these conclusions by a route which, to my mind, is too seldom pursued by Rousseau's interpreters, I trust that they will nevertheless be familiar to all his readers, for these are indeed some of the most central themes of both his philosophy of history and his political theory. One point that may be thought to follow from his critique of the idea of representation here is that what is most central to his conception of sovereignty is not so much that it should be absolute—for, as a matter of fact, Rousseau's sovereign has no force to implement its own will; nor even that it should be unitary and indivisible—since the general will can only be formulated in opposition to each citizen's particular will; but rather that the sovereign must always be direct, the unmuffled voice of the people who constitute the state, in articulate exercise of their own authority, unmediated and unrefracted by any delegated powers. 'Wherever the represented are present, there can be no representation', he claims in Book III, chapter fourteen of the *Contrat social*.<sup>79</sup> Although I can hardly begin here to pursue that theme in all its permutations, let me just note that the idea of the misrepresentation of freedom in the modern state is but a single, albeit major, aspect of what Rousseau perceived to be the general corruption of civilization in the passage of humanity out of a world of simplicity, spontaneity and immediacy into a complex world of calculated selfishness, which even persons who recoil in horror from what they take to be his sinister conception of the state may find all too familiar. As Jean Starobinski puts this thesis in a variety of forms and with respect to a wide range of works in his splendid study of Rousseau's thought, *La transparence et l'obstacle*, mankind's passage from nature to culture has rendered obscure, opaque and devious what it is suggested must once have been transparent, direct and pure.<sup>80</sup>

I have here focused on Rousseau's view of misrepresented freedom, but of course the idea of representation has a far wider currency than in the political sphere alone. Impersonating actors are to be found not only on thrones or in parliamentary chambers but also in pulpits and confessionals, and equally on the stage, where Rousseau finds that they render their audience no less passive and inert than are the subjects of the crown. The artificial contrivance of harmony in music, he thought, similarly distorts the natural fluency of melody; the loss of inflection in language renders our speech monotonous, our prose thus made prosaic; and the representation of speech in writing disengages meaning from utterance and deforms the exuberant intonations through which we would once have expressed our passions and our pleasures.<sup>81</sup> The representation of liberty in the modern state, conceived in terms of voluntary subjection, stands to citizens as writing does to speech. It does not render plain but distorts; in

impersonating their purported authors, governments only render them subject to their own control, binding electors under terms and conditions which leave them unfree to express their will. I can hardly think of a broader or more pervasive theme in the whole of Rousseau's philosophy.

One not insignificant implication of these matters for students of political thought is the sense in which it would appear that Vaughan may after all have been much closer to the truth than Derathé in his identification of the moral dimension of Rousseau's conception of liberty with the public domain—in placing emphasis on what would today perhaps be termed *participatory democracy*. If I have a single overriding reason for regarding Derathé's solidly contextual reading of Rousseau as unconvincing and Vaughan's wildly anachronistic folly as perhaps more faithful to his subject's meaning, it is that the images of a natural law constraint upon state power which are so central to Derathé's defence of Rousseau against the imputations of collectivism seem not to accord with Rousseau's bolder and more radical vision of the politically engaged character of liberty. Rousseau *does* situate his moral conception of liberty within the state, and he seeks to protect the liberty of citizens less by safeguarding a sphere of privacy which state power must not infringe than by ensuring that membership of the state becomes a matter of the greatest devotion—political engagement assuming, for those who partake of collective self-rule, the most active and direct form.

This bolder and more radical vision of liberty is, of course, according to Rousseau's critics also more dangerous. For a great many readers, the mobilization of a publicly spirited sense of fraternity smacks of collectivism or even totalitarianism<sup>82</sup>—charges which inspired Derathé to adopt a very different perspective on Rousseau's idea of natural law from that of Vaughan. But I think that in defending his political philosophy from the misinterpretations which Robespierre and the Jacobins placed upon it, commentators should first acknowledge that there are many resonances in Rousseau which do indeed anticipate the radical fervour of Jacobin political ideals, and they should then look for the at least equally striking differences elsewhere than in his doctrine of natural law. These differences should not prove hard to find. Readers who are persuaded that Rousseau's zealous political philosophy found its cutting edge in the guillotine and thereby achieved a benighted unity of theory and practice might bear in mind how much he himself recoiled from violence and proclaimed that even the liberty of the whole of humanity did not justify shedding the blood of a single man;<sup>83</sup> *terror* was a word almost entirely absent from his political vocabulary, and he employed it only to condemn such governments as acted in defiance of the law it was their duty to uphold. In the light of my main theme in this section, we should of course recall, moreover, that Rousseau conceived his idea of popular sovereignty

as the only safeguard of citizens against the tyranny of government—tyranny of a kind which would join the Committee of Public Safety, whose rise he did not anticipate, to those ancient despotisms that he knew. The Jacobin doctrine of revolutionary government as the supreme representative of the people's will directly contradicts the idea of indivisible popular sovereignty which Rousseau had put forward, and to which Robespierre may have subscribed in theory but never in fact.

Most important of all, perhaps, the fundamental truth about Rousseau's meaning which redeems Vaughan's misbegotten reading from the learned corrections of Derathé—in effect, that our political institutions shape human nature and morality, for better or worse—points to a vision of human redemption from corrupt society which was largely ignored by both scholars. Having declined equally from our state of natural innocence and also the fraternal republics of antiquity, it was not now politically possible, according to Rousseau, for us to efface the harmful stains of human history and restore our primeval ignorance or ancient virtue. Only in fantasy could he make a personal escape from the benighted civilization which in his day was already termed *commercial society*, through reverie casting himself adrift in the cleansing waters of oblivion. Just in his dreams could he relish the 'sublime delirium' and 'noble distraction' of perfect freedom,<sup>84</sup> in imagination alone overcoming the real barriers confronting *vivre entre soi* under the infinitely soothing attractions of *vivre en soi*. However much the citizen of Geneva regretted the loss of his political patrimony, and the corruption of humanity from a fanciful past, the only tranquil joy which he savoured in his own life Rousseau found in blissful communion, not with other citizens, but in solitude with Nature.<sup>85</sup>

## ROUSSEAU'S READING OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS AND THE THEOLOGY OF COMMERCIAL SOCIETY

In the *Troisième Dialogue* Rousseau suggests that all his writings pursued a single theme—to the effect, as he puts it, that ‘Nature made mankind happy and good but . . . society depraves and renders it miserable’.<sup>1</sup> *Emile*, in particular, he adds, ‘is nothing but a treatise on the original goodness of mankind’. He no doubt conceived *Emile* in that vein, since the opening line of its first book heralds precisely the claim that in the *Dialogues* he would declare to be his works’ chief contention: ‘Everything is good when it springs from the hands of our Creator; everything degenerates when shaped by the hands of man’.<sup>2</sup> Yet if on his own testimony we accept that this was the guiding thread of his philosophy as a whole, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the text which most fully elaborates Rousseau’s central principle, and which on account of the attention he there devotes to it lies at the nexus of his whole career, is the *Discours sur l’inégalité*.

The *Contrat social* was to become holy writ in the course of the French Revolution, when France’s political leaders were to focus on the nation’s spiritual regeneration, but the *Discours sur l’inégalité* far better articulates what Rousseau took to be the stages of mankind’s long day’s journey into night, which he sought to explain largely through a neologism that recapitulates the Pelagian heresy decried by St. Augustine—the faculty of *perfectibilité*, whose abuse by its possessors he deemed responsible for our species’ decrepitude.<sup>3</sup> For most of Rousseau’s contemporaries and all the jurisprudential writers whom he challenges in this work, both the prospect and advent of civil society belied the dogma of original sin, according to which the miseries of this world were the legacy of our earliest ancestors’ self-inflicted fall from grace. In rejecting that Christian doctrine progressive thinkers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries contended that mankind could overcome the defects of its savage state, either without, or in advance of, celestial redemption. According to Rousseau, however, since the state of nature was innocent of both vice and danger, it had no need of the remedies of civil society or ‘civilization’, an equivalent term which acquired its modern meaning just around the time of the publication of the *Discours sur l’inégalité*.<sup>4</sup> On the contrary, Hobbes, Locke, Pufendorf and all the other thinkers whom he challenges for having



failed to strip away society from their portraits of the state of nature had conceived their ideas as solutions to a problem of which those solutions were in fact the cause. Civilization was in his view not the cure to the problem of human nature but the disease itself, whose stages marked our progressive rather than primeval abandonment of the traits with which our progenitors had been endowed by a benevolent God.

Rightly regarded by his political admirers as a modern legislator in the image of Lycurgus or Solon, and eventually esteemed as the Moses of Revolutionary France, Rousseau ought even more, in the light of what he declares to be his central principle, to be read as a modern Tacitus, the pre-eminent chronicler of human corruption.<sup>5</sup> Each of Rousseau's chief political texts, as well as dealing with modern writings, is cast within a classical mould, by which I mean especially Ovid's *Metamorphoses* with regard to the *Discours sur l'inégalité* and Livy's *Rise of Rome* with regard to the *Contrat social*. But they ought also to be read as commentaries on the Bible; that is, in the case of the second *Discours* as an interpretation of the book of Genesis and with regard to the *Contrat social* as a treatment of the book of Exodus. However we read it, the *Discours sur l'inégalité* offers us the richest testimony and deepest seams to be found anywhere in his writings of his conception of benign human nature and malignant human history described in the *Dialogues* as the guiding principle of his writings. The great tributaries of his system spring from that source.

Important questions must nevertheless be raised about the coherence of his philosophy and the links between its diverse themes if his claim is to carry conviction. What are his readers to make of the fact that two vast subjects to which he devoted more of his attention throughout his life than to any other matter apart from himself—subjects which, moreover, profoundly engaged his attention in the period he composed the second *Discours* and then around the time of its publication—are conspicuous by their absence from this text? Why is the *Discours sur l'inégalité* virtually silent with regard to music, on the one hand, and religion, on the other, each as central to his philosophy of history as a whole as any of the themes actually articulated in this work? That music and religion were of paramount importance to Rousseau in explaining both the origins of culture and the degeneration of mankind is amply manifested in his *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, which, although completed a few years later, is virtually a companion-piece to the second *Discours* in so far as it turns inside out its major and one of its minor themes, embracing an account of the evolution of society within the context of a history of language whereas the *Discours* encapsulates a history of language within the context of a history of the evolution of society.

The *Essai sur l'origine des langues* offers the most elaborate analysis anywhere in Rousseau's writings of mankind's corruption that was attrib-

utable to the deformation of languages since antiquity, while the final chapter of that work, entitled 'The Relation of Languages to Governments', occupies much the same place there as the concluding pages of the second *Discours* in addressing society's ultimate decay, albeit in this case couched in terms of the proposition that languages that have come to be separated from music are inimical to freedom.<sup>6</sup> The *Essai* equally, as the *Discours* does not, provides numerous illustrations drawn from Rousseau's reading of Scripture and gives expansive scope to his philosophy of religion,<sup>7</sup> as well as offering a critique of priestcraft, so vital to both his chapter on the civil religion in the *Contrat social* and the 'Profession de foi du vicaire Savoyard' in *Emile*. Even the floods and earthquakes that according to Rousseau in the *Discours* must originally have brought savages into territorial proximity are, in the *Essai*, described not as fortuitous natural catastrophes but as supernatural phenomena caused by the tilting of the globe's axis as if 'with the touch of the finger', thereby changing the position of the Earth and settling the vocation of mankind, giving rise to the birth of the arts, laws and commerce but also wars in scattered clusters of habitation.<sup>8</sup> Why are these themes and images, so central to Rousseau's account of our natural goodness and social corruption, not to be found in the most seminal exposition of his philosophy of history?

In this short essay I mean to address that question with regard to the still extant fragments of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in so far as they shed light on its original framework and the range of topics in it that Rousseau initially intended to develop. Just as the *Contrat social* distilled only a number of themes from a larger treatise he at first planned to call the *Institutions politiques*, so the second *Discours* embraces only a part of his philosophy of history, whose elaboration elsewhere can be traced to both early and intermediate sketches of the text, of which the manuscript submitted for publication has been lost. On Rousseau's own testimony the subjects of music and religion were very much in his mind when he drafted it, and his main or at least only professed reason for removing the passages he penned about them was that they were in need of more ample attention than was permitted by the format of his argument. Excised from the *Discours sur l'inégalité* as unwieldy, this material would come to be interpolated within fuller expositions of the same topics in later works.

As with virtually all of his treatments of political themes, in contrast with so many of his other major writings, only a few fragments remain, now scattered between the world's three principal collections of his papers, lodged in the Bibliothèque de Neuchâtel, the Bibliothèque de Genève and the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. Beginning with Georges Streckeisen-Moultou's collection of Rousseau's *Oeuvres et correspondance inédites* published in 1861, three of these fragments, described by their editors as drafts or preparatory segments of the second *Discours*,

have appeared in print, as have a number of other disparate passages thematically related to this text. The first transcription was followed by several more in other collections of Rousseau's writings, most recently in the third volume of the Pléiade edition of his *Oeuvres complètes* in 1964, the second volume of Michel Launay's collection of the same material in 1967, Heinrich Meier's German edition of the second *Discours* in 1984 and Roger Masters' and Christopher Kelly's English edition of the *Discours sur l'inégalité* in 1992, not forgetting an earlier notable article by Ralph Leigh on 'Les manuscrits disparus' published in the *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* in 1959.<sup>9</sup>

A full assemblage of the manuscripts of the second *Discours*, however, would be substantially larger still. It would have to include Rousseau's own marginal notes inscribed in a copy of his text in preparation for a second edition, sold at auction in Paris around seventeen years ago and belonging now to the Musée Jean-Jacques Rousseau at Montmorency.<sup>10</sup> Above all, it would have to incorporate material from Rousseau's *Du principe de la mélodie*,<sup>11</sup> much of which came to be published in 1755 as the *Examen de deux principes avancées par M. Rameau* but which, in the light of Albert Jansen's transcription in 1884 of another manuscript drawn from the same archive,<sup>12</sup> identifiably embraces material that originally formed part of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, 'that I removed', wrote Rousseau, 'because it was too long and out of place', only to transport it subsequently to the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*. So far as I know, the sole complete edition of this manuscript in print remains my own, published in 1987 as an appendix to my study of *Rousseau on Society, Politics, Music and Language*,<sup>13</sup> although the material within it that would come to figure in the *Essai* was first published thirteen years earlier in two separate transcriptions, one by me and the other by Marie-Élisabeth Duchez,<sup>14</sup> then entrusted with the thankless task, never completed and quite possibly never to be undertaken again, of providing a comprehensive edition of Rousseau's *Dictionnaire de musique* and its associated writings.

While the manuscripts treating the corruption of music and language comprise the most substantial material which Rousseau withdrew, two others that broach the subject of religion ought to command our attention as well. The first, located in Geneva, was initially published with all its excisions and variants brushed away by Streckeisen-Moultou, while the second, more recently acquired by the Bibliothèque de Neuchâtel, was fully transcribed in print for the first time by Launay.<sup>15</sup> These two fragments really comprise different states of what would have been a single passage apparently intended by Rousseau to serve as the original conclusion of his text but which he elected to strike out, not in its entirety but just in so far as it deals with religion. Each, marked by the visceral intensity of the prose style so characteristic of Rousseau's political writings

before the appearance of the rather loftier *Contrat social*, places heavy stress upon the machinations of priests in fomenting their parishioners' superstitions and in terrorizing and ultimately seeking to usurp the power of magistrates. The first fragment begins with Rousseau's lament at mankind's endeavour to rise up from the domain of beasts to that of angels and concludes with references to the chimeras of the imagination that make us prone to magic, divination, astrology and other supernatural reveries. The second, which in its final version would become the penultimate paragraph of the published text, elaborates a theme already sketched in the first to the effect that if Heaven itself had not spoken, and if the Revealed voice of God had not taught men about the religion they should follow, there might have been no limit to the miseries inflicted on mankind by priests.

The young Marx, had he been aware of the passage, could have referred to it in his portrayal of religion as the opiate of the people; in his later writings he could have invoked the material Rousseau transferred from the *Discours sur l'inégalité* to the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* as exemplars of what he meant by the fetishism of commodities. It is at any rate by way of this twice deleted passage that the theological tenor of what Rousseau regarded as the guiding principle of his whole philosophy makes its fleeting appearance in manuscript fragments of the second *Discours*, for in the light of it we can grasp, even from a text which otherwise never mentions a divine power, Rousseau's conviction that by contrast with His perfidious priestly interpreters God's own genuine voice and Nature's benign impulsions are the same. As Leigh remarks in restoring the excisions and variants of the Geneva or first draft of this passage cleansed away by Streckeisen-Moultou, 'This is precisely one of the great lacunas of the published text . . . and even God Himself here adopts other forms within the ample skirts of Nature'.<sup>16</sup>

In several of his writings inspired by the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, most notably his so-called 'Lettre sur la Providence' to Voltaire of 18 August 1756, Rousseau was to develop the claims about religion withdrawn from his published text. The 'first who spoil the cause of God', he remarked in this letter, 'are the priests and the devout, who never grant that anything occurs according to the established order',<sup>17</sup> adding—by way of a reply to Voltaire's denial of the axioms that all is good and everything is right—that the whole is indeed good and that all is thus good for the whole. Rousseau thus makes plain that he subscribed to the ideas of Leibniz and Pope which Voltaire had attacked in his poem on the disaster of Lisbon, believing as they did, and as Voltaire did not, in the *scala naturae* or great chain of being and in the fundamental regularity of the universe. If for Voltaire the Lisbon earthquake could not but undermine credulity in divine omnipotence, for Rousseau it in no way challenged his faith in

divine beneficence,<sup>18</sup> since he insisted that the evils of this world were not of God's making but of ours. In attributing those evils to human history rather than original sin Rousseau sought to exculpate God Himself and not only Adam and Eve for mankind's subsequent fall.

In both his *Confessions* and correspondence Rousseau contended that *Candide*, published in 1759, was in fact Voltaire's reply to his 'Lettre sur la Providence', although he declined to speak of it since, he claimed, he had not read it.<sup>19</sup> With respect to Rousseau's writings *Candide* may be taken to be a reply not only to the 'Lettre sur la Providence' but to the *Discours sur l'inégalité* itself, of which Rousseau had sent a copy to Voltaire in 1755, who promptly responded with a letter which began 'I have received, sir, your new book against the human race'. Voltaire had scant patience for Rousseau's historical pessimism, which he found as repellent as his philosophical optimism and his eschatological faith in Providence. To Voltaire and other *philosophes* the proposition that mankind was naturally good seemed as dogmatically vacuous as the opposite Christian contention that mankind was naturally sinful. From their progressively civilized point of view Rousseau stood closer to the forces of darkness than to those of enlightenment. His was the voice of the barbarian, as inscribed in the passage from Ovid on the title-page of the first *Discours*<sup>20</sup> but made articulate in the second. In espousing the belief that the human race is naturally good and that society alone has rendered it miserable, Rousseau managed to estrange himself not only from the sullen theologies of his day but also from their chief antagonists, the partisans of humanity, *les lumières*. Of all the major writings produced by enlightened thinkers of the eighteenth century, none was so radically subversive of the *philosophes'* campaigns to confront vice and relieve misery through the power of true knowledge as his *Discours sur l'inégalité*.

In the same year that *Candide* was published there appeared another text of central significance to the spirit of that age, whose author was equally attentive to the threat Rousseau had posed to it four years earlier. In his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* Adam Smith, like Voltaire himself in *Candide*, never mentions Rousseau by name, although in the *Edinburgh Review* of 1756 he had in fact proved one of the second *Discours'* initial interpreters, sharing Voltaire's and other *philosophes'* dim view of the work's tribute to savagery over civilization in its manifold contrasts of our species' naturally benign innocence with its sinful history.<sup>21</sup> Smith's whole account of sympathy in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* may be read as a critique, not only of Mandeville's conception of self-love and Hutcheson's alternative notion of a genuinely moral sense, but also of Rousseau's ideas of *amour de soi* and *pitié*, which inspire the second *Discours'* hostile portrait of sociable man, always living outside himself and having no independent identity except in the opinions of others, as distinct from

*scours* in

which Rousseau contrasts *l'homme sauvage* and *l'homme sociable* is discussed at length by Smith and in his review is rendered in an appendix in the original French. In a brief remark of his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* where he describes the production of luxury, Smith came later to portray the natural selfishness of proprietors as 'led by an invisible hand', unwittingly advancing the interest of society.<sup>22</sup> That expression, the 'invisible hand', can already be found in Smith's manuscript history of astronomy dating from the late 1750s,<sup>23</sup> and it was taken up again in *The Wealth of Nations* of 1776 in much the same sense as in his *Moral Sentiments* to mean the promotion of a public benefit as an unintended consequence directed by an imperceptible force.<sup>24</sup>

In the twentieth century the expression has come to be identified by many commentators as one of Smith's most notable contributions to social theory, and both its history and meaning have been the subject of considerable scrutiny, most recently at some length in the fifth chapter of *Economic Sentiments* by Emma Rothschild.<sup>25</sup> Together with my friend and former colleague, Ryan Hanley, I am now engaged in retracing the history of the expression 'invisible hand', and we hope thereby to map fresh avenues out of Rothschild's pioneering research. But from where precisely, from what most proximate source if there was one, did Smith come to invoke this expression and recast it with a meaning peculiarly his own? Hanley and I are convinced, or at least persuaded, that Smith's chief inspiration was a passage from note 6 of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, which he had just reviewed, in which Rousseau describes the Hottentots thus:

Their eyesight is so alert and the grasp of their hands so secure that Europeans are no match for them. At a hundred paces they will strike a target no larger than a small coin. . . . It is as if the stone they hurl is carried by an invisible hand.<sup>26</sup>

The original manuscript source of these lines survives and is here reproduced for the first time:

Ils ont la vue si prompt & la main si certaine que les Européens n'en approchent point & cent pas, ils touchent <sup>avec</sup> un coup de pierre une marque de la grandeur d'un demi-fal et ce qu'il y a de plus étonnant c'est qu'ils ne se fixent comme nous les yeux sur le but, ils font des mouvements & des connoissances continuelles. Il semble que leur Pierre fait voler sa main sans main invisible.

Ils ont la vüe si prompte et la main si certaine que les Européens n'en approchent point. A cent pas, ils toucheront du'un coup de pierre une marque de la grandeur d'un demi sol. . . . Il semble que leur pierre soit portée par une main invisible.<sup>27</sup>

Rousseau is not himself this passage's author, since it is drawn from Peter Kolb's *Caput Bonae Spei hodieum, Das ist, Vollständige Beschreibung des africanischen Vorgebürges der Guten Hoffnung* of 1719, transcribed, in French, in the abbé Prévost's *Histoire générale des voyages*<sup>28</sup> as is noted in the margin of the manuscript. But in the English translation from the original German Kolb's text is rendered as an 'invisible power',<sup>29</sup> and it is apparently only in French, and by way of Rousseau, that Smith had occasion to notice it. How odd that this expression could, in Rousseau's fashion, be transported as a moveable feast, not only from the eighteenth-century's supreme critic of the age of Enlightenment to perhaps its chief advocate, but from a tool of native self-reliance to an instrument of market society. Having substituted natural forces for a divine presence in recounting mankind's loss of innocence in the course of its manufacture of culture, Rousseau also bequeathed a compelling image of his theology to modernity's new science of political economy, which even in turning his philosophy inside out could endeavour to show, no less than he had done, how human affairs might be successfully conducted without manifest controls. In passing from the *Discours sur l'inégalité* to the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Nature's invisible hand came to be recast as that of commerce, and civilization itself, steered by an imperceptible and divine but not omnipotent force, could henceforth be portrayed by those who were well disposed to it as more truly benign than the barbarian savagery Rousseau appeared to prefer.



## THE MANUSCRIPT AUTHORITY OF POLITICAL THOUGHTS

By way of commenting on the study of manuscripts I mean in these remarks to put a plea for toleration, or methodological eclecticism, as distinct from both the philosophical and especially the contextualist approaches to the interpretation of political argument now prevalent among Anglo-American theorists. Uncovering manuscripts might be thought to lead merely towards arcane knowledge gained from subtextual probes with scalpels and lenses, and in conducting archival research I have indeed sometimes felt myself transported by otherworldly attractions, sniffing the glue of the secret diaries of long-departed friends. The case I wish to advance here, however, has less to do with remoteness than pertinence. I shall be concerned most particularly with the insights that manuscripts may shed upon writings destined to become more sharply focused through later refinement but which, in their initial and sometimes explosive utterance, offer glimpses of the interpenetration of themes that cross their authors' minds perhaps more clearly than do published works.

I first met Jimmy Burns in the mid-1960s when I was a postgraduate student at the London School of Economics working on Rousseau and some of his modern interpreters, just after Jimmy himself had addressed the same themes in a notable article in *Political Studies* that had caught my attention.<sup>1</sup> Why he was so patient in dealing with a stranger who could not refrain from disputing his own account of Rousseau's meaning did not then prompt the curiosity on my part it merited, and later I found it required no explanation at all, since Jimmy was indiscriminately gracious to all tiresome and importunate students. Over the years I have often thought that his proposed translation of the real title of the work for which *Du Contrat social*<sup>2</sup> was only intended as a half-title—that is, *Principes du droit politique*—made perfect sense as *Principles of Constitutional Law*, if only because that title is virtually irresistible to anyone who devotes so much of his own professional life to the study of Bentham. It was, moreover, by way of his treatment of Bentham, rather than Rousseau, and most particularly his painstaking devotion to deciphering Bentham's manuscripts, that I came to find in Jimmy a kindred soul whose sensitivity to the surprises that lurk in archives spared him the methodological strait-jackets of either dogmatic truth or demonstrable accuracy such as too



often confine one-eyed studies of political thought. Of all the memorably congenial political theorists or intellectual historians of his generation, Jimmy has always struck me as the most benign and most tolerant. In keeping his distance throughout his professional life from a political thinker he served as an indefatigable amanuensis, he gave me reason to hope that my transcription of Rousseau's manuscripts need not of itself contaminate me fatally. He has shown us all that it is possible to probe conceptual undergrowths without losing sight of the bridges or buttresses overhead. Even the writing of methodological essays is largely alien to him. In resisting that temptation, he has proved wiser than I can be here.

In commenting on manuscripts mainly in order to correct contextual treatments of political thought, I have it in mind less to stress the putative differences between historical and philosophical readings of texts than to cast doubt on the validity of such distinctions. Historians of ideas often decry the attempts of philosophers to address the sense of past thinkers' arguments in plucking them from the circumstances of their composition, but through these remarks I mean to show that contextual meanings also have to be ascribed and legislated by their interpreters. They are not, merely on the evidence of their being couched in historical terms, thereby rendered more accurate or more reliable. In his entry on 'History' in the *Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy* edited by Robert Goodin and Phillip Pettit, Richard Tuck has described the historical revolution, to which he has contributed much himself, as 'the new history', a term appropriated by Dario Castiglione in a notable essay on the subject published a few years ago in the *Political Theory Newsletter*.<sup>3</sup> There may indeed be as many denominations of 'the new history' as there are persons who practise it, proceeding, for instance, from Stefan Collini in his focus on the determinants of a political culture, to John Pocock on political language and discourse, to Quentin Skinner on the intentional meaning of particular authors. If the approaches they adopt are in each case distinctive, however, our new historians of political thought are nevertheless agreed that political writings must always be situated within the particular intellectual landscapes that define them, excluding philosophical perspectives as anachronistically decontextualized from the worlds and the works they purport to explain.

To my mind, however, in insisting upon the contextual analysis of political doctrines, we risk just relocating ambiguities of interpretation from one domain to another. What counts as a proper context is not an independent variable but inescapably our own construction, as open to challenge as are the abstractions it is meant to supplant. This is hardly an original thesis. It has many precursors and in terms I admire was articulated at length in 1933 by Michael Oakeshott in *Experience and Its Modes*. My aim here is to pursue its implications with reference to the

study of manuscripts, which I believe need not be based on presuppositions as to what their authors must mean in the light of the intentions we impute to them or the interpretations of their thought which we ascribe to their immediate contemporaries. Manuscripts are of course no more pregnant with meaning than are published works; their recoverable sense also reflects the skills of their interpreters. But as well as constituting drafts of other texts, they can point towards meanings their authors might later refine, sharpen, blunt, suppress, abandon or deem insignificant. They may articulate a free association of ideas and give expression to dreams that wend across disciplines. As distinct from the works to which they give rise, they are genuine *pièces fugitives*, not to be confined to quarters, bursting from their contexts.

As I understand them contextual readings of political arguments do not, as a matter of fact, always displace philosophical ones, and even the most historically learned interpretations may seem at bottom to have eluded the truth. Consider for a moment a number of recent studies of Locke. Thanks initially to Peter Laslett and his pupils, and now to several generations of scholars inspired by his contextualist account of the *Second Treatise*, we have come a very long way from Brough Macpherson's model of the capitalist presuppositions of Locke's theory of possessive individualism. After John Dunn in particular it has become impossible for Locke scholarship to make a retrograde step with impunity. But where exactly do we find ourselves in having assimilated the most up-to-date contextualist interpretations of Locke's political thought? James Tully, among the most learned of all our new historians of the subject, does not, as I read him, make use of his undeniable scholarship to decisive advantage in his confrontation with Jeremy Waldron about the true meaning of the texts they explore. Perhaps no one has ever studied the sources of Locke's political philosophy in general, or his theory of property in particular, with greater care, and I am unacquainted with any finer treatment than Tully's of Locke's debts to, and departures from, Suárez, Grotius and Pufendorf, in their uses of the terms *dominium* and *proprietas*, and of the formulations of his objections to Filmer.

Much of Tully's substantially juristic account of Locke on property is designed to refute the anachronisms of Macpherson's essentially economic interpretation of the same subject, and in highlighting their differences he lays great stress upon the fact that, on his reading of the text, 'property in political society is a creation of that society',<sup>4</sup> not so much a natural right preserved as an entitlement determined by positive law, its distribution accordingly secured by convention. Several passages of the *Second Treatise* are presented as evidence which informs this interpretation, which to my mind is neither required by Tully's account of Locke's sources, nor warranted by the text itself, including the passages presented

by Tully in defence of his claims, even allowing for the opacity of Locke's own views.

In a long commentary on Tully's thesis, Jeremy Waldron provides what seems to me far more convincing testimony, equally drawn from the *Second Treatise*, that property rights are indeed *natural* entitlements which ought to survive men's transition to civil society from their original state, as not only Macpherson but other careful readers of that text had correctly understood to be its meaning. When Locke speaks of property rights as 'determined' by positive law, he is not claiming that they are *created* by civil society but only that they are *regulated* there, Waldron contends,<sup>5</sup> recalling a somewhat similar debate which some years ago exercised other political theorists about the meaning of *bestimmen* or *determine* in Marx's theory of history. My point here is not to show that a subtly contextualist reading of a political doctrine may be successfully challenged by a purely analytical account, or that the doctrine is better interpreted with respect to its internal coherence than in the light of claims prevalent in works its author embraced or combated. I mean only that Tully's case, designed to disabuse Locke's readers of a widespread misconception, remains unproven in the face of Waldron's challenge, and I am surprised to find that in his most recent study of *Locke in Contexts*, where Tully replies to his critics, he leaves this objection unanswered.<sup>6</sup>

Consider, too, the work of the late Richard Ashcraft who, after devoting more than twenty years of his life to the most brilliantly meticulous study of Locke's democratic radicalism that could ever have been hoped for this side of pedantry, had to contend with Ellen Meiksins Wood's carefully assembled riposte that Locke was no democrat, as well as with Mark Goldie's even more closely argued challenge to the effect that he was not much of a radical either.<sup>7</sup> Because it turns around manuscripts I shall comment exclusively on this second case. As readers of *History of Political Thought* and *The Historical Journal* will know, the question of whether Locke had been a covert conspirator against James II has come to hinge on the meaning of the word *tree* in letters he addressed around 1685 to one of the members of his circle, Samuel Clarke, identified by Ashcraft as a fellow conspirator. Writing to Clarke about 'seeds' and 'trees', Ashcraft claims that these terms were a code for 'money' and 'troops', to which Goldie replies that Locke had an abiding interest in vines and trees, in this context expressing a preference for limes over horse-chestnuts, so that when he talks of 'trees' Locke just plainly means 'trees'—a point unconvincing to Ashcraft, who retorts that the letters are in ciphers, marked by the repetition of secret injunctions Clarke would have understood.<sup>8</sup>

Not least as a student of Rousseau, I am myself quite partial to trees, and since those which Rousseau recollects in the Seventh Walk of his *Rêveries* may, I suspect, have been originally inspired by a lust for Sophie

d'Houdetot which he hoped might be more lyrically persuasive in botanical form, I can understand, with Ashcraft, how reference to trees might pass from one discourse to another. In Locke's own lifetime, after all, Andrew Marvell had also employed a kind of sexual code in his rich imagery of vegetable love. But how are readers to legislate between Ashcraft and Goldie in this matter? Goldie's common—or garden—reading of Locke on trees seems quite compelling, but even if Locke had only meant to state his preference for limes over chestnuts, may we not see that preference itself as at least a faint sign of his radicalism, bearing in mind that the lime is a Whig tree, in contrast with the oak, which is Tory? May we not turn to chapter 5, paragraph 28 of the *Second Treatise*, where Locke speaks of being nourished by acorns picked under an oak, and, noting that there is no reference to limes anywhere in the text, thus deduce that he held the state of nature itself to be Tory? At any rate, when a weary Ashcraft calls for 'interpretive charity',<sup>9</sup> I feel inclined to regret our collective failure to grant him that peace of mind in good time.

Or consider Richard Tuck on Hobbes. In a number of recent essays, and in his 1989 'Past Masters' on *Hobbes*, Tuck has suggested that the anonymous manuscript entitled *A Short Tract on First Principles*, uncovered by Ferdinand Tönnies among the Harleian papers in the British Museum and published a century ago, is not in fact by Hobbes.<sup>10</sup> Supposing that it is indeed Hobbes's work, other scholars had dated it from around the end of 1630 or the beginning of 1631, and there at least appears to be no dispute that if it were actually by Hobbes it would have had to be drafted before 1636, when we know from his correspondence that he had come to reject the particulate or corpuscular theory of light which the work embraces.

Since Tuck, however, had already established to his own satisfaction that Hobbes had no consistent natural philosophy before the publication of Descartes' *Discours de la méthode* in 1637, he claims that there is nothing particularly Hobbesian about the *Short Tract* and no good reason for ascribing it to Hobbes, preferring instead to attribute it to Robert Payne, a member of the circle of Sir Charles Cavendish and the Earl of Newcastle at Welbeck Abbey. Johann Sommerville, a former pupil of Tuck, finds his tutor's arguments plausible, without, however, hazarding the manuscript's attribution to Payne.<sup>11</sup> In his remarkable edition of Hobbes's *Correspondence*, Noel Malcolm agrees with Tuck that the *Short Tract*, apparently drafted in Payne's own hand, can for that reason be 'plausibly attributed to him', although he disputes Tuck's identification of Payne's handwriting in the light of letters which he contends are not actually in Payne's hand but are, rather, transcripts from Payne made by Thomas Birch.<sup>12</sup> According to Tuck, at the time the *Short Tract* is alleged to have been drafted Hobbes had been preoccupied with epistemological matters and

not natural philosophy—in particular, with the fashionable revival of Pyrrhonism under the influence of Montaigne and Charron, whose sceptical challenge was met in this period by Mersenne and Gassendi, together with their mutual friend, Hobbes, before the argument would later be given a new twist in the direction of natural philosophy by Descartes.<sup>13</sup>

But Tuck's reading of the *Short Tract* has not borne well the close scrutiny of other historians, it having already been established by Jean Jacquot in 1952 that the handwriting of the text in question bears striking similarity to that of a letter addressed by Hobbes to Cavendish among the same papers.<sup>14</sup> To more recent commentators on the subject, there seems scant reason for denying Hobbes's authorship, notwithstanding Tuck's suppositions of the correct timing of Hobbes's pertinent intellectual interests such as would contextually preclude his having had the range of scientific interests the work articulates. As Richard Popkin and Tom Sorell have shown over the past couple of decades, moreover, the sceptical crises which troubled Mersenne and Gassendi are hardly mentioned by Hobbes, who, by contrast, following Descartes' imputation of plagiarism in a letter to Mersenne, replied that certain ideas on light which he admittedly shared with Descartes had not been culled from his work but had been independently conceived in research he had undertaken around 1630, as he had already conveyed to the Earl of Newcastle and to Cavendish at the time, which forms one of the main reasons for the scholarly ascription of the *Short Tract* to that period in the first place.<sup>15</sup>

In a notable commentary on the subject published in 1993, Perez Zagorin agreed with Sorell that the appropriate context for an assessment of the *Short Tract* is that of Euclidean geometry and Galilean mechanics, providing sources for the formulation of Hobbes's natural philosophy independent of Descartes, and an anti-sceptical focus around a theory of perception, owing little to the epistemological doctrines of Mersenne and Gassendi, whose expression, in much the same terms, can be traced from the *Short Tract* to the *Elements of Law*, which had supplied Tönnies' original reason for publishing the works together.<sup>16</sup> Two years later, in the most authoritative treatment of the *Short Tract* thus far produced, Karl Schuhmann demonstrated, not least by meticulously collating this text with passages from other writings by Hobbes, that it must indeed have been manufactured by him, albeit probably in 1632 or 1633 rather than 1630.<sup>17</sup> Allowing that Tuck may one day reply to what now seems a formidable set of objections to his exclusion of the manuscript from the corpus of Hobbes's writings, it seems to me that, at least for the time being, the historical case against his contextualist reading of Hobbes is as persuasive as Waldron's philosophical case against Tully's reading of Locke. How is it that the new history, which like logical positivism in the 1930s was meant to overcome our confusion of categories in the interpretation

of arguments, has sometimes managed to conduct us from one wilderness to another? Where are the clearings in the history of political thought from which we can safely map out a new frontier? Who benefits from this surfeit of fresh readings, of which, to my taste, too many come into the world with the express wish that the others should leave it? Plainly our publishers benefit, for in so far as our new historians have failed to dispose of decontextualized analyses, on the one hand, while at the same time generating multiple candidates for historical investigation, on the other, we are now confronted with several accredited perspectives on every major thinker where before it was thought that a single framework might suffice—at least two Hobbes industries, three independent approaches to Locke and four distinct ways of situating Mill in the history of liberal thought, allowing, of course, that Mill's contribution to liberalism was problematic even before the historians parted company from the philosophers. What are we to do in the face of such confusion? Never mind who wrote the *Short Tract on First Principles*. If we must all unravel the intricacies of the connections between Hobbes and the *de facto* Tories, Hobbes and the Engagement Controversy, or Hobbes and the Royal Society (in this case a lack of connection), who can blame those among us who give up in frustration in the face of so much historical detail and just resign themselves to their original brisk grapple with the unsituated mysteries of eighteen central chapters from the *Leviathan*? In the short space that remains, let me suggest how the study of manuscripts may point in another direction.

Of course manuscripts sometimes matter scarcely at all. No one would have been more dismayed than Marx to find the history of Western communism in the twentieth century so much shaped by the scholarly interpretation of papers that, around the time of their composition, he jettisoned to the scrap heap of history. Such papers, moreover, take widely different forms, from documents in public records offices to jottings and drafts of letters which their authors abandoned. Each of these forms invites an appropriate scholarly use, as is plain, for instance, from Ralph Leigh's magisterial edition of the *Correspondance complète de Rousseau*, which assembles the biographical details of perhaps five thousand minor figures who populated Rousseau's world from manuscripts of one kind, but also documents the immediacy of Rousseau's vision and the stages of creativity of his writing from manuscripts of another. Let me call this second kind dreams trapped in archives, although the same manuscripts may sometimes be better described as nightmares which decline to take leave of their host.

There are of course many important aspects of the subject which must be overlooked here—not least what counts as a manuscript in this age of new technologies when, in the composition of our texts upon screens,

we destroy the rough drafts that express the spontaneity of our imagination in the very act of refining statements we hope will be fit for public consumption. There are also notable technical problems about the retrieval of manuscripts, for instance in Henry Hardy's reconstruction of dictated recordings of lectures given by Isaiah Berlin for which, in certain instances, there was no surviving manuscript. Thanks to the ingenuity of staff at the National Sound Archive who located a relic in the National Science Museum and thereby managed to reassemble a long defunct dictabelt transcription machine, the transfer of obsolete tapes to modern cassettes was achieved and Berlin's *ipsissima verba* have survived,<sup>18</sup> which, if the matter had been left to him alone, may not really have been his first preference.

The point I wish to stress is that if we start from an author's manuscripts rather than the imputed context of his or her published work, we might at least avoid the trap into which Tuck has apparently fallen of supposing that a manuscript cannot be by its author, because it does not seem tailored to fit that context. To put this point in more general terms, one of my main objections to the contextualist strictures of our so-called 'new history' of political thought is that it seems, to my mind, too narrowly political in focus. Having divorced the truly historical treatment of texts from the world of political theory to which my former tutors supposed they could freely contribute by way of commenting on past authors, our new historians have also sometimes disengaged those features of an intellectual context which they regard as appropriate to political argument from all the rest, isolating the various languages of politics they address from other discourses—from anthropology, psychology and the philosophy of music and language, for instance, just to name certain themes of particular interest to me. The compelling attraction of such circumscribed frameworks for historians is that they can provide an apparently more solid foundation—embracing institutions and sometimes even events—within or around which to locate ideas in context that more abstract interpreters have ignored. In transporting political thought from the peaks of Parnassus to the lowlands of the Fens, some of them have brought down-to-earth, even subterranean, respectability to a subject which, in History Faculties or Departments, is otherwise held to be irredeemably philosophical. But political institutions and the popular languages of public morality are by no means the only framework within which political theories were formed.

When in the late 1960s I came across and then later transcribed the manuscript of Rousseau's *Du principe de la mélodie* in the archives of the Bibliothèque de la Ville de Neuchâtel, I was particularly drawn to those passages of the text which I took, and still take, to be of remarkably political character. It is in this manuscript that we find the first surviving



draft of what were to become chapters eighteen and nineteen of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* in which Rousseau describes the chords of the scale of Western music as a crude and vulgar innovation unknown to the Greeks and then traces the moral decadence of modern music to the barbarian invasions of the Roman Empire, bringing about, among other things, the destruction of the mellifluous intonations of ancient Greek and Latin and their replacement by the dull and nasal consonants which Emperor Julian had compared to the croaking of frogs. As prose replaced poetry the civic culture of its speakers likewise became prosaic, Rousseau claims, and thereafter, in the final chapter of his *Essai*, entitled 'Rapport des langues aux gouvernemens', he argues that languages which have come to be separated from music are inimical to freedom.

No earlier sketch of that chapter figures in *Du principe de la mélodie*, but the political implications which Rousseau draws directly from his account of the corruption of music and language in the manuscript I uncovered and transcribed<sup>19</sup> point to a thematic unity of his philosophy which embraces disciplines that his specialist interpreters must bridge if they are to grasp his meaning correctly. It was Rousseau's belief that a prosaic rhetoric inspires servile manners and that speech made hollow by its lack of tone and rhythm also makes for hollow men. The languages of modern Europe are little more than the ineffectual chatter of persons who just murmur feebly to one another, with voices that lack inflection and therefore spirit and passion as well, he argued. As our speech has succumbed to the loss of its musical traits, so has it been deprived of its original vigour and clarity and become instead little more than the faint mutterings of individuals who have no strength of character or purpose. In the form they have currently adopted in commercial society, the vocal intonations which had once expressed our pleasures, Rousseau explains, have been reconstituted as the terms that denote our trades. Whereas the languages of passion had been superseded by the languages of need—that is, *aimez-moi* had been replaced by *aidez-moi*—now all that we say to one another is *donnez l'argent*. Any attentive reader of the *Contrat social* will recognize the same critique of commercial society in Book III, chapter fifteen, with the same expression—*donnez de l'argent*—there rendered as the principal medium of commercial society's discourse.

To my mind, Rousseau's philosophy of music forms a no less integral feature of his political theory than does the same subject in the *Republic* of Plato, and yet, despite the fact that the text had been recorded more than seventy years ago,<sup>20</sup> and despite other evidence known to scholars that it had originally been drafted as a fragment of the *Discours sur l'inégalité* and was then withdrawn because of its length,<sup>21</sup> *Du principe de la mélodie* had never been seriously studied before, largely on account of its also including more technical treatments of music in reply to Rameau's



objections to the articles on music Rousseau had prepared for Diderot's *Encyclopédie*. Rousseau's philosophy of music, which forms much the largest single subject aside from his correspondence in the quite massive Neuchâtel archive, has only in the past twenty years or so received the editorial notice it merits, simply because a certain (albeit modest) command of musical notation and musical theory is indispensable for that task, and Rousseau's literary and political editors have been unable or unwilling to acquire a sufficient mastery of the subject to deal with it in a scholarly way. But it lies at the heart of both Rousseau's life and his writings as a whole, and I believe that there can be no persuasive interpretation of his political philosophy which ignores it.

Let me add one other point here about what might be regarded as solely aesthetic and acoustical reflections in the context of Rousseau's political and social philosophy. In recounting what he takes to be the decay of Western music in its divorce from the inflected languages of antiquity, Rousseau as I read him just adds a correlative perspective to his account of civilization as mankind's progressive enslavement to institutions which purport to make it free. That proposition is indeed implied by his manuscript testimony to the effect that *Du principe de la mélodie* once formed a fragment of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*. What, indeed, are our moral relations as Rousseau conceived them but calculations of intervals in scales whose harmonies may take the form of dominant and subdominant modes? The prevailing social divisions between persons have their counterpoint in the divisions of their octaves, the enthrallments of instrumental music are matched by those of instrumental politics, and the subjugation of peoples is achieved in no small measure by their masters' conjugation of verbs and their manipulation of language in general.

When Rousseau takes issue with the notion of the *basse fondamentale* of Rameau, in particular, his style of cross-examination seems to me remarkably akin to that of John Plamenatz on Hobbes.<sup>22</sup> Rousseau's method of interrogating not only Rameau but also Locke, Diderot, Buffon, Condillac and Helvétius, as well of course as his most formidable adversary, Hobbes, distills from their writings what he regards as profound, disposes of what he holds to be mistaken, inconsistent or naïve, relocates their arguments in specific contexts to show that they do not hold universally, if at all, identifying them as peculiar perspectives bred of a particular time and set of circumstances, wrongly extrapolated in his view, to human nature in general. His main complaint against other luminaries bears a striking resemblance to the allegations of decontextualized anachronism so often made by advocates of the new history, except that in order to grasp this charge one must first contextualize it philosophically, with respect not just to the immediate circumstances of its composition in connection with Rameau's notion of the *basse fondamentale*, but

also a whole tradition of speculation, across a variety of disciplines, which Rousseau takes to task as if confronting contemporary adversaries. His charges are quintessentially those adopted by Plamenatz, and indeed, if I dare say so, Macpherson, as well. Supposing that in order to break the hermeneutic circle, we must somehow at least attempt to enter the minds of past authors and not just reveal the strategies of their published works, why must we handicap what is already an undeniably, perhaps insuperably, difficult task, by excluding from our focus of interpretation the very devices which those authors themselves employed to understand their own precursors?

It was by way of Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité*, whose few surviving manuscript fragments I have been assembling throughout almost the whole of my professional life, that I was initially drawn to Lord Monboddo's papers and correspondence on the origins of language and on the humanity of apes lodged in collections in Edinburgh, Cambridge, Birmingham and elsewhere.<sup>23</sup> Monboddo was one of the eighteenth century's greatest admirers of this text, though he also took issue with it and, in the course of attempting to refine his own anthropological speculations on the origins of language so as to correct Rousseau even while acknowledging his debt, he recast the first edition of his own work *On the Origin and Progress of Language* along lines, illuminated by his manuscripts, which turn on his correspondence with commentators and the availability of sources to which he had access in the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh. In recounting these matters I felt inclined to follow the trajectory of Monboddo's and indeed Rousseau's own speculations on the humanity of orang-utans in the direction of twentieth-century scientific experiments on the teaching of languages to apes. Did I breach some sacred principle of the division of labour in moving from eighteenth-century speculation and experiments to contemporary research on what strikes me as precisely the same questions as were at issue in the Enlightenment? In investigating recent palaeoanthropological findings and studies of the sublingual vocal tract was I just moving out of my depth? Why should DNA hybridization studies in genetics pass without any comment from those who are convinced that they can trace these biological formulations of Scottish conjectural history to their source? One of the most striking features of the European Enlightenment was the interdisciplinary character of its philosophy, its lack of impermeable boundaries within its maps of knowledge, its denial of esoterically privileged information to any hegemonic castes. Manuscripts may have that character too. They demand public scrutiny. They invite their interpreters to investigate their meanings and pursue their intimations wherever they might lead, *sans parti pris*.

Lack of attention to manuscripts sometimes accounts for major flaws in the interpretation of an author's published work. Consider the example

of one of the pre-eminent political theorists of America since the Second World War who, with profound sophistication, showed how it was possible to contribute directly to our subject through the translation of classic texts, including Plato's *Republic* and Rousseau's *Lettre à d'Alembert sur les spectacles* and *Emile*. Both in his introduction and notes to Rousseau's greatest masterpiece Allan Bloom rightly remarks that *Emile* was conceived in large measure as a reply to Locke's *Thoughts concerning Education*, and since Rousseau's stance is so plainly defined by way of objections to Locke, he contends that a deep understanding of Rousseau presupposes some knowledge of Locke's teaching.<sup>24</sup> That is undeniably true. Such understanding also presupposes some familiarity with Helvétius, however, whom Bloom neglects to mention. There are at least four surviving manuscripts of *Emile*, as well as a number of fragments, and I do not suggest that it is the responsibility of a translator to collate them. But even if Bloom had deemed it unnecessary to leave the shores of Lake Michigan for a visit to Paris and especially Geneva to inspect Rousseau's papers, he ought at least to have read the first draft of *Emile*, known as the *Manuscrit Favre*, published in the same volume of Rousseau's *Oeuvres complètes* from which his translation is drawn, and then consulted the excellent notes to the text by John Spink, as well as the more comprehensive annotation by Pierre Burgelin to the final version of *Emile*.

In offering his readers a guide to Rousseau's meaning, Bloom ought above all to have paid some attention to the wonderfully majestic collation and edition of the manuscripts of the 'Profession de foi du vicaire Savoyard' and the equally splendid three-volume study of *La Religion de Rousseau* prepared by much the most distinguished Rousseau scholar of his generation, Pierre-Maurice Masson,<sup>25</sup> killed on the Front in the First World War, whose profoundly moving final letters to his wife and to his publishers with respect to editorial matters, incidentally, have survived. If Bloom had managed a few supplementary hours of essential reading, he would have found that in *Emile* Rousseau addresses passages from Helvétius's *De l'esprit* and in his original draft refers to it; and either through Masson's or Burgelin's editorial notes, Bloom might also have had his attention drawn to a letter drafted in September 1762, and to a passage of the *Lettres de la montagne* of 1764, in which Rousseau claims that he had originally intended to attack this already celebrated work but had then suppressed his criticism in order to dissociate himself from the muckrakers which *De l'esprit* had stirred immediately on its publication in 1758.<sup>26</sup>

Much of Rousseau's argument in his 'Profession de foi du vicaire Savoyard' in the fourth book of *Emile* forms a proof of the existence of God by way of refuting the central thesis of Helvétius's work—that is, the contention that human intelligence springs from sensory experience and that our judgements are therefore no more than sensations. Because our

senses are passive, our impressions of the objects that excite them cannot spontaneously give rise to our judgements of the relation between objects, he argues in his 'Profession de foi' in reply to Helvétius. Judgement is a matter of interpretation, which therefore requires human agency, pointing to intelligence and a will, which cannot have sprung from our bodily parts or matter alone, but must stem from an intelligence outside us, and hence, according to Rousseau, from God who is the ultimate author of our spirituality.

The educational doctrine of *Emile* as a whole, moreover, refutes a second principle articulated by Helvétius but equally ignored by Bloom, that is, the claim that *l'éducation peut tout*, challenged by Rousseau not only in *Emile* but also in the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, in a long passage to which Bloom never refers, where, through his fictional protagonist, Saint-Preux, he objects to this notion because it gives rise to the dangerous pretensions of tutors who suppose themselves licenced to mould pupils in any way that they choose.<sup>27</sup> Bloom would have been well-advised to take some heed of Rousseau's challenge to Helvétius. He of course has not overlooked Rousseau's insistence throughout the text upon the difficult art of governing without precepts and of doing everything by doing nothing. But in failing to notice that Rousseau's argument forms a challenge as much to Helvétius as to Locke, he misses half the point. For Rousseau's whole philosophy of education, as he puts it in *Emile*, is at bottom purely negative.<sup>28</sup> It sets aside all the books and lessons by which children's tutors might otherwise indoctrinate their pupils, shaping them before their time in the image of adults, rather than allowing their education to proceed endogenously out of their own curiosity and first-hand experience as they mature. That programme of negative education stands at the opposite end of a spectrum from one which at its other extreme embraces the claim that *l'éducation peut tout* as a practical conclusion of the argument that judgement springs directly from sensation. Some easily accessible information about the manuscript background of *Emile* would have served Bloom well in the fulfilment of an undertaking he set for himself of both translating and interpreting Rousseau's text.

A little further reflection on this subject, moreover, should soon show that Rousseau's challenges to Locke and Helvétius form parts of much the same argument—that is, a response to what Rousseau took to be dangers inherent in contemporary materialism. This point, which I should like to develop by way of some final remarks on Locke, underpins my contention that some of our new historians of political thought have circumscribed their subject in too narrowly political a way, excluding from their range of interests themes that once figured very near the heart of political argument but are not now accorded that status in more rigorous interpretations of its appropriate contexts. If I may here speak on behalf

of intellectual historians of the Enlightenment more generally, there seems to me something rather odd about Locke scholarship as it is currently practised in certain quarters—by which I do not mean at all the meticulous concentration of a number of scholars upon the political landscape of the world which Locke inhabited but rather such enthusiasm as is displayed by those who first offer us very close readings of the *Second Treatise* and then transpose its themes on natural law, labour or property to contemporary philosophical discourse informed by Ludwig Wittgenstein, Robert Nozick, Jerry Cohen, Michel Foucault and other modern luminaries.<sup>29</sup> Historians who with one hand point the way to a redemptive truth which corrects philosophical error ought not, with the other hand, to throw dust in their readers' eyes.

However subtly addressed, some of the questions at issue in these discussions seem to me desultory, feeding upon each other rather than drawing succour from Locke. Where, I wonder, do Locke's other writings figure in the scholarship now so earnestly addressed to the *Second Treatise*, and where, with respect to the new history, should one turn for guidance in identifying the influence throughout the eighteenth century of a thinker pre-eminently regarded at the time as godfather of the whole Enlightenment? Philosophically minded postmodernists may be excused for forgetting the French Revolution and the nineteenth century in order to hold an Enlightenment Project of their own invention responsible for the most sinister crises of modernity, but are historians of ideas entitled to skip stages as well? Allowing that most interpreters of the *Second Treatise* in the eighteenth century were best acquainted with it through the passages cited by Jean Barbeyrac in his annotations to Pufendorf's *De jure naturae et gentium*, Locke's work was undoubtedly then known and read first-hand as well. But by contrast with his *Letter concerning Toleration*, *Thoughts concerning Education* or especially the *Essay concerning Human Understanding* his principal contribution to political thought cannot by any means be said to have had a wide circulation, and it is mainly to these other texts and not the *Second Treatise* that most Enlightenment commentaries on Locke were addressed. I shall conclude with just one, albeit a centrally important, example.

In the course of a long controversy about the nature of the human intellect to which Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, Cudworth and many other philosophers had already contributed, Locke observed, in the fourth book of his *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, that it was at least conceivable that God should add or, rather, 'superadd', to matter a faculty of thinking, thereby animating insensate particles with the power of thought. A few pages later, he stressed that it was impossible for matter of itself ever to give rise to thought, thus combating the chief contention of materialists, chiefly Spinozists, of his own day, who asserted what he

denied.<sup>30</sup> But Locke's proposition that through God's will matter might be made to think occasioned numerous rebuttals from theologians and philosophers of the early eighteenth century, most of whom associated this claim with Locke's further suggestion, in the same section of his work, that the truths of morality and religion do not depend upon the immateriality of the soul.

Such questions were to lay at the heart of the dispute between Anthony Collins and Samuel Clarke in the first decade of the eighteenth century, with which some greater familiarity by modern philosophers might have led to our being spared its reconfiguration as a 1960s debate on methodological individualism, whose central points had been virtually exhausted two hundred and fifty years earlier. Hartley, Reid and Priestly, in turn, pursued certain ramifications of Locke's argument about thinking matter several steps further. In France, Voltaire commented upon it in his *Lettres philosophiques* of 1734, and French materialists throughout the mid-eighteenth century, including Maupertuis, La Mettrie, Diderot and d'Holbach, drew inspiration from it, some stressing what would now be termed its *physicalist* and others its *physiological* or organic implications. In his *Traité des sensations* of 1754, Condillac attempted to construct a theory of the formation of human intelligence from pure sensory experience, while in the article 'Évidence' published in the sixth volume of the *Encyclopédie* in 1756, Quesnay (most probably) attempted to show that sensation gives rise to judgement, and then two years later in *De l'esprit* Helvétius put forward the same thesis, rejected by Rousseau in *Emile*.

But this eighteenth-century debate as to whether our judgements might spring from sensation did not end with Rousseau and Helvétius. Through Helvétius especially it was taken up again by Bentham and then above all by James Mill, whose whole philosophy of education, as it was the great misfortune of his son to experience first-hand, was essentially Helvétian in character and ultimately Lockean in origin. To my mind, it is the eighteenth-century debates about sensationalism, and the implications of that doctrine for the philosophy of education as pursued above all by the utilitarians and Philosophic Radicals of the nineteenth century, which point most comprehensively to Locke's influence upon Enlightenment political and social thought. Here is the Locke whom the philosophes of the eighteenth century knew best. But I suspect that it is because these arguments appear to be drawn from another discourse, which according to the contextualist canons of our new histories of political thought is not fundamentally political in focus, that they have been largely ignored by Locke's most recent political interpreters and have been left instead to be explored by historians of philosophy, theology and science.<sup>31</sup> More's the pity.<sup>32</sup>

PREPARING THE DEFINITIVE EDITION OF THE  
CORRESPONDANCE DE ROUSSEAU

I. ITS NATURE AND SCALE

To thank Ralph Leigh for an honourable mention in a note of his edition of the *Correspondance complète de Rousseau* was to risk the benign sarcasm of a man who knew the full measure of the recognition due to him. 'What do you mean, honour?', he could growl at so slight an expression of gratitude. 'It's immortality'—thus bestowed on the still living through a power Leigh shared only with the Académie française. Modesty was perhaps not his most conspicuous trait, but greater sign of it would in no way have enhanced his academic achievement, which was to set unprecedented and undreamt of standards of scholarship in the field of eighteenth-century studies. Of course Rousseau's own immortality had been well secured even without the assistance of Leigh, all the more because above every other major figure of the period he had been in so many respects an outsider, remote from it, both of the Enlightenment and against it, *an sich aber nicht für sich*. And yet there are certain crucial respects in which this work may be said to reshape as well as reaffirm that reputation, and to demand a reassessment of the true nature and scope of Rousseau's meaning and influence.

For one thing, thanks to Leigh, he managed to sustain a correspondence, and not just win immortality, beyond the grave. The Leigh edition ends not with the death of Rousseau in 1778 but with that of Thérèse Levasseur in 1801 and with the advent of the age of Napoleon (R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complete de Jean Jacques Rousseau* [hereafter CC] (Geneva, Banbury and Oxford, 1965–98), no. 8382–84 and 8386). The last nine volumes are in many respects the most important of all, for the material they embrace, and the interpretive commentaries around it, comprise an indispensable archive for the assessment of Rousseauism at the end of the *ancien régime*. They deal with Rousseau's literary remains, and with the complex affairs of the trustees of his estate in their negotiations for a complete edition, including, of course, both parts of the *Confessions*; with commentators speculating on the circumstances of his death, and with others reflecting on his character as they visit his shrine at Ermenonville. They deal with all the authorized and known pirate editions of



his works—several uncovered or identified by Leigh himself—and with the ambitions and negotiations of their publishers in the crucial decade between Rousseau's death and the outbreak of the French Revolution, upon which so much scholarship about his putative influence has previously foundered for want of this testimony; and they deal with the celebrations of his memory in the popular press and with the festivals in his honour in both Paris and Geneva, in the course of the French Revolution. These volumes, every one of them undertaken after Leigh's retirement from his chair of French at Cambridge, form a monumental repository and chronicle in their own right, the touchstone for all future research on Rousseau's revolutionary influence—in fact, henceforth the *point de départ*, from a bibliographical perspective, of some of the most central questions to do with the connection between the French Revolution and the Enlightenment.

Second, the textual notes and variants which Leigh presents, not only for Rousseau's own letters but for each of the more than fifteen thousand manuscripts which are transcribed in the *Correspondance*,<sup>1</sup> form an extraordinary collection—one of the most important ever assembled—for the study of French literature and literary style in the period. The famous letter to Voltaire of 18 August 1756, the so-called 'Lettre sur la providence', is presented in full in two different versions covering nearly fifty pages (CC, no. 424 and 424 bis), with comprehensive annotation for all the variants of the seven surviving manuscripts (of an original thirteen), whose relation to one another requires a genealogical table, duly provided by Leigh, to explain it, plus almost one hundred *explications de texte*, some of them of essay length. The surviving drafts of Rousseau's extraordinary letter to Saint-Germain of 26 February 1770 are likewise presented in two versions, with collations for all the other manuscript variants, over fifty-four pages. The remarkable and even illustrated pilgrimage to Ermenonville recorded by Brizard and Anacharsis Cloots in 1783 (CC, no. 7843) receives similar treatment and annotation, and at sixty-three pages may be the longest document of the whole *Correspondance*, and the most complex in the editorial problems it posed. Rousseau, as Leigh often remarks, was the Flaubert of the eighteenth century—the beauty, metre and cadences of his prose refined and tempered out of the torments of their composition. We all recall the anguish described in the *Confessions* (OC, vol. 1, pp. 113 and 114 [C 113 and 114]): 'Mes idées s'arrangent dans ma tête avec la plus incroyable difficulté' ['Ideas take shape in my head with the most incredible difficulty'], a problem which Rousseau explains made it desperately painful for him to write. 'Mes manuscrits, raturés, barbouillés, mêlés, indéchiffrables attestent la peine qu'ils m'ont coûtée. Il n'y en a pas un qu'il ne m'ait fallu transcrire quatre ou cinq fois avant de le donner à la presse. . . . Je n'écris point de



lettres sur les moindres sujets qui ne me coûtent des heures de fatigue'. ['My blotted, scratched, confused, illegible manuscripts attest to the pain they have cost me. There is not one that I have not had to rewrite four or five times before sending it to the printer. . . . I never write a letter on the most trivial subject that does not cost me hours of weariness']. Leigh's transcriptions of the corpus of Rousseau's letters remind us, on the one hand, of how much his whole life was a kind of literary voyage, and of how so many of the most sublime passages in his prose are to be found in the letters themselves. On the other hand, all the variants transcribed by Leigh provide a unique insight into Rousseau's style of composition, the at once laborious and exhilarating manner in which reverie is transformed into art. Leigh was Jean-Jacques's stenographer and recording angel for much the largest surviving archive—and it is very large indeed—of his manuscript material. The textual notes and variants stand to the letters themselves as they stand collectively to the *Confessions*. They are the most fundamental source from which Rousseau's autobiography was shaped, in the immediacy of their composition more authentic in many ways than the assembled reflections Rousseau produced later to lend them greater coherence and plausibility. They map the draft stages of the gestation of his ideas, the instantaneous evocation of his dreams. When historians like Bronislaw Baczko wistfully remark about such dreams, 'Combien il est rare de relever leur trace dans les archives!' ['How rare it is to find a trace of them in the archives!'],<sup>2</sup> Leigh's edition of the *Correspondance de Rousseau* points the way.

Third, and no less important, are the thousands of *notes explicatives* that Leigh appended to the eighty-four hundred letters and seven hundred annexed documents (the distinction is dropped after Rousseau's death) which comprise this collection. From national, municipal and military archives, and from public records offices in France, Switzerland, Italy, England, Scotland, Germany and other countries, he compiled the biographies of at least five thousand correspondents or persons mentioned in exchanges and their families—many of them utterly obscure figures who sought Rousseau's advice in domestic matters, or who turned to him for political guidance, or who merely wrote to him in the not always vain hope that a meeting, even his signature, might one day lend credence to the fabrications of a friendship around which their own literary fortunes could be made. Some of the sycophants or uncritical admirers whose faintly ridiculous machinations Leigh recounts are well-known—Boswell, for instance, or Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, or Madame de la Tour de Franqueville. But Rousseau was lord to many flies, and practically everyone who scampered after him, or who sought the crumbs from his table, or who even had occasion to fear those crumbs, is identified in this work: the mysterious republican comtesse de Wartensleben (CC, no. 5426),

writing on behalf of the wayward son of a friend, who inspires in Rousseau's reply (CC, no. 5450) one of the finest pages of eighteenth-century French prose; or the whole family of Nicolas-Eloy Thévenin (CC, no. 6438), who falsely accused Rousseau of failing to pay a debt; or the entire clan of the surgeon Laubel (CC, no. 6305 and app. 569), who conducted the autopsy on the concierge of the château de Trye, whom Rousseau, in one of his darkest hours, imagined that he was suspected of having poisoned. Almost everyone who passed through his life here emerges from the shadows of obscurity; hardly any stone in the path of biographical scholarship is left unturned. Leigh, as sensitive in his fashion as was Rousseau to the enthusiasms of friendship and the anxieties of betrayal, comes in his commentaries to rekindle the suspicions which Jean-Jacques nurtured and, at the same time, by documenting the remarks of the persons who inspired them, takes a dispassionate stance of a kind that was never open to Rousseau himself. In an appendix relating all the possible motives and circumstances which surrounded Voltaire's cryptic and artful offer of refuge to Rousseau when he fell foul of the authorities in France, Leigh concludes, on Rousseau's behalf, 'Ce n'est pas là une de ces pressantes invitations qui incitent à faire ses valises sur le champ' (CC, app. 271) ['This was not one of those pressing invitations that prompts one to pack one's bags on the spot']. Through these immensely voluminous notes, all the diversity of Rousseau's life and times comes to be illuminated, not only through his own eyes, as we find in the *Confessions*, but through the eyes of his contemporaries as well. Especially for the later volumes, where the notes are often unconnected with the texts above them, it is Leigh's commentary rather than the original documents which most excite attention. I know of no work in eighteenth-century studies with more magisterial annotation. The index alone, when it appears, should prove a compulsory guide, for other scholars, not only to the biography of Rousseau, but to the whole eighteenth-century world he inhabited. And let us remember the vast scale of this enterprise. Forty-nine volumes of text have appeared thus far, together with another of critical apparatus just out<sup>3</sup>—that is to say, over twenty thousand pages and probably in excess of thirteen million words in all, of which, on my crude reckoning, more than three million were drafted by Leigh himself, rather more than by Rousseau, as it happens, leaving aside the fact that the ten million words of which he is not the author are for the most part Leigh's own transcriptions from the manuscripts. Three million words—not one of them, incidentally, in his native tongue—would comprise about thirty volumes in their own right, if the prefaces, notes and commentaries had been so assembled. Leigh was nearly forty when he began to contemplate a new edition of the Rousseau correspondence. The first volume, and hence his first book-length publication, appeared when he was fifty,

an indulgence for the rigours of scholarship that no university or research council would be likely to extend today. He died at the age of seventy-two, having seen through the press more than half a million words each year in the interval, aside from his other publications, his teaching and his family responsibilities in the course of his wife's long illness, which was to cost her her life in 1972. The *Correspondance complète de Rousseau* is an utterly formidable achievement.

## II. THE DUFOUR-PLAN EDITION

Of course, like all major publishing ventures, this *finished* product, massive though it is, constitutes only part of the story. In every such enterprise there are off-stage preparations and plays within the play, or banks within the bank, whose accounts never come to be disclosed. There are negotiations with librarians and archivists, many of them immensely helpful, but others displaying little more than the irritation of indolent holders of sinecures whose repose has been disturbed by an agitated foreigner. There are dealings with descendants, or associates of descendants, of Rousseau's correspondents, known to hold certain documents but determined that their publication should not compromise the family name; and Leigh had more than once to wait for a literary inheritance to pass into more pliant hands, publishing a letter out of turn, with a fulsome expression of gratitude to its new possessor, or to the old one he had worn down with repeated entreaties, as if the document were only newly discovered. There are others who continually deny all knowledge of such documents, contrary to the available evidence, sometimes hinting that they hope to enhance the value of the scribbles they own by *excluding* them from the *Correspondance*, or alternatively intimating that disclosure of their whereabouts would contradict the depositions they or their parents had earlier made to the tax inspectorate. Leigh suffered greatly from what he called 'the voluminous secondary correspondence', 'the complex and intricate negotiations with archivists, librarians, collectors, families, dealers and auctioneers. Along with the problems of bulk', he adds, 'come [those] generated by the time-scale of the operation. Over a period of some thirty years . . . you discover that the paper of your original notes has frayed and crumbled, that the ink has yellowed and faded, that your early scribble is undecipherable, that your eyes have changed focus or have become blurred and dim. . . . you find that you can no longer work fourteen hours a day. The never-ending journeys to remote sources become tiring and tiresome. You can no longer run with the same *élan* after the retreating bus, train or plane; and those enormous folio works of reference, produced in and for a more heroic age, become im-

possible to lift, or else slip from your enfeebled grasp'.<sup>4</sup> 'And then, alas,' he adds, 'there is the question of finance. The poor might find it easier to enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the rich can afford to edit an extensive correspondence. The great wealthy foundations . . . are reluctant to help a scholar working on his own. They rush to the assistance of institutions, or impressive-looking teams, which, more often than not, exist only on paper, and whose work tends not infrequently to grind to a halt, while the funds allocated to it dribble away into overheads and superstructure. These great foundations . . . are afraid [the scholar working alone] will spend their money on riotous living'. Here, therefore, are Leigh's 'three golden rules for editing large-scale correspondences: (1) Be rich, and, if possible, influential too; (2) Be young and vigorous, and make up your mind never to grow old; (3) Always start at least a hundred years before you actually do'.<sup>5</sup>

Not least because newly discovered Rousseau letters are becoming scarce, and because only a few dozen were uncovered in the course of Leigh's endeavours, there are some persons, even today, who wonder why this work had to be done at all. Was there not a wholly serviceable edition already available, the *Correspondance générale de Rousseau*, prepared by Théophile Dufour and completed by Pierre-Paul Plan, in twenty volumes between 1924 and 1934? This was, and by some scholars is still, held to be a quite sufficiently authoritative text, published 'avec le concours de l'Institut de France', prepared by the 'ancien directeur des Archives et de la Bibliothèque de Genève', 'collationnée sur les originaux', as was heralded on the title-page to each volume—a monumental work, widely acclaimed, upon which numerous literary prizes were lavished when it appeared. Lack of space prevents me from commenting at length here on the merits of that confection, which Leigh once described as 'one of the most extraordinary hoaxes ever perpetrated on the world of learning'.<sup>6</sup> Suffice it to say that anyone who inspects the Dufour archive in Geneva<sup>7</sup> can see plainly that, by and large, he did *not* transcribe Rousseau's letters from the original manuscripts, but rather transcribed the variants between the manuscripts and published texts, and between the texts of different editions, by way of annotating the printed versions of Rousseau's correspondence. Dufour was particularly well-acquainted with the numerous editions of Rousseau's *Oeuvres* which had appeared in the 1820s, and he cut out pages from two copies of tomes 17–20 of the second Lequien edition, dating from 1826, and pasted them to blank sheets.<sup>8</sup> These tomes of the correspondence of Rousseau themselves reproduce the five volumes of letters included in the second Musset-Pathay edition of Rousseau's *Oeuvres complètes* dating from 1823 to 1826, in turn a transcription from the Moulton-Du Peyrou Geneva edition of 1782. In certain cases Dufour worked instead from the two volumes of Rousseau

*inédits* appended to the Musset-Pathay edition in 1825. For other letters he just dissected later editions—among them the Hachette of 1865 and thereafter—in the same fashion, or turned to an assortment of works in which newly discovered documents had appeared, including even the *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau*.<sup>9</sup> For letters addressed to Rousseau, he relied largely upon the Streckeisen-Moultou collection of 1865, every now and again severely censuring his predecessor for errors of transcription, including deliberate suppressions and negligent omissions, but largely reproducing the same texts, incorporating other suppressions and omissions.<sup>10</sup> As a consequence of its duplication of such earlier printed versions, the *Correspondance générale de Rousseau* is peppered with misattributions of dates and persons, with replies which predate the request, with letters sent from places Rousseau had not yet visited, or which he had left several years before his letter was apparently posted.

Part of the explanation of the literary farrago which constitutes this work has to do with the fact that its putative editor had already died before it came to be compiled under his name. Dufour was one of those all too familiar figures in the world of scholarship who devote the whole of their lives to the uncritical and unsystematic assemblage of data so diffuse and so disorganized that it cannot be made fit for publication. He was, in his day, if I may so put it, the Lord Acton of Geneva—in that he drew together so much material (indeed, he made almost equally voluminous jottings on Calvinism and the history of Geneva), while seeing so little through the press. He began to accumulate his archive on the correspondence of Rousseau as early as 1864, at the age of twenty, and, when he died in 1922, he left a mass of papers but no instructions of any kind as to what purpose it might serve. As Plan himself remarks disarmingly in his preface, ‘Dufour n’a laissé aucune indication précise sur ses intentions; son activité prodigieuse s’est limitée à la chasse des matériaux, et il ne s’est pas expliqué sur les manières dont il entendait les mettre en oeuvre’.<sup>11</sup> Yet, thanks to Plan, Dufour is credited with having collated the original manuscripts. Thanks, moreover, to Plan’s own testimony, the *Correspondance générale de Rousseau* incorporates what Dufour apparently never intended to include—that is, the letters addressed to, as well as those sent by, Rousseau. But, true to his practice, Plan seems to have cared little more for the manuscript collation of letters that Rousseau received than for those that he drafted. Like Dufour before him, Plan reproduced letters from their first, or what he believed to be their best, publication, thus recapitulating the errors of previous editors and passing off the liberties they took with their texts as authentic transcriptions. Who can tell from the Dufour-Plan edition of Rousseau’s correspondence that the letters of Leonhard Usteri, for instance, were reconstructed by

their first editor into classically proportioned French prose from the strange circumlocutions, ungrammatical prolixities and occasional lapses into pidgin-French which Usteri had actually conveyed to Rousseau?

None of this need have occurred; nor, for that matter, should Dufour himself be blamed, for there is no reason to suppose that he ever envisaged producing, or contributing to, a new edition of Rousseau's correspondence. In so far as he had any ambition to see his desultory compilations published, he merely hoped to complete an index which would tabulate all the mistakes of transcription in each of the previously printed editions—a preoccupation with misprints and typographical errors clearly evident in his similarly unfinished and posthumously published *Recherches bibliographiques sur les oeuvres imprimées de Rousseau* (2 vols., Paris, 1925). In 1922 this forlorn wish of a nearly eighty-year-old scholar was conveyed to Alexis François, the Secretary of the Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Geneva, who had just edited Rousseau's correspondence with Coindet (having earlier edited his correspondence with Tissot) and who, on behalf of the Société Rousseau, was now about to assume responsibility for a new 'definitive' edition of the whole Rousseau correspondence. François wished to incorporate the work of Dufour as part of a collaborative venture, and he showed as little interest in a projected catalogue of editorial mistranscriptions as, apparently, Dufour displayed for his endeavours. Some months after their meeting, Dufour died, and François, together with his appointed publishers, Hachette, now hoped they might somehow take stock of Dufour's collection and annotations. His aim, he reports, was to acknowledge the provenance of such notes in his edition, but when in 1923 Dufour's daughter, Hélène Pittard-Dufour, speaking for her family, stipulated that the name of her father must appear on the work's title-page and covers, François refused. How could he pass on responsibility for what he expected would be his own life's work (he was then in his early forties) to a defunct scholar whose collection of papers he had not yet even inspected, and whose reliability had still to be established? Eventually, the Société Rousseau came up with another proposal which might better flatter the memory of Dufour and thereby satisfy his daughter's sense of honour, embracing the formula 'avec la participation des papiers Th. Dufour' on the work's title-page, thus meeting her original condition. In the meanwhile, however, the Dufour family had commissioned a detailed inventory of his Rousseau documents which had, on grounds never explained, established that they were in sufficiently coherent order to permit publication. In the spring of 1923, accordingly, Mme. Pittard-Dufour entered into negotiations with an alternative publisher, Armand Colin, and another editor, Plan, was found, who readily acceded to the demand that the name of Dufour should appear on every title-page.<sup>12</sup>

Plan was a journalist and not undistinguished scholar who had worked on Rousseau and Malesherbes and on Rousseau's reputation in the eighteenth century, not to mention the catalogue de l'Enfer, that is, the collection of prohibited books at the Bibliothèque nationale. Eventually, he was to be associated with the Bibliothèque publique et universitaire de Genève. But, for most of his life, he was, as Bernard Gagnebin once put it, 'un boulevardier qui vivait dans les cafés'.<sup>13</sup> So incensed were the archivists of the Rousseau collections in Geneva and Neuchâtel at this outcome of the projected new edition of the correspondence of Rousseau (indeed, for a time the Société Rousseau entertained the notion of a competing second edition) that, when Plan sought access in Geneva to material from the Bibliothèque de Neuchâtel, his request was turned down. It was in this fashion that a collection of papers really meant to inform a catalogue of printers' errors and publishers' variants came to assume the identity of a very different work, conceived by another editor, whose own aspirations were cut short by his initial disinclination to pay what was judged proper tribute for the right to cull a painstakingly, if somewhat pointlessly, assembled archive. Thus was immortality purchased at the price of scholarship by a daughter for her father.<sup>14</sup> The Dufour-Plan edition of the *Correspondance générale de Rousseau* was, at least from the point of view of Rousseau studies, a publishing fiasco which from its inception cried out for remedy. In deceiving its readers, Plan had actually done a disservice to the reputation of Dufour.

### III. DEALING WITH BESTERMAN

After the debacle of its own long-cherished plans to take part in a 'definitive' edition of the correspondence of Rousseau, the Société Rousseau might well have looked askance at a projected new edition, begun some thirty years after that of Dufour-Plan, this time by a little-known Englishman from Cambridge. Foreign scholars have perhaps been welcomed with more conspicuous cordiality in Switzerland than in France, and by the 1950s Theodore Besterman, the first and largely self-appointed Director of the Musée Voltaire in Geneva, had already embarked on his own edition of Voltaire's *Correspondence*. But relations between Besterman and the indigenous world of Swiss scholarship often proved stormy and eventually broke down in international scandal, and Besterman himself, after a hasty evacuation to Oxfordshire where he set up a new Voltaire Foundation, came to portray the city of Geneva as 'a corrupt and xenophobic municipality'.<sup>15</sup> In the meanwhile, and not least as a measure of his own appreciation of the extent of French and Swiss support for his endeavours on their behalf, he had elected to annotate the Voltaire correspon-



dence in English. When it transpired that Besterman was also to be Leigh's publisher, and that the editors of the two most substantial projects of our time in Swiss eighteenth-century studies—indeed, in French Enlightenment studies generally—were thus outsiders, there was bound to be unease, not only in Swiss academic circles but in France as well. Who on the Continent could have bargained for the real allegiance and first principles of each man? Who anywhere dared guess that the latest editor of Rousseau's correspondence, together with his publisher, who was himself the editor of Voltaire's correspondence, would each assume the personality of his subject and in the labyrinthine course of their dealings would come to resuscitate, in spirit, the greatest quarrel of eighteenth-century French literature? The publication of the Leigh edition of the *Correspondance complète de Rousseau* was to rekindle both the mutual admiration and shared mistrust of the Enlightenment's most formidable adversaries—on the one hand, of the braggart and mountebank, addicted to luxury, whom Rousseau condemned for debasing the upright morals of his Genevan compatriots, and, on the other, of the insufferable lunatic whose self-righteous unworldliness Voltaire decried as a betrayal of the practical ideals of his own cosmopolitan republic of letters.

The two men first met through the pages of the *Modern Language Review* in the summer of 1954, Besterman in his capacity as editor of what was intended to be the definitive edition of Voltaire's correspondence, Leigh as the reviewer of the first three volumes. It was an inauspicious encounter, since Leigh's review is a devastating though not uncharacteristic blast, altogether a *tour de force*, at Besterman's expense. While praising Besterman as a 'literary sleuth of the first order'<sup>16</sup> whose work would prove 'an important "instrument de travail"' that would make all other editions seem 'antediluvian', he remarked, nevertheless, that 'this edition is not so good as it might be' and then proceeded to amplify that comment with a comprehensive catalogue of its mistranscriptions, 'dubious readings', improbable chronologies and other blunders of an editor whom he portrayed as 'gossipy, importunate, otiose, and unsystematic'.<sup>17</sup> In their first direct exchange (RAL to ThB, 3 August 1954), Leigh sought to soothe his wounded prey by observing that though 'my criticisms must inevitably seem to you severe . . . for all of them I have given chapter and verse. In fact, at the very last moment, I deleted from my typescript a list of some forty odd misprints *etc.* [my italics], because I did not wish my review to appear one-sided'.

Besterman, who had already made Voltaire's home and bed at Les Délices his own, was outraged by such cavilling criticism from an upstart reviewer, which had somewhat soured the launch of what he planned to be the greatest monument of literary scholarship of our age. 'I do not disapprove of your review because of its criticisms', he replied in his own



first letter to Leigh (8 August 1954). 'Far from it, I welcome constructive criticism. (For that matter, I have in my time written much more severe reviews). What I object to is the tone of your comments, their obvious animus, and your lack of a humanistic scale of values'.<sup>18</sup> In the meanwhile, he had taken the precaution of writing to the assistant editor of the journal, informing her that 'no further volumes of Voltaire's correspondence will be sent for review by Dr. Leigh' (ThB to Winifred Husbands at University College London, 22 July 1954). A copy of that letter was passed on to Leigh, whose own approach to Besterman—on this occasion more in the spirit of Voltaire himself than his editor had been able to muster—was prompted by it. 'Being both editor and publisher', he wrote (3 August 1954), 'you are in a unique position to impose sanctions, and you have taken full advantage of it. . . . Your action raises an important issue of principle. . . . Whatever you intend, the effect of your decision can only be the suppression of criticism. . . . I cannot bring myself to believe that you really wish to purchase immunity from criticism in this way . . . nor that Voltaire himself would have approved of this infraction of a principle he so persistently defended; the principle of free speech'.

Besterman was most certainly wounded by Leigh's review, but he was nevertheless impressed by the all too conspicuous scholarship which had informed it, and he persevered in sending the Voltaire correspondence, as the volumes appeared, to the *Modern Language Review*, where Leigh continued in much the same vein as before, with Besterman, honourably swallowing his pride, now correcting his text in the light of Leigh's and other testimony. By 1956 (19 April) he could acknowledge his gratitude, always in his own fashion: 'Let me thank you . . . for all the trouble you have taken . . . with this labour of what I cannot exactly call love'. 'You must spend a great part of your time on my edition! . . . If you are not careful you will finish by becoming quite urbane' (ThB to RAL, 8 April 1957). The volumes of the Voltaire *Correspondence* began to pass direct from the editor to the reviewer, now more by way of appreciation for services rendered than as review copies. Besterman's wrath had, to his credit, been short-lived. He protested vigorously that Leigh was unfair to claim that he invariably defends Voltaire (ThB to RAL, 19 April 1956). 'I am undoubtedly *for* Voltaire', he remarked, 'but not blindly or uncritically', to which Leigh's response (23 April 1956) was that he had merely implied that Besterman refrains 'from criticising Voltaire, where criticism would be appropriate, given that you are going to comment editorially on such matters'. This exchange between the two men is striking, for it was to inform the temper and anxiety that underlay all their dealings with respect to the publication of the Rousseau correspondence, as well as that of the Voltaire correspondence, over a period of twenty years. Not only was Besterman plainly '*for* Voltaire', but, in adopting the entrepreneurial

cunning of his master in the great cause of humanity and reason, he was moved, throughout his career as publishing patron and Godfather of Enlightenment studies as a whole, to see the inhabitants of his own world as if through Voltaire's eyes. 'You get more like J. J. R. every day', he remarked to Leigh (1 May 1973), nineteen years after their first exchange, as if it were at last plain that the vitriol and arsenic which Voltaire had detected in Rousseau's veins had managed to contaminate his scribe.

Leigh, for his part, while he grumbled that Besterman was 'too fond of making generalisations about [his] character' (6 March 1968), did not resist the imputation to him of Rousseau's qualities; he may even have warmed to the portrayal of that resemblance drawn by a man who, on Voltaire's behalf, found Jean-Jacques himself so tiresome. And he undoubtedly *did* display certain Rousseauist attributes in his dealings with Besterman—mistrustful as he often was of his publisher's real motives and inclined to suspect a sinister scheme behind a thoughtless remark, or, on the other hand, inattentive to the costs and risks of producing, amending and distributing publications of unknown length and equally doubtful circulation. In pushing back whole frontiers of knowledge with only a scalpel, Leigh took little notice of the business of cultivating the new fields he cleared. Like Johnson in his celebrated letter to Lord Chesterfield of 7 February 1755, he would plainly have preferred 'not to confess obligations where no benefit has been received . . . unwilling that the public should consider [him] as owing that to a patron, which Providence has enabled [him] to do for [himself]'. In Besterman, nevertheless, he had met, perhaps without sufficiently recognizing his good fortune, a man of exceptionally rare gifts in the world of publishing, to whom Enlightenment studies over the past thirty years owe much of their efflorescence: an entrepreneur with a true love of scholarship. It is hard to imagine another publisher in any country consenting to produce the *Correspondance complète de Rousseau* in the form which it took. For all their conflicts of temperament, the collaboration of Leigh with Besterman made possible the appearance in print of the most remarkable work ever produced in eighteenth-century studies.

The first suggestion that Leigh should embark on a new edition of the correspondence of Rousseau actually came from Besterman, in the autumn of 1956, although Leigh had long before formed the view, in the course of his research on Rousseau's writings and influence, not only that such a work was needed, but even that he ought to undertake it himself.<sup>19</sup> On Besterman's invitation, he began that task, without any clear brief or notion of its prospective length or style—even without a contract, until, after several volumes had already appeared, a formal agreement was drawn up in 1968. Over the whole period of their dealings from the early 1960s until the death of Besterman in 1976, they exchanged

recriminations, now not about the Voltaire correspondence, but that of Rousseau. What would the work be called? Leigh, anxious to ensure that it would supersede the Dufour-Plan edition, had resolved to correct Dufour's errors in his notes, and proposed the same title as before: the *Correspondance générale de Rousseau*. Besterman reluctantly yielded to Leigh's insistence on such notes but demanded that the title be changed, as it was, to the *Correspondance complète de Rousseau* (ThB to RAL, 18 October 1961, and RAL to ThB, 24 October 1961). Leigh was initially determined to include a dedication to his wife, the pianist Edith Kern. Besterman suppressed it, sparing Leigh, as he put it, 'all sorts of genevoiseries' that would have been called forth by an editor's dedication of a great man's works (ThB to RAL, 30 November 1964). Although the matter of copyright had never been discussed and was to remain unsettled for several years even after first publication, volume one actually appeared, in January 1965, bearing the unauthorized copyright of Theodore Besterman. Leigh exploded, and thereafter Besterman left out all reference to it, until the printing of volume seven in 1969, the first to be properly covered by an editor's contract (including a royalty), which was then duly published under the copyright, once again, of 'Theodore Besterman'. In 1965, after ten years of mutual reproach and remonstrance, tempered by intermittent flashes of cordiality, Besterman sighed wearily to Leigh, 'I do wish that you would get rid of that chip on your shoulder. I hoped that when the first volume was safely published you would feel more equanimity, but really you are getting more and more peevish' (ThB to RAL, 31 May 1965). On other occasions it was his own exasperation with Leigh, rather than the thunder of Leigh's annoyance with him, which stirred Besterman most. If ever a history of their turbulent relationship comes to be written, I think it should bear, as its title, the opening line of a letter Besterman sent to Leigh on 14 November 1960: 'Pistols for two and coffee for one!' [later published as Robert Wokler, 'Pistols for Two and Coffee for One: Rekindling Voltaire's and Rousseau's Quarrel in the Footnotes', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 362 (1998): 1–10].

Throughout the eleven years of publication of the *Correspondance complète de Rousseau* before Besterman's death, the quarrel between its editor and publisher had one principal manifest source, with certain unexpressed ramifications: this was the length of the work, and especially the density of its footnotes, which Leigh so often revised in proof, and hence the sheer cost of producing each volume. When in 1961 Besterman asked Leigh how long the whole enterprise would be, Leigh replied, '5400' letters, 'but experience shows it would be wiser to allow for up to 6000' (4 July 1961). When completed, it in fact came to embrace more than 9000 documents in all—not a number, I believe, which Leigh ever secretly had in mind, but one which, like Topsy, just grew. And those notes!,

Besterman complained on receiving the typescript of the first volume, even while congratulating Leigh 'on a remarkable piece of work'. They are not notes at all, but rather 'essays in the guise of notes' which 'go far beyond the scope of an edition of correspondence' (ThB to RAL, 12 October 1964). Leigh had tried to prepare Besterman for the shock. 'You should not . . . be unduly alarmed if the annotation of the first volume in particular seems to be rather heavy', he had forewarned (RAL to ThB, 3 July 1964). 'The earliest letters are the most difficult . . . and . . . a good many things need to be said at the beginning once and for all'. These at once cautionary and reassuring remarks were to be utterly contradicted by the evidence of the later volumes. The notes are as long throughout, and, not least by virtue of their length, form the very essence of this masterpiece. They terrified Besterman, who had already had more than one occasion (mainly in the preparation and enlargement of the microfilm of the Neuchâtel papers) to balk at Leigh's extravagance. 'I never contemplated anything on this scale', he scolded ruefully (15 August 1959), 'and I do feel you should not have committed me to so enormous [an expense] without consulting me'. The cost of publishing the Rousseau correspondence, particularly the early volumes, for which there were few subscribers, was very substantial indeed, and Leigh, until brusquely confronted by his publisher's demand for a subsidy, appeared blissfully unaware of the nature of Besterman's own misgivings at the extent of his investment in his work. 'Especially with Dufour-Plan still in print', Besterman reminded him just before the first volume appeared (24 September 1964), 'this publication is going to be very difficult to sell'. To excite interest, he sent out seventy-five hundred prospectuses, more than for Voltaire's *Correspondence*.

In June 1965, after a decade of preparation, the whole venture nearly came to stillborn grief, when Besterman suggested that as Leigh was now pursuing a grant for some editorial assistance with UNESCO, and as he had now himself just received what he called 'the fatal invoice' from the printers—32,000 Swiss francs, equivalent to more than £2500—the time had finally come to settle accounts. 'I am afraid', he remarked, rather too casually, 'I must now set out what you owe me. First of all frs 1803.40 for excess author's corrections. . . . Then there is frs 1476.50, being half the cost of the two colour plates. Finally frs 320 . . . for the six extra copies, and frs 85 for the offprints. This makes a total of 3684.90, which I should be glad to receive as soon as possible' (ThB to RAL, 4 June 1965).<sup>20</sup> Confronted by such news, Leigh burst forth in exasperated rage. 'I am at my wits' end about that bill', he complained bitterly (8 June 1965). 'Before I start to correct the proofs of the second volume . . . I need a clearer understanding of what corrections are permissible and what percentage of free corrections I am allowed . . . I simply cannot afford to go on after all the sacrifices I have made!' Besterman's retort was penned the next day.

'To say that I am staggered by your . . . letter . . . is to put it mildly', he sniped. 'You continue to behave as though I have a bottomless purse and an unlimited willingness to dip into it. Neither of these things is true. Your first volume has been so expensive to produce that even if the entire edition is sold I shall be substantially out of pocket. In these circumstances it is difficult for me to take patiently the offhand way in which you dismiss your debt, and I must make it perfectly clear to you that I am not prepared to go on unless you keep your word'. These letters drove Leigh to despair, with the product of ten years' labour and his projected whole life's work thus placed in jeopardy. 'It is not I who think you have "a bottomless purse" etc. etc.', he replied plaintively, 'but you who think this of me' (10 June 1965). In embarrassment he approached his College (Trinity, Cambridge) Council and then, to Besterman, rehearsed the full history of their relationship and the reasons why it was quite impossible for him, even through his College, or the University, to subsidize the publication of his own work: 'This is not Leeds or Newcastle', he lamented on 11 June 1965 (whatever can he have had in mind?). 'If you had said to me in 1956 when you first approached me that you could not publish without a subsidy, I should have promptly replied "nothing doing". I have enough agony trying to raise money to finance essential research, and I must repeat . . . that if there is no manuscript, there can be no publication, and all the subsidies in the world are useless if there is no work to subsidise'.

Leigh now seemed genuinely at the brink of total collapse. Besterman, for all his admiration of Leigh's scholarship, was clearly not the sort of devoted, dutiful and, so far as it had been in his power, beneficent publisher that Rousseau had found in Marc-Michel Rey. And yet Besterman's reply to these anguished cries reveals a man perhaps more feckless than callous, unable to fathom the extent of Leigh's desolation: 'Are you not making heavy weather of this publication subsidy business?', he sighed (15 June 1965), with a tone of newly cultivated equanimity.<sup>21</sup> 'When I first suggested publishing the Rousseau correspondence I was quite prepared to face a loss, and I have been quite prepared for it ever since, even though costs have so enormously increased in the meanwhile. Nevertheless I always hoped that some subsidy might be forthcoming, and surely I cannot be blamed for trying to get some money if any were going. Yet you talk as though I were committing some dreadful crime!' He might have added Johnson's remark that 'No man but a blockhead ever wrote except for money', but of course Leigh, not a businessman or publisher but merely one of the finest scholars of his age, was, indeed, just such a blockhead. Eventually, the crisis passed. Besterman's purse proved deeper than he cared to admit, and, in due course, as he had always hoped, albeit privately, the *Correspondance complète de Rousseau* began to make

money for its publisher. Ultimately, it was to draw a much needed and greatly welcomed royalty for its editor as well. The number of its subscribers was, in Besterman's own lifetime, actually to surpass the number of purchasers of his *Correspondence* of Voltaire.

For Besterman himself, this burgeoning popularity of Leigh's work was a mixed blessing. While replenishing his purse, it diminished his control over, and his main professed reason for objecting to, Leigh's editorial excesses. Above all, it progressively undermined his own stature as Voltaire's editor and amanuensis. By the sheer excellence of the Rousseau correspondence annotation, and the unparalleled command of his subject which Leigh displayed in it, his work manifestly upstaged and outshone Besterman's own endeavours on behalf of *le roi soleil* of the Enlightenment—a feat all the more galling because readers of Voltaire's exchange of letters with Rousseau would henceforth turn to the more authoritative and, from his point of view, inevitably deeply biased, version produced by Rousseau's shadow, and put into bold print, on exceptionally fine paper, by Voltaire's ghost. These were not matters which could be considered in Besterman's own exchanges with Leigh, but they must have fuelled a growing anxiety which a man of such profound self-esteem could not have harboured when he first lent his encouragement to Leigh. What was he to do? In 1965, when the last of the 107 volumes of his edition of the correspondence of Voltaire was published, there appeared, under his auspices, the first volume of another eighteenth-century correspondence which set editorial standards that might seem to threaten his own work with obsolescence. In 1968 was begun the fresh publication of an updated version of Voltaire's *Correspondence*, edited once more by Besterman, this time described as 'definitive', to the exasperation of librarians and book collectors everywhere, who had only just paid their last instalment on the first set. No doubt there were sound academic, and perhaps even some compelling financial, reasons for embarking on a new edition so quickly on the heels of its precursor. Helpful corrections to Besterman's mistakes had been supplied from many quarters, none more assiduous than Leigh, whose contribution had been acknowledged by his appointment, in 1956, to the advisory committee of Voltaire's *Correspondence*.<sup>22</sup> In the meanwhile, a great many new Voltaire documents had been discovered or at last located, not least by virtue of the publication of Besterman's original edition, and a whole archive had even been released from the Saltykov-Shchedrin Library in Leningrad, thanks to Besterman's forthright request, made direct to Nikita Khrushchev (one premier to another, as it were), 'to give orders that a microfilm should be . . . sent to me', in the interests of 'international cultural cooperation' (ThB to NK, The Kremlin, Moscow, 2 January 1958).<sup>23</sup> All these and other factors no doubt underlay Besterman's decision to produce the

Voltaire correspondence a second time.<sup>24</sup> But to the extent that the editorial revisions of the definitive version also point to the inadequacies of the first, Leigh's *Correspondance complète de Rousseau*, interpolated between the two sets of Voltaire, may help to explain why Besterman himself came to judge his initial effort an inadequate false start. It would be one of the most ironical legacies of a great eighteenth-century quarrel if the fulsome annotation of Rousseau's correspondence by his editor were to have provoked Voltaire's editor, on his behalf, to say everything a second time.

Allowing that the tensions of their fraught relationship did serve to drive Besterman to wholesale repetition, they inspired Leigh, instead—always a man of more poetic temperament—to translate them into blank verse. In 1967, while he was in the United States, but at a not more than usually tempestuous moment of an always stormy and, for the world of scholarship, utterly invigorating collaboration, he addressed the following lines to Besterman:

#### LES QUANDS

- QUAND un auteur se trouve séparé de son éditeur par six mille kilomètres d'océan, il est normal qu'il désire savoir si ses envois arrivent à bon port.
- QUAND un auteur remet un manuscrit à son éditeur au mois de juin et que le mois de novembre soit presque écoulé sans qu'il reçoive aucune épreuve, il est normal qu'il s'inquiète un peu, surtout si au prix de mille efforts et de mille sacrifices il s'est arrangé pour corriger ces épreuves avant son retour imminent en Europe, et cela afin justement d'épargner des frais à sondit éditeur.
- QUAND un auteur a des changements à demander, il est normal qu'il veuille savoir où en sont les typographes, afin justement de les faire faire avec le minimum de frais ou de ne pas irriter son éditeur par des demandes impossibles à satisfaire.
- QUAND un auteur a cru remarquer, dans la seconde et dernière épreuve d'un travail (qui, assure-t-on, n'est pas seulement un ouvrage utile, mais aussi un beau livre) des singularités typographiques qui le défigurent, il est normal qu'il les signale à son éditeur, et qu'il s'attende à recevoir les observations de celui-ci.
- QUAND un auteur, obéré de travail et de correspondances, sans secrétaire et ne sachant où donner de la tête, écrit fort poliment à son éditeur pour lui demander la raison de son étrange silence, il ne s'attend pas à recevoir

de sondit éditeur un petit billet fort sec qui ne lui  
dit rien, dicté à une secrétaire qui ne devrait pas être  
au courant de ces choses-là, et signé par celle-ci.

To this delightfully abrasive commentary, if I may purloin the last line from an essay of which Leigh was always proud, 'it would be lacking in charity to add a single word'.<sup>25</sup>



## ROUSSEAU'S TWO CONCEPTS OF LIBERTY

### I

It is the misfortune of extraordinary doctrines that they suffer a remarkably common fate in the hands of their interpreters, and at first glance there may appear to be nothing very special about the prevalent distortions of the political thought of Rousseau. His ideas, like those of other great thinkers, have been widely embraced or denounced with almost equal abandon, in fierce and recurrent controversies which merely reflect the striking impact his philosophy has had upon his followers from the French Revolution to the present day. It is not particularly odd that professed disciples should have obscured his meaning as much as his detractors have done, nor even that we have come to judge the significance of his claims in the light of the activities of others who sought to realize them in practice. What is peculiar about Rousseau's reputation among pre-eminent political theorists, however, is the extent to which his critics are agreed that he could not have been committed to the philosophy he actually set forth.

In the history of political thought there is no more outspoken defender of freedom than Rousseau, no one who expressed a deeper regret over the liberty we have lost or a more profound longing for the liberty we should seek, and yet the main charge levelled against him by his opponents has consistently been that the manipulative powers entrusted in his works to sovereign assemblies, legislators, and tutors alike deprive persons of the very liberty he claims they should enjoy. Of all thinkers decried as collectivist or totalitarian, of all those vilified for sacrificing liberty upon the altars of state control and social indoctrination, none professed a greater love of freedom, nor a more resolute determination to maintain the independence of a free man. My remarks here are inspired by just this puzzling antinomy, as if what Rousseau really stands for is the opposite of what he stood for in his life and thought. The objection to his doctrine which I wish to consider, therefore, is not the reproach so commonly made against political and social thinkers that their pursuit of one great goal conflicts with others of at least equal value. It is, rather, that the very concept acknowledged to lie at the heart of his philosophy in fact means the opposite of what he claims on its behalf—in effect, that his defence of liberty is illiberal.

That charge of illiberalism is of course generally premised on the claim that Rousseau defined liberty falsely, and that the institutions he prescribed for its fulfilment in fact thwart or destroy it. At least when Bertrand Russell spoke of Hitler as 'an outcome of Rousseau', or when T. D. Weldon remarked that men can be forced to be free in Rousseau's sense when they are incarcerated in Wormwood Scrubs or Broadmoor,<sup>1</sup> I take it that something like this complaint is what they had in mind. To be sure, the alternative view of liberty presupposed by such criticism is all too seldom explained, and it may seem difficult to identify such darkly sinister portraits as are commonly drawn of Rousseau's thought against an allegedly contrasting background that is itself so dimly lit. Yet just that lack of definition, I believe, forms an essential ingredient of the concept of freedom which Rousseau is accused by his liberal critics of having ignored. For while he is said to have prescribed and delimited the nature of human freedom by confining it in a political strait-jacket that requires all men to act together, his opponents hold dear a principle which has no determinant content, and whose attainment is marked by the lack of interference of other persons in the pursuit of what each of us may choose to do. Rousseau's imputed circumscription of an imprescribable concept is crucial to the liberal case against him, for from a truly liberal perspective individuals are free only when they are unhindered in their actions, when they have no duty opposed to their will, and not, as it is suggested he would have us believe, when they have no will but to perform their duty.<sup>2</sup> Now at least since the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, liberalism has come to be associated above all with the idea and exercise of personal freedom safeguarded from public control, but this element of its theory is generally acknowledged to stem largely from the definition of liberty as 'the absence of external impediments' which was first provided by Hobbes, and the same theme also lies at the heart of the concept which Isaiah Berlin has rightly termed 'negative liberty'.<sup>3</sup> Freedom in that sense is properly defined by the non-existence of forces that might confine it, by the absence of any restrictions against it and not the presence of prescribed ends towards which it should be aimed. Those to whom it is attributed are directed nowhere in particular; quite the contrary, others are enjoined not to harm them or stand in their way.

It is true that for nearly all liberal thinkers a rule of law is acknowledged to be indispensable to the enjoyment of such freedom, in that it establishes where the frontiers of individual liberty lie and protects each person's freedom from infringement by everyone else. But in its enforcement, the rule of law can only preserve liberty and does not itself create or promote it. Since by their very nature laws set limits to the enjoyment of freedom, men in society are most free, as Hobbes imagined, when the rule of law is most effective but the laws themselves remain most reticent

about what men may do. Because he defined liberty in terms of the outspoken making of laws rather than in the context of their general silence—because he thought it prevailed under the very constraints imposed by a legal system—Rousseau, it is claimed, did not hold to this conception of freedom.

His alleged failure to safeguard personal rights and interests from state interference has also not endeared him to most liberals. It is precisely on account of their fundamental concern with the demarcations between us rather than with the activities we pursue within those bounds that liberals are so anxious to preserve the distinction between our private and public domains which Rousseau's political doctrine is seen to have undermined. Here again Hobbes laid the foundation for this principle of liberalism, above all, perhaps, in his contention that the ancient Greeks and Romans and their followers had adopted a confusing concept of liberty in associating it with the commonwealth as a whole rather than with the relations between particular men within it.<sup>4</sup> Under the classical liberal formulations of such thinkers as von Humboldt, Constant and John Stuart Mill, the liberty of particular men has come to require the protection of their individual affairs and aspirations from state or social control. But in extolling the merits of so-called civil liberty under the rule of an absolute sovereign, Rousseau, it is so often alleged, sought to submerge all that makes us different from one another under a fictitious liberty of the commonwealth which true liberals decry. More than any other complaint, this anxiety underlies most liberals' mistrust of his doctrine. Committed as they are to the liberties of separate individuals pursuing diverse personal initiatives, they show little sympathy for Rousseau's apparent confusion of liberty with public engagement and social solidarity. Even under regimes of popular self-rule of the kind he prescribed, it is not the liberty of particular men that prevails but the illiberal rule of each person by all the rest. Never mind Rousseau's contention that in our political institutions we have already fabricated such a world; according to his liberal critics, this is what his doctrine entails.

Of course such misgivings about Rousseau's doctrine are not shared by all liberal interpreters of his political thought. Robert Derathé, the most distinguished of contemporary commentators, has stressed the importance of the safeguards for individual liberty against the exercise of sovereign power that Rousseau introduced in his writings,<sup>5</sup> and which have been overlooked by so many of his critics, while other scholars have even attempted to restore Rousseau to his rightful place near the pinnacle of classical liberal thought, from whose principles some modern pretenders have been seen to renege.<sup>6</sup> If only for the good reason that I believe they generally provide more accurate readings of Rousseau's works than do the denigrators of his totalitarianism, I do not intend to challenge

these perspectives here, except perhaps for such oversights as stem from the company in which they have thought fit to re-introduce Rousseau, now that their interpretations show him to have really been on his best behaviour. In attempting to dissociate his remarks about liberty from the history of liberalism, I mean to show that liberal adumbrations of his ideas have as a rule departed from their actual meanings, and indeed that Rousseau may be portrayed as hostile to freedom only against a canvas from which the widely shared conceptions of liberty he inherited, employed, and refined before the advent of liberalism, have been wiped out.

Hobbes, I believe, was quite right to remark upon the absence of his own idea of liberty from both ancient and modern political thought. But to accept the originality of his perspective on this subject is tantamount to admitting that other uses of the term which he and his followers have rejected may be more orthodox than the meanings they have stipulated and prefer. Liberals have shown themselves to be remarkably tolerant about most matters apart from the definition of liberty, and yet before Hobbes, and in his own day, and with Rousseau later, liberty was conceived as having a quite different sense from 'the absence of external impediments' and 'the silence of the law' as applied to particular men rather than to commonwealths as a whole.

Contemporary scholars have come to agree with Hobbes that the ancient Greeks did not share the definition of liberty which he supposed to be uniquely correct. Herodotus showed no hesitation in ascribing the term *eleutheroi*—free men—to the Greeks in general, whose liberty he contrasted with the tyranny of Persian government; nor did Thucydides doubt that Athenians owed their greatness over Sparta to the liberty of their *polis* as a whole. Even when Plato and Aristotle condemned the excesses and abuses of individual liberty, they perceived it as engendered under democratic constitutions and not just as a matter of the unfettered relations of particular men. For Hobbes the idea of a free state meant no more than its lack of subjection to alien rule; for the Greeks it had everything to do with the quality of life of politically autonomous citizens. Whereas for liberals the idea of freedom has come to be divorced from that of democracy, the Greeks had no conception of liberty without it; while for liberals we are free when left by the state to ourselves, for the Greeks we were most free when as political agents we took common part in the deliberations of public affairs.

If for the ancient Greeks liberty meant democratic self-rule above all, for the Romans the idea was connected more closely still with the obligations of law. *Libertas est potestas faciendi quod jure liceat* was a commonplace of the Roman Republic, as Maurice Cranston has observed.<sup>7</sup> To be *liber*—free from paternal control—was at the same time to be *civis*—civilized for political life, so that the acquisition of citizenship and liberty

went hand in hand. Hobbes was later to oppose liberty and law, but lawlessness was defined by the Romans not as *libertas* but *licentia*, a distinction appropriated by Locke in his own conception of natural liberty, so different in turn from that of Hobbes.

Machiavelli of course drew most of his account of liberty from Roman Republican sources, specially emphasizing the need for a patriotic spirit and the public devotion of a free people bearing its own arms. Such was enough to try the patience of Hobbes yet again, who dismissed Machiavelli with the same stroke as had swept away the ancient Greeks and Romans, for neglecting the liberty of particular men.<sup>8</sup> Among Hobbes's contemporaries, moreover, perhaps the most systematic political philosopher was Spinoza, who defined true liberty as the guidance of reason which overcame our enslavement to passion. This was hardly an original notion, since it had been central to ancient Greek, Roman and Christian accounts of the human will and the nature of self-determination, which Rousseau was also to recapitulate in a wholly familiar terminology in the next century. But the idea of freedom of the will, so crucial to that tradition, was similarly rejected by Hobbes, for whom the postulate of slavery to one's passions, that is, subjection to internal impediments, was nonsense. Hobbes may have been right on every point that he raised against both ancient and modern thinkers, but his Procrustean disposal of Western political thought hardly left a single unmutated bedfellow with whom he might share his concept, and it is therefore at least odd that liberals should have adopted his definition of liberty as if it were central to all meanings of the term.

I leave aside Marxist, so-called New Liberal, and other more recent conceptions of liberty which have been similarly judged an abuse of language, but before I move on to those elements of Rousseau's account of freedom which are most strikingly his own, I think it is worth noting that his doctrine, unlike that of Hobbes, contains so many commonplace and familiar features. Rousseau's reflections on liberty in the light of autonomy, democracy, political engagement, citizenship, patriotism, the rule of law, the bearing of arms, and subjection to reason, were the stock-in-trade of most definitions of liberty, apart from those stipulated by Hobbes, up to his own day. Why, then, has his conception of liberty been judged so illiberal?

One historical reason above all others, I believe, underlies this charge against him—and that is the influence which his ideas allegedly exercised upon the French Revolution. Liberalism as a political doctrine has been traced to a variety of sources, including Greek democracy, the Protestant Reformation, modern constitutionalism and *laissez-faire* political economy, as against Oriental or Papal despotism, royal or mercantilist absolut-

ism, and much else besides. I have here instead stressed the contribution of Hobbes, simply because I believe that his philosophy enunciates the theoretical foundations of liberalism in the framework which has most characteristically shaped its language since the turn of the nineteenth century. It may appear strange that Hobbes—the pre-eminent theorist of absolute sovereignty—should have played as crucial a part in the conception of liberalism as Rousseau—the foremost theorist of liberty—has played in its apparent betrayal; but it seems to me that both figures, of whom neither was a liberal, have had a decisive impact upon the course of its history, the one by way of originally articulating its central ideas, the other by bearing its severest censure.

As a political ideology liberalism is of course as absent from the periods in which Hobbes and Rousseau lived as it is alien to their writings. Not only did the words 'liberal' and 'liberalism' first appear in European political discourse around the beginning of the nineteenth century, but the peculiar terminology of liberal doctrines which we have come to inherit from von Humboldt, Constant, and later John Stuart Mill, as well as others, may be distinguished from earlier languages of liberty along just those lines that Hobbes had stipulated as uniquely correct. Hobbes's contention that the Greeks and Romans and their modern disciples had failed to address themselves to the liberty of particular men was recapitulated by liberal thinkers of the early nineteenth century in their focus upon the private liberty of individuals as against the allegedly false doctrine that freedom could be achieved through our shared subjection to the community. For Constant, no less than for Hobbes, this plain contrast marked the difference between what he termed 'ancient liberty' and 'modern liberty'. On his interpretation, any idea of collective liberty as realized through democracy, political legislation, or the institution of popular sovereignty, at least in the context of modern society, was a dangerous sham.<sup>9</sup>

Just such a confusion of real liberty with despotism was unearthed by Constant as an implication of Rousseau's thought, which in Constant's own lifetime had given rise to the worst excesses of Jacobin tyranny, upheld in the name of the people's freedom. It has today become fashionable to follow Jacob Talmon in attributing to Rousseau the first principles of totalitarian democracy,<sup>10</sup> but we too often forget that much the same charge had already been made against Rousseau in the course of the French Revolution, once the Jacobins had been deposed. Of course this imputed influence of Rousseau upon the Revolution by early liberals is hardly surprising, both in the light of the immense intellectual debt which the Jacobins and other revolutionaries professed to owe to him, and on account of the fact that for most major nineteenth-century thinkers—Hegel, Marx and Proudhon, for instance, as well as Constant—the authentic

voice of Rousseau was actually that of Rousseauism, with his meaning thus in effect distilled from his interpreters' assessments of a revolution which, it was taken for granted, he had inspired.

This is not the place to pursue the details of that strange saga in the history of political theory and practice, and I shall not even attempt to disengage what I take to be Rousseau's meaning from his revolutionary influence, however much it should be stressed that he in fact recoiled from any actual revolution he anticipated, and claimed that the liberty of the whole of humanity could not justify shedding the blood of a single man.<sup>11</sup> My point here is rather to emphasize that the modern political doctrine of liberalism first took shape around the perceived judgement, confirmed by Jacobin despotism, that Rousseau had defined freedom wrongly.<sup>12</sup> The Revolution had shown that liberty and popular sovereignty could not go hand in hand. Thereafter, no defence of liberty other than in terms of the private life of unregulated individuals could be acknowledged as truly liberal. Rousseau has become the enemy of freedom just because the triumph of his ideas in practice was held to have destroyed the only form of liberty which liberals judge worthy of the name.

## II

Such misconceptions have strayed from Rousseau's political doctrine almost as far as it is possible to go. Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the critique of his illiberalism has been its utter neglect of the central theme of all his writings—that is, his constant lament that while Nature has made us happy and good, in society we have made ourselves miserable and depraved. This continual refrain, this guiding principle which he tells us informed all his major works,<sup>13</sup> has been wholly ignored by those who have instead resolved on his behalf to fix his gaze upon a vision of mankind's liberated future which they then judge unsatisfactory. In his own lifetime and before the Revolution it was Rousseau's philosophy of history, his bitter attack upon the trappings of civilization and culture, which at once excited most of his radical admirers and at the same time estranged him from both the *philosophes* and the religious and political establishments of his day. Only in the Revolution and afterwards did the attention of disciples and critics alike come to be focused instead upon his theory of our political redemption, in which our liberty might be achieved through membership of a sovereign assembly. The significance of this oversight by his detractors can scarcely be exaggerated, since the idea of liberty allied most closely to his principal doctrine is in fact not that which persons might somehow gain or regain in political life but rather the liberty they have lost in becoming subject to the laws.

In his *Discourse on the Arts and Sciences*, with which he effectively burst upon the literary world of the Enlightenment, Rousseau charged that civilization had been the bane of humanity and that men in society had forsaken, as he put it, 'that original liberty for which they seem to have been born' (OC, vol. 3, p. 7 [DSA 6]). It is this deprivation of the freedom for which we had been born that in Rousseau's philosophy marked our passage from nature to culture and our enslavement in the stultifying social world we had constructed. In his *Discourse on Inequality* he developed that proposition largely in terms of the subjugation of our freedom attributable to private property and all the morally pernicious institutions and forms of government built upon such a miserable base. Liberty, he exclaimed there, was an essential gift of Nature, which men possessed by virtue of their humanity alone (OC, vol. 3, p. 184 [DI 179])—an attribute which thus could only be impaired and not fulfilled through our civil and political undertakings. In his *Essay on the Origin of Languages* he put forward much the same thesis in terms of the corruption of our speech that had occurred in the course of our social history, as modern languages, increasingly devoid of their original musical inflexion, had rendered those who spoke them progressively more passive, servile and unfree. These themes recur throughout Rousseau's works and lie very near the heart of most of them. However sharp was the contrast between his own account of the state of nature and that of Hobbes, he certainly agreed with Hobbes that our fundamental liberty was to be found there, and not under the political hegemony of any sovereign's rule.

As distinct from Hobbes, however, Rousseau is alleged by his liberal critics to have believed in an illusory form of freedom which was realized when men were bound by civil laws or 'artificial chains', as Hobbes described them. That illusion of freedom can indeed be found in Rousseau's doctrine, but only because it is explicit in his argument, in his claim that civil society was fabricated from it. In the course of our history, he contended, we have made ourselves slaves just because we have been credulous, running 'headlong into our chains', he remarked, 'supposing that we had ensured our freedom' (*Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 177 [DI 173]). How else could we have accepted the yoke of despotism but because it had been wrapped around us like a mantle of justice? In a passage of an essay entitled 'On the State of War', devoted largely to an attack upon what he termed 'the horrible system of Hobbes', Rousseau developed this theme most emphatically. 'I open books of law and morality', he wrote:

I listen to wise men and jurists and, moved by their penetrating words, I deplore the miseries of nature, I admire the peace and justice established by the civil order, I bless the wisdom of public institutions and take comfort



that I am a man in seeing myself a citizen. Well instructed in my duties and my happiness, I shut the book, leave the class, and what do I see outside? I see unfortunate people trembling under an iron yoke, the whole of humanity crushed by a handful of oppressors, a starving multitude racked by pain and hunger, of whom the rich peacefully lap up the blood and tears, and throughout the world nothing but the strong holding sway over the weak, armed with the redoubtable strength of the laws. (OC, vol. 3, pp. 608–10)

Such lines, so characteristic of Rousseau's conception of the liberty we have lost, do not figure prominently in the canon of his illiberalism. Yet, in his view, it was only because men thought their artificial chains had made them free that these self-inflicted shackles kept them in their place.

More than any other thinker before, and certainly more than any liberal philosopher after him, Rousseau developed his account of our illusory freedom across the whole spectrum of social and cultural life. His conception of private property as the crucial institution marking our long passage from the natural to the civil state of course raised an economic dimension of striking significance in his political thought, addressed as it was to the class origins of different constitutions and the perpetual conflict, at least of interest, between rich and poor. So strong was the link he perceived between inequalities of wealth and deprivations of freedom (in effect between poverty and slavery) that we might even with some justice ascribe to Rousseau an economic theory of history, indeed a theory of economic determinism, according to which our political systems were shaped by forces of a still more fundamental kind.<sup>14</sup> But we must bear in mind that even in his account of private property Rousseau placed greatest emphasis upon the cunning eloquence of those who claimed that right, and on the foolishness of persons so readily beguiled. Rhetoric, persuasion and deception were as central to his account of how we had ensnared ourselves as was the institution of private property, established through the manipulation and abuse of language. In a sense, language—the medium of our conjugation—was for Rousseau the main instrument of our subjugation as well, since from the linguistic base of our specification of terms stemmed the moral emblems of our specialization of roles, and ultimately the fixation of social man in an abstract world of his own making.

Rousseau's whole theory of culture, moreover, reinforces, elaborates and embellishes this conception of the illusory bonds under which political slavery masquerades as freedom. Our arts, letters and sciences, he remarked in his first *Discourse*, are but 'garlands of flowers round the iron chains by which men are weighed down' (OC, vol. 3, p. 7 [DSA 6]). Contemporary theatre, he complained in his *Letter to d'Alembert*, not only made an adornment of the most terrible vices but also promoted and

increased the inequality of fortunes, which is incompatible with the preservation of liberty.<sup>15</sup> Music, displaced from its springs of poetry and melody, he lamented in his *Essay on the Origin of Languages*, has become a collection of artificial scales and listless harmonies, echoed in speech by the prosaic rhetoric of mountebank kings and charlatan priests.<sup>16</sup> Just as in society we have come to be enmeshed within hierarchical moral relations, so in music we have become enthralled by the calculation of harmonic intervals, each measuring the loss of our independence under artificial chains more insidious than any imagined by Hobbes, each a proof of the strength of our illusions and the captivating power of the instruments of our captivity. When liberals decry Rousseau's commitment to an uplifting form of positive liberty that threatens our true freedom, they forget how profoundly negative was his philosophy of history, according to which our liberty had been lost already. Others might suppose that individuals gained their freedom as society developed and its arts and sciences were perfected. For Rousseau every stride in the apparent advance of civilization had in reality been a step towards the decrepitude of our species and the alienation of our fundamental liberty (*Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 171 [DI 167]).

Of course, it must be remembered that his idea of natural liberty was in an important sense illusory as well, in so far as mankind never actually inhabited the innocent pristine state in which such liberty could be enjoyed. According to Rousseau's philosophy, in order to get at the truth it was often necessary to lay the facts aside, as he remarked himself, and even though we must not exaggerate this distinction, since he drew much of the evidence for his portrait of primitive man from the available historical record of our origins, it remains the case that the state of nature he conceived was a fiction. There could therefore be no point in our attempting to return to it, he noted in a long discussion on the subject in his *Discourse on Inequality* (n. 9, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 202–08 [DI 197–204]); there was no sense in our trying to recover the merely hypothetical freedom he had ascribed to mankind in that state. Critics, who believe that in his political doctrine Rousseau sought to re-establish the independence from one another which we had lost, rather neglect this feature of his thought, and they also overlook his repeated claims that in political society man's nature is transformed.<sup>17</sup> With duty substituted for instinct as our guide, Rousseau observed, our constitution is altered, and our lives are reshaped. Good social institutions do not fulfil human nature but instead *denature* man, depriving him of the wholeness of his physical existence in exchange for a moral existence that is relative and partial.<sup>18</sup> For these very reasons Rousseau's liberal critics have been wrong to locate his fundamental account of freedom in the state. The liberty that was most expressive of human nature in his philosophy could not be gained or restored in a new

form under the institutions he described in the *Social Contract*. Nowhere did he map out a programme for the political redemption of our freedom, made progressively more remote from our grasp as civilization and society advanced relentlessly towards our subjection.

Indeed, it is almost everywhere else apart from in his political writings that we find Rousseau longing for and attempting to preserve that fragile independence of the human spirit that in the modern world was at least akin to natural liberty. A passionate desire to find freedom informed his botanical communion with Nature in his later years, when the company of other men had become so burdensome to him. Earlier it had inspired his disenchantment with much of the Enlightenment establishment, from whose dark and oppressive influence he had sought refuge in his escape from Paris. Rousseau's uncompromising (if eventually unsuccessful) determination to refuse the pensions that were offered to him, his contempt for urban artifice and culture and his love of the open sky outside the closed city—indeed, the whole of his life, and most of its crises—were inspired by the profoundest expression of the human craving for freedom recorded in Western literature. It is true that many of his works were also emblazoned with the signature 'Citizen of Geneva', and I shall presently return to this proclamation and to its place in his account of liberty. But let us not forget that Rousseau's republican identity was of briefer duration, and brought him less untrammelled joy, than this essentially solitary dreamer's life-long rapture in ecstatic love of Nature. 'I was never really fit for civil society', he wrote with weary resignation in his *Reveries*, his last major work.

My natural independence always left me incapable of the thralldom necessary for anyone who wishes to live among men. . . . As soon as I feel the yoke, either of necessity or of men . . . I am nothing. . . . I had never thought that the liberty of man consists in doing what he wishes, but rather in not doing that which he does not wish. (*Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, Sixième promenade, in OC, vol. 1, p. 1059 [R 103–04])

Critics who find Rousseau so hostile to real freedom are too inattentive to these features of his life and thought. And yet they herald much of the spirit of a dawning age of Romanticism, from which modern liberals have in fact borrowed more of their vocabulary of personal negative liberty than they nowadays admit, even while contrasting its language with that pernicious conception of liberty they instead impute to him.

If there is one work which more than any other expresses Rousseau's fullest account of negative liberty, it must surely be *Emile*. 'The first of all goods', Rousseau remarked there, 'is not authority but freedom' (*Emile* II, in OC, vol. 4, p. 309 [E 84]). It is in vain that we seek to find liberty associated with the laws, he continued, since 'liberty does not exist under

any form of government [but] only in the heart of the free man' (*Emile* V, in OC, vol. 4, p. 857 [E 473]). The whole purpose of the tutor's education of the child in that text was to subvert and retard, as far as possible, the development of those relations of mutual dependence which in society have rendered us unfree, for such reasons as Rousseau had already explained in his *Discourse on Inequality*. 'There are two kinds of dependence', he now argued, in one of the work's more celebrated passages:

Dependence on things, which is natural, [and] that on men, which is due to society. Dependence on things, having no morality, does no harm to liberty and engenders no vices. Dependence on men, being disordered, engenders them all, and it is because of them that master and slave mutually deprave one another. . . . Keep the child in dependence on things alone; you will have followed the order of nature in the course of its education.<sup>19</sup>

The child, born free like savage man, must be protected from the social bonds that ineluctably debase the savage's nature and destroy his freedom. Unlike our primitive forebears, who were enticed to plunge headlong into their chains, Emile is encouraged to improve his robust faculties spontaneously and without the contamination of others, until he has gained sufficient strength, with the late blossoming of his reason, to confront the tribulations of life in society. If the *Social Contract* recounts the terms required for savage man's political metamorphosis into a citizen, *Emile* offers instead an education according to nature, in which the original passions and attributes of the child—not least its sexuality—are brought to fruition, each in his good time. To control their nature, as citizens are required to do, is to reform the work of God, to undo, as Rousseau put it in *Emile*, what God had inscribed at the bottom of each person's heart (*Emile* IV, in OC, vol. 4, p. 491 [E 212]). The fundamental task of Emile's tutor, then, is to avert society's reformation of God's work. He must, wrote Rousseau, provide his pupil with an education that is at first 'purely negative' (*Emile* II, in OC, vol. 4, p. 323 [E 93]), rather along the isolationist lines of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* than the consolidating paths of Plato's *Republic*.<sup>20</sup>

Critics<sup>21</sup> have of course not been slow to observe that in undoing the oppressive handiwork of society, Emile's tutor often appears to exercise God's powers himself, and there are certainly some extraordinary passages in the text in which Rousseau speaks of the subjection of Emile to his tutor, in that while acting under the belief that he is master of his will, he yet finds that all his wishes coincide with those of his tutor on his behalf.<sup>22</sup> How the tutor's manipulation of Emile's world establishes his dependence upon things and not upon man is a problem to which I believe Rousseau provides an inadequate answer. But if we are persuaded that herein lies the seeds of his programme of totalitarian indoctrination,

we might pause for a moment to consider how inept must be a social system built upon that programme, according to which each child must be kept away from all others by a single tutor who devotes much of his own life to the task, only to find, in due course, that his charge is unfit for both political and domestic responsibilities, and, following the infidelity of his wife, becomes a vagabond, and then a slave to pirates, perhaps even ending his days on a desert island.<sup>23</sup> Notwithstanding all the numerous claims about Rousseau's insidious influence, *Emile* hardly offers the stuff of which Hitler might have been a proud follower.

In their neglect of his philosophy of history, perhaps the most striking of his critics' omissions is the very definition of our fundamental liberty which Rousseau put forward. For the freedom we had suppressed, he believed, was no uplifting principle of public virtue but only a faint distinction between savage man and beast. All other creatures, he remarked in the *Discourse on Inequality*, behaved as their instincts impelled them to do, while we alone, even in our original state, must have been the authors of our actions, as we came to terms with each situation in a manner free from Nature's control. It was therefore because we lacked a set of prescribed responses to our natural drives rather than because we were endowed with any positive traits unique to our species that, according to Rousseau, we must always have enjoyed a prospect of development—in due course out of the state of nature and into another of our own making—which animals did not share.<sup>24</sup>

This idea of liberty as a merely inchoate trait distinguishing man from beast is perhaps the most remarkably negative conception of freedom in Western social and political thought.<sup>25</sup> In Rousseau's philosophy it was linked to no substantive goal or desirable end of any sort, being without a determinant moral content such as critics have judged to be the principal illiberal characteristic of his doctrine in general. Quite the contrary, Rousseau's conception of our natural liberty was at least partly designed to show how other accounts of freedom were inadequate just because they were not negative enough, a thesis which he developed above all, once again, in reply to Hobbes, whose reflections on this subject he found wanting for two reasons.

First, Hobbes had failed to grasp the fact, so central to our plight, as Rousseau understood it, that men may render themselves subject to internal impediments, which, in their operation upon the human spirit, were no less a constraint upon their freedom than shackles round their wrists or threats to box their ears. Any suggestion that we might be or become slaves to our passions was as absurd for Hobbes as the correlative idea of a disembodied freedom of the will, but freedom of the will and the absence of human slavery to innate passions were for Rousseau crucial to

that otherwise scarcely perceptible *differentia* between man and beast. If we were not at least capable of being the agents of what we did, if it was only our appetites and aversions that moved us, then our lives were just a succession of events that happened to us, lacking all merit, vice or perfectibility, with each member of our species trapped in the same changeless world as all the others. Without free will, he supposed, both morality and human history were impossible. In his opposition to Hobbes on this point, Rousseau's view that our distinctive qualities were not wholly explicable with reference to natural causes or impulsions comes to much the same verdict as Isaiah Berlin's contention in 'Historical Inevitability' that if determinism were true then we would not be free to act in a morally responsible way.<sup>26</sup> No less than for Berlin in his understanding of moral agency, for Rousseau the language of free will lay at the heart of our ordinary perception of social relations—with this difference, of course, that according to Rousseau our history bore witness to our becoming slaves to new passions, that is, to the fundamental and ever worsening abuse of our liberty, rather than, as for Berlin, to diverse cases of its exercise for better or worse.

Less controversial, perhaps, is what I take to be Rousseau's second reason for regarding Hobbes's conception of liberty as insufficiently negative, and this was that Hobbes had drawn too complex a picture of human nature in support of his belief that the freedom of each person was imperilled by that of all his neighbours. In ascribing certain socially developed characteristics of our lives, such as the pursuit of power and glory, to humanity in general, Hobbes had wrongly supposed that masterless men were naturally in need of a commonwealth for protection. This is to say that he found fault with human nature mainly because, in Rousseau's terminology, he mistook *amour propre* for *amour de soi*, imagining that we cared for ourselves at the expense of others rather than without regard to them. Much the same error, moreover, was held by Rousseau to be a common failing of most philosophies of natural law and the social contract, including those of Grotius, Locke and Pufendorf, who attributed rather more benign qualities or principles, such as a sense of justice or a right of property, to mankind in the state of nature. All such thinkers had failed to strip away our social traits from their postulates about the essence of the human race as a whole; according to Rousseau, they had confused our acquired attributes with what was fundamental to our constitution.

Yet in their focus upon his unduly collectivist conception of liberty, critics of Rousseau's illiberalism (I must stress once more) forget that he claimed time and again that it was just because we had already made ourselves social that we had forsaken our freedom. While savage man lives within himself, Rousseau remarked, 'sociable man, always outside

himself, only knows how to live in the opinions of others'.<sup>27</sup> Our natural integrity, and with it our freedom from one another, had been lost just because we had come to value ourselves in the light of qualities we imagined that others judged worthy of esteem. Rousseau agreed with Hobbes that the natural life of man must have been solitary, but it could only have become poor, nasty, brutish and short when subject to the fears and aspirations of a social world we did not at first inhabit. The more negative our approach to an understanding of human nature, the less negative, or at any rate, the less defective, appears the state of nature we uncover.

As is well known, Rousseau believed that civil society must originally have been founded when men, already socialized by vice, attempted to obtain Locke's political warrant for the morally pernicious institution of private property, which in turn must have occasioned Hobbes's vile state of war, fought over the distribution of property. Rather like the debauched protagonists of the Marquis de Sade's *The New Justine*, the so-called natural men portrayed first by Locke and then Hobbes might well have said of themselves, 'No sooner did we commit a horror than we sought to legitimate it'.<sup>28</sup> These two thinkers and others had inadvertently drawn an accurate picture of the state of civil society, supposing it to be a description of the state of nature, for the vices in need of remedy which they depicted were not those of our original constitution but rather those that stemmed from the very social systems they commended to us. According to Rousseau, in short, Hobbes and Locke had conceived their ideas as solutions to some problems of which those solutions were in fact the cause.<sup>29</sup>

Liberal thinkers since the end of the eighteenth century have largely inherited Hobbes's and Locke's concern with inviolable frontiers, safeguards and barriers between persons; but that is because their philosophies continue to be imbued with many of the assumptions about our essential motives, fears and desires that Rousseau believed his social contract precursors had confused for natural traits. To that extent their views of human nature are overburdened with the weight of attributes they believe universally characteristic of mankind; and, tied to these encumbrances, they stand apart from Rousseau's emptier, more formal, more strictly negative conception of our distinguishing behavioural traits—unique only because, in his view, they are uncontrolled by instincts. Paradoxically, again, it is at least some of the doctrines of negative liberty so often contrasted with his allegedly positive idea which in contemporary political thought constitute the prevailing forms of 'the retreat to the inner citadel', as Berlin has termed it. In the light of the argument Rousseau himself presents, we could only retreat to citadels we had already taken the trouble to construct, and we were only prompted to seek sanctuary there because we had contrived to make enemies outside.



## III

I suspect that few of these comments about Rousseau's conception of negative liberty will be thought pertinent by those who deplore his philosophy of illiberalism and who may be impatient for me to get to the real point, which is the place of liberty in his specifically political doctrine. It might at first appear that his prescriptive writings must be ill-suited to a philosophy of history which charts the course of human corruption, or at least that his vision of our transformation into free citizens can have little in common with his account of our lost natural liberty. Yet Rousseau's political writings are of crucial significance to his reflections on the human condition in general, inspired as they all are by the proposition he enunciated in his *Confessions* and elsewhere, that everything depends ultimately upon politics and that the character of a people is invariably shaped by its government.<sup>30</sup> That claim about the central determinant of the ways we live underlies Rousseau's account of virtue as well as of vice, and it is scarcely possible for an interpretation of his ethics to stray far from it. Just the same, it is important that we recognize the fact that so many themes of Rousseau's political theory of freedom have a more settled place in the familiar galaxy of great doctrines than do his philosophies of nature and history.

I have already noted the marked differences between Rousseau's programme of natural education in *Emile* and Plato's scheme of public instruction in the *Republic*; and yet perhaps no work by a major modern political theorist more closely follows the *Republic* than Rousseau's *Considerations on the Government of Poland*. Here Rousseau speaks of the solitary individual as nothing, and of the love of his country as forming the whole existence of the citizen (OC, vol. 3, p. 966 [P 189]). How is it possible, asked Rousseau, to stir the hearts of a free people and to make them love their fatherland and its laws? 'Dare I say it?', he replied. 'Through children's games' (OC, vol. 3, p. 955 [P 179]): through a national system of public education, appropriate only to free men, binding them to a common existence under the law.<sup>31</sup> I doubt if any other text of Rousseau, moreover, bears the imprint of Machiavelli's influence more conspicuously than does his *Discourse on Political Economy*. 'The fatherland cannot exist without liberty', he wrote there, 'nor liberty without virtue, nor virtue without citizens'.

Without them you will have nothing but degraded slaves, beginning with the rulers of the state. . . . If men could be accustomed early to regard their individuality . . . just as a part of the state, they could at length come to identify themselves . . . with this greater whole, to feel themselves members of the



country, and to love it with that exquisite feeling which men in isolation have only for themselves. (OC, vol. 3, p. 259 [PE 20])

It would be difficult, furthermore, to find in any pre-eminent political treatise an idea of liberty more conspicuously indebted to that of Montesquieu than this passage from Rousseau's *Social Contract*: 'Liberty', Rousseau remarked, 'is not the fruit of all climates, nor within the grasp of all peoples'. The difference between free states and monarchies lies in the fact that in the one all are devoted to the common good, while in the other subjects are made miserable in order for despotism to reign (*Social Contract* III.8, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 414, 415 [SC 100, 101]). In each of these statements, and many others like them, Rousseau appears to have set aside what Hobbes termed the liberty of particular men and to have addressed himself instead to the liberty of the commonwealth as a whole. But while his concern with citizenship, obedience to the laws, and the public domain in general shows how he identified freedom differently from most liberals, these features of his doctrine nevertheless stand him in good company among many illustrious predecessors of other persuasions. They form a part, but not a peculiarly original part, of the tradition of positive liberty which liberals decry.

Of course Rousseau seems sometimes to have invited special criticism for his pains, when, as for instance in the *Social Contract* once more, he contrasted lowly natural liberty with ennobling civil and moral liberty: the one now identified, in apparent contradiction with the *Discourse on Inequality*, as mere slavery to one's passions; the others as intelligent self-mastery, limited by the general will.<sup>32</sup> 'People have vainly attempted to confuse liberty with independence', but, he added in his *Letters from the Mountain*,

These two things are so different that they exclude one another. When everyone does what he pleases he often does what displeases others, and that cannot be called a free state. . . . In the common liberty no one has the right to do what the liberty of another forbids him. . . . Liberty without justice is a veritable contradiction. (*Lettres de la montagne*, Huitième Lettre, in OC, vol. 3, p. 841–42 [LWM 261])

Passages such as these have prompted Rousseau's liberal critics to observe that his political philosophy betrays the faith in freedom he so disingenuously proclaimed. Lester Crocker, the most distinguished, learned and prolific of Rousseau's modern detractors has no doubt that real liberty is 'swallowed up' by his 'collective monolith', the 'all-devouring general will'. Throughout his writings, suggests Crocker, we find Rousseau promoting the 'destruction of privacy' under systems of 'control and manipulation'.<sup>33</sup> In his doctrine of civil and moral liberty, therefore, according to

which men are denatured and *made* free, lies the germ of what is perceived by liberals to be the repressive rule of totalitarian politics. But what is it about that doctrine which distinguishes Rousseau from other collectivists, so that only he incurs such wrath?

I have already suggested that the main reason for this has to do with his assimilation of liberty to popular sovereignty, a link discredited in both theory and practice under the Jacobin dictatorship of the French Revolution. That point bears re-emphasis, and its significance requires further attention, since the conjunction of liberty with sovereignty forms an original theme in his writings (indeed, a major innovation in the history of political thought) which sets Rousseau apart even from Plato, Machiavelli, Montesquieu and others, who like him were concerned with political and not just personal liberty. Prior to its use in his philosophy, the concept of sovereignty had been connected by its interpreters with the idea of force, power or empire, and it generally pertained to the dominion of kings or other governors over their subjects rather than to citizens' freedom. For both Bodin and—yet again—Hobbes, in particular (the best-known advocates of absolute sovereignty before Rousseau) the terms 'souveraineté' or 'sovereignty' were derived from the Latin *summam potestatem* or *summum imperium*, which defined the prevailing, that is to say, unequalled, power of the ruler. For Rousseau, by contrast, the idea of sovereignty was essentially a principle of equality, which identified the ruled element, or the subjects themselves, as the supreme authority, and it was connected with the concepts of will or right rather than force or power: it expressed 'le moral' of politics and not 'le physique', a most fundamental distinction in his philosophy, on which I shall comment presently. But I believe it is just because of his innovative association of an altogether unlikely pair of terms—'liberty', as drawn from an ancient republican tradition with emphasis on self-rule, and 'sovereignty', from a modern absolutist ideology addressed to the need for predominating power—which prompts liberal critics to judge his doctrine to be more sinister than any other collectivist conception of freedom. How can absolute force and perfect liberty possibly go hand in hand? To be 'forced to be free', to achieve one's liberty under the constraint of the whole body politic, as Rousseau stipulated in one of the most famous passages of the *Social Contract* (I.7, in OC, vol. 3, p. 364 [SC 53]), seems the vilest deception imaginable from a man pretending to be liberty's truest friend. Small wonder, then, that Rousseau perceived as so splendid and just the inscription of the word '*Libertas*' on the prisons and fetters of the galleys of the city of Genoa. 'It is only evil-doers of all states', he observed in a footnote of his *Social Contract* (IV.2, in OC, vol. 3, p. 440 n. 2 [SC 124 n. 2]), 'who prevent the citizen from being free. In a country where all such men were in the galleys, one would enjoy the most perfect liberty'. As Hobbes had

already remarked, 'It is an easy thing, for men to be deceived, by the specious name of liberty' (*Leviathan*, ch. 21, p. 140), evidenced, in his case, by the meaningless inscription of the word '*Libertas*' on the turrets of the city of Lucca.

Against this hostile construction of Rousseau's doctrine, many of his sympathetic readers have in recent years adopted a point of view, best developed by Robert Derathé, to the effect that the absolute power he attributed to the sovereign was none the less circumscribed by natural law. Several notable passages in his writings confirm that he did indeed conceive the sovereign to be subject to a higher moral principle;<sup>34</sup> but it is not clear how Rousseau's invocation of natural law was designed to protect the freedom of individuals from absolute rule, and, as Maurice Cranston has noted,<sup>35</sup> there seems to be no hint of this constraint in the *Social Contract* itself, whose account of popular sovereignty has been the focus of most objections to his political thought.

What his liberal critics have all too commonly failed to grasp, in my view, is not so much an overriding theory of natural law but rather the very concept of absolute sovereignty they deem a threat to the exercise of our real freedom. For Rousseau defined popular sovereignty in such a way as to exclude precisely the infliction of that harm to persons which his theory is alleged to justify. The absolute authority of the sovereign, he wrote, must both come from all and apply to all (*Contrat social* II.4, in OC, vol. 3, p. 373 [SC 61]). The voice of the general will which it enacts cannot pronounce on individuals without forfeiting its own legitimacy, since it articulates in laws the common interest of every citizen, whereas the exercise of force over disparate persons is reserved exclusively for a nation's government. Rousseau's sovereign never implements its own laws and never punishes transgressors against it (see the *Contrat social* II.5 and III.1, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 377 and 397 [SC 65, 83–84]) nor indeed forces anyone to be free. In a richly perceptive reading of the remark about enforced freedom, John Plamenatz has suggested that it is inspired by Rousseau's understanding of how men come to discipline themselves and feel at once thwarted and liberated in their performance of duty.<sup>36</sup> Yet even if we allow that Rousseau actually speaks of the force over a person which may be exercised on behalf of the whole body politic and not just a compulsion an individual places over himself, it still does not follow that this force is wielded on command of the sovereign.

More than any other major political theorist before or after him Rousseau distinguished 'right' from 'power', the formulation of principle from its application (in this context the moral will which determines laws from the physical force that implements them) by placing each in different hands, here respectively, the legislative power and the executive power. I shall return to that theme about moral will and physical force, and to its

overall bearing on Rousseau's conception of liberty, in my final section; but it is worth stressing just now how much we owe our appreciation of the fundamental contrast between force and freedom in human affairs to the writings of Rousseau himself, and not just to Hobbes and liberal thinkers. As well as because of the fact that sovereignty and liberty had been generally opposed by earlier commentators, it is also because Rousseau so sharply discriminated force from freedom on most occasions, that the conjunction of these terms in the *Social Contract* seems odd. In a later passage of the same text he even added that 'it is only the force of the state which ensures the liberty of its members' (*Contrat social* II.12, in OC, vol. 3, p. 394 [SC 80]). But critics wholly misread Rousseau's meaning in those passages—indeed, they ignore what he says—when they ascribe to him the view that the punishment we suffer for flouting the law renders us truly free. For such force as governments exercise against recalcitrants, Rousseau contended, was designed to protect them from personal dependence (which invariably *does* deprive them of their freedom), and to legitimate their own civil undertakings, without which the social contract would otherwise be 'absurd, tyrannical and liable to the gravest abuse' (*Contrat social* I.7, in OC, vol. 3, p. 364 [SC 53]). Rousseau believed that according to the terms of their association, all subjects undertook to obey the laws and that without exception all were then required to take part in the laws' formulation as members of their state's sovereign assembly. His point about force and freedom means scarcely more than that citizens must always be bound by their own agreements, even if they are occasionally inclined to break or overlook them. No force is exercised except over persons who have reneged on their decision to abide by laws they enact themselves, and no force is exercised at all by the sovereign.

The tyrannical abuse of powers which liberal critics impute to Rousseau's sovereign was actually perceived by him to be a misappropriation of the powers of government, against which the absolute sovereignty of citizens was the only real safeguard. In their periodic election of parliamentary representatives the people of England perversely entrusted their legislative authority to what should have been merely an executive power, and thereby showed themselves unfit for the liberty it was their duty to exercise directly themselves (see the *Contrat social* III.15, in OC, vol. 3, p. 430 [SC 114]). In Geneva, somewhat differently, the executive power (effectively the Petit Conseil) had made itself progressively more dominant by arrogating responsibilities that properly belonged to the assembly of citizens (the Conseil Général), even obstructing that sovereign body from meeting. With the executive force of Rousseau's native state substituted for its popular will, absolute right was corrupted into unfettered power.<sup>37</sup> 'Where force alone reigns', Rousseau remarked in his *Letters from the Mountain*, 'the state is dissolved. That . . . is how all democratic

states finally perish' (*Lettres de la montagne*, Septième Lettre, in OC, vol. 3, p. 815 [LWM 239]).

Having regard to such claims it is worth bearing in mind that Rousseau's conception of civil liberty in the *Social Contract* was drawn as much from an idealized model of Geneva as from Spartan and Roman sources, and that his political self-identification as 'Citizen of Geneva' thus referred to a republic whose constitutional liberties, in his view, had already been undermined. The modern citizens of Geneva, no less than our primitive forebears portrayed in the *Discourse on Inequality*, had been deprived of their liberty, but in the case of his compatriots that was because they had allowed their sovereign will to be stilled and the executive power of government to rise up despotically in its stead.<sup>38</sup> Paradoxically, it appears, Rousseau's conception of an absolute sovereign ensured civil liberty not so much by virtue of an overarching natural law as on account of an infrastructural separation of powers. Once again, Hobbes, for whom absolute sovereignty entailed the undivided concentration of all powers, appears in this matter as his foremost adversary. Rousseau, no less than Locke, was determined that governments must not exercise 'force beyond right'. Unlike Locke, however, he found protection from such despotism only in a vigilant sovereign of the whole people. Liberty was thus made secure, in his view, by the very institution which, his liberal critics have since alleged, can only destroy it. So long as the general will of a community remained general, citizens kept their freedom under the rule of its laws.

I take this novel association of the ideas of sovereignty and freedom to have informed the meaning of what Rousseau termed 'civil liberty'; but it must be remembered that the *Social Contract* also introduces a second positive concept of freedom, which Rousseau called 'moral liberty', or 'obedience to the law we prescribed to ourselves' (*Contrat social* I.8, in OC, vol. 3, p. 365 [SC 54]). Defined in that way, the concept seems to mean little more than the ancient Greek notion of autonomy, although in Rousseau's nomenclature, especially in its affinities with his idea of the general will, it has distinctive connotations somewhat different from the sense of autonomy as political self-rule or independence. Both in his definition of moral liberty and in his novel use of the expression 'general will', Rousseau articulated classical principles of freedom in a modern vocabulary which may, at first glance, seem as alien to those principles as his invocation of ancient liberty in justification of modern sovereignty. Indeed, some of Rousseau's most striking images derive their force from just such attempts to illuminate the values of old cultures in a new language commonly thought to have dispensed with them, and much may be learnt about his meaning if we regard him, to use his own words (although not about himself), as one of those 'moderns who had an ancient soul'.<sup>39</sup>

A distinctive feature of his concept of moral liberty is its peculiarly reflexive element of self-prescription. For Rousseau, every morally free agent was required to determine the rules that would guide him by looking inward into the depths of his own conscience in a self-reliant manner, free from the influence of all other persons. The most absolute authority, he observed in his *Discourse on Political Economy* (OC, vol. 3, p. 251 [PE 13]), 'is that which penetrates into man's innermost being', incorporating him in the common identity of the state, as he put it in the *Social Contract* (I.6, in OC, vol. 3, p. 361 [SC 50]). Liberal critics recoil in horror from these claims, in so far as they take them to imply the complete submergence of our separate wills under the collective (even organic) will of the body politic which envelops and moulds us. Yet what Rousseau meant by his conjunction of moral liberty with the general will has no such significance, and it was designed to avert rather than achieve the social indoctrination of individuals. Not only did he insist upon the fact that a nation's general will could only be realized through opposition to the particular wills of each of its members, with the constant tension between two kinds of will or interest—instead of the suppression of one by the other—indispensable to the achievement of the common good (see the *Contrat social* II.3, note, in OC, vol. 3, p. 371 [SC 60]). He also stressed that the same opposition was present in the minds of all citizens, so that every person was motivated by both a particular will and a general will, dividing his judgement of what was beneficial to himself from what was right for the community (see the *Contrat social* I.7, in OC, vol. 3, p. 363 [SC 52–53]). Especially in the modern world, Rousseau believed, our general will was much weaker than our particular will, and it was to be strengthened and animated not by our imbibing the collective opinions of our neighbours in a public assembly, but just the reverse—by all men expressing their own opinions alone, 'having no communication amongst themselves', which might render their separate judgements partial to this or that group interest (*Contrat social* II.3, in OC, vol. 3, p. 371 [SC 60]). To ensure that in the assembly there were as many votes as individuals, every member must act without regard to the rest, consulting his own general will as a citizen, thereby still obeying himself alone. Our personal identity was only lost when in legislation we echoed the opinions of an unreflective, indiscriminating multitude. For Rousseau, the more perfect our independence from others (the more profoundly we turned into ourselves for guidance) the more likely were our deliberations to yield the common good.

In the social contract state which he envisaged, deep introspection was therefore the corollary of the outward pursuit of that common good or public interest. The idea of 'will', in this context, as has been noted before, expresses the voluntarist, contractarian strain of modern political thought,

whereas what is general encapsulates the ancient idea of a public good towards which each person's will should be aimed. It follows that according to Rousseau's philosophy, in order to be a citizen of a *res publica* one must look deep within oneself for a personal commitment to a collective goal. Of course, in promoting the general will, it is our dedication to the shared good of all which renders our moral liberty, as he conceived it, so much grander and more noble than the natural freedom he claimed men forfeit when they enter into civil society. But that belief in an uplifting form of liberty, so often decried by his liberal critics, requires for its fulfilment no great leap forward into the modern world of Hitler and Broadmoor. It is, yet again, an expression of the ancient idea of liberty that Hobbes and Constant, in their different ways, found unacceptable by contrast with the modern concept of personal freedom.

We have only to turn to Rousseau's *Considerations on the Government of Poland* to note how passionate was his commitment to ancient political liberty as against this alternative, individualist notion. In a chapter of that work entitled 'The Spirit of Ancient Institutions' Rousseau grieved over the civil and moral liberty we had lost in passing from antiquity into the modern world, much as in other contexts he lamented our forsaken natural liberty, destroyed in the abandonment of our primeval state. 'Modern men', he wrote, 'no longer find in themselves any of that spiritual vigour which inspired the ancients in everything that they did' (OC, vol. 3, p. 959 [P 182]).<sup>40</sup> Ancient legislators sought to forge links that would attach citizens to their fatherland and to one another, in religious ceremonies, games and spectacles. The laws that rule modern men, by contrast, are solely designed to teach them to obey their masters (see OC, vol. 3, p. 958 [P 182]). In his *Letter to d'Alembert* on the theatre he pursued a similar theme (p. 137 [OC, vol. 5, p. 93; LD 102]), complaining that we have lost all the strength of the men of antiquity. In Sparta, especially, the citizens, in continual assembly, consecrated the whole of their lives to amusements which were great matters of state (p. 179 [OC, vol. 5, p. 122; LD 133]). Why should it not be so in modern republics as well?, he exclaimed, above all in Geneva, where the people ought to be 'forever united' through festivals held 'in the open air, under the sky' (p. 168 [OC, vol. 5, p. 114; LD 125]). Yet what do we find instead? 'Private meetings (*les tête-à-tête*) . . . taking the place of public assemblies', the people hiding themselves, as if guilty of a vice that they dare not reveal except in shadows (pp. 172–73 [OC, vol. 5, p. 117; LD 128–29]). It thus appears that for Rousseau ancient liberty had been lost, largely because of its displacement from the public arena into the world of private affairs. Where today, he asked, is 'the concord of citizens'? 'Where is public fraternity? . . . Where is peace, liberty, equity, innocence?' (pp. 178–79 [OC, vol. 5, p. 121; LD 133]). The term 'fraternity' cited here in conjunction



with liberty does not figure often in Rousseau's works, however much its meaning seems so obviously infused in his conception of the general will and indeed resonates throughout his political writings as a whole. But it is employed as well, once again, in his *Considerations on the Government of Poland*, where he proclaimed the need for Polish youth to become accustomed to 'equality' and 'fraternity', 'living under the eyes of their compatriots, seeking public approbation' (OC, vol. 3, p. 968 [P 191]).

By so linking the ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity, Rousseau—in this as in so much else—heralded an incoming French Revolution with his gaze fixed upon a bygone ancient world. Without equality, he observed in the *Social Contract*, 'freedom cannot subsist', for between the estate of the rich man and the beggar, public liberty is always traded; the one buys, and the other sells. 'Each is equally fatal to the common good' (II.11, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 391–92 n. [SC 78 n.]). For that common good to be promoted, he added in his *Project for a Constitution for Corsica*, it was necessary that 'no one should enrich himself' (OC, vol. 3, p. 924 [PCC 143]). In the feast of the grape pickers which he portrayed in his *New Héloïse*, moreover, all three principles were drawn together. 'Everyone lives under the most intimate familiarity', he wrote; 'all the world is equal' (*Julie, ou La Nouvelle Héloïse*, Cinquième Partie, Lettre VII, in OC, vol. 2, p. 607 [J 496]). At dinner each gaily joins with all the rest, in 'sweet equality' but without luxury, in the enjoyment of liberty limited only by perfect candour (pp. 608–09 [J 498]). The exultant feast in which all partake freely, equally and fraternally was of course purely imaginary; and no doubt similarly fanciful was Rousseau's belief that it reflected (indeed surpassed in joy) the saturnalian banquets of the ancient Romans (see p. 608 [J 497]). But there is no doubting the fact that the concept of liberty which Rousseau's image evokes is altogether different from the ideas of personal liberty set forth by Hobbes and Constant. For in the modern world, as he perceived it, liberty had come to be shorn of its associations with equality and fraternity. Rousseau complained in his *Essay on the Origin of Languages* that whereas our ancestors had once sung 'Aimez-moi' and cried out 'Aidez-moi' to one another, we now only mutter 'Donnez de l'argent' (see the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, chs. 10 and 20, pp. 131 and 197–99 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 408, 428–29; EOL 279, 298–99]). The same expression, repeated in the *Social Contract*, is described there as the harbinger of a society in chains, ruled by the slavish institution of finance, unknown to the men of antiquity.<sup>41</sup> We moderns have been transformed into mute auditors of declamations from the pulpit and proclamations from the throne, our collective voice stilled. While once our interests were openly shared and inscribed in our hearts, now they are in conflict, secreted away in the linings of our purses. Have we forgotten that once we aspire to serve the state with our purses rather



than our person, it is on the edge of ruin? Have we forgotten that 'in a well-ordered city everyone flies to the assemblies'? (*Contrat social* III.15, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 428–29 [SC 113]). Modern liberty, stripped of fraternity, on the one side, and equality, on the other, stands exposed as nothing more than private gain. But so far from it embracing the only proper use of the term 'liberty', the contemporary ethos of private gain was for Rousseau just ancient slavery in a modern form, all the more psychologically insidious for our pursuing it as if it were real freedom. Turned inward on himself and outward against his neighbours, modern man in fact, like primeval man in fiction, had run headlong into chains which he supposed had made him free.

#### IV

If natural liberty may be regarded as Rousseau's negative idea of freedom, and civil and moral liberty his positive idea, how are these two concepts related? Why did he employ the same term to embrace our personal liberty, on the one hand, and our political liberty, on the other, particularly since he considered the two notions mutually exclusive? To that extent, of course, he would actually have agreed with Hobbes and Constant that different ideas have been implied by a single word, although unlike them he judged both uses correct and still appropriate, each in its proper place. His reason for invoking one expression in two distinct ways, I think, is quite simply that he found them to share at least a certain range of meanings, in the light of which their differences may be seen to be in direct opposition and conflict.

For one thing, each concept meant for Rousseau the absence of personal dependence or domination. When he remarked, for instance, in his *Project for a Constitution for Corsica*, that 'Whoever depends upon others . . . could not be free' (OC, vol. 3, p. 903 [PCC 127]), he ascribed to that term a sense which embraced both his negative and positive concepts, since our lack of subjection, either to the will of other individuals, or to our own passions in society, was a central feature of each perspective. So too is his claim, with regard to both concepts, that poverty enslaves us. Our passage from antiquity into modernity, no less than from the state of nature into society, had each been marked by our loss of independence, on account of the unequal distribution of private property that made both rich and poor beholden to one another. Most important of all, perhaps—though it is least often noticed—is the fact that both concepts were for Rousseau indeterminate in their exercise and undirected towards any particular goal. There could be no proper aim of human endeavour that was prescribed in advance with regard to either

our natural freedom or our civil and moral liberty. However perfectible men might be, he supposed in his *Discourse on Inequality*, as free agents they had done almost everything possible to make themselves worse than animals. Whatever equality was indispensable to the freedom he proclaimed in the *Social Contract*, moreover, he set out no socialist programme to achieve it, for that would have merely shifted responsibility for our subjection from the rich to the state, thereby bringing the principle of equality into conflict with that of liberty. According to his social doctrine, the abolition of slavery did not entail the abolition of property as well. Liberal critics who complain of the totalitarian nature of Rousseau's absolute sovereign ignore the fact that he prescribed no policies that the sovereign must promote, nor could he have done so, except by legislating what he supposed to be right on behalf of the people, thus again depriving them of their freedom of choice.

These and other similarities between Rousseau's two concepts of liberty are not insignificant, and a proper elaboration of their place in his philosophy might well require a whole essay in itself. I concentrate here upon the differences, however, for two reasons: first, because I believe that for Rousseau they were of greater importance than the common frame of reference which warranted his use of the same term 'liberty' in both cases; and, second, because my principal aim throughout has been to elucidate those distinctions against the background of liberal critiques of his doctrine and the charge that neither of the two concepts of liberty he employed (if, that is, their difference was even noted) really mean what we understand by freedom. For Rousseau, there were indeed two concepts, and not one. In their failure to recognize this fact, Hobbes and his followers have stipulated a unique alternative definition, but only—it would appear in the light of his doctrine—by abusing its meaning and impoverishing our political discourse.

How could this be so? Let me attempt to explain it. Until recently, it was fashionable in the history of philosophy (albeit quite wrong) to contrast seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century British empiricism with Continental rationalism in the same period. For those who find it useful to take stock of particular doctrines in bulk, I would suggest that a dichotomy between British monism, stemming mainly from Hobbes and Hume, as opposed to Continental dualism, embracing above all Descartes and Kant, might be a slightly more apt wholesale description of the most pertinent difference between two great traditions of thought in and around the Enlightenment. With regard to the concept of liberty, it is at any rate odd that by and large each of the major Continental European languages possesses one term, to which many native philosophers have ascribed two contrary meanings, whereas in English we have two terms, which our leading philosophers have deemed must share the same sense.<sup>42</sup>

In most European languages, that is, the idea of liberty has been derived lexically from either the Latin *liber* or the Germanic *fréo*, whereas in English, with our common inheritance, we employ the terms liberty and freedom more or less interchangeably. It is true that there are certain locutions and contexts in which this is not the case, but these give rise to no profound philosophical differences, and throughout my remarks here I have used both words as if each did indeed serve equally as a translation of Rousseau's term *liberté*. Yet notwithstanding the stipulations of Hobbes, *liberté*, *Freiheit* and their cognates have throughout their etymological history been employed by philosophers in two distinct senses, whose opposed meanings at once informed and reflected dual interpretations of our nature. Whether couched in the vocabulary of reason's opposition to appetite, or of the conflict of mind and body, or the tensions between an inner and outer or higher and lower self, two contrasting concepts of liberty or freedom have been invoked by almost countless European thinkers before Rousseau and after him—for a time, especially in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, by a fair number of British philosophers who were themselves dualists, in some cases even followers of his doctrine.<sup>43</sup>

The distinction which Rousseau drew between natural liberty, on the one hand, and civil and moral liberty, on the other, derived its terminology largely from that form of dualism which first arose under the influence of Descartes and Malebranche in the seventeenth century, according to which *l'homme physique* and *l'homme moral* were marked by different attributes and properties. This dichotomy between 'le physique' and 'le moral' proved almost a commonplace of Enlightenment speculation in a whole variety of disciplines, and it was perhaps most prevalent in French philosophical biology in the late eighteenth century, in the period culminating with the publication, in 1802, of the *Rapports du physique et du moral de l'homme* by Cabanis.<sup>44</sup> Like Buffon and others among his contemporaries, Rousseau adopted that terminology and indeed developed some of the central ideas of his philosophy around it. The contrast of 'le physique' and 'le moral' appears on the opening page of his *Discourse on Inequality* (see OC, vol. 3, p. 131 [DI 131]), where it announces the work's main theme—in effect that our moral distinctions cannot be ascribed to the physical or natural differences between us. Nothing could be more plain to Rousseau's readers than the fact that he was determined to disengage two kinds of inequality, and one critic, Louis Bertrand Castel, even entitled his reply to the second *Discourse*, *L'Homme moral opposé à l'homme physique*. According to Rousseau, moreover, as he explained in so many of his writings, the same dichotomy set apart love from sex, authority from power, right from force—even legislation

from government, he remarked in the *Social Contract*: 'Every free action', he wrote there,

is produced by the concurrence of two causes, one moral, that is, the will which determines the act, the other physical, that is, the power which executes it. . . . The body politic has the same impetus . . . force and will . . . the latter . . . the *legislative power*, the former, the *executive power*.<sup>45</sup>

No political thinker ever drew a sharper divide than Rousseau between what was natural or physical in our constitution and what was moral or political in our social arrangements. If only his biographers had borne that in mind, we might have been spared volumes of misguided analyses of his life, whose authors have thought fit to infer his political principles from his urinary complaint or sexual repressions. It is a particular virtue of Maurice Cranston's recent biography<sup>46</sup> that it keeps intact this fundamental distinction between 'le physique' and 'le moral' and does not, as so many others have done, trace the main promptings of Rousseau's philosophy to the region of his genitals. With regard to his philosophy, it is of course that same distinction which marks the contrast between natural liberty as against civil and moral liberty—the achievement of the one, as Rousseau put it in the *Social Contract* (I.8, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 364–65 [SC 53–54]), requiring the alienation of the other. 'What man loses by the social contract', let us recall,

is his natural liberty and an unlimited right to everything that he attempts to get . . . what he gains is civil liberty and the proprietorship of all he possesses. . . . Beyond this [he also acquires] moral liberty, which alone renders man truly master of himself.

In civil society we do not make our natural liberty secure, but renounce it in exchange for liberty of another sort. 'Give man entirely to the state or leave him entirely to himself', Rousseau concluded in a fragment 'On Public Happiness' (OC, vol. 3, p. 510), for the contradiction between our desires and our duties renders our condition miserable. Men could not possibly enjoy both forms of liberty together.

Neither form of liberty, it is as well to remember, had ever been enjoyed by men at all. In contrast with Hobbes, who supposed the misconceived idea of ancient liberty had been corrected by his own modern notion, Rousseau identified both his positive and negative concepts with the past—one ancient, and the other antediluvian—each construed as must have been the case, though the facts did not always confirm it. His intensely drawn portrait of modern man as subjugated victim of the illusion of his freedom still speaks eloquently to our age, perhaps even more poignantly than it addressed his own; to my mind, it comprises the most

remarkable moral indictment ever conceived of a social and political world which, not long after his death, was to adopt liberalism as its main philosophy. But his glorious description of the world of antiquity must carry less conviction, from whatever perspective we approach it, if only because—as Rousseau himself admitted in the *Social Contract* (III.15, in OC, vol. 3, p. 431 [SC 115])—the Greeks maintained their freedom because of their possession of slaves, which is to say that the splendid liberty of some men had been achieved by cutting it off from others. Rousseau's contrast between two kinds of liberty was surely not intended mainly to distinguish classes or to justify slavery—the very antithesis of liberty in both senses of his term. His intoxicating images of Sparta and Rome, like his picture of the state of nature, owed as much to his contempt for the institutions of the present world as to his love of antiquity, and many of their most vivid colours may be seen to emerge only as the sombre canvas of modern institutions is wiped clean. Just because of this, it is difficult to conceive the civil and moral liberty which Rousseau prescribed in the *Social Contract* as any less fictitious than the natural liberty he claimed we had lost as well. Yet if both of his concepts of liberty were drawn from imaginary lost worlds; and if in his day the only states in which men might still be capable of achieving true political freedom were Corsica and, perhaps, Poland; and if, even there, freedom once lost could never be acquired again; what is it about his peculiar vision of liberty that could have inspired the hostility of his liberal critics and occasioned, from some of them, the charge that it lays the foundation of modern totalitarianism? Judging, at any rate, from the experience of Corsica, which was invaded, and Poland, which was partitioned (each soon after Rousseau drafted constitutions for them), the impact of his ideas upon those few specific political causes he advanced ought to have been more a matter for concern to his friends than alarm to his enemies.

But it is not, I believe, because of any of his particular programmes that Rousseau has won the hearts of so many of his readers, and just for that reason has excited the deep enmity and distrust of others. On the contrary, it is on account of the very generality of his doctrines, and the prodigious force of the imagery through which he conveyed them. In discriminating public liberty from private despotism, he has inspired generations of his followers to perceive the malignancies of their world in the light of blissful ideals to which they might aspire. Yet more captivating even than his portraits of ancient virtue and modern vice has been his remarkable vision of our metamorphosis. As he conceived them, our contemporary institutions had betrayed the fundamental principles from which they sprang. 'Nothing is more free than your legitimate state', he addressed his compatriots in his *Letters from the Mountain* (Septième Lettre, in OC, vol. 3, p. 813 [LWM 237]); 'nothing more servile than your

actual state'. Because our corruption in society had been due to human endeavour, it was possible to conceive how we might correct the abuse of our liberty, how we might turn our will instead in the direction of personal fulfilment and political regeneration. 'The limits of possibility in moral affairs are less sharply circumscribed than we suppose,' he commented in the *Social Contract* (III.12, in OC, vol. 3, p. 425 [SC 110]), and 'we may judge what still can be done by what has been done already'. If, to his critics, his ideas were only chimeras, his reply, in *Emile* (IV, in OC, vol. 4, p. 549 [E 253–54]), was that theirs were just prejudice.

Of course Rousseau proposed no revolutionary transformations of corrupt society into new republics of virtue, and it cannot be stressed too strongly that he wished to avert rather than promote revolution and spurned the idea of overthrow, through violence, of any of the governments of his day. The uplifting enhancement of our social relations which he envisaged was all entirely in his dreams and reveries, but it was through those dreams—through what in his *Moral Letters* he called the 'devouring strength' and 'noble distraction' of 'sublime delirium' (*Lettres morales* IV, in OC, vol. 4, p. 1101 [ML 191])—that he has illuminated the prospect of a wholly changed universe of social relations and thus aroused the profound enthusiasm of his disciples and admirers. While 'the world of reality has its limits', he exclaimed, 'the world of imagination is infinite' (*Emile* II, in OC, vol. 4, p. 305 [E 81]). There, like his own fictitious pupil Emile, Rousseau could drink from the waters of oblivion, the past effacing itself from his memory, with a new horizon opening up before him (see *Emile et Sophie*, *Lettre Deuxième* in OC, vol. 4, p. 912 [ES 711]). There, in savouring the solitary enjoyment of undisturbed natural liberty, he could contemplate a social world of perfect civil and moral liberty as well.

It is such flights of fancy which, to my mind, offend Rousseau's liberal critics most of all. His idea of 'perfectibility' (a term which, we should recall, he invented in his *Discourse on Inequality*) has raised, as they see it, the nightmare prospect of reshaping human nature in accordance with ideals that violate their sense of personal freedom. Worse still, his claim to the effect that men are always what their governments make of them has for liberals a particularly sinister ring, when it is attached as much to the manufacture of virtue as of vice—especially in the light of Rousseau's belief, as expressed, for instance in his *Discourse on Political Economy* (OC, vol. 3, p. 251 [PE 12–13]), that, however good it is to deal with men as they are, 'it is better to make them what they must be'. Does this not suggest, his opponents fear, the complete indoctrination of our minds under governments more despotic than any ever previously experienced? As they read Rousseau, worst of all are his accounts of our need for legislators, that is, persons who occupy an extraordinary position in the state, attempting to 'change . . . human nature', as he put it, and 'transform each

individual' from a solitary being into part of a greater whole (*Contrat social* II.7, in *OC*, vol. 3, pp. 381–82 [SC 69]). Do not such claims anticipate the most insidious feature of totalitarianism in the modern world, in which Hitler has shown us only too well how the monstrous ideal of the legislator may be given real substance?

In reply to his detractors, it is perhaps pointless to recollect Rousseau's insistence that the legislator or lawgiver was the father of a nation and not its ruler, that he had no subjects but instead inspired individuals to form their own new state, and that, if he miraculously succeeded in transforming human nature, this was because his divine eloquence had persuaded others to establish a sovereign for themselves. Never mind the fact that Rousseau's legislators—principally Moses, Lycurgus and Numa—were for the most part ancient prophets and guides who had pointed the way to men's achievement of civil and moral liberty such as had been unknown to them before.<sup>47</sup> In probing the metamorphoses of human nature which Rousseau conceived in his dreams on the model of ancient myths, his liberal critics resolutely uncover a vision of an alternative world that they judge dangerously abhorrent. Yet where else but in his dreams could Rousseau find escape from the social and political tyrannies under which liberals believe their true freedom is enjoyed already? Where else but in reverie could Rousseau's imagination have come to legislate for all mankind? Why is it that his liberal critics find his fanciful ideals more intolerable than all the weight of the social systems of the world that he described and they inhabit? So long as liberal principles prevail, individuals in society who are anxious to learn why their liberty seems so oppressive will find in Rousseau's works the resonant voice of a solitary prophet of the brotherhood of man.<sup>48</sup>

## THE ENLIGHTENMENT AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTIONARY BIRTH PANGS OF MODERNITY

### CONCEPTUALIZING THE ENLIGHTENMENT PROJECT

It is as true of the human sciences as of the sciences of nature that, by and large, only the most recent formulations of their overriding principles are deemed worthy of scientific scrutiny. The rudiments of physical anthropology and then biology and linguistics around the end of the eighteenth century, followed by sociology and social statistics in the early nineteenth century, and economics and political science in the early twentieth century, were characteristically sketched by pioneers whose fresh perspectives were in each case designed to free themselves of the excess baggage of their precursors. In virtually all disciplines, each major step is portrayed as if it were a new beginning, marking a conceptual revolution which relegates antecedent approaches to the defunct realm of the history of ideas.

From the point of view of scientific discovery, nothing could be more defunct than fossilized concepts which purport to explain human character or behaviour but reveal little more than their own age. When Saint-Simon and Comte put forward their ideas of social physiology or sociology, they supposed that they were laying the foundations of a new science, more deeply rooted in an understanding of society's structures, mechanisms and organization than any of their precursors had previously imagined. When Quetelet and other statisticians of the early to mid-nineteenth century devised mathematical explanations to account for the regularities of social phenomena in human populations, they articulated notions of spontaneous natural law as distinct from jurisprudential principles of societal order which had purportedly been prevalent before. In the twentieth century, Graham Wallas, Charles Merriam and other political scientists promoted new methodologies through which the forces that were held to shape political institutions—public opinion, the formation of parties and eventually voting behaviour—could be investigated and measured without the encumbrance of mysterious philosophical abstractions.<sup>1</sup> Namierite historians in England, *Annales* historians in France and Marxist sociologists everywhere have decried the vacuous concepts of the history of ideas, as vestiges of a disembodied and epiphenomenal World Spirit. Even the predominant traditions of intellectual history today—German



*Begriffsgeschichte* and English contextualism—insist upon the discontinuity between an historical understanding and the scientific practice of a discipline, so as to ensure that the canons of current research are not anachronistically superimposed upon the past.

Of all periods in modern intellectual history, much the most discredited in the eyes of contemporary social scientists is the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. The Enlightenment has been variously depicted as superficial in entrusting the promotion of self-reliance or social progress to the forces of reason over religion; it has been denounced for having naïvely sought to frame an understanding of moral and mental phenomena in terms of objective natural laws modelled in the image of Newtonian physics; it has been held in derision for supposing that human nature was everywhere the same, governed by universally constant appetites or infinitely malleable and hence capable of perfection; it has been found vacuous because its speculative histories of the human race or atomistic conceptions of human nature took no account of the inescapably complex textures of social life.

Such objections to the Enlightenment are not all compatible, but either collectively or separately they have come to colour popular perceptions of eighteenth-century intellectual history as well as criticisms made by contemporary social scientists. With regard to our explanations of human nature and society, the Enlightenment has to its detractors come to seem the last pre-scientific age, as the fresh disciplines we currently pursue, whose collective birth may be said to mark its demise, supplant its conjectures with real evidence. Modern notions of social science thus not only reject methodologies of the history of ideas in general. In conducting their empirical investigations of society today, contemporary scientists identify their own approaches as departing, both historically and conceptually, from the Enlightenment Project.

In the light of such putative disjunctions between eighteenth-century modes of thought and modern social science, it is altogether remarkable that so many other critics of the Enlightenment—sometimes even the same critics—have also denounced that intellectual movement for having engendered the pre-eminent political forces and social practices of modernity. For Jacob Talmon and Lester Crocker, the principal beneficiaries of the Enlightenment have been the totalitarian democracies of the twentieth century, whose vast schemes of social engineering are said to have drawn their inspiration above all from eighteenth-century notions of moral plasticity, perfectibility and the recasting of human nature. For Alasdair MacIntyre, the Enlightenment's critical scepticism, empty formalism and vacuous rationalism have cut modern societies adrift from the moorings of shared beliefs, religious faith and communal action on which their survival depends. For John Gray, our naïve trust in perpetual progress and in the universal rights of man inspired by Enlightenment thought just

obscures the insuperable cleavages between nations and cultures which no spirit of cosmopolitanism can hope to overcome. For Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer and Zygmunt Bauman, even the horrors of the Holocaust may be understood as a dreadful expression of the merely instrumental notions of scientific rationality to which Enlightenment thinkers subscribed.<sup>2</sup>

How is it possible that Enlightenment beliefs should have strayed so far from the genuine truths of social science while at the same time becoming so deeply imbedded within the structures of modern social life? The contention that the Enlightenment Project at once failed in theory but triumphed in practice amounts to an extraordinary indictment of the very social sciences which are said to have superseded it, and that for at least two major reasons. On the one hand, the claim implies an inversion of the relation between abstract ideas and the social realities said to underlie them, by virtue of its advocates' stipulation that modernity is in fact fundamentally shaped by our perceptions of its nature. Even while denying the significance of conceptual history in their empirical investigations of social phenomena, interpreters of the moral universe we inhabit have turned their own explanatory schemes inside out. In so far as we identify the deepest structures of modernity within Enlightenment philosophy, we have all become conceptual historians. Never has World Spirit been so manifest in human history as in the current epoch, marked by the social scientific community's disencumbrance of that illusion. However much the eighteenth century may have failed to adopt its own leading principles, by the common agreement of its critics we find ourselves today trapped in the age of Enlightenment.

On the other hand, the spiritual triumph of Enlightenment ideas in practice, if such an apotheosis has indeed occurred, undermines the theoretical plausibility of the very social sciences which are said to contradict them. What can be the use of our truly empirical sciences of human nature and society when it is conceded that modernity has been shaped instead by the lofty abstractions of the Enlightenment Project? Why should our funding councils and universities subsidize the piecemeal investigations of our social researchers in the field when it is supposed that they will there only uncover the manifold intimations of Enlightenment thought? If ours is indeed the age of Enlightenment, whose theoretical principles have been unsheathed in the institutions which today govern our lives, might we not gain a better understanding of modernity by abandoning our social sciences and returning instead to the study of philosophical history?

I do not myself subscribe to the belief that contemporary civilization has been fundamentally shaped by Enlightenment principles, nor to the view that such principles have failed because they have not been, or never can be, universally adopted. I am convinced that critics of Enlightenment

thought over the past two hundred years have, by and large, not understood that intellectual movement correctly, even though, unlike a great number of better-informed specialists of eighteenth-century doctrines, they have correctly identified the Enlightenment in terms of certain widely shared principles, across diverse subjects. I regret that the Enlightenment's detractors have been so indiscriminating in their treatment of eighteenth-century thinkers as to fail to notice how much one central figure of that age of intellectual ferment—Rousseau—offered a more profound critique of some of the Enlightenment's most cherished ideals and aspirations than any produced since his day. My comments here, however, will only address these issues obliquely. In appraising certain accounts of the ideological foundations of the modern world, I shall instead attempt to disaggregate broad claims that have been put forward about the political and scientific legacy of a so-called Enlightenment Project. I mean to identify a particular period in European intellectual and political history which, to my mind, came to exercise a decisive impact upon what in the West has come to be understood as genuinely modern society. I shall argue that in that period a number of Enlightenment principles were not so much enacted as transfigured in ways that made the practical realization of those principles, as they were actually adopted, inconsistent with other, still more central, doctrines of the Enlightenment. And I shall try to show that modernity's debt to the Enlightenment took at least one institutional form which betrayed that legacy.

It will follow from my account that the most striking and persuasive criticism of modernity can be drawn from within the Enlightenment Project itself. I shall not mind if my remarks here may appear to constitute a peculiarly Hegelian reading of the connection between the Enlightenment and modernity by way of the French Revolution, except that I regard the incipient institutions of the modern state which in the course of the French Revolution came to contradict Enlightenment ideals as corresponding in practice to nothing so much as the theoretical image of the state elaborated in Hegel's own post-Enlightenment political philosophy. My overriding objective will be to explain, as best I can in the short space available, how both the invention of our modern understanding of the social sciences, on the one hand, and the post-Enlightenment establishment of the modern nation-state, on the other, encapsulated doctrines which severed modernity from the Enlightenment philosophy which is presumed to have inspired it. I shall be offering illustrations not so much of the unity of political theory and practice in the modern world as of their disengagement. In providing here some brief remarks on how post-Enlightenment justifications of modernity came to part company from their Enlightenment prefigurations, I hope to sketch an account of certain links between

principles and institutions which bears some relation to both Enlightenment and Hegelian conceptual history.

More than thirty years ago Reinhart Koselleck and Michel Foucault, independently and in different ways, remarked upon the upheavals of the intellectual map of Europe which they each described as having occurred over a period of several decades around 1800.<sup>3</sup> Their respective notions of a *Sattelzeit* or period of accelerated social and ideological change, on the one hand, and of an epistemic metamorphosis across academic disciplines, on the other, comprise perhaps the two most striking among recent contributions to a very long tradition of speculation about the nature and roots of modernity. Every school child who is taught that the principal features of the modern world spring either from the French or from the Industrial Revolution is presented with political or economic images of the transformation of European society, which were prefigured in literary, artistic or philosophical terms in the Italian Renaissance in the mid-sixteenth century, in the French *Querelle des anciens et des modernes* of the late seventeenth century, and in the international republic of letters' *Encyclopédie* of the mid-eighteenth century.

In what might be called the perennial discourse of modernity, the conceptual frameworks around the Protestant foundations of capitalism as introduced by Weber, or of the force of will and subjectivity in civil society and the state as explained by Hegel, or of egalitarian democracy as portrayed by Tocqueville, or of the class structures of industrial capitalism as depicted by Marx, have exercised far greater influence than any schemes of conceptual change along lines mapped by Koselleck or Foucault. But in a crucial sense, all these ideological frameworks for an understanding of the spirit and tensions of modernity have been abandoned by the very disciplines which modernity is said to have engendered. For the great new science of society, or *sociology*, that was developed in the nineteenth century came to be articulated in other ways, expressing different priorities, which were also to inform the self-images nurtured in the practice of diverse sciences of human behaviour, including psychology and politics. By relegating conceptual history to a secondary and derivative role, our post-Enlightenment sciences of society have deconceptualized the classical expressions of modernity itself.

In their focus upon the linguistic transformations and defining concepts of modernity, Koselleck and Foucault have righted that inversion and have returned with a vengeance to just those traditions of philosophical history which had purportedly ended with the birth of our social sciences in their genuinely modern form. From the perspectives they adopt, the discourse of modernity has turned upon itself and become a discourse about discourse. In the beginning was the word, and the world

which we inhabit has been manufactured in its image, freshly ground in a crucible of linguistic change. The *Sattelzeit* delineated by Koselleck and his associates in their massive *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* over the past twenty-four years encompasses the period from about 1750 to 1850,<sup>4</sup> and while their work is predominantly addressed to German intellectual and social history, it may also be read as a conceptual map of the whole of modernity, whose dynamic forces are encapsulated in two great monuments of human enterprise and endeavour at the beginning and end of that period, the *Encyclopédie* and the Crystal Palace. It was in the 1750s that the words *perfectibilité* and *civilisation* made their first appearance in any European language,<sup>5</sup> and it is from the 1750s that the scientific, political and economic manufacture of modernity may be conceptualized around such terms.

Foucault's scheme of the epistemic metamorphosis of classical into modern civilization was intended, in *Les mots et les choses*, to be concentrated in a shorter period of perhaps twenty or thirty years around the end of the eighteenth century, in which he located the genesis of the human sciences of biology, linguistics and economics by way of identifying their newly conceived principles and fresh vocabularies. In suggesting that 1795 was a pivotal year of that intellectual transformation, Foucault anticipated the more detailed work of Georges Gusdorf, Sergio Moravia, Emmet Kennedy, Martin Staum, Cheryl Welch, Brian Head and others devoted to the *idéologues* of the 1790s,<sup>6</sup> and while he seldom turned his gaze upon the role of the French Revolution in his conceptual history of modernity, he drew special attention to a short span of years in which terms such as *démocrate*, *révolutionnaire* and *terroriste*—as well as *idéologie* itself—erupted into European political discourse in conjunction with the events or doctrines which these new words defined.

In his subsequent writings on the trappings of sexuality and power in the modern world, Foucault pursued the intimations of his work on the potency of concepts, by identifying our prevailing forces of social control fundamentally in terms of mental structures, the corrective disciplines of our forms of punishment issuing from our taxonomic disciplines of knowledge, our structures of *pouvoir* and patterns of *savoir* inescapably joined. With Koselleck and Foucault together, the discourses of modernity may appear to have supplanted sociology as the pre-eminent social science of our time. For those of us who require holy writ, the Bible of our civilization might as well be *Printing and the Mind of Man*.

In the remarks which follow, I shall comment on two subjects which, to my own mind, lend some substance to such discourses of modernity but at the same time also place a number of their central tenets in doubt. Recent research has identified the first printed use of the term *science sociale* in the year 1789 and has indicated that a recognizably modern conception of

the nature of the social sciences was developed in the course of the French Revolution, at first to conceptualize the ideological programme which it was the Revolution's purported aim to achieve but, subsequently, even more to account for its failures. Other research addressed to doctrines of the state and the nation and to ideas of representation which were formulated in the course of Revolutionary debates between 1789 and 1794 has suggested that some of the defining features of French government, in that crucial period of its invention simultaneously in the realms of theory and practice, were conceived within a framework that owed less to any indigenous tradition of French political thought than to a seventeenth-century English doctrine of the public personality of the state.<sup>7</sup>

The particular configurations of both subjects within a few tempestuous years of French history may be seen as lending some warrant to the conceptual histories of modernity offered by both Koselleck and Foucault, though for different reasons—supporting Foucault's depiction of quite sudden and dramatic epistemic change around 1795, on the one hand, and Koselleck's broader perspective on the interconnections between intellectual, political and social history on the other. The same point may of course be made negatively in each case, in that, with respect to the idea of a social science and the construction of the state in their modern forms, Koselleck's account of a century-long *Sattelzeit* seems to grant insufficient priority to the immediate impact of the most momentous cataclysm of modernity, whereas Foucault's sketch of the metamorphosis of the human sciences appears to lack the requisite political and institutional dimensions. The fundamental contrast between civil society and the state, as set out by Hegel and then overturned by Marx, also has some bearing on the presentation of my case here, in so far as I mean to consider the contemporaneous but at bottom antagonistic invention of fresh methods of interpreting society, on the one hand, and creation of fresh institutions for the maintenance of political order, on the other. The point on which I wish to place greatest stress, however, is that these two subjects illuminate not only certain connections between the Enlightenment and modernity but, even more importantly, certain tensions between them which conceptual historians of all denominations have characteristically failed to notice.

So that I may at least attempt to place both those connections and those tensions under some scrutiny, I must first, however, dispose of the argument, so often made by specialists of various disciplines of eighteenth-century intellectual history, or of particular geographical regions or circumscribed periods, that there never had been a coherent Enlightenment Project at all, so that any attempt to explain modernity with reference to it must be pure fabrication. Alternatively, that thesis may be advanced as well with regard to the notion of modernity. From either or both perspectives, it is claimed that the task of genuine historians must be to break

down such global concepts, to explain diversity and conflict, to situate ideas only in the specific contexts in which they were manufactured, in all their rich particularity and texture.

The truth of such propositions is of course undeniable, and yet specialists who invoke them as a matter of principle in order to discount conceptual history altogether often do disservice to their own fields of research. Across a variety of disciplines in eighteenth-century thought, there lie questions fit for historical investigation about the common presuppositions of subjects we now see as unrelated only because we no longer share the perspectives of authors whose meaning we seek to explain. If we insist upon fragmenting eighteenth-century intellectual history because we are convinced that our current disciplines are marked by impermeable boundaries, we risk parting company from the very objects of our scrutiny. In our commendable pursuit of local knowledge gained from surveys of the Enlightenment Project's manifold dialects and regional differences,<sup>8</sup> we ought not to lose sight of the international dimensions of what was widely perceived, already in the eighteenth century, by its subscribers and enemies alike, to be a great intellectual movement orchestrated out of Paris, Edinburgh, Naples, Philadelphia and Geneva, with an Eastern flank in Königsberg and bustling outposts in publishing houses, literary salons, scientific academies and corresponding societies scattered over Europe and America. If throughout much of his life Rousseau took issue with an interdisciplinary and cosmopolitan Enlightenment Project after having initially contributed to it, I cannot see why we must deny ourselves any grasp of his own interpretation of its nature. At any rate, specialist historians of eighteenth-century thought can have scant impact in philosophers' and conceptual historians' current controversies about the Enlightenment Project if, from the wings, they just shout that there never was one. Better to confront the critics of the Enlightenment Project with evidence of their mistakes than to regard all their loose talk as beneath contempt.

### INVENTING SOCIAL SCIENCE

When the abbé Sieyès introduced the expression *la science sociale* in the initial issue of his most famous pamphlet, *Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état?*,<sup>9</sup> he did not herald this neologism as signifying a new science of society, different in its approach from all previous disciplines. The epistemic metamorphosis of the concept was no thunderbolt which, like the goddess Athena, burst from Zeus's head. It was to follow rather than accompany the first appearance of the words, and Sieyès himself thought so little of them that in subsequent editions of this most popular of all French Revolutionary pamphlets he replaced them with the expression, *la science de*



*l'ordre social*. The meaning of the words he employed seemed plain enough to him and needed no elaborate explanation. They simply referred to the principles of social order which France's Third Estate, representing the nation as a whole, sought to realize in practice, divorced from all particular or factional interests. Reflecting on his own work in a conversation with Étienne Dumont a few months after the publication of *Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état?*, Sieyès remarked that politics was a science he believed he had already completed.<sup>10</sup> He might have said the same of social science, for he imagined that, with his encouragement, the political system of France would be empowered to put into practice the science of society he had himself set out in theory, having elaborated it just so that it could be publicly enacted and thereby made real.

Subsequent appearances of the term in its earliest articulations have been traced to Pierre-Louis Lacretelle's *De l'établissement des connoissances humaines* of 1791, to a pamphlet by Dominique-Joseph Garat addressed to Condorcet in December of that year, and to Condorcet's own *Projet de décret sur l'organisation sociale* of January 1792. It is very likely that the words *la science sociale* gained a certain currency in the fertile political literature of the period from 1789 to 1792 and that other instances of their use in those years have still to be uncovered. But with respect to the expression's already ascertained pioneering examples, perhaps two points in particular may be noted. First, it should be remarked that every one of these authors of the earliest recorded uses of the term was a member of the short-lived *Société de 1789*—a club formed to commemorate the launch of the Revolution and to ensure the success of its reconstruction of French society—which was dissolved in 1791 after its membership had splintered into just such sectarian groups, representing different interests of the nation, which Sieyès had sought to prevent.<sup>11</sup>

The second point to note about these earliest expressions of the term is its authors' more or less indiscriminate conjunction of *la science sociale* with other human sciences, such as *la morale* and *la politique*, in the terminology of Lacretelle, or even with *l'art social*, in the language of Condorcet, the aim of which, as he put it in the prospectus of the *Société de 1789* that he drafted, was to promote political stability through constitutional reform, based upon the prevailing *sciences morales et politiques*. In its first printed articulations in the most politically explosive period at the dawn of the establishment of the modern state, *la science sociale* was introduced, quite innocuously, as a term roughly equivalent to politics in general. To purloin a remark (albeit with regard to the philosophy of Montesquieu) by Destutt de Tracy, himself the inventor of the term *idéologie* in the year 1796, it may be said that in the course of the French Revolution's first endeavours to establish a new order, social science meant much the same as the new politics.<sup>12</sup>



After the rise and fall of the Jacobins and the passing of their Terror, the new term, *science sociale*, was to undergo the epistemic break or metamorphosis proclaimed by Foucault on behalf of all the human sciences, precisely in 1795, the year of the *décalage*, the great rupture or conceptual guillotine, as if men's minds could only be changed after their heads had already been severed. In that year the *Convention* established the *Institut national des sciences et des arts*, and within it the *Classe des sciences morales et politiques*, one of whose six sections was called *Science sociale, et législation*. The stipulated conjunction of social science with legislation in this name, and the election of Sieyès, Garat and Cabanis to other sections of the *Classe des sciences morales et politiques* considered as a whole, might appear to make Foucault's notion of an epistemic metamorphosis with regard to the words *science sociale* just a tame sequel to the first performance, articulated by at least the survivors of a cast of already familiar characters. After 1795, however, the term *science sociale* came progressively to acquire a fresh meaning, all the more explosive for its divorce from, rather than conjunction with, politics and legislation. From the time of Foucault's *annus mirabilis* of the human sciences in general, social science in particular came to acquire the meanings now associated with it as the central science of modernity.

That transformation of a fresh expression into a new concept was made possible by the intellectual predominance within the *Classe des sciences morales et politiques* of another section devoted to the analysis of sensations and ideas, the specially recognized domain of the so-called *idéologues*, led by de Tracy and Cabanis, until the dissolution of the entire *Classe* in 1803 by the First Consul, Napoleon Bonaparte, who had his own way of effecting epistemic change. Separately and collectively, the *idéologues* attempted to delineate a new science of human nature which was more deeply rooted in the psychology of the human mind and the physiology of the human body than any conception of *la science sociale* as the art of politics could ever be. They had learnt the dreadful lessons of the Terror and, following the Constitution of the year 1795, they were less disposed than their precursors had been to proclaim the dangerously egalitarian doctrine of the natural rights of man, preferring instead to defend such rights as mankind could only enjoy in society. Distrustful of the critical character of the revolutionary programmes which had inspired the establishment of the *Société de 1789*, they were convinced that the problems of social disorder and derangement which the Revolution itself had generated were as striking as the despotism of the *ancien régime* had appeared to the aspiring legislators of the National Assembly. Wholesale constitutional reform had proved a remedy just as harmful as the disease, in part because it was too drastic, in part too superficial, engendering political violence without producing social change. While they were men of pre-  
do  
nd large,

as secular as was the anti-clericalism of their precursors, their new conception of the science of society was more historical, more preservative, more solidly situated, they supposed, in the concrete world of real experience.

Perhaps above all, the *idéologues* sought to explain mental and moral phenomena scientifically by retracing them to their physical roots. One of their central figures, Volney, attempted in this way to account for the production of cultural institutions, including political systems and religious beliefs, in connection with the physical geography that shaped the manner in which diverse populations lived. In his *Rapports du physique et du moral*, first delivered as a set of readings to the *Classe des sciences morales et politiques*, Cabanis himself expounded a doctrine of *la science de l'homme*, which he conceived to be a synthesis of physiology, morals and the science of ideas. If the *idéologues* had produced their writings in the twentieth century, they would have been warmly received as fellow travellers of the contemporary school of the French *Annales*; already in the eighteenth century theirs was a social science of *mentalités*.<sup>13</sup> Unlike Condorcet and Sieyès they could never have confused the nature of that science with the art of politics.

There were no doubt other factors as well as their distrust of politics and legislation which made the *idéologues* conspicuously less incendiary than had been the inventors of an acutely critical notion of *la science sociale*. It may even be the case that their membership of the *Classe des sciences morales et politiques*, which Keith Baker has described as the embodiment of Condorcet's dream of a social sciences academy,<sup>14</sup> lent a more conservative character to the discipline than had been conceived by their patron saint, just on account of its institutionalization in an academic setting made possible by patronage of a different kind. In adopting holistic methodologies of social explanation unlike those that had figured in the notions of Condorcet and Sieyès, at any rate, they parted company from their ideological precursors and could even appear to have made common cause with a number of profoundly reactionary critics of the whole French Revolution, including Bonald and de Maistre, who likewise supposed, and indeed stressed even more, that the political manipulation of French society had fractured it. In France after 1795, the idea of a genuine social science, or *science de la société*, as Bonald sometimes termed it, could be appropriated by romantic conservatives no less than by progressive liberals or socialists.<sup>15</sup> In every case, however, it would exclude the political tampering of naïvely enthusiastic legislators and metaphysicians, now identified in the same rogues' gallery as the clerics and despots reviled by the *philosophes*.

In large measure modelled upon the *idéologues'* attempt to sketch a new *science de l'homme*, the first great synthesis, of a post-French Revolutionary science of society was to be the scheme elaborated by Saint-Sim

nating in

his *Introduction aux travaux scientifiques du XIXe siècle* of 1807–1808 and his *Mémoire sur la science de l'homme* of 1813. While Saint-Simon perceived himself as a disciple of the Enlightenment, inspired in his revolutionary ardour by its critical spirit, its commitment to science and its *Encyclopédie*, he also found himself drawn to the philosophical conservatism of Bonald and acknowledged a special debt to the physiologist, Jean Burdin, the author of a *Cours d'études médicales ou exposition de la structure de l'homme* of 1803. Through Burdin's influence he acquired the belief, to which he was to subscribe for the rest of his life, that physiology was the chief of all human sciences, and in his *Mémoire sur la science de l'homme* he put a case for a positive science of human nature and society which had as its aim the synthesis of the anatomy of Vicq-d'Azyr, the physiology of Bichat, the psychology of Cabanis and the philosophical history of Condorcet.

That *science de l'organisation sociale*, as he sometimes termed it, was to lead Saint-Simon to inspect the internal constitution and morphology of the social body in a fresh idiom, different from the perspectives, adopted by the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment he admired, including even Montesquieu, who above all other major eighteenth-century thinkers came closest to sharing his conception of a social science. In the course of the nineteenth century, through the influence of Saint-Simon's principal disciple, Comte, this new positive science of society, soon to be known by the word Comte invented—*sociologie*—was to become the pre-eminent science of modernity itself. It would be the science of society conceived in terms of its organization, its infrastructure and internal functions. To ensure society's proper order, it would require, not the constitutions of legislators, but regulation by administrators and engineers. In place of the political power sought on behalf of the public good by the first social scientists, after its epistemic metamorphosis the new science of society would promote social hygiene. Rather than aiming to achieve the enfranchisement of all citizens, it would be designed to fulfil the prognosis of Pope's couplet from *An Essay on Man*:

For Forms of Government let fools contest;  
Whate'er is best administer'd is best.<sup>16</sup>

### MANUFACTURING THE NATION-STATE

No less than modern social science, the modern state is also an invention of the French Revolution, in this case bred not out of Thermidor but from the National Assembly of 1789, whose destruction of the *ancien régime* heralds the self-creation of modernity in its political form. In a notable

series of writings, Quentin Skinner has traced the origins of our conception of the state to transfigurations of the language of *status*, or the condition of the members of a *civitas*, in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe into the modern terminology of *état* or *state* to signify the *civitas* as a whole.<sup>17</sup> The development of such new terminology and the institutions of government which it articulates are of profound importance to an understanding of the modern state, as are the theories of sovereignty of Bodin and most especially Hobbes in the late sixteenth and mid-seventeenth century, which encapsulate some of the central features of states today as ultimate repositories of political judgement and founts of all authority, exercising uncontested rule within defined territorial limits. Foucault himself, in addressing what he took to be a shift in the art of government from control over lands to control over the conduct of subjects, also came to hold the view, albeit from a quite different perspective, that the character of the modern state began to crystallize around the theme of its own rationality—its *raison d'état*—towards the end of the sixteenth century.<sup>18</sup>

But however much prefigured by Hobbes's doctrines of sovereignty and representation in particular, the modern state required for its formation a principle which is absent from the political philosophies of both Bodin and Hobbes, and which is missing as well from the vast number of tracts on the practice of government that were produced even earlier in the Renaissance. In addition to superimposing undivided rule upon its subjects, the genuinely modern state further requires that those who fall under its authority be united themselves—that they form one people, one nation, morally bound together by a common identity. With some notable exceptions, the modern state is of its essence a *nation-state*, in which nationality is defined politically and political power is held to express the nation's will. Hobbes had conceived a need for a unitary sovereign in his depiction of the artificial personality of the state, but he had not supposed that the multitude of subjects which authorized that power could be identified as having a collective character of its own. Joined together with his conception of the unity of the representer, as outlined in the sixteenth chapter of his *Leviathan*, the modern state generally requires that the represented be a moral person as well, national unity going hand in hand with the political unity of the state.<sup>19</sup> While it speaks with only one voice in the manner imputed to absolutist monarchy, the modern nation-state cannot take the form of a monarchical *civitas* along any lines set forth by Bodin or Hobbes. It is instead, as it has been known since the late eighteenth century, a *democratic republic*.

That expression, employed by Paine and others to explain how Athenian democracy could be writ large by way of the people's representation in an assembly which they elect, has never corresponded properly, however, to the constitution of the United States of America which it

purportedly described. In the course of their history, the people of America have not comprised a single nation, and in many respects, by design as well as on account of civil war, their government has not even been that of a single state. So far from having been incorporated in the federal constitution of the United States, the idea of democracy was held by its founding fathers—Madison most conspicuously among them—to be a dangerously despotic notion. The political authors of the first republic of the New World drew up their system in such a way as to ensure that it would be divided internally between the separate states and the different branches of government, so as to substitute indirect forms of authority for any democratic assembly of the people as a whole. Political modernity, in so far as it is marked by the advent of the nation-state, was to begin not in the United States of America but in Revolutionary France.<sup>20</sup>

In neglecting the most immediately pertinent political dimensions of modernity, Foucault managed to obscure the best reason for tracing its epistemic metamorphosis to the pivotal year of 1795. But he also left too vague his dating of modernity as a whole, since, if I may here invert the chronology of Bishop Ussher's account of universal history since Genesis, modernity was endowed by its creator with its political form on 17 June 1789. Between modernity's explosive birth and the fall of the Bastille, that is to say, the human race must have enjoyed four weeks of innocence. It might be supposed that conceptual historians are characteristically imprecise about dates, but Hegel's grasp of the chronology of political modernity was perfectly correct, and for almost two hundred years the section devoted to 'Absolute Freedom and Terror' in his *Phänomenologie des Geistes* has comprised the most accurate reading of its earliest stages.

On 17 June 1789, the deputies of the Estates General, which had been convoked the previous autumn by King Louis XVI, resolved that they were no longer assembled at the monarch's behest but were rather agents of the national will (*le voeu national*), entrusted with the task of representing the sovereignty of the people of France. The three estates thereby constituted themselves as a single *Assemblée nationale*,<sup>21</sup> bearing sole authority to interpret the people's general will. It is in this way that political modernity was born, with a unicameral political system corresponding to a unitary will, a unified state speaking on behalf of an undifferentiated nation.

Since the motion that thus generated the National Assembly had been put—initially to the delegates of the Third Estate alone—by the abbé Sieyès, it may be said that the inventor of the term *science sociale* is also the father of the modern nation-state. Although the words *souveraineté* and *état* were seldom evoked in his writings, he had a better grasp of their meaning, as articulated in the political philosophy of Hobbes, than any other public figure of the French Revolution, and he was convinced of the

indispensability of their application, in Hobbes's fashion, to the first genuinely self-governing populace of the modern age. Allowing for mankind's constant temptation to resist parental guidance, it therefore appears that Sieyès, on two counts, stands to the whole of modernity as does God to his Creation. Sieyès indeed strove harder than God had done to ensure that his handiwork flourished, since over the next several years after modernity had been born he was to be its nursemaid and counsellor as well. No one has contributed more to shaping the modern world's political discourse and the character of its nation-state in particular.

Hegel, who had witnessed modernity's birth and was to devote much of his life to portraying its childhood, came eventually to reflect upon Sieyès' paternity of modernity, as it were, in his essay, *Über die englische Reformbill*, of 1831, where he remarked that Sieyès had been able to extract out of his own papers the plan which was to give France the constitution it came to enjoy.<sup>22</sup> In the language which he had employed earlier in his *Phänomenologie* of 1807, he described this birthday of modernity, in his fashion, as the undivided substance of absolute freedom ascending the throne of the world without there being any power able to resist it.<sup>23</sup>

In pursuit of the reasoning which had led to the formation of the National Assembly, it next followed from its members' debates of late August and early September 1789 that the King of France must be denied an absolute veto over its legislation, principally on the grounds that there could be no sovereign above the people's representatives. Both Robespierre and Sieyès argued forcefully in the same debates that the King could not even be permitted a suspensive veto, since the unity of the nation prohibited any executive constraint over its legislative will, while the King's particular will could not be elevated above the rest. The advocates of a suspensive veto, on the other hand, either wished, as monarchists, that the King should retain a residual power in a more mixed constitution, or, as democrats, that he might hold the Assembly's power in check on behalf of the people of France.

Their triumph of 15 September 1789 over the opponents of any royal veto was three years later to ensure the final destruction of both the monarchy and the Legislative Assembly, which in October 1791 succeeded the National Assembly. For having been granted a suspensive veto but at the same time denied thereby the right to represent the nation, the King was to find his office preserved in name only, cut off from the populace to which he might have appealed against the state. When his suspensive veto came to be exercised on behalf of just those forces which had opposed the Revolution altogether, the people of France were able to see the fracture of their constitution that had been manufactured at its birth, and in a particularly trenchant way they came to recognize the weakness of the authority of their state. In the late summer of 1792, with the King and the

Legislative Assembly in conflict, the nation in effect brought them down together. As Hegel accordingly remarked in his *Phänomenologie*, all social groups or classes which are the spiritual spheres into which the whole is articulated are abolished.<sup>24</sup>

Around the time of its establishment along lines envisaged in Sieyès' plan, the National Assembly, seeking to make its identity clear, deliberated not only about the powers of the King but also about the powers of the people. Both in the spring of 1789 and again at the end of July, Sieyès argued successfully that the people of France must be denied any binding mandate, or *mandat impératif*, over their own delegates, since such a mandate would deprive the people's representatives of their freedom and would accordingly substitute the multifarious particular wills of scattered citizens for the collective will of the nation as a whole. The act of creation of the National Assembly which Sieyès had sponsored declared that the Assembly was one and indivisible. As the father of modernity insisted, if the general will was to speak with one voice in a unitary nation-state, it could no more be accountable to the people at large than to a king.

At the heart of Sieyès' conception of modernity lay an idea of representation which in his eyes was to constitute the most central feature of the French state. The modern age in its political form, which he termed *l'ordre représentatif*, depended for its prosperity upon a system of state management which adopted the same principle of the division of labour as was necessary for a modern economy. This system entailed that the people must entrust authority to their representatives rather than seek its exercise directly by themselves, their delegates articulating their interests on their behalf while they accordingly remain silent. In thus distinguishing the effective agents of state power from its ultimate originators, Sieyès merely pursued the logic of his own differentiation of *active* from *passive* citizens, whose separate identification for a brief period under the French Constitution of 1791 was to prove one of the crowning achievements of his career as the first legislator of modern France.<sup>25</sup> In the light of his doctrine of representation, it was accordingly plain to Sieyès that the people as well as the King must be barred from seeking control over the National Assembly, since any diminution of its authority from an external source would constitute a danger to the expression of the general will.

There could be no confusion in France between representation and democracy such as inspired Paine and others to imagine that the hybrid form of government established in America had nourished a classical principle of self-rule in a large state. For Sieyès, who sometimes spoke of direct democracy as a form of *démocratie brute*, it would be tragic for the first genuinely modern state of human history to make a retrograde step.



In establishing a political system that was without precedent, France could not hesitate between ancient and modern principles of government. Despite his endorsement of other constitutional safeguards against the sovereign assembly's abuse of its powers, Sieyès did not permit any allegiance to Montesquieu with respect to such matters to overcome his mistrust of Rousseau; he was above all adamant that the people themselves, lacking discipline, must be deprived of such means as would put public order at risk. The inventor of the term *science sociale* was convinced that democracy was no more fit for modernity than was the mixed constitution that would issue from the preservation of a royal veto. No plebiscite or other vestige of direct democracy could be tolerated by the sole representative of the entire nation. Sovereignty thereby passed from the nation's multifarious fragments to the people's delegates constituted as one body, the populace ceasing to have any political identity except as articulated through its representatives, who by procuration were granted authority to speak for the electorate as a whole.

While the conception of the modern state put forward by Sieyès thus required that both the King, on the one hand, and the people, on the other, should be marginalized from the government of France, the implementation of his plan did not proceed as smoothly as he might have hoped. Apart from the King's disinclination to yield all his powers to an assembly which he had originally called into being himself, the people had their revolutionary champions as well. The Jacobins, in particular, regarded Sieyès' distinction between active and passive citizenship as anathema and, opposing his principle of the indivisibility of the general will as articulated by the nation's representatives, they sought to return directly to the people, in their districts and through their communes, the indivisible sovereignty of the whole nation which had been expropriated by their independently minded political delegates. No less than Condorcet, among the Legislative Assembly's internal critics, the Jacobins, from their Club and from the Commune of Paris, contended throughout 1791 and 1792 that the people must be empowered to exercise their rights as citizens, even if in defiance of laws that would silence them.

The Jacobin notion of sovereignty, conceived as residing with the people as a whole, thus seemed to contradict the logic of modernity pursued by Sieyès and his associates, in so far as the Jacobins portrayed themselves as standing for the people rather than for the nation that had been substituted for them. The case which Sieyès assembled on behalf of representation against democracy seemed to them a peculiarly modern form of despotism. In this respect, it may be said that Robespierre and Saint-Just embraced the idea of popular sovereignty not less but more than did Sieyès, who in fact found the term almost as uncongenial as Locke had



done a century earlier. As opposed to the political idea of the sovereignty of the nation, which to them signified no more than the sovereignty of the state, the Jacobins subscribed to a belief in the social sovereignty of the nation conceived as the sovereignty of the people in general.

But the Jacobins' contradiction of Sieyès' logic of modernity was in a crucial sense illusory, since the nation which they envisaged to be comprised of all its people was to prove as monolithic as Sieyès' conception of a nation represented by the state. When the Jacobins came to power within the Convention in the autumn of 1793, they behaved as Sieyès and his associates had done earlier, but in reverse—that is, they attempted to root out the people's enemies within the state, just as Sieyès had sought to silence the enemies of the state within the nation. The right of initiative of all citizens through direct elections and by way of referenda, such as had been proposed by Condorcet at the beginning of the year, was tempered by layers of indirect suffrage and obstructions to collective action which left the people in their sections and communes with only a tenuous and residual right of veto, when the Constitution of 1793 came to be enacted after the Girondins' fall. In attempting to render the citizen population of France active so that the people's delegates could be accountable to and even decommissioned by their true sovereign, the Jacobins were obliged to cleanse the nation of its internal differences, closing the Catholic churches, for instance, and forcing the Commune of Paris, from which they had drawn so much of their own strength, to surrender its powers.

For the people to act as a collective grand jury of their government, they must also speak with one voice. Having supported the rights of primary assemblies against the state, the Jacobins came within the Convention to oppose assemblies which betrayed the nation. Pure democracy was to prove as incompatible in practice with Robespierre's populism as it was alien to Sieyès' notion of representative government, so that in 1793, no less than in 1789, when these two enemies had last been in agreement in their opposition to the royal veto, they could once again be of one mind. The Terror of the Jacobins was to follow directly from their idea of the sublime unity of the nation, which required a lofty purity of public spirit that made the vulgar purity of democracy seem an uncouth substitute for virtue. Popular sovereignty was not only to be given voice but actually created by the nation's genuine representatives. The greatest enemy of the people for whom they stood, and who had still to be manufactured in the image of what they might become, were all the fractious people cast in recalcitrant moulds resistant to such change, who thereby stood in the way of the agents of the people of the future. As Hegel remarks by way of bringing the passage on 'Absolute Freedom and Terror' in his *Phänomenologie* to a climax, in its abstract existence of unmediated pure negation, the sole work of freedom is therefore death, a death

without inner significance, the coldest and meanest of deaths, like cutting off the head of a cabbage.<sup>26</sup>

### THE HEGELIAN MISREPRESENTATION OF ROUSSEAU

The history of the early development of this political discourse of modernity, and of the French Revolutionary assemblies and debates in which its principles were articulated and transformed, has been recounted several times before, most thoroughly, to my mind, by Patrice Gueniffey and Lucien Jaume.<sup>27</sup> Paul Bastid, Murray Forsyth, Pasquale Pasquino, Jean-Denis Bredin, Keith Baker, Antoine de Baecque, William Sewell and others have stressed the special significance of Sieyès' contribution, and in a notable recent essay, Istvan Hont, placing further emphasis upon Sieyès' doctrine, locates it at the heart of a long and complex debate, over several centuries, about the nature of the state in general and the character of the modern nation-state in particular.<sup>28</sup> I have here, however, tried to flesh out what I believe to be Hegel's reading of the French Revolutionary birth of political modernity, and that for several reasons: First, because I believe that Hegel's conception of the Terror as joined umbilically to the foetus of the National Assembly in the act of its creation offers an exceptionally imaginative account of the connection between political theory and political practice, even of the transfiguration of philosophy into violence; second, because it forms one of the most remarkable interpretations ever proposed of the genesis of modernity as a whole; third, because it provides a conceptual history of the political form which Hegel believed modernity had taken that bears comparison with the schemes of Koselleck and Foucault, albeit in a dramatically different idiom; and fourth, because it portrays the French Revolution as the political offspring or afterbirth of the Enlightenment.

Hegel perfectly well understood Sieyès' role as nursemaid and chief counsellor of the French Revolution, but as is plain most of all from his *Philosophie des Rechts* and his *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*, he believed that the Revolution's spiritual father was not Sieyès himself but Rousseau, who in the *Contrat social* had articulated the idea of absolute freedom which was to be given political embodiment in the National Assembly and was subsequently to be unsheathed in the Terror. I hold that belief to be entirely without foundation, and to the extent that it informs Hegel's conceptual history of modernity, I regard its falsity as undermining his whole case for joining the French Revolution to the Enlightenment.<sup>29</sup> Of course Hegel had no doubt that Rousseau's attachment to the republics of antiquity and his contempt for the trappings of civilization bore witness to his fundamental antagonism towards Enlightenment

ideals of human progress. But in prescribing a notion of liberty that was at once absolute and pure, Rousseau was in Hegel's eyes the author of a philosophy which was no less abstract than Kant's, and which, as a blueprint for political change, was to prove the most dangerous of all the monolithic schemes of the Enlightenment. Koselleck's account of the conceptual origins of the French Revolution in his *Kritik und Krise* is similarly built round an extravagant portrayal of the impact of Rousseau's insidious philosophy, deemed to have unleashed the permanent revolution and permanent dictatorship of the modern totalitarian state.<sup>30</sup>

According to Hegel, Rousseau's great achievement had been to put forward the idea of *will* as the state's fundamental principle. In conceiving his notion of the will only in terms of its individuality, or *Einzelheit*, however, he had in his characteristically shallow fashion portrayed the union of individuals within the state as a mere contract of particulars, whose indeterminacy and arbitrariness made impossible the truly concrete union of wills upon which the establishment of a genuine political community depends. Having constructed his notion of the *volonté générale* as a compound formed out of individuals' capriciousness, Rousseau had failed to see that the universal or general will, the *allgemeine Wille*, of the state depends upon cooperative obedience to its rules rather than on any idea of contractual association designed to leave individuals as free as they were before. In attempting to invest Rousseau's abstractions with political power, the revolutionaries of France overthrew the constitution of their state, because it stood in the way of the fulfilment of their principles. The Reign of Terror, Hegel claims in his *Philosophie des Rechts*, was the destructive and fanatical form which had been taken by Rousseau's abstract idea of absolute freedom, when in practice it confronted institutions incompatible with its own self-realization.

Through the language he employs in his conceptual history of modernity, Hegel's reading of the revolutionary influence of Rousseau might appear to correspond with other images that had been drawn by so many of Rousseau's revolutionary admirers and critics alike in just those debates that were to inform the account of absolute freedom and terror which is offered in the *Phänomenologie*. As early as 1791, Louis Sébastien Mercier had produced a work whose very title encapsulates a belief that was already widespread at the time, *Rousseau, considéré comme l'un des premiers auteurs de la Révolution*. After the fall of Robespierre in 1794, Rousseau's remains were transferred from their grave at Ermenonville and brought to the Panthéon in Paris, where *le citoyen de Genève* could forever be acclaimed as a hero of the French nation. More than three years earlier, Edmund Burke had denounced Rousseau as the 'insane Socrates' of the National Assembly,<sup>31</sup> and throughout the last decade of the eighteenth century the *Contrat social* would indeed come to be es-

teemed as the Revolution's holy writ, fusing its Ten Commandments and its Sermon on the Mount in a blueprint for a new social order conceived by the patron saint of the First Republic of France three decades before its actual Creation.

But neither Hegel's reading of Rousseau, nor his conceptual history of the National Assembly's prefiguration of the Terror in its act of union, bears any relation to France's own revolutionary canonization of its spiritual legislator. The interpretation of Rousseau's revolutionary significance offered by Hegel, later taken up by Marx, is based entirely upon Hegel's understanding of what he regarded as a defining feature of the age of modernity, the advent of *bürgerliche Gesellschaft*, that is, the realm of civil society, which he describes, in his *Philosophie des Rechts*, as an association of self-sufficient individuals whose common interests are pursued by contract and through legal institutions only.<sup>32</sup> Hegel was contemptuous of all political thinkers, including Rousseau, who laboured under the misapprehension that the state could be, or might ever have been, established by contract. It was within civil society alone, and not the state, as he conceived it, that individuals, the bearers of natural liberty, remain as free after making their common agreements as before. According to Hegel, Rousseau's failure, and that of the revolutionaries he inspired after him, had quite simply been due to the fact that they had all attempted to construct the state in the image of civil society and had neglected to transcend it so as to enter the true realm of communal action, described as *Sittlichkeit*, or ethical life, in the *Philosophie des Rechts*. Rousseau had merely abstracted *homo oeconomicus*, the individual in a civil society or market economy, from his concrete political relations and then had falsely supposed that by contract such a person could come together with others like himself to form a civil association which had as its aim the preservation of each person's natural freedom.

Hegel, following Fichte before him, never noticed that Rousseau's account of the *volonté générale* pertained specifically to a collective will, resembling his own notion of the *allgemeine Wille*, rather than to a compound of particulars, which would have been merely the *volonté de tous*. He was not aware that Rousseau's vision of the moral personality of the state, as outlined in the *Contrat social*, entailed much the same dimensions of political solidarity and self-recognition as part of a greater whole that were embraced by his account of ethical life. He did not perceive that Rousseau shared with him a notion of community that transcended the arbitrariness of the individual will in civil society.

Still less was Hegel attentive to Rousseau's critique of the modern idea of representation—to his insistence that citizens could only be truly free if they were themselves engaged in legislation, since the substitution of one's will by delegates acting on one's behalf was nothing other than despotism.

Even while upholding a commitment to civil liberty of a kind which could not be enjoyed except by citizens partaking of their state's corporate identity, Rousseau insisted upon each person's genuine autonomy, or self-direction, which Hegel wrongly assumed to mean the maintenance of natural liberty, thereby neglecting Rousseau's belief that liberty must always exclude dependence on others, prohibiting the representation of individuals' freedom of choice. Rousseau was convinced, as Hegel was not, any more than Sieyès had been, that to express the general will citizens must deliberate together and then heed their own counsel; they could not just vote for spokesmen who, as their proxies, would determine the nation's laws. In large states, as Rousseau recognized in both his *Contrat social* and *Gouvernement de Pologne*, there must be means whereby the true sovereign could exercise its will even when assemblies were entitled, over prescribed periods and subject to general ratification, to speak with the consent of the people as a whole. There must in such circumstances be plebiscites, he believed, such as had been enjoyed by the people of the Republic of Rome, entitled to dispense with their tribunes at will, for in the presence of the represented, as Rousseau put it, there could be no representation.<sup>33</sup>

For all his misgivings about democracy as a form of government, Rousseau believed more passionately than any other eighteenth-century thinker in the idea of popular or democratic sovereignty. It was principally this doctrine, which was presumed to have been inscribed in all the Declarations of the Rights of Man and all the constitutions of the revolutionary years, that ensured Rousseau's renown as the patron saint of a regenerated France. But the doctrine was upheld by him in its pure form, embracing the people as a whole,<sup>34</sup> while the purity of purpose sought by Sieyès, Robespierre and their associates with respect to the sovereignty of the nation was always of another, contradictory, sort. As is perhaps plainest from his *Gouvernement de Pologne*, Rousseau subscribed to just that notion of a *mandat impératif* which in the modern world most closely approximated the full legislative authority of citizens acting collectively, such as he understood to have prevailed in the free republics of antiquity. He was a democrat against representation, he stood for the direct and unmediated sovereignty of the people against all forms of delegated power, and not once in the course of a revolution said to have been framed by his ideas did the advocates of his philosophy—in the National Assembly, the Commune of Paris, the Jacobin Club or the Club of the Cordeliers—come to prevail.

Hegel's conceptual history of modernity, within which Rousseau's idea of absolute liberty is portrayed as having engendered both the National Assembly and the Terror, was thus only made possible by the category mistake of his confusing Rousseau's political doctrine with the philoso-

phies of both Sieyès, whom he supposed to have put Rousseauism into practice, and Robespierre, whom he regarded as having brought Rousseauism to its dreadful climax. The father of modernity was of course no more likely to assume responsibility for the Terror than was God ever inclined to accept blame for original sin. Sieyès was never persuaded by Hegel's reading of the French Revolution and always remained convinced that the Terror had actually sprung from the betrayal of his own ideas on the part of populists who could not abide the principle of indirect sovereignty which his theory of representation prescribed. From his point of view, a form of Rousseauism had indeed been responsible for the Terror, in dissolving all his achievements in the National Assembly through its successful implementation of just that brutish form of direct democracy which was unfit for the modern world.

The inappropriateness of democracy for modernity was as striking to Sieyès as was the unsuitability of modernity for democracy in the eyes of Rousseau. With regard to *his* grasp of the meaning of Rousseau's political philosophy, Sieyès was as clear as was Hegel obscure. Perhaps it was because he was not himself a conceptual historian of modernity but only its father that his reading of the texts of other authors was sometimes less blind than that of modernity's scribe. Most of the features of Rousseau's political philosophy which Hegel had overlooked, Sieyès recognized, and he devoted much of his career to combating those democrats of the National Assembly who espoused them. As against Rousseau's democratic notion of sovereignty he turned instead to that of Hobbes, even to the extent of preferring a monarchical over a republican regime if polyarchy was to be averted. Rousseau's followers in the National Assembly had no understanding of the system of representation required in a modern state, he supposed, but at least a sketch of it could be drawn from the sixteenth chapter of Hobbes's *Leviathan*.<sup>35</sup> The Jacobins likewise, in their advocacy of one nation, proved as little democratic as was Sieyès in upholding the integrity of one state.

Yet even before the genuinely modern nation-state came to be manufactured by Sieyès, Rousseau was convinced that the world had already suffered more of modernity than it could bear. When he contemplated much the same future that Sieyès was to call into being, it filled him with dread. In the third book of *Emile*, as if to anticipate Koselleck, he remarked that 'we are approaching a state of crisis and the age of revolutions. . . . I hold it impossible that the great monarchies of Europe still have long to survive'.<sup>36</sup> He had perceived already, from the abuse of their popular mandates by the legislative assemblies of both England and his native Geneva, that when the people's will is represented, absolute right was corrupted into unfettered power. He had foreseen the terror as vividly as Hegel described it. 'Where force alone reigns', he had remarked in

his *Lettres de la montagne*, 'the state is dissolved . . . that is how all democratic states finally perish'.<sup>37</sup>

### MODERNITY'S JETTISONED HERITAGE

Where, then, does this scenario, focused upon the French Revolution, leave the conceptual history of modernity with respect to its imputed origins in the Enlightenment? The pioneers of modern social science around the year 1795 plainly owe a debt to certain eighteenth-century thinkers and traditions of thought. Sieyès, as well as many of the *idéologues* whose use of the term *science sociale* differed from his own, drew inspiration from the sensationalist philosophy of Condillac and especially from his sketches, in his *Traité des sensations* and *Traité des systèmes*, of a unified science of human nature which would be free of the metaphysical abstractions associated with seventeenth-century notions of the soul. By way of Condillac, they also owed a more distant debt to Locke's epistemology; and they agreed with Maupertuis, La Mettrie and d'Holbach, among Condillac's contemporaries, that the moral attributes of human nature could be explained with reference to man's physical constitution alone, and with Helvétius that the central task of a system of education was to shape the pliant clay of human nature. In their physiological conception of a social science the *idéologues* owed a certain debt to Bordeu and Barthez, indirectly perhaps even to Haller, taking particular stock of such features of the Montpellier school of physiology as had inspired Diderot's writings on the subject and were to come to the notice of Saint-Simon mainly by way of Burdin and Bichat.

Above all, perhaps, they were spiritual descendants of Montesquieu's *Esprit des lois*, in its attempt to formulate what might be termed deep structural explanations of human behaviour, interpreting laws in terms of manners and mores, and even religions by way of mental dispositions which reflected the influence of climate and other external factors upon the nerve fibres of the body. Most of the ideological and scientific sources of French Revolutionary social science were themselves French, but at least in his theory of the political division of labour, Sieyès believed that he had followed and even anticipated Adam Smith,<sup>38</sup> who may therefore be described, as he has always been known in Japan, as the godfather of modernity, just as Voltaire was the godfather of the Enlightenment.

Foucault was in a fundamental sense mistaken to suppose that the human sciences were first invented around 1795, since the epistemic metamorphosis he traces to that period of European intellectual history actually had a longer term of gestation throughout the eighteenth century than he allows. In its materialist philosophy it may indeed be said to have issued,



through the Enlightenment, from some central elements of seventeenth-century Cartesian science itself. But to describe that metamorphosis, in Foucault's manner, as the *invention* of the human sciences does a great injustice to other themes and traditions of eighteenth-century thought, including Hume's perspective, which aimed at establishing a science of human nature on different foundations, equally concerned with the internal operations of the mind, but drawn from a conceptual framework of natural philosophy or physics rather than physiology.

It could even be argued with some plausibility that the human sciences were not so much invented around 1795 as superseded then by fresh scientific schemes which had as their defining characteristic the elimination from their accounts of a specifically human element. Mirabeau's *La Science ou les droits et les devoirs de l'homme*, or Filangieri's *La Scienza della legislazione* or Ferguson's *Principles of Moral and Political Science*, for instance—each published or compiled before the French Revolution—placed special emphasis upon notions of human action and the human will, upon what it is that persons have a mind to do, and how they ought to behave, in the light of such truths as could be established about man's nature. Among the more striking features of the new sciences of society which Foucault's conceptual history of the modern age portrays is the removal of politics from explanations of human nature—the elimination of the spheres of legislation and political action from *la science sociale* and their redescription as abstract, utopian, metaphysical and, after the Terror, dangerous to know. Nothing was to prove so destructive of that central feature of the Enlightenment Project which throughout the latter half of the eighteenth century was conceived as a science of legislation for the promotion of human happiness than the birth, by Caesarean section plucked from the womb of the old society, of genuinely modern social science. The proponents of the fresh disciplines that arose from around 1795 were far less committed than their predecessors to changing the world. They sought instead, by interpreting its internal functions, to preserve it.

While a comprehensive history of the early development of our modern notions of social science can only be pieced together from detailed accounts of its various disciplines, there should be little doubt that the advent of the nation-state, in its manufacture by the father of modernity and his successors, has not fulfilled the Enlightenment Project but, on the contrary, brought it to an untimely end. Over the past thirty years, Jürgen Habermas—perhaps the best-known enthusiast of Enlightenment principles among contemporary social theorists—has argued valiantly on their behalf and against their detractors, in promoting eighteenth-century ideals of rational and critical discourse in a *bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit*, or bourgeois public sphere, comprised of citizens committed to the pursuit



of indefinite social progress through all the richly textured mediums of self-emancipation.

Yet although the Enlightenment Project itself is in my mind in no way to blame for modernity's failure, the demise of all that Habermas holds dear was already sown in the establishment of the nation-state under the guidance of Sieyès, who contrived in advance to cut off Habermas's fondest hopes as if, instead of seeds that should be nurtured, they formed, in Hegel's terminology, the useless head of a cabbage. For as has been noted by communitarian critics of modernity of all denominations from Leo Strauss to Sheldon Wolin and beyond, the establishment of the nation-state has been marked throughout its history by the depoliticization of its subjects and the destruction of the public sphere of their engagement with one another as citizens,<sup>39</sup> accelerating a process decried, in the Enlightenment itself with reference to the state, even before it had become a nation-state, not least by Rousseau.

Unless it is the legal despotism of Le Mercier de la Rivière, not a single major scheme of government conceived by Enlightenment thinkers—not classical republicanism or its modern derivatives meant for large states, not enlightened monarchy, nor democracy, nor the re-establishment of the ancient constitution, nor the mixed constitution, nor the separation of powers—has come to prevail anywhere in the epoch sired by the father of modernity.<sup>40</sup> Most commentators on the philosophical foundations of the modern age of course ascribe seminal influence not to Sieyès but to Kant, mainly in the light of his portrayal of autonomous human agency, freed from the shackles of classical metaphysics, religious dogma and historical tradition.<sup>41</sup> After initially describing Kant's arousal of philosophy from its dogmatic slumber as a soporific awakening which only lulled it into fresh anthropological sleep, Foucault himself came to reassess the impact of the Kantian ethic upon modernity as critical and liberating, if not the harbinger of universally acceptable rules of conduct.<sup>42</sup>

But in heralding the liberation of the self from all externally imposed authority, Kant excluded the domain of politics, whose most characteristically modern institutions in particular have embraced new images of personal identity and have given rise to fresh constraints upon the exercise of individual choice which are thoroughly incompatible with the ideals of moral independence that he espoused himself. Though he greatly welcomed the French Revolution, and in particular its republican zeal, Kant maintained a lofty optimism about its ultimate achievement on behalf of the whole human race that left little room for engagement as a protagonist of any of its immediate aims. A life-long sense of prudence and political circumspection no doubt also forbade the invocation of the modernist principles of his ethics as wholesale grounds for opposition to the modern state.

Yet Locke, near the end of the seventeenth century, and Rousseau and other liberally minded thinkers of the eighteenth century before Kant, had already denounced the Hobbesian account of sovereignty as a form of voluntary subjection, in consequence of which the people were deemed to be bound by an artificial power of their own making. It extracted slavery from liberty, claimed Rousseau in particular, driving the consenters to the Leviathan's rule into chains which they believed would make them free. Since political power is by its very nature undemocratic, perhaps the principal ideological achievement of social contract theory in the two centuries in which it flourished in European political thought was its success in portraying the legitimation of state power back to front, as if it were ultimately enacted by the authorization of the governed, so that popular choice could be made to *appear* to have supplanted either God or nature as the real originator of the state.

The *mandat impératif* was in the eighteenth century designed to preserve an essential element of democracy within a system of representation whose centripetal force progressively tore it free of any popular control. In the course of the French Revolution democracy's advocates were accordingly defeated, as they would be again in the Paris Commune of 1871. By and large, such defeats, which had several precedents in the history of the Roman Republic, were predictable, and so too would be the later triumph of the Leninist conception of a communist party vanguard of the proletariat over the democratically inspired criticism of Leon Trotsky and Rosa Luxemburg.

The utter inappropriateness of democracy for the modern age had been perfectly plain to Sieyès, and it is a measure of the impact of the father of modernity upon the social sciences we have inherited from the end of the age of Enlightenment that political scientists of the twentieth century, following Roberto Michels and Joseph Schumpeter, have shared Sieyès' objections to pure democracy and have merely pursued them a few steps further. For in portraying the establishment of rule by competing elites as genuine democracy—that is, as the only sense of democracy that has any real meaning—they have adopted the representative alternative to democracy which Sieyès bequeathed to the modern age and have granted to it the name of its opposite.<sup>43</sup> Almost every state throughout the world now describes itself as democratic in just this way.

Classical republicanism, on the other hand, can in some sense be said to have survived the French Revolution not just in name but in fact, for although modernity is inescapably hostile to it as well, it has managed to make fitful appearances at least in the only form our governments occasionally tolerate, that is, as socialism. With respect to its ideals of collective and civic identity, classical republicanism of course may itself be described as a forebear of modern nationalism and even of the nation-state.

Yet since the French Revolution, most of its adherents, when they have upheld their principles, have remained sufficiently populist, sometimes even sufficiently egalitarian, to resist the hegemony of contemporary governments. So long as the nation-state continues to flourish, nevertheless, it may be safely assumed that modern republicanism, or socialism, will occupy in the political realm a place such as is filled by the polar bear in the natural world, as a species which has a splendid history but has become endangered, almost vestigial, now that it can no longer roam free.

If all this was in a fundamental sense predictable and in no way contrary to the plan of modernity mapped by its father, what could not have been foreseen by anyone in the Enlightenment or in the course of the French Revolution was the price that modern civilization would be obliged to pay for its establishment of the nation-state. In opposing the democratic *mandat impératif* in the National Assembly, Sieyès recognized the threat to the expression of the nation's general will which might be constituted by the people. It was of the essence of his plan that the nation in assembly spoke for all the people and must never be silenced by the people themselves. Over the past two hundred years the nation-state has characteristically achieved that end because it represents the people, standing before them not just as monarchs had done earlier, as the embodiment of their collective will, but rather by assuming their very identity, bearing the personality of the people themselves. While a small number of genuinely multinational states have in that period been established as well and continue to flourish, the majority of peoples everywhere now comprise nations which, by way of their representatives, are politically incorporated as states. All peoples that have identities form nation-states. What Sieyès did not foresee was that in the age of modernity heralded by his political philosophy, a people might not survive unless it constituted a nation-state. In the age of modernity, it has proved possible for the nation-state to become the enemy of the people.

To the Hobbesian theory of representation, the nation-state adds the dimension of the comprehensive unity of the people, the representer and represented together forming an indissoluble whole, the state now identical with the nation, the nation bonded to the state, each understood through the other. As Hannah Arendt rightly noted in her *Origins of Totalitarianism*, it has been a characteristic feature of the nation-state since the French Revolution that the rights of man and the rights of the citizen are the same.<sup>44</sup> By giving real substance and proper sanction to the various declarations of the rights of man within the framework of its own first constitutions, the French revolutionary nation-state invented by Sieyès joined the rights of man to the sovereignty of the nation.<sup>45</sup> It defined the rights of man in such a way that only the state could enforce them and only members of the nation could enjoy them.

So far from putting into practice the universal rights of man long advocated by proponents of cosmopolitan enlightenment, the modern nation-state was to ensure that henceforth only persons comprising nations which formed states could have rights. In such modern states as are not genuine nation-states, human rights may still have some purchase. In the United States, in particular, where citizens have no single national identity, courts of law are generally so sympathetic to the exercise of human rights, and so generous in their recompense when they judge that such rights have been breached, that lawyers seldom charge their clients in advance for their services. But the history of modernity since the French Revolution has characteristically been marked by the abuse of human rights on the part of nation-states which alone have the authority to determine the scope of those rights and their validity.

Not only individuals but whole peoples which comprise nations without states have found themselves comprehensively shorn of their rights. At the heart of the Enlightenment Project, which its advocates perceived as putting an end to the age of privilege, was their recognition of the common humanity of all persons. For Kant, who in Königsberg came from practically nowhere and went nowhere else at all, to be enlightened meant to be intolerant of injustice everywhere, to pay indiscriminate respect to each individual, to be committed to universal justice, to be morally indifferent to difference,<sup>46</sup> even while obedient to civil authority. But in the age of the nation-state, it is otherwise. Thanks ultimately to the father of modernity, ours is the age of the passport, the permit, the right of entry to each state or right of exit from it which is enjoyed by citizens that bear its nationality alone. For persons who are not accredited as belonging to a nation-state in the world of modernity, there are few passports and still fewer visas. To be without a passport or visa in the modern world is to have no right of exit or entry anywhere, and to be without a right of exit or entry is to risk a rite of passage to the grave. That above all is the legacy bequeathed to us from the political inception of the modern age on 17 June 1789. It was then that the metempsychosis of modernity began, when we took the first steps of the Mephisto Waltz of our transfiguration, when we started to manufacture Frankenstein's monster from Pygmalion's statue.<sup>47</sup>

ROUSSEAU AND MARX

I

The political theories of Rousseau and Marx arouse stronger feelings than do most doctrines, and they have exercised a greater influence on the course of social revolutions than have the ideas of any other modern writers. But while each continues to attract widespread interest, they are seldom compared with one another, and only in Italy has there been any extensive discussion of the nature of the conceptual relations between them. Bobbio, Cotta, Mondolfo and Marramao have all written on the subject over the past forty years or so,<sup>1</sup> and Galvano della Volpe and Lucio Colletti have each devoted books to it which proved sufficiently popular to warrant several editions.<sup>2</sup> English readers, accordingly, should be thankful to New Left Books and Lawrence and Wishart for recently publishing translations of the two main works about Rousseau and Marx in that tradition—della Volpe's *Rousseau e Marx* and Colletti's *Ideologia e società*<sup>3</sup>—though some may wonder at the bearing of these texts upon their subject, once they have been shorn from the world of Italian Marxism to which they belong. Della Volpe's book, whose English edition appeared in 1978, is a collection of essays written for the most part over twenty years earlier, in which the author's principal aim is to assess what he takes to be the limited egalitarianism of Rousseau and Marx and to rescue this doctrine from some of its Stalinist misinterpreters. Colletti's more engaging and better argued work confronts the views of della Volpe in the manner of a courteous critic, invoking the authority of scholarly essays drawn from the most respectable, and bourgeois, French and English academic journals. To my mind each of these books offers a provocative but not always illuminating treatment of the subject, largely because in translation they have been plucked from their time and context. Together with Touchstone in *As You Like It*, I think it can be said about them that 'When they were at home, they were in a better place'. Far more satisfactory, in my view, though regrettably less familiar even to English readers, is the commentary by John Plamenatz in his account of *Karl Marx's Philosophy of Man*,<sup>4</sup> to which my remarks here owe an intellectual debt I am happy to acknowledge.

Such links as would connect the philosophies of Rousseau and Marx ought, of course, to form a subject of interest in themselves, not least to

historians of ideas engaged in tracing Rousseau's influence or locating Marx's sources. From time to time scholars have in fact attempted to establish the intellectual influence exercised by Rousseau over Marx, particularly as it may have been mediated by Marx's father, who, according to Eleanor Marx, knew his Rousseau and Voltaire 'by heart'.<sup>5</sup> A few commentators have been intrigued, too, by the fact that in 1843 Marx turned to a meticulous reading of the *Social Contract* and in his Kreuznach notebooks transcribed no less than 103 passages from that work, all of which, incidentally, are still readily identifiable today.<sup>6</sup> And if we know from Marx himself that he read Rousseau's most important study of politics with such diligent care, it might appear from Engels's testimony that he was at least equally if not more impressed by Rousseau's second major contribution to political thought, that is, the *Discourse on Inequality*, since, in *Anti-Dühring*, Engels observed that this work includes a sequence of ideas which, in its dialectical detail, corresponds exactly ('gleich auf ein Haar') with Marx's own masterpiece, *Capital*.<sup>7</sup>

Yet if such evidence seems fertile ground for plotting the course of a historical influence, or mapping the extent of a historical debt, it is fertile ground stretched thinly over unnegotiable channels. As both della Volpe and Colletti have ruefully observed, Marx, despite his considerable debt to Rousseau, 'never gave any indication of being remotely aware of it'.<sup>8</sup> There are no more than some twenty-two references to Rousseau anywhere in the corpus of Marx's published writings, including his letters, and most of these are just passing citations.<sup>9</sup> His father may have known his Rousseau and Voltaire by heart, but Karl seemed scarcely able to distinguish them, and on at least one of the occasions that he mentions Rousseau he speaks of the philosophy of 'Rousseau-Voltaire',<sup>10</sup> as if this pair of mortal enemies of the Enlightenment formed a Gilbertonsullivan compound, each standing for much the same as the other. Marx must have left his painstaking notes from the *Social Contract* behind when, in his introduction to the *Grundrisse*, he likened the citizens of Rousseau's ideal state to naturally independent Robinson Crusoes, coming together through covenants to engage in freely competitive social relations on the model later elaborated by Smith and Ricardo.<sup>11</sup> For though *Robinson Crusoe* is, indeed, a book Rousseau admired, it is in *Emile* that he commends it<sup>12</sup> and nowhere in the *Social Contract*, and neither a desert state nor one of freely competitive social relations has any place at all in the political argument of that work. [R. Wokler intended, in the event that this article was reprinted, to add a note acknowledging that there is in fact one reference to *Robinson* [Crusoe] in the *Social Contract* at I.2, in OC, vol. 3, p. 354; SC 43.] Marx's misreading of the *Social Contract*, moreover, is no small matter of his memory having failed him during the fourteen-year interval between 1843 and 1857, when his mind would

have been absorbed by other ideas. For the sense of the passage in the *Grundrisse* to which I have just referred closely follows a similar misreading of the *Social Contract* that figures in the *Jewish Question* which Marx drafted in the same year he culled Rousseau so assiduously and ought, presumably, to have been most under his sway. There Marx quotes at length from some lines in Rousseau's chapter on the legislator, which he had actually transcribed himself, dealing with the metamorphosis of human nature and the moral transformation of man through the pact of association.<sup>13</sup> Commentators have often been struck by the similarity between Rousseau's account of the abrupt change in human nature brought about by the social compact, and Marx's description of the proletarian redemption of our human essence through the revolutionary movement of communism, in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* and *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*,<sup>14</sup> also dating from this period. We might have expected that Marx himself, if he did not acknowledge Rousseau as his source, would at least have been impressed by these parallels, but in the *Jewish Question* he addressed himself to Rousseau's argument precisely in order to oppose it. Rousseau's conception of an uplifted form of popular morality was, he claimed, artificial and abstract, because it set the citizen apart from the individual in his everyday life and thus failed to recognize that human emancipation must have a social as well as a political objective. What a blundering misconstruction of the text that is. Marx need only have turned to Book I, chapter 9 or Book II, chapter 11 of the *Social Contract* to see just how deeply committed Rousseau was to the social framework, and, indeed, institutions of economic equality, without which he believed the true liberty of morally transformed individuals could never be secured. Rousseau's doctrine of human nature, radically transformed in accordance with the terms of a social compact, may be nonsense, but if so, then Marx's central arguments of the *Jewish Question* and the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* which so closely resemble that doctrine in both substance and style ought to be regarded as implausible for practically the same reasons.

What, then, are we to make of Engels's remark that the *Discourse on Inequality* corresponds to *Capital* in exact dialectical detail? Even if we make allowances for Engels's hyperbole—for the fact that he sometimes uncovered extraordinary similarities between Marx and other thinkers while at the same time praising him for his profoundly original genius—there ought to be no doubt that in the *Discourse on Inequality* Marx found precisely that focus upon the social relations of men whose absence from the *Social Contract* he deplored. There *should* be no doubt about this, but doubt there must be, since Marx gives no sign of having found anything of the sort in the *Discourse on Inequality*. We know that he corresponded with Engels about *Anti-Dühring* and even drafted a



manuscript on the same subject, of which Engels incorporated an edited version in his published text.<sup>15</sup> In the preface to the second edition of *Anti-Dühring* Engels actually asserts that he had read the whole manuscript of the book to Marx before it was printed<sup>16</sup>—an unsubstantiated statement, though it suggests Marx had at least two opportunities, once in person, and once in print, to remark upon the fact that his closest collaborator was informing the world that his greatest work, the product of a lifetime's reflection, had already been anticipated by Rousseau in the *Discourse on Inequality*. This was not a trivial claim, and it is difficult to imagine that Marx was unaware that Engels had made it. Yet we have no reason for supposing that Marx ever attempted to refute, or disavow, or even take stock of it. He seems to have said nothing at all about the subject, and there the matter rests.

Worse still for scholars convinced of Rousseau's influence on Marx is the fact that—so far as I am aware, at least—we have no evidence to suggest that Marx even read the *Discourse on Inequality*. Apart from his references to the *Social Contract* there are occasional citations in his writings of Rousseau's *Encyclopédie* article on political economy, but no mention at all of the *Discourse on Inequality*, not so much as an allusion to this most Marxist of all Rousseau's works. Nor, to my knowledge, did Marx ever refer to any of the other compositions which bear testimony to the radical philosophy of Rousseau and to the social and economic dimensions of his doctrine—to the *Discourse on the Arts and Sciences*, for instance, the *Letter on the Theatre*, the *Essay on Languages* and all the rest. We can only speculate on what Marx might have said about Rousseau if he had taken the trouble to read these texts; one hopes that he might at least have found in them a doctrine more congenial to his own views, as well as some incentive to look at the *Social Contract* in a fresh light. It seems difficult to appreciate that Marx, who was so widely read in such a broad range of subjects, and whose major writings were so often set out as commentaries on the ideas of others, should have taken so little notice and—when he did notice—held such a poor opinion, of the social theory of a figure already regarded in his day as one of his main precursors. Yet there is no denying the fact that, as Plamenatz has observed, 'Marx's references to Rousseau are few, and on the whole unflattering and unperceptive'.<sup>17</sup>

Why Marx took such scant notice of Rousseau is a problem whose solution we are unlikely ever to discover. Conceivably, Marx may actually have known Rousseau's writings too well instead of too little, and he may have been better disposed to them than he ever admitted. We should not forget that Hegel's immense influence on the *Grundrisse* received scant acknowledgement from Marx, and sometimes he manifestly not only neglected to commend his sources but even poured his greatest scorn



upon those figures—among them Proudhon and Bakunin—whose doctrines his own views resembled most.

Another, rather more plausible, answer leads in almost the opposite direction, and it is suggested to me by the fact that Marx's lengthiest discussion on Rousseau—that is, his commentary in the *Jewish Question*—incorporates a critique of Rousseau's abstract citizen in a more general censure of the juridical rights of man, including property, equality and security, won by the French Revolutionaries and proclaimed by them in the Declarations of the Rights of Man and their Constitutions of 1793 and 1795.<sup>18</sup> Now we know from *Anti-Dühring*<sup>19</sup> that Engels supposed the Revolution had marked the bourgeois and republican fulfilment of the abstract principles expressed in the *Social Contract*, and some such view seems also to be what Marx had in mind in his introduction to the *Grundrisse*. If so, it would appear to follow that Rousseau's ideals, as Marx conceived them, must have come to practical fruition in a revolution which, on his own testimony elsewhere,<sup>20</sup> had failed to achieve man's true social emancipation. According to Engels, moreover, Rousseau's social contract principles had been put into practice not only by the Revolutionary constitutions; they had also been realized in the Jacobin Terror.<sup>21</sup> This was a thesis advanced earlier in the nineteenth century by Maistre and especially Hegel, among others, and it had been implied even before that in the writings of Burke. As several commentators have remarked—not least della Volpe and Colletti<sup>22</sup>—Marx probably drew much of what he did know about Rousseau from his reading of Hegel, whose own misrenderings of the *Social Contract* stemmed from what he took to be their practical application in the course of the French Revolution. Marx, I believe, was, like Hegel, less concerned with the sense of Rousseau's doctrine than with its significance as an ideological expression of the aims and achievements of the French Revolutionaries, but whereas Hegel saw that significance largely in the Terror, I suspect Marx may have seen it more in the establishment of a bourgeois Republic. In one case, that is, the *Social Contract* was held to be a blueprint for a revolution that had gone too far; in the other, in what was perhaps good dialectical fashion, it may have been understood as the manifesto of a revolution that had not gone far enough. In both cases, however, if my guess is correct, the attempt to link the *Social Contract* directly to the Revolution led to striking misinterpretations of its author's meaning. It may be one of the ironies of his poor scholarship that, by appraising Rousseau's works in the artificial glare of a revolutionary doctrine he regarded as defunct, Marx not only failed to see, or neglected to state, how closely they in fact approximate the substance of his own writings. He also failed to notice how much revolutionary light, and even heat, they could shed upon the darker and colder corners of his philosophy. All of this, however, opens up a new

field, full of unturned stones. I have not undertaken that research, and my remarks in this paragraph are less provisional than speculative.

Of course nothing I have said so far should be taken to imply that I regard Rousseau and Marx as proponents of unrelated social theories. On the contrary, the lack of a direct historical influence joining the two thinkers is a matter of interest only *because* we had good reason to expect that some such link might elucidate the striking conceptual similarities between them. At least a few of the works of Rousseau evidently did figure as part of Marx's education, and it is in the light of their theoretical affinities that I find it surprising that Marx drew so little inspiration from the ideas of a writer I believe he ought to have admired more. Theirs is not a resemblance, such as that between Leibniz and Newton with regard to the differential calculus, or between Darwin and Wallace with regard to natural selection, of two men at about the same time coming more or less independently to similar conclusions. The fact, moreover, that the social theories of Rousseau and Marx *do* correspond closely, one with the other, seems to me manifestly clear. We have only to compare Rousseau's conception of property in the *Discourse on Inequality* with that of Marx in the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* to see this relation. We have only to juxtapose their respective philosophies of history in which class conflict is the vehicle of revolutionary change, and the substitution of egalitarian for inegalitarian property relations the condition of society to which men should aspire. I shall in a few moments try to identify important differences pertaining to just these matters, but I have no doubt that, at least initially, the resemblances are more striking still. Something akin to Rousseau's conception of the general will was perceived by Marx to have been realized in practice by the Paris Commune. In his account of communist society, moreover, no less than in Rousseau's social contract state, Marx anticipated that men would be brought together by fraternal bonds through which not only equality but also moral liberty could finally be won. However little each thinker had to say about the institutions of future society, both saw mankind under contemporary social systems as alienated from its human essence by forces of which individuals were at once the authors and victims, and by forms of economic exploitation made binding through the exercise of legal and political authority. No one has investigated these links more perceptively than Plamenatz, whose academic career was in part devoted to the rescue of both Rousseau and Marx, together with Hegel, from the ill-informed disdain shown towards their supposedly obscure ideas by political philosophers of an earlier generation. More tenuous, no doubt, but still striking are those links of practical significance and application with which commentators have drawn together at least some of the principles of Rousseau and Marx. A good many of Rousseau's political detractors have held the doctrines of Marx

to be loathsome for much the same reasons that they regard the views of Rousseau as insufferable, while his admirers, on the other hand, have often, as with Fidel Castro, seen the *Social Contract* and the *Communist Manifesto* as landmarks in the same magnificent revolutionary tradition. Can anyone deny that in Rousseau's republic of virtue, just as in Marx's classless state, each citizen will contribute only as much as he is able and, in turn, will receive as much as he needs?<sup>23</sup>

Such resemblances and parallels, and many more like them, may turn out to be profound and significant when fully elaborated, and I set them aside here only because I fear that even if they could be drawn in convincing fashion they would shed too little light on the peculiar genius of either man. For both Rousseau and Marx, as with most major thinkers, we shall generally come closer to an understanding of their meaning if we study their ideas against the background of the sources they tried to refute rather than those they managed to reflect. Too often our attempts to trace historical lineages from conceptual parallels do injustice to putative creditors and borrowers alike. If, on the one hand, Marx voiced only what Rousseau asserted first, then why should we listen to the stubborn mule, who may not have been attentive to the message anyway, when we can still put our ear to the horse's mouth?<sup>24</sup> If, on the other hand, Marx maintained what Rousseau said, but better, then why should we look for the fluff on the lamb when we can already fleece the wool from the sheep? In the absence of a demonstrably certain and direct philosophical debt, for which so many scholars have hunted or fished in vain, I should like to offer, as an alternative, a few points of criticism which betoken some contrasts between the doctrines of Rousseau and Marx rather than any lines of historical influence.

## II

It is one of the many curious features of Rousseau's intellectual biography that this continually uprooted, solitary vagabond held fast to a single guiding principle which, on his own testimony, informed all his major writings—to wit, that Nature made man happy and good, while society made him miserable and depraved.<sup>25</sup> Marx, on the other hand, was for many years firmly rooted to his seat at the British Museum and long betrothed to the Revolution beyond it, but he sometimes appears to have stood his ground on little else, and his shifts of focus and interest, which led him to abandon many of his works before publication, have been the bane of his interpreters ever since. Persistent efforts by scholars to understand Marx's exact meaning have, accordingly, suffered much the same

fate as attempts by others to establish what became of Rousseau's forsaken children. In the seemingly endless disputes about the compatibility of his humanist and scientific doctrines several issues have been raised time and again, and I trust I may be forgiven—at least for the reason that I mean to be brief—for resuscitating two of these issues here: first, Marx's account of the correspondence of relations to forces of production in his theory of history; and, second, his views about the moral status or implications of that historical theory.

In a profoundly original account and defence of historical materialism, Jerry Cohen has recently argued that the correspondence between forces and relations of production described by Marx<sup>26</sup> invariably attests to the primacy of the former over the latter.<sup>27</sup> Some commentators have instead alleged that our relations of production, as Marx conceived them, must be so linked with any underlying forces that they cannot in fact be abstracted from or initially determined by them,<sup>28</sup> but this claim is said to betray a fundamental misunderstanding of Marx's view. For while neither of these features of society can exist independently of the other, they are, according to Cohen, functionally related in such a way that one may account for the other's character,<sup>29</sup> with no circularity of *explicans* and *explicandum*.<sup>30</sup> On this interpretation the forces are primary since, though they are themselves conditioned by changing relations, it is they which promote, or select, such relations as are conducive to their own further development.<sup>31</sup> Productive forces so envisaged, moreover, are actually seen to incorporate an element of human agency rather than exclude it, so that, as Cohen puts this thesis, 'once we notice that the development of the forces is centrally an enrichment of human labour power the emphasis on technology loses its dehumanizing appearance'.<sup>32</sup>

Now for a number of reasons which cannot be pursued here I am persuaded that Cohen's argument provides a more sophisticated interpretation of historical materialism than any we have had before.<sup>33</sup> And while I share some of the doubts of his reviewers as to the accuracy of his account of Marx's meaning,<sup>34</sup> I believe his occasional infidelity to the texts he explains tends to improve upon the original theory rather than detract from it. A defence which reformulates a thesis and manages to escape from some of its awkward corollaries seems to me all the more creditable for that, and as I mean here to invoke the philosophy of Rousseau in order to criticize not Cohen but Marx, I am content to accept Cohen's revisions as if they had been made on Marx's authority and with his assent. If I find Cohen unconvincing that is mainly because in defending Marx he has offered a defence of historical materialism too, and in that aim I think he has failed, for a host of reasons, among which at least a few can be drawn from the social theory of Rousseau. Let me turn, then,

to some of Rousseau's ideas which may be taken to intersect with those of Marx, and which I believe Marx might have sought to confront, rebut, or accommodate, if only he had been aware of them.

It seems to me, firstly, that Rousseau would have regarded the Marxist—or Marx–Cohen—doctrine of historical materialism as too much encumbered by stratified forces and relations which operate 'independently of our will', as Marx often put it,<sup>35</sup> and which, according to Cohen, can be seen to correspond with one another in terms of non-purposive functional explanations.<sup>36</sup> Why, I believe Rousseau might have asked, should so much weight be placed upon the absence of will, and upon explanations of a non-purposive kind? His account of property relations in the *Discourse on Inequality* and elsewhere<sup>37</sup> suggests that he would have had little difficulty in agreeing with Marx that the ties which this institution engenders are essentially legal bonds arising from the division of labour characteristic of particular economic systems,<sup>38</sup> but, unlike Marx, he emphasized the specifically wilful character of that bondage—the fact that it depends upon consent, persuasion, deception, and language.

We have only to cast a glance over their respective ideas of property to see this most striking difference between each author's account of the economic foundations of society. For Marx our property rights were established by formal rules which constituted part of our intellectual or ideological superstructures whose features were ultimately determined by our underlying material forces of production. Since such rights could only be defined within a superstructure, they could not directly figure as part of the economic base of any class society.<sup>39</sup> For Rousseau, on the other hand, private property did form the basic element of every existing social system, and that it did so was precisely due to its ideological character. The importance of his conjunction of the origin of civil society with the first claim to private property in the *Discourse on Inequality* lies in the fact that he conceived it as an entitlement enjoyed by some individuals to which others are required to give their assent. The private ownership of land, he believed, could only be established deliberately on the part of those who possess it and must be authorized even by those who do not. It was instituted by principles which require approval and legitimation, and he would not have accepted that the class divisions which rights of property express were really rooted in material forces independent of human will. Yet that claim must surely be the corner-stone of Marx's theory of history, however Cohen or others interpret it. Society, wrote Marx, is not founded upon the law, but the law upon society, whose needs arise from the prevailing material mode of production.<sup>40</sup> Engels also perceived this fact clearly enough when he asserted that we must eat and drink before we pursue politics and that, therefore, the economic production of the immediate means of subsistence forms the foundation

on which our state institutions have evolved, and in the light of which our legal concepts must be explained.<sup>41</sup> This was, he remarked, the great law of human history Marx had discovered, and it was informed by Marx's own charge against his idealist precursors—made, for instance, in *The German Ideology* and repeated in his *Preface to the Critique of Political Economy*—that consciousness is determined by life rather than life by consciousness.<sup>42</sup> Cohen, who rightly subjects each of those works to a most rigorous interpretation, never refers to this statement in his defence of Marx's theory of history.<sup>43</sup> But if, as Engels supposed, it forms a crucial part of his mentor's greatest discovery, I think Rousseau would have viewed it as his most profound mistake. For, by contrast with Marx, he surmised that consciousness—indeed belief of a kind which Marxists later termed 'false consciousness'—was so inextricably bound up with life that no primacy of any sort could be ascribed to material existence over modes of thought.

The significance he attached to the concept of authority, and to wilful behaviour and rule-governed conduct linked with that concept, led Rousseau into fields of social thought, especially linguistics, which were largely unexplored by Marx. Since economic domination depends upon the legitimacy of rules, and since these can only be established by consent, then the devices employed to elicit that consent, Rousseau supposed, must also occupy an essential place in any satisfactory theory of our history. He believed that our main instrument of subjugation has been much the same as the medium through which we conjugate too, that is, language. For his part Marx was so preoccupied with the unintended consequences of our actions that he had relatively little to say about the role of language in human affairs. Just as consciousness was determined by life, so too, he claimed in *The German Ideology*, was language: 'The problem of descending from the world of thoughts to the actual world', he insisted, '[turns] into the problem of descending from language to life. . . . Neither thoughts nor language in themselves form a realm of their own . . . they are only *manifestations* of actual life'.<sup>44</sup> Rousseau, on the other hand, regarded language as of central importance as a determinant of man's behaviour. The founder of civil society needed to find people foolish enough to believe him. In order to secure his entitlement to the land he had to induce others to renounce any claims of their own in his favour, and the institution of property itself depended upon the continual renunciation of a right by individuals who had not subscribed to the initial agreement but were persuaded of its justice. All that persuasion, of course, required the most artful eloquence and deception, the terms of which Rousseau recounts in several passages of the *Discourse on Inequality* and elsewhere, and which rather resemble, in a different context, the sublime rhetoric of the legislator of the *Social Contract*, who, we will recall, must

also persuade without convincing.<sup>45</sup> So inextricably was language bound up with the foundation of society, in Rousseau's judgement, that he was actually unable to decide whether language was fundamentally a social institution or society itself a linguistic artefact.<sup>46</sup> Not only the institution of property but all our interpersonal ties were characteristically conceived by him in a linguistic framework, embracing artificially fixed meanings and symbolic representations which we employ to identify and distinguish one another and mark out what later came to be termed our station and its duties. It was from the ways in which we ascribe sense and especially attribute moral significance to our behaviour and the behaviour of others that society was constructed, and from the linguistic base of our specification of terms stemmed the moral emblems of our specialization of roles, and ultimately the fixation of social man in an abstract world of his own making. The ideological principles enunciated in language were thus not divorced from the real substance of social life; they were its very foundation.<sup>47</sup>

I have here addressed myself very briefly to Rousseau's views on language mainly to show how, unlike Marx, he believed the conception and expression of our ideas to be of prime consideration in determining the nature of our economic modes of life. It was Rousseau's focus upon thought as it was bound up with life which led him to regard property as shaped as much by our authority relations as by the material forces of production to which those relations correspond. It was the same focus which prompted him, so much more than Marx, to consider the symbolic and cultural features of human behaviour responsible for both the character and origin of man's exploitation by man. If property, as he conceived it, displayed the deliberate, wilful purpose of our economic ties—if this institution was in some measure explicable as the consequence of a performative linguistic act such as the issue of a command or a promise to obey—it was equally through language, he argued, that the subterfuge, the deceit, hypocrisy, and false values which underlay our allegiances were articulated and expressed. More perceptively, perhaps, than any other thinker before him, and certainly more perceptively than Marx, Rousseau recognized the importance of imagery and illusion as constitutive elements of our social bonds. We act upon reflection, but our reflection is misled, even depraved, he observed,<sup>48</sup> and through language what we believe we see plainly turns out to be *trompe-l'oeil*. In our undertakings to respect the private property of others we envisage ourselves in a position to enjoy the same entitlements, even though all the land we could acquire is already in private hands. In political society we think ourselves free but run headlong into our chains,<sup>49</sup> lured by the semblance of liberty. Everywhere we meekly accept the yoke of despotism because it is wrapped around us like a mantle of justice.



The whole of Rousseau's theory of culture, in fact, reinforces this conception of illusory bonds which form the nexus of society. What are our arts, letters, and sciences but, as he put it, those 'garlands of flowers woven round the iron chains by which men are weighed down'?<sup>50</sup> What is contemporary theatre, he asked, but the adornment of vice behind the mask of eloquence which moves audiences to approve the most terrible crimes? What has our music become, now that it has been displaced from its springs of poetry and melody, but a collection of artificial scales and listless harmonies echoed, in speech, by the prosaic rhetoric of mountebank kings, counterfeit scholars and charlatan priests? Everywhere we are confronted by incantations and diatribes, by recitations from the pulpit and proclamations from the throne, distracted by the demons of art, stupefied by preaching and shouting devoid of sense. In music, he wrote, 'the calculation of intervals [has been] substituted for the finesse of inflexions',<sup>51</sup> but this calculation of intervals was only a variant form of the divisive moral relations by which individuals have become equally enthralled in civilized society. Just as we have ceased to assemble together to determine our civic ideals, so, similarly, through art, science, and religion we have been numbed and made passive, displaced from the centre of cultural life and herded into its pit and pews. Transformed from agents of what we do into witnesses of what happens to us, we are, in the modern world, turned into a hushed audience and taught deference and timidity. In the arts, no less than in our political relations, Rousseau observed in his *Essay on the Origin of Languages*, 'it is necessary to keep subjects apart; that is the first maxim of contemporary politics'.<sup>52</sup> Such, I believe, was the essence of his view of culture, and it is an aspect of his social theory as a whole from which Marx, if he had been familiar with it, might have drawn some inspiration but also, perhaps, a number of correctives to his own approach as well.

These elements of Rousseau's philosophy of culture, together with his conception of property, thus embrace a wider—more political, linguistic, aesthetic and scientific—spectrum of human activities than Marx allowed to be of central significance, and, of course, my aim here has been to stress the greater scope of Rousseau's vision of our civilization's decline as compared with Marx's account of the factors which shape our historical epochs. But equally, this is just to say that Rousseau relied *less* than Marx upon the thesis that mankind is essentially *Homo faber*, that we are distinguished from animals, as Marx sometimes observed, by virtue of the fact that we produce our own means of subsistence, so that what individuals truly are, 'depends on the material conditions determining their production'.<sup>53</sup> For Rousseau, what individuals are depends as much upon the patterns of their fixation in abstract worlds of their own making as upon either their material relations, or their technological forces, of production.



A conception of *Homo faber* lies at the heart of his own theory no less than at the base of Marxism, but what he adds to Marx is a richer anthropological theory<sup>54</sup> of the exploitative nature of social relations in class-divided societies. He believed our chains were as much of cultural as of economic origin, and that it was through culture that *Homo faber* had become *Homo fabulator* and our species as a whole, not *Homo sapiens* but *Homo deceptus*. Marx taught us that we have nothing to lose apart from our chains, but if he had read Rousseau attentively he would have found explanations of more links in those chains than he ever perceived himself.

### III

The second contrast between Rousseau and Marx I wish to consider has to do with the place of moral values in their doctrines. As I have already suggested, there are many similarities between their accounts of the defects characteristic of class society—their conceptions of man's self-estrangement, their views of the dehumanizing effects of the division of labour, their perspectives on the suffering caused by social inequality generally. As Marx himself implies in the *Jewish Question*, the main difference between them seems to be that Rousseau's principles were articulated in a political frame of reference, emphasizing such terms as sovereignty, equality and liberty, whereas in his focus upon our 'species-being' he instead stressed the social, rather than political, essence of man. On this reading of their disagreement it appears that Marx was just as much concerned with liberty as Rousseau was, though he conceived the context of human emancipation in another way. As we know from a familiar passage of *Capital*, he believed that the true realm of freedom only begins when labour is no longer determined by external purposes. 'Freedom', he wrote, 'can only consist in socialized man, the associated producers, rationally regulating their interchange with Nature . . . instead of being ruled by it as by [some blind power]'.<sup>55</sup> The agents whose freedom must be truly realized are not abstract citizens but real producers, and Marx was prompted by this approach to the question of freedom to voice some of his most eloquent pleas on behalf of human liberty in terms of free time. A man who is so occupied in working for the capitalists that he has no free time is 'less than a beast of burden', he commented in *Wages, Price and Profit*,<sup>56</sup> so that in place of the pompous catalogue of the inalienable rights of man he put forward what he termed 'the modest Magna Charta of a legally limited working-day, which shall make clear when the time which the worker sells is ended and when his own begins'.<sup>57</sup> The freedom to which Marx was committed thus appears to be as important a moral

concept in his philosophy as freedom conceived in terms of sovereignty and the exercise of the general will was for Rousseau. On this interpretation we might even say that Marx's theory is a corrective to that of Rousseau, based, as it was, upon a sharper awareness than Rousseau had, or could have had, of the economic forces and constraints which render us unfree even when we enjoy civil liberty and political independence.

Yet to render the contrast between their views of liberty in that way is also misleading, in so far as Marx was less concerned to ground abstract moral principles in our economic relations than to deny their direct relevance to his account of human history as a whole. 'Communists do not preach morality at all', he remarked in *The German Ideology*. Only discontented schoolmasters base their arguments for revolution on their moral dissatisfaction.<sup>58</sup> Because Marx regarded most conservative moral doctrines as ideological, and most radical moral doctrines as utopian—above all because he saw morality itself as part of the intellectual superstructure of any economic system—he went to great lengths to expunge moral ideals from his social theory. Morality and all such 'phantoms [of] the human brain', he wrote, have no independence, no history, no development of their own. They are products of thought which derive their real existence from the material production of man.<sup>59</sup> Now in adopting this stance Marx undermined much of the force of his own condemnation of capitalism. Since our moral ideas were shaped by the modes of production to which they correspond, he believed that they could only be assessed in terms of that correspondence and not with respect to their inherent merit or attractiveness. As he put it in *Capital* and reiterated in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, the justice of transactions which take place between agents of production depends upon the extent to which they adequately express those relations; justice cannot be invoked as a standard by which to judge them: '[Their] content is just whenever it corresponds, is appropriate, to the mode of production. It is unjust whenever it contradicts that mode'.<sup>60</sup> It therefore followed that whereas slavery or fraud was unjust with regard to the capitalist mode of production, there could be no injustice within the market itself—no such thing as an unjust wage, no unjust extraction of surplus value from a worker's labour power. Because it was not an abuse of capitalist production but a manifestation of it, exploitation, in short, was not unjust.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, any reform of capitalism which was designed to redistribute profits in such a way as to abolish the exploitation of workers must violate fundamental property rights sustained by the capitalist mode of production and hence would itself be an unjust imposition of a principle incompatible with it.<sup>62</sup> The correspondence of moral ideals with their underlying modes of production precludes our calling upon any supposed universal standards in judgement of the merits of a particular economic system. From this point

of view, justice, and indeed the rightness of all moral principles,<sup>63</sup> is determined in something like the manner Hobbes thought necessary—that is, our values are established by a predominant *de facto* power whose control over human affairs they express and legitimate—with this crucial difference, of course, that the sovereign power described by Hobbes shapes our moral principles through an act of will, whereas that of Marx operates at a deeper level independently of our will. Marx's mistrust of the language of morals, it seems, has its roots in just those misgivings which inform his doubts regarding the place of will and consciousness as determinants of human affairs in his theory of history.

On this point, at any rate, Marx is quite explicit. 'Right', he remarked in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*,<sup>64</sup> 'can never be higher than the economic structure of [the] society' to which it applies. Not only was he unwilling to accommodate any so-called rights of man in his philosophy, but he could find no room either, he said, for what this or that proletarian, or indeed even the whole proletarian movement, might imagine to be its aim, since the only question worth considering was what the proletariat *is*, and what, historically, it is compelled to do.<sup>65</sup> Communism, therefore, was unconcerned with the pursuit of lofty moral principles. It is not an idea, he insisted, to which reality must somehow adjust itself. It is the actual movement transcending the present state of affairs, resulting from premises already in existence.<sup>66</sup> However much other socialists might aspire to bend the laws of history, Marx himself suffered from none of their illusions and advocated no utopia of his own. The visionary authors of the Gotha Programme could hardly have suffered a sharper insult from him than his acid remark that they 'could just as well have copied the whole of Rousseau'.<sup>67</sup>

Let me conclude, then, with the reply which I believe Rousseau would have made to these claims. The proposition that morality must always be explained in terms of our material modes of production is a thesis I have already dealt with in my remarks about his account of property and his theory of culture. The point Rousseau invites us to consider, we should recall, is that our ideas, including our moral ideas, and even our illusory moral ideas, are not built round or upon the material substratum of our lives, but are rather embedded within, and constitute an integral part of, the basic ways in which we live. If Marx had only put his case more modestly—particularly if he could have been guided by Montesquieu—Rousseau might not have quarrelled with him at all. Largely because he himself had learnt so much from Montesquieu, Rousseau was as convinced as anyone in the Enlightenment that our moral, legal and political principles are influenced by forces outside us—by customs and mores beyond the control of individuals, and by such factors as climate and terrain beyond the control of men collectively.<sup>68</sup> But neither Montesquieu

nor Rousseau believed that those influences causally determine or functionally explain our moral ideas in any sense supposed by Marx or Cohen; they only, and everywhere, act as fetters upon the dissemination of ideas, in so far as they discourage the application of principles, independently conceived, in places and circumstances to which those principles are not rightly suited.<sup>69</sup> According to Marx it was the relations of production that fettered the forces in ways which prompted a revolutionary transformation of society. For Montesquieu and Rousseau, by contrast, such fetters were a mark of more or less stable, rather than revolutionary, epochs; they operated upon intellectual superstructures and not economic foundations; and they manifested the influence of forces which were divorced from our will upon our social relations, and not, as Marx contended, the influence of social relations upon forces.

The difference between Montesquieu's and Rousseau's conceptions of such matters, on the one hand, and Marx's theory of the relation between a societal base and its superstructure, on the other, is an important subject which, perhaps fortunately, there is not enough space to consider here. But I think it is worth mentioning Montesquieu in this context, because, according to Rousseau, that illustrious thinker had nevertheless laboured under a misapprehension about the nature of our moral ideas—a misapprehension which I believe he would have held that Marx suffered from too. For Montesquieu, wrote Rousseau in *Emile*,<sup>70</sup> had conflated the interpretation of political principles with a study of actual states, whereas these were incompatible and wholly distinct subjects. He had, that is, confused fact and right, and even if Rousseau were as convinced by Marx's materialist explanation of morality as he was by Montesquieu's view of the spirit of laws, he would still have regarded Marx as mistaken to suppose that our ideals neither need nor could have any independent validity. 'What kind of a right is it which perishes when force fails?', he asked in the *Social Contract*.<sup>71</sup> If force creates right, the effect changes with the cause, and the word 'right', since it has no meaning apart from force, means absolutely nothing.

Rousseau also differed from Montesquieu, and would, I think, have similarly disagreed with Marx, over at least one further point, connected with these matters, about the influence of morality. That difference is expressed most vigorously in his claim, made in the *Social Contract*,<sup>72</sup> that 'what is possible in our moral affairs is less sharply circumscribed than we suppose'. Marx may have had little patience for the groundless idealism and fantasies of other socialist thinkers, but for Rousseau it was in our dreams that we shaped and breathed life into our moral principles, and through our fantasies that we conceived the means for their realization in practice as well. If our social bonds were only manifestations of our abstract notions of obedience under circumstances in which we also

supposed ourselves free, then no feature of our material mode of existence could of itself prevent our abandonment of those notions and hence, too, delivery from our illusions of freedom. However confined is reality, Rousseau observed, the world of imagination, which we inhabit at the same time, is infinite.<sup>73</sup> And whereas in our minds and hearts every one of us may perceive a world without limits—whereas in masturbation, to which Rousseau succumbed all his life, we picture ourselves in the arms of a lover possessing any of the qualities we desire—so he imagined the possibility of mankind collectively achieving new bliss, acquiring a new corporate identity, under institutions of popular self-rule.

Just as reverie constitutes the free association of ideas never before conceived, democracy, as Rousseau pictured it, might be said to comprise a free association of people such as had never been truly envisaged before. The imagery of public participation in all facets of social life was deeply felt and richly drawn by Rousseau, around such aesthetic, religious, and cultural symbols of solidarity as he portrays in the military dance of the regiment of Saint-Gervais in his *Letter on the Theatre*, or the uplifting song of the grape pickers in *The New Héroïse*.<sup>74</sup> Democratic politics as he saw it was infused with the charm and gaiety of a cultural festival, a popular banquet, a theatrical display of all the people, held in the open air, under the sky.<sup>75</sup> Shakespeare's melancholic Jaques in *As You Like It* may have regretted that 'All the world's a stage', but through the force of his imagination Jean-Jacques aspired to make it so.

We should be mistaken, however, if we were to regard Rousseau's images of freedom as utopian ideals of a kind which Marx thought irrelevant to the main course of human history. Time and again Rousseau insisted that fictitious and imaginary states of the past or future were not his concern. Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia*, he reflected in his *Letters from the Mountain*, may have been chimeras, but he had attempted in the *Social Contract* to lay the theoretical foundation of an object which was real, that is, the constitution of Geneva, and it was because he had set his sights too close to home rather than too far away that he had not been forgiven by his critics.<sup>76</sup> Of course the Geneva he portrayed was not exactly real either, and its history is recounted by him in hypothetical terms not unlike his speculative reconstruction of the history of mankind in the *Discourse on Inequality*, where, in order to get at the truth, it had proved necessary to lay the facts aside. But in all his political works I believe Rousseau was determined to show that what we suppose to be real in public affairs is in fact abstract, artificial, illusory. They think that I am swayed by chimeras, he remarked about his critics in *Emile*; I see that they are moved by prejudice.<sup>77</sup> His political doctrines were framed, as he put it in the introductory chapter of the *Social Contract*, to construct a system of laws as they might be, taking men as they are, and, in my view,

his arguments have always drawn much of their appeal from the conviction underlying them—that our political and social institutions, being human contrivances, *can* be changed, and that, once they are changed properly, the despair and decadence of our lives, which is attributable to them, may be overcome as well.

How odd it seems, in the light of these differences, that it was Marx who was the revolutionary, while Rousseau always counselled restraint. Despite espousing the thesis that no social order ever perishes until all the productive forces for which there is room in it have matured, Marx felt little hesitation about advocating a communist revolution in Germany, before the fruits of capitalism had really been harvested, and in Russia, before the seeds had even been sown.<sup>78</sup> Rousseau, for his part, foresaw a century of revolutions which would bring down the monarchies of Europe,<sup>79</sup> and yet the liberty of the whole of humanity, he insisted, could not justify shedding the blood of a single man.<sup>80</sup> He had drafted his political writings about Geneva not to foment revolution but to arrest it,<sup>81</sup> and whereas Marx was later to try, but fail, to direct the revolutionary fortunes of his contemporaries in the Communist League and the First International, Rousseau actually managed, quite by himself—not only on his own testimony but also on that of other witnesses—to prevent the outbreak of a revolution in Paris which would have occurred but for the fact that the publication of one of his works so incensed the crowd that its hostility was turned instead upon him.<sup>82</sup>

Marx may have been committed to the shortening of the working day, and to increasing the free time of the working classes, but if his doctrine of historical materialism ensured that time was so much on their side, we may well wonder why both he and the proletariat did not have at least a little more time on their hands, while awaiting the full evolution of the economic system they must eventually bring down. Rousseau, whose rage against the corruption of the *ancien régime* was matched only by Marx's contempt for fellow socialists, sought nothing so passionately as a life of solitude and isolation, which, however, was constantly upset by political turmoil of a kind Marx was never able to incite. All this is most baffling, and to my mind it confirms the conclusion of Plamenatz, specifically about Marx but which I believe he thought equally true of Rousseau—that each author, while pointing with one hand in the direction in which he wished us to go, was with the other throwing dust in our eyes.<sup>83</sup> If Rousseau had lived in Marx's day he would most likely have been inspired to think afresh about the material or economic forces that shape human history and their connection with those ideas by which, he supposed, men are moved too. If he had lived in our day he might well have looked at Marx's putatively scientific account of our historical epochs and wondered whether it was not really an expression of just that naïve

faith in humanity which had been held against him, and whether his own bleaker conception of our decline was not more justified than Marx's optimism. Of this profoundly significant difference between their respective philosophies of history I have hardly taken any note at all here.

Stemming from what I have said, however, one thing does seem to me clear—and this is that Marxists now are in need of some of the light, and certainly more of the fire, of Rousseau's vision to keep their movements out of the cold. Marx was in my view mistaken, or at any rate misleading, in his famous eleventh thesis on Feuerbach that philosophers had only interpreted the world, whereas the point was to change it. In a sense Rousseau anticipated this remark when, in a reply to one of his early critics he had agreed, 'Let us correct ourselves, and speculate no more'.<sup>84</sup> But he also perceived, even if it seems Marx occasionally did not, that when we reinterpret the world we *do* come to change it, since a world of abstract images cannot survive as it is if men no longer accept the illusions of their place within it. In *Emile* he claimed that however much the golden age might be a chimera, to bring it to life it was only necessary to love it.<sup>85</sup> An impossible task, no doubt, as he himself recognized. Yet by exciting such love, and by envisaging our release from bondage of our own making, Rousseau captivated the revolutionary imagination of mankind in fervent ways which Marxists have also managed to achieve, but only by abandoning the doctrines they purport to follow. Still in need of reinterpretation, the world they have changed remains much as it was.<sup>86</sup>

ERNST CASSIRER'S ENLIGHTENMENT:  
AN EXCHANGE WITH BRUCE MAZLISH

In 1932 there appeared a study of the European Enlightenment of seminal significance. The book immediately caught the attention of the general public and for the past sixty years has coloured assessments of that intellectual movement put forward, mainly by its critics, of virtually all denominations. No treatment of eighteenth-century thought in any language has been published in more editions. The work is elegant, light-hearted and urbane, but I believe that its influence upon interpretations of the Enlightenment has been sinister. In developing the proposition that eighteenth-century thinkers made science the new religion of mankind and offered a kind of terrestrial grace or happiness to its true believers alone, it portrayed the secular world of modernity within an ideological mould which merely turned Christianity inside out, in the service of absolutist principles of another sort. To my mind this proposition in different permutations informs the account of Jacob Talmon and his disciples that the Enlightenment was at bottom an age of totalitarian democracy. It underpins the postmodernist critique of the monolithic metanarratives of Enlightenment put forward by Jean-François Lyotard and his followers. It prefigures the charge of Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Zygmunt Bauman that the Holocaust was facilitated by eighteenth-century ideals of social engineering and Enlightenment canons of instrumental reason.<sup>1</sup> It even forms the intellectual framework on which is painted the canvas of Charles-Louis Müller's *The Last Roll Call of the Victims of the Terror* at the Snite Museum of Art, illustrated on the program cover of the 1998 annual meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies assembled here at the University of Notre Dame.

The work to which I am alluding is of course Carl Becker's *Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers*.<sup>2</sup> Its central thesis as I read it is that the *philosophes* demolished the City of God only to rebuild it upon the terrestrial plain. In substituting dogmatic reason for dogmatic faith, the Enlightenment thus loved the thing it killed and embraced it even by destroying it.

In the same year there also appeared another work, couched in a wholly different idiom, a work that should have served as a rebuttal of Becker's text, around which all the true friends of Enlightenment might



have rallied. If there is a single book in any language that might be said to encapsulate the true 'Enlightenment Project', supposing that there was one at all, it is Ernst Cassirer's *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung*. Here is a work before which scholars of eighteenth-century thought profess to stand in awe, on account of the range of its themes and the depth of its arguments. Michel Foucault, in reviewing the first French translation of Cassirer's book in 1966 hailed it as a masterpiece which, no less than Kant himself two hundred years ago, sought to identify the conditions necessary for scientific knowledge to be gained.<sup>3</sup> It had attempted to address the forms of understanding which made Kant and Kantianism possible and thus, by excavating a set of foundational abstractions, set out in a manner not dissimilar to Foucault's own archaeological investigations, to identify the constitution of modernity itself.

If only such praise from the Enlightenment Project's fiercest postmodern critic had genuinely echoed the esteem in which Cassirer's work was held by eighteenth-century scholars, the history of Enlightenment studies over the past forty years would, I believe, have taken a very different course. In fact, that history has by and large been marked by our abandonment of Cassirer's approach and perspectives, as we have descended from his great temple of Parnassus to study instead the Grub Street pamphleteers and *salonnières* in the mundane world below. In reviewing *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment* soon after it first appeared in English in 1951, Alfred Cobban condemned what he took to be the excessively German focus, beginning with Leibniz, on the one hand, and, concluding with Kant and Herder, on the other, of a book purportedly attempting to portray the cosmopolitanism of European thought. Here, wrote Cobban (somewhat carelessly) was a work which almost appears to have joined the 'Enlightenment to the genealogical tree of the Nazi movement'.<sup>4</sup> Peter Gay, once an apparent disciple of Cassirer's account of the Enlightenment, not only freed himself from its thrall in an essay on 'The Social History of Ideas' he prepared for a festschrift to honour Herbert Marcuse<sup>5</sup> but also embarked on a fresh career as an historian of sexual manners in the nineteenth century, no longer stirred by the Enlightenment but by its Romantic reaction. Robert Darnton, Daniel Roche and Roger Chartier have built their careers upon studies of the manufacture and circulation of Enlightenment texts with respect to which the philosophical methods of Cassirer seem antediluvian and irrelevant to the real, contextual and subtextual, treatment of eighteenth-century thought. John Pocock, by way of investigating the diversity and plurality of eighteenth-century discourses, is adamant that there never was a single Enlightenment Project, hence no systematic philosophy of the Enlightenment, and thus no real call for a book such as Cassirer's.

The main consequence of our collective abandonment of Cassirer has, to my mind, been our disengagement from the battle which has raged overhead and around us about the true meaning of the Enlightenment, while we who study its doctrines intensively have laid down our arms and denied that it has any meaning at all. By way of tunnelling and burrowing beneath the great arches of *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, we have declared our indifference to its fate and have acquiesced in the demolition of its ideals on the part of its detractors. We may be students of Enlightenment thought, but we refuse to acknowledge the vacuous cosmopolitanism and spurious unity ascribed to the principles of that intellectual movement as framed by Cassirer's images, and because we believe it never had real substance we do not mind its enemies' deconstruction of the so-called Enlightenment Project.

I have two aims in this short treatment of Cassirer's Enlightenment. First, I mean to show that his text does indeed encapsulate the Enlightenment Project, in the only sense in which that term genuinely merits serious scrutiny—that is, with respect to the avowed ideals and objectives of the eighteenth-century republic of letters itself. Second, I wish to show that the circumstances of Cassirer's commitment to and completion of *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* in the period between, on the one hand his famous exchange with Heidegger at Davos in the spring of 1929 and his appointment as Rector of the University of Hamburg in the autumn of that year, and on the other his flight from Germany in the spring of 1933, also encapsulate the central lessons to be learnt from 'The Enlightenment Project' in our time. I offer, as an eighteenth-century model for the first point, d'Alembert's *Discours préliminaire* to the *Encyclopédie*; for the second, which I am happy should be drawn from the eighteenth-century as well, let it be Condorcet's *Esquisse d'un tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain*. To my mind much that is at stake, not only within the field of Enlightenment studies but also with respect to modernist and postmodernist interpretations of the age of Enlightenment in general, hinges upon our reading of Cassirer's book and on our understanding of the cultural universe which he defended, since his life and thought together point to modernity's betrayal of what I here take to be the Enlightenment Project and to the persecution of its leading advocate.<sup>6</sup> I categorically deny the claim of Becker and his postmodernist followers that the Enlightenment loved the thing it killed, but I believe that Cassirer's work, more than any other text produced in this benighted century scourged by waves of ethnic cleansing and genocide, bears witness to the fact that modernity has endeavoured to kill the thing it loved.<sup>7</sup>

In the manner of d'Alembert's *Discours préliminaire*, Cassirer's book forms a kind of manifesto for an age of enlightenment, mapping out the

whole 'Mind of the Enlightenment' as he entitles his first chapter, rather like d'Alembert's own chart of the branches of human knowledge which he appended to *his* text.<sup>8</sup> But neither work was conceived as any kind of polemical tract with an express or implied political message, except perhaps in so far as Cassirer notes in his own preface how 'more than ever before. . . the time is ripe for applying . . . self-criticism to the present age, for holding up to it that bright clear mirror fashioned by the Enlightenment'.<sup>9</sup> 'The fundamental tendency of the Enlightenment', he claims, had not been simply 'to observe life and to portray it in terms of reflective thought', but rather to shape life itself, to bring about 'that order of things which it conceives as necessary, so that by this act of fulfilment it may demonstrate its own reality and truth'.<sup>10</sup> Cassirer accordingly envisaged the Enlightenment as comprising an interconnected set of philosophies which sought not only to interpret the world but to change it.

His conception of reason as an active power, bestowing vitality as well as purpose and direction upon human endeavour, might have been drawn from Reid above all other Enlightenment thinkers, or in his own day from Bergson. But without mentioning either thinker, Cassirer instead ascribes that notion to the spirit of the Enlightenment as a whole, whose subtle difference from the spirit of seventeenth-century philosophy he attempts to explain along the same lines that d'Alembert had invoked in the *Discours préliminaire* in his contrast between the seventeenth-century's *esprit de système*, on the one hand, and the eighteenth-century's *esprit systématique*, on the other.<sup>11</sup> Cassirer remarks that d'Alembert had made this distinction—in effect embracing the difference between the philosophies of *l'âge classique* and *l'âge moderne*—'the central point of his argument',<sup>12</sup> and by way of elaborating that proposition in his own fashion he was to reinvigorate it as a central theme of his *Philosophie der Aufklärung*. D'Alembert had set himself much the same task of offering a general portrait of the mind of the mid-century Enlightenment in an essay titled *Eléments de philosophie*, first published in a collection of his *Mélanges* in 1759 and substantially drawn from themes he had already elaborated almost a decade earlier in the *Discours préliminaire*,<sup>13</sup> and it is by way of a lengthy and sympathetic commentary on that text that the first chapter of Cassirer's work begins.

The *esprit systématique* of Enlightenment philosophy, as Cassirer conceived it, added the prospect of historical concreteness to the seventeenth-century postulates of reason.<sup>14</sup> It aspired through the right sort of mediation to a new alliance between the 'positive' and 'rational' spirit of mankind; it called for synthesis, for 'the structure of the cosmos . . . [not] merely to be looked at, but to be penetrated', as he put it.<sup>15</sup> If *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* includes no ostensible political message, the main explanation to my mind is that the whole work is couched in the lan-

guage of engagement, critique, commitment and the practical fulfilment of ideals. It offers not just a philosophical commentary on the foundations of eighteenth-century philosophy but a speculum of modernity projected upon itself through the reflected images of the Enlightenment Project. Like Voltaire, whose ideal of freedom is depicted as arising from his concrete political observations,<sup>16</sup> Cassirer was convinced that it is sufficient to reveal such an ideal in its true form to ensure that all the forces necessary for its realization will be mobilized.

By way of chapters devoted to 'Natural Science', 'Psychology', 'Religion', 'History', and 'Law', much of *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* is designed to provide treatments, conceived more in depth than in breadth, of the unity of the Enlightenment's conceptual origin.<sup>17</sup> Here, too, Cassirer largely follows d'Alembert, both with respect to the fundamental principle allegedly shared by all the sciences in their patterns of coherence with one another, and with respect to the contributions of their greatest, and most particularly British, luminaries from the early seventeenth century to the mid-eighteenth-century age of the *Encyclopédie*. Bacon's, Locke's and Hume's epistemologies; Berkeley's theory of vision; above all Newton's optics and the analytical method of his empiricism as contrasted with the abstract deductivism of Descartes, are each accorded their place as contributions to the inner transformations that mark the advance of both the natural and the human sciences of the age of Enlightenment.

As distinct from d'Alembert, however, Cassirer adds a predominantly German dimension to the vitalist perspective he ascribes mainly to French thinkers and the empiricist approach he associates with the scientific method of Englishmen, Irishmen and Scots. To his opening chapter on 'The Mind of the Enlightenment', he appends a section devoted largely to the philosophy of Leibniz, while in the final, and by far his longest, chapter—on 'Aesthetics'—his most elaborate treatment is reserved for the philosophy of Baumgarten, whose aesthetic ideals of 'richness, magnitude, truth, clarity, assurance, abundance and nobility' are deemed to have reached their apotheosis in the mind of Lessing.<sup>18</sup> Following Goethe, Cassirer portrays Lessing as possessing a magic power, not only in the sphere of poetry, 'but in the whole realm of eighteenth-century philosophy. It is above all because of [Lessing] that the century of the Enlightenment . . . did not fall prey to the merely negative critical function', he remarks. Because of Lessing, 'it was able to reconvert criticism to creative activity and shape it and use it as an indispensable instrument of life and of the constant renewal of the spirit'.<sup>19</sup> With this tribute to the majesty of two German poets at the dusk of the age of Enlightenment, Cassirer's *Philosophie der Aufklärung* comes to its close.

Cobban could not have been further from the truth when he denounced the German dimension of Cassirer's work as providing a kind of

genealogy of Nazism. The whole thrust of Cassirer's argument with respect to German thinkers was designed to portray their influence within the European Enlightenment as a whole. 'As in all other fields in the eighteenth century', he remarks, 'so in aesthetics there is an uninterrupted exchange of ideas'. 'It is impossible to draw a sharp line of demarcation along national cultural barriers'.<sup>20</sup> By way of a German philosophical tradition through Leibniz, Wolff and Baumgarten, notions of dynamic continuity, of 'unity in multiplicity, being in becoming, constancy in change',<sup>21</sup> were introduced to the Enlightenment. Leibniz's philosophy called for 'a new intellectual orientation' of the mind of man, with which 'the highest development of all individual energies' would lead to the greatest universality, 'the highest harmony, the most intensive fullness of reality'.<sup>22</sup> By way of recognizing the inner vitality and pure spontaneity of our perception of beauty, Baumgarten had in Cassirer's eyes been one of the first thinkers to overcome the antagonism between 'sensationalism' and 'rationalism' and to achieve a new productive synthesis of 'reason' and 'sensitivity'.<sup>23</sup> Virtually all the German figures whom Cassirer cites are credited with having heightened the sensibility of the mind of the Enlightenment, and with adding the vigour of creativity to its critical temper. Even Herder's break with the age of Enlightenment, in his insistence upon the unique atmosphere of every age and every nation, is depicted as fundamentally inspired by the metaphysics of Leibniz<sup>24</sup> and made possible 'only by following the trails blazed by the Enlightenment'. According to Cassirer, 'the conquest of the Enlightenment by Herder is . . . a genuine self-conquest'.<sup>25</sup> There is no trace in *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* of a German Counter-Enlightenment in the manner of Isaiah Berlin.

In his chapter devoted to 'Law, State, and Society', Cassirer addresses seventeenth- and eighteenth-century notions of the inalienability of rights and the apriority of law, absolutely binding on and universally valid for all persons.<sup>26</sup> On such foundations, he claims, was the doctrine of human and civil rights as we know it built up in the age of Enlightenment.<sup>27</sup> It was embraced in different forms in the American Declaration of Independence and in the French Revolutionary *Déclarations des droits de l'homme*, and through Condorcet's *Esquisse d'un tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain* its historical antecedents were traced and the closest approximation to its fullest realization in the free states of America was celebrated.<sup>28</sup> Here again we see once more, remarks Cassirer, 'how conscious the leading minds of the French Revolution were of the connection between theory and practice'.<sup>29</sup> But if he sees the doctrine of human and civil rights as forming the spiritual centre towards which all the tendencies in the direction of moral renewal and political reform were to find their ideal unity in the age of Enlightenment,<sup>30</sup> Cassirer also insists upon the perennially critical character of the Enlightenment's, and most particularly

Rousseau's, enthusiasm for the force and dignity of law, which so much inspired both Kant and Fichte.<sup>31</sup>

Rousseau's doctrine of the *volonté générale*, together with Voltaire's notion of the 'freedom of the pen', comprise, in Cassirer's judgement, the real 'Palladium of the rights of the people'.<sup>32</sup> In Rousseau, too, on whose philosophy he had just completed a study, *Das Problem Jean Jacques Rousseau*, which in Gay's translation would later come to acquire a wide readership in the English-speaking world, Cassirer found a kindred soul who, like Herder, transferred the Enlightenment's 'center of gravity to another position'.<sup>33</sup> In the mirror of his state of nature as portrayed in the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, Cassirer contends that the present form of the state and contemporary society could 'behold their own countenances and pass judgment on themselves'.<sup>34</sup> Rousseau's speculum of the politics of the age of Enlightenment, putting its moral corruption under scrutiny by way of self-reflection, takes up the 'bright clear mirror' which Cassirer in his preface holds up to his own time. To put my point another way, *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* stands to the whole of Cassirer's age of modernity in much the same position as does Rousseau's state of nature with respect to civil society or civilization. As I read it, his book was conceived as the lens of the Enlightenment Project.

I turn now, finally, to my second point about the circumstances of the book's composition or what, in England's Cambridge, would be termed its intellectual context. *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* was the last work Cassirer produced in Germany before his exile. Although it may be read as the final volume of a trilogy of studies devoted to European intellectual history since the Renaissance which he saw to press between 1927 and 1932, it was not in fact conceived in that fashion. It was written in great haste, mainly in the winter and spring of 1932, and Cassirer's turning to it had only been made possible at all by his premature resignation of the Rectorship of the University of Hamburg, which had freed him sufficiently to spend the summer of 1931 at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, where in addition to reading the materials he required for his book on the Enlightenment he also launched his study of Rousseau. While Cassirer was drafting his work, the Weimar Republic itself was in its death throes. Hindenburg dissolved the Reichstag on 4 June 1932. On 31 July the Nazis won a resounding victory in the national elections, only to find an otherwise fractious collection of opposition parties determined to preserve the Republic against the threat which they posed. On 30 January 1933 Adolf Hitler was made Chancellor of Germany. A few months later the Republic itself was destroyed, and with it, Bertolt Brecht, Albert Einstein, Walter Gropius, Wassily Kandinsky, Thomas Mann, Paul Tillich, Bruno Walter and many other luminaries of twentieth-century science and culture, as well as Cassirer, had gone into exile.<sup>35</sup>

How has it been possible for contemporary social philosophers to abandon these orphans of the Enlightenment Project and to nominate Dietrich Eckart, Joseph Goebbels and Alfred Rosenberg in their place? It's enough to drive the fundamentalist Right of American politics into the arms of Hillary Clinton. If the notion of an 'Enlightenment Project' has any plausible validity at all, if just one guiding thread may be identified as marking the passage from *l'âge classique* to *l'âge moderne* delimited by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, on the one hand, and the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme* of 1789, on the other, it can only be the principle of religious toleration, which united Spinoza, Bayle, Locke, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau and *philosophes* of almost every persuasion in common cause against religious bigotry.<sup>36</sup> In the year 1932 *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* stood in much the same relation to the Weimar Republic as had Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes* with respect to the survival of the city of Jena in 1806, when it was bombarded by Napoleon. It formed the expression of a civilization besieged by the armed World Spirit of an alternative culture. In the case of Cassirer's work, it constitutes what might in fact be termed the last will and testament of this civilization, whose principles he held aloft in that bright, clear mirror which he understood to form the mind of the Enlightenment.

Once before, in 1916, Cassirer had completed a work ostensibly devoted to the history of philosophy, at a time of great national calamity. His *Freiheit und Form*, on which he had worked since the beginning of the World War I, dealt with many themes of German intellectual history that were to be taken up again in his *Philosophie der Aufklärung*. By way of raising in a fresh idiom Kant's four fundamental questions—*Was kann ich wissen?* [What can I know?], *Was soll ich tun?* [What should I do?], *Was darf ich hoffen?* [What may I hope?] and *Was ist der Mensch?* [What is Man?],—he attempted to show in metaphysical terms that the real spirit of Germany was not in fact nationalist and militarist but rather humanist, tolerant, pluralist and cosmopolitan, in the tradition of Leibniz and Goethe.

The political crisis through which Germany passed sixteen years later was itself prefigured philosophically in the celebrated debate between Cassirer and Heidegger which took place in the *Hochschule* of Davos, in Switzerland, in the spring of 1929, two years after the explosive impact of the publication of Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*.<sup>37</sup> Although outwardly a courteous exchange with regard to the interpretation of Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, the confrontation of Cassirer and Heidegger proved to be a spirited battle over the soul of Kant and, indeed, as Cassirer later came to believe, over the soul of Germany itself. Theirs was a renewed



exchange between Erasmus and Luther, and once again, to the great discomfiture of Cassirer, it appeared to be the voice of Luther *cum* Lucifer that triumphed.

Cassirer and Heidegger disagreed fundamentally with respect both to the ethics of Kant and to his conception of language, in each case from a different perspective on Kant's philosophy as a whole, with Cassirer emphasizing epistemological problems and Heidegger stressing instead the metaphysical foundations of the finite existence of man. The two philosophers agreed that the notion of unsurpassable human finitude formed the kernel of the Kantian approach, but for Cassirer that psychological truth remained compatible with the unconditionality and universality of Kant's notion of the moral law, and while he allowed that the irreducible diversity of languages excluded the transposition of terms from one to another, it still remained the case that speakers of different languages could make themselves mutually intelligible by virtue of their partaking of language in general. The multiplicity of symbolic forms did not exclude their objectivity, he insisted.

For Heidegger, by contrast, Kant's categorical imperative was only a specific form of the moral law appropriate to a being perpetually ignorant of any transcendent notion of the good, and to Cassirer's sense of the underlying *logos* of discursive exchange he opposed the idea of the *Unterscheidung* or differentiation of points of view, which would later be taken up by postmodernist thinkers, most notably Derrida, in his focus upon the intransitivity of difference. Cassirer took offence at Heidegger's own abridgement of their dialogue, in which Heidegger ascribed to Kant the destruction, or *Zerstörung*, of the foundations of Western metaphysics. A fortnight after the Davos encounter, in a talk in Hamburg in celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the births of Lessing and Mendelssohn, he elaborated on the meeting of minds which could be achieved by a Protestant and a Jew in the age of Enlightenment, when it had been possible to achieve salvation by way of humane mutual understanding. When later that year, in the midst of wildly anti-Semitic propaganda, he accepted the Rectorship of the University of Hamburg, he began, as never before in his life, to examine the nature of his own Jewish identity and to reassess the profoundly Jewish background of Hermann Cohen, who had at Marburg been his principal teacher of the philosophy of Kant and who, in 1873, a year prior to Cassirer's birth, had become one of the first Jews, and among them the most conspicuous, to hold an academic appointment in Germany.

Cassirer had been greatly disturbed by his confrontation with Heidegger, especially by the hypnotic power he had seen Heidegger exercise upon his audience, above all on its youthful members. In *The Myth of the*



*State*, published posthumously in 1946, he offered the following assessment of his adversary in a philosophical encounter which he believed had presaged the violence of Germany's transfiguration over the last sixteen years of his life. 'In order to express his thought Heidegger had to coin a new term', he wrote:

He spoke of the *Geworfenheit* of man (the being-thrown). To be thrown into the stream of time is a fundamental and inalterable feature of our human situation. We cannot emerge from this stream and we cannot change its course. We have to accept the historical conditions of our existence. . . . I do not mean to say that these philosophical doctrines had a direct bearing on the development of political ideas in Germany. . . . But the new philosophy did enfeeble and slowly undermine the forces that could have resisted the modern political myths. A philosophy of history that consists in somber predictions of . . . the inevitable destruction of our civilization and . . . sees in the *Geworfenheit* of man one of his principal characters . . . renounces its own . . . ethical ideals. It can be used . . . as a pliable instrument in the hands of . . . political leaders.<sup>38</sup>

It was in such times, and with such fears and anxieties weighing upon him, that Cassirer launched and completed his *Philosophie der Aufklärung*. Like Condorcet, he wrote the work for which he is now best remembered as a philosophical critic of a civilization of which he had been one of the foremost luminaries himself, on the very threshold of the betrayal of both its principles and promise. Like Condorcet, he suffered the fate of an outcast prophet, politically persecuted and driven to seek sanctuary by officials who regarded him as an enemy of the state. Like Condorcet, his common humanity and optimism for the future of mankind as a whole was, at least at the time of his composition of *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung*, no less than when Condorcet completed his *Esquisse*, undimmed by personal misfortune and the crisis that had been befallen the civic culture whose ideals he upheld. An alien and diseased power had arisen in Germany which rendered his philosophy a stranger to the world only because that world had become a stranger to itself, a shadow in the bright clear mirror of its own enlightenment. The concluding lines of Condorcet's *Esquisse d'un tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain*, informed by the same sentiments as Cassirer's masterpiece, might also have served as its postscript. 'How welcome is this picture of the human race', wrote Condorcet,

freed from all its chains and from the rule of chance. . . . How this spectacle consoles the philosopher for the errors, crimes and injustices which stain the earth, and of which he is often the victim. . . . Such contemplation is for him a refuge, where the recollection of his persecutors cannot pursue him. . . .

There he lives in genuine fellowship with others like himself, in a paradise that his reason has managed to create and his love of humanity embraces with the purest joy.<sup>39</sup>

Following his exile, Cassirer never again set foot in Germany. After settling briefly in England, and then moving to Sweden, he embarked in 1941 for the United States of America, where he was to die just before the end of World War II.<sup>40</sup>

## ISAIAH BERLIN'S ENLIGHTENMENT AND COUNTER-ENLIGHTENMENT

Isaiah Berlin often compared himself to a tailor, who only cuts his cloth on commission, or to a taxi driver who goes nowhere without first being hailed,<sup>1</sup> a journeyman philosopher, rather like Locke's philosophical underlabourer, so frequently invoked in the tradition of Oxford analytical philosophy. One such commission, from Scribner's *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, led him to produce the essay on 'The Counter-Enlightenment' in 1973 which is commonly said to mark the invention of that term, at least in English.<sup>2</sup> In fact, the expression was not at all invented by Berlin. It is perhaps odd that the French, whose eighteenth-century *philosophes* bequeathed the Enlightenment to the world by way of spreading that infection abroad, have never had a term for it at all and hence no term for the Counter-Enlightenment either. In the English language, the term *Enlightenment* seems to have made its first appearance in the late nineteenth century in English commentaries on Hegel, a few decades before the expression *Scottish Enlightenment* came to be invented, and fully one hundred years before anyone had heard of the *Enlightenment Project* conceived by Alasdair MacIntyre in his book *After Virtue* more than three decades after the launch of the Manhattan Project.<sup>3</sup> It was of course the Germans, whose detractors still insist it never had one, who invented the term the *Enlightenment* (*Die Aufklärung*) in the 1780s, by way of a series of *Berlinische Monatsschrift* essays which embraced Wieland's, Reinhold's, Mendelssohn's and, most famously, Kant's treatment of the subject, and who around a century later also introduced the term *Gegen-Aufklärung*—Counter-Enlightenment—to European social thought and intellectual history.<sup>4</sup>

Berlin's coinage of 1973 is not even the first minting of the expression in English, since the term Counter-Enlightenment appeared fifteen years earlier in William Barrett's *Irrational Man*, where Barrett states, not without some justice, that 'Existentialism is the counter-Enlightenment come at last to philosophical expression'.<sup>5</sup> For all I know, the term has an even longer pedigree in English. Now that what passes for civilization has been transcribed on disk, it might be helpful if some computer hack were to trace every one of its published uses prior to 1973. Berlin's essay on the subject in the Scribner *Dictionary of the History of Ideas* rehearses the

doctrines of a familiar cast of characters who had engaged his attention before: Hamann, to whom he had devoted a chapter of his collection, *The Age of Enlightenment*, in 1956;<sup>6</sup> Vico, on whom he had already published an essay in 1960 in a collection on eighteenth-century Italy;<sup>7</sup> Herder, on whom he had contributed an essay for a Johns Hopkins Press collection on the eighteenth century, subsequently published as an article in *Encounter* in 1965;<sup>8</sup> and de Maistre, the subject of an essay Berlin largely completed by 1960 but first published in Henry Hardy's edition of *The Crooked Timber of Humanity* thirty years later.<sup>9</sup> It would not be until 1977 that he first turned his attention to Jacobi.<sup>10</sup>

Although the term Counter-Enlightenment is now associated with Berlin more than with any other scholar or thinker, we ought to bear in mind that before the mid-1970s, by which time he had long retired from the Chichele Professorship of Social and Political Theory in Oxford and had also left his subsequent position as President of Wolfson College, that expression, and the ideas which it encapsulated, had virtually no bearing at all upon his academic reputation. His initial writings on Hamann, Vico and Herder, if read at all, were received with much the same enthusiasm as had greeted David Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature* 240 years earlier.<sup>11</sup> At least until he was in his seventies Berlin's fame rested chiefly on four other works: his not altogether flattering intellectual biography of Marx;<sup>12</sup> his contributions to the philosophy of history in the essay 'Historical Inevitability' and in his treatment of Tolstoy in *The Hedgehog and the Fox*;<sup>13</sup> and, in the field of political theory, his 'Two Concepts of Liberty',<sup>14</sup> much the most widely discussed of all the inaugural lectures given by professors of politics in the English-speaking world in the twentieth century. It was by virtue of his defence of the idea of 'negative' liberty in particular that Berlin, already in his fifties, came to be regarded as the supreme advocate among contemporary political philosophers of a notion of modern liberty, which Benjamin Constant had contrasted with the ideal of ancient liberty in his celebrated treatment of the subject in 1819<sup>15</sup> and which, by way of John Stuart Mill, was to form the kernel of modern liberalism itself. Berlin came in the late twentieth century to be regarded as liberalism's foremost advocate—or its chief apologist, according to its detractors. In Perry Anderson's critiques of British national culture in the *New Left Review*, for instance, or, more recently, Quentin Skinner's own inaugural lecture in Cambridge, it was the alleged vacuousness of Berlin's liberalism that was subjected to closest scrutiny.

One might have imagined that, in the years following his retirement, Berlin's political philosophy would have ripened sufficiently to begin its natural course of decay; on the contrary, however, his work on the Counter-Enlightenment has enhanced his standing over the past twenty-five years, invigorating keen interest in new circles, most notably among

communitarians who had earlier found his liberalism unpalatable. Thanks in large measure to the editorial labours of Hardy, works which Berlin drafted or broadcast more than thirty years ago make him appear less a defender of modern liberalism than a sceptical critic of the universalist pretensions of modernity, a sage of disparate cultures who recognized the inescapable conflict and incommensurability of their values, thereby apparently making common cause with the anti-foundationalist detractors of the metanarratives of modernity, and becoming—from his unlikely perch at the Albany or Athenaeum—‘a Savile Row postmodernist’, as Ernest Gellner portrayed him.<sup>16</sup>

Perhaps even more than his liberalism had done before, it is Berlin's pluralism that now forms the mainspring of his reputation; and while that idea figures prominently in his essay on Montesquieu, first published in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* in 1955, and in three eloquent paragraphs addressed to it which form the conclusion of his ‘Two Concepts of Liberty’,<sup>17</sup> it is largely through his elaboration and embellishment of his notion of the Counter-Enlightenment that his pluralism has come to be seen as the mainspring of his political philosophy as a whole.<sup>18</sup> I say ‘elaboration and embellishment’ because his original contribution on the subject was as much ignored as had been his earlier studies of Hamann, Herder and de Maistre from which it was distilled. In 1976 Berlin reassembled and expanded two of those earlier essays as a book, the last that he would edit himself, entitled *Vico and Herder*,<sup>19</sup> which for the first time occasioned the scholarly attention that had previously been devoted only to his writings in other disciplines. Here we find these pre-eminent spokesmen of the Counter-Enlightenment portrayed not only as critics of some of the most central tenets of Enlightenment philosophy but also, in anticipating the divide between the *Naturwissenschaften* and *Geisteswissenschaften* that would come to inform the historiography and social sciences of the next two centuries, the pre-French Revolutionary postmodernists of their day.<sup>20</sup>

Here we find historicized conceptions of human nature opposed to the timeless principles of natural law.<sup>21</sup> Here, through Vico's notions of *verum ipsum factum* and Herder's putative conception of *Einfühlung* or empathy, we can detect a species of understanding, of *Verstehen*, only accessible to persons able to penetrate a scheme of things subjectively, with an insider's grasp of how it comes to be what it is.<sup>22</sup> Here we find our contemporary notions of culture, of the spiritual dimensions of human activity represented in the arts, in legal systems, languages, and myths.<sup>23</sup> Through Herder, in particular, we confront ideas of communal identity, of language and the arts as forming the essence of man's species-being, of a celebration of multiplicity and difference, which Berlin termed populism, expressionism and pluralism, respectively.<sup>24</sup> In casting as profoundly radical and

original two provincial and, in certain respects, reactionary figures of the eighteenth century—each largely unappreciated by his contemporaries in the international republic of letters—Berlin managed to pluck from the peripheries of the age of Enlightenment the seeds that would subsequently come to transform it, without ever having to channel a course through those ideological swamps that other commentators interested in the same subject associated above all with the influence of Rousseau.

In *The Magus of the North*—in part inspired by the chapter on Hamann in *The Age of Enlightenment* but which Hardy in fact assembled from papers dating from the mid-1960s for the Woodbridge Lectures at Columbia—Berlin added that Hamann, in his defence of the particular, the intuitive, the concrete and the personal, denounced the opposite attributes of the Enlightenment and all its works and thereby proved the founder of modern anti-rationalism and romanticism and the forerunner of Nietzsche and the existentialists.<sup>25</sup> These themes were also to inform the Mellon Lectures Berlin delivered in Washington in 1965, finally published in 1999 as *The Roots of Romanticism*, with a recording of the last lecture in its original form appended as a compact disk.<sup>26</sup>

*The Roots of Romanticism*, incidentally, which Berlin himself never completed, also forms the unfinished *magnum opus* of Moses Herzog in Saul Bellow's novel, published one year before Berlin presented his lectures, that refers to many of the same persons, including Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Tolstoy and de Maistre, who were to figure in Berlin's own cast of characters, as well as the Hotel Pierre, in New York, where Berlin often resided when in America. One way of reading *The Roots of Romanticism* is by intercalating Berlin's inchoate lectures at appropriate points of Bellow's novel, so that by way of the compact disk one book may be said to complement the other, with Herzog thus the first fictional figure in world literature to have undergone transubstantiation, through Berlin passing over to the other side and thereby acquiring his own voice.

Several of the reviews of his *Vico and Herder* Berlin found profoundly dispiriting. While friends and admirers, like Patrick Gardiner and Hayden White, commended his scholarship,<sup>27</sup> other philosophers and historians of ideas found major faults in his arguments and took him to task. Arthur Scouten, writing in *Comparative Literature Studies*, and Hans Aarsleff, in the *London Review of Books*, in particular, incurred his wrath. They challenged the main thrust of his argument about the Counter-Enlightenment, Scouten partly on account of Berlin's exaggerating the extent to which Herder had parted company from the *Encyclopédistes*,<sup>28</sup> Aarsleff mainly with respect to Berlin's apparent ignorance of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century anthropological linguistics, in the light of which Vico and Herder, separately and together, ought to have been portrayed as disciples of Enlightenment philosophy rather than as critics.<sup>29</sup> In acid replies to each

author, Berlin valiantly defended his scholarship, insisting, especially against Aarsleff, on the profound originality of Vico and the depth of the influence of Hamann upon Herder.<sup>30</sup>

Two other reviewers, William Walsh, writing in *Mind*, and Arnaldo Momigliano, in the *New York Review of Books*, troubled him even more. Can it really be the case, as Berlin had claimed on behalf of Herder, that to explain the meaning of an activity in its local context was also to endorse it?, asked Walsh. How can a genetic explanation form a justification? We are not required to agree that whatever is, is right.<sup>31</sup> Momigliano, from the perspective of an historian of the classical tradition, pursued the same point in a different way. The philosophies of Vico and Herder, the second born in the year the first had died, must not be conflated, he argued, since Vico remained deeply immersed in the values of Christian and classical culture, whereas Herder's fascination with Orientalism inclined him instead towards modern racism. In any event, Berlin appeared to overlook the implications of his reading of these two main protagonists of the Counter-Enlightenment. The crucial question to be asked in each case, Momigliano insisted, was that if we accept Berlin's account of their attachment to pluralism, how then are we to escape the conclusion that they were also relativists? Before we celebrate their vitality, let us pause to take stock of where such pluralism would lead.<sup>32</sup>

Momigliano was personally well-acquainted with Vico's classical sources and references, but in contrasting the ancient Vico with the modern Herder, and in imputing a relativist stance not only to Vico and Herder but, by implication, also to Berlin himself, he appears to have fallen under the influence of Leo Strauss, whose colleague he had become at the University of Chicago since 1959, after having earlier been a close companion of Berlin at All Souls College, Oxford. Strauss and Momigliano were expatriate Jews, refugees from Fascist powers, who were convinced that Central and Eastern Europe's descent into Fascism and Western Europe's appeasement of it had been prefigured by modern social science's abandonment of the universalist and absolutist principles of classical or Christian civilization. The Counter-Enlightenment doctrine of relativism that Berlin appeared to applaud was denounced by them as lending warrant to the most catastrophic crisis of modernity, thereby making it conceptually and then historically and practically possible. For Strauss, in particular, the relativism entailed by value-free modern social science had opened the prospect of the Holocaust and the extermination of the Jews.<sup>33</sup> Alexander Pope's couplet from his *Essay on Man* had correctly encapsulated our dilemma. In the world of modernity, whatever is, is indeed right.

Berlin did not reply in print to the reviews of Walsh and Momigliano as he had done with respect to those of Scouten and Aarsleff, but in 1979 he accepted an invitation of the International Society for Eighteenth-Century

Studies to speak at its Congress of the Enlightenment at Pisa, just a few miles from his summer home in Liguria. There, at a session over which Momigliano himself presided and which I attended—virtually his last public appearance in any academic setting—he supplied his answer to the imputation that his heroes of the Counter-Enlightenment had been heralds of relativism and all its dreadfully attendant consequences. His talk was entitled ‘Alleged Relativism in Eighteenth-Century European Thought’, and it was published, in 1980, in the *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*; a revised version appeared a decade later in Hardy’s edition of *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*.<sup>34</sup>

‘A distinguished and learned critic has wondered if I fully appreciate the implications of the historical relativism of Vico and Herder which, unacknowledged by them . . . constituted a problem which has persisted to this day’, Berlin remarked. ‘If we grant the assumption that Vico and Herder were in fact relativists . . . the point made by my critic was valid. But I now believe this to be a mistaken interpretation of Vico and Herder, although [and here he may be referring to some remarks about relativism which he had made in his original treatments of these writers] I have, in my time, contributed to it myself’. ‘True relativism’, he continued, in so far as it entails fundamental doubt about the possibility of objective knowledge, is derived from other and later sources—from the metaphysics of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, from social anthropology, from Marx and Freud. It is a nineteenth-century doctrine, not consistently put forward by any influential thinker of the eighteenth century, he claimed.<sup>35</sup> Vico and Herder, he now contended, were pluralists rather than relativists; they believed not in the absence of objective ends but in their variety, their multiplicity, and sometimes conflict. Relativism, he maintained here, was not the only alternative to universalism.<sup>36</sup> The Counter-Enlightenment had confronted Enlightenment monism not by way of the potentially sinister trappings of a nineteenth-century ideology but by invoking the liberating principles of pluralism. It was in this manner that Berlin restated the central theme of his concluding section on ‘The One and the Many’ in his ‘Two Concepts of Liberty’, except that whereas previously it had been various forms of *monism* which had given rise to the ‘slaughter of individuals on the altars of the great historical ideals’, as he had put it,<sup>37</sup> conceptual responsibility for that dreadful outcome had now been passed even more to *relativism*.

If the Counter-Enlightenment was fundamentally pluralist, the Enlightenment must of course have been its opposite—uniformitarian, undifferentiated, homogeneous and monolithic. In mapping the richly pluralist dimensions of the Counter-Enlightenment, Berlin, all too frequently for my liking, portrayed the Enlightenment as if, as he put it in *The Roots of Romanticism*, it could be boiled down to three fundamental principles,



which also, incidentally, constitute the Ionian fallacy, as he elsewhere describes it,<sup>38</sup> and indeed virtually the whole of our Western intellectual tradition so enthusiastically bludgeoned into well-merited obsolescence on Berlin's behalf by John Gray.<sup>39</sup> These principles are, first, that all genuine questions can be answered; second, that all the answers are knowable; and third, that all those knowable answers must also be compatible.<sup>40</sup> That, in short, is what might be termed Berlin's version of the Enlightenment Project, and for his communitarian, postmodernist, or pluralist admirers it has proved quite sufficiently devastating to licence their hammering of the last nail into the Enlightenment's coffin.

It is of course true that a richer and more sympathetic portrait of the age of Enlightenment in general can be culled from Berlin's writings, particularly in the last paragraph of his introduction to Enlightenment thinkers where he praises their intellectual honesty and the courage of their campaigns against injustice and ignorance,<sup>41</sup> and perhaps above all in his *Conversations* with Ramin Jahanbegloo, published in 1992, where he speaks of himself as a liberal rationalist who, despite their dogmatism, subscribes fundamentally to the liberationalist values of Voltaire, Helvétius, d'Holbach, Condorcet and the Enlightenment in general. 'They were against cruelty', he remarks there, 'they were against oppression, they fought the good fight against superstition and ignorance. . . . So I am on their side'. [But] 'I am interested in the views of the opposition', he continues, not because [I] greatly admire them but because 'clever and gifted enemies often pinpoint fallacies' of the Enlightenment and expose some of its 'political implications' as 'inadequate' and, 'at times, disastrous'.<sup>42</sup> It is just this last proposition, we might note, that forms the central thesis of Jacob Talmon's *Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* of 1952, in fact inspired by (an unmentioned) Harold Laski in which Talmon instead acknowledges a debt to Berlin's 'stimulating suggestions', as he puts it.<sup>43</sup>

For those of us who work in diverse fields of eighteenth-century studies and also greatly admire his achievement, Berlin's invention of a monolithic Enlightenment with just three legs is more than a trifle embarrassing, particularly since it was only assembled so that it might be deconstructed in the manner of Procrustes and thereby point the way to a richer understanding of the diverse threads that constitute its opposite. It makes little sense, I believe, for a pluralist to set aside his own principles when addressing Enlightenment thinkers, who to my mind for the most part characteristically espoused the values with which Berlin confronts them no less tenaciously than he did. In depicting the Enlightenment as if its centrally guiding thread was an absolutist commitment to the pursuit of truth by way of science, Berlin appears to join both Carl Becker, whose *Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* he praises in his *Roots of Romanticism*,<sup>44</sup> as well as Richard Rorty, whose portrayal of an

Enlightenment doctrine of mind which mirrors nature is drawn upon a similarly Procrustean bed.<sup>45</sup>

According to Becker in particular, the *philosophes* of the eighteenth century had simply turned inside out the Christian absolutism which they decried, substituting the pursuit of earthly happiness in place of the unworldly salvation of our souls, thereby demolishing the city of god only to rebuild it on the terrestrial plain.<sup>46</sup> The Enlightenment can thus be portrayed as having loved the thing it killed and of taking on its mantle in the very act of destroying it, by substituting a rationalist form of arcane dogmatism for another, based on faith.<sup>47</sup> Berlin was to my mind far too wise and learned to be seduced by such nonsense.

Even among those *philosophes* of whom it might be said that this was their pre-eminent objective, the pursuit of scientific truth in the Enlightenment did not take the form of belief in the one and only true religion by another name. Of all major eighteenth-century thinkers, Montesquieu was perhaps the most tenacious supporter of the proposition that the laws of nature and the operations of the human mind must be understood in the same way. No one in the Enlightenment subscribed more plainly to physicalist explanations of social behaviour and culture, and Rorty's account of mind as nature's mirror in fact describes the central thrust of Montesquieu's philosophy perfectly. Yet from that monolithic perspective on both the natural and human sciences, there springs no universalism or cosmopolitanism of any kind. Above all his contemporaries, Montesquieu was specially sensitive to the local variety, specificity and uniqueness of social institutions, customs and mores. His *Esprit des lois* might well have been subtitled 'A Study of Difference'. His *Lettres persanes* ought to be required reading in any course of comparative literature devoted to the subject of 'Otherness', as indeed should be Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* and Voltaire's *Candide*.

A postmodernist definition of the Enlightenment in terms of its deconstruction of Christian dogmas by way of critical theory would, I believe, more aptly describe that century-long intellectual movement which was inspired by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 and the Glorious Revolution in England three years later than do the uniformitarian strictures of Becker and Rorty. From Berlin's own pluralist perspective, the advent of that fresh approach may be said to be marked by the passage from Bossuet's *Histoire universelle* to Fontenelle's *Pluralité des mondes*. No one who read the voyages assembled by the abbé Prévost in his collection, which added so much to that produced by Samuel Purchas in the previous century, could fail to notice how disparate were the cultures of mankind throughout the world, and how diverse their social institutions. No one who read about the Egyptian or Hebrew chants in Burney's *General History of Music* or about Persian or Chinese tunes in Rousseau's

*Dictionnaire de musique* could any longer be persuaded that the Western scale and its harmonies were universally appreciated.

Accounts relating real or imaginary journeys to exotic worlds, or singing the praises of a primitive golden age, circulated as widely, and often among the same readers, as did Enlightenment treatises on the natural sciences and on the progress of civilization. Europe's spiritual and political hegemony over the rest of the world was not appreciated at all but in fact fiercely opposed in a great many anti-colonialist classic works of eighteenth-century philosophy and anthropology, from Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité* to Diderot's *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville* to the abbé Raynal's *Histoire des deux Indes*. Even while expressing optimism with respect to the increasingly secular development of the human race as it rose from barbarism to civilization, the proponents of the Enlightenment Project characteristically displayed a profound pessimism about the imperialist nature of Western Christendom. Instead of denouncing the Enlightenment's rationalist and universalist pretensions, its detractors would do better to investigate the sceptical empiricism which informed the doctrines of its leading advocates, from Bayle to La Mettrie and d'Holbach, who framed fundamentally liberal objections to the bigotry of sacred knowledge as uncovered by revelation and to the universalism of blind faith.<sup>48</sup>

These commonplace truths, which warrant reiteration only because they are so infrequently remembered by most modern, postmodern, and communitarian critics of Enlightenment philosophy, were well known to Berlin. Although it had sometimes been gained second-hand and was seldom reliably stored for invocation in scholarly footnotes, Berlin's erudition was vast and his command of the literature in eighteenth-century fields in which I was working myself was as broad as that of any person I ever met while completing my doctorate at Oxford; and it was generally deeper on account of the fact that his own philosophical interests more closely approximated the ideas in the texts we discussed than those of my tutors with just literary backgrounds, whose grasp of the intellectual context of an eighteenth-century work sometimes obscured their penetration of its meaning.

When I conveyed to Berlin my thoughts about the *Querelle des Bouffons* of the mid-1750s,<sup>49</sup> he not only pointed me towards commentators who had addressed this musical dispute's seventeenth-century precursors but also corrected some doubtful eighteenth-century Italian prose I had transcribed that was in need of such attention. Berlin's own essay on Montesquieu in *Against the Current* sheds genuinely fresh light upon that central thinker, perhaps the most central thinker, not of the Counter-Enlightenment but of the Enlightenment itself. Although the tone of Aarsleff's objections to Berlin's account of Herder strikes me as exces-

sively severe, I feel more than a little inclined to agree with his contention that the intellectual gulf between Herder and Hamann is vast, and I am pleased to find from recent scholarship on Herder (of which Berlin could not have been aware) that many crucial passages of Herder's *Ideen*, his masterpiece, were drawn directly from Adam Ferguson and, more distantly, Montesquieu.<sup>50</sup> As Berlin himself reports at length, moreover, Hamann read Hume meticulously and was greatly persuaded by his account of the nature of belief and reason.<sup>51</sup> All of which, to my mind, suggests that much of what has come to pass for the Counter-Enlightenment properly figures within the Enlightenment and not outside it.<sup>52</sup>

With the exception of the caricatures of that intellectual movement which he drew for the purpose of highlighting what he supposed was its opposite, Berlin's sympathies, style, and almost the whole corpus of his writings strike me as cast in an Enlightenment mould. This really is the principal thesis I wish to convey here—that Berlin was a *philosophe* of enlightened disposition *malgré lui*,<sup>53</sup> whose life and work together display the spirit of enlightenment at virtually every juncture apart from where he contrived to address that subject. However postmodern he might have come to appear by virtue of the recent diffusion of lectures he conceived thirty or forty years before his death, it is hard to imagine this admirer of the analytical precision of Austin's prose impressed by the lectures on ontology which rendered Heidegger in Freiburg 'the secret king of philosophy' of an utterly different kind, although I suppose that he would have regarded Derrida's alleged charlatanry an insufficient reason to deny him an honorary degree, at any rate from Cambridge.<sup>54</sup> Gray describes the main thrust of his philosophy as *agonistic* in its liberalism,<sup>55</sup> but the combative nature of his imagery is an altogether milder affair than the traumatic notion of *Geworfenheit*—of being thrown—that lies at the heart of the human predicament described by Heidegger and out of which have sprung postmodernist notions of a decidedly coarser species than Berlin's bespoke variety from Savile Row.<sup>56</sup>

As for 'difference' and 'otherness', I suspect that no philosopher of the twentieth century was more peripatetic but at the same time comfortably at home in every culture of the three continents he visited regularly in which he was welcomed. Throughout the night of his spiritual apotheosis in the company of Anna Akhmatova, depicted so brilliantly in Michael Ignatieff's biography, it was she who spoke incessantly of the inner world and dark intensity of Dostoyevsky and other writers who had laboured on Russian soil, Berlin who instead invoked the more luminous subtleties of Turgenev among exiled artists who had worked abroad.<sup>57</sup> No nineteenth-century figure was to command his admiration more than Herzen, that ebullient Westernizer among dour Slavophiles, that cosmopolitan Russian abroad, that generous spirit of enlightenment from a dark-eyed

nation in a still benighted age, whom he describes as a kind of Russian Voltaire of his day.<sup>58</sup> When Berlin addressed the greatest literary masterpiece of his native language, Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, it was not the rich tapestry of the social life of the Russian peasantry and aristocracy portrayed there which engaged his attention most, but rather Tolstoy's theory of history, his respect for Rousseau and other thinkers of the French-Enlightenment, his contempt for 'unintelligible mysteries' drawn from 'mists of antiquity', his hostility to the cant of the freemasons. The Tolstoy he most admired, cast in his own image, he describes as a sceptical realist who stood in life-long opposition to dogmatic authoritarianism.<sup>59</sup>

In several respects, and above all in his comprehensive mastery of the Enlightenment *oraison funèbre* or funeral oration which comprises so many chapters of his *Personal Impressions*,<sup>60</sup> Berlin was the spiritual descendant of both d'Alembert and Condorcet, permanent secretaries, in the late eighteenth century, of the *Académie française* and *Académie des sciences*, respectively. When, for instance, he congratulated Lewis Namier on his production of an excellent book—'all the better for being short',<sup>61</sup> he added—his wit could glisten with the sparkle of Voltaire. But to my mind, in his ideals, his enthusiasms, his spontaneity, his vitality, his mimicry of others, his genial self-abasement fuelled by genuine self-doubt, he was more like Diderot than anyone I ever knew. By dint of his own *Einführung* with diverse past and present thinkers Berlin managed to make their ideas vivid and compelling, without having to adopt them as his own. Such transitivity or clairvoyance was much sought and greatly prized by the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment I know best. No academic figure of our time was better suited or more attracted to the delights of the linguistic turns of the eighteenth-century *salon*.

Even with respect to his nationalism and Zionism, Berlin strikes me as a child of the Enlightenment. At least in the English-speaking world, communitarians today, including many who found themselves drawn more to Berlin's pluralism than to his liberalism, have been mainly concerned with the cultures of ethnic minorities in parts of the world conquered and colonized by Europeans, or with the loss of spiritual bonds of fraternity in societies predominantly held together by market mechanisms alone. Berlin, by contrast, focused on the identity of a community that colonized but never gained security in Europe, and although a practising Jew with a command of Hebrew sufficient to enable him to lecture in that language, he never displayed the slightest interest in Jewish theology and scarcely any in Jewish culture and the arts. However remarkable their achievements, the greatest of Jewish artists—Heine and Mendelssohn, for instance—he judged manifestly inferior to Goethe and Beethoven, respectively, if only because Heine and Mendelssohn had all too conspicuously attempted to scale the summits of just German culture, whereas Goethe

and Beethoven, he contended, had produced poetry and music of universally sublime character which had transcended the national identities of their composers.<sup>62</sup> Though he travelled frequently to Israel, the Wailing Wall of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem—famously described by his devoutly observant relative, Yeshayahu Leibowitz, as the *Kotel* recast as a *Dis-kotel*—bore scant mystical significance for him. As passionate as was his commitment to Zionism, he loathed the extremism of Menachem Begin and the Irgun,<sup>63</sup> which he regarded as a band of terrorists, and although he seldom spoke in public on such matters, he was convinced that the existence of a Jewish state—that last child of a European *Risorgimento*, as he sometimes put it<sup>64</sup>—did not exclude but on the contrary necessitated the establishment of a Palestinian state as well. ‘Home is the place where, when you have to go there, they have to take you in’, Robert Frost had once said,<sup>65</sup> and Berlin concurred. What was necessary above all else, to his mind, was that in a world in which Jews cannot but remain perpetual strangers, destined never to be truly naturalized, there must somewhere be a refuge or homeland for them too, not one in which they should all be obliged to live, but one to which they might one day have to flee.

These are questions which have bedeviled Jews throughout the history of their diaspora. But from the late seventeenth to the late eighteenth century, in the great schisms of Catholic and Calvinist Europe which gave rise to a different diaspora that inspired the pleas of toleration of Spinoza, Bayle, Locke and others—which to my mind lie at the heart of the only intellectual movement of the period that might correctly be termed ‘The Enlightenment Project’<sup>66</sup>—these issues were pursued in fresh ways, and for the Jews in a new idiom, in the language of civil and human rights. Here, in the context of an eighteenth-century debate about Jewish identity, assimilation and incorporation in the state, pursued with renewed vigour after the French Revolutionary enfranchisement of the Jews—not least by Marx—lies the proper context for an understanding of Berlin’s Zionism.

I must not, however, fail to introduce the fly in this ointment. If the Enlightenment constitutes the background of Berlin’s Zionism, its fundamental tenets, contrary to the central thesis I have just put forward, do not spring at all from Enlightenment ideals of toleration. Those ideals—encapsulated most famously by Voltaire in his *Lettres philosophiques* where he describes a London Stock Exchange comprised of men who before they worship their different gods in their separate churches negotiate in a common currency, of which the only infidels are traders who go bankrupt<sup>67</sup>—do not and cannot embrace Berlin’s Zionism. For Voltaire and most other *philosophes* of the Enlightenment, the Jews only required the protection of the rule of law by civil powers uninterested in matters of faith. For Berlin, the Jews must be empowered to return to a land in

which they alone constitute the predominant community. When writing about such matters with respect to the eighteenth century, Berlin was impressed not by the *Plea for the Toleration of the Jews* compiled by Moses Mendelssohn, grandfather of the composer, translator of Rousseau and, by virtue of his learning and humanity, one of the foremost luminaries of the German Enlightenment. He was struck instead by the provocative and in some respects even anti-Semitic diatribe produced by Hamann, who regarded the mere toleration of differences as a denial of their importance—a genuinely postmodernist claim. When pursuing the same themes in the mid-nineteenth century in his essay on the ‘Life and Opinions of Moses Hess’, he hailed as a masterpiece Hess’s treatment of *Rome and Jerusalem*, in which Hess denounced as inconsistent a belief both in enlightenment and in the Jewish mission in exile, on account of its endorsing the ultimate dissolution and the continued existence of Judaism at the same time.<sup>68</sup> Here, wrote Berlin, was a work which preached Zionism more than thirty years before the term had been invented, all the more powerfully persuasive today than it had proved in the course of Hess’s own lifetime, in view of its warning to Germany’s assimilated Jews that they would one day suffer a cataclysm of greater magnitude than any they could conceive.<sup>69</sup>

In 1932, in the same year that Becker’s *Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* was published, Ernst Cassirer, one of the first Jewish rectors of a German university, produced as well his *Philosophie der Aufklärung*, which in large measure articulates his own defence of a noble tradition of German Enlightenment, including Leibniz, Wolff and Baumgarten, in the face of contemporary barbarism.<sup>70</sup> But while Cassirer was drafting his work, the Weimar Republic he served—in effect modern Germany’s own Enlightenment Project—was itself in its death throes. A few months after the publication of *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung*, the institutions which had protected the civil rights of assimilated Jews vanished with the Republic’s dissolution, and as a consequence Bertolt Brecht, Albert Einstein, Walter Gropius, Wassily Kandinsky, Thomas Mann, Paul Tillich, Bruno Walter and many other luminaries of twentieth-century science and culture, as well as Cassirer, were forced into exile.<sup>71</sup> In an essay on ‘Jewish Slavery and Emancipation’ which first appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* in 1951 and has only just been published again, Berlin remarked that while the Jews had taken every conceivable step to adapt and adjust themselves in the societies in which they had sought to be naturalized, their efforts had all ‘proved unavailing’.<sup>72</sup> The extermination of European Jewry had established the hopelessness of true assimilation, he adds in his *Conversations with Jahanbegloo*.<sup>73</sup> That perception above all else sustained his Zionism. It marks the most decisive break of his attachment to the principles of the Enlightenment I know, to my mind



much more striking than his depiction of its three-legged uniformitarian faith in his portrayal of the Counter-Enlightenment.

I should like finally to comment briefly on just one matter which I believe to be intimately connected with this subject, although it was not addressed directly by Perry Anderson when he first raised it in his own fashion in an essay on 'Components of the National Culture', which appeared in the *New Left Review* in the summer of 1968.<sup>74</sup> Readers of this collection who can should cast their minds back to that period of our history which, by way of the Prague Spring and the student uprising in France in May, seemed for many left-wing commentators at the time a fresh and then subsequently a false dawn. Almost as if to recapitulate celebrated lines about a spectre haunting Europe occasioned by the revolutions of 1848, Anderson begins his text as follows: 'A coherent and militant student movement has not yet emerged in England', he writes. 'But it may now be only a matter of time before it does'.<sup>75</sup> Why was England so bereft of a radical political culture, he wondered, such as had arisen in Germany, Italy and France? The principal reason, he explained, was the absence of a theoretical centre in England, which had never produced a classical sociology or national tradition of Marxism. And one of the main factors which explain England's 'listless mediocrity' and 'wizened provincialism' in such matters, as he put it, was that since 1900 it had been subjected to a wave of immigrants from Eastern and Central Europe whose 'elective affinity' for a quiescent society and unsystematic and untheoretical social sciences had impeded the development of a political culture such as could be found, in 1968, in Germany, Italy, and France. Whereas dissident radicals, or 'Reds', who fled the instability of Central Europe settled elsewhere—the Frankfurt Marxists in America, for instance, Lukács in Russia, and Brecht and Mann in Scandinavia—England had by a process of natural selection proved attractive only to the 'Whites', which had thus ensured that the mantle of intellectual authority progressively passed from Victorian families bearing the name Macaulay, Trevelyan, Arnold, Huxley, Stephens, Wedgwood or Hodgkin, to Germans like Eysenck; to Austrians such as Wittgenstein, Popper, Gombrich and Klein; to Poles like Malinowski and Namier; and to Russians like Isaiah Berlin.<sup>76</sup>

I must not comment too lengthily here on this curious tableau of enduring complacency made possible by England's attraction of expatriate academics from Central and Eastern Europe, cloned with suitably acquired characteristics. Let me note only that, while distinguishing 'Reds' from 'Whites', Anderson never once mentions the word 'Jew', nor does he take stock of anything to do with Judaism which might explain why these expatriates abandoned their homes abroad. If when fleeing Russia Berlin's parents had settled instead in Germany, Italy or France and stayed



there, it is more than likely that I should not have had this tale to tell. Unless it was Chaim Weizmann, no political leader of any people in the contemporary world so commanded Berlin's esteem as Winston Churchill. Even more than Franklin Roosevelt, if only because it seemed to his own followers whom he rallied to his cause that success was so unlikely, Churchill's 'greatest service to mankind' had been to show that it was 'possible to be politically effective and yet benevolent and humane'.<sup>77</sup>

Berlin died on 5 November 1997. He was virtually the last survivor of that generation of immigrants whose ascendancy over higher education in Great Britain Anderson so much lamented. He had precious little in common, ideologically or temperamentally, with other luminaries of that White rather than Red emigration—with Hayek, Eysenck or Popper, for instance—who collectively are held to have steered the English nation through its long slumber while less ideologically hamstrung radical students on the Continent revolted. His Zionism, like his liberalism, was undogmatic. He formed no school and had no followers. He flourished in a civic culture which was not his own without ever abandoning his native identities or the exotic languages of his youth. He was a Russian Jew who had come to feel at home abroad, the first Jewish Fellow of All Souls and the only holder of the Order of Merit and President of the British Academy whose two grandfathers, an uncle, an aunt, and three cousins had been shot, quite possibly by the associates of a very elderly Latvian citizen of Australia whom the British Home Secretary felt minded to deport but not detain when alerted of his presence in England around three years ago.<sup>78</sup> A few weeks before Berlin's death, John Pocock had delivered the first of a series of lectures in his honour at Oxford, which he had conceived as both paying his tribute and articulating their differences. Exactly one week after his passing, Quentin Skinner gave his inaugural lecture as the Regius Professor of Modern History in Cambridge, 'Liberty before Liberalism', in which he addressed and sought to correct the concept of negative liberty introduced by Berlin's own inaugural lecture forty years earlier.<sup>79</sup>

With respect to Berlin's approach to the reading of texts in political theory and the history of ideas, Pocock and Skinner in their different ways point to *décalages* or breaks which are both epistemic and generational. In view of the number of columns of print that followed the demise of Britain's pre-eminent academic pillar of the establishment, some of which in other circumstances might have been devoted to reporting Skinner's lecture, there is a sense in which Berlin's death could accurately be described, in the words of Norman Mailer on the passing of Truman Capote, as 'a good career move'. But although he was eighty-eight years old, his demise shook me and many other persons throughout the world very deeply indeed. I was reminded of the Jewish child portrayed so af-

fectionately in Louis Malle's autobiographical *Au revoir les enfants*, whose dazzling command of Schubert at the piano just before his deportation gave his classmates a glimpse of another world in their midst which they had never known first-hand, of all that was best in European civilization, brought to them and then taken away by all that was worst. Not only by the sheer humanity of his writings and the exuberant cadences of his style, but by virtue even of the circumstances of his presence in England, Berlin was, to my mind, the very epitome of the spirit of enlightenment.<sup>80</sup>

## PROJECTING THE ENLIGHTENMENT

### I

In three chapters of *After Virtue* Alasdair MacIntyre describes what he terms ‘the Enlightenment Project’ whose breakdown underlies the chaos of moral values in contemporary culture.<sup>1</sup> That project was in his view centrally concerned with providing universal standards by which to justify particular courses of action in every sphere of life, and although Enlightenment thinkers manifestly did not agree as to exactly *which* principles might be acceptable to rational persons, he claims they nevertheless collectively propagated the doctrine that such principles must exist, and that moral conduct must therefore be subject to intelligible vindication or criticism. Many post-Enlightenment philosophers have continued to pursue that aim, but in the absence of any prevalent framework of values within which moral judgements could be agreed, they have only shown, according to MacIntyre, that this ideal cannot be attained. The legacy of the Enlightenment has therefore been to render our morality confused—to divide our allegiances between different competing doctrines and to foster disagreement about what is right and good, even when we seek to make our standards plain. Without already settled moral beliefs, we have come to identify our principles only in terms of abstract notions of the self and individual choice, freed from the contingencies of social roles or historical tradition. In such a world every person may legislate his or her own code of conduct. Adrift in the democratic sea of modernity, we clutch at values which are incompatible, incommensurable and arbitrary.

A similar argument, albeit with different emphases, also informs both *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* [WJ] and *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry* [TRV].<sup>2</sup> Six chapters of *Whose Justice?* are devoted to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century themes, mainly concerned with the peculiar blend of Calvinist Augustinianism and Renaissance Aristotelianism deemed to be centrally distinctive of the background to the Scottish Enlightenment, and with Hutcheson’s and Hume’s conceptions of practical reason and justice, all in the context of an overarching image of the Enlightenment, whose ‘central aspiration’ is described there (WJ, p. 6) in much the same terms as in *After Virtue* [AV]. In *Three Rival Versions* Ma  
work of

moral discourse which he associates especially with the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, dating from 1873, inspired, in turn, by principles of science, reason and progress, and by an allegedly 'unified secular vision of the world' (TRV, p. 216) such as had already been infused in the Enlightenment *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and d'Alembert.

If pride of place among moral philosophers seems to pass slowly from Aristotle to Aquinas in his three most canonical writings, MacIntyre's Enlightenment Project, by contrast, remains largely unreconstructed, unredeemed and undiminished in its failure, even after substantial embellishment. His three principal works comprise an extraordinary indictment of the theoretical and practical legacy of eighteenth-century philosophy, as comprehensive as any among the numerous critiques produced over the past half-century, and among the most trenchant since Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* and Hippolyte Taine's *Origines de la France contemporaine*. His account projects the Enlightenment's implications and influence as they stem from its aims. He holds it to blame for some of the most sinister aspects of a morally vacuous civilization, cursed by the malediction of unlicensed Reason. His intellectual history of the period forms one of the mainsprings of his own philosophy.

Of course opposition to a putative Enlightenment Project figures conspicuously in many other doctrines, including perhaps all of the most prominent ideologies of the past two hundred years. Conservatives and Romantics have characteristically condemned the scepticism, atheism and generally critical temper of eighteenth-century speculative philosophy for bringing into question the very foundations of the *ancien régime*, thereby allegedly inspiring the French revolutionaries with their anti-authoritarian spirit and a zealous determination to transform the world, which culminated in the Jacobin Terror. Marxists, radicals and communitarians have judged its commitment either to utilitarianism or to natural rights as heralding the age of bourgeois liberties, appropriate to a world of independent producers engaged in maximizing their separate interests, under bureaucratic authorities following principles of instrumental reason. Modern liberals and libertarians have instead judged the Enlightenment's espousal of at least some of the rights of man as conducive to institutions of popular sovereignty and democratic control which have prompted state interference in the private domain and have proved hostile to the interests of commercial society. Such images of the Enlightenment are of course scarcely compatible, and they ill accord with the substantial intellectual debt which the same ideologies are also said to owe to eighteenth-century philosophy. But MacIntyre's account owes little to them. Although he seems to share certain misgivings about the loss of public engagement and the moral fragmentation of modern life with communitarian critics of the Enlightenment (like Charles Taylor and Michael Sandel), and although he

ma  
ng above

all from Hegel, his objections in fact have a rather different focus and, by and large, as I hope to indicate, a strikingly distinct pedigree.

In retracing that pedigree and thus attempting, as it were, to reproject the steps of his own construal of the Enlightenment Project's trajectory, I mean to show how his interpretation of an intellectual tradition depends above all on his assessment of its impact. And while most of my remarks here stem from a quite different understanding of the Enlightenment which leads me to take issue with MacIntyre's claims, I should first like to give due weight to what I take to be the chief merits of his approach. In *After Virtue* and elsewhere he puts a compelling case for the integration of moral philosophy with moral behaviour and conduct, rejecting the demarcations of academic disciplines which, on the one hand, keep the metaphilosophy of morals uncontaminated by historical and sociological commentary, and, on the other, leave down-to-earth historical discourse uninformed by theoretical analysis. Overcoming the double barrenness of detached philosophy and mindless history has been an admirable aim promoted by MacIntyre throughout his career, and he has pursued it in this context by recounting how certain speculative presuppositions gave rise to consequences which have shaped the lives of persons and indeed the character of whole societies, even when their members are scarcely aware of their own fundamental moral uncertainties spawned by such beliefs. As the title of the fifth chapter of *After Virtue* makes plain, the Enlightenment Project of justifying morality which MacIntyre portrays not only failed, but 'had to fail'. The chaos of values prevalent in democratic society is the negation in concrete form which springs from the negativity of its philosophy. Corresponding in the world of ideas to a defunct institution which fetters the development of a new productive force, it had to be annihilated, and it was.

Claims of such magnitude are seldom made by philosophers, least of all by those whose analytical skills were sharpened as his were by the scalpels of post-World War II Oxford. MacIntyre's philosophy of history is on a grand scale, scarcely attempted in this century since Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee, and far more persuasive—not to mention intelligible—than either. In its attempt to thread the unity of theory and practice within the morals of modern civilization it is boldly conceived and splendidly incautious—indeed profoundly reminiscent in its nature of the Enlightenment Project he holds in such low esteem. In a sense, it might even be described as that Project turned upside down, or back to front, inspired as it is by a deep religious conviction and a profound sense of faith of a kind from which eighteenth-century sceptical philosophers, themselves missionaries in reverse, endeavoured to liberate peoples enthralled by them. MacIntyre's philosophy of history, moreover, forms a richly textured tapestry drawn from an impressively wide range of reading, both of

primary sources and modern authorities, most notably, perhaps, with regard to the Scottish Enlightenment, but also on Aristotle, medieval conceptions of morality, nineteenth-century ethics, and contemporary French and American philosophy. If *After Virtue* remains his principal work, because of its depth and scale, *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* and *Three Rival Versions* make more substantial contributions to the history of ideas on account of their scholarship, increasingly remarkable for its historical specificity and attention to detail. These works do not recapitulate the all too glaringly obvious errors so unfortunately evident in his *Short History of Ethics*; in taking stock of his philosophy of history as a whole, current readers must learn to grapple not only with the subtle turns of his argument but also with the both dense and delicate contextual treatments of the writings and authors he investigates. It is a formidable achievement, demanding close scrutiny. The Enlightenment Project portrayed at its heart is, nevertheless, profoundly misleading.

## II

In *After Virtue* that Project is reconstructed from its nineteenth-century dénouement to its seventeenth-century source by the regression of a lineage of concepts not unlike Alex Haley's search for his ancestral family in *Roots*. MacIntyre begins with the publication of Kierkegaard's *Enten-Eller* (*Either-Or*) in 1842, a work which is found to herald the capriciousness of moral choice in contemporary culture, in that it provides an account of two contrasting ways of life—the ethical, or the realm of duty, and the aesthetic, or the realm of pleasure and satisfaction—without offering any grounds to justify one over the other. What makes the argument of Kierkegaard seem so disturbing is the apparent incommensurability of two distinct value systems, and the arbitrariness and irrationality of any moral choice between them. That perspective, according to MacIntyre, was largely inspired by Kant, whom Kierkegaard had read with care, and whose ethics provide the essential background for his own philosophy (AV, p. 42). Kant, that is, while making compliance with duty a morally binding principle, had provided no logical grounds for doing so, leaving the performance of duty for duty's sake indefensible to anyone who elected to act in accordance with self-interested prudence rather than disinterested reason (AV, pp. 44–45). Kierkegaard merely appropriated Kant's doctrine to show that the precepts of reason could not themselves be rationally vindicated. Kant, moreover, had put forward his own conception of duty as a universal law largely to overturn a hedonistic morality whose principles prescribed that duty stems from passion or interest. No moral code, he contended, could be based on the pursuit of happiness or personal

benefit, since our duties would then hold only conditionally, overturned without contradiction when our advantage changed.

The two central Enlightenment figures whom MacIntyre identifies as subscribing to the sort of principles Kant deemed immoral are Diderot, on the one hand, and Hume, on the other. In *Le Neveu de Rameau*, Diderot, speaking in his own voice, propounds the view that the conservative rules of bourgeois morality conform to conscientious desire and passion, while speaking as the nephew of the dialogue, he acknowledges that such rules are just sophisticated disguises for our devious and predatory abuse of one another. The logic of any ethic of desire which corresponds with feelings obliges him, claims MacIntyre, to recognize that there are incompatible desires which may be ordered in rival ways (AV, pp. 45–46). Hume, independently and more philosophically, is deemed to have put forward much the same thesis. Convinced that morality must either be the work of reason or of the passions, he contended that it had to be attributable to the passions, since they alone form the springs of human action. Of course he allowed that moral judgements required the invocation of general rules, but, like Diderot, he sought to account for such rules by explaining ‘their utility in helping . . . to attain those ends which the passions set before us’ (AV, p. 46), and in both his *Treatise of Human Nature* and his *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* he sought to explain how persons might feel bound to adhere unconditionally to certain rules by discriminating between desires and feelings according to normative criteria of a kind which could not themselves be feelings (AV, pp. 46–47). In this sense, Hume and Kant may be understood as exact philosophical counterparts within the Enlightenment Project, the one deriving his morality from reason, the other from passion—in one case, indeed, laying the groundwork for all subsequent rights-based deontological moral philosophies, in the other promoting the consequentialist and utilitarian ethics of the post-Enlightenment world.

In drawing this group portrait to its close, MacIntyre concludes that Hume may even have found inspiration in the Jansenism of Pascal, whose conception of reason as a merely calculative faculty which cannot inspire action or belief anticipated his own view that it could serve as a means but never prescribe the ends of human endeavour. According to MacIntyre, Pascal stands at a seminally important point in the history of the Enlightenment Project (AV, p. 52), since his account of reason, so attuned to the innovations of seventeenth-century philosophy and science, excluded the Scholastic essences conceived as potentialities to act which had been inherited from Aristotle. At the heart of the Enlightenment Project, as he describes it in *After Virtue*, lay a rejection of teleology so central to Aristotle’s developmental notion of man’s perfection. In abandoning that idea of self-fulfilment, philosophers of the Enlightenment left no place for the

classical ethics of virtue, which articulated qualities that promoted the excellence of character. They regarded the nature of humanity as uniform and constant, thus dismembering the moral consciousness of man by cutting off the contingent and unfolding truths of his experience from the realm of duty and obligation. Whether rooting morality in reason or passion, their diremption of one from the other entailed the loss of reason's capacity to control what the passions pursued. It divorced the precepts of morality from the facts of human nature, leaving individuals as sovereign masters of their own conduct. In this sense Pascal's conception of reason as incapable of prescription heralds Kierkegaard's notion of the irrationality of moral choice. The Enlightenment Project can be seen to have cast moral philosophy adrift by its rejection of the classical ethics of virtue and the entelechies of Aristotle and Scholasticism.

In *Whose Justice?* MacIntyre's portrait of the Scottish Enlightenment takes shape by contrast in the opposite direction—that is, forward, from the mid-seventeenth century, by reconstituting the deconstructed tradition described in *After Virtue* with much fuller embellishment and greater elaboration within a particular tradition, now inaugurated rather than consummated by the rejection of Aristotle. His refashioned and refocused argument, of substantially greater length than in *After Virtue*, proceeds in the following way. As a result of the 1707 Treaty of Union with England, Scotland lost her sovereignty but not her identity, sustained against Anglican cultural forces by the Presbyterian order of its Calvinist Church, by the institutions and practitioners of Scots law, and by its unique and relatively homogenous educational system which promoted a peculiarly Scottish ethos of Protestant civility (WJ, p. 220). In this closely knit nexus of legal, theological and educational systems, the five national universities (at a time when England had just two) filled a central role, both spiritual and practical, in the articulation of a Scottish identity, and MacIntyre devotes most of his attention to that role, and especially to the contribution made within it by professors of moral philosophy, as 'one of the most important bearers of a distinctly Scottish tradition' (WJ, p. 251).

The co-existence of Augustinian theology with the revived study of Aristotelianism had been sustained in seventeenth-century Scottish universities through the influence of men like Robert Baillie, Principal of Glasgow University after the Restoration, and Viscount Stair, Lord President of the Scottish Court of Session, but the political settlement with England, and the need perceived by Scottish educationalists to contend with the pretensions of the new sciences and metaphysics of their day, put the adherents to what is termed 'the central Scottish intellectual tradition' (WJ, p. 254) under strain to reaffirm both their faith and their principles. According to MacIntyre, Francis Hutcheson, appointed to the Glasgow Chair of Moral Philosophy in 1730, felt a special responsibility to meet



such needs because he assumed himself entrusted with the task of secular instruction in Christian theology as well. In his lectures and publications based upon them he attempted to refine the philosophical principles of morality he had inherited partly from Aristotelian Scholasticism and partly from Calvinism, mainly in the light of Shaftesbury's psychological account of the passions. From Shaftesbury he developed an idea of the *moral sense* as a kind of inward rationale for principles which could no longer be shown to be true in the light of either Reason or Revelation, but which corresponded closely with the religious feelings of his contemporaries, who had grown both politically and spiritually vulnerable to moral conflict. Hutcheson's doctrine was thus espoused with enthusiasm by his students, and ministers, merchants, advocates and the gentry all rushed to subscribe to his posthumously published *System of Moral Philosophy*. As MacIntyre observes, it had been his remarkable achievement to provide 'new foundations both for moral theology and for the philosophy of law and justice, and in doing so preserving the distinctive characteristics of the Scottish presbyterian and intellectual tradition' (WJ, pp. 278–79).

That achievement, however, proved short-lived and unstable, for on the subversive road leading from the lowlands of Perfidious Albion there soon appeared Hume. Cosmopolitan philosopher and historian of England Hume, says MacIntyre, writes of his native Scotland 'as if it were a foreign country' (WJ, p. 320), uncultivated, uncivilized, barbarous. Although he was in certain respects indebted to Hutcheson—partly for his own account of the passions in his *Treatise of Human Nature* and above all in his acceptance of the claim that reason is practically inert (WJ, p. 285)—he shared none of Hutcheson's attachment to a Scottish Presbyterian social and intellectual tradition. He spoke for himself, in the first person, and turned to Hutcheson, together with Hobbes, Shaftesbury, Mandeville and others, only to provide an account of the complex intentionality of human passions which was superior to theirs (WJ, p. 293). That account imputes to the self a social identity shaped in reciprocal relations with and expectations of other persons, and it provides the framework of a moral philosophy whose evaluative principles accord with human passions and not with any standards of right reason independent of men's judgement.

Yet on inspection it transpires that the conservative principles of justice, property, order and rank which Hume in fact endorses are most distinctive of the social order, embracing landowning classes and their clients, which he inhabited himself and of which he approved, so that what his philosophy presents as human nature turns out to be eighteenth-century *English* human nature and, indeed, only the dominant variant of that (WJ, p. 295). Whereas Hutcheson's moral philosophy had sought to renew as well as preserve a Scottish inheritance in religion, law and edu-

cation in the face of new challenges, Hume had grasped that Scottish theology and law could not survive such change. He therefore undertook to refute the conceptual foundations of Scotland's past. Its unphilosophical culture, he came to believe, stood in the way of philosophical enquiry and a general science of human nature. Together with other thinkers of the Enlightenment, as was once remarked, although not about Hume,<sup>3</sup> he thus threw dust in our eyes even while pointing in the direction he wished us to follow. He has made those persuaded by him blind to what we in fact need to recover, that is, 'a conception of rational enquiry . . . embodied in a tradition', whose standards of justification emerge from and are vindicated within it (WJ, p. 7).

### III

What are we to make of this? To my mind, it is all wonderfully confused, both in method and substance, generally and in detail. An Enlightenment Project shaped by a mid-seventeenth-century Jansenist (Pascal) and a mid-nineteenth-century Christian existentialist (Kierkegaard), with an encyclopaedic romantic (Diderot) and a motley crew of Scots and Germans between them, needs more justification to pass muster than MacIntyre provides. It may be thought that the diversity of thinkers linked with that whole assemblage is too great, or the tensions between them too profound, to allow any ascription of a generic identity or common purpose to them, and eighteenth-century scholars who have failed to uncover any such 'project' or 'movement' or even 'the Enlightenment' after a lifetime's research devoted to the subject could be forgiven their exasperation when confronted by so great a leap and quick fix.

But let us grant that the idea of an 'Enlightenment Project' is credible. Even if our terminology was not employed by eighteenth-century thinkers themselves (the expression 'Scottish Enlightenment', for instance, was apparently invented in 1900), what we have in mind may indeed have formed part of the self-image of that age. The literary salons and academies, the moral weeklies and journals, the *Encyclopédie* and other dictionaries of the arts and sciences, the association of philosophy with kingship which in the eighteenth century was already described as 'enlightened despotism', all lend warrant to the notion of shared principles, a campaign, an international society of the republic of letters, a party of humanity. Its friends and critics would not perhaps have been surprised to hear its name, but they would have been entitled, as are MacIntyre's readers, to learn what the Project was about. What was its political economy, its anthropology, its conjectural history or philosophy of science? Allowing that it failed, and perhaps even had to fail, would it not have been

appropriate first to explain what it set out to achieve? And would it not also have been sensible to identify its central figures? Montesquieu is nowhere mentioned in *After Virtue* or *Whose Justice?*, while Rousseau receives only the most scanty attention and Smith hardly much more. How is it possible that Voltaire—the godfather of the Enlightenment Project on any plausible interpretation of its meaning—is altogether missing from MacIntyre’s cast? Readers anticipating that after the Scots he must address the French may be disheartened to discover from *Whose Justice?* (p. 11) that the only tradition of practical reasoning in the Enlightenment which MacIntyre deems worthy of similar attention is that of Kant, Prussian public law and Lutheran theology.

At least part of the explanation of his neglect of French thinkers is that he regards them as relatively insignificant by comparison with the intellectual range and variety of the Scots, contending, furthermore, that their general lack of a secularized Protestant background and the absence from their country of a politically influential intelligentsia which might have read their works, or progressive universities that might have been attentive to them, left them alienated from their own society, as Scottish, English, Dutch, Danish and Prussian intellectuals were not (AV, p. 36). I confess my failure to comprehend the significance of their lack of Protestantism, but put baldly in this way each of these points is in fact false. The *philosophes* of the Enlightenment characteristically exercised a great deal *more* influence in France, and over the political life of their nation, than did intellectuals in other European countries, not least because France enjoyed by far the most substantial reading public in the eighteenth century, *outside* the universities which resisted their ideas, though they also had allies among scholars and scientists within universities and in the academies, as well as among liberal theologians, of whom several contributed to the *Encyclopédie*.

Yet supposing that MacIntyre’s inaccurate claims about the institutional marginality of French Enlightenment thinkers were true, his premise about the depth and range of their influence would still be false. In so far as the *philosophes* of the French Enlightenment were self-employed writers, they were often *more* free to speak their mind, unconstrained by the obligations of office or the duties of teaching a prescribed syllabus. Their apparent licence to comment on topical issues of the day made their influence all the greater, not only in France but in French-reading circles throughout Europe and even America. When, as often happened, they were judged to have abused their freedom, they were not just excluded from university appointments but imprisoned or exiled, which enhanced their reputations still more. MacIntyre appears to subscribe to the view that only holders of public positions, with socially rooted responsibilities, can exercise any real impact on their followers. But that is

surely absurd. To the extent that the Enlightenment was indeed a critically subversive movement, as MacIntyre portrays it, its estrangement from the settled institutions of its day, in France and elsewhere, enhanced its power. By deliberately excluding a French focus from his study, MacIntyre offers his readers an account of peripheries without a core. His Enlightenment Project has been shorn of its projectionist.

Only two French eighteenth-century figures attain any prominence in his work—Diderot and the Chevalier de Jaucourt. *Three Rival Versions* contains several paragraphs devoted to Jaucourt's articles 'Morale' and 'Moralité' for the *Encyclopédie*, which embrace the proposition that morality is a matter of general rules independent of religious faith, inviting MacIntyre's comment that 'it is striking how far other thinkers of the Enlightenment agree' with him (TRV, p. 175). If he had added that Jaucourt was of Huguenot background he might have judged his influence even greater, but what in fact is most striking about the judgement of Jaucourt's contemporaries was their agreement that he was just an indefatigable compiler of the views of others. Diderot himself, who had cause to be grateful to him for completing more than one-quarter of the *Encyclopédie* single-handed, wrote precisely this. Jaucourt of course drew most of his material from other encyclopaedias, including those of Moréri, Chambers and Brucker, and in the case of 'Morale' and 'Moralité' he may have relied most of all upon Bayle. It was not at all difficult to be persuaded by a man who spoke on behalf of so many others.

Diderot is introduced by MacIntyre not as a contributor to his own *Encyclopédie* but as the author of the *Neveu de Rameau*. The main point MacIntyre elicits from that work, as we have seen, is that the older Diderot, the bourgeois moralist in the dialogue, cannot legislate between his own moral preferences and those of the bohemian nephew, thus admitting that there are irredeemably incompatible orderings of desire (AV, p. 46; see also WJ, p. 346). This thesis is contrasted by MacIntyre with the proposition advanced in the *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville*, where Diderot instead acknowledges the superiority of natural desires (such as exercise free rein in Polynesia) over the corrupted desires characteristic of Western civilization. That distinction, states MacIntyre, cannot survive the proposition—in short, that we have no grounds for discriminating between desires—which in *Le Neveu de Rameau* Diderot at last forces himself to recognize (AV, p. 46). But this is a misreading of the *Supplément*, whose central claim is that a morality in accordance with nature is preferable to one that combats it. Western civilization is found to repress natural desires rather than to espouse different ones. The *Supplément* does not discriminate between desires but between moralities, and it commends only what is compatible with the promptings of nature. There are, moreover, reasons to doubt whether the unresolved dramatic tensions between

the two fictional protagonists of *Le Neveu de Rameau* express the fundamental moral scepticism of their author's own philosophy. In any case, the *Supplément* was drafted more than ten years after *Le Neveu* and, in conjunction with several other writings, it appears to reflect Diderot's considered judgement that moral principles should accord with both public utility and physiology, which he does not see as giving rise to a conflict of desires. MacIntyre's forays into eighteenth-century French moral philosophy, in short, do not carry sufficient conviction.

Neither, regrettably, do his comments about Scotland. The six Scottish chapters of *Whose Justice?* shed much illumination on a society whose legal and religious institutions, buttressed by its educational curriculum, reinforced a sense of national identity which was and remains among the most remarkable in Europe. If MacIntyre's elegiac tribute to a noble and indigenous tradition of practical reasoning seems sometimes to approximate a Scottish Nationalist Party broadcast of the songs of Ossian, I do not wish to quarrel with him for that, even though the civic culture and ethics of virtue which he portrays before the Union of 1707 strike me as unduly uniform and unlikely to have been quite so prevalent as he suggests. What I cannot detect is any evidence that Hutcheson assumed the responsibilities for sustaining that tradition which MacIntyre entrusts to him after his appointment to the Glasgow Professorship of Moral Philosophy. For one thing, his principal writings, including those which Hutcheson himself judged most original, had already been completed and published before he took up his Chair. His theory of the *moral sense* was thus fully articulated prior to the ascribed occasion of its composition.

In so far as his philosophical works reflect a specifically national focus, moreover, they appear less Scottish than Irish, not only on account of their having been drafted in Ireland by a native Ulsterman, but more notably because they were intended principally for the Presbyterian students of the private academy he had established in Dublin in 1718, and they figure in a campaign waged out of that city in the 1720s by the circle of Viscount Molesworth to inculcate among Irish youth a respect for liberty and virtue, which it was thought were inadequately embraced in Scottish universities. Hutcheson was to take up his Glasgow appointment not as a conservative adherent to a Scottish tradition of higher education but as a vigorously critical reformer. His widely attested popularity as a lecturer in Glasgow, partly due to his casual style of delivery in English rather than by way of Latin readings, was even more attributable to the zealotry of his preaching a joyously uplifting moral philosophy in accordance with benign nature and providence, that contrasted with the gloomy precepts around original sin of Augustinian Scholasticism. The Scottish theological tradition which MacIntyre claims Hutcheson reaffirmed was actually rejected by him, and indeed rejected with as much determination as,

for other reasons, still in the same period of his life, he opposed the jurisprudence of Pufendorf and the epistemology of Locke. If in apparently espousing Christian Stoicism Hutcheson eventually proved more morally conservative than he might have wished, this was not because of his resolve, as a professor, to keep alive a peculiarly Scottish intellectual inheritance, but almost the opposite—that is, because the pedagogical demands of his office required him to teach by way of textbooks and compendia in accordance with a prescribed syllabus which, by and large, was not of his choosing. The two major works he produced after 1730, the *Synopsis metaphysicae* and the *System of Moral Philosophy*, were deemed by him, in the first case, ‘a trifle . . . foolishly printed’, and, in the second, ‘a confused book . . . a farrago’. This distinguished university professor, according to MacIntyre a bearer of a great Scottish tradition, could in fact prove a bore, even to himself, when weighed down by the burdens of his office.

While he portrays Hutcheson as having deliberately aimed at reaffirming the values of a beleaguered past, MacIntyre sometimes depicts Enlightenment thinkers as instead unwitting adherents of circumscribed social practices, advocating ideals which really serve only particular interests as if they were of universal validity. Hume, whose favourite principles are found to be specially well-suited to the interests of the landed gentry, is represented in just this way, and so too are both Diderot and Kant. Each of these figures is depicted as ostensibly radical in his philosophy but in fact conservative as a moralist—Diderot mainly on account of his concern with the responsibilities of parenthood, Hume and Kant largely because of their uncompromising views on the need to keep promises. But do such moral standpoints really reflect the settled social institutions by which philosophers of a certain disposition feel bound? Diderot’s anxieties about his daughter, to whom MacIntyre refers, were largely inspired by his rage and frustration at the morally reprobate conventions of a system of marriage which required intricate negotiations to ensure her dowry, while the fastidious respect for promises shown by Hume and Kant may just exemplify the awesome esteem for marriage vows felt by two shy bachelors psychologically incapable of undertaking them.

The connections between normative principles and social institutions which MacIntyre seeks to draw seem to me elusive and inconsistent. Why, for instance, did the Enlightenment Project issue in the moral disorder of contemporary culture but not noticeably in the chaos of the French Revolution? MacIntyre makes a point of challenging certain writers, among whom he names J. L. Talmon, Isaiah Berlin and Daniel Bell, who have traced the origins of totalitarianism and the Jacobin Terror to the Enlightenment. Jacobinism, he claims, was inspired not only by the virtues of liberty, equality and fraternity, but also by patriotism, productive

labour and a simplicity of manners which owed much to the influence of Rousseau and, more distantly, to Aristotle. Such benign communitarian sources manifestly could not have been responsible for violence. Indeed, MacIntyre doubts whether any commitment to virtue could have been 'so powerful as to be able to produce of itself such stupendous effects' as the Terror, which he ascribes instead to the political institutionalization of virtue through desperate means employed by men such as Saint-Just (AV, p. 221).

But how is it that the institutionalization of virtue during the French Revolution exculpates the moral philosophy which Saint-Just and others sought to implement, whereas in the post-revolutionary world that philosophy may be deemed responsible for the conduct of persons unaware that they were endeavouring to put Enlightenment moral ideas into practice? Allowing, with MacIntyre, that the abstractions of philosophy may be dangerous, why should his treatment of the insidious influence of Enlightenment principles carry greater conviction than Burke's or Hegel's accounts of how such principles unfolded into revolutionary violence? Why should eighteenth-century doctrines have had greater impact on the remoter march of modernity than on the more proximate course of the French Revolution? Can the influence of ideas, like the putative progression of certain historical epochs, actually skip stages? Readers of MacIntyre's philosophy of history are too often tempted with richly appetizing food for thought, but then denied the required sustenance. If the Enlightenment Project had to conclude in failure, was its inception equally necessary?, they are entitled to ask. How, indeed, according to MacIntyre, did the Enlightenment Project come to arise at all? And if abstract ideas are generally so deeply intertwined with social conventions as he claims, how has it come to pass that the contemporary practice of history remains, on his own testimony, so little contaminated by philosophical issues as to be almost mindless, and the practice of philosophy so similarly insular as to lack any pertinent social focus?

#### IV

At least some of these issues, it seems to me, can be best understood in terms of the Enlightenment's more strictly philosophical legacy, as MacIntyre explains it, and against the background of his own intellectual biography. In the second and third chapters of *After Virtue*—that is, the chapters immediately preceding his discussion of the Enlightenment Project—MacIntyre asserts that the lack of rational criteria for securing moral agreement in contemporary culture is largely attributable to a prevalent philosophical doctrine, according to which all evaluative judge-



ments are at bottom nothing but statements of preference which by their nature cannot be shown to be either true or false (AV, pp. 11–12). This doctrine he calls ‘emotivism’, following the terminology of its principal exponent, C. L. Stevenson. It is in confrontation with emotivism in its various philosophical guises, MacIntyre contends, that his own thesis must be defined (AV, p. 21). That confrontation, already evident from the final chapter on modern moral philosophy in his *Short History of Ethics*, dating from 1966, was indeed elaborated even earlier in a course of lectures he gave at Oxford entitled ‘What was morality?’, and it forms part of a very wide debate with numerous contributors among mainly British moral philosophers of the post–World War II period. Much of the material in that debate was first published in *Mind* or in the proceedings of or supplementary volumes to the *Aristotelian Society* in the late 1940s and 1950s, and some of it has since been reassembled in such collections as *The Is–Ought Question* edited by W. D. Hudson in 1964 or *Revisions: Changing Perspectives in Moral Philosophy* edited by Stanley Hauerwas and MacIntyre himself in 1983.

Among its heroes or heroines from the professedly anti-emotivist point of view adopted by MacIntyre are Philippa Foot, Elizabeth Anscombe and Stuart Hampshire—the first because she attempted to show that it was impossible to extract from the meaning of moral terms such as ‘good’ some evaluative significance that was externally related to the object so defined; the second because she placed particular emphasis on the Christian tradition in which our moral discourse and values were once embedded; and the third because he drew special attention to Aristotle’s ethics and to the extraordinary gulf that had arisen between classical moral philosophy, concerned with moral choice and judgement, on the one hand, and modern meta-ethics, divorced from evaluative claims and devoted only to problems of language and meaning, on the other.

MacIntyre’s villainous doctrines, moreover, are by and large the same as those which Philippa Foot, Elizabeth Anscombe and Stuart Hampshire had in mind. They embrace the prescriptivism of R. M. Hare and his divorce of the language of moral imperatives from that of description, as well as the logical positivism of A. J. Ayer, which divided judgements into a threefold classification of logical, factual and emotive, relegating moral principles, together with theology, to the emotive category. From both Ayer’s sceptical Humean perspective and Hare’s reformulated Kantian doctrine, it thus transpired that moral judgements were of necessity distinct from matters of fact. Ayer and Hare appear to have been condemned, each by the logic of his philosophy, to fall victim to the irreconcilable conflict between the morality of passions and the morality of reason which had been characteristic of their eighteenth-century forbears, described by MacIntyre in *After Virtue*. As he furthermore makes plain in



his *Short History of Ethics* (pp. 249–65), both of their doctrines may be understood in connection with C. L. Stevenson's emotivism, dating from his seminal work of 1944, *Ethics and Language*. According to Stevenson, the proposition 'this is good' means little else than 'I approve of it'—a claim which in yet another idiom reinforced the positivist and prescriptivist disjunction of facts from values. Stevenson, for his part, apparently developed his moral philosophy out of the intuitionism of H. A. Prichard and especially G. E. Moore, who in his *Principia Ethica* had portrayed all attempts to define the attributes of goodness as a naturalistic fallacy, on the grounds that goodness was a simple and undefinable property of which nothing could be rationally predicated as true or false. Following both Henry Sidgwick and William Whewell, Moore supposed that goodness could only be intuited, never justified, a view which Whewell in turn drew essentially from the younger Mill, who had decoupled the moral injunctions of utilitarianism from their unconvincing psychological foundations devised by Bentham, while Bentham's mistake had been due to the general failure of the Enlightenment Project, for the reasons I have already advanced. As MacIntyre remarks in *After Virtue*, 'The history of utilitarianism thus links historically the eighteenth-century project of justifying morality and the twentieth century's decline into emotivism' (AV, p. 63).

The is–ought distinction of modern moral philosophy is in this fashion explained as emanating, through intuitionism and emotivism, from Moore's criticism of the naturalistic fallacy, in its turn heralded by the passage from Book III, part 1, section 1 of the *Treatise of Human Nature* in which Hume had challenged the erroneous deduction of propositions with the word 'ought' from statements containing the word 'is' in all the systems of morality known to him. In a notable commentary on that passage first published in *The Philosophical Review* in 1959, MacIntyre contends that Hume did not himself believe in the autonomy of morals, as so many of his interpreters have alleged, and that he in fact derived 'ought' from 'is' in his own theory of justice. Moore's intuitionism, moreover, was only indirectly indebted to Hume, who is unmentioned anywhere in the *Principia Ethica*. But Hume, Moore and the other moral philosophers whom MacIntyre names as proponents of the fact–value distinction are nevertheless collectively deemed responsible for the Enlightenment Project and its legacy. That Project failed in its unwarranted bifurcation of 'ought' from 'is', in cutting off moral principles from their moorings in human nature, thereby releasing them to drift, with every passing current of philosophical fashion, into arbitrariness and irresolution.

MacIntyre is not the first interpreter of ethical naturalism to have reconstructed the history of objections to that alleged fallacy and to have traced them to the Enlightenment. Among others, both David Raphael, in

*The Moral Sense*, dating from 1947, and Arthur Prior, in his *Logic and the Basis of Ethics* of 1949, had addressed this subject long before MacIntyre and had each chronicled its seventeenth- and eighteenth-century prefigurations in the works of Hutcheson and Hume, but also Ralph Cudworth, Samuel Clarke, Thomas Reid, Richard Price and others, through their contrasting accounts of the place of feelings and reason in morals. The various texts which invite such treatments of ethics and of the fitful appearance of a certain principle within a speculative tradition had already been assembled even earlier by L. A. Selby-Bigge in his *British Moralists* at the end of the nineteenth century and are now available in a new format, with a somewhat different cast, in the collection compiled under the same title by Raphael. Yet in his initial reflections on emotivism, MacIntyre turned his attention, not to its Enlightenment origins, but to its philosophical underpinnings and influence. Readers hard-pressed to keep up with the permutations of his faith may therefore be comforted to learn that the principles of his clash with emotivism, as explained in *After Virtue*, have always informed his outlook on the world. They constitute the moral bedrock of his philosophy, unaffected by the great or subtle modulations of his views on Christianity, Hegelianism, Marxism or irrationalism.

His critique of the emotivist theory of ethics is substantially prefigured in the M.A. dissertation he completed at the University of Manchester, under the title *The Significance of Moral Judgements*. Already then, in 1951, he challenged the presuppositions of the intuitionist and emotivist ethics of Moore and Stevenson. Already then, he found fault with the logic of contemporary moral discourse in its misconceived appeal to categorical truths and universal standards. Already then, in commenting on Hume's distinction between 'ought' and 'is', he stressed that our notions of what is right and good, shaped by concrete and conditional circumstances, must fill a place within the structure of socially prescribed behaviour. 'Moral judgements', he claimed—still as a young man of twenty-two—form 'part of a pattern of language and action, continually to be adjusted and criticised'. The arguments we employ 'are not just about the applications of . . . principles, but also about which principles to apply . . . not just about the relation of the facts to . . . judgements, but also about which facts are relevant to our decisions'.<sup>4</sup> It is salutary to find such durable and enduring precepts at the dawn of his career. They provide a solid foundation to his life-long censure of emotivism. But only with an almighty, unfounded and uncalled for leap of the imagination can MacIntyre bring that censure to bear upon his projection of the Enlightenment. His comments on the legacy of eighteenth-century moral philosophy, portrayed as if it were a peripatetic long day's journey into night, only render it obscure.

The Enlightenment did *not* confront the entelechies of Aristotelian Scholasticism with a new metaphysics and epistemology drawn from Descartes and Locke. Aristotelianism had been largely discredited in most European universities—especially the progressive institutions accorded popular significance by MacIntyre—long before the eighteenth century, and the curriculum which Hutcheson and other professors of moral philosophy and related subjects felt obliged to offer included a great deal more Stoicism and rather more civic humanism, more natural jurisprudence in the tradition of Grotius and Pufendorf as explained by Carmichael, Barbeyrac or Brucker, than MacIntyre allows. The ethics which serious eighteenth-century academic commentators thought it most essential to refute—in Germany and Scotland as well as France—was first that of Hobbes, then Spinoza's and then perhaps Mandeville's. After around 1750, the figure who began to command the greatest attention and praise was Montesquieu, rather like John Stuart Mill in British universities of the late nineteenth century. To the extent that Jansenist doctrines were prevalent in secular studies, it was less because of the continued irradiation of Augustinian theology than because of the still intellectually fashionable standing of Antoine Arnauld's and Pierre Nicole's *Logique, ou l'art de penser* and of the Port-Royal *Grammaire générale*.

Neither is MacIntyre correct to claim that Enlightenment thinkers characteristically believed in the uniformity of human nature and of the moral laws that govern it. Many eighteenth-century moral philosophers, including Helvétius and Kant, did subscribe to such views, but those that did generally agreed with Hume that men might change their situations and circumstances and thereby improve or worsen their conduct. Others, like Turgot or Smith, adopted more manifestly developmental notions of human nature and character, deemed to pass through stages, like the epochs of civilization. Still others endorsed biological models of mankind's perfection or corruption, along lines intimated by the natural historians of humanity, most notably Buffon. Rousseau not only adopted yet another evolutionary perspective, but in fact invented the term *perfectibilité* to encapsulate his understanding of the malleability of human nature, in a potentially benign but in fact humanly blighted providential framework somewhat akin to that of Pelagius. Teleological conceptions of man's moral metamorphosis such as Aristotle had put forward are not absent from eighteenth-century philosophy, even if Aristotle himself was no longer widely acclaimed for such notions. MacIntyre's account of the Enlightenment Project is on this point far too blunt and shallow.

In need of most substantial revision is his disregard of one principle which lies at the heart of that Project, however else it may be conceived—that is, the principle of toleration. Eighteenth-century thinkers, a few of whom became globetrotters themselves, had greater access than ever be-

fore in European history to reports by explorers, merchants and missionaries on primitive and un-Christian societies. They recognized the sophistication and utility of moral traditions different from their own, and sometimes, as with Diderot, called for anti-colonial policies to preserve the integrity of other cultures. If the Christian moral tradition predominant in Europe did not win their universal approbation, that was because, with Voltaire, they deemed so many of its principles hypocritical, bigoted or intolerant, and the practices of its political and priestly powers despotic. For the *philosophes* of the eighteenth century it did not follow from the moral specificity of our disparate cultures that persons from one community were unable to grasp the values of another, still less that their differences must render them enemies. Religious and moral diversity, they believed, did not entail dreadful crusades against infidels. Rather, they thought it possible for the whole of humanity to engage in peaceable assembly, like the traders at the London Stock Exchange, each a faithful follower of his church, but also capable of dealing with other men as if they were of the same religion. In such circumstances, remarked Voltaire in his *Lettres philosophiques*, the Presbyterians trust the Anabaptists, but in Scotland, where they are supreme, they affect a solemn bearing, behave as pedants and preach through their nose.

Having summoned St. Benedict to return in *After Virtue* (p. 245), MacIntyre concludes his *Three Rival Versions* with an appeal for the reconstitution of the Thomistic university as a place of 'constrained disagreement' following the failed experiment of unconstrained agreement in contemporary liberal universities (TRV, pp. 230–33). It is difficult to imagine that, under such constraint Hume would have fared any better than he did in his candidacy for the Edinburgh Chair of Moral Philosophy in 1745 (WJ, pp. 286–87). Whatever Hutcheson's actual reasons for opposing Hume's appointment, there can be little doubt that, both in the interests of the Scottish intellectual tradition as described by MacIntyre and on behalf of a Thomistic principle of constrained disagreement, he ought to have found Hume unfit for that post and to have stood in his way. Hutcheson, after all, had trained as a minister. Indeed, on the 'enforced exclusion' principle which MacIntyre himself expressly commends, the successful candidate (Cleghorn, also trained for the ministry) had been 'rightly preferred to Hume' (TRV, p. 224). But would not natural reason, common sense or justice suggest otherwise? Was the Enlightenment Project's attachment to the translatability of foreign languages and the intelligibility of other cultures not more compelling than MacIntyre's own portrayal of such languages and cultures as 'alien'? (TRV, pp. 171–72). The merest hint of theological correctness, like political correctness, is a potentially most dangerous thing. It may kindle the fires of orthodoxy, and eventually fan the flames of heresy and persecution, even

while observing the pieties of confraternity. A cosmopolitan spirit of tolerance and goodwill would be a welcome antidote to the fractious fundamentalism of many contemporary religious movements and the all-too-persistent ravages of ethnic and civil wars. The moral chaos of the modern world stems not from the failure of the Enlightenment Project but from its neglect and abandonment.

## NOTES

---

### INTRODUCTION

My thanks to Ann Wochiler for her letters and for providing me with copies of several documents from Robert Wokler's papers; to Norman Geras for bibliographical assistance; and to Chris Bertram, Joshua Cherniss, Bryan Garsten, Ryan Hanley, Raj Patel, Jennifer Pitts and Josephine Quinn for their comments on a draft of this introduction.

1. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York, 1985), vol. 2, p. 643.

2. Many of the relevant texts in this debate are now easily available in the second volume of R. Masters and C. Kelly (eds.), *The Collected Writings of Rousseau* (Hanover, N.H., 1992). (The editors offer their own brief, Straussian reply to Wokler's argument on p. 200, n. 3.)

3. 'La Querelle des Bouffons and the Italian Liberation of France: A Study of Revolutionary Foreplay', in C. Duckworth and H. Le Grand (eds.), 'Studies in the Eighteenth Century', vol. 6 (Papers presented at the Sixth David Nichol Smith Memorial Seminar, Melbourne 1983), special issue, *Eighteenth-Century Life* 11, n. s., 1 (February 1987): 94–116.

4. 'Apes and Races in the Scottish Enlightenment: Monboddo and Kames on the Nature of Man', in P. Jones (ed.), *Philosophy and Science in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1988), pp. 145–68.

5. To take perhaps the most extreme instance of this phenomenon, an ambitious series of interlocking arguments about the French Revolution, Saint-Simon, 'ideology', the 'passage from political to social science', the Abbé Sieyès, Jacobinism, Hegel and the origins of the modern nation-state appeared in various combinations and permutations across a number of works, spread over two decades, without ever being set down in any obviously definitive version. 'Saint-Simon and the Passage from Political to Social Science', in A. Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987); 'Hegel's Rousseau: The General Will and Civil Society', in S.-E. Liedman (ed.), 'Deutscher Idealismus', special issue, *Arachne* 8 (1993): 7–45; 'Regressing towards Post-Modernity', in L. Clark and G. Lafrance (eds.), *Rousseau and Criticism / Rousseau et la critique*, Pensée Libre no. 5 (Ottawa, 1995), pp. 263–72; 'The French Revolutionary Roots of Political Modernity in Hegel's Philosophy, or the Enlightenment at Dusk', *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 35 (Spring–Summer 1997): 71–89; 'Contextualizing Hegel's Phenomenology of the French Revolution and the Terror', *Political Theory* 26.1 (February 1998): 33–55; 'The

Enlightenment Project as Betrayed by Modernity', *History of European Ideas* 24.4–5 (1998): 301–13; 'The Enlightenment and the French Revolutionary Birth Pangs of Modernity', in J. Heilbron, L. Magnusson, and B. Wittrock (eds.), *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity: Conceptual Change in Context, 1750–1850*, *Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook* 20, 1996 (Dordrecht, 1998), pp. 35–76; 'The Enlightenment, the Nation-State and the Primal Patricide of Modernity', in both N. Geras and R. Wokler (eds.), *The Enlightenment and Modernity* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, 2000), pp. 161–83, and in *Discussion Paper Series* 46 (Collegium Budapest, Institute for Advanced Study, 1999); 'From the Moral and Political Sciences to the Sciences of Society by Way of the French Revolution', in B. S. Byrd, J. Hruschka and J. C. Joerden (eds.), 'The Origin and Development of the Moral Sciences in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century', special issue, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik / Annual Review of Law and Ethics* 8 (2000): 33–45; 'Ancient Postmodernism in the Philosophy of Rousseau', in both R. Grant and P. Stewart (eds.), *Rousseau and the Ancients / Rousseau et les anciens*, *Pensée Libre* no. 8 (Montreal, 2001), pp. 418–43, and in P. Riley (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Rousseau* (Cambridge, 2001); 'Repatriating Modernity's Alleged Debts to the Enlightenment: French Revolutionary Social Science and the Genesis of the Nation-State', in P. Joyce (ed.), *The Social in Question* (London, 2002), pp. 62–80; 'Political Modernity's Critical Juncture in the Course of the French Revolution', in N. Witoszek and L. Trägårdh (eds.), *Culture and Crisis: The Case of Germany and Sweden* (New York, 2002), pp. 202–18; and 'Ideology and the Origins of Social Science', in M. Goldie and R. Wokler (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 688–709.

6. Isaiah Berlin, *Political Ideas in the Romantic Age*, ed. H. Hardy (Princeton, 2006); Wokler, 'A Guide to Isaiah Berlin's *Political Ideas in the Romantic Age*', *History of Political Thought* 29.2 (Summer 2008): 344–69.

7. 'The Enlightenment, the Nation-State and the Primal Patricide of Modernity', in Geras and Wokler, *The Enlightenment and Modernity*, p. 179.

8. M. Hobson, J. T. A. Leigh and Wokler (eds.), *Rousseau and the Eighteenth Century: Essays in Memory of R. A. Leigh*, (Oxford, 1992); J. Mali and Wokler (eds.), *Isaiah Berlin's Counter-Enlightenment* (Philadelphia, 2003); Wokler (ed.), *Rousseau and Liberty* (Manchester, 1995); C. Fox, R. Porter and Wokler (eds.), *Inventing Human Science: Eighteenth-Century Domains*, (Berkeley, 1995); Geras and Wokler (eds.), *The Enlightenment and Modernity*; Goldie and Wokler (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*. For my own thoughts on this last volume, see Christopher Brooke, 'Light from the Fens?', *New Left Review* 2.44 (March–April 2007): 151–60.

9. Maurice Cranston, *Jean-Jacques: The Early Life and Work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1712–1754* (London, 1983); *The Noble Savage: Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1754–1762* (London, 1991); *The Solitary Self: Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Exile and Adversity* (London, 1997).

10. John Plamenatz, *Man and Society: Political and Social Theories from Machiavelli to Marx*, 3 vols., a new edition, rev. by M. E. Plamenatz and R. Wokler (London, 1992); *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, ed. R. A. Leigh vols. 47–49 (Oxford, 1988–89); *Political Writings*, by Diderot, ed. and trans. J. Hope Mason and R. Wokler (Cambridge, 1992).

11. *Rousseau: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2001), p. viii.

12. 'The Influence of Diderot on the Political Theory of Rousseau', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 132 (1975): 55–111.

#### CHAPTER 1: PERFECTIBLE APES IN DECADENT CULTURES: ROUSSEAU'S ANTHROPOLOGY REVISITED

1. I am much indebted to David Adams, Dennis Austin, Marjorie Gray, George Kerferd, Gill Sainsbury, Hillel Steiner and Ann Wochiler for their guidance and assistance in the preparation of this text.

2. Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Le Totémisme aujourd'hui* (Paris, 1962), p. 145.

3. Lévi-Strauss, 'Jean-Jacques Rousseau, fondateur des sciences de l'homme', in Samuel Baud-Bovy et al. (eds.), *Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Neuchâtel, 1962). More recent and extensive accounts of Rousseau's anthropology can be found in Michèle Duchet, *Anthropologie et histoire au siècle des lumières* (Paris, 1971); Victor Goldschmidt, *Anthropologie et politique: Les principes du système de Rousseau* (Paris, 1974); and Ronald Meek, *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage* (Cambridge, 1976).

4. Robert Ardrey, *The Social Contract* (London, 1970), p. 96.

5. See, for instance, Ardrey, *The Territorial Imperative* (London, 1967), pp. 13–14, 78–79.

6. See especially Ardrey, *African Genesis* (London, 1961), pp. 148, 150, 154–55; *The Territorial Imperative*, pp. 21, 30, 289; and *The Hunting Hypothesis* (London, 1976), p. 190.

7. See Ardrey, *The Social Contract*, p. 96. The enthusiasm Ardrey shows for Rousseau in this work apparently owes much to the influence of Roger Masters (see *ibid.*, p. 99), the distinguished author of *The Political Philosophy of Rousseau* (Princeton, 1968).

8. Though Lévi-Strauss is mentioned in a parenthetical aside in Ardrey's latest book, *The Hunting Hypothesis*, p. 59.

9. See *The Petty Papers*, ed. the Marquis of Landsdowne (London, 1927), vol. 2, p. 27.

10. See Perrault et al., *Suite des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire naturelle des animaux* (Paris, 1676), p. 126.

11. For general introductions to Enlightenment anthropology, both physical and cultural, see especially Carminella Biondi, *Mon frère, tu es mon esclave!* (Pisa, 1973); Duchet, *Anthropologie et histoire au siècle des lumières*; Clarence



Glacken, *Traces on the Rhodian Shore* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967), chs. 11–14; John Greene, *The Death of Adam* (Ames, Iowa, 1959); Georges Gusdorf, *Dieu, la nature, l'homme au siècle des lumières* (Paris, 1972); Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* (New York, 1968), ch. 2; Meek, *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage* [(Cambridge, 1976)]; Franck Tinland, *L'Homme sauvage* (Paris, 1968); and Herbert Wendt, *In Search of Adam* (Boston, 1956), chs. 1–5. A fairly representative sample of the wide range of contemporary views about the relation between nature and culture in anthropological theory may be drawn from the following works: Montague Ashley Montagu (ed.), *Culture: Man's Adaptive Dimension* (Oxford, 1968); Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving* (New Haven, 1962); Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (London, 1975); Serge Moscovici, *La société contre nature* (Paris, 1972); Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox, *The Imperial Animal* (London, 1972); and Leslie White, *The Evolution of Culture* (New York, 1959).

12. For a splendid treatment of these contrasts, see Antonello Gerbi, *The Dispute of the New World* (Pittsburgh, 1973).

13. See the passage from the fifth volume (1755) of Buffon's *Histoire naturelle* (Paris, 1749–1804) reproduced in the *Oeuvres philosophiques de Buffon*, ed. Jean Piveteau (Paris, 1954), p. 359a.

14. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in *Oeuvres complètes* [hereafter OC], ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–[95]), vol. 3, p. 208, n. 10 [DI 204 n. 10].

15. *Ibid.*, p. 134 [DI 134].

16. See *ibid.*, pp. 140–41 and p. 208, n. 10 [DI 139–40 and 204 n. 10].

17. See *ibid.*, p. 139 [DI 138–39].

18. 'Orang-utan' is originally a Malay term meaning 'man of the woods', and it is now applied exclusively to one species of anthropoid ape (*Pongo pygmaeus*) found in Borneo and Sumatra only. In European letters, however, the word was first employed (by Nicolaas Tulp in his *Observationum medicarum* of 1641) in connection with the African chimpanzee, and until about the end of the eighteenth century these two species, and many other great apes, both real and fictitious, as well, were regularly assimilated under the generic name 'orang-utan'. Some of the confusions about the identification of this creature in the Enlightenment are discussed in my 'Tyson and Buffon on the Orang-utan', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 155 (1976): 2301–19. For Rousseau's comments on the orang-utan in his 'Lettre à Philopolis' (Bonnet), see OC, vol. 3, pp. 234–35 [DI 227].

19. Each of these figures is cited in a long passage from the *Histoire générale des voyages* (Paris, 1746–89), vol. 5 (1748), pp. 87–89, that Rousseau quotes almost in full in note 10 of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*.

20. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 209–11, n. 10 [DI 205–08 n. 10].

21. See *ibid.*, p. 211 [DI 208 n. 10].

22. If anything, the black man was for Rousseau more like the natural savage than was the white man (see *ibid.*, p. 137, note [DI 136]). In 'Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Negro', *Journal of Negro History* 21 (1936): 294–303, Mercer Cook makes the interesting point, too seldom remembered, that Thomas Day's poem *The Dying Negro* was dedicated to Rousseau (in the 3rd ed. of 1775). For Buffon's reflections on skin colour and degeneration, see especially his *Histoire naturelle*, vol. 3 (1749), pp. 502–03; the *Oeuvres philosophiques de Buffon*, pp. 354b–55a; and the commentary on this subject of Phillip Sloan, 'The Idea of Racial Degeneracy in Buffon's *Histoire Naturelle*', in Harold Pagliaro (ed.), *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, vol. 3, (Cleveland, 1973), pp. 293–321.

23. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 208, n. 10 [DI 204 n. 10].

24. Rousseau to Hume, 29 March 1766, in R. A. Leigh (ed), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau* (Geneva, Banbury and Oxford, 1965–[1998]), vol. 29, no. 5129, p. 66. The suggestion that apes or monkeys remain silent for good reasons of their own, especially to avoid work and enslavement, appeared at least as early as 1623 in Richard Jobson's *The Golden Trade*.

25. See especially Arnout Vosmaer, 'Description de l'Orang-Outang' (Amsterdam, 1778), pp. 12–13; Buffon, 'Addition à l'article des Orangs-outangs', *Histoire naturelle*, suppl. vol. 7 (1789), pp. 15–16; and Petrus Camper, 'De l'orang-outang, et de quelques autres espèces de singes', in his *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1803), vol. 1, pp. 46–51.

26. *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vol. 12, appendix 286, pp. 301–06 ['Rousseau, hitherto . . . Citizen of Geneva, but from now on, ORANG-UTAN'].

27. Particularly as Sir Oran Haut-ton in Thomas Love Peacock's *Melincourt* of 1817.

28. See Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), p. 244. With regard to the idea of evolution in the Enlightenment, see also Peter Bowler, 'Evolutionism in the Enlightenment', *History of Science* 12 (1974): 159–83; William Bynum, 'The Great Chain of Being after Forty Years: An Appraisal', *History of Science* 13 (1975): 1–28; Bentley Glass et al. (eds.), *Forerunners of Darwin, 1745–1859*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, 1968), chs. 2–9; Emile Guyénot, *Les sciences de la vie aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles: L'idée d'évolution* (Paris, 1941); and Jacques Roger, *Les sciences de la vie dans la pensée française du XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1963).

29. Speculation about the possible lineages of man and the taxonomic classification of hominoid fossils are today in a state of perhaps greater flux than ever before. For one of the more recent surveys of the subject, see *Paleoanthropology: Morphology and Paleocology*, ed. Russell Tuttle (The Hague, 1975).

30. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 211, n. 10 [DI 208 n. 10].

31. In his *Philosophy of Natural History* (Edinburgh, 1790–99), vol. 1, p. 521, Smellie maintained that 'Man, in his lowest condition, is evidently linked, both in

the form of his body and the capacity of his mind, to the large and small orang-outang'. This contention may be contrasted, for instance, with that of Jean-Baptiste Audebert, who, in his *Histoire naturelle des singes et des makis* (Paris, 1799–1800), asserted that the orang-utan was not a type of man, or 'une espèce demi-humaine' ['a half-human species'], but rather an animal which 'dans l'ordre naturel, se place immédiatement après l'homme' ['in the natural order, stands immediately after man'] (pp. 12–13). By the early nineteenth century the gulf between orang-utans and men once again appeared so wide that some commentators found sufficient room between them to introduce the Negro as an intermediate species—a thesis challenged by Friedrich Tiedemann in his 'On the Brain of the Negro, Compared with That of the European and the Orang-Outang', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 2 (1836): 497–527.

32. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 147 and pp. 216–17, n. 12 [DI 145 and 213–16 n. 12]. The orang-utan's general promiscuity, however, was so widely taken for granted in the eighteenth century that some critics, such as Jefferson, for example (in his *Notes on the State of Virginia* of 1785), even assumed that the creature was more sexually attracted to Negro women than to females of its own species.

33. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 160 and p. 199, n. 5 [DI 157 and 193–94 n. 5].

34. Cf. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 159–60 [DI 156–57] and Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago* (London, 1869), vol. 1, p. 91.

35. Cf. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 140 [DI 139]; John MacKinnon, 'The Behaviour and Ecology of Wild Orang-utans', *Animal Behaviour* 22 (1974): 51, 65–67; MacKinnon, *In Search of the Red Ape* (London, 1974), p. 64; and Peter Rodman, 'Population Composition and Adaptive Organisation among Orang-utans of the Kutai Reserve', in Richard Michael and John Crook (eds.), *Comparative Ecology and Behaviour of Primates* (London, 1973), pp. 187, 195–97, 206. MacKinnon's general conclusion (*In Search of the Red Ape*, p. 64) is that the orang-utan appears to be 'a solitary nomad'. According to Rodman (p. 197), 'The dispersion of orang-utan populations and the simplicity of social relations within them are both striking and disappointing when compared with the complexity of social structures found among other primates'.

36. See *The Territorial Imperative*, pp. 3, 116, 223, 252–53 and Ardrey, *The Social Contract*, pp. 40, 67, 88.

37. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 135 [DI 134–35]. There are useful accounts of primitive man's forms of nourishment, according to the anthropological theory of Rousseau, in Masters, *The Political Philosophy of Rousseau*, pp. 122–25, and Goldschmidt, *Anthropologie et politique*, pp. 245–56.

38. *The Hunting Hypothesis*, p. 104.

39. See Ardrey, *The Social Contract*, p. 275 and *The Hunting Hypothesis*, p. 33. Cf. *African Genesis*, pp. 149–50. Ardrey's reflections on chimpanzees in captivity seem to me particularly odd in the light of his cautionary remarks else-

where (see *The Territorial Imperative*, p. 215) against our making inferences about natural behaviour from the conduct of animals in zoos. In fact, however, there has been evidence, most of it in the past ten years or so, that wild chimpanzees hunt and kill other mammals, including baboons and red colobus monkeys. The fullest treatments of this subject can be found in Jane van Lawick-Goodall, 'The Behaviour of Free-living Chimpanzees in the Gombe Stream Reserve', *Animal Behaviour Monographs* 1 (1968): 161–311 and Geza Teleki, *The Predatory Behavior of Wild Chimpanzees* (Lewisburg, Pa., 1973). In *The Hunting Hypothesis* (see pp. 35–36) Ardrey comments upon some of this evidence, which he admits came as a surprise to him, and he also stresses the importance of a brief report on chimpanzee cannibalism, regarded by its author, though (J. D. Bygott, in *Nature* 18 [August 1972]), as either 'aberrant behavior' or an unusual 'adaptive response to social or ecological pressures'. The evidence of chimpanzee predation is, I think, quite inconclusive as well. First, the sightings are still relatively scanty and are mainly from the Gombe Stream Reserve where it may well be, as Teleki suggests, that the recent liquidation of most large terrestrial carnivores has left an unoccupied niche only latterly filled by chimpanzees. Second, both van Lawick-Goodall and Teleki maintain that the hunting activities of chimps provide no more than infrequent supplements to basically vegetarian diets, so that, as Ardrey himself acknowledges, their kills seem to be unrelated to any need for food. Third, they are predators of a highly extraordinary kind, since they more commonly tolerate and intermingle with their prey, young baboons and chimpanzees even often grooming one another. At any rate there is, to my knowledge, no evidence as yet of predation among the other great apes, including the orang-utan—except, of course, in zoos.

40. See, for instance, the remarks of Ashley Montagu in his introduction to the facsimile reprint of *Orang-Outang* (London, 1966), p. 12.

41. See the following passage from Voltaire's *Dictionnaire philosophique*, article 'Luxe', in his *Oeuvres complètes* (Kehl, 1784–89), vol. 41, p. 506, n. 3: 'Tout ennemi du luxe doit croire avec *Rousseau* que l'état de bonheur & de vertu pour l'homme est celui, non de sauvage, mais d'orang-outang' ['Every enemy of luxury should believe with *Rousseau* that the state of happiness and virtue for man is not the state of the savage, but that of the orang-utan']. This statement does not figure in any of the editions of the *Dictionnaire philosophique* published in Voltaire's lifetime, nor in his *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* frequently incorporated in expanded versions of the *Dictionnaire*. It ought strictly to have been printed in his *Mélanges*, but several publishers of his works have included it in the format first presented in the Kehl edition. Jerom Vercruysse, the distinguished Voltaire scholar, has even suggested to me that the passage may not have been drafted by Voltaire himself, though in the absence of any manuscript evidence my guess is that it is one of his own compositions. See also Voltaire's letter to Rousseau of 30 August 1755 (*Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vol. 3, no. 317, pp. 156–62) on his receipt of the copy of the *Discours sur l'inégalité* which Rousseau had sent him.

42. Thus Aristotle, for instance, remarked in his *Politics* (book 1, ch. 2) that human language was distinct from the mere animal emission of sounds, because instead of signifying pleasures and pains it served to declare what was just and unjust. And Hobbes in his *Leviathan* (ch. 14) observed that 'To make Covenants with bruit Beasts, is impossible'.

43. Diderot, *Suite du rêve de d'Alembert*, in his *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Jules Assézat and Maurice Tourneux (Paris, 1875–77), vol. 2, p. 190 ['Speak, and I will baptize you']. Jacques Scherer has employed this quotation in the very title of his general study of Diderot's manner of thought and style of literary expression, *Le Cardinal et l'orang-outang: Essai sur les inversions et les distances dans la pensée de Diderot* (Paris, 1972). About the passage itself, he writes (p. 39), 'Eclairante et fulgurante parole, qui désigne un seuil, une accession à l'humanité, une solennisation de l'émergence de l'humain par le langage' ['Illuminating and striking speech, which designates a threshold, an attainment of humanity, a solemnization of the emergence of the human through language']. The *Rêve de d'Alembert*, first published after Diderot's death, dates from 1769.

44. See especially David Premack, *Intelligence in Ape and Man* (Hillsdale, N.J., 1976), pp. 14–15. Excellent critical accounts of some of the recent experiments in teaching languages to chimpanzees are provided by Roger Brown in 'The First Sentences of Child and Chimpanzee', in Brown, *Psycholinguistics: Selected Papers* (New York, 1970), pp. 208–31, as well as in the same author's *A First Language* (London, 1973), pp. 32–51. Despite their differences, both Brown and Premack, I believe, stand quite apart from Ardrey (see *The Hunting Hypothesis*, pp. 33–34) and Eugene Linden (see his *Apes, Men and Language* [New York, 1975], pp. 70–76, 187–88, 215–16), who make much bolder claims about the linguistic capacities of apes and the relation between animal and human systems of communication in general.

45. Herder, *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache* (1772), in his *Sämmtliche Werke* (Berlin, 1877–1913), vol. 5, pp. 44–45 ['Apes always ape but they have never imitated'].

46. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 210, n. 10 [DI 207 n. 10].

47. See *ibid.*, pp. 146–47 [DI 144–46].

48. Cf. Condillac, *Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines* (1746), parts 1.ii.4, §§ 35 and 38, 2.i.1, § 6, and 2.i.9, §§ 82–83, in the *Oeuvres philosophiques de Condillac*, ed. Georges Le Roy (Paris, 1947–51), vol. 1, pp. 19, 61, 83; and Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, OC, vol. 3, pp. 146–51 [DI 144–49]. I have considered the relation between Rousseau's linguistic philosophy and that of Condillac at length in my *Rousseau's 'Discours sur l'inégalité' and Its Sources, Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* (forthcoming, 1978). [This project was not completed, but the issues are discussed in the third chapter of Robert Wokler, *Rousseau on Society, Politics, Music and Language* (New York, 1987).] On this subject see also Jacques Derrida, 'La linguistique de Rousseau', *Revue*

*internationale de philosophie* 82 (1967): 448–52, and Jean Starobinski, ‘Rousseau et l’origine des langues’, in Starobinski, *Rousseau: La transparence et l’obstacle*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1971), pp. 360–64.

49. See Rousseau’s *Discours sur l’inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 125, 132 [DI 126–27, 132], and his draft version of the *Contrat social* dating from about 1756 (*Manuscrit de Genève* I.2), in OC, vol. 3, p. 284 [GM 155]. According to the philosophers of natural law—particularly Grotius and Pufendorf—whom Rousseau challenged in his political writings, individuals in the state of nature must generally have been marked by a *desiderium* or an *appetitus societatis*.

50. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l’inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 162, 168–69 [DI 159, 164–66], and the *Essai sur l’origine des langues* (probably dating largely from around 1760), ed. Charles Porset, 2nd ed. (Bordeaux, 1970), ch. 9, p. 113 [OC, vol. 5, p. 402; EOL 274].

51. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l’inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 169–70 [DI 166–67].

52. See *ibid.*, p. 164 [DI 161]; the ‘Dernière réponse’ (1752) to Charles Borde’s first *Discours sur les avantages des sciences et des arts* (1751), in OC, vol. 3, p. 80 [LR 70–71]; and the preface to *Narcisse* (1753), in OC, vol. 2, pp. 969–70, note [PN 101–02, note].

53. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l’inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 167 [DI 163–64].

54. See *ibid.*, p. 171 [DI 167].

55. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, chs. 10 and 11, pp. 129, 131, 135 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 407, 408, 409; EOL 279, 280, 281]. An illuminating treatment of these passages is provided by Derrida in his *De la grammatologie* (Paris, 1967), pp. 318–22. This work also contains an important chapter on Lévi-Strauss’s anthropological linguistics in relation to the ideas of Rousseau on that subject.

56. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, chap. 19, pp. 189–91 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 425–26; EOL 296–9].

57. See *ibid.*, ch. 20, pp. 197–201 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 428–29; EOL 298–99].

58. *Ibid.*, chs. 10 and 20, pp. 131 and 197–99 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 407–08 and 428–29; EOL 279–80, 298–99]. I have discussed these themes more fully in my ‘Rameau, Rousseau, and the *Essai sur l’origine des langues*’, *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 117 (1974): 220–38, and in ‘Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution’, in Robert Brissenden and J. Christopher Eade (eds.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 4 (Canberra, [1979, pp. 251–83]).

59. See, for instance, Diderot’s *Suite de l’apologie de l’abbé de Prades* (1752), in his *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 1, p. 467. For Rousseau’s use of the expression *Peuples policés*, see his *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* (1751), in OC, vol. 3, p. 7 [DSA 7].

60. Rousseau, *Confessions* (drafted mainly in the mid to late 1760s), in OC, vol. 1, p. 404 [C 377: ‘no people would ever be other than the nature of their government made them’]. Cf. his preface to *Narcisse*, in OC, vol. 2, p. 969 [PN 101], and his *Discours sur l’économie politique* (1755), in OC, vol. 3, p. 251 [PE 12].

61. Rousseau, *Contrat social* (1762) III.9, in OC, vol. 3, p. 420, note [SC 105: 'Such was their ignorance that they called humanity what was a beginning of servitude']. The quotation is from Tacitus, *Agricola*, 21.

62. Edward Wilson, *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), pp. 168, 560.

63. See, for example, Rousseau, *Contrat social* II.12, in OC, vol. 3, p. 394 [SC 81: 'the force of habit'].

64. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 212–13, n. 10 [DI 209–11, n. 10: ['the ruck of Philophastrers' at p. 210]. See also the section of the fifth book of *Emile* (1762) which Rousseau entitled 'Des Voyages' (OC, vol. 4, p. 826). For accounts of his intellectual debt to the travel literature on exotic nations available in the eighteenth century, see especially Gilbert Chinard, *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1913), pp. 341–65, and Georges Pire, 'Rousseau et les relations de voyages', *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 56 (1956): 355–78. The best general study of the significance which was attached in the Enlightenment to such expeditions is provided by Duchet in her *Anthropologie et histoire au siècle des lumières*, pp. 25–226.

65. See, for instance, Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving*, pp. 18–22; Marshall Sahlins and Elman Service (eds.), *Evolution and Culture* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1960), chs. 4 and 5; and Tiger and Fox, *The Imperial Animal*, pp. 37–38.

66. This proposition has been advanced by Konrad Lorenz, among others, in his *On Aggression* (London, 1967), p. 224.

67. See Roger Masters, 'Genes, Language, and Evolution', *Semiotica* 2 (1970): 304–13.

68. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 171 [DI 167].

69. Masters, 'Genes, Language, and Evolution', p. 309.

70. In *Rousseau: La transparence et l'obstacle* (see especially pp. 22–33, 84–87, 194, 315–16), Starobinski provides an eloquent interpretation of almost the whole of Rousseau's thought in the light of his explicit and implied views on the nature of transparency and obfuscation in human affairs.

71. Rousseau, *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 7 [DSA 6: 'the Sciences, Letters, Arts . . . spread garlands of flowers over the iron chains with which they are laden']. A perceptive treatment of this passage in the context of Rousseau's general contempt for the *amour-propre* of intellectuals is supplied by Judith Shklar in her *Men and Citizens: A Study of Rousseau's Social Theory* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 109–12.

72. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 138 [DI 138: 'the state of reflection is a state against Nature . . . the man who meditates is a depraved animal']. These lines contrast sharply with the following statement made by Diderot in his article 'Droit naturel' for the fifth volume (1755) of the *Encyclopédie* (*Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 14, p. 301): 'Celui qui ne veut pas raisonner, renonçant à la qualité d'homme, doit être traité comme un être dénaturé' ['Whoever



declines to seek that truth forfeits his status as a man and should be treated by the rest of his kind as a wild beast', as trans. in R. Wokler and J. Hope Mason (eds.), *Political Writings*, by Diderot (Cambridge, p. 19)].

73. Geertz, 'The Cerebral Savage: On the Work of Lévi-Strauss', in *The Interpretation of Cultures*, p. 355.

74. Lévi-Strauss, *La Pensée sauvage* (Paris, 1962), pp. 326–27 ['particular humanities into a general one']. The quotation is from Rousseau's *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, chap. 8, p. 89 [OC, vol. 5, p. 394; EOL 266–67: 'in order to study man one has to learn to cast one's glance afar'].

75. *Confessions*, p. 3 ['exactly according to nature and in all its truth'].

76. *Manuscrit de Genève* I.2, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 286, 287, 288 [GM 157, 158, 159: 'But where is the man who can thus separate himself from himself? We conceive of the general society in terms of our particular societies . . . although there is no natural and general society among men'].

77. *La Pensée sauvage*, pp. 326, 327 ['the idea of a general humanity, to which ethnographic reeducation leads']. In an article entitled 'The Social Anthropology of Rousseau's *Emile*', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 132 (1974): 137–81, Godelieve Mercken-Spaas labours under what I take to be a misapprehension that Rousseau offered an account of the universal attributes of man which is similar, even 'identical', to that of Lévi-Strauss. The passages from *Emile* which she cites refer to generic (and sentimental) constants of human nature that Rousseau supposed were always masked and distorted by culture, whereas Lévi-Strauss regards cultural systems as symbolic manifestations of our uniform mental categories.

78. [Marshall] Sahlins, *The Use and Abuse of Biology* (London, 1977), p. 15.

79. Ardrey, *The Social Contract*, p. 101.

80. Rousseau, *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 20 [DSA 18: 'herds of cattle'], and *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 183, 182, 154 [DI 178, 177, 152: 'Beasts that are slaves of instinct'; 'Animals born free and abhorring captivity'; 'the mournful lowing of Cattle entering a Slaughter-House'].

81. Rousseau referred explicitly to documented evidence of human encounters with vampires in his *Lettre à Christophe de Beaumont* (1763), vol. 4, p. 987, and in the first draft of *Emile*, that is, the *Manuscrit Favre*, probably dating from 1758–59 (see *La 'Profession de foi du Vicaire savoyard' de Rousseau*, ed. Pierre-Maurice Masson [Fribourg and Paris, 1914], pp. 331, n. 3, and 332). In the *Manuscrit Favre*, in OC, vol. 4, p. 231, he also commented upon 'les monstres de l'imagination' ['the monsters of the imagination'] conceived by tormented and degraded men who lead 'une vie molle et sédentaire' ['a soft and sedentary life']. For his accounts of the demonic nature of religion in general, and of priests that savour the deaths of the individuals they tend in particular, see especially his letter to Voltaire of 18 August 1756, *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vol. 4, no. 424, p. 40; the *Manuscrit Favre*, in OC, vol. 4, pp. 227–28; and *La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761), in OC, vol. 2, part 6, letter 11, pp. 717–18. I am most



grateful to Christopher Frayling, a leading authority on eighteenth-century vampirism, for his permission to incorporate here a few sentences from our unpublished paper on orang-utans and vampires in Rousseau's anthropology, presented at the XVth International Congress of the History of Science, Edinburgh, August 1977 [later published as 'From the Orang-utan to the Vampire: Towards an Anthropology of Rousseau' in R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Rousseau after Two Hundred Years* (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 109–29].

82. Lévi-Strauss, *Le Totémisme aujourd'hui*, p. 145 ['i.e. to use the diversity of species as conceptual support for social differentiation', as trans. in Lévi-Strauss, *Totemism*, trans. Rodney Needham (Boston, 1962), p. 101]. See also his 'Jean-Jacques Rousseau, fondateur des sciences de l'homme', pp. 243–44.

83. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 154 [DI 152].

84. See *ibid.*, pp. 136–37, 141, and p. 219, n. 15 [DI 135–37, 140 and 217–18 n. 15].

85. See *ibid.*, p. 142 [DI 141].

86. See *ibid.* pp. 131, 141, 157–58 [DI 131, 140, 154–56].

87. See Ardrey, *African Genesis*, p. 256.

88. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 134, 137 and pp. 196–98, n. 3 [DI 134, 137 and 190–92, n. 3]. In his treatment of these passages Goldschmidt (see *Anthropologie et politique*, pp. 240–45) contends—mistakenly, I believe—that Rousseau's account of bipedal man precluded the possibility of human evolution in his philosophy.

89. Over the past several years allometry has become a very fashionable subject of speculation in genetic theory. One of the best introductions to the idea is provided by Bernhard Rensch in his *Evolution above the Species Level* (London, 1959), pp. 133–69.

90. See, for instance, Ralph Holloway Jr., 'Cranial Capacity and the Evolution of the Human Brain', in Montagu, *Culture: Man's Adaptive Dimension*, pp. 178, 183.

91. Foster to Samuel Thomas von Sömmerring, 19 May 1785, quoted in Hugh Nisbet, *Herder and the Philosophy and History of Science* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 250 ['But isn't it true that all birds hold their heads upright; in particular the most stupid ones?'].

92. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 142 [DI 141: '[T]his distinctive and almost unlimited faculty, is the source of all of man's miseries . . . it is the faculty which, by dint of time, draws him out of that original condition in which he would spend tranquil and innocent days . . . it is the faculty which, over the centuries, causing his enlightenment and his errors, his vices and his virtues to bloom, eventually makes him his own and Nature's tyrant.']. See also Rousseau's letter to Voltaire of 18 August 1756, *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vol. 4, [no. 424,] p. 39, and note *b*, *ibid.*, p. 65.

93. The term was not only 'brought into vogue' by Rousseau, as John Passmore reports in *The Perfectibility of Man* (London, 1970), p. 179, for, aside from

a hint that it may have been employed in conversation by Turgot from around 1750, there is no recorded instance of its use at all, in any European language, prior to that of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*. As Starobinski has established (see vol. 3, pp. 1317–18), its appearance in the issue of Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire* of 15 February 1755 implies little more than that Grimm was likely to have had an advance viewing of the manuscript of the *Discours*, already in the hands of its publisher the previous autumn. Starobinski notes, moreover, that the term was not incorporated in the fourth (1762) edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, though it appears in the fifth edition (of 1798–99), and he traces its first mention in a work of reference to the *Dictionnaire de Trévoux* of 1771.

94. Starobinski, *Rousseau: La transparence et l'obstacle*, p. 24 ['the form of an accelerated *fall* into corruption . . . Rousseau takes the religious myth and sets it in historical time'].

95. See, for instance, Rousseau, *Contrat social* II.8, in OC, vol. 3, p. 385 [SC 72–73].

96. Frances Power Cobbe, *The Life of Frances Power Cobbe by Herself*, 3rd ed. (London, 1894), vol. 2, p. 244, quoted in Brian Harrison, 'Animals and the State in Nineteenth-Century England', *English Historical Review* 88 (1973): 804.

## CHAPTER 2: RITES OF PASSAGE AND THE GRAND TOUR: DISCOVERING, IMAGINING AND INVENTING EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION IN THE AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT

1. Commentaries on the themes just intimated in this paragraph can be found in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Idea of Europe: From Antiquity to the European Union* (Cambridge, 2002); Denys Hay, *Europe, the Emergence of an Idea*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh, 1968); Federico Chabod, *Storia dell'idea d'Europa* (Rome, 1959); Gerard Delanty, *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality* (London, 1995); Peter Gowan and Perry Anderson (eds.), *The Question of Europe* (London, 1997); Alan Milward et al., *The European Rescue of the Nation-State* (London, 1992).

2. See Jean Starobinski, 'Le mot civilisation', originally published in *Le Temps de la réflexion* in 1983, reprinted in his collection of essays, *Le remède dans le mal* (Paris, 1989).

3. James Howell, *Instructions for Forreine Travell* (London, 1642), sect. 1, p. 8.

4. Edward Gibbon, *Memoirs of My Life* (1796), ed. G. A. Bonnard (London, 1966), p. 135. For just that reason Howell had encouraged travellers to seek only the company of natives of the countries they visited, since 'the greatest bane of English Gentlemen abroad', he remarked (*Instructions*, sect. 3, p. 32), 'is too much frequency and communication with their own Countrey-men'.

5. Among the best treatments of the history and itineraries of the Grand Tour known to me are Charles Batten, *Pleasurable Instruction: Form and Instruction in Eighteenth-Century Travel Literature* (Berkeley, 1978); Jeremy Black, *The British*

and the Grand Tour (London, 1985); Michèle Cohen, 'The Grand Tour: Constructing the English Gentleman in Eighteenth-Century France', *History of Education* 21 (1992): 241–57; Brian Dolan, *Exploring European Frontiers: British Travellers in the Age of Enlightenment* (London, 2000), and *Ladies of the Grand Tour* (London, 2001); Ray William Frantz, *The English Traveller and the Movement of Ideas* (New York, 1968). On the history of travel and tourism in general, see especially Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing* (Cambridge, 2002), and Daniel Roche, *Humeurs vagabondes, De la circulation des hommes et de l'utilité des voyages* (Paris, 2003). My greatest debt is to Christopher Hibbert, *The Grand Tour* (London, 1969).

6. See Denis Diderot, *Mémoires pour Catherine II*, ed. Paul Vernière (Paris, 1966), p. 118.

7. Among the most classic treatments of this subject remain Gilbert Chinard, *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1913), and Geoffrey Atkinson, *The Extraordinary Voyage in French Literature* (New York, 1969).

8. In contrasting the objectives of grand tourists from those of earlier voyagers and travellers, I of course do not mean to obscure the distinctions made by other commentators—for instance James Buzard, 'The Grand Tour and after (1660–1840)', in Hulme and Youngs (eds.), *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*, pp. 37–52—between tourism in the Age of Enlightenment and more widespread forms of tourism that developed later, still less mass tourism such as came to be possible, and prevalent, in the twentieth century. But to my mind the ideological roots of modern tourism, however much more popular, democratic and vulgar it may appear, ought properly to be traced to the Grand Tour. Karl Baedeker's much appreciated nineteenth-century guidebooks for travellers were direct descendants of the classic treatment of the subject in the Age of the Enlightenment, Thomas Nugent's *The Grand Tour*, first published in 1749.

9. James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill and L. F. Powell, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1934–50), 3.10 and 5.121.

10. See Tobias Smollett, *Travels through France and Italy* (London, 1760).

11. See E. S. de Beer (ed.), *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1955), c. 17 November 1643, 2.85–90.

12. See W. S. Lewis (ed.), *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, 48 vols. (New Haven, 1937–83), 13.167–68, letter to Richard West, c. 15 May 1739; Arthur Young, *Travels during the Years 1787, 1788, & 1789*, 2nd ed. (London, 1794), 1.10.

13. Lewis (ed.), *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, 14.143, letter to Gray, 19 November 1765.

14. See Howell, *Instructions*, sect. 11, p. 139. Gibbon, by contrast, found himself at a disadvantage throughout his tour of Italy on account of his having scant mastery of Italian despite his perfect command of French.

15. See Président de Brosses, *Lettres familières d'Italie* (1740; Brussels, 1995), pref  
H. Lynch

Piozzi, *Observations and Reflections made in the Course of a Journey through France, Italy, and Germany* (1789), ed. H. Barrows (Ann Arbor, 1967), 1 November 1784, pp. 30–32; and James Edward Smith, *A Sketch of a Tour on the Continent, in the Years 1786 and 1787*, 3 vols. (London, 1793), 3.124.

16. See Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651), ch. 21, para. 8.

17. See J. W. von Goethe, *Italienische Reise*, ed. Herbert von Einem and Erich Trunz (Hamburg, 1957), remarks of 3 March, 13 March and 19 March 1787, pp. 189–90, 204–06 and 213–14.

18. de Brosset, *Lettres familières d'Italie*, de Brosset to M. de Neuilly, undated, pp. 167–68.

19. See Gibbon, *Memoirs of My Life*, p. 134.

20. See Lionel Cust and Sidney Colvin, *History of the Society of Dilettanti* (London, 1898).

21. On the subject of seventeenth-, eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century travel to Greece by scholars as distinct from tourists—that is, by professionals rather than amateurs—see especially David Constantine, *Early Greek Travellers and the Hellenic Ideal* (Cambridge, 1984), and Dolan, *Exploring European Frontiers*, ch. 4: ‘Greece and the Levant—the Archaeological Appropriation of the Historical Frontier’, pp. 113–49.

22. See Richard Chandler, *Travels in Asia Minor, and Greece: or, an Account of a Tour made at the Expense of the Society of Dilettanti*, 2 vols. (London, 1817).

23. See Edward Daniel Clarke, *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa*, 6 vols. (London, 1810–23).

24. See Howell, *Instructions*, sect. 7, pp. 86–101.

25. See Immanuel Kant, *Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht* (1798), ed. K. Vörländer, J. Kopper and R. Malter (Hamburg, 1980), Bk. I, § 29, p. 69n.

26. For another point of view with regard to these developments, informed by an outsider’s grasp of European history at least as deep and rich as that of anyone I know or have read whose outlook is embraced by it alone, see J.G.A. Pocock, ‘Deconstructing Europe’, in Gowan and Anderson (eds.), *The Question of Europe*, pp. 297–317. For their forbearance and advice on particular themes I am grateful to Diogo Curto and Anthony Molho. For providing images of each of the plates illustrated here I am much indebted to Helen Chillman, Librarian of the Visual Resources Collection of Yale University’s Art and Architecture Library, and I am also grateful to the Lord Chamberlain for his permission to reproduce Zoffany’s *Tribuna of the Uffizi*.

### CHAPTER 3: ROUSSEAU ON RAMEAU AND REVOLUTION

1. Pamphlets about Rousseau’s connection with the Revolution, and with the debates regarding the convocation of the Estates General that preceded it, actually beg k devoted

to the subject was Mercier's *De J. J. Rousseau, considéré comme l'un des premiers auteurs de la Révolution* (1791).

2. The *Lettre* appeared on or around 22 November 1753 (see R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, (Geneva, Banbury and Oxford, 1965–[98]), vol. 2, p. 233 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 289–330; LFM]).

3. Rousseau, *Confessions*, in *Oeuvres complètes* [hereafter OC], ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–[95]), vol. 1, p. 384 [C 358: 'It was the time of the great quarrel between the courts and the clergy. The courts had just been dissolved; the excitement was at its height; there was every danger of an approaching revolt. My pamphlet appeared, and immediately all other quarrels were forgotten; no one could think of anything except the threat to French music. The only revolt now was against me, and such was the outburst that the nation has never quite recovered from it. . . . Whoever reads that this pamphlet probably prevented a revolution in France will think that he is dreaming. Yet it is an actual fact']. The events to which Rousseau refers in this passage are not really those which directly followed the exile and dispersion of the magistrates of the Paris Parlement, for that prolonged state of affairs, dating from 9 May 1753 to 1 September 1754, caused no particular crisis around 22 November 1753. In fact the survival in Paris of the *Grand'Chambre* or Central Court of the Parlement after May 1753 provided the King with the pretence that the Parlement had suffered no dissolution at all, and it was only on 8 November 1753, when the Crown issued *lettres de cachet* to the councillors of the *Grand'Chambre* itself that the 'fermentation' of which Rousseau speaks began in earnest. For several months after the exile of the Parlement the King had encountered increasing resistance to his will on the part of the *Grand'Chambre* (and also several lower courts then still in session), but his dissolution of this assembly was immediately understood as an attempt to suppress the Parlement itself and was thus regarded as a critical escalation of the dispute. On 11 November a new court of justice, the *Chambre royale*, was established to replace the Parlement, but the Châtelet—that is, the tribunal of the *prévôt de Paris*—promptly refused to recognize its authority, and the King replied by suspending this body as well. Other tribunals (for instance the *Cour des aides*) quickly followed suit in resisting the *Chambre royale*, so that by the time the *Lettre sur la musique françoise* appeared the capital of France was in very serious political disarray. For an account of these developments see especially Edmond-Jean-François Barbier's *Chronique de la régence et du règne de Louis XV*, ed. A. de la Villegille, 8 vols. (Paris, 1857), vol. 5, pp. 431–55; the *Journal et mémoires du marquis d'Argenson*, ed. J. B. Rathery, 9 vols. (Paris, 1859–67), vol. 8, pp. 155–92; and Ernest Glasson's *Le parlement de Paris*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1901), vol. 2, pp. 195–205.

4. D'Alembert, for instance, produced his *De la liberté de la musique* in 1760; John Gregory came to Rousseau's defence in his *Comparative View of the State and Faculties of Man with Those of the Animal World* in 1765; and in 1780 there appeared both Jean-Benjamin de La Borde's censorious account of the *Lettre* in

his *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne* as well as an even more vituperative collection of replies to La Borde on Rousseau's behalf by Mme. de la Tour de Franqueville (see the *Collection complète des Oeuvres de Rousseau*, ed. Paul Moulthou and Pierre-Alexandre Du Peyrou, 17 vols. [Geneva, 1782 (1780)–89], vol. 15, pp. 487–543 and pp. 560–609). In 1753 and 1754 alone at least thirty-two replies to Rousseau's text were published (see Louise Richebourg [Reichenburg], *Contribution à l'histoire de la 'Querelle des Bouffons'* (Paris and Philadelphia, 1937), pp. 38–84). See also Théophile Dufour, *Recherches bibliographiques sur les oeuvres imprimées de Rousseau*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1925), vol. 1, pp. 36–42; Servando Sacaluga, 'Diderot, Rousseau, et la querelle musicale de 1752', *Diderot Studies* 10 (1968): 133–73; and the list from the second (Paris, 1757) edition of the *Histoire du Théâtre de l'Académie royale de musique en France* by Louis Travenol and Jacques Bernard Durey de Noinville, reprinted in *La Querelle des Bouffons*, ed. Denise Launay, 3 vols. (Geneva, 1973), vol. 3, pp. 2285–93 (henceforth cited as *La Querelle*).

5. See Cazotte's *Observations sur la Lettre de Rousseau* (probably published in December 1753), in *La Querelle*, vol. 2, pp. 844–45.

6. See *La Querelle*, vol. 3, pp. 2025–174.

7. See Mercier, *Tableau de Paris*, 12 vols. (Amsterdam, 1783–88), vol. 7, p. 269.

8. See Rousseau, *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 384–85 [C 358–59], and the *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vol. 2, pp. 234, 237, 324, 325, 330.

9. See his *Journal et mémoires*, vol. 8, p. 179.

10. See Palissot's letter to Jacob Vernes of 28 December 1753, in the *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vol. 2, p. 234.

11. See his *Journal et mémoires*, vol. 8, p. 184.

12. See Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique*, ed. Maurice Tourneux, 16 vols. (Paris, 1877–82), vol. 1 [2], pp. 258–59.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 313–14 ['It is difficult to predict how this quarrel will conclude and the public is much more intrigued by it than by the Chambre royale and its goings-on. . . . One must wait for minds to calm down, and for us to recover from the fervour and the passion that M. Rousseau has excited with his Letter'].

14. Lady Sydney Morgan [Sydney Owenson], *France*, 2 tomes in 1 vol. (London, 1817), tome 2, vii, pp. 127–28 [p. 211 of volume]. Cf. Rousseau, *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 384 [C 358].

15. A splendid—albeit brief—account of the parallels between the historical interpretations of Rousseau's influence upon the musical revolution of 1752–54, on the one hand, and the political revolution of 1789, on the other, is supplied by Charles B. Paul in his 'Music and Ideology: Rameau, Rousseau, and 1789', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32 (1971): 395–410.

16. See, for instance, Robert A. Nisbet, 'Rousseau and Totalitarianism', *Journal of Politics* 5 (1943): 93–114.

17. Jean Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *Les Jugements allemands sur la musique française au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1940), p. 202.

18. See Noël Boyer, *La Guerre des bouffons et la musique française* (Paris, 1945), pp. 11, 164, 166.

19. See Rousseau, *Lettre*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, p. 707 [OC, vol. 5, p. 305; LFM 155].

20. Ibid., p. 708 [OC, vol. 5, p. 305; LFM 155: 'in a word, the whole ensemble must convey only one melody to the ear and only one idea to the mind. This unity of melody seems to me an indispensable rule and no less important in Music than the unity of action in a Tragedy, for it is founded on the same principle and directed toward the same object']. See also, pp. 712, 719 and 729–30 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 307, 310, 313–14; LFM 156, 158, 161–62].

21. Ibid., p. 676 [OC, vol. 5, p. 292; LFM 144: 'it is from melody alone that the particular character of a National Music must be derived; all the more so as, its character being produced principally by the language, song strictly speaking should be affected by its greatest influence']. See also, p. 681 [OC, vol. 5, p. 294; LFM 145–46].

22. See *ibid.*, pp. 676–77 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 292–93; LFM 144–45].

23. Ibid., pp. 678–80 [OC, vol. 5, p. 293; LFM 145: 'The impossibility of inventing pleasant songs would oblige Composers to turn all their attention to the side of harmony, and, lacking real beauties, they would introduce conventional beauties, which would have almost no merit but the difficulty overcome. Instead of a good Music, they would devise a learned Music; to substitute for song they would multiply accompaniments. . . . In order to take away insipidness, they would augment the confusion; they would believe they were making Music, and they would be making only noise. . . . Wherever they saw notes they would find song, seeing that in effect their song would be only notes. *Voces, praetereaëque nihil*'].

24. It was one of Rousseau's central postulates in this work (see *ibid.*, pp. 743–49 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 319–21; LFM 166–68]) that French composers of opera since Lully had come to develop a theatrical technique of declamatory recitative and a drawling and monotonous form of aria, both of which were inappropriate to any kind of musical performance.

25. Ibid., p. 764 [OC, vol. 5, p. 328; LFM 174: 'the French do not at all have a Music and cannot have any; or that if ever they have any, it will be so much the worse for them'].

26. See *ibid.*, p. 689 [OC, vol. 5, p. 297; LFM 148]. In the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* (see the passage from the seventh chapter cited below), however, Rousseau later drew a somewhat different dichotomy between the musical attributes of the two languages, there asserting that Italian was just like French and all other modern European languages in the sense that it lacked determinate musical accents which would give its words an exact and constant tone and character when sung. And while Italian speech might *lend* itself to music more readily than other tongues, it was not in fact, he maintained, a musical language. Even in



the *Lettre*, moreover, Rousseau acknowledged that Italian composers still sometimes employed the gothic harmonies which had been the most characteristic style of the baroque idiom in both France and Italy before the period beginning around the turn of the eighteenth century when Corelli, Bononcini, Vinci and Pergolesi (see *La Querelle*, vol. 1, p. 717, note [OC, vol. 5, p. 308, n. 2; LFM 157, n. 2]) had introduced compositions of a truly musical kind. These cumbersome harmonies, according to Rousseau, remained prevalent in French music, and (ibid., p. 718 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 309]) ‘depuis même que les Italiens ont rendu l’harmonie plus pure, plus simple, & donné tous leurs soins à la perfection de la mélodie, je ne nie pas qu’il ne soit encore demeuré parmi eux quelques légères traces des fugues & desseins gothiques, & quelques fois de doubles & triples mélodies’ [LFM 158: ‘Even though the Italians made harmony purer, simpler, and gave all their attention to the perfection of melody, I do not deny that there still remains among them some slight traces of fugues and gothic designs, and sometimes of double and triple melodies.’]. It would be a mistake, however, Rousseau concluded in the *Lettre* (p. 764, note [OC, vol. 5, p. 328, note]), for French composers to imitate their Italian colleagues: ‘J’aimerois mieux que nous gardassions notre maussade & ridicule chant, que d’associer encore plus ridiculement la mélodie Italienne à la langue Française’ [LFM 174, note: ‘I would prefer that we keep our glum and ridiculous song than combine, still more ridiculously, Italian melody with the French language’].

27. In his *Lettre* (see especially, p. 722; [OC, vol. 5, p. 311; LFM 159]) Rousseau refers directly to *La Serva padrona* by Pergolesi, an excellent example of *opera buffa*, first produced in Naples in 1733 and already staged in Paris at the Comédie Italienne in 1746, whose renewed performance at the Opéra by the company of Eustachio Bambini was much acclaimed and in fact constituted the musical inauguration of the *Querelle*. Rousseau also calls attention in the text to Grimm’s *Petit prophète de Boehmischbroda* (see *Lettre*, p. 749 [OC, vol. 5, p. 321; LFM 168]), which was the most important literary contribution to the *Querelle* before his own. But in addition to these citations the *Lettre* contains many other passages that deal specifically with the music around which the controversy was shaped. It includes comments upon at least four more operas (*Il Maestro di musica* and *Il Tracollo* which were principally by Pergolesi, and *La Bohémienne* [*La Zingara*] and *La Femme orgueilleuse* [*La Donna superba*] by Rinaldo di Capua) which were staged by ‘Les Bouffons’: it mentions three further composers (Leo, Niccolò Jommelli and Gioacchino Cocchi) and one librettist (Metastasio) whose intermezzi were performed during their season in Paris; and it refers to a whole host of still other composers (e.g. Nicola Antonio Porpora, Baldassare Galuppi, Davide Pérez and Domenico Terradellas) whose music had been made to serve as overtures or pasticcis or who, more indirectly still, had just helped to inspire the contemporary style of *opera buffa* (see *Lettre*, pp. 699–705 and 710–11 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 301–04 and 306–07; LFM 152–54]). Rousseau’s profound knowledge of this usually slight form of opera stemmed from the fascination



which he felt for it during his stay in Venice in 1743–44 (see note 29). While the ‘Bouffon’ season was in progress he prepared a collection of Italian songs under the title ‘Canzoni di batello’ as well as an edition of *La Serva padrona*; and his own opera, *Le Devin du village*, moreover, itself first staged during that season, was described by some of his critics (notably Fréron) as substantially plagiarized from the music which he had heard in Italy before. This charge, it should be noted here, was first made with regard to *Le Devin* in 1753 (see the *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vol. 2, pp. 329 and 333), that is, two years before Rameau made the same claim about Rousseau’s earlier operatic ballet, *Les Muses galantes* (see *ibid.*, pp. 338–40).

28. At length in the fourth chapter of my Oxford University D.Phil dissertation entitled ‘The Social Thought of Rousseau: An Historical Interpretation of His Early Writings’ [later published by Garland in Wokler, *Rousseau on Society, Politics, Music and Language* (New York, 1987)].

29. See Rousseau, ‘Unité de mélodie’, *Dictionnaire de musique* (Paris, 1768 [1767]; repr., Hildesheim and New York, 1969), p. 536 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 1143–146; DM 476–79]. In the *Lettre* (see *La Querelle*, vol. 1, pp. 699–701 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 301–02; LFM 152–53]) Rousseau had already recalled an experience in Venice which confirmed the superiority of French over Italian song, at least to his own satisfaction. In his *Confessions*, moreover, he later devoted a few pages to the delights of Venetian song, for which, he claimed (*Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 314), ‘j’eus bientôt . . . la passion qu’elle inspire à ceux qui sont faits pour en juger’ [C 294: ‘I soon contracted the passion which it inspires in all those born to understand it’], despite his having come to Venice with a characteristically French prejudice against Italian music.

30. Rousseau, ‘Unité de mélodie’, in *Dictionnaire de musique*, p. 538 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 1144–45; DM 478: ‘In order to prove that the energy of Music comes wholly from the Harmony . . . [M. Rameau] has not seen that he proved wholly the contrary of what he wanted to prove: for in all the examples he gives, the Accompaniment of the Bass serves merely to determine the Song. . . . Harmony acts merely by determining the Melody to be this or that sort, and it is purely as Melody that the Interval has different expressions according to the place of the Mode where it is employed’]. See also the *Lettre à M. Burney sur la musique*, in *Collection complète des oeuvres de Rousseau*, vol. 8, p. 551 [OC, vol. 5, 433–39].

31. There is, to be sure, no direct reference to the *Querelle* in the *Observations*. Thus one reviewer of Rameau’s work remarked (in the journal *Annonces, affiches et avis divers*, reprinted in Jean Philippe Rameau, *Complete Theoretical Writings*, ed. Erwin R. Jacobi, 6 vols. [n.p., 1967–72], vol. 6, p. 307) that while all the defenders of French music had waited impatiently for Rameau to produce a decisive reply to Rousseau’s *Lettre*, and while his energetic rejoinder did in fact ensure that ‘notre Musique . . . est vengée’, it was still the case that ‘il s’explique . . . indirectement dans ses Observations’ [‘our music . . . is vindicated’; ‘he explains the

matter . . . indirectly in these Observations']. Yet despite this lacuna the second half of the text is devoted almost entirely to a critique of the mistakes that Rousseau had committed in the *Lettre*. For accounts of the reception of the *Observations* in 1754–55, see Rameau, *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, pp. lxxviii–lxxiv, and vol. 6, pp. 305–26.

32. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 316 ['a feeling that will strike every unbiased man who might wish to indulge in the pure effects of Nature'].

33. Ibid., vol. 5, p. 213 ['A partisan of Melody who signs up against the perfection of Harmony in general is missing an opportunity'].

34. This change in Rousseau's views from the time that he prepared his articles on music for the *Encyclopédie* to the time that he completed the *Lettre* can be traced through his *Lettre à M. Grimm sur 'Omphale'* of 1752 via a manuscript (Bibliothèque de la Ville de Neuchâtel, Ms R 69) which he probably drafted around 1750 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 261–74; LG]. I have tried to plot the course of that development in the thesis cited in note 28 above.

35. See Rousseau, 'Accompagnement', in *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, 35 vols. (Paris, 1751–80), vol. 1, p. 77 [AE 203].

36. Rousseau, *Lettre*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, p. 751 [OC, vol. 5, p. 322; LFM 168: 'the most perfect model of true French recitative']. Rousseau's remarks upon the celebrated monologue 'Enfin il est en ma puissance' of the heroine in Act II of *Armide* appear on pp. 751–53. In his *Nouveau système de musique théorique* of 1726 (see the *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 2, pp. 51 and 90–100) Rameau himself had dealt at length with this passage, claiming that it illustrated 'la plus parfaite distribution qu'on puisse imaginer' ['the most perfect example imaginable'] of his own rules of harmonic modulation. Rousseau's critique of the monologue in the *Lettre* was thus prefaced with the charge that the acclamation by Rameau 'devient une véritable satire' ['becomes a veritable satire'], while Rameau, for his part, retorted (in 1760 in his *Code de musique pratique*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 4, p. 193, note) that 'il faut être bien peu sensible aux effets de l'harmonie . . . pour avoir osé critiquer ce Monologue' [one must be quite insensitive to the effects of harmony . . . to have presumed to criticize this Monologue].

37. See especially Rameau's *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, pp. 260, 271–72, 316, 317, and his *Erreurs sur la musique*, *ibid.*, vol. 5, pp. 220, 229.

38. Ibid., p. 219 ['as long as Melody alone is considered the principal moving force of Music's effects there will not be great progress in this Art', as trans. in Masters and Kelly (eds.), *The Collected Works of Rousseau*, vol. 7, p. 231].

39. Ibid., p. 214 ['a chimera . . . the effect of which has only weak appeal in Music without the help of harmony']. For his part, Fréron, in a critique of the *Lettre* published anonymously in Geneva in 1754, charged (see his *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, p. 786) that the notion of the unity of melody was a commonplace derived initially from Horace.

40. With regard to the *Traité de l'harmonie*, see especially Rameau's *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 1, p. 31 and pp. 168–69; with regard to the *Génération harmonique*, see, for example, *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 45. Beginning at approximately this point in the text I have drawn and developed a number of passages from my article on 'Rameau, Rousseau, and the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*', in *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 117 (1974): 179–238. I am grateful to the late editor of *Studies on Voltaire* [Theodore Besterman] for permitting me to reproduce some extracts from that essay.

41. The principle that harmony gives rise to melody is, in my view, central to all of Rameau's writings about music. It should be noted, however, that his conception of harmonic structure was established from his account of the resonance of one note alone, and not, as some commentators have supposed, from the divisions of the octave (see, for instance, the *Traité de l'harmonie*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 1, p. 40). Perhaps the best general interpretations of Rameau's theory of harmony are provided by Matthew Shirlaw in *The Theory of Harmony*, 2nd ed. (DeKalb, 1955), pp. 63–285, and Jacques Chailley in his 'Rameau et la théorie musicale', *Revue musicale* 260 (1965): 65–95. Much the finest account of Rameau's theory in its application to his own music is provided by Paul-Marie Masson in his splendid *L'Opéra de Rameau* (Paris, 1930), pp. 464–98.

42. Rameau, *Démonstration*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, pp. 157–58 ['It is to Music that nature seems, to us, to assign the Physical principle of the purely Mathematical first concepts around which all the Sciences turn, I mean, the ratios, Harmonics, Arithmetic & Geometry, from which follow the progressions of the same kind, & which manifest themselves the first moment a sounding body resonates']. Rameau might have drawn some inspiration for this passage from the first proposition, entitled 'Il n'y a quasi nul art, nulle science, ou profession, à qui l'harmonie . . . ne puisse servir' ['There is almost no art, no science, or profession, which harmony . . . could not serve'], in the eighth book of the third volume of Marin Mersenne's *Harmonie universelle* (first pub. Paris, 1636). That work and—even more—Gioseffo Zarlino's *Istitutioni harmoniche* of 1558 constitute the principal modern sources from which Rameau developed his harmonic theory.

43. In his *Génération harmonique* of 1737 and again in his *Nouvelles Réflexions sur le principe sonore* of 1760, for instance (see his *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, p. 38, and vol. 4, pp. 213 and 255–58), Rameau commented favourably upon the application of the laws of harmony, by Pythagoras, both to music on the one hand and to planetary motion on the other. It is true, however, that in his *Observations* (see *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 274–77) he also objected to a number of ideas pertaining to the divisions of the octave which had been attributed to Pythagoras.

44. Rameau, *Observations*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, pp. 264–65 ['Let us not neglect . . . anymore this mother of the Sciences & the Arts, let us examine her well & try from now on to let ourselves be led only by her. The prin-

ciple in question is not only involved in all the aesthetic Arts . . . it is also the principle of all the calculative Sciences: this cannot be denied without denying at the same time that these Sciences are founded on the proportions and progressions that Nature announces through the Phenomenon of the sounding Body, with circumstances so pronounced that it is impossible to deny the evidence: & how could anyone deny it! since if there are no proportions, then there is no Geometry']. These remarks may have been inspired, in part, by the following passage from Jean Adam Serre's *Essais sur les principes de l'harmonie* (Paris, 1753), p. 28: 'Dans l'ordre réel des choses, l'Harmonie, Fille de la Nature même, est la Mere de tous les Sons que peut employer la Mélodie' ['In the real order of things, Harmony, the Daughter of Nature herself, is the Mother of all the Sounds that Melody can employ'].

45. Rameau, *Réponse à MM. les éditeurs de l'Encyclopédie*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, pp. 355–56 ['This is the predominant power of geometrical proportion in Music'; 'as it is, we say, in Architecture, & as it should be, if I am not wrong, in many other Sciences']. The *Réponse* first appeared in 1757, following the publication, in the foreword to vol. 6 of the *Encyclopédie*, of a defence of Rousseau against Rameau's charges by the editors. See also Rameau's *Génération harmonique*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, pp. 29 and 53.

46. See, for instance, the passage from his *Observations* (in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, p. 316) discussed above.

47. See his remarks, for example, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, p. 324.

48. See *ibid.*, pp. 305–07. Cf. the *Lettre sur la musique françoise*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, pp. 754–55 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 323–24; LFM 169–70].

49. Rameau, *Observations*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, p. 305. Much of this text, Rameau himself admitted (*ibid.*, p. 301), was conceived to render Lully 'la justice qui lui est due' after Rousseau's unwarranted attack.

50. Rousseau, *Lettre*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, pp. 744–45 [OC, vol. 5, p. 319; LFM 166: 'extravagant squawking'].

51. See Rousseau, *Lettre*, pp. 746–48 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 320–21; LFM 167].

52. See Rameau, *Erreurs sur la musique*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, p. 210. In Rousseau's view the fundamental components of every kind of music included not only harmony and melody but measure as well, and it was in fact the case, he claimed in the *Lettre* (*La Querelle*, vol. 1, p. 675 [OC, vol. 5, p. 292]), that 'le chant tire son principal caractère de la mesure' [LFM 144: 'song derives its principal character from the meter']. Measure provided the structure of song, he continued (see *ibid.*, p. 680), bearing the same relation to melody as syntax does to speech; while earlier, in his article 'Mesure' for the tenth volume of the *Encyclopédie*, he had even suggested that harmony and melody stood together as the intoned substance of music, whereas measure constituted its form. This perspective was to have some bearing upon his argument in the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* considered here, and of course it also figures clearly in his

proposition of the *Lettre* that the measured speech of the Italian language made it more suitable to musical expression than was French.

53. See Rameau, *Erreurs*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, p. 212.

54. See Rameau, *Observations*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, pp. 328–29. Rameau noticed a discrepancy between Rousseau's complaint made in the *Lettre* (see *La Querelle*, vol. 1, p. 715) that French choirs only made noise and his previous contention ('Choeur', *Encyclopédie*, vol. 3 [1753], p. 362) that 'un beau *choeur* est le chef-d'oeuvre d'un habile compositeur. Les François passent pour réussir mieux dans cette partie qu'aucune autre nation de l'Europe' [*AE* 213: 'a beautiful chorus is the masterpiece of a skillful composer. The French pass for succeeding better in this part than any other nation in Europe']. By pointing to this contrast Rameau showed his own awareness of the fact that Rousseau's hostility to French music was absent from his initial contributions to the *Encyclopédie*, though Rameau's attention to the article 'Choeur' might in fact have been drawn at first not so much by the observations of Rousseau as by the following remark of Cahusac which was added to Rousseau's text: 'M. Rameau a poussé cette partie aussi loin qu'il semble qu'elle puisse l'être: presque tous ses *choeurs* sont beaux, & il en a beaucoup qui sont sublimes' ['M. Rameau has pushed this part as far as it seems it can be pushed: almost all of his choruses are beautiful, & there are many that are sublime'].

55. This opera, *Platée*, first staged at Versailles in 1745, became particularly popular after a performance at the Paris Opéra on 21 February 1754 which effectively marked the end of the season of 'Les Bouffons'. In 1745 Rameau had also produced a comic operatic ballet, *La Princesse de Navarre*, and around 1760 he was later to compose another lyrical comic opera, *Les Paladins*.

56. See Rousseau, *Lettre*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, pp. 751–52, and notes 36 and 49 above [*OC*, vol. 5, pp. 322–23; *LFM* 168–69].

57. See *ibid.*, pp. 726–31 [*OC*, vol. 5, pp. 312–14; *LFM* 160–62].

58. See, for instance, the following passage from Rousseau's article 'Système' in the *Dictionnaire de musique*, p. 474 [also *OC*, vol. 5, p. 1082]: 'Jusqu'à notre siècle l'Harmonie, née successivement & comme par hasard, n'a eu que des règles éparses, établies par l'oreille, confirmées par l'usage, & qui paroissent absolument arbitraires. M. Rameau est le premier qui, par le *Système* de la Basse-fondamentale, a donné des principes à ces règles . . . ce Dictionnaire a été composé . . . [sur son *Système*]' ['Until our century, Harmony, born gradually and as by chance, had only scattered rules, established by the ear, confirmed by use, and which seemed absolutely arbitrary. M. Rameau is the first who, by the System of the Fundamental Bass, gave principles to these rules . . . this Dictionary has been assembled . . . (according to his *System*)', as trans. in Masters and Kelly (eds.), *The Collected Works of Rousseau*, vol. 7, p. 58]. It should be noted here that this tribute to Rameau appears in roughly the same form in the fourth supplementary volume to the *Encyclopédie* already published in 1767, though there had been no mention of Rameau in Rousseau's initial article 'Système' for the fifteenth volume

of the *Encyclopédie* printed in 1765. Most of Rousseau's essay in the Dictionnaire—the longest in the entire work—is nevertheless devoted to the musical theory of Tartini rather than to that of Rameau.

59. See the foreword of Rousseau's *Examen de deux principes*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, p. 266. The first edition of the published text appeared in 1781 in two distinct versions, both sharing the same Genevan publishers, printers and presses. The *Examen* has not yet been published in the edition of Rousseau's *Oeuvres complètes* which I have consulted here, and my references therefore pertain to that version of the first edition which is reproduced in Rameau's *Complete Theoretical Writings* [published later in OC, vol. 5, pp. 347–70; ETP].

60. Rousseau, *Examen*, in Rameau, *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, pp. 275 and 277 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 357 and 358–59; ETP 277, 279: 'In order to compare melody to harmony M. Rameau begins by stripping the first of everything that, belonging to it, cannot be suited to the other. He does not consider melody as a song, but as a filling out; he says that this filling out arises from harmony, and he is right . . . [But] the accents of the voice pass all the way to the soul; for they are the natural expression of the passions, and by depicting them they arouse them. It is by means of them that music becomes oratorical, eloquent, imitative, they form its language. . . . Melody is in music what design is in Painting, harmony produces merely the effect of colours. It is by means of the song, not by means of the chords, that sounds have expression, fire, life; it is the song alone that gives them the moral effects that produce all of Music's energy']. The claim that harmony is secondary to melody had already appeared as a central theme of Rousseau's *Lettre*, and it was to be reiterated often in his later works as well, particularly in the nineteenth chapter of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*; in the articles 'Harmonie', 'Mélodie', and 'Unité de mélodie' in the *Dictionnaire de musique*; and in the *Observations sur l'Alceste de Gluck* (probably drafted around the beginning of 1775). Rousseau's analogy in this passage between melody and harmony in music, on the one hand, and design and colour in painting, on the other, was developed much further in the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* (see especially chs. 13 and 16). The connection, in general, between music and painting as artistic forms of expression, and the possibility, in particular, of translating notes of the scale into the medium of prismatic colours, had captured the interest of many thinkers in the eighteenth century after the publication, in the *Mercure de France* of November 1725 (see pp. 2552–77), of the Jesuit Father Louis-Bertrand Castel's 'Clavecin pour les yeux, avec l'art de Peindre les sons'. In his *Erreurs sur la musique* (see the *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, pp. 220–22) Rameau had commented upon the analogy in one of his many demonstrations that harmony exercised a more profound effect upon the soul than did melody, which, without a harmonic structure, was in this context only like a confused succession of colours that passed before the eyes of viewers too quickly to be understood. For his part, Rousseau—who was also familiar with Castel's

ocular harpsichord—accepted the opposite position that it was melody and design which gave artistic expression its true force.

61. See Rousseau, *Examen*, in Rameau, *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, p. 279 [also OC, vol. 5, pp. 360–61; ETP 281].

62. *Ibid.*, pp. 271–72 [OC, vol. 5, 353–54; ETP 274–75: ‘But if the lengthy routine of our harmonic successions guides the trained man and the professional Composer, what was the guide of those ignorant people who have never heard harmony in those songs which nature dictated long before the invention of the art? Did they therefore have a feeling for harmony anterior to experience, and if someone made them hear the Fundamental Bass of the tune they had composed, it is to be thought that any of them would recognize his guide there, and that he would find the slightest relation between that bass and that tune? . . . The Greeks recognized as consonances only those that we call perfect consonances; they rejected from among that class thirds and sixths. . . . Consider now what notions of harmony one could have and what harmonic modes one could establish by banishing thirds and sixths from among the class of consonances!’. With two very minor modifications the second part of this passage was later incorporated by Rousseau in his *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, ed. Charles Porset, 2nd ed. (Bordeaux, 1970), ch. 18, p. 183 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 423–24; EOL 294]. See also the *Examen*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, p. 272–73; the *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, ch. 14, p. 157 [OC, vol. 5, p. 415; EOL 286]; and the article ‘Harmonie’, *Dictionnaire de musique*, p. 241 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 850–51]. In the article ‘Harmonie’ Rousseau remarked that ‘de tous les peuples de la terre . . . les Européens sont les seuls qui aient une *harmonie*, des Accords, & qui trouvent ce mélange agréable’ [DM 412–13: ‘of all the peoples of the earth . . . the Europeans are the only ones who have a *Harmony*, Chords, and who find this mixture pleasant’]. In the appendix to his *Dictionnaire de musique*, moreover, he incorporated some examples of ancient musical notation as evidence of the variety of tonal systems which had been devised by men in different cultures. Drawing upon a number of authorities (see the article ‘Musique’, *Dictionnaire de musique*, p. 314 [OC, vol. 5, p. 924; DM 444–46]) he also provided illustrations of Persian and American Indian tunes, and the few bars of the ‘Air Chinois’ which he drew from Father Jean-Baptiste Du Halde’s *Description de la Chine* (4 vols. [Paris, 1735]—see vol. 3, p. 267) were eventually to figure in the scores of Weber’s overture to *Turandot* and Hindemith’s *Symphonic Metamorphosis of Themes by Weber*. According to Rameau, on the other hand, Greek and Chinese music were in some sense unnatural and defective (see especially his *Nouvelles Réflexions sur le principe sonore*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 4, pp. 216–17). At the same time Rameau believed the scales of Greek and Chinese music resembled ours *in principle*, and in his *Observations* (in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, p. 277), for instance, he contended that ‘nos Modernes ont . . . eû tort de conclure, sur la fausseté du système de Pytagore, que les Anciens ne pratiquoient pas l’harmonie’ [‘our Moderns . . . were wrong to conclude, from the falsity of



Pythagoras's system, that the Ancients did not practice harmony'], maintaining (see, for example, *ibid.*, pp. 286–87) that the ancient Greek tetrachord was constructed upon the same principle of the resonating 'corps sonore' which provided the harmonic pattern of the octave scale. Rousseau never shared this view, and he later argued (see the article 'Tétracorde' in his *Dictionnaire de musique*, p. 512 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 1116–20]) that the tetrachord had not been based upon a principle of harmony at all, but was instead a pattern of both speech and song which the Greeks had adopted in order to express the sonorous inflexions of their language.

63. In his articles 'Fondamental' and 'Gamme' for the seventh volume of the *Encyclopédie* (published in 1757) d'Alembert later objected to Rameau's attempts to endow his speculations with 'un faux air scientifique' ['a false air of science'] as if they were geometrical proofs, and in his capacity as a professional geometer himself he protested 'contre cet abus ridicule de la Géométrie dans la Musique' ['against that ludicrous misuse of Geometry in Music'] ('Fondamental', *Encyclopédie*, vol. 7, p. 62). See also 'Gamme', *ibid.*, p. 465. These attacks inaugurated a controversy between d'Alembert and Rameau—during which some fourteen essays were published by the two men—that lasted into the 1760s, almost up to the time of Rameau's death.

64. See Rousseau, *Examen*, in Rameau's *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, pp. 283 and 285 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 364 and 365–66; ETP 283 and 285].

65. I have dealt with these matters in some detail in the works cited in note 28 above. See also my 'Rameau, Rousseau, and the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*' (note 40 above); Marie-Élisabeth Duchez, 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues', *Revue de musicologie* 60 (1974): 33–86; and Porset, 'L' "inquiétante étrangeté" de l'*Essai sur l'origine des langues*: Rousseau et ses exégètes', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 154 (1976): 1715–58.

66. This is almost sheer conjecture—based principally upon Rousseau's intimation in his *Confessions* (see OC, vol. 1, p. 560 [C 518]) that the work was finished by the autumn of 1761, from which I surmise that most of the text was written around that period or shortly before—apart, of course, from those passages we know he drafted in 1754 and 1755. A similar conclusion follows from the dating of a fragment about the art of writing (Neuchâtel Ms R 19—see OC, vol. 2, pp. 1249–52 and 1934) which contains an oblique reference to the *Essai*. I know of no evidence at all to suggest that Rousseau drafted any part of the *Essai* in the years between 1755 and 1760, and there is at least one reference (to an idea in d'Alembert's *De la liberté de la musique* in ch. 20) which probably dates from 1760.

67. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 1, p. 27 and ch. 12, p. 139 [OC, vol. 5, p. 675; EOL 248].

68. See *ibid.*, p. 141 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 410–11]. Commenting upon a passage from the first book of Strabo's *Geographica* (for which his immediate source was almost certainly Father Bernard Lamy's *La Rhétorique ou l'art de parler*—see the fourth edition [Paris, 1701], vol. 1, xix, p. 108), Rousseau added here that 'Dire



et chanter . . . ne furent d'abord que la même chose' [EOL 282: 'To say and to sing . . . were initially but the same thing']. The propositions that music and language have a common source, and that poetic speech was developed before prose, can both be found in several classical writings. They also figure prominently in the linguistic theories of the three perhaps best-known authorities on this subject in the eighteenth century, that is, Vico, Monboddo and Herder. But there is no evidence that Rousseau ever saw the work of Vico—despite academic controversy on this matter—and though Monboddo and Herder were both well acquainted with the *Discours sur l'inégalité* neither made any reference at all to the *Essai*.

69. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 14, p. 161 [OC, vol. 5, p. 417; EOL 288]. For Rameau's distinction between sounds and noise see especially his *Génération harmonique*, in *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 3, p. 29, and his *Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie*, *ibid.*, pp. 172–74. By the time Rousseau prepared his article 'Bruir' for the *Dictionnaire de musique* he was no longer in agreement with Rameau on this point, remarking (p. 60 [OC, vol. 5, p. 671]) that we might conjecture that 'le Bruit n'est point d'une autre nature que le Son; qu'il n'est lui-même que la somme d'une multitude confuse de Sons divers, qui se font entendre à la fois & contrarient, en quelque sorte, mutuellement leurs ondulations' [that 'Noise is not of a different Nature than Sound; that it is itself nothing but the sum of a confused multitude of various Sounds, which make themselves heard at the same time and counteract, in some way, each others' undulations'].

70. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 2, p. 43 [OC, vol. 5, p. 380; EOL 253: '[T]he origin of languages is not due to men's first needs; it would be absurd for the cause of their separation to give rise to the means that unites them. To what may this origin then be due? To the moral needs, the passions. All the passions bring together men whom the necessity to seek their subsistence forces to flee one another. Not hunger nor thirst, but love, hatred, pity, anger wrung their first voices from them.'].

71. It is true, however, that according to Rousseau in the *Essai* men are not naturally inclined to show compassion toward other creatures like themselves. Our sentiment of pity, he argued there (see *ibid.*, ch. 9, p. 93 [OC, vol. 5, p. 395; EOL 267–68]), is displayed in the ways that we identify with the suffering of others, and he described it as a feeling of empathy for which, even at first, we required a socially formed and well developed sense of judgement and imagination.

72. *Ibid.*, ch. 9, p. 123 [OC, vol. 5, p. 406; EOL 277–78: 'In this happy age when nothing recorded the hours, nothing required them to be counted; time had no other measure than enjoyment and boredom. . . . Here the first festivals took place; feet skipped with joy, an eager gesture no longer proved adequate, the voice accompanied it with passionate accents, pleasure and desire merged into one and made themselves felt together. Here, finally, was the true cradle of peoples, and from the pure crystal of the fountains sprang the first fires of love']. In his article 'Chant' for the *Dictionnaire de musique* (pp. 83–84 [OC, vol. 5, p. 695]) Rousseau

later remarked that men do not sing by nature, since true savages, mutes and infants are all marked by their lack of song: 'Le *Chant* ne semble pas naturel à l'homme. Quoique les Sauvages de l'Amérique chantent, parce qu'ils parlent, le vrai Sauvage ne chanta jamais. Les Muets ne chantent point; ils ne forment que des voix sans permanence, des mugissemens sourds que le besoin leur arrache. . . . Les enfans crient, pleurent, & ne chantent point. Les premières expressions de la nature n'ont rien en eux de mélodieux ni de sonore' [DM 375: 'Song does not seem to be natural to man. Although the Savages of America sing, because they speak, the true Savage never sang. Mutes do not sing at all; they form only voices without permanence, muted howls which need wrests from them. . . . Children scream, cry, and do not at all sing. The first expressions of nature have nothing melodious and sonorous about them']. Rousseau's concession to the songs of American Indians was based upon Mersenne's account (in turn drawn from the work of Jean de Léry) of 'Trois Chansons des Ameriquains' in his *Harmonie universelle* (see vol. 2, ii, p. 148 of the 1963 Paris reprint of the 1636 edition). In plate N of the *Dictionnaire de musique* a transcription of these three, allegedly Brazilian, tunes is misdescribed as a 'Chanson des Sauvages du Canada'.

73. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 9, p. 113 [OC, vol. 5, p. 402; EOL 274]. See also Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 162 and pp. 168–69 [DI 159 and 164–66], and the manuscript fragment, now lost, transcribed in OC, vol. 3, p. 533.

74. The influence of climate upon the nature of language constitutes the dominant theme of chs. 8–11 of the *Essai*. The subject attracted the attention of many prominent Enlightenment thinkers, from whose writings Rousseau undoubtedly drew some of his own inspiration too. His principal sources may well have been that section of the abbé Jean-Baptiste Dubos's *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture* (first published in 1719) entitled 'Le pouvoir de l'air sur le corps humain prouvé par le caractere des Nations' (see the 1733 Paris edition, vol. 2, xv, pp. 251–76) and a passage from Lamy's *La Rhétorique ou l'art de parler* (see vol. 1, xv, pp. 81–82).

75. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 9, pp. 113–15 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 402–03; EOL 274–75].

76. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 10, pp. 129 and 131, and ch. 11, p. 135 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 407, 408 and 409; EOL 279, 280: 'In southern climates where nature is prodigal needs are born of the passions, in cold countries, where it is miserly, the passions are born of the needs, and the languages, sad daughters of necessity, reflect their harsh origin . . . in those regions where the earth yields whatever it yields only after so much labor and where the source of life seems to reside more in the hands than in the heart . . . their first word was not *love me* but *help me*. . . . Such in my opinion are the most general physical causes of the characteristic difference between primitive languages. Those of the South must have been lively, resonant, accentuated, eloquent, and often obscure by dint of energy: those of the North must have been muted, crude, articulated,

shrill, monotone, clear by dint of their words rather than of good construction']. An illuminating treatment of these remarks is provided by Jacques Derrida in his *De la grammatologie* (Paris, 1967) pp. 318–22. In his *Lettre* (see *La Querelle*, vol. 1, pp. 735–36 [OC, vol. 5, p. 316]) Rousseau treated modern Italian as if it were the contemporary language of love, and he described it there in terms that are similar to those which he attached here to the original southern tongues: 'C'est le langage de l'amour . . . vif, bouillant, entrecoupé, & tel qu'il convient aux passions impétueuses' [*LFM* 163: 'There it is the language of love . . . lively, ardent, faltering, and such as befits the impetuous passions']. He was, in any case, not the only writer in the eighteenth century to draw a distinction between the industrious labourers of the North on the one hand and the frolicsome peoples of the South on the other. Much the same point can be found, for instance, in Diderot's (or Saint-Lambert's) article 'Législateur' in the ninth volume of the *Encyclopédie* and in Montesquieu's *Esprit des loix*, vol. 14, ii.

77. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 19, pp. 189–91 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 425–26; *EOL* 295–97]. In the paragraph preceding this passage Rousseau made clear that it was principally classical Latin, already less musical than ancient Greek, which suffered this fate. To be sure, several other Enlightenment thinkers, for instance Condillac (see his *Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines*, vol. 2, i.5, § 56), had already advanced that claim before him.

78. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 19, p. 189 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 425; *EOL* 295: 'Thus melody, as it began to be less closely tied to discourse, imperceptibly assumed a separate existence, and music became increasingly independent of words. This was also the period when the wonders gradually ceased which it had wrought when it was but the accent and the harmony of poetry, and when it endowed poetry with a power over the passions which speech has since exercised only over the reason'].

79. See *ibid.*, ch. 5, p. 55 [OC, vol. 5, p. 384; *EOL* 256]. Inspired largely by the physical and anatomical researches of Denis Dodart (see his *Mémoire sur les causes de la voix de l'homme et de ses différens tons*, in *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences. Année 1700* [Paris, 1703], pp. 238–87), Rousseau drew a fuller and more general distinction between 'la Voix de parole' and 'la Voix de Chant' in his article 'Voix' for the *Dictionnaire de musique* (see especially pp. 540–43) [OC, vol. 5, pp. 1146–49].

80. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 11, p. 135 [OC, vol. 5, p. 409; *EOL* 280–81].

81. *Ibid.*, ch. 7, p. 81 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 392; *EOL* 265: 'All modern European languages are more or less in the same situation; I do not even exclude Italian. By itself, Italian is no more a musical language than is French. The difference is simply that one lends itself to music and the other does not'].

82. In his article 'Musique' for the *Encyclopédie*, vol. 10 (see p. 901), Rousseau had already distinguished ancient from modern music largely in terms of the

connection to poetry that had once been the central feature of musical expression but had now been lost.

83. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 19, p. 193 [OC, vol. 5, p. 426; EOL 297: 'Song thus deprived of all melody and consisting solely in the volume and duration of sounds must finally have suggested ways in which it might be made still more resonant with the aid of consonances. Several voices constantly drawing out in unison endlessly long sounds chanced upon a few chords which made the noise seem pleasant to them by accentuating it, and this is how the use of descant and of counterpoint began'].

84. 'On sait que nôtre harmonie est une invention gothique', Rousseau lamented (*ibid.*, ch. 18, p. 181 [OC, vol. 5, p. 423; EOL 293: 'It is known that our harmony is a Gothic invention']). See also his *Lettre*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, p. 716 [OC, vol. 5, p. 308; LFM 157], and his article 'Harmonie' in the *Dictionnaire de musique*, p. 242 [OC, vol. 5, p. 851; DM 413].

85. See especially Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 19, p. 195 [OC, vol. 5, p. 427; EOL 298]. Cf. *ibid.*, ch. 17, p. 179 [OC, vol. 5, p. 422; EOL 293]; his *Lettre*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, pp. 677–78 [OC, vol. 5, p. 293; LFM 144–45], and his article 'Harmonie', in the *Dictionnaire de musique*, pp. 241–42 [OC, vol. 5, p. 850; DM 412].

86. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 14, p. 155 [OC, vol. 5, p. 415; EOL 286: 'The songs which to us are the most beautiful will only moderately affect an ear completely unaccustomed to them; it is a language for which one has to have the Dictionary'].

87. *Ibid.*, ch. 19, p. 187 [OC, vol. 5, p. 424; EOL 295: 'the calculation of intervals replaced delicacy of inflection'].

88. See especially *ibid.*, ch. 18, p. 181 [OC, vol. 5, p. 423; EOL 293–94]. Cf. Rousseau, *Lettre*, in *La Querelle*, vol. 1, pp. 681 and 685–86 [OC, vol. 5, p. 294; LFM 145], and his *Examen*, in Rameau's *Complete Theoretical Writings*, vol. 5, pp. 275–76 [OC, vol. 5, p. 357–58; ETP 277–78].

89. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 5, p. 57 [OC, vol. 5, p. 384; EOL 256–57]. 'L'art d'écrire ne tient point à celui de parler', he continued (*ibid.*, p. 61 [OC, vol. 5, p. 386; EOL 258: 'The art of writing does not in any way depend on that of speaking']). Rousseau believed that the art of writing does not truly represent what we say; on the contrary, in his view, writing destroyed speech. It arose later and was from the start connected with needs different from those that gave rise to our earliest tonal utterances.

90. See *ibid.*, ch. 5, pp. 67–69 [OC, vol. 5, p. 388; EOL 260–61]. Rousseau's remarks in this passage, foreshadowed to a large extent by some of the arguments in Plato's *Phaedrus*, were elaborated further in a fragment of Neuchâtel Ms R 19 printed in the OC, vol. 2 (see pp. 1249–51). The most comprehensive treatment of Rousseau's general distinction between spoken and written languages is provided by Derrida in his *De la grammatologie* (see pp. 321–26).

91. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 1, p. 39 [OC, vol. 5, p. 379; EOL 251–52].

92. Ibid., ch. 20, pp. 199 and 201 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 428 and 429; EOL 299: 'Some languages are conducive to freedom; they are the sonorous, rhythmic, harmonious languages in which speech can be made out from quite far. Ours are made for the buzz in the Sultan's Council Chamber. . . . Now, I maintain that any language in which it is not possible to make oneself understood by the people assembled is a servile language; it is impossible for a people to remain free and speak that language']. D'Alembert raised the question of the link between political liberty and music in the very title of his *De la liberté de la musique*, a work which Rousseau had almost certainly read when he prepared this chapter of the *Essai*. For the most important of d'Alembert's remarks about the subject see *La Querelle*, vol. 3, pp. 2216–17.

93. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 20, pp. 197 and 199–201 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 428–29; EOL 298–99: 'What speeches then remain to be addressed to the people assembled? Sermons. And why should those who deliver them care whether they persuade the people, since it does not award privileges? . . . Our preachers agonize, work themselves into a sweat in their churches, without anyone's having any idea of what they have said. After they have worn themselves out shouting for an hour, they leave their pulpit half-dead. Surely it was not worth the effort. . . . Imagine someone delivering a harangue in French to the people of Paris in the Place Vendôme. Let him shout at the top of his voice, people will hear that he is shouting, but they will not make out a single word. . . . The reason there are fewer mountebanks in the marketplaces of France than of Italy is not that in France people listen to them less, but only that they cannot hear them as well'].

94. Ibid., pp. 197–99 [OC, vol. 5, p. 428; EOL 298–99: 'Societies have assumed their final forms; nothing can be changed in them any more except by arms and cash, and since there is nothing left to say to the people but, *give money*, it is said with posters on street corners or with soldiers in private homes; for this there is no need to assemble anyone: on the contrary, subjects must be kept scattered; this is the first maxim of modern politics'].

95. The first edition of the *Essai* was produced in 1781 in two different versions which have precisely the same format—and were incorporated in the same tomes—as the two versions of the original edition of the *Examen de deux principes* (see note 59 above).

96. Burke, *A Letter to a Member of the National Assembly* (1791), in *The Works of Edmund Burke*, 12 tomes in 6 vols. (London, 1803–13), vol. 6, p. 32.

97. See especially Daniel Mornet, 'Les enseignements des bibliothèques privées (1750–1780)', *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* 17 (1910): 465–68; Mornet, 'L'Influence de J. J. Rousseau au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* 8 (1912): 44–45; Joan McDonald, *Rousseau and the French Revolution* (London, 1965), pp. 46–48, 87–88, 103, 104 and 155; and Robert

Darnton, *Mesmerism and the End of the Enlightenment in France* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), pp. 3 and 162.

98. Burke, *Letter*, in *Works*, vol. 6, p. 39.

99. Rousseau, *Emile* III, in OC, vol. 4, p. 468 [E 194: 'We are approaching a state of crisis and the age of revolutions'; 'I hold it impossible that the great monarchies of Europe still have long to last'].

#### CHAPTER 4: VAGABOND REVERIE

Only the most accessible English editions of Rousseau's works are cited, and I have often preferred my own translation while nevertheless pointing to the location of another. [In this chapter the author himself provided the citations to the English editions.]

1. Rousseau, *Confessions*, in *Oeuvres complètes* [hereafter OC], ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–95), vol. 1, p. 430; C 400–01.

2. Ibid., pp. 427–28; C 398.

3. Ibid., p. 438; C 408.

4. Letters 11 and 17 in Part iv, respectively.

5. Rousseau, *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 436; C 406.

6. Ibid., p. 440; C 410.

7. R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau* (Geneva, Banbury and Oxford, 1965–98), no. 533, vol. 4 [pp. 273–81].

8. Rousseau, *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 445; C 414–15.

9. Rousseau, *Lettre à d'Alembert*, in OC, vol. 5, pp. 53–54 and 114–15; LD 58, 125–26.

10. Rousseau, *Emile*, in OC, vol. 4, pp. 305, 549; E 81, 253.

11. Rousseau, *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, no. 5477 [vol. 31, pp. 31–32].

12. Rousseau, *Lettres morales*, in OC, vol. 4, p. 1101 [ML 190].

13. Rousseau, *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 181; C 175; Rousseau, *Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques: Dialogues*, OC, vol. 1, p. 872 [RJ 164].

14. Rousseau, *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 410; C 382.

15. Ibid.

16. Rousseau, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, in OC, vol. 1 pp. 1003–04; R 36–38.

17. Rousseau, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 1062, 1070–71; R 108, 117–18.

18. Rousseau, *Julie, ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*, in OC, vol. 2, p. 471; J 387.

19. Rousseau, *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 180–81; C 175; Rousseau, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 1063–64; R 109–10; and Rousseau, *Dictionnaire de Botanique*, in OC, vol. 4, p. 1201 [DB 93].

20. Rousseau, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 1068–69; R 114–15.
21. Rousseau, *Dictionnaire de Botanique*, in OC, vol. 4, pp. 1220–21 [DB 109].
22. Rousseau, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 1069; R 115.
23. Rousseau, *Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques: Dialogues*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 716 [RJ 44].
24. Ibid., p. 725 [RJ 51].
25. Rousseau, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 995; R 27.
26. Ibid., p. 1046; R 88.
27. Ibid., pp. 1042–44; R 83–85.
28. Rousseau, *Julie, ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*, in OC, vol. 2, p. 521; J 428.

#### CHAPTER 6: ROUSSEAU'S PUFENDORF: NATURAL LAW AND THE FOUNDATIONS OF COMMERCIAL SOCIETY

1. Rousseau, *Confessions* IX, in the *Oeuvres complètes* [hereafter OC], ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris: 1959–[95]) vol. 1, p. 404 [C 377].
2. Rousseau, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, Sixième Promenade, in OC, vol. 1, p. 1059 [R 103].
3. See especially my 'La Querelle des Bouffons and the Italian Liberation of France: A Study of Revolutionary Foreplay', in C. Duckworth and H. Le Grand (eds.), "Studies in the Eighteenth Century", vol. 6, special issue, *Eighteenth-Century Life* 11, n.s., 1 (1987): 94–116; 'Liberty, Equality and Fratricide', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 14 July 1989, pp. 15–16; and 'Hegel's Rousseau: The General Will and Civil Society', in Sven-Eric Liedman (ed.), 'Deutscher Idealismus', special issue, *Arachne* 8 (1993): 7–45.
4. In addition to the work of Vaughan and Derathé which is considered here, there are particularly notable discussions of the place of natural law in Rousseau's political thought in Iring Fetscher, *Rousseaus politische Philosophie* (Neuwied, 1960); Victor Goldschmidt, *Anthropologie et politique: Les principes du système de Rousseau* (Paris, 1974); Franz Haymann, 'La loi naturelle dans la philosophie politique de J.-J. Rousseau', *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* 30 (1943–45): 55–110; René Hubert, *Rousseau et l'Encyclopédie* (Paris, 1928); Paul-L. Léon, 'Le problème du contrat social chez Rousseau', *Archives de philosophie du droit et de sociologie juridique* 3–4 (1935): 157–201; and Roger Masters, *The Political Philosophy of Rousseau* (Princeton, 1968).
5. For Stoic and Scholastic contributions to the philosophy of natural law, see especially Marcia L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1985); Alfred Dufour, *Droits de l'homme, droit naturel et h*  
Contribu-



tion to *Political Thought* (Oxford, 1939); and Malcolm Schofield, *The Stoic Idea of the City* (Cambridge, 1991).

6. For a fuller discussion of the differences between Vaughan and Derathé, see my 'Natural Law and the Meaning of Rousseau's Political Thought: A Correction to Two Misrenderings of His Doctrine', in G. Barber, C. Courtney and D. Gilson (eds.), *Enlightenment Essays in Memory of Robert Shackleton* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 319–35.

7. *The Political Writings of Rousseau*, ed. C. E. Vaughan (Cambridge, 1915), Introduction, vol. 1, pp. 40 and 48.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

9. See Rousseau, *Contrat social*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 360 [SC 49–50], and Robert Derathé, *Rousseau et la science politique de son temps* (1950; 2nd ed., Paris, 1970), p. 342.

10. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 152 [DI 150].

11. Rousseau, *Manuscrit de Genève*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 284 [GM 155].

12. See Derathé, *Rousseau et la science politique de son temps*, p. 165.

13. See Rousseau, *Emile*, in OC, vol. 4, p. 842 [E 462].

14. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 193 [DI 188].

15. See especially Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, Seconde Partie, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 184 [DI 179]; Rousseau, *Manuscrit de Genève* I.2, in OC, vol. 3, p. 288 [GM 159]; Rousseau, 'Etat de guerre', in OC, vol. 3, p. 610; and Rousseau, *Emile* IV, in OC, vol. 4, p. 524 [E 235–36].

16. See Rousseau, *Confessions* III, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 110 and 1283, note 5 [C 110]; Rousseau, 'Mémoire à M. de Mably'; and Rousseau, 'Projet pour l'éducation de Sainte-Maire', in OC, vol. 4, pp. 31, 51 and 1265 [PEM 129].

17. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 183 [DI 178]. The passage is cited in Pufendorf, *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, VII, ch. 6, § 10, n. 1 (in the first Barbeyrac edition published in Amsterdam [1706], vol. 2, p. 273). It also figures in Diderot's *errata* for the first two volumes of the *Encyclopédie*, published in 1753, intended as an addition to his article on 'Autorité politique' in volume one, as well as in the *Remontrances du Parlement de Paris* of April 1753 (see *Les Remontrances du Parlement de Paris*, ed. J. Flammarion [Paris, 1888–98], I, p. 522). Barbeyrac's source for his citation is a passage from Algernon Sidney's *Discourses Concerning Government*.

18. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 182 and n. 1 [DI 177]; *Sur l'Economie politique*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 244 [PE 5]; *Manuscrit de Genève*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 298 and n. 1; and the *Contrat social*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 354, n. 1 [SC 43]. The references and allusions are drawn from Pufendorf, *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, ed. Barbeyrac, IV, ch. 4, § 4, n. 1 and VI, ch. 2, § 10, n. 2.

19. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 124–25 [DI 126] and, for Barbeyrac, especially his comments in *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, II, ch. 3, § 2, n. 2. In this case, at least, Barbeyrac just elaborates on Pufendorf's own critique, in the light of the general agreement of learned men in the modern wor

men and



animals'—animals having the capacity to follow rules and perform duties only in a figurative sense, he claims.

20. Neither does the name of Barbeyrac figure in his correspondence. There are, by contrast, abundant references to Grotius throughout Rousseau's major political writings and most especially in the *Contrat social*. In his correspondence, moreover, he refers to Grotius twice, the first time, disingenuously, to deny any debt to, or interest in, his works, the second time, a few years later, to acknowledge the authority of Grotius, reason and natural law (see Rousseau's letters 712 and 2726 to anonymous lawyers and to Marc Chappuis of 15 October 1758 and 26 May 1763, respectively, in R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau* [Geneva, Banbury and Oxford, 1965–(98)], vol. 5, p. 179, and vol. 16, p. 246). I am grateful to Janet Laming for granting me access to the name index of the *Correspondance complète* prior to its publication.

21. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 136, 183 and 183–84 [DI 135–36, 178 and 179].

22. See *ibid.*, p. 153 [DI 151].

23. Rousseau, *Sur l'Economie politique*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 263 [PE 24].

24. Rousseau, *Lettres écrites de la montagne*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 844 [LWM 262].

25. Cf. Pufendorf, *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, ed. Barbeyrac, I, ch. 1 § 20.

26. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 153 n. 1 and p. 159 n. 2 [DI, 151, 156], and Pufendorf, *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, II, ch. 2, § 9 and II, ch. 1, § 6, respectively.

27. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 123, 132–35 and 148 [DI 124–25, 131–35, 146], and Pufendorf, *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, II, ch. 2, § 2, n. 3, and II, ch. 2, § 4. It should be noted, however, that Pufendorf sometimes suggests (see *ibid.*, I, ch. 1, § 7, for instance) that, while the pure state of nature did not exist at the commencement of human history, it arose later in the course of it.

28. See Rousseau, *Manuscrit de Genève*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 282 [GM 153–54].

29. Cf. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 135–36 [DI 134–36]; Pufendorf, *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, II, ch. 2, § 2; and Montesquieu, *L'Esprit des lois*, I, ch. 2. Rousseau's reasons for associating Cumberland with Pufendorf and Montesquieu on the subject of human timidity are not self-evident. From its second edition of 1684, there are frequent references in the *De jure naturae et gentium* to Cumberland's *De legibus naturae*, first published in 1672, the same year as the initial edition of Pufendorf's text. With reference to ch. 2, § 4 of *De legibus naturae*, Pufendorf himself suggests (*De jure naturae et gentium*, II, ch. 3, § 15) that his own conception of natural law is fundamentally the same as Cumberland's. But ch. 1, § 4 addresses mankind's *benevolentia* in terms of love and makes no comment upon human feebleness or timidity, in Pufendorf's manner. Indeed, Cumberland's critique of the essential misanthropy of Hobbes's doctrine is based on a more positive notion of community under the rule of law than Pufendorf's perspective of sociability bred from frailty in a *res nullum* in which

the original community of mankind is conceived in a negative sense. In a subsequently deleted passage from the second draft of *Emile* (see OC, vol. 4, pp. 523 and 1475 [E 235]) Rousseau was to take Cumberland to task once more, on the subject of injustice. He may have had direct acquaintance with Cumberland's work, or through Barbeyrac's own translation, published as the *Traité philosophique des loix naturelles* in 1744, but he would not have been struck by any comment of Barbeyrac on the similarity between Pufendorf's and Cumberland's conceptions of human nature. Perhaps the likeliest explanation for his joining them together with respect to the idea of timidity is a reference by Pufendorf himself (in the *De jure naturae et gentium*, II, ch. 1, § 6) to ch. 2, § 28 of *De legibus*, followed immediately by Pufendorf's own treatment in II, ch. 1, § 7 of (in Barbeyrac's translation) 'la foiblesse des Hommes'. It is difficult to disagree with Linda Kirk, when she claims in her *Richard Cumberland and the Natural Law* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 120, that Rousseau's comments on Cumberland comprise 'a superficial examination'.

30. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 151 [DI 149].

31. Ibid., p. 137 [DI 137]. Cf. Pufendorf, *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, II, ch. 1, § 8.

32. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 132 [DI 132].

33. See ibid., p. 126 [DI 127].

34. For a fuller treatment of this subject, also addressing other commentaries, see especially my 'The Influence of Diderot on the Political Theory of Rousseau: Two Aspects of a Relationship', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 132 (1975): 55–111. For an assessment of its bearing upon Diderot's wider political thought, see the introduction to my edition, with John Hope Mason, of *Political Writings*, by Diderot (Cambridge, 1992). The same chapter of the *Manuscrit de Genève* is also designed to contradict Book I, article ii of Bossuet's *Politique tirée de l'Ecriture sainte*, entitled 'De la société générale du genre humain naît la société civile, c'est-à-dire, celle des états, des peuples et des nations' ['The society of mankind gives birth to civil society, that is to say, to states, peoples, and nations'].

35. See Diderot, 'Droit naturel', in his *Oeuvres complètes*, édition critique et annotée (Paris, 1975–), pp. 26 and 28, and *Political Writings*, pp. 19 and 20–21.

36. Employing the expression *volonté générale* for the first time in his own writings, Rousseau, in his article 'Economie politique', cross-references Diderot's article 'Droit naturel'. I have tried to show (see my 'The Influence of Diderot on the Political Theory of Rousseau', pp. 73–90) that Rousseau's conception of the *volonté générale* in the 'Economie politique' bears striking similarities to Diderot's own views in the 'Droit naturel', and at the same time contrasts sharply with central aspects of the political philosophy he expounded in both earlier and later writings.

37. See Diderot, 'Citoyen' and 'Hobbisme', in his *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 6, p. 463, and vol. 7, p. 406, and *Political Writings*, pp. 15 and 27.

38. Diderot, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 7, p. 406, and *Political Writings*, p. 28.

39. See Rousseau, *Manuscrit de Genève* I.2, 3 and 4, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 283–85, 288, 292, 294–95 [GM 154–56, 159].

40. See Rousseau, *Manuscrit de Genève* I.2, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 287–88 [GM 158–59] and Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, Première Partie, in OC, vol. 3, p. 153 [DI 151].

41. Both works were published in Bologna, the first in 1978, the second in 1990. The *Discussioni su Pufendorf* address Latin commentaries of the period 1663 to 1700. *Pufendorf discepolo di Hobbes* is presented by Palladini as contributing towards a reinterpretation of modern natural law.

42. See Pufendorf, *De jure naturae et gentium*, II, ch. 3, § 15.

43. See *ibid.*, II, ch. 3, § 20.

44. See especially Palladini, *Pufendorf discepolo di Hobbes*, Part I, ch. 2 and Part II, ch. 3, pp. 91–171 and 245–71.

45. Pufendorf, *De jure naturae et gentium*, IV, ch. 4, §§ 2 and 6. See especially I. Hont, 'The Language of Sociability and Commerce: Samuel Pufendorf and the Theoretical Foundations of the "Four-Stages Theory"', in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 270–72. Referring to the commentaries on Grotius of Kaspar Ziegler, Johann von Felden and Johann Heinrich Boecler, they all confused 'communioem negativem cum positiva', writes Pufendorf (*De jure naturae et gentium*, IV, ch. 4, § 2)—that is, common things belonging to nobody, on the one hand, and common things rightfully shared between several persons, on the other. Barbeyrac translates this as a confusion of '*Communauté positive avec la Négative*', while Basil Kennet—in the English translation of Pufendorf to which he contributed the major share, dating from 1703 and incorporating Barbeyrac's notes from 1710—renders the passage as a confusion of 'Negative Communion with Positive'.

46. See Pufendorf, *De jure naturae et gentium*, VII, ch. 1, § 4.

47. See Hont, 'The Language of Sociability and Commerce', pp. 273 and 274; and Hont, 'Negative Community and Communism: The Natural Law Heritage from Pufendorf to Marx', unpublished paper presented at a workshop of the John Olin programme on the History of Political Culture, University of Chicago (February 1989), p. 32.

48. See Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, V, lines 925–87; Horace, *Satires*, I, sat. iii, ll. 99–123; and Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, I, chs. viii and xliii. These passages are all cited by Pufendorf in the *De jure naturae et gentium*, II, ch. 2, § 2. His principal account of the nature of property and its origins, following a discussion of the obligations imposed by language and signs, figures in Book IV, chiefly chs. 3–9. For Montaigne, see his *Essais*, I, ch. 31 ('Des cannibals').

49. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 151 [DI 149].

50. See *ibid.*, Seconde Partie, in OC, vol. 3, p. 193 [DI 187].

51. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ed. Charles Porset (Bordeaux, 2nd ed., 1970), ch. 2, p. 43 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 380–81; EOL 252–53].

52. See *ibid.*, ch. 9, p. 113 [OC, vol. 5, p. 402; EOL 274], and Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, Seconde Partie, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 162 and 168–69 [DI 159 and 164–65].

53. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 9, p. 127 [OC, vol. 5, p. 407; EOL 278].

54. *Ibid.*, ch. 2, p. 43 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 380–81; EOL 252–53]. For Mandeville, see his *Fable of the Bees*, in the sixth edition translated into French in 1740, ed. F. B. Kaye (Oxford, 1924), especially 'A Search into the Nature of Society', vol. 1, p. 346: 'No Societies could have sprung from the Amiable Virtues and Loving Qualities of Man . . . all of them must have had their Origin from his Wants, his Imperfections, and the variety of his Appetites'. Rousseau, in both the preface to his play *Narcisse* and *Discours sur l'inégalité* (OC, vol. 2, pp. 965–96 [PN 97–98], and vol. 3, pp. 154–55 [DI 152–53]), challenges Mandeville's claim, which he rightly takes to be Hobbesian in inspiration, that society was bred from our vices.

55. See the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 9, pp. 95–107 [OC, vol. 5, p. 396; EOL 268] and Ronald Meek, *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 84–91.

56. See Rousseau, *Constitution pour la Corse*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 933 [PCC 150].

57. Rousseau, *Contrat social* II.11, in OC, vol. 3, p. 392 n. 2 [SC 78–79].

58. Hobbes, *Philosophical Rudiments* (translating *De cive*), ch. 13, § xiii, in *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Sir William Molesworth (London, 1839–45), vol. 2, p. 176.

59. Rousseau, *Emile*, in OC, vol. 4, p. 461 [E 189].

60. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, chs. 10 and 20, pp. 131 and 197–99 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 408, 428–29; EOL 279, 298–99].

61. See Rousseau, *Contrat social* III.15, in OC, vol. 3, p. 429 [SC 113].

62. See Rousseau, *Constitution pour la Corse*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 929–30 [PCC 147–48], and *Le gouvernement de Pologne*, ch. 11, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 1004–05 [P 224–25].

63. See Rousseau, *Contrat social* III.15, in OC, vol. 3, p. 431 [SC 115].

64. *Ibid.*, p. 430 [SC 114].

65. *Ibid.*, p. 356 [SC 45].

66. See Grotius, *De jure belli ac pacis*, I, ch. 3, §§ 8 and 12.

67. See Rousseau, *Contrat social* I.4, in OC, vol. 3, p. 358 [SC 48].

68. See *ibid.*, I.5, in OC, vol. 3, p. 359 [SC 49].

69. See Pufendorf, *De jure naturae et gentium*, VII, ch. 3, § 1.

70. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, Seconde Partie, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 183–84 [DI 178–79]. Rousseau had himself sent a copy to Voltaire soon after its publication, and on reading the text Voltaire peppered its margins with expletives ranging from 'faux' and 'ridicule supposition' to 'abominable', 'galimatias', 'quelle chimere' and 'Singe de Diogene'. But this passage he greeted as 'tres beau' (see George R. Havens, *Voltaire's Marginalia on the Pages of Rousseau* [Columbus, 1933], p. 19).

71. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 183 n. [DI 178].

72. See Pufendorf, *Le droit de la nature et des gens*, ed. Barbeyrac, VII, ch. 8, § 6, n. 2. In support of his defence of Locke, Barbeyrac cites a passage from Jacques Abbadié's *Défense de la nation britannique*, first published in 1692. In note 1 he invokes the authority of both Sidney and Locke against Pufendorf's own contention that a people which has rendered itself subject to absolute authority has no right to take up arms to recover its freedom.

73. See Rousseau, *Contrat social*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 355 and 356 [SC 44, 45].

74. See *ibid.*, p. 433 [SC 117].

75. See *ibid.*, III.16.

76. See *ibid.*, II.2.

77. Pufendorf's text reads: 'Peculiaris quoque species personarum politicarum est, quas dicere possis *repraesentativas*, ideo quod personam aliorum referant'. Barbeyrac's translation is rendered thus: 'Il y a encore une autre sorte particulière de *Personnes Publiques*, que l'on peut appeler *Représentatives*, parce qu'elles en représentent d'autres'. In I, ch. 1, § 12 Pufendorf refers specifically to chapter 16 of the *Leviathan*, taking Hobbes to task for inventing the legal fiction that inanimate things, such as churches, hospitals or bridges may be represented by a person, whereas what he ought to have said is merely that the state empowers particular men to act with respect to such places or things. Pufendorf's charge here is based upon a certain misreading of Hobbes's text.

78. Marsilius of Padua, *Defensor Pacis*, Discourse I, ch. 13, § 8; cf. Discourse I, ch. 12, § 5.

79. Rousseau, *Contrat social*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 428 [SC 112].

80. See especially the second edition of this work (Paris, 1971), which includes seven supplementary essays on Rousseau's life and thought.

81. These themes, mainly from the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, are discussed at length in my 'Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution', in R. F. Brissenden and J. C. Eade (eds.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century* (Canberra, 1979), pp. 251–83.

82. See especially John W. Chapman, *Rousseau—Totalitarian or Liberal?* (New York, 1956); Sergio Cotta, 'La position du problème de la politique chez Rousseau', in *Etudes sur le 'Contrat social' de Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Paris, 1964), pp. 177–90; Lester G. Crocker, *Rousseau's 'Social Contract': An Interpretive Essay* (Cleveland, 1968); and J. L. Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (London, 1955), Part I, ch. 3.

83. See Rousseau to the Comtesse de Wartensleben of 27 September 1766, in his *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, no. 5450, vol. 30, p. 385.

84. See Rousseau, *Lettres morales*, Lettre 4, in OC, vol. 4, p. 1101 [ML 190].

85. This essay was first prepared for a conference on 'Unsocial Sociability: Modern Natural Law and the Eighteenth-Century Discourse of Politics, History and Society', held at the Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte at Göttingen in June 1989.

CHAPTER 7: ROUSSEAU'S READING OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS AND THE  
THEOLOGY OF COMMERCIAL SOCIETY

1. Rousseau, *Troisième Dialogue*, in the *Oeuvres complètes* [hereafter OC], ed. B. Gagnebin, M. Raymond, et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–95) vol. 1, p. 934 [RJ 213]. All translations are my own.

2. Rousseau, *Emile*, in OC, vol. 4, p. 245 [E 43].

3. The chief work on this subject remains *Le Pélagianisme de J.-J. Rousseau*, by Jacques François Thomas (Paris, 1956).

4. See Jean Starobinski, 'Le mot *civilisation*', originally published in 1983 in *Le Temps de la réflexion*, reprinted in Starobinski's *Le remède dans le mal* (Paris, 1989).

5. Rousseau translated Tacitus, emulated his style and sometimes compared the impact of his own writings to that of his exemplar. The frontispiece of his *Confessions*, collated from one of his original manuscripts and published in 1789, portrays his bust, in senatorial garb on a marble plinth, like that of Tacitus.

6. See Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 20, in OC, vol. 5, pp. 428–29 [EOL 298–99].

7. See *ibid.*, chs. 7 and 9, in OC, vol. 5, pp. 393 and 398–99 [EOL 265–66, 270–71].

8. Cf. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 162 and 168–69 [DI 159, 164–65], and *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 9, in OC, vol. 5, pp. 401 and 402 [EOL 273, 274]. A notable reading of the *Essai*'s biblical references and theological allusions is provided by Henri Grange in his 'L'*Essai sur l'origine des langues* dans son rapport avec le *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité*', *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* 39 (1967): 291–307.

9. The manuscripts are (1) Neuchâtel Ms R n.a. 9, f. 1; (2) Bibliothèque de Genève, Ms fr. 228, fs. 39r–40v; and (3) BN Ms fr. 12760, fs. 615r–v. For printed transcriptions of these manuscripts see Rousseau, *Oeuvres et correspondance inédites*, ed. Georges Streckeisen-Moultou (Paris, 1861), pp. 345–46; Ralph Leigh, 'Les manuscrits disparus de J.-J. Rousseau', *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* 34 (1956–58): 62–67; Rousseau, *Fragment d'un brouillon*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 224–27, 1356–58 and 1377–79; Rousseau, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Michel Launay, 3 vols. (Paris, 1967–71), vol. 2, pp. 264–67; Rousseau, *Diskurs über die Ungleichheit*, ed. Heinrich Meier (Paderborn, 1987), pp. 386–410; and Rousseau, *The Collected Writings*, ed. Roger Masters and Christopher Kelly, [13] vols. (Hanover, N.H., 1990–[2010]), vol. 3, pp. 96–101. Several fragmentary passages thematically connected with the *Discours sur l'inégalité*, some drawn from Neuchâtel Mss R 30, 48 and 104 and others now lost, have been transcribed in various collections and are today most accessible in OC, vol. 3, pp. 475–81, 509 and 527–28 and Meier, pp. 412–23.

10. See the Bibliothèque Jacques Guérin, cinquième partie, catalogue of sale at Drouot-Montaigne, Paris, 29 November 1988, no. 36.

11. Neuchâtel Ms R 60 (ancienne cote 7877 c).

12. Neuchâtel Ms R 91 (ancienne cote 7887), fs. 104–05. This text, forming a projected preface for a collection of three of Rousseau's writings, was first published by Albert Jansen in his still magisterial *Rousseau als Musiker* (Berlin, 1884) and became a subject of considerable interest to francophone Rousseau scholars following the appearance of Pierre-Maurice Masson's 'Questions de chronologie rousseauiste', *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* 9 (1913): 37–61.

13. See my *Rousseau on Society, Politics, Music and Language: An Historical Interpretation of His Early Writings* (New York, 1987), appendix, pp. 435–93.

14. See my 'Rameau, Rousseau and the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 117 (1974): 179–238; Marie-Élisabeth Duchez, 'Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues', *Revue de musicologie* 60 (1974): 23–86; and Charles Porset, 'L' "inquiétante étrangeté" de l'*Essai sur l'origine des langues*: Rousseau et ses exégètes', *Studies on Voltaire* 154 (1976): 1715–58.

15. See the Bibliothèque de Genève, Ms fr. 228, fs. 39r–40v; Rousseau, *Oeuvres et correspondance inédites*, ed. Streckeisen-Moultou, pp. 345–46; and Rousseau, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Launay, vol. 2, pp. 264–67.

16. Leigh, 'Les manuscrits disparus', p. 63.

17. See Rousseau, *Lettre sur la Providence [Lettre à Voltaire]*, in OC, vol. 4, p. 1068 [LV 241].

18. See the introduction by Victor Gourevitch to his edition of *Rousseau: The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. xxvi–xxvii.

19. Rousseau, *Confessions* IX, in OC, vol. 1, p. 430 [C 400].

20. *Barbarus hic ego sum quia non intelligor illis*, drawn from Ovid, *Tristia*, V.x.37 ['Here I am the barbarian because they do not understand me'].

21. See Adam Smith, 'A Letter to the Authors of the *Edinburgh Review*', in *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence*, 6 vols. in 7 (Oxford, 1976–87), vol. 3, pp. 250–56.

22. Adam Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, IV.1.10, in *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence*, vol. 1, pp. 184–85.

23. See Adam Smith, *The History of Astronomy*, in *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence*, vol. 3, p. 49; and A. L. Macfie, 'The Invisible Hand of Jupiter', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32 (1971): 595–99.

24. See Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, IV.2.9, in *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence*, vol. 2, p. 456.

25. See Emma Rothschild, *Economic Sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet and the Enlightenment* (Cambridge, Mass., 2001), pp. 116–56.

26. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 200 [DI 195]. Rousseau's invocation of this expression so much associated with Smith is noted by Eric Schliesser in his University of Chicago doctoral dissertation of 2002, 'Indis-



pensable Hume: From Newton's Natural Philosophy to Smith's Science of Man' (see p. 238, n. 56); by me in 2004 in my entry on 'Rousseau' for the third edition of Adam and Jessica Kuper's *The Social Science Encyclopedia*, 2 vols. (London and New York, 2005), vol. 2, p. 895; and by Istvan Hont in 2005 in *Jealousy of Trade* (Cambridge, Mass.), p. 91, n.176.

27. Neuchâtel Ms R 18 (ancienne cote 7842), f. 8r. I am grateful to the Bibliothèque publique et universitaire de Neuchâtel, and its keeper of manuscripts, Mme Maryse Schmidt-Surdez, in particular, for granting me permission to reproduce this passage.

28. Abbé Prévost, *Histoire générale des voyages*, 20 vols. (Paris, 1746–89), vol. 5 (1748), p. 156.

29. See Peter Kolb's *Present State of the Cape of Good Hope*, 2 vols. (London), vol. 2 (1731), p. 243. For the original German text of this passage (published in Nürnberg) see p. 533. A Dutch translation, under the title *Naukeurige en uitvoerige beschryving van de Kaap de Goede Hoop*, was published in Amsterdam in 1727.

#### CHAPTER 8: THE MANUSCRIPT AUTHORITY OF POLITICAL THOUGHTS

1. James Burns, 'Du côté de chez Vaughan: Rousseau Revisited', *Political Studies* 12 (1964): 229–34. The first chapter of my doctoral dissertation, later recast as 'Natural Law and the Meaning of Rousseau's Political Thought', in G. Barber, C. Courtney and D. Gilson (eds.), *Enlightenment Essays in Memory of Robert Shackleton* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 319–35, embraces a reply to Burns.

2. Or, rather, *Du Contract social*, suppressed from the title-page on Rousseau's instruction because it had become too crowded with words, although a number of copies of the first edition escaped that alteration.

3. See Richard Tuck, 'The Contribution of History', in *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 72–89, and Dario Castiglione, 'Historical Arguments in Political Theory', *Political Theory Newsletter* 5 (1993): 89–109.

4. James Tully, *A Discourse of Property: John Locke and His Adversaries* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 98.

5. See Jeremy Waldron, *The Right to Private Property* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 232–41.

6. See J. Tully, *An Approach to Political Philosophy: Locke in Contexts* (Cambridge, 1993). In *The Locke Newsletter*, 13 (1982), however, he replied to other criticisms of his interpretation of Locke's meaning, by Thomas Baldwin and Waldron in particular (see pp. 9–46), which had mainly returned to the question posed by Macpherson as to whether capitalist relations could already have been enshrined in the state of nature. Matthew Kramer's *John Locke and the Origins of Private Property* (Cambridge, 1997) offers a philosophical critique both of



Locke's account of the connection between private property and civil laws and, even more, of Tully's alleged misreadings of that argument.

7. See Mark Goldie, 'John Locke's Circle and James II', *The Historical Journal* 35 (1992): 557–86; Ellen Meiksins Wood, 'Locke against Democracy: Consent, Representation and Suffrage in the Two Treatises', *History of Political Thought* 13 (1992): 657–89; and Richard Ashcraft, 'The Radical Dimensions of Locke's Political Thought: A Dialogic Essay on Some Problems of Interpretation', *History of Political Thought* 13 (1992): 703–72.

8. See Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 452–53; Goldie, 'Locke's Circle', p. 564; and Ashcraft, 'The Radical Dimensions of Locke's Political Thought', p. 771.

9. Ashcraft, 'The Radical Dimensions of Locke's Political Thought', p. 772.

10. See Hobbes, *The Elements of Law: Natural and Politic*, ed. Ferdinand Tönnies (London, 1889), p. xii and appendix I, pp. 193–210; Richard Tuck, 'Hobbes and Descartes', in G.A.J. Rogers and Alan Ryan (eds.), *Perspectives on Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 17–18; and R. Tuck, *Hobbes* (Oxford, 1989), p. 18. Tuck has elsewhere been more circumspect in doubting Hobbes's composition of the *Short Tract*. In his 'Optics and Sceptics: The Philosophical Foundations of Hobbes's Political Thought', in Edmund Leites (ed.), *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 249, he remarks only that 'until the work's authorship and date are properly established, it is wise to ignore it in discussions of Hobbes's intellectual development'.

11. See Johann Sommerville, *Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, 1992), pp. 170–71, n. 23.

12. See *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Noel Malcolm (Oxford, 1994), vol. 2, p. 874.

13. See Tuck, 'Hobbes and Descartes', pp. 16–18.

14. See Jean Jacquot, 'Sir Charles Cavendish and His Learned Friends', pt. 1, *Annals of Science*, 8 (1952), p. 21n. In identifying as the work of Payne manuscripts previously thought to have been drafted by Hobbes, Malcolm does not address this claim by Jacquot, whose expertise in such matters was also considerable. He notes, however, that Payne's handwriting closely resembles that of Hobbes. Payne, who was one of Hobbes's best friends, appears to have transcribed other manuscripts, perhaps occasionally for Hobbes's benefit. But in ascribing the *Short Tract* to Hobbes rather than Payne, the central matters at issue for most commentators have been the substance of the text rather than its handwriting, its compatibility of style and meaning with other works by Hobbes, and the absence of writings known to be by Payne which might point to similar interests or talent.

15. See *The Correspondence of Hobbes*, vol. 1, letters 33 and 34, pp. 94–114; Richard Popkin, 'Hobbes and Scepticism', *History of Philosophy in the Making: A Symposium in Honor of James D. Collins* (Washington, D.C., 1982), pp. 134–35; and Tom Sorell, 'Descartes, Hobbes, and the Body of Natural Science', *The Monist* 71 (1988): 521–23.

16. See Perez Zagorin, 'Hobbes's Early Philosophical Development', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 54 (1993): 505–18.

17. See K. Schuhmann, 'Le *Short Tract*, première oeuvre philosophique de Hobbes', *Hobbes Studies* 8 (1995): 3–36.

18. See Henry Hardy's editorial preface to Isaiah Berlin, *The Magus of the North: J. G. Hamann and the Origins of Modern Irrationalism* (London, 1993), p. x.

19. In my 'Rameau, Rousseau and the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 117 (1974): 179–238. Working independently, Marie-Élisabeth Duchez incorporated a transcription of the same text in her '*Principe de la mélodie et Origine des langues: Un brouillon inédit de Rousseau sur l'origine de la mélodie*', *Revue de musicologie* 60 (1974): 33–86. The material we each transcribed from Ms R 60 of the Bibliothèque de la Ville de Neuchâtel now figures in vol. 5 of the Pléiade edition of the *Oeuvres complètes de Rousseau*, published in 1995 and edited by Duchez, as *L'Origine de la mélodie*. The only complete transcription of Ms R 60 can be found as an appendix to my Oxford D. Phil dissertation, published as *Rousseau on Society, Politics, Music and Language* (New York, 1987), pp. 435–501.

20. By Théophile Dufour in his posthumously published *Recherches bibliographiques sur les oeuvres imprimées de Rousseau* (Paris, 1925), vol. 2, pp. 179–80, where the text is described as a '3e cahier' in connection with Rousseau's *Examen de deux principes*, under its former classification number 7877.

21. According to Rousseau's own 'Projet de préface' (Neuchâtel Ms R 91) designed to introduce a collection of three of his works in one volume. For an account of the genesis of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* in the light of *Du principe de la mélodie*, see especially ch. 5 of my *Rousseau on Society, Politics, Music and Language*, pp. 294–326. The significance of the manuscript for an understanding of both the *Discours sur l'inégalité* and the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* is considered at length by Charles Porset in 'L' "inquiétante étrangeté" de l'*Essai sur l'origine des langues*: Rousseau et ses exégètes', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 154 (1976): 1715–58, and by me in 'L'*Essai sur l'origine des langues* en tant que fragment du *Discours sur l'inégalité*: Rousseau et ses "mauvais" interprètes', in M. Launay (ed.), *Rousseau et Voltaire en 1978* (Geneva, 1981), pp. 145–69.

22. See John Plamenatz, *Man and Society*, rev. ed. (London, 1992), vol. 1, ch. 5, pp. 172–215.

23. Some of the papers pertaining to Monboddo in public and private archives which I have managed to photocopy over the years, including his correspondence with Lord Lyttelton which once formed part of the Hagueley MSS in the Birmingham Reference Library, have been dispersed and may now be difficult to trace. Such material informs, for instance, my essay, 'Apes and Races in the Scottish Enlightenment: Monboddo and Kames on the Nature of Man', in Peter Jones (ed.), *Philosophy and Science in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1988), pp. 145–68.

24. See Rousseau, *Emile*, ed. and trans. Allan Bloom (New York, 1979), Notes, preface, n. 4, p. 481.

25. See Masson's Rousseau, *La 'Profession de foi du Vicaire savoyard'*, édition critique, d'après les Manuscrits de Genève, Neuchâtel et Paris, avec une introduction et un commentaire historiques (Fribourg and Paris, 1914), and *La Religion de Rousseau*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1916).

26. See Rousseau, *Emile* (manuscript Favre), in *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–95) (hereafter: OC), vol. 4, pp. 218–19 and 1283; Rousseau to Jean-Antoine Compagret, around 10 September 1762, in R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau* (Geneva, Banbury and Oxford, 1965–98), no. 2147, vol. 13, pp. 37 and 43; and Rousseau, *Lettres de la montagne*, Première Lettre, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 693 and 1585 [LWM 138].

27. See Rousseau, *Julie, ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*, Cinquième Partie, Lettre 3, in OC, vol. 2, pp. 563–65 and 1672–73 [J 463–65 and 708].

28. See Rousseau, *Emile* II, in OC, vol. 4, pp. 323–24 [E 93].

29. I have here in mind Tully's *Locke in Contexts*.

30. See Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, book IV, ch. 3 §6, and book IV, ch. 10 §10.

31. Particularly by John Yolton in *Thinking Matter: Materialism in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Minneapolis, c. 1984) and in *Locke and French Materialism* (Oxford, 1991).

32. This essay is distilled from a paper I prepared for the Oxford Political Thought Conference at New College in 1994 and draws a few fragments from other writings, including my 'Past Masters' *Rousseau*, first published by the Oxford University Press in 1995. I am grateful to Quentin Skinner for bringing Schuhmann's work on Hobbes's *Short Tract* to my attention, and to Janet Coleman for her comments on an earlier draft of the essay and for her forbearance.

#### CHAPTER 9: PREPARING THE DEFINITIVE EDITION OF THE CORRESPONDANCE DE ROUSSEAU

1. That is, including the drafts and fragments which Leigh identifies as 'manuscripts'.

2. Bacsko, *Lumières de l'utopie* (Paris, 1978), part vii, p. 404.

3. Prepared by Janet Laming, Leigh's assistant since 1979. [Fifty-two volumes in total, including the index, were published by 1998.]

4. 'Rousseau's Correspondence: Editorial Problems', in J. A. Dainard (ed.), *Editing Correspondence*, papers given at the fourteenth annual conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 3–4 November 1978, (New York, 1979), pp. 39–40.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 40–42.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 45–46.

7. Bibliothèque publique et universitaire de Genève (Geneva, BPU), Mss fr. 3852–58 embrace the published texts of Rousseau's correspondence on which both Dufour and Plan made their annotations.

8. The *Correspondance générale de Rousseau* cites occasional corrections to the Musset-Pathay edition; the Lequien edition of the texts which the editors used most is in fact identical with that of Musset-Pathay.

9. I owe the bulk of this information about the editions Dufour pasted down to Charles Wirz, to whom I am profoundly grateful for the time he has devoted on my behalf, when he had none to spare.

10. Cf., for instance, the Dufour-Plan annotation to Rousseau's letter to Coidet of 13 August 1767 (D-P 3446, CC, no. 6022), and the conspicuous absence of such annotation for Mirabeau's letter to Rousseau of 30 July 1767 (D-P 3429, CC, no. 5998), bowdlerized to a far greater extent by Streckeisen-Moulou.

11. Plan, foreword to the *Correspondance générale de Rousseau*, 20 vols. (Paris, 1924–34), vol. 1, p. viii ['Dufour left no precise indication about his intentions; his prodigious activity was limited to the hunt for materials, and he did not explain what he intended to do with them'].

12. Plan's name does not appear there, though he is credited with occasional notes and with the supplementary table, published in 1953.

13. In the published discussion following Leigh's 'Vers une nouvelle édition de la Correspondance de Rousseau', *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* 35 (1959–62): 282. This text deals mainly with editorial matters arising from the original documents, as does the 'Communication de M. R. A. Leigh', in *Les éditions de correspondances*, Publications de la société d'histoire littéraire de la France (Paris, 1969), pp. 20–29. Gagnebin paints a rather more complimentary portrait of Plan in his introduction to the table of the *Correspondance générale de Rousseau*.

14. For a detailed account of the aborted negotiations of François and the Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau with Hélène Pittard-Dufour (herself a writer under the pseudonym Noëlle Roger), see *L'Affaire des papiers Dufour et la Correspondance de J. J. Rousseau* by Alexis François (Paris, 1923) and, with the same title, by Pittard-Dufour (Geneva, 1923). I have consulted the copies lodged at the Institut et Musée Voltaire in Geneva. The original correspondence between these two protagonists, together with other pertinent letters, can be found in Geneva, BPU Ms fr. 4065 (see especially fols. 21, 34–35, 93–101, 104–14, 118–19, 123–25, 128–31 and 133–36).

15. 'Fifty years a bookman', the Arundell Esdaile lecture 1973 (London, 1974), p. 6.

16. *Modern Language Review* 49 (1954): 239. This remark actually pertains to Besterman's edition of *Voltaire's Notebooks*, 2 vols. (Geneva, 1952), which Leigh assesses in the same review.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 240, 241n, 242 and 244. Such comments can hardly have endeared Leigh to the editor of 'the biggest project of its kind ever published or even

attempted', as Besterman described his work, notwithstanding his avowal of modesty to the effect that 'the first person singular is not my favourite pronoun'—see his 'Twenty Thousand Voltaire Letters', in D. I. B. Smith (ed.), *Editing Eighteenth-Century Texts* (Toronto, 1968), p. 7.

18. In his opening lines, Besterman states, 'This is high comedy. I made no reply to your review, and you now complain of the mere fact that I expressed, very indirectly, disapproval of it!' His irritation at Leigh's comments is abundantly clear: 'You say in your letter that it cannot be seriously contended that your review is biased [sic] or malicious. You are mistaken. I have received several letters, in which the least unamiable epithet applied to it is "acerb"'.

19. 'For many years now', Leigh wrote to Besterman on 20 October 1956, 'I have been toying with the idea of doing Rousseau's *Correspondance* afresh, but I never thought of it as really imminent'. This holograph letter is to be found only at the Voltaire Foundation.

20. As is most evident from Besterman's antecedent letter of 31 May 1965, the main source of his irritation was Leigh's independent search for grants, 'solely for your own benefit', when he ought above all to be making some gesture to reimburse his publisher, 'so heavily out of pocket' on his behalf. Besterman himself had been profoundly irritated at never having been 'able to obtain any financial help from any foundation towards the cost of publication' of his own work, no doubt partly on account of his lack of an academic post (see 'Twenty Thousand Voltaire Letters', p. 9, and also 'Communication de M. Besterman', in *Les éditions de correspondances*, p. 8). In his reply of 3 June 1965, Leigh attempted to put his own 'side of the picture'—a picture of debilitating debts and of a family unable to take holidays, on account of his almost full-time devotion to research, whose scale had prompted his request for a change in the terms of his fellowship so as to reduce the number of his teaching hours but also, in consequence, his total stipend.

21. In the meanwhile he had received another letter from Leigh dated 12 June 1965, announcing that the Trinity College Council had made 'a generous and substantial grant in aid of my excess author's corrections. . . . God bless Henry VIII and the Senior Bursar. I am enclosing my cheque for £148.40, being the sterling equivalent of Sw. fr. 1803.40'.

22. 'You have already done more than all the other members of the committee together', wrote Besterman to Leigh on 23 May 1956. Leigh's name first appears among the members of the advisory committee of Voltaire's *Correspondence* in vol. 17. He was to join the advisory committee of the definitive edition in 1974, with vol. 33 (vol. 117 of *The Complete Works of Voltaire*).

23. I have consulted the copy of this letter lodged at the Institut et Musée Voltaire in Geneva.

24. For Besterman's own account of his reasons, see his 1968 preface to vol. 1 of the definitive edition (*The Complete Works of Voltaire*, vol. 85), pp. xi–xiii. Even so, as Besterman makes plain in 'Twenty Thousand Voltaire letters', p. 11, he

could not have begun to contemplate an edition of Voltaire's correspondence in the manner of Leigh: 'If every reference which could bear explanation had in fact been annotated, the entire publication would have run, at a guess, to three hundred volumes . . . that . . . could never have been undertaken or, if undertaken, could never have been completed'.

25. 'Boswell and Rousseau', *Modern Language Review* 47 (1952): 317. Unless otherwise indicated, the Leigh-Besterman exchanges cited here are in typescript, lodged in both Oxford and Cambridge—the Leigh originals at the Voltaire Foundation and the Besterman originals with the estate of R. A. Leigh. I am very grateful to Andrew Brown and John Leigh for making these documents available to me, for permitting me to publish material from them, and for their assistance in other matters. I am also indebted to Janet Laming, now completing the index to the Leigh edition of the *Correspondance complète de Rousseau* [completed 1998], for much useful information about certain papers; to Derek Beales, for uncovering typographical errors; and above all, as indicated above (see n. 9), to Charles Wirz, Director of the Institut et Musée Voltaire and Secretary of the Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Geneva, for his permission to refer to Besterman's letter to Khrushchev and for his generous assistance, so frequently extended to me, over many years. Earlier versions of this text were presented at a London meeting of the Johnson Club in December 1990 and at the Bristol Congress of the Enlightenment in July 1991. The first section (pp. 3–6) also figures in the proceedings of that Congress, under the title, 'Taking Stock of the Leigh Edition of the *Correspondance de Rousseau*', *Studies on Voltaire* 305 (Oxford, 1992): 1807–11.

[WHEN

- WHEN an author finds himself separated from his editor by six thousand kilometres of ocean, it is normal for him to want to know if his messages reach their destination.
- WHEN an author hands in a manuscript to his editor in June and November is almost up without his having received any proofs, it is normal that he is a bit anxious, above all if, at the cost of a thousand efforts and a thousand sacrifices, he has arranged to correct the proofs before his imminent return to Europe, and this precisely to save money for said editor.
- WHEN an author has changes to request, it is normal that he would want to know where the typographers are, precisely so as to have them done at the least cost or without annoying his editor with demands that are impossible to meet.
- WHEN an author thought to notice, in the second and last proof of a work (which, rest assured, is not just a useful work but also a beautiful book) some typographical oddities which spoil the looks of it, it is normal that he points them out to his editor, and that he waits to receive comments about this.

WHEN an author, weighed down by work and correspondence, without a secretary and not knowing where to turn, writes politely to his editor to ask him the reason for his strange silence, he does not expect to receive from said editor a very curt note that tells him nothing, dictated by a secretary who could not be up to date about these things, and signed by her.]

#### CHAPTER 10: ROUSSEAU'S TWO CONCEPTS OF LIBERTY

1. See Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy* (London, 1946), p. 711; and T. D. Weldon, 'Political Principles', in Peter Laslett (ed.), *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, First Series (Oxford, 1956), p. 32.

2. See Bertrand de Jouvenel, 'Essai sur la politique de Rousseau', in his edition of the *Contrat social* (Geneva, 1947), p. 95.

3. See Isaiah Berlin, 'Two Concepts of Liberty', in his *Four Essays on Liberty* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 118–72. This immensely influential essay has been the subject of widespread debate in British and American political thought since its first publication in 1958. Much of the criticism to which it has been subjected comes from scholars who contend that there is and has always been only one fundamental concept of (negative) liberty, and not two. I share some critics' misgivings about certain aspects of Berlin's argument, but I am as convinced as ever that there are two concepts, and two main traditions of thought, at issue, and I have no hesitation here in adopting Berlin's general distinction as my own, and hence in my choice of title. I am particularly persuaded by his claim that the doctrine of negative liberty is comparatively modern and that Constant prized it most of all (see Berlin's Introduction, p. xlv). The concept of negative liberty that I associate here with Rousseau, however, does not really form part of the tradition of thought which Berlin has embraced under that concept, for the reasons explained in this section of my essay. I have also treated the subject before, in a different context, in my 'Rousseau's Perfectibilian Libertarianism', in Alan Ryan (ed.), *The Idea of Freedom: Essays in Honour of Isaiah Berlin* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 233–52.

4. See Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ch. 21 (Oxford, 1960), p. 140.

5. See Robert Derathé, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et la science politique de son temps* (Paris, 1950).

6. See, for instance, Carole Pateman, *Participation and Democratic Theory* (Cambridge, 1970). It should be acknowledged, however, that Pateman focuses her attention upon Rousseau's status as the foremost theorist of democratic participation and remarks upon his idea of liberty more briefly.

7. See 'Some Aspects of the History of Freedom', in Cranston's *The Mask of Politics* (London, 1973), p. 32.

8. In the passage of the *Leviathan* already cited (see n. 4 above), Hobbes must surely have had Machiavelli uppermost in his mind when disposing of the



'discourse of those that [from the histories and philosophy of the ancient Greeks and Romans] had received all their learning in the politics'. Quentin Skinner, from whom I have drawn the greatest inspiration both here and in general, takes a wholly different view of Machiavelli's conception of liberty, identifying it in what he takes to be its ordinary negative sense of independence from constraints, which, for Machiavelli, however, required the exercise of positive liberty for its attainment. See Skinner's 'Machiavelli on the Maintenance of Liberty', *Politics* 18 (1983): 3–15, and 'The Idea of Negative Liberty', in Richard Rorty, J. B. Schneewind, and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Philosophy in History* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 193–221.

9. Constant's famous discourse, *De la liberté des anciens comparée à celle des modernes*, dates from 1819.

10. See J. L. Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (London, 1955), pp. 38–50.

11. See especially Rousseau, 'Préface de *Narcisse*', vol. 2, p. 972 [PN 103–04]; the 'Dernière réponse [à Bordes]', vol. 3, p. 95 [LR 84]; and *Emile* III, vol. 4, p. 468 [E 194] in *Oeuvres complètes* [hereafter OC], ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–[95]); and Rousseau to the Comtesse de Wartensleben, 27 September 1766, in R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau* (Geneva, Banbury and Oxford, 1965–[98]), no. 5450, vol. 30, pp. 384–88.

12. It is worth noting that in his *Cours de politique constitutionnelle* and elsewhere, Constant identified both Hobbes and Rousseau as purveyors of despotism on account of their shared conception, on his reading, of the absolute sovereignty of the people. The similarity between his own contrast of ancient and modern liberty and that of Hobbes did not, so far as I am aware, attract his notice, perhaps in part because his distinction portrayed ancient liberty as practically unsuited to modern society, rather than as philosophically meaningless. *De la liberté des anciens comparée à celle des modernes* even ends with a plea for the reconciliation of both sorts of liberty, the one in its isolation judged incompatible with individual freedom, the other held to threaten the exercise of our right to participate in public affairs.

13. See, above all, Rousseau, *Emile* I, in OC, vol. 4, p. 245 [E 37] and *Rousseau, juge de Jean-Jacques*, Troisième Dialogue, in OC, vol. 3, p. 934 [RJ 213].

14. I have pursued this subject at greater length in my 'Rousseau and Marx', in David Miller and Larry Siedentop (eds.), *The Nature of Political Theory* (Oxford, 1983) pp. 219–46. Some lines here, in the previous paragraph, and in the paragraph that follows, are adapted from that text.

15. See Rousseau's *Lettre à d'Alembert sur les spectacles*, ed. M. Fuchs (Bordeaux, 1968), pp. 154–55. Allan Bloom's English edition of this text [LD], under the title *Politics and the Arts* (Glencoe, 1960), provides an invaluable guide to the place of Rousseau's philosophy of the theatre in his politics.

16. See Rousseau's *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ed. Charles Porset (Bordeaux, 1970), ch. 20, pp. 197–201 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 428–29; EOL 298–99]. For an account

of the place of Rousseau's philosophy of music in the context of his political theory, see my 'Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution', in R. F. Brissenden and J. C. Eade (eds.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century* 4 (Canberra, 1979), pp. 251–83.

17. See especially Rousseau, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, Sixième Promenade, in OC, vol. 1, p. 1052 [R 96]; the *Contrat social* I.8 and II.7, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 364–65 and 381–82 [SC 53–54, 68–70]; and *Emile* I, in OC, vol. 4, p. 249 [E 39–40]. On the subject of mankind's denaturation in society, as Rousseau perceived that development, see especially Michèle Ansart-Dourlen's *Dénaturation et violence dans la pensée de J.-J. Rousseau* (Paris, 1975).

18. To my mind, it is the insufficient attention paid to this fundamental distinction between our natural and political existence which mars John Charvet's otherwise extremely perceptive *The Social Problem in the Philosophy of Rousseau* (Cambridge, 1974). For an exchange of views about it, see Charvet's 'Rousseau and the Ideal of Community' and my 'Reply to Charvet', in *History of Political Thought* 1.1 (1980): 69–90.

19. Rousseau, *Emile* II, in OC, vol. 4, p. 311 [E 85–86]. A notable discussion of this passage, and its place in Rousseau's conception of natural discipline, can be found in the second chapter of John W. Chapman's *Rousseau—Totalitarian or Liberal?* (New York, 1956), still an illuminating treatment of the whole of Rousseau's political and social thought around the themes at issue here.

20. For Rousseau's praise of *Robinson Crusoe* as a most useful book of natural education, see especially *Emile* III, in OC, vol. 4, pp. 454–55 [E 184–85]].

21. Above all, Lester Crocker in vol. 2, ch. 4 of his comprehensive biography, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (New York, 1968, 1973). For, in my judgement, a more perceptive account of the relation between Emile and his tutor, see Judith N. Shklar's, 'Rousseau's Images of Authority', in Maurice Cranston and Richard S. Peters (eds.), *Hobbes and Rousseau* (New York, 1972), pp. 333–65.

22. See, for instance, Rousseau, *Emile* IV, in OC, vol. 4, p. 661 [E 332].

23. See Rousseau's *Emile et Sophie* and Pierre Burgelin's introduction, in OC, vol. 4, pp. clxiii–clxvi and 879–924 [ES 685–721].

24. See especially Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 134–35 and 141–42 [DI 134–35, 140–41].

25. I have dealt with some of the material in the next five paragraphs in the second and third section of my 'Rousseau's Perfectibilian Libertarianism', from which a number of sentences are recapitulated here.

26. See Berlin's 'Historical Inevitability', in *Four Essays on Liberty*, especially pp. 63–66 and 73–75, and the introduction, pp. xiii–xxv. Of course for Berlin the most appropriate (although not exclusive) place in which to identify Rousseau's main conceptions of freedom is in the tradition of positive liberty, not least because of Rousseau's conjunction of liberty with sovereignty. But I think it is worth noting how much closer to Berlin Rousseau appears with regard to the subject of determinism, on which Berlin parts company from the foremost philosopher of negative liberty, Hobbes.

27. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité* (OC, vol. 3, p. 193 [DI 187]). This idea can be found in different formulations throughout Rousseau's writings. For an excellent interpretation of his account of the social life we lead outside ourselves, see Jean Starobinski's classic *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: La transparence et l'obstacle*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1971), chs. 1–3.

28. See de Sade's *La Nouvelle Justine, ou Les Malheurs de la vertu*, in his *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1966–67), vol. 7, p. 37.

29. See Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité*, the *Manuscrit de Genève* I.2, and the 'Etat de guerre', in OC, vol. 3, pp. 184, 288 and 610 [DI 179, GM 159]; and *Emile* IV (OC, vol. 4, p. 524 [E 235–36]).

30. See Rousseau's *Confessions* IX (OC, vol. 1, pp. 404–05 [C 377]); his 'Préface de *Narcisse*', in OC, vol. 2, p. 969 [PN 101]; and his *Discours sur l'économie politique*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 251 [PE 12].

31. Rousseau, *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 966 [P 189]. In his *Lumières de l'utopie* (Paris, 1978), ch. 2, Bronislaw Baczko provides an extraordinary interpretation of the utopian vision of Rousseau's *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*.

32. Rousseau, *Contrat social* I.8, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 364–65 [SC 53–54]. See also Rousseau's *Manuscrit de Genève* I.2, in OC, vol. 3, p. 283 [GM 154].

33. L. G. Crocker, *Rousseau's 'Social Contract': An Interpretive Essay* (Cleveland, 1968), pp. 30, 61.

34. For a discussion of these passages, see Derathé's *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et la science politique de son temps*, pp. 151–71.

35. In the introduction to his own edition of Rousseau's *Social Contract*, reprinted in *The Mask of Politics* (see p. 73).

36. See Plamenatz, 'Ce qui ne signifie autre chose sinon qu'on le forcera d'être libre', in *Hobbes and Rousseau*, pp. 318–32.

37. Rousseau's account of the substitution, in incremental stages, of the sovereign by the government in the Republic of Geneva bears some comparison with Trotsky's later charge, in *Our Political Tasks*, that Lenin's theory of party organization would give rise, in due course, to the substitution of the Social Democratic Party for the revolutionary proletariat, followed by a Central Committee substituted for the party, and then a dictator for the Central Committee.

38. It should be noted that there has been much academic controversy about the nature and extent of the Genevan inspiration for Rousseau's *Contrat social*, with several scholars regarding that link as relatively insignificant by comparison with natural law and other philosophical sources. The principal evidence for the connection appears in several passages of the *Lettres de la montagne*, among them Rousseau's remark there (Sixième Lettre, in OC, vol. 3, p. 810 [LWM 233–34]) that in the *Contrat social* he had not written about utopian chimeras but about an existing object, bearing witness against the outrage soon to be committed in his native city. It was for this reason, he supposed, that it was in Geneva but nowhere else that the *Contrat social* had been banned and burnt. Rousseau's account of

Genevan history in the *Lettres de la montagne*, nevertheless, is problematic, while the connection between the absolute sovereign of the *Contrat social* (from which no one is specifically excluded) and the Conseil Général described in the *Lettres* (which embraced by right only a fraction of the adult population of Geneva) remains similarly unclear. According to some of his critics, Rousseau's reflections on Geneva portray him as much less democratic than might be inferred from his remarks on popular sovereignty in the *Contrat social*, although it should be borne in mind that he speaks of democracy in the *Contrat* (mainly in III.4) just as a (defective) form of government and not as a (perfect) form of sovereignty. On this much documented subject, see especially R. A. Leigh, 'Le *Contrat social*, oeuvre genevoise?', *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* 39 (1972–77): 93–111.

39. Rousseau, *Jugement sur la Polysynodie* (*Ecrits sur l'abbé de Saint-Pierre*), in OC, vol. 3, p. 643 [JPS 97].

40. See also Rousseau's fragmentary 'Parallèle entre les deux républiques de Sparte et de Rome', in OC, vol. 3, p. 538–43.

41. See the *Contrat social* III.15, in OC, vol. 3, p. 429 [SC 113]. Cf. the *Projet de Constitution pour la Corse* and the *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 929 and 1004 [PCC; P 224–25].

42. I leave aside the Italian term *indipendenza* and its derivatives, which throughout the history of their relatively modern usage have had a more specialized meaning in political discourse than 'liberty'. I also leave aside such German negations as *Ungebundenheit* and *Unabhängigkeit*, which can hardly be said to have had a resounding impact upon the literature of freedom.

43. This is not the place to undertake a history of Western philosophy, but perhaps Kant's contrast between 'die Freiheit im innern Gebrauche' and 'die Freiheit im äußern Gebrauche', may serve to illustrate my point. Among Rousseau's followers who have conceived his distinction as one between our 'higher' and 'lower' liberty, mention should at least be made of Bosanquet and his *Philosophical Theory of the State*.

44. For an introduction to this still relatively unexplored subject in the history of ideas, see Sergio Moravia's "'Moral"—"physique": genesis and evolution of a "rapport"', in Alfred J. Bingham and Virgil W. Topazio (eds.), *Enlightenment Studies in Honour of Lester G. Crocker* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 163–74. Moravia focuses his attention mainly upon late eighteenth-century contrasts of the two terms.

45. Rousseau, *Contrat social* III.1 (OC, vol. 3, p. 395 [SC 82]). See also, for instance, the *Discours sur l'inégalité* (OC, vol. 3, p. 157 [DI 154–55]) and the *Contrat social* I.3 (OC, vol. 3, p. 354 [SC 43–44]).

46. See Maurice Cranston, *Jean-Jacques: The Early Life and Work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1754)* (London, 1983).

47. About Rousseau's concept of the legislator—even just in connection with his doctrine of liberty—a good deal more needs to be said than space here permits. I have already abused my share, and must leave the subject for another occasion.

A superb discussion of the concept can be found in Bronislaw Baczko's 'Moïse, législateur . . .', in Simon Harvey et al. (eds.), *Reappraisals of Rousseau: Studies in Honour of R. A. Leigh* (Manchester, 1980), pp. 111–30.

48. This essay was written too late to benefit from any of the comments and criticism I should have sought from colleagues and friends. As well as from Maurice Cranston and William Pickles, however, who together first excited my interest in Rousseau twenty years ago when I was at the London School of Economics, I have drawn much inspiration from the writings of one woman and three men in particular—Judith Shklar, Bronislaw Baczko, Jean Starobinski and, above all, Ralph Leigh. I now see that I should have benefited too, from reading James Miller's *Rousseau: Dreamer of Democracy* (New Haven, 1984), but my text was sent to press before I could take stock of that work. Stephen Holmes's *Benjamin Constant and the Making of Modern Liberalism* (New Haven, 1984) also appeared too late for me to consult it. I am grateful to the Master and Fellows of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, for enabling me to write the essay there during the 1984 Michaelmas Term.

#### CHAPTER 11: THE ENLIGHTENMENT AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTIONARY BIRTH PANGS OF MODERNITY

1. Notable introductions to these themes, and to the already vast and ever expanding literature about them, can be found in the contributions to this volume [Johan Heilbron, Lars Magnusson and Björn Wittrock (eds.), *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity: Conceptual Change in Context, 1750–1850*, Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook 20 (Dordrecht, 1998)] of Éric Brian, Randall Collins and Michael Donnelly; and in Peter Wagner, Björn Wittrock and Richard Whitley (eds.), *Discourses on Society*, Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook 15 (Dordrecht, 1991), most particularly in the essays there by John Gunnell ('Political Science as an Emerging Discipline in the U.S.', pp. 123–62) and Malcolm Vout ('Oxford and the Emergence of Political Science in England, 1945–1960', pp. 163–91).

2. See Jacob Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (London, 1952); Lester Crocker, *Nature and Culture: Ethical Thought in the French Enlightenment* (Baltimore, 1963); Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (Notre Dame, 1981); John Gray, *Enlightenment's Wake: Politics and Culture at the Close of the Modern Age* (London, 1995); Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialektik der Aufklärung* (Amsterdam, 1947); and Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge, 1989).

3. For Koselleck's account of such changes, see especially his *Kritik und Krise* (Freiburg, 1959) and his collection of essays dating from 1965 to 1977, *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt, 1979). He frequently objects that he has been misunderstood, however, and in seminars and

private discussions over many years he has suggested that he never had in mind any generalized notion of a *Sattelzeit* at all. For Foucault's perspective on the conceptual metamorphoses of the same period, see *Les mots et les choses* (Paris, 1966). The central themes of these texts are usefully summarized by Keith Tribe, in the introduction to his translation of *Vergangene Zukunft*, under the title, *Futures Past* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), on the one hand; and by Pamela Major-Poetzl, in *Michel Foucault's Archeology of Western Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1983), on the other.

4. The seven volumes of the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (Stuttgart, 1972–92) have been edited by the late Otto Bruner and Werner Conze as well as Koselleck, but it is Koselleck in particular who has been the work's principal guiding spirit since its inception. On the general methodology of *Begriffsgeschichte* in the manner in which he has pursued it, see especially Koselleck (ed.), *Historische Semantik und Begriffsgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1979); and Melvin Richter, 'Begriffsgeschichte and the History of Ideas', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987): 247–63, and *The History of Political and Social Concepts: A Critical Introduction* (New York, 1995). For an account of how the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century *Sattelzeit*, or pivotal period, of linguistic, political and social change in Germany, as he conceived it, marks the advent of a new epoch in its history and thus informs the structure of the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* as an historical lexicon, see Koselleck's own introduction to vol. 1, especially pp. xiv–xvi. In several of the essays of his *Vergangene Zukunft*, Koselleck stresses the importance of the emergence of new words, and of changing linguistic fashion, as encapsulating a perceptible ideological shift to a *neue Zeit* or even *Neuzeit* of modernity, for instance in the terminological displacement of *Historie* by *Geschichte* in German historical writing and discourse from around 1750. But just on account of their political and social ramifications, the pivotal linguistic and conceptual changes which he depicts do not lend themselves to compression or precise dating within a short span of years. The *Sattelzeit* of modernity traced in his writings sometimes appears to embrace the period from around 1770 to 1800 or 1830 rather than from 1750 to 1850, and occasionally it seems to have been initiated as early as 1700. In *Das Zeitalter der europäischen Revolution* (Frankfurt, 1969), a work produced collectively by Koselleck with Louis Bergeron and François Furet, the period portrayed as forming the nexus of Europe's modern political and social history extends from 1780 to 1848.

5. The first known appearance in print of the word *perfectibilité* is in Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité* of 1755. On the earliest uses of the word *civilisation* around the same time, see especially Jean Starobinski, 'Le mot *civilisation*', originally published in *Le Temps de la réflexion* in 1983, reprinted in his collection of essays, *Le remède dans le mal* (Paris, 1989).

6. With respect to the pivotal significance, for Foucault, of the year 1795, see *Les mots et les choses*, pp. 238 and 263. In *Power/Knowledge*, explaining his notion of historical discontinuity, he contends that 'the great biological image of a progressive maturation of science . . . does not seem to me to be pertinent to

history'. Pointing to medicine's 'gradual transformation, within a period of twenty-five or thirty years', around the end of the eighteenth century, he remarks that there were not just new discoveries: 'There is a whole new "regime" in discourse and forms of knowledge. And all this happens in the space of a few years'; Paul Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (London, 1984), p. 54. See also Foucault's more general delineation of an age of Enlightenment, again associated predominantly with the last decades of the eighteenth century, and including not only new regimes of science but also the establishment of capitalism and a new political order, in 'Qu'est-ce que la critique? [Critique et *Aufklärung*]', *Bulletin de la Société française de philosophie* 84 (1990): 35–63. With respect to the doctrines of the *idéologues*, dating as well from the 1790s, see especially vol. 8 (*La Conscience révolutionnaire: Les idéologues*), published in 1978, of Georges Gusdorf, *Les Sciences humaines et la pensée occidentale*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1966–78); Sergio Moravia, *Il pensiero degli ideologues: scienza e filosofia in Francia (1780–1815)* (Florence, 1974); Emmet Kennedy, *A Philosopher in the Age of Revolution: Destutt de Tracy and the Origins of 'Ideology'* (Philadelphia, 1978); Martin S. Staum, *Cabanis and Medical Philosophy in the French Revolution* (Princeton, 1980); Cheryl Welch, *Liberty and Utility: The French Ideologues and the Transformation of Liberalism* (New York, 1984); and Brian Head, *Ideology and Social Science: Destutt de Tracy and French Liberalism* (Dordrecht, 1985). All recent commentators on this subject owe a debt to the seminal work of François Picavet, *Les Idéologues* (Paris, 1891).

7. See especially the writings of Baker, Forsyth, Head and Hont cited in notes 9, 11, 14, 28 and 35 below.

8. See, for instance, Gladys Bryson, *Man and Society: The Scottish Inquiry of the Eighteenth Century* (Princeton, 1945); Katherine Faull (ed.), *Anthropology and the German Enlightenment* (Lewisburg, Kentucky, 1995); Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich (eds.), *The Enlightenment in National Context* (Cambridge, 1988); and John Redwood, *Reason, Ridicule and Religion: The Age of Enlightenment in England, 1660–1750* (London, 1976).

9. See Sieyès, *Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état?*, ed. Robert Zappieri (Geneva, 1970), p. 151. In all subsequent editions, for *la science sociale* Sieyès substituted the expression *la science de l'ordre social*. His inaugural use of the term is noted by Brian Head in 'The Origins of "La Science sociale" in France, 1770–1800', *Australian Journal of French Studies* 19 (1982): 115–32.

10. See the Bibliothèque publique et universitaire de Genève, ms. Dumont 45, fol. 19. Dumont reports of Sieyès that he hardly sees anyone else in the world but himself: 'Il auroit voulu trouver une douzaine de personnes qui voulussent approfondir avec lui l'art social, c'est à dire qu'il lui falloit des Apôtres, car il a dit en propres termes que la politique étoit une science qu'il croyoit avoir achevée' ['He would have liked to find a dozen people to deepen the art of the social with him, meaning that he needed only Apostles, since he said in so many words that politics was a science that he thought had been completed']. The passage is cited



by J. Bénétruy in *L'Atelier de Mirabeau: Quatre proscrire genevois dans la tourment révolutionnaire* (Paris, 1962), p. 399.

11. For these earliest recorded references to the term *science sociale*, see especially Keith Baker, 'The Early History of the Term "Social Science"', *Annals of Science* 20 (1964): 211–26; Baker, *Condorcet: From Natural Philosophy to Social Mathematics* (Chicago, 1975), pp. 391–95; Head, 'The Origins of "La Science sociale" in France'; and my 'Saint-Simon and the Passage from Political to Social Science', in Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 325–38. On the term's English adaptation from the French in early nineteenth-century socialist writings, in the first instance apparently by William Thompson in 1824, see Gregory Claeys, "Individualism", "Socialism", and "Social Science", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47 (1986): 81–93. On the history of the *Société de 1789*, see Augustin Challamel, *Les Clubs contre-révolutionnaires* (Paris, 1895), and Baker, 'Politics and Social Science in Eighteenth-Century France: "the Société de 1789"', in J. F. Bosher (ed.), *French Government and Society, 1500–1850* (London, 1973), pp. 208–30.

12. See de Tracy, *Commentaire sur l'Esprit des lois' de Montesquieu* (Paris, 1819), p. vii.

13. The suggestion that Volney in particular anticipated the *Annales* school, by virtue of the global historical approach he adopted in his *Leçons d'histoire* (delivered at the *École normale* in 1795 and first published in 1800), has been made by Staum in a notable discussion of the *idéologues'* influence upon the French educational curriculum in the period 1795–1802 (see his 'Human, Not Secular Sciences: Ideology in the Central Schools', *Historical Reflections* 12 [1985]: 72). On the influence especially of the *Classe des sciences morales et politiques*, but also of other classes of the *Institut national* over the same period, see also Jules Simon, *Une Académie sous le Directoire* (Paris, 1885); Staum, 'The Class of Moral and Political Sciences, 1795–1803', *French Historical Studies* 11 (1980): 371–97; 'Images of Paternal Power: Intellectuals and Social Change in the French National Institute', *Canadian Journal of History* 17 (1982): 422–44; 'The Enlightenment Transformed: The Institute Prize Contests', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 19 (1985–86): 153–79; 'The Institute Historians: Enlightenment and Conservatism', *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History* 13 (1986): 122–30; 'Individual Rights and Social Control: Political Science in the French Institute', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987): 411–30; 'Human Geography in the French Institute', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 23 (1987): 332–40; 'The Public Relations of the Second Class of the Institute in the Revolutionary Era, 1795–1803', *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History* 16 (1989): 212–22; "Analysis of Sensations and Ideas" in the French National Institute (1795–1803)', *Canadian Journal of History* 26 (1991): 393–413; and *Minerva's Message: Stabilizing the French Revolution* (Montreal, 1996).

14. See Baker, *Condorcet*, especially pp. 302, 371–72 and 388–90. Simon, in *Une Académie sous le Directoire*, stresses that the establishment of a *Classe des sciences morales et politiques* had been a deeply cherished ideal of Mirabeau and Talleyrand as well as Condorcet.

15. Diverse treatments of this theme can be found in Pierre Ansart, *La Sociologie de Saint-Simon* (Paris, 1970); Robert Carlisle, *The Proffered Crown: Saint-Simonianism and the Doctrine of Hope* (Baltimore, 1987); Henri Gouhier, *La Jeunesse d'Auguste Comte et la formation du positivisme*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1933–41); Frank Manuel, *The Prophets of Paris* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962); W. Jay Reedy, 'The Historical Imaginary of Social Science in Post Revolutionary France: Bonald, Saint-Simon, Comte', *History of the Human Sciences* 7 (1994): 1–26; Steven Seidman, *Liberalism and the Origins of European Social Theory* (Oxford, 1983); and Robert Spaemann, *Der Ursprung der Soziologie aus dem Geist der Restauration* (Munich, 1959).

16. Pope, *An Essay on Man*, Epistle III, lines 303–04. Much of what comprises the second section of this essay, as well as some material from the fifth section, is developed from my 'Saint-Simon and the Passage from Political to Social Science'. See also Baker, 'Closing the French Revolution: Saint-Simon and Comte', in François Furet and Mona Ozouf (eds.), *The Transformation of Political Culture*, vol. 3 of Furet et al. (eds.), *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture, 1789–1848* (Oxford, 1987–89), pp. 323–39.

17. See the conclusion to Quentin Skinner's *Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1978), vol. 2, pp. 349–58, and his essay on 'The State', in Terence Ball, James Farr and Russell Hanson (eds.), *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 90–131.

18. See the summary of Foucault's lectures on 'Sécurité, territoire et population', offered at the *Collège de France* in 1977–78, in his *Résumé des cours, 1970–1982* (Paris, 1989), pp. 99–106. His treatment of the subject first appeared in print in an Italian translation in the journal *Aut Aut* in 1978, and then in English as 'Governmentality', in *Ideology and Consciousness* 6 (1979): 5–21; this essay is reprinted in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (London, 1991), pp. 87–104.

19. In a sense, the establishment of the nation-state, which I here trace to the French Revolution, may be said to superimpose a modern framework of the exercise of sovereign power upon certain ancient and medieval conceptions of national and communal identity in the *rei publicae status* of citizens joined together by a common purpose. Such control over persons as was exercised by the increasingly monolithic states of early modern Europe did not supersede their control over territories but reinforced it, while the genuinely modern nation-state came apparently to embrace the language of *status* twice over, in the personification of the body politic as a whole and in the ascription of a corporate personality to all its true members.

20. For comparisons of modern republicanism in eighteenth-century America and France, see especially R. R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America, 1760–1800*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1959–64), and Patrice Higonnet, *Sister Republics: The Origins of French and American Republicanism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988).

21. By a vote of 491 to 90.

22. See Hegel, *Über die englische Reformbill*, first published in the *Allgemeine preußische Staatzeitung*, in his *Politische Schriften*. Nachwort von Jürgen Habermas (Frankfurt, 1966), p. 310. This text is included in an English translation, by T. M. Knox, of *Hegel's Political Writings*, ed. Z. A. Pelczynski (Oxford, 1964), where the passage about Sieyès figures on p. 322. It must be noted that Hegel here refers, not to Sieyès' role in establishing the National Assembly in 1789, but to his authorship of the constitution of the year VIII, which he drafted as provisional consul a decade later, following the bloodless *coup d'état* of the eighteenth Brumaire of Napoleon Bonaparte that marked the transition of France's revolutionary government from the *Directoire* to the *Consulat*. As First Consul, Bonaparte altered Sieyès' scheme to suit his own advantage and ambition.

23. See Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, ed. Wolfgang Bonsiepen and Reinhard Heede, in Hegel's *Gesammelte Werke*, published by the Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Hamburg, 1968–), vol. 9, p. 315, lines 14–15 and 27–28. In the English translation by A. V. Miller of Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* (Oxford, 1977), see §§ 584 and 585, pp. 356–57.

24. See Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, pp. 317–18, lines 33–40 and 1–2, and p. 319, lines 4–11; *Phenomenology of Spirit*, §§ 585 and 588, pp. 357 and 358–59.

25. See William Sewall Jr. 'Le citoyen/la citoyenne: Activity, Passivity, and the Revolutionary Concept of Citizenship', in Colin Lucas (ed.), *The Political Culture of the French Revolution*, forming vol. 2 of *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture*, pp. 105–23. In Sieyès' philosophy, active citizens were, by and large, stakeholders or taxpayers, whereas women, children, domestic servants and foreigners were deemed to be *passive* citizens.

26. See Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, p. 320, lines 9–13. Hegel's text reads as follows: 'Das einzige Werk und That der allgemeinen Freyheit ist daher der Tod, und zwar ein Tod, der keinen innern Umfang und Erfüllung hat, denn was negirt wird, ist der unerfüllte Punkt des absolutfreyen Selbsts; er ist also der kälteste, platteste Tod, ohne mehr Bedeutung, als das Durchhauen eines Kohlhaupts oder ein Schluck Wassers' [*Phenomenology of Spirit*, § 590: 'The sole work and deed of universal freedom is therefore *death*, a death too which has no inner significance or filling, for what is negated is the empty point of the absolutely free self. It is thus the coldest and meanest of all deaths, with no more significance than cutting off a head of cabbage or swallowing a mouthful of water' (in Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A. V. Miller (Oxford, 1979), p. 360)].

27. See especially Patrice Gueniffey, 'Les assemblées et la représentation', in Lucas (ed.), *The Political Culture of the French Revolution*, pp. 233–57; Gueniffey, *Le nombre et la raison* (Paris, 1993); and Lucien Jaume, *Le discours jacobin et la démocratie* (Paris, 1989). Pierre Rosanvallon's *Le sacre du citoyen* (Paris, 1992), in large measure devoted to the theory and practice of citizenship in the course of the French Revolution, traces the progressive establishment of universal suffrage in France since 1789.

28. See, in particular, Paul Bastid, *Sieyès et sa pensée* (Paris, 1939); Murray Forsyth, *Reason and Revolution: The Political Thought of the Abbé Sieyès* (Leicester, 1987); Pasquale Pasquino, 'Emmanuel Sieyes, Benjamin Constant et le "Gouvernement des Modernes"', *Revue française de science politique* 37 (1987): 214–28; Jean-Denis Bredin, *Sieyès: La clé de la Révolution française* (Paris, 1988); Keith Baker, 'Sieyès', in Furet and Ozouf (eds.), *Dictionnaire critique de la Révolution française* (Paris, 1988), pp. 334–45, and *Inventing the French Revolution* (Cambridge, 1990); Antoine de Baecque, *Le corps de l'histoire: Métaphores et politique (1770–1800)* (Paris, 1993); William H. Sewall Jr., *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution: The Abbé Sieyès and 'What Is the Third Estate?'* (Durham, N.C., 1994); and Istvan Hont, 'The Permanent Crisis of a Divided Mankind: "Contemporary Crisis of the Nation State" in Historical Perspective', in John Dunn (ed.), 'Contemporary Crisis of the Nation State?', special issue, *Political Studies* 42.s1 (August 1994): 166–231.

29. In the version of his lectures, dating from 1819–20, that were to form his *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, Hegel put forward, in starker terms than in any other passage of his writings, a critique of what he took to be Rousseau's individualist notion of the will in so far as it distorted the very foundations of the state. As transcribed by an anonymous student, the passage, which corresponds to § 258 of the standard edition of this work, reads as follows: 'Rousseau hat in neuern Zeiten die soeben erwähnte Ansicht vorzüglich durchgeföhrt. . . . Rousseau hat das große Verdienst gehabt, daß, indem er den Willen der Einzelnen zum Prinzip des Staats gemacht hat, er damit einen Gedanken, and zwar den Gedanken des Willens, zum Prinzip gemacht hat. . . . Rousseau hat so überhaupt den Grund gelegt, daß über den Staat gedacht worden ist . . . Das Schiefe an Rousseaus Theorie ist, daß er nicht den Willen als solchen als Grundlage des Staats gefaßt hat, sondern den Willen als einzelnen in seiner Punktualisierung. . . . Rousseau hat also einerseits dem wahrhaften Denken über den Staat den Impuls gegeben, auf der andern Seite hat er aber die Verwirrung hereingeföhrt, daß das Einzelne als das Erste betrachtet wurde und nicht das Allgemeine' (Hegel, *Philosophie des Rechts. Die Vorlesung von 1819/1820 in einer Nachschrift*, ed. Dieter Henrich [Frankfurt, 1983], pp. 212–13). 'Consequently', continues the more familiar format of 1821 in its most recent translation by H. B. Nisbet, 'when these abstractions were invested with power, they afforded the tremendous spectacle, for the first time we know of in human history, of the overthrow of all existing and given conditions within an actual major state and the revision of its constitution

from first principles . . . These . . . abstractions divorced from the Idea . . . turned the attempt into the most terrible and drastic event'. According to Hegel, therefore, the French Revolution was fundamentally shaped from 'false theories . . . which originated largely with Rousseau' and was drawn above all from the 'attempts to put these theories into practice' (Hegel, *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, ed. Allen Wood [Cambridge, 1991], pp. 277, 279). For detailed accounts of Hegel's reading of Rousseau, see especially Hans Friedrich Fulda and Rolf-Peter Horstmann (eds.), *Rousseau, die Revolution und der junge Hegel* (Stuttgart, 1991), Pierre Méthais, 'Contrat et volonté générale selon Hegel et Rousseau', in Jacques d'Hondt (ed.), *Hegel et le siècle des lumières* (Paris, 1974), and my 'Hegel's Rousseau: The General Will and Civil Society', in Sven-Eric Liedman (ed.), 'Deutscher Idealismus', special issue, *Arachne* 8 (1993): 7–45. On Hegel's more general interpretation of the conceptual origins of the French Revolution, see also Luc Ferry, 'Hegel', in Furet and Ozouf (eds.), *Dictionnaire historique de la Révolution française*, pp. 974–77; Furet, *Marx et la Révolution française* (Paris, 1986), pp. 18–25 and 78–84; Lewis Hinchman, *Hegel's Critique of the Enlightenment* (Gainesville, Florida, 1984), pp. 141–54; Joachim Ritter, *Hegel und die französische Revolution* (Frankfurt, 1965); and my 'Contextualizing Hegel's Phenomenology of the French Revolution and the Terror', in *Political Theory* 26.1 (1998): 33–55.

30. See Koselleck, *Kritik und Krise*, especially pp. 133–42. 'Ohne es zu ahnen, hat Rousseau die permanente Revolution auf der Suche nach dem wahren Staat enfesselt', he remarks (p. 136) ['Rousseau unwittingly unleashed the permanent revolution that strives for the true state']. 'Bei Rousseau wird es offenbar, daß das Geheimnis der Aufklärung, seine Macht zu verschleiern, zum Prinzip des Politischen geworden ist' (p. 138) ['In Rousseau it becomes clear that the secret of the Enlightenment—to disguise one's power—had become the principle of the political'].

31. See Burke, *Letter to a Member of the National Assembly*, in Paul Langford and L. G. Mitchell (eds.), *The Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke*, vol. 8: *The French Revolution: 1790–1794* (Oxford, 1989), p. 314.

32. On Hegel's interpretation of civil society and its distinction from the state, see especially Zbigniew Pelczynski (ed.), *The State and Civil Society: Studies in Hegel's Political Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1984); Manfred Riedel, *Bürgerliche Gesellschaft und Staat bei Hegel* (Neuwied, 1970); and Norbert Waszek, *The Scottish Enlightenment and Hegel's Account of 'Civil Society'* (Dordrecht, 1988).

33. See especially the *Contrat social* III.14–15 and the *Gouvernement de Pologne*, sect. 7 ('Moyens de maintenir la constitution'), in Rousseau's *Oeuvres complètes* [hereafter OC], ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–95), vol. 3, pp. 427–31 and 975–89 [SC 112–16 and P 197–211].

34. By which Rousseau of course meant just the citizenry, or the whole of the electorate eligible for public office. As opposed to sovereignty, which must be exercised directly by the people and from which no one could be excluded, govern-

ment, he argued, was inescapably representative and therefore could never be democratic.

35. With respect to Sieyès' debt to the Hobbesian theory of representation, see especially Murray Forsyth, 'Thomas Hobbes and the Constituent Power of the People', *Political Studies* 29 (1981): 191–203. In his own notable treatment of Sieyès' conception of the nation-state, Hont concludes that 'as a political definition of the location of sovereignty, Hobbes's "state" and Sieyès' "nation" are identical. Sieyès' "nation" is Hobbes's "Leviathan"'. Both are powerful interpretations, in a sharply converging manner, of the modern popular *civitas*' (Hont, 'The Permanent Crisis of a Divided Mankind', p. 203). With respect to the contrast between Sieyès' and Rousseau's conceptions of representation, but also the apparent convergence of their ideas of the general will and indivisible sovereignty, see Bronislaw Baczko, 'Le contrat social des Français: Sieyès et Rousseau', in Baker (ed.), *The Political Culture of the Old Regime*, vol. 1 of *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture*, pp. 493–513.

36. Rousseau, *Emile* III, in OC, vol. 4, p. 468 [E 194].

37. Rousseau, *Lettres de la montagne*, Septième Lettre, in OC, vol. 3, p. 815 [LWM 239].

38. This intellectual debt, often noticed by Sieyès' interpreters, is specially highlighted with reference to manuscript sources by Pasquino in his 'Sieyès, Constant et le "Gouvernement des Modernes"'. With respect to his writings on economic affairs, however, most of which were completed before his attention was drawn to the work of Smith, Sieyès was principally concerned with the doctrines of the physiocrats, which he largely combated. Sewall in his *Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution*, emphasizes Sieyès' claim that he had conceived his own theory of the division of labour, which had gone further than that of Smith, prior to the publication of *The Wealth of Nations*.

39. For Habermas's conception of the public sphere, see above all his *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* (Neuwied, 1962), of which an English translation, mainly by Thomas Berger, is available under the title, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, 1989). For a Straussian censure of modernity, with a Rousseauist flavour, see Pierre Manent, *Naissance de la politique moderne* (Paris, 1977). In *Politics and Vision* (New York, 1960), Sheldon Wolin frames his critique of modern political thought in large measure around conflicting images of community and organization. With respect to notions of a public sphere in France in the age of Enlightenment and the Revolution, see especially Baker, 'Defining the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century France: Variations on a Theme by Habermas', in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), pp. 181–211; Dena Goodman, 'Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime', *History and Theory* 31 (1992): 1–20; and the contributors to the forum, 'The Public Sphere in the Eighteenth Century', *French Historical Studies* 17 (1992): 882–956. Most of these authors also address the problem of the place



of women within the public sphere of the period, on which Goodman's line of argument, in particular, contrasts with that pursued by Joan Landes, in *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca, 1988).

40. The abruptness and decisiveness of the break in French history which was occasioned by the establishment of the National Assembly was of course much discussed by both participants and contemporary observers, of whom, among the Revolution's critics, Burke was perhaps foremost in his conviction that no more awful drama had ever been enacted so abruptly upon the stage of human history. Other commentators took a more sanguine view of such upheavals in France. 'How much the greatest event it is that ever happened in the world', exclaimed Charles James Fox, in applauding the fall of the Bastille (see Fox, *Memorials and Correspondence*, ed. Lord John Russell, 4 vols. [London, 1853–57], vol. 2, p. 361). As Tocqueville was later to remark, 'Comme [la Révolution française] avait l'air de tendre à la régénération du genre humain plus encore qu'à la réforme de la France, elle a allumé une passion que, jusque-là, les révolutions politiques les plus violentes n'avaient jamais pu produire' (see *L'Ancien régime et la révolution* I.3, in Tocqueville's *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. J. P. Mayer [Paris, 1951–], vol. 2, p. 89 ['Because the Revolution seemed to be striving for the regeneration of the human race even more than for the reform of France, it lit a passion which the most violent political revolutions had never before been able to produce', as trans. in Tocqueville, *The Old Regime and the Revolution*, trans. Alan Kahan (Chicago, 1998), p. 101]). The French Revolutionaries' determination to embark upon a new course of history, unencumbered by the past, is well illustrated by Lynn Hunt in her *Politics, Culture and Class in the French Revolution* (Berkeley, 1984), for instance. But I have in mind less the innovative character of that break than the leading Revolutionaries' conceptual disengagement even from Enlightenment programmes of reform, which were themselves put forward in order to transform a political system deemed to be in comprehensive need of change.

41. See, for instance, Robert Hahn, *Kant's Newtonian Revolution in Philosophy* (Carbondale, Ill., 1988); Christopher Norris, *The Truth about Postmodernism* (Oxford, 1993); Robert Pippin, *Modernism as a Philosophical Problem* (Oxford, 1991); and John Rundell, *The Origins of Modern Social Theory from Kant to Hegel to Marx* (Cambridge, 1987).

42. In his Tanner Lectures on Human Values delivered at Stanford University in 1979, Foucault maintained that 'since Kant, the role of philosophy has been to prevent reason from going beyond the limits of what is given in experience' and 'to keep watch over the excessive powers of political rationality'. Yet his occasional, and limited, defence of Kant's critical philosophy never inspired him to interpret the Enlightenment as a whole in such sympathetic terms, since, as he remarks in the same lectures, it was 'one of the Enlightenment's tasks . . . to multiply reason's political powers' (see Lawrence Kritzman [ed.], *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture* [London, 1988], p. 58). Foucault addressed the philosophy of Kant on several occasions after translating and editing Kant's *Anthropologie in*



*pragmatischer Hinsicht* as the *thèse complémentaire* he submitted for his doctorate in 1960, and later, in *Les mots et les choses*, locating Kant's work at the nexus of the period which he identified as marking the advent of *les sciences humaines*. See especially his lecture delivered to the *Société française de philosophie* in 1978, published as 'Qu'est-ce que la critique?', cited in note 6 above; a second lecture he delivered at the *Collège de France* in 1983, of which a revised fragment was published as 'Un cours inédit', *Magazine littéraire* 207 (1984): 35–39, with a subsequent translation by Colin Gordon, under the title 'Kant on Enlightenment and Revolution', *Economy and Society* 15 (1986): 88–96; and the essay he wrote not long before his death, first published in an English translation by Catherine Porter, as 'What Is Enlightenment?' in Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*, pp. 32–50. For notable accounts of Foucault's changing perceptions of Kant and the Enlightenment, see Norris, 'Foucault on Kant' in *The Truth about Postmodernism*, pp. 29–99; James Schmidt and Thomas Wartenberg, 'Foucault's Enlightenment: Critique, Revolution and the Fashion of the Self', in Michael Kelly (ed.), *Critique and Power: Recasting the Foucault/Habermas Debate* (Cambridge, Mass., 1994), pp. 283–314, and Maurizio Passerin d'Entrèves, 'Critique and Enlightenment: Michel Foucault on "Was ist Aufklärung?"' forthcoming in Norman Geras and Robert Wokler (eds.), *The Enlightenment and Modernity* [(Houndmills, Basingstoke, 2000), pp. 184–203].

43. I have commented at greater length on this distinction between democracy and representation, and on the part it has played in the development of twentieth-century political science, in 'Democracy's Mythical Ordeals: the Procrustean and Promethean Paths to Popular Self-Rule', in Geraint Parry and Michael Moran (eds.), *Democracy and Democratization* (London, 1994), pp. 21–46. With respect to ideas of representation in eighteenth-century French political thought and their articulation in the course of the Revolution in particular, see especially Keith Baker, 'Representation', in *The Political Culture of the Old Regime*, pp. 469–92, and Jean Roels, *Le Concept de représentation politique au dix-huitième siècle français* (Louvain, 1969). For more comprehensive discussions of notions of representation in modern political thought, see especially Lucien Jaume, *Hobbes et l'état représentatif moderne* (Paris, 1986), and Hannah Pitkin, *The Concept of Representation* (Berkeley, 1967). Among the most notable contributions to the vast literature on modern theories of democracy, see David Held, *Models of Democracy* (Oxford, 1987); Geraint Parry, *Political Elites* (London, 1969); and John Plamenatz, *Democracy and Illusion* (London, 1973).

44. See Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 2nd ed. (1951; London, 1958), pp. 230–31. Arendt here comments on what she terms 'the secret conflict between state and nation', arising with the very birth of the nation-state on account of its conjunction of the rights of man with the demand for national sovereignty. Her reflections on this subject have occasioned extensive commentary. See, for instance, Julia Kristeva, *Étrangers à nous-mêmes* (Paris, 1988), pp. 220–29, and Hont, 'The Permanent Crisis of a Divided Mankind', pp. 206–09.

45. The phrasing of the third article of the declaration of the rights of man and of the citizen, which begins, 'Le principe de toute souveraineté réside essentiellement dans la Nation', is owed principally to Lafayette. For the fullest histories of the sources and drafting of the whole document, and of the deliberations leading to its endorsement by the *Assemblée nationale* on 26 August 1789, see Stéphane Rials's commentary on *La Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* (Paris, 1988), and Marcel Gauchet's *La Révolution des droits de l'homme* (Paris, 1989). In stressing that this identification of the rights of man with the rights of the citizen exposed to injustice all persons who were not duly accredited citizens of nation-states, I do not ignore the exclusion of women from citizenship which the declaration of the rights of man came to legitimize as well. In the modern world, women have in a sense been exposed to a double peril, in so far as they have been deemed unfit for citizenship even when meeting various states' criteria for nationality. But since the French Revolution, they have at least progressively gained a civic identity in fundamental respects undifferentiated from that of men, whereas whole peoples which do not constitute nation-states have, in living and indeed recent memory, faced mass extermination and today still risk extinction in diverse ways. On the subject of the French Revolution and the rights of women, see especially Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*, and Sara Melzer and Leslie Rabine (eds.), *Rebel Daughters: Women and the French Revolution* (New York, 1992).

46. I have developed these remarks about Kant from two earlier essays: 'Hegel versus Kant: From the Enlightenment Project to Post-Modernity', in Knud Haakonssen and Udo Thiel (eds.), *History of Philosophy Yearbook*, vol. 2, for the Australasian Society for the History of Philosophy (Canberra, 1994), pp. 85–99, and 'The Enlightenment Project and Its Critics', in Sven-Eric Liedman (ed.), 'The Postmodernist Critique of the Project of the Enlightenment', special issue, *Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities* 58 (1997): 13–31.

47. This essay bears only scant resemblance to my original talk on the transformation of political into social science at the end of the age of Enlightenment which I presented at the second colloquium on 'The Great Transition' held at the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences at Uppsala on 11–13 June 1993. I am particularly grateful to Johan Heilbron and Björn Wittrock for their forbearance in awaiting my composition and completion of a text I scarcely had in mind when I first accepted their invitation to speak on a different subject altogether. I am also indebted to them, as well as to Istvan Hont, Joan Landes, Bruce Mazlish, Geraint Parry, Maurizio Passerin d'Entrèves, John Pickstone, Michael Sonenscher and Martin Staum, either for drawing a number of pertinent sources to my attention or for proposing judicious corrections which, however, I have not in every instance managed to include. My greatest debt is to the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences at Uppsala, for facilitating my research and writing, in the course of a fellowship during the 1995–96 academic year. I have drawn upon some passages from my sections on 'Manufacturing the

Nation-State' and 'The Hegelian Misrepresentation of Rousseau' in subsequently drafting two other essays: 'The French Revolutionary Roots of Political Modernity in Hegel's Philosophy, or the Enlightenment at Dusk', *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 35 (1997): 71–89, and 'Contextualizing Hegel's Phenomenology of the French Revolution and the Terror' (see note 29 above).

## CHAPTER 12: ROUSSEAU AND MARX

1. See Norberto Bobbio, *Politica e cultura* (Turin, 1955), ch. 11; Sergio Cotta, 'La position du problème de la politique chez Rousseau', in *Etudes sur le 'Contrat social' de Rousseau* (Paris, 1964), pp. 177–90; Rodolfo Mondolfo, *Umanismo di Marx* (Turin, 1968); and Giacomo Marramao, *Marxismo e revisionismo in Italia* (Bari, 1971).

2. Galvano della Volpe's *Rousseau e Marx*, first published in Rome in 1964, passed through four editions over the next ten years; Lucio Colletti's *Ideologia e società*, first published in Bari in 1969, appeared in two further editions by 1972.

3. See Galvano della Volpe, *Rousseau and Marx*, trans. John Fraser (London, 1978), and Lucio Colletti, *From Rousseau to Lenin*, trans. John Merrington and Judith White (London, 1972).

4. John Plamenatz, *Karl Marx's Philosophy of Man* (Oxford, 1975).

5. See *Mohr und General: Erinnerungen an Marx and Engels* (Berlin, 1970), p. 158.

6. See the Marx and Engels *Historisch-kritische-Gesamtausgabe* (hereafter MEGA), ed. D. Rjazanov (Berlin and Moscow, 1927–36), vol. 1, I.2, pp. 120–21.

7. See Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, in *Marx-Engels Werke* (hereafter MEW), 39 vols. in 41 (Berlin, 1957–68), vol. 20, pp. 130–31.

8. Colletti, *From Rousseau to Lenin*, p. 187. See also della Volpe, *Rousseau and Marx*, p. 149.

9. See MEW, vol. 1, pp. 80 (*Das philosophische Manifest der historischen Rechtsschule*); MEW, vol. 1, pp. 103, 104 ('Der leitende Artikel in Nr. 179 der *Kölnischen Zeitung*'); MEW, vol. 1, p. 370 (*Zur Judenfrage*); MEW, vol. 3, pp. 75, 317, 386, 387, 512–13 (*Deutsche Ideologie*), and the passage from this text, first published in 1962, in *The German Ideology* (Moscow, 1964), p. 213; MEW, vol. 4, p. 353 ('Die moralisierende Kritik und die kritisierende Moral'); MEW, vol. 13, p. 280 ('Die Kriegsaussichten in Preußen'); MEW, vol. 13, p. 615 (*Einleitung [zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie]*, i.e. *Grundrisse*); MEW, vol. 14, p. 588 (*Herr Vogt*); MEW, vol. 15, p. 69 ('Interessantes aus Preußen'), *New York Daily Tribune*, 30 June 1860; MEW, vol. 16, pp. 31, 32 ('Über Proudhon'); MEW, vol. 19, p. 16 (*Kritik des Gothaer Programms*); MEW, vol. 23, p. 774 (*Kapital I*); MEW, vol. 27, p. 297 (Marx to Engels, 8 Aug. 1851); MEW, vol. 27, p. 314 (Marx to Engels, 14 Aug. 1851). Apart from MEW, vol. 3, pp. 512–13, where Rousseau is mentioned thirteen times (always in passing, and that mainly by way

of quotations or paraphrases from Cabet and Grün), reference to him, or to a 'Rousseauschen Sinne', appears only once on each of these pages, while *MEW*, vol. 3, p. 75 does not mention his name at all but cites a passage from the *Contrat social*. The only reference I have found anywhere in Marx to Rousseau's most famous political concept, the 'volonté générale', appears in *MEW*, vol. 15, p. 69.

10. See *MEW*, vol. 16, p. 32. Cf. *MEW*, vol. 13, p. 280.

11. See Marx, *Grundrisse* (Harmondsworth, 1973), Introduction, p. 83; *MEW*, vol. 13, p. 615; and Karl Marx, *Texts on Method*, ed. Terrell Carver (Oxford, 1975), pp. 48 and 91–92.

12. See *Emile* III, in Rousseau's *Oeuvres complètes* (hereafter OC), ed. Bernard Gagnebin, Marcel Raymond et al., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1959–[95]), vol. 4, pp. 454–55 [E 184–85]. In *Emile* Rousseau cites *Robinson Crusoe* as a most useful book of natural education. See also *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 644, 1605 (note 2) [C 594] and *Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques*, in OC, vol. 1, pp. 812, 826 [RJ 117, 128].

13. See Marx, *On the Jewish Question*, in *Early Texts*, trans. and ed. David McLellan (Oxford, 1972), pp. 107–8; *MEW*, vol. 1, p. 370; and Rousseau, *Contrat social* II.7, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 381–82 [SC 68–70].

14. See Marx, *Early Texts*, pp. 127–28 and 148; *MEW*, vol. 1, p. 390 and suppl. vol. 1, p. 536. See also Rousseau, *Contrat social* I.8, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 364–65 [SC 53–54].

15. See Terrell Carver, 'Marx, Engels and Dialectics', *Political Studies* 28 (1980): 354–58, and *MEW*, vol. 20, pp. 9 and 624.

16. See Carver, 'Marx, Engels and Dialectics', p. 357, and *MEW*, vol. 20, p. 9.

17. Plamenatz, *Karl Marx's Philosophy of Man*, p. 60.

18. See Marx, *Early Texts*, pp. 101–5; *MEW*, vol. 1, pp. 362–77.

19. See *MEW*, vol. 20, p. 17, or the same passage in *MEW*, vol. 19, p. 190. See also della Volpe, *Rousseau and Marx*, pp. 85–86. It should be noted that Engels's own references to Rousseau are scarcely more numerous than those of Marx, with the great majority concentrated in *Anti-Dühring* alone: *MEGA*, vol. 2, 2, p. 129 ('Rationalismus and Pietismus'), *Morgenblatt für gebildete Leser*, 17 Oct. 1840; *MEW*, vol. 1, pp. 469 and 475 ('Briefe aus London'), *Schweizerischer Republikaner*, 16 May and 9 June 1843; *MEW*, vol. 4, p. 295 (*Der ökonomische Kongreß*); *MEW*, vol. 4, p. 428 ('Louis Blancs Rede auf dem Bankett zu Dijon'); *MEW*, vol. 16, p. 161 ('Was hat die Arbeiterklasse mit Polen zu tun?'); *MEW*, vol. 19, pp. 190, 192, 202 (*Die Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*); *MEW*, vol. 20, pp. 17, 19, 91, 95, 129–31, 134, 142, 239, 292 (*Anti-Dühring*); *MEW*, vol. 20, pp. 580, 584 ('Materialien zum Anti-Dühring'); *MEW*, vol. 21, p. 282 (*Ludwig Feuerbach und der Ausgang der klassischen deutschen Philosophie*); *MEW*, vol. 27, p. 318 (Engels to Marx, 21 Aug. 1851); *MEW*, vol. 37, p. 364 (Engels to Lafargue, 7 Mar. 1890); *MEW*, vol. 39, p. 97 (Engels to Mehring, 14 July 1893).

20. See, for instance, Marx, *On the Jewish Question*, in *Early Texts*, p. 108 (MEW, vol. 1, p. 370).

21. See MEW, vol. 20, p. 239 or MEW, vol. 19, p. 192.

22. See della Volpe, *Rousseau and Marx*, pp. 75–76 and p. 144, and Colletti, *From Rousseau to Lenin*, p. 188.

23. Of course, as John Hope Mason reminds me, any putative likeness drawn between the satisfaction of needs in Rousseau's social theory and in that of Marx should not conflate their different perspectives on human needs and the manner of their satisfaction. For Rousseau our needs were fulfilled mainly through acts of self-reliance and political co-operation, rather than economic production. For Marx communist society would promote a progressively expanding rather than deliberately contracted set of needs, satisfied in accordance with some principle of proportional distribution based on relative requirements.

24. As Plamenatz has observed in another context (*German Marxism and Russian Communism* [London, 1954], p. 191), 'Passing from German to Russian Marxism, we leave the horses and come to the mules'.

25. See, for instance, Rousseau, *Emile* I, in OC, vol. 4, p. 245 [E 37] and *Rousseau juge de Jean Jacques* III, in OC, vol. 1, p. 934 [RJ 213].

26. Especially in his *Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (see MEW, vol. 13, pp. 8–9).

27. See G. A. Cohen, *Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence* (Princeton, 1978), pp. 28–29, 137–38 and 143–44.

28. On this point Cohen (see *Karl Marx's Theory of History*, pp. 167–69) takes H. B. Acton and Plamenatz specially to task.

29. See Cohen, *Karl Marx's Theory of History*, pp. 134–74.

30. Among revisionist contributions to Marxism, Perry Anderson's account of the relation between a society's economic base and its superstructure in different historical epochs is challenged by Cohen (see *Karl Marx's Theory of History*, pp. 247–48) particularly with respect to this point.

31. See Cohen, *Karl Marx's Theory of History*, pp. 160–63.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 147.

33. Until the recent spate of commentaries on Marx's philosophy of history by, among others, D. Ross Gandy, Melvin Rader and William Shaw as well as Cohen, full-length book treatments of the subject have been scarce. For generations the most authoritative text was M. M. Bober's *Karl Marx's Interpretation of History*, first published in [Cambridge, Mass.,] 1927.

34. See, for instance, the comments of Walter Adamson in *History and Theory* 19 (1980): 196–201; Jon Elster in *Political Studies*, 28 (1980): 123–27; Richard Miller in the *Philosophical Review* 90 (1981): 91–117; and Peter Singer in the *New York Review of Books* 26 (Dec. 1980): 46–47. Cohen's attempt to rebut other interpretations of historical materialism has been found by several reviewers to be more ingenious than convincing, largely because he seems to have paid

too high a price for his gains. For one thing, his functional explanations appear out of keeping with the form and character of the arguments they purport to make clear, especially when applied to Marx's other claims about the correspondence between certain primary and secondary factors in social life, such as his views about the link between existence and consciousness, or between economic base and political superstructure. A functional explanation of Marx's theory of history, moreover, leaves us without a clear grasp of what he took to be the causal mechanisms of change and how they operate, whereas previously, following the perspective now regarded as insufficiently illuminating by Cohen, the prime examples of such mechanisms were thought to be social revolutions ('the locomotives of history'), initiated by classes at a certain stage in the development of the material forces of production of an economic system (see Cohen, *Karl Marx's Theory of History*, pp. 148–49 and 292). What I find particularly curious, too, and inadequately substantiated by any passages drawn from Marx himself, is Cohen's attachment of the idea of human agency and the rational exercise of labour power to his account of the technological forces of production, since Marx regarded productive forces in pre-communist societies as 'alien' powers, passing through stages 'independent of', and even governing, human will—see Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, pp. 46 and 82 (MEW, vol. 3, pp. 34 and 67).

35. See *The German Ideology*, p. 46, and the *Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, in Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* (hereafter SW), 3 vols. (Moscow, 1968–70), vol. 1, p. 503 (MEW, vol. 3, p. 34 and vol. 8, p. 8).

36. See Cohen, *Karl Marx's Theory of History*, p. 290.

37. See especially Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 173–74 and 177–78 [DI 168–70, 172–74]; the 'Dernière réponse' [to Charles Borde], in OC, vol. 3, p. 80 [LR 70–71]; and the preface to *Narcisse*, in OC, vol. 2, pp. 969–70n [PN 100–02].

38. A thesis developed by Marx above all in *The German Ideology*—see pp. 32–36, 77–84 and 379–91 (MEW, vol. 3, pp. 22–25, 61–68 and 331–42).

39. For an elucidating treatment of this subject see Cohen, *Karl Marx's Theory of History*, pp. 216–34.

40. In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, no. 231 (25 Feb. 1849), MEW, vol. 6, p. 245.

41. For instance in his celebrated speech at Marx's graveside, SW, vol. 3, p. 162.

42. See *The German Ideology*, p. 38, and the *Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, SW, vol. 1, p. 503 (MEW, vol. 3, p. 27 and vol. 13, p. 9). The verb Marx employed in each of these passages is 'bestimmen'. See also *The German Ideology*, p. 42 (MEW, vol. 3, pp. 30–31), where Marx speaks of consciousness as a social product. In *Capital*, vol. 1, ch. 19 he portrays certain ideas of political economists as 'imaginary expressions' which only represent relations of production. See Marx, *Capital*, 3 vols. (Moscow, 1954–62), vol. 1, pp. 535–42 (MEW, vol. 23, pp. 557–64).

43. Cohen's neglect of the passage might appear understandable in view of the stress he places upon human agency and rational purpose as features of the technological forces of production Marx describes (see Cohen, *Karl Marx's Theory of History*, p. 147). That would be an utterly misleading impression, however, since Cohen has elsewhere devoted a whole article to the subject of 'Being, Consciousness and Roles: On the Foundations of Historical Materialism', in eds. Chimen Abramsky and Beryl Williams, *Essays in Honour of E. H. Carr* (London, 1974), pp. 82–97. There he discusses the remark from the *Preface* and takes issue with Plamenatz over its interpretation (in Plamenatz's *Ideology* [London, 1971], chs. 2 and 3), claiming (p. 95) that 'a person's "being", in the sense of Marx's thesis, is the economic role he occupies'. I am extremely grateful to Jerry Cohen for drawing my attention to that essay and thus sparing me a most embarrassing oversight, but I still cannot see how he reconciles the meaning of this passage with the theory of history he attributes to Marx, in so far as that theory is said to allow a determinant place to what rational men do.

44. Marx, *The German Ideology*, pp. 491–92 (MEW, vol. 3, pp. 432–33).

45. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 164 and 177–78 [DI 161, 172–74], and the *Contrat social* II.7, in OC, vol. 3, p. 383 [SC 70–71].

46. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 151 [DI 149], and my 'Perfectible Apes in Decadent Cultures: Rousseau's Anthropology Revisited', *Daedalus* 107.3 (Summer 1978): 118–20.

47. Against the general drift of my argument here David McLellan reminds me that Marx likewise believed that men make their own history, while Terrell Carver and Michael Evans perceive a more prominent place for language in Marx's thought—in the 'fetishism of commodities', the 'riddle of money', and indeed his whole theory of ideology—than I have allowed. But it is economic producers, according to Marx, rather than moral agents, who characteristically shape our history, and its main patterns are not determined by individual, collective, or even conflicting, choice. Equally it is the illusory or 'fantastic', rather than linguistic, character of ideology and fetishism on which Marx lavishes most of his attention, at the same time pointing to an underlying reality which these abstractions are said to betoken or conceal: 'The verbal masquerade only has meaning when it is the unconscious or deliberate expression of an actual masquerade' (Marx, *The German Ideology*, p. 449, MEW, vol. 3, p. 394).

48. See Rousseau, *Discours sur l'inégalité*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 138 [DI 137–38].

49. See *ibid.*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 177 [DI 167].

50. Rousseau, *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, in OC, vol. 3, p. 7 [DSA 6–7].

51. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ed. Charles Porset (Bordeaux, 1970), ch. 19, p. 187 [OC, vol. 5, p. 424; EOL 295]. For an assessment of some political aspects of Rousseau's theory of music see my 'Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution', in R. F. Brissenden and J. C. Eade (eds.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 4 (Canberra, 1979), pp. 251–83.



52. Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, ch. 20, p. 199 [OC, vol. 5, p. 428; EOL 299].

53. Marx, *The German Ideology*, p. 32 (MEW, vol. 3, p. 21). This famous line actually concludes a paragraph in which Marx speaks of the mode of production as a 'definite form of activity' of individuals which gives expression to their life. It is worth noting, therefore, as McLellan points out to me, that the final sentence seems a *non sequitur*, though I cannot agree that the preceding sentences 'entirely accord with Rousseau'.

54. Especially towards the end of his life Marx did read widely and meticulously through much of the current literature in cultural anthropology (see *The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx*, ed. L. Krader [Assen, 1974]). But he did not show as much interest in the subject or its literature as Rousseau had done in the 1750s, and he never shared Rousseau's (nor even Engels's) fascination for physical anthropology.

55. Marx, *Capital*, vol. 3, 48, p. 800 (MEW, vol. 25, p. 828).

56. Marx, *Wages, Price and Profit*, ch. 13, SW, vol. 2, p. 68 (MEW, vol. 16, p. 144).

57. Marx, *Capital*, vol. 1, 10, p. 302 (MEW, vol. 23, p. 320).

58. See Marx, *The German Ideology*, pp. 267 and 413 (MEW, vol. 3, pp. 229 and 362).

59. See *ibid.*, pp. 37–38 (MEW, vol. 3, pp. 26–27).

60. Marx, *Capital*, vol. 3, 21, pp. 333–34 (MEW, vol. 25, pp. 351–52). In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (SW, vol. 3, p. 16, MEW, vol. 19, p. 18) the point is made as follows: 'Is not [the present-day distribution] the only "fair" distribution on the basis of the present-day mode of production? Are economic relations regulated by legal conceptions or do not, on the contrary, legal relations arise from economic ones?'

61. These propositions are elaborated in an engaging essay by Allen Wood ('The Marxian Critique of Justice', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 1 [1972]: 244–82), to which my remarks in this paragraph are much indebted (see especially pp. 260–75). For replies to Wood by Ziyad Husami and George Brenkert, and for Wood's rejoinder, see also *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 8 (1978–79): 27–64, 122–47 and 267–95.

62. See Wood, 'The Marxian Critique of Justice', pp. 265 and 268–69.

63. In 'Freedom and Private Property in Marx', *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 8 (1979): 122–47, Brenkert argues that Marx's conception of freedom is a moral ideal, even if his view of justice is not, while McLellan informs me that Marx probably judged communism to be better than capitalism in terms of his picture of human nature and needs. Both of these claims, however, seem to me to draw their strength more from what Marx must have meant than from what he actually said.

64. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, SW, vol. 3, p. 19 (MEW, vol. 19, p. 21). I find it difficult to agree with Cohen that this passage implies that Marx

thought moralities might be assessed one against another, some being found 'higher'.

65. See Marx and Engels, *The Holy Family* (Moscow, 1956), p. 53 (MEW, vol. 2, p. 38).

66. See Marx, *The German Ideology*, p. 47 (MEW, vol. 3, p. 35).

67. Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, SW, vol. 3, p. 14 (MEW, vol. 19, p. 16).

68. See, for instance, Rousseau's *Contrat social* III.8–9, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 414–20 [SC 100–05]; *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*, chs. 2–3, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 956–66 [P 179–89]; and *Emile* V, in OC, vol. 4, pp. 850–51 [E 468–69].

69. Hence, Rousseau wrote in the *Contrat social* III.8, in OC, vol. 3, pp. 414–15 [SC 100–01], 'Liberty, as it is not the fruit of all climates, is not within the reach of all peoples. . . . In every climate there are natural factors according to which one may assign the form of government that climate requires, and, we might even say, what sort of inhabitants it must have'.

70. See Rousseau, *Emile* V, in OC, vol. 4, p. 836 [E 458].

71. Rousseau, *Contrat social* I.3, in OC, vol. 3, p. 354 [SC 44].

72. Ibid., III.12, in OC, vol. 3, p. 425 [SC 110].

73. See *Emile* II, in OC, vol. 4, p. 305 [E 81].

74. See Rousseau's *Lettre sur les spectacles*, ed. M. Fuchs (Geneva, 1948), pp. 181–82n. [OC, vol. 5, pp. 123–24; LD 350–51] and *Julie, ou la Nouvelle Héloïse* V.7, in OC, vol. 2, p. 607 [J 497].

75. See Rousseau, *Lettre sur les spectacles*, pp. 168–69 [OC, vol. 5, pp. 114–15; LD 343–44].

76. See Rousseau, *Lettres de la montagne* VI, in OC, vol. 3, p. 810 [LWM 233–34].

77. See Rousseau, *Emile* IV, in OC, vol. 4, p. 549 [E 253].

78. Marx encouraged a communist revolution in Germany most vigorously in his *Address to the Communist League* of 1850. His endorsement of a Russian revolution based upon an indigenous form of peasant communism, which might signal proletarian uprisings in the West, appears or is implied in at least three places: a letter on Mikhailovsky of 1877, a letter to Vera Zasulich of 1881 and the preface to the 1882 Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto*.

79. See Rousseau, *Emile* III, in OC, vol. 4, pp. 468–69 and n. [E 194].

80. See Rousseau's letter to the comtesse de Wartensleben, 27 Sept. 1766, in R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau* (Geneva, Banbury and Oxford, 1965–[98]), no. 5450, vol. 30, pp. 384–88.

81. See Rousseau, *Lettres de la montagne* VI, in OC, vol. 3, p. 809 [LWM 233].

82. See Rousseau's *Confessions*, in OC, vol. 1, p. 384 [C 358], and my 'Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution', pp. 251–55.

83. Plamenatz, *Karl Marx's Philosophy of Man*, p. 472.

84. Rousseau, 'Dernière réponse' [to Borde], in OC, vol. 3, p. 94 [LR 83].

85. See Rousseau, *Emile* V, in OC, vol. 4, p. 859 [E 474].

86. My remarks about Rousseau in this final section are much inspired by the work of Ralph Leigh, Jean Starobinski, and Bronislaw Baczko, as well as Plamenatz. I am also grateful to several colleagues and other scholars who have read an earlier draft of the whole text, and whose expert knowledge, especially on Marx, has saved me from more errors than those that remain: Jerry Cohen, Michael Evans, Norman Geras, David McLellan, John Hope Mason, David Miller, Hillel Steiner, and William Weinstein. To Terrell Carver, who differs sharply from the bulk of my statements about Marx, my greatest thanks are due. If I have not managed always to be persuaded by him or others I take some comfort at least from their lack of an agreed alternative interpretation.

### CHAPTER 13: ERNST CASSIRER'S ENLIGHTENMENT: AN EXCHANGE WITH BRUCE MAZLISH

1. Cf. especially Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, *Dialektik der Aufklärung: Philosophische Fragmente* (Amsterdam, 1947), pp. 5–57 and 100–43; Jacob Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (London, 1952), pp. 3–11; Jean-François Lyotard, *Le Différend* (Paris, 1983), pp. 95–101; and Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 1–30. I shall address some of the already vast literature on this subject in *The Enlightenment Project and Its Critics* [not completed], of which a kind of prefatory outline bearing the same title appears in Sven-Eric Liedman (ed.), 'The Postmodernist Critique of the Project of Enlightenment', special issue, *Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities* 58 (1997): 13–30.

2. See Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven, 1932), particularly pp. 102–03. On Becker's anticipations of the postmodernist critique of the Enlightenment, see especially Johnson Kent Wright, 'The Pre-postmodernism of Carl Becker', *Historical Reflections* 25.2 (1999): 1–19.

3. See Michel Foucault, 'Une histoire restée muette,' *Quinzaine littéraire* 8 (1966): 3–4.

4. Alfred Cobban, 'The Enlightenment and Germany', *Spectator* 26 September 1952, pp. 406–08.

5. See Gay, 'The Social History of Ideas: Ernst Cassirer and After', in Kurt H. Wolff and Barrington Moore Jr. (ed.), *The Critical Spirit: Essays in Honor of Herbert Marcuse* (Boston, 1967), p. 117: 'The really serious difficulty in Cassirer's conception of intellectual history is . . . his failure to do justice to the social dimension of ideas'.

6. Among the most notable intellectual biographies of Cassirer are Dmitry Gawronsky's 'Ernst Cassirer: His Life and His Work', in Paul Arthur Schilpp (ed.), *The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer* (Evanston, 1949), pp. 1–37; Toni Cassirer's *Mein Leben mit Ernst Cassirer*, first printed privately in 1950 (repr., Hildesheim,

1981); and David Lipton's *Ernst Cassirer: The Dilemma of a Liberal Intellectual in Germany, 1914–1933* (Toronto, 1978).

7. This proposition forms the kernel of my own contribution, 'The Enlightenment, the Nation-State and the Primal Patricide of Modernity', to the collection I have recently edited with Norman Geras, in *The Enlightenment and Modernity* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, 2000), pp. 161–83.

8. See d'Alembert's *Mélanges de littérature, d'histoire et de philosophie* (Amsterdam, 1760), vol. 1, p. 246. As Thomas L. Hankins remarks in his *Jean d'Alembert: Science and the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1970), p. 2: Cassirer 'apparently found [the] most characteristic exemplification [of the "mind" of the Enlightenment] in d'Alembert'.

9. Cassirer, *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* (Tübingen, 1932) (hereafter *PA*), p. xvi, and *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, trans. Fritz C. A. Koelln and James Pettegrove (Princeton, 1951) (hereafter *PE*), p. xi.

10. *PA*, p. xii; *PE*, p. viii.

11. See d'Alembert's 'Discours préliminaire' in his *Mélanges de littérature*, vol. 1, pp. 36 and 156–57. D'Alembert here elaborates a theme of his *Recherches sur la précession des équinoxes* of 1749, which is pursued as well in somewhat different terms in Condillac's *Traité des systèmes* of the same year, an intellectual link noted by Cassirer himself.

12. *PA*, p. 9; *PE*, p. 8.

13. See d'Alembert's 'Essai sur les éléments de philosophie', in his *Mélanges de littérature*, vol. 4, pp. 1–6.

14. *PA*, p. 10; *PE*, p. 9.

15. *PA*, p. 13; *PE*, p. 11.

16. See *PA*, p. 336; *PE*, p. 251.

17. See *PA*, p. viii; *PE*, p. v.

18. See *PA*, pp. 477–78; *PE*, p. 357.

19. See *PA*, p. 482; *PE*, p. 360.

20. See *PA*, p. 444; *PE*, p. 331.

21. See *PA*, p. 39; *PE*, p. 30.

22. *PA*, p. 43; *PE*, p. 33.

23. *PA*, pp. 476–77; *PE*, p. 356.

24. See *PA*, pp. 308–09; *PE*, pp. 230–31.

25. *PA*, pp. 311–12; *PE*, p. 233.

26. See *PA*, p. 326; *PE*, p. 243.

27. See *PA*, pp. 332–33; *PE*, p. 248.

28. See *PA*, pp. 337–38; *PE*, p. 252.

29. *PA*, p. 339; *PE*, pp. 252–53.

30. See *PA*, pp. 332–33; *PE*, p. 248.

31. See *PA*, p. 351; *PE*, p. 262.

32. *PA*, p. 337; *PE*, p. 251.

33. *PA*, p. 367; *PE*, p. 274.

34. PA, p. 364; PE, p. 271.

35. See Peter Gay, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider* (Westport, Conn., 1968), p. xiv.

36. For an elaboration and defence of this claim, see my 'Multiculturalism and Ethnic Cleansing in the Enlightenment', in Ole Peter Grell and Roy Porter (eds.), *Tolerance in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 69–85.

37. On the meeting of Cassirer and Heidegger in Davos, see especially 'Davoser Disputation zwischen Ernst Cassirer and Martin Heidegger', in Heidegger, *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, 4th ed., in Heidegger's *Gesamtausgabe* (Frankfurt, 1991), vol. 3, pp. 274–96; Pierre Aubenque (ed.), *Débat sur le kantisme et la philosophie* (Paris, 1972); Aubenque, 'Le Débat de 1929 entre Cassirer et Heidegger', in Jean Seidengart (ed.), *Ernst Cassirer: De Marbourg à New York: L'itinéraire philosophique*, Actes du colloque de Nanterre, 12–14 octobre 1988 (Paris, 1990), pp. 82–96; John M. Krois, 'Aufklärung and Metaphysik: Zur Philosophie Cassirers und der Davoser Debatte mit Heidegger', *Internationale Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 2 (1992): 273–89; and Geoffrey Waite, 'On Esotericism: Heidegger and/or Cassirer at Davos', *Political Theory* 26 (1998): 603–51.

38. Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven, 1946), p. 293.

39. Condorcet, *Esquisse d'un tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain*, ed. Alain Pons (Paris, 1988), p. 296.

40. This essay, originally prepared for oral presentation at a 1998 ASECS discussion chaired by Mark Roche, owes a substantial debt to two unpublished works, each generously supplied to me by the author. These works are the forthcoming intellectual biography of Cassirer by Yehuda Elkana, of which I have consulted draft chapters devoted to World War I and the Davos Seminar; and an essay, 'A Bright Clear Mirror: Cassirer's *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*', by Johnson Kent Wright, soon to be published in *What's Left of the Enlightenment?: A Postmodern Question* edited by Keith Baker and Peter Hanns Reill [(Stanford, Calif., 2001), pp. 71–101]. I am grateful to these authors for the opportunity to consult their work, and also to the editors of *Studies In Eighteenth-Century Culture* for their forbearance in the face of my delay in completing the essay.

#### CHAPTER 14: ISAIAH BERLIN'S ENLIGHTENMENT AND COUNTER-ENLIGHTENMENT

1. Ramin Jahanbegloo, *Conversations with Isaiah Berlin* (London, 1992), pp. 95–96.

2. Philip P. Wiener (ed.), *Dictionary of the History of Ideas* (New York, 1968, 1973), vol. 2, pp. 100–12.

3. In French, the expression 'les lumières' refers to the authors of Enlightenment ideas as well as to their doctrines' collective character. Thanks to Rivarol and others, the term achieved a certain currency in the course of the French Revolution,

and in the second half of the nineteenth century, partly by way of Taine's surveys of the origins of contemporary France, what in English around the same time came to be described as the 'the Age of Enlightenment' was encapsulated in French as 'le siècle des lumières'. On the inauguration in English of the expression *The Enlightenment*, see John Lough, 'Reflections on Enlightenment and *Lumières*', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 8 (1985): 1–15, and especially James Schmidt, 'Inventing the Enlightenment: Anti-Jacobins, British Hegelians, and the *Oxford English Dictionary*', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64.3 (2003): 421–43. The modern imagery of the age of *The Scottish Enlightenment* owes much to James McCosh's *The Scottish Philosophy* of 1875 and, above all, Henry Grey Graham's *Scottish Men of Letters* of 1901, but it was first conceptualized within the eighteenth century by Dugald Stewart. With respect to the expression *The Enlightenment Project*, I am unaware of any published instances before the appearance in 1981 of Alasdair MacIntyre's *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (London, 1981); see chs. 5–6, pp. 49–75.

4. Norbert Hinske and Michael Albrecht (eds.), *Was ist Aufklärung? Beiträge aus der Berlinischen Monatsschrift* (Darmstadt, 1973); Ehrhard Bahr, *Was ist Aufklärung? Thesen und Definition* (Stuttgart, 1974); and James Schmidt (ed.), *What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1996). For *Gegen-Aufklärung*, see Friedrich Nietzsche's *Nachgelassene Fragmente* of the spring and summer of 1877, in Nietzsche, *Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Berlin, 1967–), sect. 4, vol. 2, p. 478, 22[17]: 'Es giebt kürzere und längere Bogen in der Culturentwicklung. Der Höhe der Aufklärung entspricht die Höhe der Gegen-Aufklärung in Schopenhauer und Wagner' ['There are shorter and longer arches of cultural development. To the height of the Enlightenment corresponds the height of the Counter-Enlightenment in Schopenhauer and Wagner'].

5. William Barret, *Irrational Man: A Study in Existential Philosophy* (New York, 1958), p. 244.

6. Isaiah Berlin, *The Age of Enlightenment*, vol. 4 of *The Great Ages of Western Philosophy* (Boston, 1956), ch. 8, pp. 271–75.

7. Isaiah Berlin, 'The Philosophical Ideas of Giambattista Vico', in *Art and Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Italy* (Rome, 1960), pp. 156–233.

8. Isaiah Berlin, 'Herder and the Enlightenment', in Earl R. Wasserman (ed.), *Aspects of the Eighteenth Century* (Baltimore, 1965), reprinted in *Encounter* 25.1 (July 1965): 29–48 and 25.2 (August 1965): 42–51.

9. Isaiah Berlin, *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas*, ed. Henry Hardy (London, 1990), pp. 91–174.

10. Isaiah Berlin, 'Hume and the Sources of German Anti-Rationalism', in G. P. Morice (ed.), *David Hume: Bicentennial Papers* (Edinburgh, 1977), reprinted in Berlin's *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*, ed. and with a bibliography by Henry Hardy, with an introduction by Roger Hausheer (London, 1979); see especially pp. 181–85.

11. 'It fell dead-born from the Press', remarked Hume in his autobiography, recapitulating a line from Pope's *Epilogue to the Satires*.

12. Isaiah Berlin, *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment*, first published by Thomas Butterworth in London in 1939, of which four editions and over ten translations had been published by 1978.

13. Isaiah Berlin, *Historical Inevitability*, Auguste Comte Memorial Trust Lecture no. 1 (London, 1954) and *The Hedgehog and the Fox* (London, 1953).

14. Isaiah Berlin, 'Two Concepts of Liberty' (Oxford, 1959), most recently published in Berlin, *Liberty*, ed. Henry Hardy (Oxford, 2002).

15. Stephen Holmes, *Benjamin Constant and the Making of Modern Liberalism* (New Haven, 1984), ch. 1, 'The Anatomy of Liberty', pp. 28–52 and Lionel Gossman, 'Benjamin Constant on Liberty and Love', in Joseph Mali and Robert Wokler (eds.), *Isaiah Berlin's Counter-Enlightenment* (Philadelphia, 2003), pp. 133–63.

16. Ernest Gellner, 'Sauce for the Liberal Goose' (review of John Gray, *Isaiah Berlin* [London, 1995]), *Prospect*, November 1995, p. 61.

17. Isaiah Berlin, 'Montesquieu', in his *Against the Current*, pp. 142, 144 and 157–58, and his 'Two Concepts of Liberty', in *Liberty*, pp. 212–17.

18. Berlin's pluralism was, to my mind, inspired ultimately by his reading of both Herder and John Stuart Mill, although its connections with later philosophical doctrines have still to be traced. I am unconvinced by Michael Ignatieff's allusion in this regard (see his *Isaiah Berlin: A Life* [London, 1998], p. 336, n. 4) to James Fitzjames Stephen's *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity* of 1873, and I suspect that ideas associated with pluralism would in Berlin's own lifetime have come to his notice more by way of such distinctions as were made by W. D. Ross in 1930 in his account of *The Right and the Good*. Kingsley Martin, in his biography of *Harold Laski* (London, 1953), describes what he terms 'the pluralist movement' prevalent in London in the 1920s (see pp. 71–72 and 74), whose decentralist and syndicalist principles have scant connection with Berlin's pluralism. In the final chapter of *Isaiah Berlin*, Gray argues (see pp. 141–56) that value-pluralism and liberalism are inconsistent ideals, notwithstanding Berlin's endeavours to derive one from the other. But in his *Conversations* with Jahanbegloo (see p. 44) Berlin himself describes these principles as incompatible, even though he subscribes to each of them.

19. Isaiah Berlin, *Vico and Herder: Two Studies in the History of Ideas* (London, 1976), and Berlin, *Three Critics of the Enlightenment: Vico, Hamann, Herder*, ed. H. Hardy (London, 2000).

20. Berlin, *Three Critics of the Enlightenment*, pp. 8–12, 13–16, 30–40, 111, 131–32, 143 and 169.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 57–62 and 212–13.

22. *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 34–39, 131, 212, 233, 318 and 360.

23. *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 55–56, 64–67, 73–78, 108, 192–96 and 314–15.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 15–16, 168–72, 176–77, 179–80, 189, 208–09, 224–25 and 231–39.



25. Isaiah Berlin, *The Magus of the North: J. G. Hamann and the Origins of Modern Irrationalism*, ed. H. Hardy (London, 1993), and *Three Critics of the Enlightenment*, pp. 283–84 and 328–29. As Hardy explains in his preface (p. 246), this text has been salvaged for readers partly by way of a machine relic found in the National Science Museum and the expertise of staff at the National Sound Archive, which together made possible the reconstitution of ‘Dictabelt’ recordings—now a defunct technology—embracing passages for which no original manuscript or typescript survived.

26. Isaiah Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism*, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 1965, ed. Henry Hardy (London, 1999).

27. White, books in review, *Political Theory* 5.1 (February 1977): 124–27, and Gardiner, review essays, *History and Theory* 16.1 (1977): 45–51. While largely welcoming Berlin’s scholarship, William Dray, however, in a critical notice, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 9.1 (March 1979): 179–82, doubts whether Berlin had managed to establish Vico’s and Herder’s significance for readers today. Among commentaries of a predominantly descriptive rather than evaluative character, see, for instance, John Michael Krois, book reviews, *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 10.4 (Fall 1977): 276–80, and James C. Morrison, ‘Three Interpretations of Vico’, including assessments as well of Ferdinand Fellmann’s *Das Vico-Axiom* and Leon Pompa’s *Vico*, offering interpretations strikingly different both from Berlin’s and each other’s, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39.3 (1978): 511–18.

28. Scouten, book reviews, *Comparative Literature Studies* 15.3 (1978): 336–40 (especially 338).

29. Hans Aarsleff, ‘Vico and Berlin’, collectively reviewing *Russian Thinkers*, *Concepts and Categories*, *Against the Current*, and *Personal Impressions*, as well as *Vico and Herder*, in the *London Review of Books*, 5–18 November 1981, pp. 6–7, succeeded by his published letter in retort to Berlin’s response of 3–16 June 1982, pp. 4–5. I greatly value Aarsleff’s friendship and regard his command of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century linguistics and philosophy as virtually unrivalled in the world of historical scholarship today. But, to my mind, his occasional rebuke of linguists and philosophers whose purportedly inflated self-esteem and standing he takes to be unmerited distracts from the strength of his arguments. Other critics, none more than Christopher Hitchens in an egregiously ill-tempered review of Ignatieff’s biography, have not hesitated to accuse Berlin of appeasement, inactivism or charlatanry. ‘Here is the rich man’s John Rawls’, remarks Hitchens (in the *London Review of Books*, 26 November 1998, p. 11), his aptitude for irony ‘conditioned . . . by his long service to a multitude of masters’.

30. Isaiah Berlin, ‘Professor Scouten on Herder and Vico’, *Comparative Literature Studies* 16.2 (June 1979): 141–45; and ‘Isaiah Berlin Responds to the Foregoing Criticisms of His Work’ and ‘Isaiah Berlin Writes’, *London Review of Books*, 5 November 1981, pp. 7–8, and 3 June 1982, p. 5.

31. W. H. Walsh, book reviews, *Mind* 87.346 (April 1978): 284–86 (especially p. 286).

32. Arnaldo Momigliano, 'On the Pioneer Trail', *New York Review of Books*, 11 November 1976, pp. 33–38 (especially pp. 34 and 38).

33. Leo Strauss, *Natural Right and History* (Chicago, 1953), introduction, pp. 2–6, and 'Progress or Return? The Contemporary Crisis in Western Civilization', dating from 1952, first published in *Modern Judaism* (1981), pp. 17–45, and reprinted in Strauss, *Jewish Philosophy and the Crisis of Modernity*, ed. Kenneth Hart Green (Albany, 1997), pp. 87–136. On Berlin's assessment of Strauss, see Jahanbegloo, *Conversations with Isaiah Berlin*, pp. 31–32.

34. *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 3 (1980): 89–106, and Berlin, *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas* (London, 1990), pp. 70–90. Berlin's revisions first appeared in L. Pompa and W. H. Dray (eds.), *Substance and Form in History: A Collection of Essays in Philosophy of History* (Edinburgh, 1981).

35. Berlin, *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*, pp. 76–78.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 85.

37. Berlin, 'Two Concepts of Liberty', in *Liberty*, p. 212.

38. The 'Ionian fallacy', as he termed it, was first discussed by Berlin in 1950 in his essay on 'Logical Translation' published in the *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. It is treated in some detail by Claude Galipeau on pp. 50–58 of his *Isaiah Berlin's Liberalism* (Oxford, 1994).

39. John Gray, *Enlightenment's Wake: Politics and Culture at the Close of the Modern Age* (London and New York, 1995), and my review, 'Laying the Enlightenment to Rest', *Government and Opposition* 32 (1997): 140–45.

40. Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism*, pp. 21–22. Variants of the same argument appear in 'The Decline of Utopian Ideas in the West', in *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*, pp. 24–25, and in 'Hume and the Sources of German Anti-Rationalism', in *Against the Current*, pp. 162–64.

41. Berlin, *The Age of Enlightenment*, introduction, pp. 28–29.

42. Jahanbegloo, *Conversations with Isaiah Berlin*, pp. 70–71.

43. Jacob L. Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (London, 1952), preface, p. vii.

44. Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism*, p. 32.

45. Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Princeton, 1980).

46. Carl H. Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven, 1932), pp. 29–31.

47. On this theme, see especially my 'The Enlightenment, the Nation-State and the Primal Patricide of Modernity', in Norman Geras and Robert Wokler (eds.), *The Enlightenment and Modernity* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, 2000), pp. 161–62.

48. I have drawn the last three paragraphs largely from my own 'Multiculturalism and Ethnic Cleansing in the Enlightenment', in Ole Peter Grell and Roy Porter (eds.), *Toleration in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 81–82.

49. See my 'La Querelle des Bouffons and the Italian Liberation of France: A Study of Revolutionary Foreplay', C. Duckworth and H. Le Grand (eds.), 'Studies in the Eighteenth Century', vol. 6, special issue, *Eighteenth-Century Life* 11, n.s., 1 (1987): 94–116.

50. I have in mind here Wolfgang Pröss's edition of Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* (Munich, 2002).

51. Berlin, *Three Critics of the Enlightenment*, pp. 281 and 328.

52. On this point, if I read him correctly, I largely subscribe to Aarsleff's interpretation of a central tradition of Enlightenment linguistics and philosophy, inspired by Leibniz and embracing Locke, Condillac and Süssmilch, which he takes to have been misconstrued by other commentators, sometimes, as with regard not only to Berlin but also Noam Chomsky, because he regards them as skewed by nineteenth-century perspectives on the course of European intellectual history.

53. I have borrowed this remark from Mark Lilla.

54. In 1992 Jacques Derrida was awarded a highly contested honorary doctorate from Cambridge, by way of an unprecedented vote forced mainly by the university's philosophers, triumphing with 336 votes in his favour against 204.

55. See especially the sixth chapter of Gray's *Isaiah Berlin*, pp. 141–68.

56. Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 7th ed. (Tübingen, 1953), p. 348, and Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven, 1946), p. 293.

57. Ignatieff, *Isaiah Berlin: A Life*, ch. 11, pp. 148–69.

58. Isaiah Berlin, 'A Remarkable Decade. IV: Alexander Herzen' (first published in *Encounter* in the mid-1950s), in *Russian Thinkers*, ed. Henry Hardy and Aileen Kelly, with an introduction by Kelly (London, 1978), p. 189.

59. Isaiah Berlin, *The Hedgehog and the Fox* (London, 1953), pp. 46 and 79.

60. See especially Berlin's commemorations of L. B. Namier and J. L. Austin in his *Personal Impressions*, ed. Henry Hardy, with an introduction by Noel Annan (London, 1980), pp. 63–82 and 101–15.

61. As recounted by Simon Schama at a meeting commemorating Berlin's life and work held in New York's Harvard Club in 1998.

62. Isaiah Berlin, 'Jewish Slavery and Emancipation', in *The Power of Ideas*, ed. Henry Hardy (London, 2000), pp. 169–70.

63. Ignatieff, *Isaiah Berlin: A Life*, p. 234.

64. Isaiah Berlin, 'The Origins of Israel' (first published by the Anglo-Israel Association in 1953), and 'Jewish Slavery and Emancipation', in *The Power of Ideas*, pp. 150 and 164.

65. Avishai Margalit, 'Address delivered at the Commemoration in the Sheldonian Theatre, Oxford on 21st March 1998', and Margalit, 'The Crooked Timber of Nationalism', in Ronald Dworkin, Mark Lilla and Robert B. Silvers (eds.), *The Legacy of Isaiah Berlin* (New York, 2001), pp. 151–52.

66. See my 'Multiculturalism and Ethnic Cleansing in the Enlightenment', in *Toleration in Enlightenment Europe*, pp. 69–85.

67. See the sixth of Voltaire's *Lettres philosophiques*. This text, incidentally, on account of its description of Presbyterians who only preach through their nose when they return to Scotland where they constitute the majority, might be said to form the Enlightenment's reply to Alasdair MacIntyre's *After Virtue*.

68. Isaiah Berlin, 'The Life and Opinions of Moses Hess', in *Against the Current*, pp. 237–40, and *Three Critics of the Enlightenment*, pp. 296–97 and 309.

69. Isaiah Berlin, 'Moses Hess', in *Against the Current*, pp. 245 and 249.

70. On the circumstances surrounding the composition of Cassirer's work and its defence of the German Enlightenment, see especially my 'Ernst Cassirer's Enlightenment: An Exchange with Bruce Mazlish', in *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 29 (2000): 335–48, and Kent Wright, '"A Bright Clear Mirror": Cassirer's *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*', in Keith M. Baker and Peter Hanns Reill (eds.), *What's Left of Enlightenment?: A Postmodern Question* (Stanford, 2001), pp. 71–101. Berlin reviewed the English translation of Cassirer's *Philosophie der Aufklärung*, first published in 1951, in the *English Historical Review* 68 (1953): 617–19.

71. Peter Gay, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider* (Westport, Conn., 1968), p. xiv.

72. Berlin, *The Power of Ideas*, p. 165.

73. Jahanbegloo, *Conversations with Isaiah Berlin*, p. 21.

74. Perry Anderson, 'Components of the National Culture', *New Left Review* 50 (July–August 1968): 3–57.

75. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

76. *Ibid.*, pp. 7–8 and 15–19.

77. Isaiah Berlin, 'Winston Churchill in 1940', 'President Franklin Delano Roosevelt' and 'Chaim Weizmann', in Berlin, *Personal Impressions* (London, 1981), pp. 16, 31, 52–53 and 62.

78. Konrad Kalejs, allegedly a member of the Arajs Kommando Unit responsible for the murder of thousands of Latvian Jews during the Second World War, returned to Australia in January 2000 after a long stay in a retirement home in Leicestershire. He died in Melbourne the following year.

79. Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 113–16.

80. These remarks, initially prepared in January 2000 for the Oxford Political Thought Conference and the Tel Aviv symposium on 'Isaiah Berlin's Counter-Enlightenment' from which this collection is drawn, were also delivered the following March as a public lecture at the Central European University in Budapest and subsequently for the political theory seminar at Harvard University directed by Harvey Mansfield. In their original format, and virtually without annotation, they were published in the second *Jewish Studies Yearbook* of the Central European University in 2002. I am grateful to Joshua Cherniss, Henry Hardy, Roger Hausheer, Joseph Mali and Wolfgang Pröss for supplying me with several leads and references.

## CHAPTER 15: PROJECTING THE ENLIGHTENMENT

This paper was first drafted for the Morrell Conference on 'After MacIntyre' at the University of York and then revised for the University of Manchester Political Thought Conference on 'Truth and Rationality' in March 1992. I am grateful to Keith Graham, John Horton, Geraint Parry and Maurizio Passerin d'Entrèves for various comments on my views of MacIntyre's philosophy; to Istvan Hont and Jim Moore for their reflections on Hutcheson; and above all to Dorothy Emmet for pointing me in the direction of MacIntyre's M.A. dissertation, which she supervised.

1. Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (London, 1981).
2. Alasdair MacIntyre, *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (London, 1988) and *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry* (London, 1990).
3. John Plamenatz, *Karl Marx's Philosophy of Man* (Oxford, 1975), p. 472.
4. University of Manchester Library, M.A. thesis 7580, April 1951, pp. 1, 47–48, 81 and 92.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE PUBLISHED WORK OF ROBERT WOKLER

---

## BOOKS

*Rousseau on Society, Politics, Music and Language: An Historical Interpretation of His Early Writings*. New York: Garland, 1987. Also presented as an Oxford D.Phil dissertation entitled, 'The Social Thought of Jean-Jacques Rousseau: An Historical Interpretation of His Early Writings', Nuffield College, Oxford, 1976. N.B. An unknown number of copies were mistakenly published by Garland under the title *The Social Thought of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*.

*Rousseau*, Past Masters series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995; reissued with corrections, 1996; German translation by M. Rehm, Freiburg: Herder, 1999; Japanese translation by S. Yamamoto, Osaka: Koyo Shobo, 2000; Italian translation by S. Ferlini, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2001; Korean translation by J. I. Lee, Seoul: Sigongsa, 2001; Turkish translation by C. Atila, Istanbul: Altin Kitaplar, 2003; reissued as *Rousseau: A Very Short Introduction*, revised, expanded and illustrated for the Very Short Introductions series, 2001; Greek translation by P. N. Pantazakos, Athens: Ellinika Grammata (distributed with To Vima), 2006; Albanian translation by J. Qineti, Tirana: Ideart, 2008; French translation by S. Baudry and D. Reynaud, Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 2011; Portuguese, Romanian, and Spanish translations in progress.

## EDITED AND CO-EDITED BOOKS

*Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, ed. R. A. Leigh, revised by R. Wokler and J. Laming, vol. 47. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1988.

*Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, ed. R. A. Leigh, revised by R. Wokler and J. Laming, vol. 48. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1988.

*Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, ed. R. A. Leigh, revised by R. Wokler and J. Laming, vol. 49, including Wokler's 'Avertissement du Quarante-Neuvième Volume'. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1989.

*Man and Society: Political and Social Theories from Machiavelli to Marx*, by John Plamenatz, a new edition, expanded and revised with M. E. Plamenatz, vol. 1: *From the Middle Ages to Locke*. London: Longman, 1992.

*Man and Society: Political and Social Theories from Machiavelli to Marx*, by John Plamenatz, a new edition, expanded and revised with M. E. Plamenatz, vol. 2: *From Montesquieu to the Early Socialists*. London: Longman, 1992.

*Man and Society: Political and Social Theories from Machiavelli to Marx*, by John Plamenatz, a new edition, expanded and revised with M. E. Plamenatz, vol. 3: *Hegel, Marx and Engels, and the Idea of Progress*. London: Longman, 1992.



- Political Writings*, by Denis Diderot, ed. and trans. with J. Hope Mason. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Rousseau and the Eighteenth Century: Essays in Memory of R. A. Leigh*, ed. with M. Hobson and J. T. A. Leigh, including Wokler's 'Preparing the Definitive Edition of the *Correspondance de Rousseau*'. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1992.
- Inventing Human Science: Eighteenth-Century Domains*, ed. with C. Fox and R. Porter, including Wokler's 'Anthropology and Conjectural History in the Enlightenment' and 'The Enlightenment Science of Politics'. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Rousseau and Liberty* (principally proceedings of a Trinity College, Cambridge colloquium sponsored by the Liberty Fund, 1988), including Wokler's 'Rousseau and His Critics on the Fanciful Liberties We Have Lost'. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- The Enlightenment and Modernity*, ed. with N. Geras, including Wokler's 'The Enlightenment, the Nation-State and the Primal Patricide of Modernity'. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.
- Isaiah Berlin's Counter-Enlightenment*, ed. with J. Mali (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 93.5), including Wokler's 'Isaiah Berlin's Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment'. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2003.
- The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, ed. with M. Goldie, including Wokler's 'Ideology and the Origins of Social Science'. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

## ARTICLES, ESSAYS AND BOOK CHAPTERS

- 'Rameau, Rousseau and the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*'. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 117 (1974): 179–238; see corrigenda in 132 (1975): 112 (monograph).
- 'The Influence of Diderot on the Political Theory of Rousseau'. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 132 (1975): 55–111 (monograph).
- 'Tyson and Buffon on the Orang-utan'. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 155 (1976): 2301–19. (Vols. 151–55 comprise Transactions of the Fourth International Congress of the Enlightenment, New Haven, 1975.)
- 'L'orango e l'uomo secondo Tyson e Buffon', *Ethos* 5.3 (September 1977): 249–65. (This is an expanded version of 'Tyson and Buffon' above, and in part Wokler's own translation of it.)
- 'Perfectible Apes in Decadent Cultures: Rousseau's Anthropology Revisited' in 'Rousseau for Our Time', special issue, *Daedalus* 107.3 (Summer 1978): 107–34.
- 'Rousseau on Rameau and Revolution', in R. F. Brissenden and J. C. Eade (eds.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 4 (Papers presented at the Fourth David Nichol Smith Memorial Seminar, Canberra, 1976). Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979, pp. 251–83.
- 'Rousseau's Perfectibilian Libertarianism', in A. Ryan (ed.), *The Idea of Freedom*:

- Essays in Honour of Isaiah Berlin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979, pp. 233–52.
- 'The Ape Debates in Enlightenment Anthropology', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 192 (1980): 1164–75. (Vols. 190–93 comprise Transactions of the Fifth International Congress of the Enlightenment, Pisa, 1979).
- 'The *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* and Its Offspring: Rousseau in Reply to His Critics', in S. Harvey, M. Hobson, D. Kelley and S. S. B. Taylor (eds.), *Reappraisals of Rousseau: Studies in Honour of R. A. Leigh*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980, pp. 250–78.
- 'A Reply to Charvet: Rousseau and the Perfectibility of Man'. *History of Political Thought* 1.1 (Spring 1980): 81–90. (This paper was read at the 1978 Oxford Political Thought Conference.)
- 'L'Essai sur l'origine des langues en tant que fragment du *Discours sur l'inégalité: Rousseau et ses "mauvais" interprètes*', in M. Launay (ed.), *Rousseau et Voltaire en 1978: Actes du Colloque international de Nice, juin 1978*. Geneva: Slatkine, 1981, pp. 145–69.
- 'Perfectibility of Man', in W. F. Bynum, E. J. Browne and R. Porter (eds.), *Dictionary of the History of Science*. London: Macmillan, 1981, 316–17.
- 'From the Orang-utan to the Vampire: Towards an Anthropology of Rousseau' (with C. Frayling), in R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Rousseau after Two Hundred Years: Proceedings of the Cambridge Bicentennial Colloquium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982, pp. 109–29.
- 'Rousseau and Marx', in D. Miller and L. Siedentop (eds.), *The Nature of Political Theory* (essays in honour of John Plamenatz). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983, pp. 219–46.
- 'Rousseau', in *Political Thought from Plato to Nato*, introduced by B. Redhead. London: Ariel Books/British Broadcasting Corporation, 1984, pp. 120–34. (This volume was published to accompany Radio 4's *Plato to Nato* series first broadcast from 18 May 1984). Reissued with minor revisions as *Plato to Nato: Studies in Political Thought* (London: Penguin/BBC Books, 1995).
- 'Rousseau e Marx', *Bollettino di Storia della filosofia* 8 (March 1987): 83–112. (This is an amended and expanded translation, on which Wokler collaborated, of 'Rousseau and Marx' above.)
- 'La Querelle des Bouffons and the Italian Liberation of France: A Study of Revolutionary Foreplay', in C. Duckworth and H. Le Grand (eds.), 'Studies in the Eighteenth Century', vol. 6 (Papers presented at the Sixth David Nichol Smith Memorial Seminar, Melbourne, 1983), special issue, *Eighteenth Century Life* 11, n.s., 1 (February 1987): 94–116.
- 'Rousseau's Two Concepts of Liberty', in G. Feaver and F. Rosen (eds.), *Lives, Liberties and the Public Good*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1987, pp. 61–100.
- 'Saint-Simon and the Passage from Political to Social Science', in A. Pagden (ed.), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, pp. 325–38.
- Entries in M. A. Riff (ed.), *Dictionary of Political Ideologies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987: 'Introduction', xi–xiv; and 'The Enlightenment', 74–86.

- 'Our Illusory Chains: Rousseau's Images of Bondage and Freedom', in M. Cranston and L. C. Boralevi (eds.), *Culture et Politique / Culture and Politics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988, pp. 41–50.
- 'Natural Law and the Meaning of Rousseau's Political Thought: A Correction to Two Misrenderings of His Doctrine', in G. Barber, C. Courtney and D. Gilson (eds.), *Enlightenment Essays in Memory of Robert Shackleton*. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1988, pp. 319–35.
- 'Apes and Races in the Scottish Enlightenment: Monboddo and Kames on the Nature of Man', in P. Jones (ed.), *Philosophy and Science in the Scottish Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988, pp. 145–68.
- 'Avertissement du Quarante-neuvième Volume', in *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, ed. R. A. Leigh, revised by R. Wokler and J. Laming, vol. 49. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1989, pp. xxiii–xxvi.
- Entries in J. Yolton, R. Porter, P. Rogers and B. M. Stafford (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to the Enlightenment*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991; American edition, 1992: 'Civilization', 88–90; 'Democracy', 119–20; 'Liberalism', 286; 'Liberty', 286–87; 'Negroes', 361–62; 'New World', 369–70; 'Optimism', 382–83; 'Patriotism', 387–88; 'People, The', 391–93; 'Physiocracy', 402; 'Politeness', 410; 'Primitivism', 422–23; 'Progress', 427–28; 'Property', 428–29; 'Rights', 458–59; and 'Savagery', 473.
- 'Preparing the Definitive Edition of the *Correspondance de Rousseau*', in *Rousseau and the Eighteenth Century: Essays in Memory of R. A. Leigh*, ed. M. Hobson, J. T. A. Leigh and R. Wokler. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1992, pp. 3–21.
- 'Taking Stock of the Leigh Edition of the *Correspondance de Rousseau*'. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 305 (1992): 1807–11. (Vols. 303–5 comprise Transactions of the Eighth International Congress of the Enlightenment, Bristol, 1991.)
- 'Anthropology and Conjectural History in the Enlightenment'. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 305 (1992): 1894–95. (Vols. 303–5 comprise Transactions of the Eighth International Congress of the Enlightenment, Bristol, 1991.)
- 'Hegel's Rousseau: The General Will and Civil Society', in S.-E. Liedman (ed.), 'Deutscher Idealismus' (papers presented at a symposium on German Idealism in November 1991, Göteborg), special issue, *Arachne* 8 (1993): 7–45.
- 'From *l'homme physique* to *l'homme moral* and Back: Towards a History of Enlightenment Anthropology' in 'Origins of the Human Sciences', special issue, *History of the Human Sciences* 6.1 (February 1993): 121–38.
- 'Democracy's Mythical Ordeals: The Promethean and Procrustean Paths to Popular Self-Rule', in M. Moran and G. Parry (eds.), *Democracy and Democratization*. London: Routledge, 1994, pp. 21–46.
- 'Projecting the Enlightenment', in J. Horton and S. Mendus (eds.), *After MacIntyre*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994, pp. 108–26.
- 'Rousseau's Pufendorf: Natural Law and the Foundations of Commercial Society'. *History of Political Thought* 15.3 (Autumn 1994): 373–402.
- 'Ralph Alexander Leigh', obituary notice. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 84 (1994): 369–91.

- 'Hegel versus Kant: From the Enlightenment Project to Post-Modernity', in K. Haakonssen and U. Thiel (eds.), *History of Philosophy Yearbook*, vol. 2 (proceedings of a colloquium on Kant and Philosophical Theories of Human Nature in the Eighteenth Century), for the Australasian Society for the History of Philosophy. Canberra: Australian National University, 1994, pp. 85–99.
- Entries in J. Black and R. Porter (eds.), *A Dictionary of Eighteenth-Century World History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994: 'Race', 626; and 'Savagery', 661.
- 'Anthropology and Conjectural History in the Enlightenment', in C. Fox, R. Porter and R. Wokler (eds.), *Inventing Human Science: Eighteenth Century Domains* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), pp. 31–52.
- 'The Enlightenment Science of Politics', in C. Fox, R. Porter and R. Wokler (eds.), *Inventing Human Science: Eighteenth Century Domains* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), pp. 323–45.
- 'Rousseau and His Critics on the Fanciful Liberties We Have Lost', in *Rousseau and Liberty*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995, pp. 189–212.
- 'The Nexus of Animal and Rational: Sociobiology, Language and the Enlightenment Study of Apes', in S. Maasen, E. Mendelsohn and P. Weingart (eds.), *Biology as Society, Society as Biology: Metaphors*, Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook 18, 1994. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995, pp. 81–103.
- 'Enlightening Apes: Eighteenth-Century Speculation and Current Experiments on Linguistic Competence', in R. Corbey and B. Theunissen (eds.), *Ape, Man, Ape-man: Changing Views since 1600* (proceedings of the 1993 Leiden Pithecanthropus Centennial). Leiden: Department of Prehistory, Leiden University, 1995, pp. 87–100.
- 'Regressing towards Post-Modernity', in L. Clark and G. Lafrance (eds.), *Rousseau and Criticism / Rousseau et la critique* (proceedings of the North American Association for the Study of Jean-Jacques Rousseau Colloquium of 1993, Trent), Pensée Libre no. 5 (Ottawa, 1995), pp. 263–72.
- 'Situating Rousseau in His World and Ours'. *Social Science Information* 34.4 (December 1995): 515–37. (This article was the Arthur Wilson Memorial Lecture presented at Dartmouth College, January 1995.)
- 'Todorov's Otherness' in 'A Symposium on "Living Alone Together"', special issue, *New Literary History* 27.1 (Winter 1996): 43–55.
- 'Diderot, Denis', in J. J. Chablis (ed.), *Philosophy of Education: An Encyclopedia*. New York: Garland, 1996, 155–58.
- 'Rousseau', in T. Mautner (ed.), *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996, 372–73. Reissued as *The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy* (London: Penguin, 1997).
- Entries in F. Spencer (ed.), *History of Physical Anthropology: An Encyclopedia*. New York: Garland, 1997: 'Monboddó, Lord (James Burnett)', 2:681–83; 'Rousseau, Jean-Jacques', 2:887–90; and 'Tyson, Edward', 2:1048–50.
- 'Deconstructing the Self on the Wild Side', in T. O'Hagan (ed.), *Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Sources of the Self*. London: Avebury, 1997, pp. 106–19.
- 'Dr Besterman, I Presume', in U. Kölving and C. Mervaud (eds.), *Voltaire et ses combats: Actes du congrès international Oxford-Paris 1994*, vol. 1. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1997, pp. 21–36.
- 'The French Revolutionary Roots of Political Modernity in Hegel's Philosophy, or

- the Enlightenment at Dusk'. *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 35 (Spring–Summer 1997): 71–89.
- 'Rousseau et la liberté'. *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* 41 (1997): 205–29. (This essay was originally presented as the 1989 annual lecture to the Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau in Geneva.)
- 'The Enlightenment Project and Its Critics', in S.-E. Liedman (ed.), 'The Postmodernist Critique of the Project of the Enlightenment' (proceedings of a colloquium held in Göteborg, April 1995), special issue, *Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities* 58 (1997): 13–31.
- 'The Enlightenment and the French Revolutionary Birth Pangs of Modernity', in J. Heilbron, L. Magnusson, and B. Wittrock (eds.), *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity: Conceptual Change in Context, 1750–1850*, *Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook* 20, 1996. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998, pp. 35–76. (This paper was originally presented at a conference in Uppsala in July 1993.)
- Entries in E. Craig (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 1998: 'Buffon, Georges Louis Leclerc, Comte de', 2:120–23; 'Diderot, Denis', 3:63–69; 'Enlightenment, Continental', 3:315–20; and 'Monboddo, Lord (James Burnett)', 6:473–74.
- 'Contextualizing Hegel's Phenomenology of the French Revolution and the Terror'. *Political Theory* 26.1 (February 1998): 33–55.
- 'The Subtextual Reincarnation of Voltaire and Rousseau'. *American Scholar* 67.2 (Spring 1998): 55–64.
- 'Pistols for Two and Coffee for One: Rekindling Voltaire's and Rousseau's Quarrel in the Footnotes'. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 362 (1998): 1–10.
- 'The Enlightenment Project as Betrayed by Modernity', *History of European Ideas* 24.4–5 (1998): 301–13. (This essay was adapted as the Torgny Segerstedt Professorial Lecture delivered in Uppsala in March 1998.)
- 'The Manuscript Authority of Political Thoughts', in 'Scholastics, Enlightenment and Philosophic Radicals: Essays in Honour of J. H. Burns', special issue, *History of Political Thought* 20.1 (Spring 1999): 107–24. (This paper was based on a talk presented at the 1994 Oxford Political Thought Conference.)
- Entries in R. L. Arrington (ed.), *A Companion to the Philosophers*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999: 'Rousseau', 476–79; and 'Voltaire', 531–33.
- 'The Enlightenment: The Nation-State and the Primal Patricide of Modernity'. *Discussion Paper Series* 46 (Collegium Budapest, Institute for Advanced Study, 1999). Reprinted and adapted as 'The Enlightenment, the Nation-State and the Primal Patricide of Modernity', in N. Geras and R. Wokler (eds.), *The Enlightenment and Modernity* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), pp. 161–83.
- 'Multiculturalism and Ethnic Cleansing in the Enlightenment', in O. P. Grell and R. Porter (eds.), *Toleration in Enlightenment Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 69–85.
- 'The Enlightenment Project on the Eve of the Holocaust', in J. Kaye and B. Stråth (eds.), *Enlightenment and Genocide, Contradictions of Modernity*. Brussels: Presses Interuniversitaires Européennes, 2000, pp. 59–79.

- 'Ernst Cassirer's Enlightenment: An Exchange with Bruce Mazlish'. *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 29 (2000): 335–48.
- 'From the Moral and Political Sciences to the Sciences of Society by Way of the French Revolution', in B. S. Byrd, J. Hruschka and J. C. Joerden (eds.), 'The Origin and Development of the Moral Sciences in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century', special issue, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik / Annual Review of Law and Ethics* 8 (2000): 33–45.
- 'The Professoriate of Political Thought in England since 1914: A Tale of Three Chairs', in D. Castiglione and I. Hampsher-Monk (eds.), *The History of Political Thought in National Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 134–58.
- 'Ancient Postmodernism in the Philosophy of Rousseau', in R. Grant and P. Stewart (eds.), *Rousseau and the Ancients / Rousseau et les anciens*, Pensée Libre no. 8 (Montreal, 2001), pp. 33–47. Expanded in P. Riley (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Rousseau* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 418–43. (This essay was the keynote address of the 1999 colloquium of the North American Association for the Study of Jean-Jacques Rousseau at Duke University.)
- 'Repatriating Modernity's Alleged Debts to the Enlightenment: French Revolutionary Social Science and the Genesis of the Nation State', in P. Joyce (ed.), *The Social in Question*. London: Routledge, 2002, pp. 62–80.
- 'Political Modernity's Critical Juncture in the Course of the French Revolution', in N. Witoszek and L. Trägårdh (eds.), *Culture and Crisis: The Case of Germany and Sweden*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2002, pp. 202–18.
- 'Der besondere Charakter der ländlichen Aufklärung des Nordens', review essay on Ø. Sørensen and B. Stråth (eds.), *The Cultural Construction of Norden*, in B. Henningsen (ed.), *Das Projekt Norden: Essays zur Konstruktion einer europäischen Region*, Wahlverwandschaft-der Norden und Deutschland, vol. 9, Berlin: Verlag, 2002, pp. 58–64. (This essay was prepared for a conference on the Union of Kalmar between Verdun and Maastricht, held in Kalmar in October 1997.)
- 'Isaiah Berlin's Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment', in A. Kovács and E. Andor (eds.), *Jewish Studies at the Central European University*, 2, 1999–2001. Budapest: Central European University Jewish Studies, 2002, pp. 205–19. Reprinted and expanded in J. Mali and R. Wokler (eds.), *Isaiah Berlin's Counter-Enlightenment*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2003, pp. 13–31.
- Entries in A. Kuper and J. Kuper (eds.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2004: 'Rousseau, Jean-Jacques', 2:894–96; and 'Social Contract', 2:933–35.
- 'Enlightenment', in D. L. Shelton (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Genocide and Crimes against Humanity*. New York: Macmillan, 2005, 286–87.
- Entries in J. Merriman and J. Winter (eds.), *Europe, 1789–1914: Encyclopedia of the Age of Industry and Empire*. Detroit, Mich.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2006: 'Bonald, Louis de', 1:268–69; 'Burke, Edmund', 1:326–28; and 'Utilitarianism', 5:2392–94.
- 'Rousseau's Reading of the Book of Genesis and the Theology of Commercial Society'. *Modern Intellectual History* 3.1 (April 2006): 85–94.



- 'Ideology and the Origins of Social Science', in M. Goldie and R. Wokler (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 688–709.
- 'Rites of Passage and the Grand Tour: Discovering, Imagining and Inventing European Civilization in the Age of Enlightenment', in A. Molho, D. R. Curto and N. Koniordos (eds.), *Finding Europe: Discourses on Margins, Communities, Images, ca. 13th–ca. 18th Centuries*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007, pp. 205–22.
- 'A Guide to Isaiah Berlin's *Political Ideas in the Romantic Age*' (with an introduction by J. L. Cherniss and R. P. Hanley). *History of Political Thought* 29.2 (Summer 2008): 344–69.
- 'All Ears', in H. Hardy (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah: Personal Impressions of Isaiah Berlin*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009, pp. 169–73. Also a biographical memoir (abridged) in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 150.4 (December 2006): 669–72. (This was a commemorative lecture delivered by Robert Wokler at the Harvard Club in New York on 2 June 1998; it first appeared on the website of the Isaiah Berlin Literary Trust in 2006.)

#### REVIEWS, OTHER ARTICLES AND MISCELLANEOUS

- 'On the Death of Malcolm X: The Politics of Fratricide', in 'Race,' special issue, *Clare Market Review* (student journal of the London School of Economics) 62.1 (1965): 22–25.
- 'The Angels of Destruction Visit California' (on the Los Angeles race riots), in 'Conflict', special issue, *Clare Market Review* 62.2 (1965): 10–13.
- 'Rousseau's Politics', review of R. Grimsley (ed.), *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Du contrat social. Government and Opposition* 8.4 (Autumn 1973): 518–22.
- Review of R. Grimsley, *The Philosophy of Rousseau* and J. Hall, *Rousseau: An Introduction to His Political Philosophy*. *Philosophical Quarterly* 24.96 (July 1974): 281–84.
- 'Rousseau's Paradox', review of K. F. Roche, *Rousseau: Stoic and Romantic* and J. Charvet, *The Social Problem in the Philosophy of Rousseau*. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 20 September 1974, p. 18.
- Review of F. O'Gorman, *Edmund Burke: His Philosophy* and D. Cameron, *The Social Thought of Rousseau and Burke: A Comparative Study*. *Political Studies* 22.4 (December 1974): 486–90.
- 'The Analogies of Nature', review of A. Verri, *Lord Monboddo, dalla metafisica all'antropologia*. *Times Literary Supplement*, 11 March 1977, pp. 262–63.
- Replies to letter on Monboddo in *Times Literary Supplement*, 6 May 1977, pp. 561, and 17 June 1977, p. 733.
- 'The Very Rhythm of Rousseau', review of S. Ellenburg, *Rousseau's Political Philosophy*. *Times Literary Supplement*, 19 August 1977, p. 995.
- 'The Enlightenment and the Revolution: Some Notes on Norman Hampson's Variations on a Theme by Robert Darnton'. *British Society for Eighteenth Century Studies Newsletter* 13 (October 1977): 18–21.
- Catalogue of Voltaire and Rousseau*, a book exhibition to commemorate the bi-



- centenary of their deaths (with D. Adams), John Rylands Library, University of Manchester, February 1978.
- 'The Enlightenment Hostilities of Voltaire and Rousseau' (feature article), *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 29 September 1978, pp. 9–10.
- Review of B. Parekh (ed.), *Jeremy Bentham: Ten Critical Essays* and R. Steintrager, *Bentham. Political Studies* 27.2 (June 1979): 340.
- Review of R. Fralin, *Rousseau and Representation. Political Studies* 28.2 (June 1980): 325.
- 'Descending into Paranoia', review of R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vols. 34–36. *Times Literary Supplement*, 6 February 1981, p. 143.
- Review of M. F. Plattner, *Rousseau's State of Nature: An Interpretation of the Discourse on Inequality. Political Studies* 29.1 (March 1981): 156–57.
- 'The Apes and Us', review of thirteen books on sociobiology and ethology. *Quarto* 15 (March 1981): 5–7 (publisher's correction in *Quarto* 16 [April 1981]: 20).
- 'The Great Dissimulator', review of H. C. Mansfield Jr., *Machiavelli's New Modes and Orders: A Study of the Discourses on Livy. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 10 April 1981, p. 17.
- 'Eminently Enlightened', review of H. Mason, *Voltaire. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 16 October 1981, p. 1216.
- Review of N. O. Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment. Political Studies* 29.4 (December 1981): 657.
- Review of J. T. Schleifer, *The Making of Tocqueville's Democracy in America. Political Studies* 29.4 (December 1981): 658.
- 'Adrift in a Gene Pool', review of P. Singer, *The Expanding Circle: Ethics and Sociobiology. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 26 February 1982, p. 22.
- 'A Polity of Nature', review of J. Howard, *Darwin* and W. George, *Darwin. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 2 July 1982, p. 17.
- 'Critical Dialectic', review of S. Rose (ed.), *Against Biological Determinism and Towards a Liberatory Biology. Times Higher Education Supplement* 30 July 1982, p. 17.
- 'Natural Slavery', review of A. Pagden, *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 11 February 1983, p. 15.
- 'Balance of Life', review of M. Barthélemy-Madaule, *Lamarck the Mythical Precursor. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 25 March 1983, p. 17.
- Review of M. Cranston and P. Mair (eds.), *Ideology and Politics. Political Studies* 31.1 (March 1983): 164–65.
- Review of B. Noone Jr., *Rousseau's 'Social Contract': A Conceptual Analysis. Political Studies* 31.1 (March 1983): 169–70.
- Review of J. A. Bernstein, *Shaftesbury, Rousseau and Kant: An Introduction to the Conflict between Aesthetic and Moral Values in Modern Thought. Ethics* 93.3 (April 1983): 640–41.
- Review of R. Porter and M. Teich (eds.), *The Enlightenment in National Context. Political Studies* 31.2 (June 1983): 343–44.
- 'The Vagabondage of the Philosophe', review of R. A. Leigh (ed.), *Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau*, vols. 37–40 and M. Cranston, *The*

- Early Life and Work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Times Literary Supplement*, 2 September 1983, p. 919–20 (publisher's correction in *TLS*, 9 September 1983, p. 961).
- Review of K. Taylor, *The Political Ideas of the Utopian Socialists. Political Studies* 31.3 (September 1983): 529.
- 'Founding a School for Statesmanship', review of S. Collini, D. Winch and J. Burrow, *That Noble Savage of Politics: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 9 March 1984, p. 15.
- 'Look to Nature', review of R. Brown, *The Nature of Social Laws: Machiavelli to Mill. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 30 November 1984, p. 16.
- Review of D. LaCapra and S. L. Kaplan (eds.), *Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives. Political Studies* 33.1 (March 1985): 174–75.
- Review of B. Goodwin and K. Taylor, *The Politics of Utopia. Political Studies* 33.1 (March 1985): 175–76.
- 'R. A. Leigh' (obituary). *Daily Telegraph*, 2 January 1988, p. 12.
- 'Brain Drain "Myth"' (letter). *The Times*, 24 February 1989, p. 13.
- Review of J. Miller, *Rousseau: Dreamer of Democracy. Journal of Modern History* 61.2 (June 1989): 380–81.
- 'Liberty, Equality and Fratricide' (feature article). *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 14 July 1989, pp. 15–16.
- Introduction to *A Catalogue of Saint Simon*. Wickmere, Norfolk: Merrion Book Company, 1989.
- 'Serious Bookworms Should Go to Japan' (letter). *Independent*, 26 July 1990, p. 24.
- 'Vagabondage', review of M. Cranston, *The Noble Savage. New Statesman*, 12 April 1991, pp. 36–37.
- Introduction to *A Catalogue of John Wilkes and Liberty*. Wickmere, Norfolk: Merrion Book Company, 1991.
- 'Prop Forward', review of P. N. Furbank, *Diderot: A Critical Biography. New Statesman*, 8 May 1992, p. 40.
- 'Why was Firm Prosecuted?' (letter). *Daily Telegraph*, 12 November 1992, p. 20.
- 'Europe's Shameful Example to the World' (letter). *Guardian*, 6 March 1993, p. 26.
- 'The Blood Spilled in Bosnia is on Britain's Hands' (letter). *Sunday Times*, 25 April 1993, p. 7.
- 'Keeping It in the Family', review of P. Cavalieri and P. Singer (eds.), *The Great Ape Project. Times Literary Supplement*, 17 September 1993, pp. 5–6. Reprinted in J. Koobatian, *The Thinking Reader* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 2002), pp. 205–9.
- Review of I. Hampsher-Monk, *A History of Modern Political Thought: Major Political Thinkers from Hobbes to Marx. Political Studies* 41.4 (December 1993): 685.
- Review of N. J. H. Dent (ed.), *A Rousseau Dictionary. Political Studies* 41.4 (December 1993): 719–20.
- Introduction to *A Catalogue of Benjamin Franklin*. Wickmere, Norfolk: Merrion Book Company, 1994.

- 'Why We Must Shun Owen's Plan' (letter). *Daily Telegraph*, 22 January 1994, p. 14.
- 'Call for Concerted Action on Bosnia' (letter). *The Times*, 10 February 1994, p. 17.
- 'After Its Humiliation at Gorazde, the United Nations Could Still Salvage a Little Credibility' (letter). *Independent*, 19 April 1994, p. 15.
- Review of B. Fontana (ed.), *The Invention of the Modern Republic. Political Studies* 42.4 (December 1994): 763.
- 'Singular Praise for a Pluralist', review of J. Gray, *Isaiah Berlin. Times Higher Education Supplement*, 3 March 1995, p. 22.
- Review of Y. Glaziov, *Hobbes en France au XVIIIe siècle. History of European Ideas* 21.3 (May 1995): 473–75.
- 'In Bosnia, the West Blunders On' (letter). *New York Times*, 1 June 1995, p. 24.
- 'Appeasers of Bosnia Genocide' (letter). *Independent*, 16 August 1995, p. 14.
- 'The Three Steps to Figure Out a Salary' (letter). *Cambridge Evening News*, 21 August 1995, p. 6.
- Review of C. Galipeau, *Isaiah Berlin's Liberalism. Political Studies* 43.3 (September 1995): 533–34.
- 'Belated Response to Bosnia Crisis' (letter). *The Times*, 5 September 1995, p. 15.
- 'Voltaire "Free Speech" Quote was Invented' (letter). *Cambridge Evening News*, 5 September 1995, p. 15.
- 'Arguments for a Deeper Shade of Green', review of R. Sylvan and D. Bennett, *The Greening of Ethics*; R. Elliot (ed.), *Environmental Ethics*; and F. Ferré and P. Hartel (eds.), *Ethics and Environmental Policy. Times Literary Supplement*, 8 September 1995, p. 9.
- 'Music and the Moral Voice', review of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Ecrits sur la musique, la langue et le théâtre*, vol. 5 of B. Gagnebin, M. Raymond et al. (eds.), *Oeuvres complètes*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade and of M. O'Dea, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Music, Illusion and Desire. Times Literary Supplement*, 3 May 1996, pp. 8–9.
- 'Jews, Arabs and Stolen Nazi Gold' (letter). *Independent*, 14 September 1996, p. 15.
- 'Laying the Enlightenment to Rest', review of J. Gray, *Enlightenment's Wake. Government and Opposition* 32.1 (Winter 1997): 140–45.
- Review of W. Sewell, *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution: The Abbé Sieyès and What is the Third Estate? Contemporary Sociology* 26.2 (March 1997): 240–41.
- 'Tatton Triumph for Rousseau' (letter). *Independent*, 6 May 1997, p. 10.
- Review of N. Waszek, *The Scottish Enlightenment and Hegel's Account of 'Civil Society'.* *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 35 (Spring–Summer 1997): 90–91.
- 'Balkan Ethics' (letter). *Independent*, 22 September 1998, p. 2.
- 'A Modern Candide', review of M. Ignatieff, *Isaiah Berlin: A Life* and G. Dalos, *The Guest from the Future: Anna Akhmatova and Isaiah Berlin. Times Literary Supplement*, 18 December 1998, pp. 7–8.
- Catalogue of the Library of John Plamenatz.* London: Quaritch, 2006.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## INDEX

---

- Aarsleff, Hans, 247, 248, 252–53, 357n29, 359n52
- Abbadie, Jacques, 318n72
- Adorno, Theodor, 187, 233
- Akhmatova, Anna, 253
- Alembert, Jean-Baptiste le Rond d', 72; and Cassirer, 237; *De la liberté de la musique*, 294n4, 310n92; *Discours préliminaire* to *Encyclopédie*, 235–36; *Éléments de philosophie*, 236; and Isaiah Berlin, 254; and MacIntyre, 261; and Rameau, 71, 305n63; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 82
- amour de soi*, 97, 118, 167
- amour propre*, 167
- anatomy, 4, 5, 7, 12
- ancien régime*, 136, 196, 261
- Anderson, Perry, 245; 'Components of the National Culture,' 257, 258
- Anet, Claude, 75
- Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 142
- Annales* school, 195
- Anscombe, Elizabeth, 273
- anthropology, 1–28, 31, 41, 86, 131, 185, 226
- antiquity, 31, 32, 86; republics of, 109, 112; slavery in, 104–5. *See also* Greeks, ancient; Romans, ancient
- apes, 4, 9, 13–14, 28, 283n24; and Ardrey, 12, 21; and culture, 18–19; as degenerate men, 11; descent from, 6–13; humanity of, 131; and language, 4, 5, 131; men as fallen, 21; and perfectibility, 24. *See also* chimpanzees; monkeys; orang-utans
- Aquinas, Thomas, 261, 277
- Ardrey, Robert, 6, 11–12, 13, 21, 22, 24, 25, 281n7, 284–85n39; *The Social Contract*, 2–3
- Arendt, Hannah, *Origins of Totalitarianism*, 212, 343n44
- Argenson, René-Louis, marquis d', 48; *Mémoires*, 47
- Aristotle, 286n42; and Foot, 273; and Jacobins, 272; and liberty, 157; and MacIntyre, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 276; and nature and art, 4
- Arnauld, Antoine, *Logique*, 276
- Arundel, Lord, 40
- Ashcraft, Richard, 124–25
- Audebert, Jean-Baptiste, 283–84n31
- Augustine, 30, 113
- Augustinianism, 260, 265, 270, 276
- Au revoir les enfants*, 259
- Austrian Netherlands, 32, 43
- autonomy, 88, 90, 157, 158, 174, 206
- Ayer, A. J., 273–74
- Bacon, Francis, 237
- Baczko, Bronislaw, 138
- Baecque, Antoine de, 203
- Baillie, Robert, 265
- Baker, Keith, 195, 203
- Bakunin, Mikhail, 218
- barbarians, 61, 62, 64, 103, 129
- barbarism, 31, 101, 252
- Barbeyrac, Jean: and Cumberland and Pufendorf, 314–15n29; and Locke, 106–7, 318n72; and Pufendorf, 93–94, 95, 97, 134, 276, 313–14n19, 316n45, 318n72; Rousseau's lack of reference to, 314n20; translations by, 93, 95, 97, 106–7
- Barbier, Edmond-Jean-François, 48
- Barrett, William, *Irrational Man*, 244
- Barthez, Paul-Joseph, 208
- Bastid, Paul, 203
- Battel, Andrew, 8
- Bauman, Zygmunt, 187, 233
- Baumgarten, Alexander Gottlieb, 237, 238, 256
- Bayle, Pierre, 102, 240, 252, 255, 269
- Becker, Carl, 235; *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers*, 233, 250, 251, 256
- Beethoven, Ludwig van, 254–55
- Begin, Menachem, 255
- Begriffsgeschichte*, 186, 334n4
- Bell, Daniel, 271
- Bellow, Saul, 247

- Benedict, St., 277  
 Bentham, Jeremy, 79, 121, 135, 274  
 Bergson, Henri, 236  
 Berkeley, George, 237  
 Berlin, Isaiah, 128, 168, 238, 244–59, 271, 356n18; *Against the Current*, 252; *The Age of Enlightenment*, 245, 247; 'Alleged Relativism in Eighteenth-Century European Thought,' 249; *Conversations*, 250, 256; 'The Counter-Enlightenment,' 244–45; *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*, 249; *Four Essays on Liberty*, 330n26; *The Hedgehog and the Fox*, 245; 'Historical Inevitability,' 167, 330n26; 'Jewish Slavery and Emancipation,' 256; 'Life and Opinions of Moses Hess,' 256; *The Magus of the North*, 247; *Personal Impressions*, 254; *The Roots of Romanticism*, 247–48, 249–50; 'Two Concepts of Liberty,' 245, 246, 249, 328n3; *Vico and Herder*, 246–48  
 Besterman, Theodore, 81, 87, 144–53; and Leigh, 145–53, 325–26n17, 326nn18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 326–27n24  
 Bible, 101, 115  
 Bibliothèque de Neuchâtel, 116, 144  
 Bichat, Marie François Xavier, 196, 208  
 Birch, Thomas, 125  
 Bloom, Allan, 132–33  
 Blumenbach, Johann, 4, 10  
 Bobbio, Norberto, 214  
 Bodin, Jean, 171, 197  
 Bonald, Louis, 195, 196  
 Bonnet, Charles, 4, 10  
 Bordeu, Théophile, 208  
 Bossuet, Jacques-Bénigne, *Histoire universelle*, 251  
 Boswell, James, 40, 70, 138  
 botany, 73–76, 86, 164  
 Boyer, Noël, *La guerre des bouffons et la musique française*, 49  
 Brecht, Bertolt, 239, 256, 257  
 Bredin, Jean-Denis, 203  
 Brenkert, George, 350n63  
 Brizard, Gabriel, 137  
 Brosses, Charles de, 35, 39–40  
 Brucker, Jacob, 98, 269, 276; *Historia critica philosophiae*, 98  
 Buckingham, Duke of, 40  
 Buffon, Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de, 4, 7, 9, 11, 75, 76, 93, 130, 276  
 Burdin, Jean, 208; *Cours d'études médicales*, 196  
 Burgelin, Pierre, 132  
 Burke, Edmund, 67, 82, 204, 272, 342n40; *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, 261  
 Burlamaqui, Jean-Jacques, 93  
 Burney, Charles, *General History of Music*, 72, 251  
 Burns, Jimmy, 121–22  
 Byron, Lord, *Don Juan*, 40  
 Cabanis, Pierre Jean Georges, 194, 196; *Rapports du physique et du moral*, 180, 195  
 Calas, Jean, 84  
 Calvinism, 260, 266  
 Camper, Petrus, 4  
 Cantone, Simone, 35  
 capitalism, 44, 189, 226, 227, 231, 350n63. *See also* commerce; economics  
 Capote, Truman, 258  
 Carmichael, Gershom, 276  
 Carver, Terrell, 349n47  
 Cassirer, Ernst: *Freiheit und Form*, 240; *The Myth of the State*, 241–42; *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung*, 234–43, 256; *Das Problem Jean Jacques Rousseau*, 239  
 Castel, Louis Bertrand, *Discourse*, 180  
 Castiglione, Dario, 122  
 Castillon, Jean de, 26  
 Castro, Fidel, 220  
 Catherine II, 31, 37  
 Cavendish, Sir Charles, 125, 126  
 Cazotte, Jacques, *Observations sur la Lettre de Rousseau*, 47  
 Cervantes, Miguel de, 42  
 Chambers, Ephraim, 269  
 Chandler, Richard, 41  
 Charron, Pierre, 126  
 Chartier, Roger, 234  
 Charvet, John, 330n18  
 chimpanzees, 9, 12, 13–14, 284–85n39. *See also* apes; monkeys; orang-utans  
 Christianity, 30, 31, 233; and Becker, 251; and Enlightenment, 251; and Foot, 273; and MacIntyre, 266, 267; and Middle Ages, 29; and original sin, 26, 113; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 82, 84  
 Churchill, Winston, 258

- citizen/citizenship, 165; active vs. passive, 200, 201; and ancient Greeks and Romans, 157–58, 176; and civil religion, 84; and general will, 175–76; and Habermas, 209–10; and individual, 216; and Jacobins, 201, 202; and law, 170, 172, 173, 174; and legislation, 205–6; and liberty, 158, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174; and love of country, 169, 176; and Marx and Rousseau, 215, 216, 218, 220, 226; and nationality, 213; and popular sovereignty, 112; self-rule through state by, 90; and Sieyès, 200, 201; and state, 90, 109, 110, 111; and United States, 213; and voluntary subjection, 96; and women, 344n45
- civilization, 212; advance from barbarism to, 26; as bane of humanity, 161; and Cassirer, 240, 242; and colonialism, 252; and commerce, 103, 112; corruption of, 105, 110; and degeneration, 7–8; as denaturing, 22; as disease, 114; as enslavement, 130; and Grand Tour, 31, 32, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44; and language, 9, 14, 17–18; and loss of liberty, 163, 164; and MacIntyre, 261, 262, 266, 269; and men as cattle, 21–22; and music, 64, 65; and nation-state, 45; and northern and southern cultures, 61; and orang-utan, 12; and perfectibility, 24, 26, 27; and primitive men, 97; progress of, 252; and property, 17–18; and Pufendorf, 101; Rousseau's view of, 118, 160, 203–4, 225; as self-domestication, 8; as term, 30, 190, 334n5. *See also* society
- civil society, 239; advent of, 113; and *bürgerliche Gesellschaft*, 44; and commerce, 105; and common good, 98; and contract, 205; decadence of, 103; as denaturing, 92, 105; and formation of people, 106; founding of, 15, 20, 22; and Hegel, 189, 191, 205; and language, 223; and liberty, 161, 176, 181; and Locke, 124, 168; and property, 15, 124, 168, 222, 223; and representation, 109; and vice, 168; and virtue, 88
- Clarke, Edward Daniel, 41
- Clarke, Samuel, 124, 135, 275
- climate, 7, 60–61, 83, 170, 208, 228–29, 307n74
- Cloots, Anacharsis, 137
- Club of the Cordeliers, 206
- Cobban, Alfred, 234, 237–38
- Cohen, Hermann, 241
- Cohen, Jerry, 134, 221, 222, 223, 347–48n34, 349n43, 350–51n64
- Colletti, Lucio, *Ideologia e società*, 214, 215
- Collini, Stefan, 122
- Collins, Anthony, 135
- commerce, 42, 44, 115, 120, 261; and civilization, 103, 112; and civil society, 105; and Europe, 29–30; and language, 129; and liberty, 103–4; as misrepresentation of need, 109; need for, 96, 102; and Pufendorf, 100; Rousseau's contempt for, 88; and sociability, 100, 102, 103; and social corruption, 104; and society, 79, 112, 129, 261. *See also* capitalism; economy; money
- Commune of Paris, 201, 206
- communism, 216, 228, 350n63, 351n78
- Communist League, 231
- communitarians, 246, 250, 252, 254, 261
- compassion, 22–23, 306. *See also* pity
- Comte, Auguste, 185, 196
- Condé, Prince de, 33
- Condillac, Étienne Bonnot de, 14, 16, 31, 130; *Traité des sensations*, 135, 208; *Traité des systèmes*, 208
- Condorcet, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Caritat, marquis de, 195, 196, 201, 202, 242, 250, 254; *Esquisse d'un tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain*, 235, 238, 242–43; *Projet de décret sur l'organisation sociale*, 193
- consent, 106, 107, 206, 211, 222, 223
- Constant, Benjamin, 156, 159, 176, 177, 178, 245; *Cours de politique constitutionnelle*, 329n12
- Constitution of 1793, 202, 218
- Constitution of 1795, 194, 218
- Conti, Louis-François de Bourbon, Prince de, 73
- contract: and Hegel, 205; and institution of government, 107; and property, 106; and submission, 107. *See also* Rousseau, Jean-Jacques—*Contrat social*; social contract
- Convention, 194, 202
- Corneille, Pierre, 87
- Corsica, 182



- Cotta, Sergio, 214  
 Counter-Enlightenment, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 253, 257  
 Counter-Reformation, 30  
 Cranston, Maurice, 157, 172, 181  
 Crocker, Lester, 170, 186  
 Crusades, 30  
 Crystal Palace, 190  
 Ctesias, 7  
 Cudworth, Ralph, 134, 275  
 culture: and adaptation, 23–24; and Ardrey, 2; and compassion vs. self-love, 22–23; and deception, 20; evolution of, 19; fixity of, 20; and illusion of liberty, 162; and Isaiah Berlin, 246; and language, 13–20, 24; and Lévi-Strauss, 1, 2, 20–21; and loss of innocence, 120; and luxury, 84; and music, 59, 114; northern vs. southern, 60–61; passage from nature to, 1, 22–23, 161; physical explanation for, 24; and plasticity of human nature, 25; of primitive peoples, 5; and religion, 114; Rousseau's attack on, 160; and society, 18, 19, 22, 24, 225; and symbols, 19; and Volney, 195; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 84. *See also* society  
 Cumberland, Richard, 94, 96; *De legibus naturae*, 314–15n29  
 d'Alembert, Jean-Baptiste le Rond. *See* Alembert, Jean-Baptiste le Rond  
 Danube, 32–33  
 Dapper, Olfert, 8  
 Darnton, Robert, 234  
 Darwin, Charles, 11, 219  
*Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*, 44–45, 238, 240, 344n45  
 Declaration of Independence, American, 238  
 Declarations of the Rights of Man, 206, 212, 218  
 Defoe, Daniel, *Robinson Crusoe*, 165, 215  
 Delessert, Madeleine-Catherine, 74  
 Deleyre, Alexandre, 70  
 della Volpe, Galvano, *Rousseau e Marx*, 214, 215  
 democracy: and Constant, 159; and French Revolution, 211, 261; and Geneva, 85; and Grand Tour, 41; and imagination, 230; and Jacobins, 202, 207; and liberty, 157, 158; and Locke, 124; and MacIntyre, 262; and modernity, 210, 211; participatory, 111; and popular sovereignty, 206; and representation, 211, 343n43; and Sieyès, 200, 201, 207, 211; and United States of America, 197–98  
 Derathé, Robert, 111, 112, 172; *Rousseau et la science politique de son temps*, 89–90, 91–93  
 Derrida, Jacques, 241, 253; *De la grammatologie*, 307–8n76  
 Descartes, René, 31, 126, 135; and Cassirer, 237; *Discours de la méthode*, 125; and dualism, 179, 180; and Enlightenment, 276; and intelligence, 134; and Voltaire, 82  
 despotism, 161; and Constant, 159, 329n12; dangers of political, 88; enlightened, 31, 83; and French Revolution, 194; and government as shaping human nature, 183–84; and justice, 224; of Le Mercier de la Rivière, 210; and liberty, 182; and Madison, 198; and popular sovereignty, 174; and Voltaire, 83  
 Destutt de Tracy, Antoine Louis Claude, comte, 193, 194  
 Diderot, Denis, 68; 'Agriculture,' 97; 'Autorité politique,' 97; 'Cité,' 97; 'Citoyen,' 97; and colonialism, 277; and *Confessions*, 76; 'Droit naturel,' 95, 97, 98, 288–89n72, 315n36; and *Encyclopédie*, 130; and general will, 315n36; 'Hobbesisme,' 97–98; and Isaiah Berlin, 254; and language, 13; 'Législateur,' 307–8n76; and MacIntyre, 261, 267, 269, 271; *Mémoires pour Catherine II*, 31; and morality, 269–70, 271; *Le Neveu de Rameau*, 264, 269–70; and painting, 72; and physiology, 208; and Pufendorf, 97, 98, 99; and Rameau, 71; and religious toleration, 240; Rousseau's break with, 69; Rousseau's interrogation of, 130; Rousseau's response to, 98–99; *Suite du rêve de d'Alembert*, 286n43; *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville*, 252, 269–70  
 Diodorus Siculus, 101  
 Dostoyevski, Fyodor, 253  
 Dubos, Jean-Baptiste, *Réflexions critiques*, 307n74  
 Duchez, Marie-Élisabeth, 116, 305n65, 320n14, 323n19

- Dufour, Théophile, 141–43, 144; *Recherches bibliographiques sur les oeuvres imprimées de Rousseau*, 143
- Du Halde, Jean-Baptiste, *Description de la Chine*, 73, 304n62
- Dumont, Étienne, 193
- Dunn, John, 123
- duty, 69; and government, 111; and Hobbes, 98; and Hont, 100; and instinct, 163; and language, 224; and liberty, 105, 155, 172, 173, 181; and MacIntyre, 263–64, 265; and state, 90; and state of nature, 92, 97, 99; and Voltaire, 83
- Eckart, Dietrich, 240
- economics, 102, 103; development of, 185, 190; and language, 224; and Marx and Rousseau, 219, 227, 229, 347n23, 349n47; and rules, 223; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 82. *See also* capitalism; money
- economy: and English government, 85; and Europe, 29; and Hegel, 205; market, 205; and Marx and Rousseau, 222. *See also* commerce
- education: and *Emile*, 133; and Helvétius, 208; and law, 169; and liberty, 165–66, 169; and MacIntyre, 265; negative, 133; and sensualism, 135; and universities, 30–31
- Einstein, Albert, 239, 256
- emotivism, 273, 274, 275
- Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 261
- Encyclopédie*, 54, 97, 189; and Cassirer, 237; and Koselleck, 190; and MacIntyre, 261, 267; and *philosophes*, 268; and Saint-Simon, 196
- Engels, Friedrich, 222–23; *Anti-Dühring*, 215, 216–17, 218
- England, 32, 173, 207; Glorious Revolution in, 251; government of, 85; and radical culture, 257; and sovereignty of Parliament, 107; and Treaty of Union of 1707, 265; and Voltaire, 82, 84–85
- Enlightenment: and Becker, 251; and French Revolution, 203, 208; and Isaiah Berlin, 246, 247, 249–50, 254, 255, 256–57; and MacIntyre, 260–78; and modernity, 188; Rousseau's critique of, 188; as subversive, 269; as term, 244; and totalitarian democracy, 233; and Voltaire, 208
- Enlightenment Project: and Cassirer, 234, 235; coherence of, 191; and colonialism, 252; concept of, 185–92; international dimensions of, 192; and MacIntyre, 261, 262, 265, 267–68; and modernity, 210; and nation-state, 209; and Pascal, 264; and politics, 209; and privilege, 213; and religious toleration, 240; Rousseau's critique of, 192
- Epicureanism, 100
- Épinay, Louise Florence Pétronille Tardieu d'Esclavelles, marquise d', 69, 76
- equality: and liberty, 216; and liberty and fraternity, 177, 178; and Marx and Rousseau, 218, 219, 226; and modern states, 109; and sovereignty, 171; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 85
- Erasmus, Desiderius, 42–43, 241
- Estates General, 198
- ethology, 2, 5, 11–12, 21, 25
- Europe, 29–30, 31, 32, 40
- Evelyn, John, 33, 40
- evolution, 3, 20, 24
- Eysenck, Hans, 257, 258
- Ferguson, Adam, 253; *Principles of Moral and Political Science*, 209
- Feuerbach, Ludwig, 232
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 205, 239
- Filangieri, Gaetano, *La scienza della legislazione*, 209
- Filmer, Sir Robert, 94, 123
- finance, 103, 104–5
- First International, 231
- Fontenelle, Bernard de, *Pluralité des mondes*, 251
- Foot, Philippa, 273
- force, 172, 173, 174, 181
- Forsyth, Murray, 203
- Foucault, Michel, 79, 134, 191, 203, 333–34n3, 334–35n6; and Cassirer, 234; and government, 197; and human sciences, 208–9; and Kant, 210, 342n42; and modernity, 189, 198; *Les mots et les choses*, 190; and Rousseau's *Dialogues*, 77; and *science sociale*, 194
- France: and Grand Tour, 32–35, 42, 43; and MacIntyre, 268; May 1968 student uprisings in, 257; and radical culture, 257; Third Estate, 193
- François, Alexis, 143

- Frank, Anne, 79  
 fraternity, 176–77, 178, 219  
 Frederick the Great, 31, 43  
 French Enlightenment, 47, 268  
 French language, 51, 53, 55, 71, 72, 296n26  
 French music, 55–56  
 French opera, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 296n24  
 French Revolution, 48, 67, 189; and Cassirer, 238; and *Contrat social*, 113, 204–5, 218; and democracy, 211; and despotism, 194; and Engels, 218; and Enlightenment, 188, 203, 208; and equality, 177; and Foucault, 190; and fraternity, 177; and Hegel, 203–8; and Jews, 255; and Kant, 210; and liberty, 171, 177; and MacIntyre, 271–72; and Marx and Rousseau, 218; and National Assembly, 342n40; and nation-state, 44–45, 196, 337n19; and popular sovereignty, 171; and postmodernism, 134; and Rousseau, 293n1; Rousseau's influence on, 46, 49, 88, 89, 114, 137, 158, 159–60, 204–5; and social sciences, 191; and Terror, 261; and virtue, 272; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 80, 81  
 Fréron, Élie-Catherine, 297–98n27, 299n39  
 Freud, Sigmund, 249  
 Gagnebin, Bernard, 144  
 Garat, Dominique-Joseph, 193, 194  
 Gardiner, Patrick, 247  
 Gassendi, Pierre, 126  
 Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Jean, *Jugements allemands sur la musique française au XVIIIe siècle*, 49  
 Gay, Peter, 234, 239, 352n5, 354n35  
*Geisteswissenschaften*, 246  
 Gellner, Ernest, 246  
 general will/*volonté générale*, 97, 98; and Cassirer, 239; and citizens, 175–76; and Diderot, 315n36; and fraternity, 177; and Hegel, 205, 206; and laws, 174; and liberty, 170; and Marx and Rousseau, 219, 227; and moral liberty, 175; and National Assembly, 198; and particular wills, 110; and popular sovereignty, 172; and Sieyès, 200, 201, 206, 212; and state, 204. *See also* will  
 Geneva, 70, 144, 207, 231; Calvinist pastorate of, 86; civil war in, 83; constitution of, 230; and *Contrat social*, 331–32n38; government of, 173, 331n37; idealization of, 174; and Rousseau, 80–81, 85–86; Rousseau as Citizen of, 80, 85, 88, 164, 174; sovereign assembly of, 86; and Voltaire, 80–81, 83, 85–86  
 George I, 107  
 George III, 73  
 German Enlightenment, 256  
 Germany, 32, 43, 239–40, 242, 243, 257  
*Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 190  
*Geworfenheit*, 253  
 Gibbon, Edward, 31, 33–34, 41, 292n14; *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 40  
 Girondins, 202  
 Gluck, Christoph Willibald: *Alceste*, 72; *Iphigenia in Aulis*, 72  
 God, 101; as benevolent, 114, 117–18; and *Emile*, 165; goodness from, 113; and intelligence, 134; and Locke, 135; and Nature, 117; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 84  
 Goebbels, Joseph, 240  
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 40, 237, 240, 254–55; *Italianische Reise*, 39  
 Goldschmidt, Victor, *Anthropologie et politique*, 281n3, 284n37, 290n88, 312n4  
 Gombrich, E. H., 257  
 government: and Foucault, 197; institution of, 107; and language, 65–66; and Montesquieu, 83; and popular sovereignty, 172; as shaping character, 169; as shaping human nature, 183–84; and Sieyès, 201; and sovereignty, 109; and United States of America, 198; and Voltaire, 82–83  
 Grand Tour, 29–45, 292n8; itinerary of, 31–43  
 Gray, John, 186–87, 250, 253, 356n18  
 Gray, Thomas, 33  
 Greece, 40–41  
 Greeks, ancient, 30, 40, 157; and autonomy, 174; and equality and fraternity, 177; and liberty, 156, 157, 159, 176, 177; and liberty and slavery, 182; music of, 58, 129, 304–5n62. *See also* antiquity; Romans, ancient  
 Green, T. H., 90  
 Gregory, John, *A Comparative View*, 294n4

- Grimm, Friedrich Melchior, baron von, 26, 76, 290–91n93; and *Confessions*, 76; *Correspondance littéraire*, 48; 'Lyrical Poem,' 72; *Petit prophète de Boehmisch-broda*, 297n27
- Gropius, Walter, 239, 256
- Grotius, Hugo, 276, 287n49, 314n20; *De jure belli ac pacis*, 105–6, 107; and human nature, 21, 93; and liberty, 105; and Locke, 123; and natural law, 82, 93, 105, 167; and Pufendorf, 100, 316n45; Rousseau's reference to, 314n20; and state of nature, 93, 99; and subjection to ruler, 96, 105, 106, 107, 110
- Gueniffey, Patrice, 203
- Gusdorf, Georges, 190
- Habermas, Jürgen, 79, 209, 210
- Haller, Albrecht von, 208
- Hamann, Johan Georg, 245, 246, 248, 253, 256
- Hampshire, Stuart, 273
- Hanley, Ryan, 119
- Hardy, Henry, 128
- Hare, R. M., 273
- Hartley, David, 135
- Hauerwas, Stanley, *Revisions*, 273
- Hayek, Friedrich von, 258
- Head, Brian, 190
- Hegel, G. W. F., 210, 339n29; and civil society, 191, 205; and Enlightenment, 244; and French Revolution, 203–8; and general will, 205, 206; *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, 339n29; and history, 189; and liberty, 203, 204, 205; and MacIntyre, 262, 272; and Marx, 217, 218, 219; misrepresentation of Rousseau, 203–8; and modernity, 204, 205, 206; and morality, 205; *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, 198, 199, 200, 202–3, 204, 240; *Philosophie des Rechts*, 203, 204, 205; and revolution, 67; and Rousseauism, 159–60; and Sieyès, 207, 338n22; and social contract, 218; and state, 188, 189, 191, 204, 205; and Terror, 203, 204, 205, 206, 218; *Über die englische Reformbill*, 199; *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*, 203; and will, 204, 339n29
- Heidegger, Martin, 235, 240–42, 253; *Sein und Zeit*, 240
- Heine, Heinrich, 254
- Helvétius, Claude Adrien: *De l'esprit*, 47, 132, 135; and education, 208; and intelligence and sensory experience, 132–33; and Isaiah Berlin, 250; and morality and human nature, 276; Rousseau's interrogation of, 130
- Herder, Johann Gottfried von, 245; and apes, 14; and Cassirer, 234, 238, 239; and Claude Perrault, 4; and *Encyclopédistes*, 247; and human nature, 10; *Ideen*, 253; and Isaiah Berlin, 246–47, 248, 249, 252–53; and language, 305–6n68; and orang-utans, 24; and perfectibility, 26
- Herodotus, 7, 157
- Herzen, Alexander, 253–54
- Hess, Moses, *Rome and Jerusalem*, 256
- Hindemith, Paul, *Symphonic Metamorphoses*, 73, 304n62
- historical materialism, 221, 222, 231, 347–48n34
- history, philosophy of, 109, 160; and human corruption, 169; and liberty, 163, 166; and MacIntyre, 262–63; and Marx, 222, 223, 227, 228, 347–48n34; and Marx and Rousseau, 219, 221; and music and religion, 114; and perfectibility, 26–27; and Pufendorf, 101; and Rousseau, 26–27, 84, 86, 110, 114, 163, 166, 169; and Voltaire, 84, 86; and voluntary subjection, 110
- Hitchens, Christopher, 357n29
- Hitler, Adolf, 155, 166, 176, 184, 239
- Hobbes, Thomas, 276, 286n42; and British monism, 179; and Constant, 329n12; and Descartes, 126; and Diderot, 97–98; and human nature, 21, 101–2, 167; and Isaiah Berlin, 330n26; *Leviathan*, 38, 108, 127, 197, 207; and liberalism, 159; and liberty, 98, 108, 155–56, 157, 158, 161, 163, 166–67, 170, 171–72, 173, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181; and MacIntyre, 266; and Marx, 228; and Montesquieu, 97; and natural law, 82; and natural rights, 98; and obligation, 108; and passions vs. needs, 103; and Plamenatz, 130; and Pufendorf, 94–95, 96, 99, 100, 102, 318n77; and representation, 197, 212; Rousseau's interrogation of, 130, 161–62; Rousseau's opposition to, 93;

Hobbes, Thomas (*cont.*)

Rousseau's response to, 98–99; and rule of law, 155–56; and self-love, 102; and *A Short Tract on First Principles*, 125–26, 127, 322n14; and Sieyès, 198–99, 207, 341n35; and sociability, 101; and sovereign, 159, 171, 228; and sovereignty, 108, 174, 197, 207, 211; and state of nature, 113–14, 161, 168; and state of war, 97, 98; and subjection to ruler, 106, 107, 110; and war, 168

Holbach, Paul-Henri Thiry, baron d', 135, 208, 250, 252

Holland, 32, 43

Holocaust, 187, 233, 248

Homer, 40, 41

Hont, Istvan, 99, 100–101, 102, 104, 203, 341n35

Horace, 101

Horkheimer, Max, 187, 233

Houdetot, Élisabeth Françoise Sophie de la Live de Bellegarde, comtesse d', 69–71, 74, 124–25; *Story of Madame de Montbrillant*, 76

Howell, James, 31, 42

Hudson, W. D., *The Is–Ought Question*, 273

human nature: animal and cultural features of, 3; atomistic conceptions of, 186; as benign, 114; as good, 79, 113; and Hobbes, 21, 101–2, 167; and Hume, 209, 276; indeterminacy of, 25; and Isaiah Berlin, 246; and Kant, 276; legislators as transforming, 183; and Lévi-Strauss, 1; and MacIntyre, 265, 266, 267; and morality, 208; natural goodness of, 115, 118; original goodness of, 2; and physical development as species, 6; plasticity of, 21, 25; political institutions as shaping, 88, 112, 163, 183–84; and politics, 209; and Pufendorf, 95, 99–100; as same everywhere, 186; science of, 194, 196, 208; and slavery, 106; and social contract, 168, 216; society as denaturing, 163–64; as timid, 314–15n29; as timid vs. aggressive, 94, 96, 101–2; transformation of, 87; uniformity of, 276  
humans: and animals, 23; and apes, 21, 131; brain of, 24, 25; capacity for progressive self-instruction, 23; as cattle, 21–22; decline of, 86; degeneration of,

114; degradation of, 25; descent from apes, 6–13; development of, 76; diversity of, 7, 8; as estranged from selves, 87; evils of history of, 114, 118; evolution of, 10–11, 12; and language, 4, 13, 25; loss of innocence by, 120; and modern evolutionary theory, 10–11; self-domestication of, 71; vertical posture of, 24, 25

human sciences, 185, 191, 193, 194, 196, 208–9

Humboldt, Wilhelm von, 156, 159

Hume, David, 73; and Ayer, 273; and British monism, 179; and Cassirer, 237; *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, 264; and human nature, 209, 276; and MacIntyre, 260, 264, 266–67, 271, 275, 277; and morality, 271, 274, 275, 276; *Treatise of Human Nature*, 264, 266–67, 274; and Voltaire, 81

Hutcheson, Francis, 118, 361; and MacIntyre, 260, 265–67, 270–71, 275, 276, 277; *Synopsis metaphysicae*, 271; *System of Moral Philosophy*, 266, 271

*idéologues*, 194, 195, 208, 336n13

Ignatieff, Michael, 253, 356n18

imagination, 70, 71, 72, 112, 117, 183, 184, 229, 230–31, 306n71. *See also* reverie

individuals, 339n29; and citizens, 216; and citizenship, 169, 175; and collectives, 90; and Diderot, 97; freedom and autonomy of, 88; and general will, 97; and Hegel, 204, 205; and Hobbes, 100; and Kant, 210, 213; liberty of, 91, 109, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 163, 170, 172, 175, 176, 178, 184, 205, 206, 225, 260, 265; and Locke, 90, 91; and Marx, 216; and Pufendorf, 100, 101, 108; and state of nature, 91, 92; and will, 204

inequality, 180; evolution of, 25–26; and Marx and Rousseau, 226; and perfectibility, 26–27; and positive law, 92; and social decay, 115; and theatre, 163. *See also* equality

instinct, 4, 5, 21, 22, 23, 25, 163, 166, 168  
Italian language, 52, 55, 296n26, 307–8n76

Italian music, 55–56

Italian opera, 50, 53, 54

- Italy, 32, 35–40, 41, 42, 257  
 Ivernois, Jean-Antoine d', 73
- Jacobi, Friedrich Heinrich, 245  
 Jacobins, 206; and Constant, 159; and democracy, 202, 207; and Engels, 218; and liberty and popular sovereignty, 171; and MacIntyre, 271–72; misrepresentation of Rousseau by, 111; and representation, 112; and *science sociale*, 194; and Sieyès, 201–2; and Terror, 261  
 Jacquot, Jean, 126, 322n14  
 James II, 33, 124  
 Jansenism, 264, 267, 276  
 Jaucourt, Louis, Chevalier de: 'Morale,' 269; 'Moralité,' 269  
 Jaume, Lucien, 203  
 Jefferson, Thomas, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, 284n32  
 Jesuits, 41  
 Jews, 241, 248, 254, 255–56  
 Johnson, Samuel, 32, 40, 77, 147, 150  
 judgement, 132–33, 135, 306n71
- Kandinsky, Wassily, 239, 256  
 Kant, Immanuel, 29; *Anthropologie*, 44; and Cassirer, 234, 239, 240, 241; and Continental dualism, 179; and Counter-Enlightenment, 244; and Enlightenment, 244; and Foucault, 210, 342n42; and French Revolution, 210; and Hare, 273; and Hegel, 204; and human nature, 276; and justice, 213; *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, 240; and MacIntyre, 263–64, 268; and morality, 210, 241, 271, 276; and state, 210  
 Kelly, Christopher, 116  
 Kennedy, Emmet, 190  
 Kennet, Basil, 316n45  
 Kern, Edith, 148  
 Kierkegaard, Søren, 265, 267; *Enten–Eller (Either–Or)*, 263  
 Kirk, Linda, 314–15n29  
 Klein, Ernst Ferdinand, 257  
 Kolb, Peter, *Caput Bonae Spei hodieum*, 120  
 Koselleck, Reinhart, 189, 190, 191, 203, 334n4; *Kritik und Krise*, 204, 207, 333–34n3, 340n30  
 Kramer, Matthew, *John Locke and the Origins of Private Property*, 321–22n6
- La Barre, Chevalier de, 84  
 La Borde, Jean-Benjamin de, *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*, 294–95n4  
 labour, division of, 222, 226  
 Lacroette, Pierre-Louis, *De l'établissement des connoissances humaines*, 193  
 La Mettrie, Julien Offray de, 4, 14, 135, 208, 252  
 language(s): and apes, 4, 5, 131; artificial, 64; and barbarians, 61, 62; and Cassirer, 241; and civilization, 14; and civil society, 223; and climate, 60–61, 307n74; and commerce, 129; and corruption, 114–15; and culture, 13–20, 24; and deception, 15, 20, 224; and *Discours sur l'inégalité*, 114, 115, 116; and economics, 224; first, 59–60, 63; fixity of, 20; and government, 65–66; and humans, 4, 13, 25; and hybridization, 20; and Isaiah Berlin, 246; and liberty, 65, 115, 129; loss of inflection in, 17, 110, 129, 161; and Marx and Rousseau, 222, 223–25, 349n47; and Middle Ages, 29; and modern Europe, 65; and morality, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 62, 224; and music, 17, 51–52, 53, 55, 56, 59–67, 71, 115, 129, 130, 161, 296n26, 305–6n68, 308n77; and Nature, 17, 60–61; and objects of thought, 16; and passions, 17, 60, 61, 62, 65, 129; and poetry, 63, 71, 72, 129; and politics, 18; and property, 16, 17–18, 162, 223, 224; and prose, 17, 62, 63, 65, 110, 129, 225; and Pufendorf, 95; and sentiments, 60, 61, 62; of sincerity, 79; and society, 14–19, 20, 62, 65–67, 97, 102–3, 114, 224; and state of nature, 14, 97; and symbols, 18; and thought, 14; and writing, 64, 309n89. *See also* French language; Italian language; speech  
 La Rochefoucauld, François de, 102  
 Laski, Harold, 250  
 Laslett, Peter, 123  
 La Tour de Franqueville, Madame de, 138, 294n4  
 Laubel, M., 139  
 Launay, Michel, 116  
 law: and Cassirer, 238, 239; changes in, 230–31; and citizens, 170, 172, 173, 174; and education, 169; and Engels, 223; and general will, 174; and Hobbes, 155–56; and inequality, 92; and liberty,

- law (*cont.*)  
 158, 160, 161, 164–65, 173; and Mac-Intyre, 265, 268; and Marx, 222–23; and Montesquieu, 208; and natural law, 91; and Pufendorf, 96; rule of, 82, 155–56, 158; and savages, 92; silence of, 155–56, 157; and society, 92, 222; and Voltaire, 82
- legislation, 205–6, 209
- Legislative Assembly, 199–200
- legislators, 109, 154, 176, 183–84, 216, 332–33n47
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 219, 238;  
 and Cassirer, 234, 237, 240, 256; and goodness of all, 117; and intelligence, 134; and natural development, 10; and Voltaire, 82
- Leibowitz, Yeshayahu, 255
- Leigh, Ralph, 81, 117, 127, 136–41; and Besterman, 145–53, 325–26n17, 326nn18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 326–27n24; ‘Les manuscrits disparus,’ 116; *Les Quands*, 152–53, 327n25
- Le Mercier de la Rivière, Pierre-Paul, 210
- Lenin, V. I., 211, 331n37
- Le Nôtre, André, 33
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 237
- Levasseur, Thérèse, 136
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 287n55, 289n77; and history and morality, 27; influence of Rousseau on, 1–3; and naturalized culture, 25; neglect of Rousseau’s ideas in, 5–6, 11, 20–21, 22, 23; *L’Origine des manières de table*, 1–2; *La Pensée sauvage*, 20; *Les Structures élémentaires de la parenté*, 2; *Le Totémisme aujourd’hui*, 1; *Tristes tropiques*, 1
- liberalism: adoption of, 182; and French Revolution, 261; and Hobbes, 159; and Isaiah Berlin, 245, 246, 253, 254, 258; and liberty, 155, 156, 157; and Romanticism, 164; Rousseau’s influence on, 158–60
- liberty, 328n3; and absolute sovereign, 156; and ancient Greeks and Romans, 156, 157–58, 159, 176, 177; and ancient slavery, 104–5, 182; ancient vs. modern, 245, 329n12; and animals, 166, 167; and citizens, 158, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174; civil, 85, 156, 170–71, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 205, 206; and civiliza-  
 tion, 163; and civil society, 161, 176, 181; and collectivism, 90, 167; and commerce, 103–4; and commonwealth, 156, 170; and Constant, 159, 177, 178, 245, 329n12; and democracy, 157, 158; and dependence, 178; and despotism, 182; and duty, 105, 155, 172, 173, 181; and education, 165–66, 169; and English government, 85; and equality, 177, 178, 216; and force, 172, 173; forced, 171, 172; and fraternity, 176–77, 178; French Revolution of 1789, 171, 177; and general will, 170, 175; and Grotius, 105; and Hegel, 203, 204, 205; and Hobbes, 98, 108, 155–56, 157, 158, 161, 163, 166–67, 170, 171–72, 173, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181; illusion of, 161, 162, 181–82; of individuals, 91, 109, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 163, 170, 172, 175, 176, 178, 184, 205, 206, 225, 260, 265; and Isaiah Berlin, 155, 245, 258, 328n3, 330n26; and Jacobins, 171; and language, 65, 115, 129; and law, 158, 160, 161, 164–65, 173; and liberalism, 155, 156, 157; and Locke, 158; loss of, 18, 154, 160–64, 165, 167–68, 169, 174; and Machiavelli, 158, 328–29n8; and Marx, 350n63; and Marx and Rousseau, 219, 226–27, 230; misrepresentation of, 109; misuse of, 25; and modernity, 181–82; and money, 104; moral, 170–71, 174–76, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 219; and morality, 111, 166; and music, 65, 115, 129, 163, 310n92; natural, 158, 163, 164, 166, 170, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 206; and Nature, 161, 166; negative, 155, 164–65, 166, 168, 169, 178, 245, 258, 328n3; and perfectibility, 24, 179, 183; personal vs. political, 178; political dimension of, 89, 169–78; and popular sovereignty, 160, 171, 174; positive, 163, 170, 174; private, 109, 159, 160; and property, 106, 161, 162; public control of, 155; and Pufendorf, 94; and reason vs. passion, 158; and representation, 105, 106, 109, 110–11, 205–6; Rousseau’s defense of, 154–55; Rousseau’s definition of, 155, 160; and Rousseau’s estrangement from society, 76; Rousseau’s passion for, 88; Rousseau’s vision of, 78; and savages, 165, 166,



- 167–68; and society, 97, 161, 163, 165, 167–68, 224; and sovereign, 91, 156; and sovereign assembly, 160; and sovereignty, 88, 173, 174; and Spinoza, 158; and state, 88, 90, 157, 163, 175; and state of nature, 23, 91, 161, 163; surrender of, 96; as term, 179–80; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 85; and voluntary subjection, 105–12; and will, 158, 165, 166–67. *See also* slavery
- Linnaeus, Carl, 4, 13, 76; *Philosophia botanica*, 75; *Regnum vegetabile*, 75; *Systema naturae*, 75
- Lisbon, earthquake at, 117–18
- Livy, *Rise of Rome*, 114
- Locke, John, 126, 127, 321–22n6; and Barbeyrac, 106–7, 318n72; and Cassirer, 237; and civil society, 124, 168; democratic radicalism of, 124; and *Emile*, 132; and Enlightenment, 276; *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, 134; and God, 135; and Grotius, 123; and Hobbesian sovereignty, 211; and human nature, 21; and Hutcheson, 271; and individual, 90, 91; and James II, 124; and language, 16; *Letter concerning Toleration*, 134; and liberty, 158; and materialism, 133–35; and morality, 135; and natural law, 82, 91, 167; and popular sovereignty, 201–2; and property, 97, 123–24, 168; and Pufendorf, 94, 123; and religion, 135; and religious toleration, 240, 255; and right and force, 174; Rousseau's interrogation of, 130; Rousseau's opposition to, 93; *Second Treatise of Government*, 106, 123–24, 125, 134; and social contract, 90; and society and state of nature, 113–14; and sovereign, 92–93; and state of nature, 101; *Thoughts concerning Education*, 132, 134; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 85
- London, 32, 35, 42
- Lorenz, Konrad, *On Aggression*, 288n66
- Louis XIII, 107
- Louis XIV, 29, 33, 83
- Louis XV, 48
- Louis XVI, 198, 199–200, 201
- Lovejoy, Arthur, 10
- Low Countries, 42–43
- Lucretius, 101
- Lukács, Georg, 257
- Lully, Jean-Baptiste, 296n24; *Armide*, 53, 56
- Luther, Martin, 241
- Lutheranism, 268
- Luxemburg, Rosa, 211
- Lycurgus, 114, 184
- Lyotard, Jean-François, 233
- Mably, Jean Bonnot de, 93
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, 158, 169, 171, 328–29n8
- MacIntyre, Alasdair, 186, 260–78; *After Virtue*, 244, 260, 262, 263–65, 268, 272–73, 274, 277; *Revisions*, 273; *Short History of Ethics*, 273, 274; *The Significance of Moral Judgements*, 275; *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry*, 260, 263, 269, 277; *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?*, 260, 263, 265–67, 268, 270
- Macpherson, Brough, 123, 131
- Madison, James, 198
- Mailer, Norman, 258
- Maintenon, Françoise d'Aubigné, Madame de, 33
- Maistre, Joseph-Marie, comte de, 67, 80, 195, 218, 245, 246
- Malcolm, Noel, 125, 322n14
- Malebranche, Nicolas, 180
- Malesherbes, Chrétien Guillaume de Lamoignon de, 78, 144
- Malinowski, Bronisław Kasper, 257
- Malle, Louis, 259
- Malthus, Robert, 41
- mandat impératif*, 200, 206, 211, 212
- Mandeville, Bernard, 102, 103, 118, 266, 276; *Fable of the Bees*, 317n54
- Mann, Thomas, 239, 256, 257
- manuscripts, 121–35; and contextualism, 121, 122–33, 135, 186; and historical readings, 122, 127; and interpretation, 131–32; and philosophical readings, 122, 123, 127; and published works, 123
- Marana, Giovanni Paolo, *Espion turc*, 32
- Marcuse, Herbert, 234
- Marramao, Giacomo, 214
- Marsilius, 108–9
- Martin, Kingsley, 356n18
- Martyn, Thomas, 74
- Marvell, Andrew, 125

- Marx, Eleanor, 215
- Marx, Karl, 214–32, 347n23, 347–48n34; *Address to the Communist League*, 351n78; *Capital*, 215, 216, 226, 227; and citizenship, 215, 216, 218, 220, 226; and class and capitalism, 189; *Communist Manifesto*, 220; *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, 216; *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, 227, 228; and *Discours sur l'inégalité*, 216–17; *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, 216, 219; and economics, 219, 227, 229, 347n23, 349n47; and economy, 222; eleventh thesis on Feuerbach, 232; and equality, 218, 219, 226; father of, 215; and French Revolution, 205; and general will, 219, 227; *The German Ideology*, 223, 227; and Germany and Russia, 231; *Grundrisse*, 215–16, 217; and Hegel, 217, 218, 219; and history, 27; and Hobbes, 228; and individuals, 216; and inequality, 226; and Isaiah Berlin, 245, 249; *Jewish Question*, 216, 218, 226; and Jews, 255; and language, 222, 223–25, 349n47; and laws, 222–23; and liberty, 219, 226–27, 230, 350n63; and Montesquieu, 228–29; and morality, 226–30; philosophy of history of, 124, 219, 221, 222, 223, 227, 228, 347–48n34; *Preface to the Critique of Political Economy*, 223; and property, 218, 219, 222, 224, 225, 227, 228; and Pufendorf, 101; and religion, 117; and Rousseauism, 159–60; and social class, 219, 220, 222, 226; and society, 220–26; and sovereignty, 226, 227; and state and civil society, 191; and vampires, 22; and Voltaire, 80; *Wages, Price and Profit*, 226; and will, 222, 228
- Marxism, 158, 257, 261
- Mason, John Hope, 347n23
- Masson, Pierre-Maurice, *La Religion de Rousseau*, 132
- Masters, Roger, 116, 281n7
- materialism, 133–35, 208–9
- Maupertuis, Pierre-Louis Moreau de, 135, 208
- McLellan, David, 349n47, 350n53, 350n63
- Meier, Heinrich, 116
- Mendelssohn, Moses, 241, 244, 254; *Plea for the Toleration of the Jews*, 256
- Mercier, Louis Sébastien: *Le Tableau de Paris*, 47; *Rousseau*, 204
- Mercken-Spaas, Godelieve, 289n77
- Merolla, Girolamo, 8
- Merriam, Charles, 185
- Mersenne, Marin, 126; *Harmonie universelle*, 300n42, 306–7n72
- Michels, Roberto, 211
- Mill, James, 135
- Mill, John Stuart, 127, 135, 156, 159, 245, 274, 276, 356n18
- Mirabeau, Victor de Riquetti, marquis de, *La science ou les droits et les devoirs de l'homme*, 209
- modernity, 187; and Cassirer, 234, 236, 237, 239; coherence of, 191; communitarian critics of, 210; and democracy, 211; and Enlightenment, 188; and Enlightenment Project, 210; and Foucault, 190, 198; and Hegel, 199, 203, 204, 205, 206; and Isaiah Berlin, 246, 248; jettisoned heritage of, 208–13; and Koselleck, 190; and liberty, 181–82; and MacIntyre, 260; nature and roots of, 189; passage from antiquity to, 178; and postmodernism, 134; and representation, 109; Rousseau's contempt for, 182; and secularism, 233; and Sieyès, 200, 207, 209, 212; and vice, 105
- Molesworth, Viscount, 270
- Molière (Jean-Baptiste Poquelin), 87; *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, 33
- Momigliano, Arnaldo, 248, 249
- monarchy, 83, 197, 210, 212
- Monboddo, James Burnett, Lord, 4, 10, 14, 305–6n68; *On the Origin and Progress of Language*, 131
- Mondolfo, Rodolfo, 214
- money, 102, 103–5. *See also* commerce; economics
- monkeys, 6, 9, 10, 24, 283n24. *See also* apes; orang-utans
- Montaigne, Michel de, 93, 126; *Essais*, 101
- Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat, baron de La Brède et de, 93, 94, 170, 193, 196, 276; *Esprit des lois*, 97, 208, 251; and government, 83; and Herder, 253; and human nature, 314–15n29; and Isaiah Berlin, 246, 252; *Lettres persanes*, 32, 251; and liberty, 171; and MacIntyre, 268; and Marx and Rousseau,

- 228–29; and Pufendorf, 96; and religious toleration, 240; and Sieyès, 201
- Moore, G. E., 275; *Principia Ethica*, 274
- morality: and anthropology, 28; and association, 216; and Cassirer, 239; decadent, 17; and Diderot, 269–70, 271; and free will, 167; and government, 169; and Hegel, 205; and human nature, 208; and Hume, 271, 274, 275, 276; and Hutcheson, 270–71; and Jaucourt, 269; and Kant, 210, 241, 271, 276; and language, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 62, 224; and liberty, 111, 166; and Locke, 135; and MacIntyre, 260–62, 263–64, 265, 266–67, 269–70, 272–74; and Marx and Rousseau, 226–30; and Montesquieu and Rousseau, 229; and music, 63, 64, 65; and natural differences, 25–26; and natural dissimilarities, 180; and natural law, 82, 89; and perfectibility, 26, 27–28; and physical dissimilarities, 16, 180; and production, 227, 228–29; and Pufendorf, 94; and self-love, 23; and social contract, 90; and society, 15, 163; and sovereign, 172; and state, 90, 98; and subjection to ruler, 106; and uniformity of human nature, 276; universal standards for, 260–61; and wealth, 103
- moral liberty. *See under* liberty
- Moravia, Sergio, 190
- More, Thomas, *Utopia*, 230
- Moréri, Louis, 269
- Morgan, Lady Sydney, *France*, 48–49
- Moses, 184
- Müller, Charles-Louis, *The Last Roll Call of the Victims of the Terror*, 233
- Murray, Johann Anders, 75
- music, 71–73, 78, 306–7n72; and ancient Greeks, 58, 129, 304–5n62; ancient vs. modern, 308–9n82; and barbarians, 64, 129; and basse fondamentale, 54, 56, 58, 130; chords in, 129; and culture, 59, 114; decline of, 18, 129, 130; and *Discours sur l'inégalité*, 114, 115, 116; diversity of conventions in, 57; evolution of, 57; French, 55–56; and French politics, 48–49; and Greek vs. Latin languages, 308n77; and harmony, 64, 296n26; harmony vs. melody in, 50–51, 52–53, 54–55, 57–58, 62–63, 71, 110, 163, 225, 300n41, 301–2n52, 303n60; instrumental, 64, 65, 130; Italian, 55–56; and language, 17, 51–52, 53, 55, 56, 59–67, 71, 115, 129, 130, 161, 296n26, 305–6n68, 308n77; and liberty, 65, 115, 129, 163, 310n92; loss of meaning in, 61–62; and morality, 63, 64, 65; national styles of, 51, 55; nature of, 49; and painting, 57, 72, 303n60; and political theory, 129; and society, 64, 65–67, 130; and virtue, 72; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 86
- Namier, Lewis, 254, 257
- Napoleon I, 41, 194
- nation: and French Revolution, 191; and National Assembly, 198
- National Assembly, 194, 196, 198, 199, 200, 203, 205, 206, 207, 212, 342n40
- nation-state, 196–203; advent of, 29; and civilization, 45; and Enlightenment Project, 209; and French Revolution, 44–45, 196, 337n19; and personality of the people, 212; and representation, 212; and republicanism, 212; and rights of man and rights of citizen, 212–13, 344n45; and Sieyès, 198–99, 200–202, 203, 207, 210, 213; and sovereignty, 337n19. *See also* state
- natural law, 105; anterior, 96–99; and collectivism, 91; defined, 89; generative, 99–104; and Hobbes, 82; and Jacobins, 111; modern vs. ancient, 94; moral, 97; and morality, 82, 89; and natural rights, 92–93; and passion, 92; and Pufendorf, 95, 99; and sociability, 14; and sociology, 185; and sovereign, 172; and state, 89, 111; and state of nature, 92, 167; superior, 89–93
- natural liberty. *See under* liberty
- natural rights, 92–93
- nature, 78; and animals vs. humans, 23; and Aristotle, 4; and botany, 75, 76; and chain of being, 10; and first communities, 15; and God, 117; and language, 17, 60–61; and Lévi-Strauss, 1, 2; and liberty, 161, 166; as making humans happy and good, 113, 160, 220; and music, 55, 58; passage to civil state from, 162; passage to culture from, 1, 22–23, 161; and Plato, 4; Rousseau's communion with, 88, 112, 164; and society, 22. *See also* state of nature

- Naturwissenschaften*, 246  
 Nazis, 234, 238, 239  
 Negroes, 9, 283n22  
 Newcastle, Earl of, 125, 126  
 New Liberals, 158  
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 85, 219, 237  
 Newtonian physics, 186  
 Nicole, Pierre, *Logique*, 276  
 Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm, 247, 249  
 Nozick, Robert, 134  
 Numa, 184  
  
 Oakeshott, Michael, *Experience and Its Modes*, 122  
 obligation, 97, 265, 268; and ancient Greeks and Romans, 157; and animals, 23; and Hobbes, 98, 108; and language, 13, 62; and MacIntyre, 265; and natural law, 91; and society, 92, 97; and state of nature, 97, 100  
 orang-utans, 12, 28, 131, 282n18, 283–84n31, 284n32, 285n41; and Herder, 24; humanity of, 8–10; and savages, 9, 11, 13. *See also* apes; chimpanzees; monkeys  
 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 114  
  
 Paine, Thomas, 197–98, 200  
 Palestinian state, 255  
 Palissot, Charles, 47  
 Palladini, Fiammetta, 101, 102; *Discussioni seicentesche su Samuel Pufendorf*, 99; *Samuel Pufendorf discepolo di Hobbes*, 99  
 Paris Commune of 1871, 211, 219  
 Pascal, Blaise, 87, 102, 264–65, 267  
 Pasquino, Pasquale, 203  
 passions, 99; and Hutcheson, 266; and language, 17, 60, 61, 62, 65, 129; and MacIntyre, 264, 265; and natural law, 92; slavery to, 158, 166–67, 170, 178; and society, 102–3  
 Passmore, John, *The Perfectibility of Man*, 290–91n93  
 Paul, 30  
 Payne, Robert, 125, 322n14  
 Pelagianism, 113, 276  
 perfectibility, 276, 290–91n93; and antiquity, 30; and corruption, 27, 113; and Enlightenment, 186; and humans vs. animals, 23; and liberty, 24, 179, 183; and malleability of human nature, 276; of men and apes, 24; and morality, 26, 27–28; and natural liberty, 24; and plasticity of human nature, 25; of primates, 10–11; and progress, 25, 26; and property, 26–27; Rousseau's concept of, 26–28; and society, 97; as source of misfortunes, 26; as term, 190, 334n5  
 Pergolesi, Giovanni, *La Serva padrona*, 297n27  
 Perrault, Claude, 4  
 Petty, Sir William, 4  
 Petty, William, 40  
*philosophes*, 195, 196; and Becker, 233, 251; influence of, 268–69; and Isaiah Berlin, 254; and Locke, 135; and natural goodness, 118; and perfectibility, 26; and religious toleration, 240; Rousseau's estrangement from, 160; Rousseau's relationship with, 82, 87; and toleration, 277  
 Philosophic Radicals, 135  
 philosophy, 82, 84–85  
 physics, 209  
 physiology, 194, 196, 208, 209  
 Piozzi, Mrs. (Hester Thrale), 35, 36  
 Pittard-Dufour, Hélène, 143, 144  
 pity, 22, 97, 99, 118, 306n71  
 Plamenatz, John, 130, 217, 219, 231; *Karl Marx's Philosophy of Man*, 214  
 Plan, Pierre-Paul, 141, 142–44  
 Plato, 93; and Grand Tour, 41; *Laws*, 72; and liberty, 157, 171; and nature and custom, 4; *Phaedrus*, 309n90; *Republic*, 31, 129, 165, 169, 230  
 pluralism, 246, 248, 249, 250, 251–52, 254, 356n18  
 Pocock, John, 122, 234, 258  
 Poland, 182  
 Polignac, Cardinal de, 13  
 politics, 92, 189; art of, 195; and human nature, 209; human nature as shaped by, 88; and Marx and Rousseau, 226; and natural law, 91; and social sciences, 193; and virtue, 88; and Volney, 195; and Voltaire, 82, 83  
 Pope, Alexander, 40, 117; *An Essay on Man*, 196, 248  
 Popkin, Richard, 126  
 Popper, Karl, 257, 258

- Port-Royal *Grammaire générale*, 276  
 postmodernism, 79, 134, 233, 235, 241, 250; and difference, 256; and Enlightenment, 251; and Isaiah Berlin, 246, 252, 253  
 poverty, 162, 178  
 Prague, 32, 43  
 Prague Spring, 257  
 Prévost, Antoine François, 251; *Histoire générale des voyages*, 8, 120  
 Price, Richard, 275  
 Prichard, H. A., 274  
 Priestly, Joseph, 135  
 priests, 22, 30, 115, 117. *See also* religion  
 Prior, Arthur, *Logic and the Basis of Ethics*, 275  
 privacy, 109, 111, 156, 170  
 production, forces and relations of, 221, 222, 224, 225, 227, 228–29, 347–48n34, 350n53  
 progress: and Enlightenment, 186–87, 204, 210, 252; and MacIntyre, 261; and perfectibility, 25, 26; and Pufendorf, 104; and Vaughan, 91  
 property, 101; abolition of, 179; and civil society, 15, 124, 168, 222, 223; corruption through, 16; and language, 16, 17–18, 162, 223, 224; and liberty, 106, 161, 162; and Locke, 97, 123–24, 168; and Marx, 227; and Marx and Rousseau, 218, 219, 222, 224, 225, 228; and perfectibility, 26–27; in persons, 15; and Pufendorf, 94, 100, 101; and society, 123; and state of nature, 101, 167; unequal distribution of, 178  
 Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, 159–60, 218  
 Proust, Marcel, 75  
 Pufendorf, Samuel, 31, 276, 287n49; and Barbeyrac, 313–14n19, 318n72; and Cumberland's *De legibus*, 314–15n29; *De jure naturae et gentium*, 93, 95, 101, 104, 106–7, 108, 134, 314–15n29, 316n45; *De officio hominis et civis*, 93, 97; and Diderot, 97, 98, 99; and Grotius, 316n45; and Hobbes, 99, 100, 102, 318n77; and human nature, 21, 314–15n29; and Hutcheson, 271; and Locke, 94, 123; and natural law, 82, 91, 167; and representation, 108; Rousseau's references and allusions to, 93–96; and sociability, 96–99, 103; and society and state of nature, 113–14; and voluntary subjection, 106, 110  
 Purchas, Samuel, 251  
 Pythagoras, 300n43  
 Pythagoreanism, 55, 72  
  
*Querelle des anciens et des modernes*, 189  
*Querelle des Bouffons*, 48, 49, 52, 53, 252, 297n27, 298n31  
 Quesnay, François, 'Évidence,' 135  
 Quetelet, Adolphe, 185  
  
*raison d'état, ragione di stato*, 29, 197  
 Rameau, Jean-Philippe, 50, 71, 72, 300n41, 302n58, 303n60, 306n69; *Code de musique pratique*, 299n36; and d'Alembert, 305n63; *Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie*, 54; *Erreurs sur la musique dans l'Encyclopédie*, 53, 54, 56, 57; *Génération harmonique*, 54; and Mersenne and Zarlino, 300n42; *Nouveau système de musique théorique*, 299n36; *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique*, 53, 54, 55, 56, 298n31; *Les Paladins*, 302n55; *Platée*, 302n55; *La Princesse de Navarre*, 302n55; and Pythagoras, 300n43; response to Rousseau, 52–57; and Rousseau's 'Choeur,' 302n54; Rousseau's response to, 57–67, 93, 129–31; and Serre, 300–301n44; *Traité de l'harmonie*, 54, 71  
 Raphael, David, 274–75; *The Moral Sense*, 275  
 Raynal, Guillaume Thomas François, *Histoire des deux Indes*, 252  
 reason, 252; and antiquity, 30; and Becker, 251; and Cassirer, 236, 238; dogmatic, 233; and Enlightenment, 186; and human development, 9; and human nature, 4; and Hutcheson, 266; instrumental, 233, 261; and Isaiah Berlin, 247; and liberty, 158; and MacIntyre, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 268, 272–73; and *Moral Letters*, 71; and state of nature vs. society, 97  
 Redouté, Pierre Joseph, 74  
 Reformation, 29, 30  
 Reid, Thomas, 135, 236, 275  
 Reinhold, Karl Leonhard, 244  
 religion, 30, 115; civil, 84; and culture, 114; and *Discours sur l'inégalité*, 117;

- religion (*cont.*)  
 in *Emile*, 70; and Enlightenment, 186;  
 and Isaiah Berlin, 251, 255; and Jau-  
 court, 269; and Locke, 135, 240, 255;  
 and MacIntyre, 262, 265; and Montes-  
 quieu, 208; and science, 233; and tolera-  
 tion, 240, 255, 277; and Volney, 195;  
 and Voltaire and Rousseau, 82, 84. *See*  
*also* priests
- Renaissance, 30, 31, 32, 189, 260
- representation, 96, 104–12; and civil soci-  
 ety, 109; and democracy, 211, 343n43;  
 as distorting, 110–11; and French Revo-  
 lution, 191; and Hobbes, 197, 212; and  
 liberty, 105, 106, 109, 110–11, 205–6;  
 and nation-state, 212; and Sieyès, 200,  
 207; and United States of America,  
 197–98
- republicanism, classical, 210, 211–12
- republic of letters, 30, 34–35
- republics, 70, 108; ancient, 203, 206; of  
 antiquity, 109, 112; democratic, 197–98;  
 modern, 176
- reverie, 71, 72, 75, 77–78, 112, 117, 138,  
 183, 184, 230. *See also* imagination
- Revett, Nicholas, *Antiquities of Athens*, 41
- Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 30, 251
- revolution, 88, 183, 231
- Rey, Marc-Michel, 150
- Ricardo, David, 215
- rights: and Cassirer, 238–39; civil, 238; and  
 Diderot, 98; and force, 171, 174, 229;  
 and Gray, 186–87; and Hobbes, 98;  
 human, 89, 213, 238; as inalienable,  
 238–39; of man and rights of citizen,  
 212–13, 344n45; and Marx, 228; and  
 Marx and Rousseau, 218; and nation-  
 state, 212–13, 344n45; natural, 97, 98,  
 261; and natural law, 89; and power,  
 172, 173, 207–8; and Pufendorf, 94,  
 100, 101; as safeguarded from state,  
 156; of slavery, 106; and state, 90
- Robespierre, Maximilien, 202, 204; and  
 Louis XVI, 199; misrepresentation of  
 Rousseau by, 111; and popular sover-  
 eignty, 112, 201, 206; and Rousseauism,  
 207; visit to Rousseau, 83
- Robinet, Jean-Baptiste-René, 10; *De la*  
*nature*, 26
- Roche, Daniel, 234
- Rochemont, M. de, 47
- Romans, ancient, 30, 211; and *Contrat so-*  
*cial*, 174; and equality, 177; and frater-  
 nity, 177; and Grand Tour, 40; and lan-  
 guage, 61; and liberty, 156, 157–58, 159,  
 176, 177; and music, 129; and plebi-  
 scites, 206; and Rousseau's contempt for  
 modernity, 182; taxes in, 104. *See also*  
 antiquity; Greeks, ancient
- Romanticism, 71, 164, 247
- Roosevelt, Franklin, 258
- Rorty, Richard, 250–51
- Rosenberg, Alfred, 240
- Ross, W. D., 356n18
- Rothschild, Emma, *Economic Sentiments*,  
 119
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 29; abandonment  
 of children by, 78, 81; articles for *Ency-*  
*clopédie*, 52, 53, 71, 72, 130, 299n34;  
 as Citizen of Geneva, 80, 85, 88, 164,  
 174; dictionary of botanical terms, 74,  
 75; discrediting of, 76; education of, 93;  
 and *Elyseum*, 74, 77; and Geneva, 85–  
 86, 88; influence on public affairs, 83;  
 and Island of Saint-Pierre, 77, 78; and  
 Jacobins, 272; and Lake Geneva, 78;  
 as legislator, 83; and *L'Ermitage*, 72,  
 76; letter of October 1757 to Sophie  
 d'Houdetot, 69; letter of September  
 1762, 132; letter to Saint-Germain of 26  
 February 1770, 137; 'Lettre sur la Provi-  
 dence' to Voltaire of 18 August 1756,  
 117, 118, 137; and Lisbon earthquake,  
 117; marriage of, 73; and money gifts,  
 73, 88, 164; as music copyist, 73; politi-  
 cal career of, 83; as secretary to French  
 ambassador to Venice, 52–53, 83; third  
 letter to Malesherbes, 78; transfer of re-  
 mains to Panthéon, 204; and visit from  
 Robespierre, 83
- 'Accompagnement,' 53, 71
- 'Choeur,' 302n54
- Confessions*, 21; and botany, 75; and  
 composition, 137–38; composition of,  
 76; and *Dictionary of Music*, 72; and  
*Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 305n66;  
 and French Revolution of 1753, 46–47,  
 294n3; government as shaping character  
 in, 169; and *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, 68;  
 and *Lettre sur la musique françoise*, 46–  
 47; love in, 69; and music, 71, 298n29;  
 prohibition of public readings from, 76;

- and Pufendorf, 93; and Tacitus, 319n5; and Voltaire, 118; and walking, 74
- Considerations on the Government of Poland*, 169, 176, 177
- Constitution pour la Corse*, 103, 104
- Contrat social*: and citizenship, 165; and commercial society, 129; condemnation of, 81; and constitution of Geneva, 230; and correction of abuses of liberty, 183; and corruption of civilization, 105; and culture, 18; and *Discours sur l'inégalité*, 117; and Engels, 218; and equality, 109, 177, 179; and finance, 104, 105, 177–78; and fraternity, 177; and French Revolution, 67, 113, 204–5, 218; and Geneva, 85, 331–32n38; and Grotius, 314n20; and Hegel, 203; and individual vs. collective, 90; and language, 223–24; and laws, 230–31; and *Lettre sur la musique françoise*, 49; and liberty, 164, 165, 170, 171, 173, 174, 177, 181, 182; and liberty and commerce, 103; and Livy, 114; and Marx, 215–16, 217, 218; and morality, 229; and moral liberty, 175; and natural law, 91, 92, 94; and perfectibility, 27; and Pufendorf, 96; and religion, 115; and representation, 104, 105, 107, 110, 206; and right and force, 229; and sovereignty, 172; and state, 205; and subjection to ruler, 106, 107; and Terror, 218
- Correspondance complète de Jean Jacques Rousseau* (Leigh edition), 127, 136–53
- Correspondance générale de Rousseau* (Dufour-Plan edition), 141–44, 148, 149, 325n8
- Le Devin du village*, 47, 52–53, 72, 297–98n27
- Dictionnaire de musique*, 52, 71–72, 73, 116, 251–52, 302n58, 303n60, 304–5n62, 306n69, 306–7n72, 308n79
- Discourse on Political Economy*, 169–70, 175, 183
- Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, 47, 84, 161, 162, 217
- Discours sur l'inégalité*: and anatomy, 7; and Castel, 180; and colonialism, 252; and *Du Principe de la mélodie*, 129, 130; editions of, 115–16; and Engels, 215, 216–17; and *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 59, 117; fragments of, 115–17; and Geneva, 85; and human development, 76, 230; and human evolution, 10, 12–13; and individual vs. collective, 90; and inequality, 92; and 'invisible hand,' 119, 139–40; and language, 14, 15, 114, 115, 116, 223; and liberty, 161, 163, 165, 166, 174, 179; manuscripts of, 116; and Marx, 215, 216–17; and Monbodo, 131; and music, 114, 115, 116; and natural law and state of nature, 92; and natural right, 97; and orang-utans, 8, 11; and Ovid, 114; and passage to civil state from state of nature, 105; and perfectibility, 26, 27, 179, 290–91n93; philosophy of history in, 115; and priests, 117; and property, 219, 222; and Pufendorf, 93–95, 96, 101, 104; and religion, 115, 117; and representation, 105; and savages, 97; and Smith, 118–19; and sociability, 102; and social decay, 64–65, 115; and social impurities, 70; and society as depraving, 113; and subjection to ruler, 106, 107; and Voltaire, 118, 317n70
- 'Dissonance,' 71
- Du Principe de la mélodie*, 116, 128–30, 323n19, 323n21
- 'Economie politique,' 94, 97, 217, 315n36
- Emile*: and Bloom, 132–33; and citizens, 165; condemnation of, 81; and correction of abuses of liberty, 183; and Cumberland, 314–15n29; and Defoe, 215; and education, 133; and goodness of mankind, 113; and illusion, 230, 232; and *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, 133; and law, 92; and Lévi-Strauss, 1, 289n77; and liberty, 164–66, 183; and Locke, 132; manuscripts of, 132, 133; and modernity, 207; and money, 103; and Montesquieu, 229; 'Profession de foi du vicairé Savoyard,' 115, 132–33; and religion, 70, 82, 115; and sensation and judgement, 135
- Emile et Sophie*, 183
- Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 305n66, 307–8n76, 310n95; and corruption, 114–15; and *Discours sur l'inégalité*, 116, 117; and economics, 102; and finance, 177; and language, 102–3, 114–15; and liberty, 161, 163; and Marx, 217; and money, 104, 105; and music, 114, 129,



- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (*cont.*)  
 296n26, 301–2n52, 303n60, 304n62;  
 and Pufendorf, 104; and religion, 114;  
 Rousseau's reply to Rameau in, 59–67;  
 and society, 16–17; and submission, 225  
 —'L'Etat de guerre,' 93  
 —*Examen de deux principes avancés par*  
*M. Rameau*, 57–59, 116, 303n60,  
 310n95  
 —*Les Fêtes de Ramire*, 86  
 —'Fundamental Bass,' 71  
 —*Gouvernement de Pologne*, 104, 206  
 —'Imitation,' 72  
 —*Julie, ou La Nouvelle Héloïse*, 68–69, 70,  
 73, 74; and *Emile*, 133; and equality, lib-  
 erty and fraternity, 177; and love, 68–69;  
 and money, 104; and public participa-  
 tion, 230; Voltaire's opinion of, 86  
 —*Lettre à Christophe de Beaumont*,  
 289n81  
 —*Lettre à d'Alembert sur les spectacles*,  
 70, 104, 132–33, 162–63, 176, 217, 230  
 —*Lettre à M. Grimm sur 'Omphale'*,  
 299n34  
 —'Lettre à Philopolis,' 8  
 —*Lettres de la montagne*, 85, 94, 132, 170,  
 173–74, 182–83, 208, 230, 331–32n38  
 —*Lettres morales*, 183  
 —*Lettre sur la musique française*, 59, 72,  
 301–2n52, 303n60, 307–8n76; central  
 theses of, 49–52; compositions treated  
 in, 297–98n27, 298n29, 299n36; public  
 reaction to, 46–49; Rameau's response  
 to, 52–57  
 —'Lettre sur la Providence,' 84  
 —*Lettre sur les spectacles*, 85  
 —*Manuscrit de Genève*, 90, 92, 94, 95,  
 97, 98  
 —*Manuscrit Favre*, 132, 289n81  
 —'Mémoire à M. de Mably,' 93  
 —*Moral Letters*, 70–71  
 —'Music,' 72  
 —'Musique,' 308–9n82  
 —'Notes,' 72  
 —*Observations sur l' 'Alceste' de Gluck*,  
 303n60  
 —*Oeuvres* (Lequien edition), 141, 325n8  
 —*Oeuvres complètes* (Georges Streckeisen-  
 Moulto edition), 115–16, 117, 142  
 —*Oeuvres complètes* (Hachette edition),  
 142  
 —*Oeuvres complètes* (Moulto-Du Peyrou  
 Geneva edition), 141  
 —*Oeuvres complètes* (Muset-Pathay  
 editions), 141–42, 325n8  
 —*Oeuvres complètes* (Pléiade edition), 90,  
 116  
 —'On Public Happiness,' 181  
 —'On the State of War,' 161–62  
 —'Opera,' 72  
 —'Plainsong,' 72  
 —*Project for a Constitution for Corsica*,  
 177, 178  
 —'Projet pour l'éducation de Sainte-  
 Maire,' 93  
 —*Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, 27, 74,  
 75, 76, 77–78, 124–25  
 —*Rousseau, Judge of Jean Jacques: Dia-*  
*logues*, 71, 77  
 —'System,' 72  
 —*Troisième Dialogue*, 113, 114  
 Rousseau, Thérèse, 73  
 Rousseauism, 136, 160, 207  
 Royal Academy, 41  
 rulers, 96, 105–6, 108, 184  
 Russell, Bertrand, 155  
 Russia, 41, 83, 351n78  
  
 Sade, marquis de, *The New Justine*, 168  
 Saint-Just, Louis Antoine Léon de, 201, 272  
 Saint-Lambert, Jean François de, 69,  
 307–8n76  
 Saint-Pierre, Bernardin de, 138  
 Saint-Pierre, Charles Castel, abbé de, 29  
 Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy,  
 comte de, 185, 195–96, 208; *Introduc-*  
*tion aux travaux scientifiques du XIXe*  
*siècle*, 196; *Mémoire sur la science de*  
*l'homme*, 196  
 Saint-Simon, Louis de Rouvroy, duc de,  
*Mémoires*, 33  
 Sandel, Michael, 261  
*Sattelzeit*, 189, 190, 191, 333–34n3, 334n4  
 Saussure, Horace Bénédicte de, 42  
 Sauttersheim, Ignaz de, 73  
 savages, 283n22; and animals, 97; and  
 apes, 6; change into citizens, 165; deca-  
 dence of, 103; and degeneration, 7–8;  
 and evolution, 7; and human plasticity,  
 25; and impurities of society, 70; and  
 language, 14; and law, 92; and Lévi-  
 Strauss, 1; and liberty, 165, 166, 167–68;

- and natural catastrophes, 14–15, 115;  
and orang-utans, 9, 11, 13; overcoming  
of defects of, 113; and Pufendorf, 95; as  
self-reliant, 96, 102; as self-sufficient,  
118–19; and territorial proximity,  
14–15, 115
- Scandinavia, 41
- Scholasticism, 89, 264, 266, 270, 276
- Schopenhauer, Arthur, 249
- Schuhmann, Karl, 126
- Schumpeter, Joseph, 211
- science, 185; Cartesian, 209; and Cassirer,  
237; and Isaiah Berlin, 250, 251; and  
MacIntyre, 261; natural, 185; and reli-  
gion, 233; and submission, 225; and Vol-  
taire, 84, 86
- science de la société*, 195
- science de l'homme*, 195
- science de l'ordre sociale*, 193
- science de l'organisation sociale*, 196
- sciences morales et politiques*, 193
- science sociale*, 190–91, 192–94, 208, 209
- Scotland, 270; and Treaty of Union of  
1707, 265, 270
- Scottish Enlightenment, 244, 263, 265–67,  
268
- Scouten, Arthur, 247
- secularism, 31, 233, 266
- Selby-Bigge, L. A., *British Moralists*, 275
- self-interest, 100, 104
- self-love, 22–23, 99, 103, 110
- self-reliance, 186, 347n23
- sensationalism, 208
- Serre, Jean Adam, *Essais sur les principes  
de l'harmonie*, 300–301n44
- Sewell, William, 203, 338n25, 339n28,  
341n38
- sexuality, 15; and education, 165; and Fou-  
cault, 190; and language, 17; and orang-  
utans, 11; and Pufendorf, 95
- Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, third  
earl of, 266
- Shakespeare, William, *As You Like It*, 70,  
230
- Short Tract on First Principles*, A, 125–26,  
127, 322n14
- Sidgwick, Henry, 274
- Sidney, Algernon, 85, 318n72
- Sieyès, Emmanuel-Joseph, abbé, 194, 195,  
203, 335–36n10; and democracy, 207,  
211; and general will, 200, 201, 206,  
212; and Hegel, 207, 338n22; and  
Hobbes, 198–99, 207, 341n35; and  
Louis XVI, 199; and modernity, 207,  
209, 212; and nation-state, 198–99,  
200–202, 203, 207, 210, 213; and  
physiocrats, 341n38; and popular  
sovereignty, 201–2, 206; *Qu'est-ce que  
le tiers-état?*, 192–93; and representa-  
tion, 207; and Rousseauism, 207; and  
Smith, 208, 341n38; and social sciences,  
208; and sovereignty, 198–99; and Ter-  
ror, 207
- sin, original, 26, 30, 113, 118, 270
- Sirven, Pierre-Paul, 84
- Skinner, Quentin, 122, 197, 245, 328–  
29n8; 'Liberty before Liberalism,' 258
- slavery: and ancient Greeks, 182; in antiq-  
uity, 104–5; civilization as, 130; to com-  
pulsions, 25; and ethos of private gain,  
178; and Marx, 227; to passions, 158,  
166–67, 170, 178; and poverty, 162,  
178; and property, 16; right of, 106; as  
self-imposed, 161–62; and Voltaire, 106.  
*See also* liberty
- Smellie, William, 11, 283–84n31
- Smith, Adam, 101, 119–20, 208, 215, 268,  
276, 341n38; and source of phrase 'in-  
visible hand,' 119–20, 139–40; *Theory  
of Moral Sentiments*, 118, 119, 120; *The  
Wealth of Nations*, 119
- Smith, James Edward, 36
- Smollett, Tobias, 32
- sociability, 14, 95, 96–99, 101, 314–15n29;  
commercial, 100, 102, 103
- social class, 162, 219, 220, 222, 226
- social contract, 211; and Ardre, 21; and  
Engels, 218; and Hegel, 218; and human  
nature, 168; and Locke, 90; and Marx  
and Rousseau, 219; and morality, 90;  
and natural law, 91; and state, 175. *See  
also* contract; Rousseau, Jean-Jacques—  
*Contrat social*
- socialism, 179, 211, 212
- social sciences, 187, 246, 248; and  
Ardre, 2; development of, 190–91,  
192–96; and England, 257; and French  
Revolution, 191; modern, 186, 188;  
physiological conception of, 208; and  
Sieyès, 208
- Société de 1789*, 193, 194
- Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 143

- society: and Ardrey, 11–12, 21; and Cassirer, 239; commercial, 79, 112, 129, 261; and conflict, 99; as corrupt/corrupting, 87, 92, 98, 103, 104, 112, 115, 183; and culture, 18, 19, 22, 24, 225; decay of, 64; as denaturing man, 163–64; as depraving, 113–14, 160, 220; development of, 3; and Diderot, 98; diversity among different, 19; and duty, 99; illusory bonds of, 224–25; improvement of, 183; impurities of, 70; initial formation of, 14–15; and instinct, 4; and language, 14–19, 20, 62, 65–67, 97, 102–3, 114, 224; and law, 92, 222; and *Lettre sur la musique françoise*, 50; and liberty, 97, 161, 163, 165, 167–68, 224; and MacIntyre, 266; market, 120; and Marx and Rousseau, 220–26; misery from, 113–14, 118, 160, 220; and morality, 15, 163; and music, 64, 65–67, 130; mutual dependence in, 22; nature and culture in, 22; need for, 102; passage from state of nature to, 178; and passions vs. needs, 102–3; and perfectibility, 97; and physical explanation for culture, 24; and physical properties and faculties, 8; and property, 123; and Pufendorf, 95, 99–100; Rousseau's estrangement from, 76, 77; and *sociologie*, 196; and sociology, 185; and state of nature, 93, 96–97, 113–14, 167; symbolic relations of, 18; and timidity vs. aggression, 102; and vice, 168. *See also* civilization; culture
- Society of Dilettanti, 40–41
- sociology, 185, 189, 196
- Solon, 114
- Sorell, Tom, 126
- sovereign: absolute, 156, 159, 174, 179; constraints on, 92; and Hobbes, 159, 171, 228; and liberty, 91, 156; and morality, 172; and natural law, 172; and totalitarianism, 179; as voice of people, 110. *See also* rulers
- sovereignty: absolute, 171, 172; and Bodin, 197; concept of, 171–72; and English government, 85; and equality, 171; and Hobbes, 108, 174, 197, 207, 211; and Jacobins, 201; and liberty, 88, 173, 174; and Marx and Rousseau, 226, 227; and nation-state, 337n19; of Parliament, 107; popular, 109; representation of, 107–8, 109; and Sieyès, 198–99, 201; as voluntary subjection, 211
- sovereignty, popular: and citizens, 112; and Constant, 159, 329n12; and constraint, 172; and democracy, 206; and French Revolution, 261; and general will, 172; and government, 172; and liberty, 160, 171, 174; and Locke, 201–2; and Robespierre, 206; Rousseau's support of, 206; and Sieyès, 201–2, 206; and tyranny, 111–12
- Spain, 41–42
- Sparta, 157, 174, 176, 182
- speech, 65, 78; and barbarians, 17; corruption of, 161; and human development, 9; and human vs. animal behaviour, 9, 10, 13, 14, 59; and music, 51, 52, 55, 56, 59, 60–61, 63–64; poetic vs. prosaic, 305–6n68; prosaic, 225; and writing, 110, 309n89. *See also* language
- Spengler, Oswald, 262
- Spink, John, 132
- Spinoza, Baruch, 134, 158, 240, 255, 276
- Stair, Viscount, 265
- Starobinski, Jean, *La transparence et l'obstacle*, 110, 288n70, 290–91n93
- state: ancient vs. modern, 176; and citizen/citizenship, 90, 109, 110, 111; and collectivism, 91; and duties, 90; establishment of, 107; free, 157; and French Revolution, 188, 191; and general will, 204; and Hegel, 188, 189, 191, 204, 205; and Kant, 210; and liberty, 88, 90, 157, 163; and morality, 90, 98; and moral liberty, 175; and National Assembly, 198; and nation-state, 197; and natural law, 89, 111; personality of, 191, 197; and popular sovereignty, 109; and Pufendorf, 95; and representation, 110–11; and rights, 90; rights as safeguarded from, 156; and Sieyès, 198–99, 200, 203; and social contract, 175; and Voltaire and Rousseau, 84, 85. *See also* nation-state
- state of nature: and Cassirer, 239; and duty, 99; as free of vice and danger, 113; and Hobbes, 113–14, 161; and individuals, 91; and language, 14, 97; and liberty, 91, 161, 163; and natural law, 92, 167; and natural liberty and perfectibility, 23; passage to civil state from, 101, 105; passage to society from, 178; and pity,

- 99; and plasticity of human nature, 25;  
and property, 101, 167; and Pufendorf,  
94–95, 100; and Rousseau's contempt  
for modernity, 182; savages as orang-  
utans in, 11, 13; and society, 93, 96–97,  
113–14, 167; and Switzerland, 42. *See*  
*also* nature
- Staum, Martin, 190
- St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, 30
- Stephen, James Fitzjames, 356n18
- Stevenson, C. L., 273, 275; *Ethics and Lan-  
guage*, 274
- Stoics, 89, 100, 276
- Strauss, Leo, 210, 248
- Streckeisen-Moultou, Georges, 115, 116,  
117
- Stuart, James, *Antiquities of Athens*, 41
- Suárez, Francisco, 123
- subjection, voluntary, 96, 105–12, 211
- Swift, Jonathan, *Gulliver's Travels*, 251
- Switzerland, 32, 33, 42
- Tacitus, 18, 114, 319n5
- Taine, Hippolyte, *Origines de la France  
contemporaine*, 261
- Talmon, Jacob, 159, 186, 233, 271; *Origins  
of Totalitarian Democracy*, 250
- Tartini, Giuseppe, 72, 303
- Taylor, Charles, 261
- Teleki, Geza, 284–85n39
- Terror: and *Contrat social*, 218; and  
Engels, 218; and French Revolution, 261;  
and Hegel, 203, 204, 205, 206, 218; and  
Jacobins, 202; and MacIntyre, 271–72;  
and *science sociale*, 194; and Sieyès, 207
- theatre, 78, 110; and vice, 162–63, 225;  
and Voltaire and Rousseau, 85, 86
- Thévenin, Nicolas-Eloy, 139
- Thirty Years' War, 29
- Thucydides, 41, 157
- Tillich, Paul, 239, 256
- Tocqueville, Alexis de, 82, 189, 342n40
- toleration, 82, 240, 255, 276–77
- Tolstoy, Leo, *War and Peace*, 254
- Tönnies, Ferdinand, 125
- totalitarian democracy, 159, 186, 233
- totalitarianism, 49, 111, 154, 156, 171,  
182; and absolute sovereign, 179; and  
*Emile*, 165–66; and Koselleck, 204; and  
MacIntyre, 271–72; Rousseau as antici-  
pating, 184; and Talmon, 159
- Tour de Franqueville, Mme de la,  
294–95n4
- Toynbee, Arnold, 262
- Traité des droits de la reine*, 94
- Treaty of Utrecht, 29, 44
- Treaty of Versailles, 45
- Treaty of Westphalia, 29, 44
- Trotsky, Leon, 211; *Our Political Tasks*,  
331n37
- Tuck, Richard, 122, 125–26, 128, 322n10
- Tully, James, 123–24, 126, 321–22n6;  
*Locke in Contexts*, 124
- Turgenev, Ivan, 253
- Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques, baron de  
l'Aulne, 101, 276, 290–91n93
- tutors, 133, 154, 165–66
- Tyson, Edward, *Orang-Outang*, 12
- United States, 197–98, 200, 213, 257
- Usteri, Leonhard, 142–43
- utilitarians, 135, 261, 264, 274
- van Lawick-Goodall, Jane, 284–85n39
- Vaughan, C. E., 111, 112; *The Political  
Writings of Rousseau*, 89–91, 92
- vice: and government, 169; modern, 182;  
and modernity, 105; and society, 168;  
and theatre, 162–63, 225
- Vico, Giovanni Battista, 245, 246–47, 248,  
249, 305–6n68
- Vicq-d'Azyr, Félix, 196
- virtue, 82; ancient, 105, 112, 182; and civil  
society, 88, 92; and French Revolution,  
272; and government, 169; and Mac-  
Intyre, 265; and music, 72; and perfect-  
ibility, 27; from political life, 88; repub-  
lic of, 220
- Volney, Constantin François, 195, 336n13
- Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet), 33; *Can-  
dide*, 84, 118, 251; and Cassirer, 237,  
239; *Correspondence*, 144–47, 149,  
151–52; *Dictionnaire philosophique*, 82,  
285n41; and Enlightenment, 208; *Les  
Fêtes de Ramire*, 86; and Frederick the  
Great, 31; and French Revolution of  
1753, 48; influence on policy, 83; intel-  
lectual style of, 87; and Isaiah Berlin,  
250; *Lettres philosophiques*, 85, 135,  
255, 277; and Lisbon earthquake, 117;  
and MacIntyre, 268; *Poème sur le désas-  
tre de Lisbonne*, 84; reputation of, 80,

- Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet) (*cont.*)  
 86; and Rousseau, 80–87, 93, 145; and  
 Rousseau's *Discours sur l'inégalité*, 118,  
 317n70; Rousseau's 'Lettre sur la Provi-  
 dence' to, 117, 118; *Sentiment des citoy-  
 ens*, 81; and slavery, 106; and toleration,  
 82, 240, 277; and vampires, 22
- Waldron, Jeremy, 123, 124, 126
- Wallace, Alfred Russel, 219; *The Malay  
 Archipelago*, 11
- Wallas, Graham, 185
- Walpole, Horace, 33, 35, 37
- Walsh, William, 248
- Walter, Bruno, 239, 256
- war, state of, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 161, 168
- Warens, Françoise Louise, Madame de, 73,  
 75, 93
- Wartensleben, comtesse de, 138–39
- Weber, Carl Maria von, *Turandot*, 73,  
 304n62
- Weber, Max, 189
- Weimar Republic, 239, 240, 256
- Weizmann, Chaim, 258
- Welch, Cheryl, 190
- Weldon, T. D., 155
- Whewell, William, 274
- White, Hayden, 247
- Wieland, Christoph Martin, 244
- will: and force, 181; free, 167; and Hegel,  
 204, 339n29; individualist notion of,  
 339n29; and liberty, 158, 165, 166–67;  
 and Marx, 228; and Marx and Rous-  
 seau, 222; material forces independent  
 of, 222; moral, 172; and sovereignty,  
 171; submergence of separate under col-  
 lective, 175. *See also* general will/*volonté  
 générale*
- Wilson, Edward, 18
- Winckelmann, Johann Joachim, 40, 41
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 134, 257
- Wolff, Christian, 238, 256
- Wolin, Sheldon, 210
- Wordsworth, William, 42
- World War II, 45
- Zagorin, Perez, 126
- Zarlino, Giofesso, *Istitutioni harmoniche*,  
 300n42
- Zionism, 254–57, 258